

Textkompendium

Vi har tidigare läst litteratur och texter som vi själva valt och återberättat för varandra, den här gången har vi satt ihop ett kompendium för gemensam läsning.

De texter vi har valt till detta kompendium kan läsas ur de sammanhang de är skrivna men även ur de sammanhang och tid ni befinner er i med era projekt. Vi hoppas att texterna ska slå ner i temat kommunikation som vi passerat och framåt i teman som berör ekonomiska resurser, ledarskap och makt, vårt sammanhang och framtidsvisioner.

Vi kommer under internat 22-23 april att ha textseminarium – då vi diskuterar texterna tillsammans.

Tankar och frågor ni kan ställa er under läsningen:

- a) Hur upplever du texterna? Varför upplever du texterna så?
- b) Vad vill texterna uttrycka? Vad uttrycker de i relation till era projekt?
- c) Vad betyder texterna i världen? I ditt egna rum och din egna tid?
- d) Vilka betydelsefulla likheter och skillnader hittar du i relation till din egna tid och ditt egna rum?
- e) På vilka villkor skapas språket i texterna?

Texterna:

vithet och konst.

- On White Privilege and Museums av Nina Simon, hon är Verkställande direktör för Santa Cruz Museum of Art & History,
- ON BLACK ARTISTS av Toni Morrison

rörelser.

- What can social innovation learn from the power of personal testimony? Lessons from the Quipu project in Peru

motstånd.

- Angelou – The Mask av Maja Angelou

Wednesday, March 06, 2013

On White Privilege and Museums

Two weeks ago, Roberto Bedoya [asked](#) several arts bloggers, including me, to write a post reflecting on Whiteness and its implications for the arts. I am in no way an expert in issues related to racial and ethnic representation in the arts. I write this piece in good faith about the organizations I know best: museums.

As a feminist, when I really think about this issue, I realize that it's not solely one of Whiteness. It is one of privilege, and so for the most part, I'm going to cast it in that way.



The vast majority of American museums are institutions of white privilege. They tell histories of white male conquest. They present masterpieces by white male artists and innovations by white male scientists. The popular reference point for what a museum is--a temple for contemplation--is based on a Euro-centric set of myths and implies a white set of behaviors. Other reference points for museums--as community centers, as place-based narrative vehicles, as social or performance spaces--are suspect and often branded as "unprofessional."

Three quick lenses on Whiteness and privilege in museums:

1. Whiteness is in the language we use to describe the objects that we show and the programs we produce. When non-white stories are told, they are always flagged as such--an exhibition of Islamist scientific inventions or women pioneers or African-American artists. I will never forget walking through a major art institution in San Francisco and being shocked by the fact that artwork in the African and Oceanic sections was often labeled with modifiers like "beautiful,"--words intended to legitimize that only exacerbated the sense that these objects were not legitimate artworks in their own right. I never saw comparable adjectives used in the European art labels at the museum. I remember a photography exhibition in Boston where one photograph of three young ballerinas was labeled with their names. A second image, of three ballerinas with Down Syndrome, were labeled with their difference. The message, when museums produce targeted campaigns or events or exhibitions for non-white audiences is: we acknowledge you as others in our midst. Not as humans, or artists, or scientists, or dancers. As others.
2. Whiteness is in the way professionals react to non-white projects. I wrote [an angry response post](#) two years ago to [Edward Rothstein's New York Times denunciation](#) of "identity museums" as inappropriately attention-seeking and "me"-oriented. As if every white museum is not itself an "identity museum" of the privileged, white "me." The insidious thing about privilege is the opportunity to stop using a modifier like "identity" or "white" and instead refer to your culture as canonical.
3. Whiteness is in the behaviors we expect of our visitors, volunteers, and staff members. I recall one particularly ugly incident in St. Louis in which museum marketers required staff members to delink a signature youth program's web presence from the main site because the kids involved were "too black" for the brand image of the institution. Just last month, there was [the story](#) of the low-income family kicked out of a Paris museum for being "too smelly." Privilege sanctions white institutions to make ugly assumptions and choices at cross-purposes to their messages about diversity and inclusivity.

The white privilege frame distorts the extent to which museums can represent and reflect the diversity of humanity. This distortion is not merely political or theoretical. The sad irony is that the Whiteness of museums is crippling their future--not just for multi-racial or marginalized audiences, but for everyone. When the NEA reports [twenty years of declining participation](#) in traditional arts institutions, it's not portraying a mass exodus of African-American and Latino audiences. It's talking about white people. One of the odd artifacts of white privilege is the privilege to ignore the fact that an increasing percentage of white people don't find museums relevant.

The "temple for contemplation" construct is the most damaging myth about museums in existence today. It doesn't match actual visitor behavior (most people visit museums in groups and self-report that their social experience is one of the top three reasons for their enjoyment of the museum). It doesn't match visitor motivation (John Falk's extensive visitor identity research has shown that "spiritual pilgrimage" fits a small minority of visit motivations). It doesn't match arts engagement preferences for active, social experiences. And yet it looms in the popular culture, preventing would-be participants of all backgrounds from discovering the ways that a museum visit can fulfill other identity-related needs.

Unsurprisingly, the museums that are bucking these trends are those that have embraced a different reference point: one of an interactive, educational, social experience. I'm talking about zoos, aquaria, science centers, and children's museums--all of which do a much better job supporting and stewarding diverse participation than traditional art, history, and science museums. These museums offer more inclusive experiences, and they reach broader audiences.

The most galling artifact of white privilege in museums is expressed in their extreme reluctance to confront the reality of increasing irrelevance. Only an organization in the most privileged position could experience declining participation and argue that its relevance is increased because of its relative rarity. Only an organization suffering from extreme delusion and a healthy endowment could dismiss inclusive forms of engagement as "pandering." I have worked with white museums in majority-black cities that are neither willing nor forced to accept the fact that they are not representative of their communities. The fact that a city or state history museum could blithely disenfranchise the majority of its citizens is shocking. And it's made possible because of the privileged position of Whiteness.

How is this discussion different in 2013 than it was in the 1980s and 1990s, when the "diversity wars" were raging at museums and other arts institutions? When I look back on debates and writings from that time, the statements about inclusion and fairness are just as apt as if they were written today. The difference, I think, is two-fold:

1. On the positive side, there is more data, and therefore more arsenal, to mount an argument that the position of Whiteness and privilege in traditional museums and arts institutions is unrepresentative of our entire population's interests and needs. Shifting ideas about authority, access to information, and arts participation crosses racial, socio-economic, and generational boundaries. White privilege is becoming increasingly antiquated and indefensible.
2. On the negative side, increased efforts at inclusion have been treated primarily as add-ons and not as necessary changes to the heart of white institutions. Now, when asked about diversity, most white institutions can point to a particular program or initiatives and say, "we've got that covered." In the worst cases, demographically-targeted programs can be used as fundraising shells ("poverty pimping") to protect the white privilege machine that most of the budget fuels. The overall result is that white museums are grossly unprepared to meet the challenge of dramatic shifts in demographics and cultural engagement interests. They've

added colorful patches to their garments when the whole cloth needs to change.

I am a white woman. I cannot change my race or gender. What I can do is acknowledge the privileged frame which I have been granted, and try with humility and openness to relentlessly challenge and expand it. I feel this is something that we have to do both personally and institutionally to make our organizations as relevant and essential as possible.

<http://museumtwo.blogspot.se/2013/03/on-white-privilege-and-museums.html?m=1>

+ *Se kommentarer på sidan!*

TONI MORRISON ON BLACK ARTISTS

July 9, 2014 <http://www.arraynow.com/our-blog-archive/2015/8/13/toni-morrison-on-black-artists>

On May 30, 1975, the author and intellectual Toni Morrison visited Portland State University and gave a speech, followed by a Q+A with a panel of academics. That speech was recently uncovered by an archivist and posted by the Portland State Library, then tweeted and amplified by a blog called The Anti-Intellect Blog.

The excerpts below from Ms. Morrison's speech were transcribed by AFFRM Founder Ava DuVernay.

Toni Morrison on Black Artists | Portland, 1975

"Free dedicated artists reveal a singularly important thing: that racism was and is not only a public mark of ignorance, it was and is a monumental fraud. Racism was never the issue. Profit and money always was. The threat was always jobs, land or money. When you really want to take away, to oppress and to prevent, you have to have a reason for despising your victim. Racism was always a con game that sucked all the strength of the victim. It's the red flag that is danced before the head of a bull. It's purpose is only to distract. To keep the bull's mind away from his power and his energy. Keep it focused on anything but his own business. It's hoped for consequence is to define black people as reaction to white presence.

Nobody really thought that black people were inferior. They only hoped that they would behave that way. They only hoped that black people would hear it all and weep or kill or resign or become one. They never thought black people were lazy - ever. Not only because they did all the work, but they certainly hoped they would never try to fulfill their ambitions. And they never thought we were inhuman. You don't give your children over to the care of people you believe to be inhuman, for your children are all the immortality you can express. Racists were never afraid of sexual power or switchblade. They were only interested in the acquisition of wealth and the status quo of the poor. Everybody knows that if the price is high enough, the racists will give you whatever you want.



It's important to know who the real enemy is and to know the very serious function of racism, which is distraction. It keeps you from doing YOUR WORK. It keeps you explaining over and over your reason for being."

It may very well be left to artists to grapple with this fact (the distraction). For art focuses on the single grain of rice, the tree-shaped scar and the names of people shipped not only the number. And to the artist one can only say: not to be confused. You don't waste your energy fighting the fever. You must only fight the disease. And the disease is not racism. It is greed and the struggle for power.

And I urge you to be careful for there is a deadly prison. A prison that is erected when one spends one's life fighting phantoms, concentrating on myths and explaining over and over to the conqueror

your language, your lifestyle, your history, your habits. And you don't have to do it anymore. You can go ahead and talk straight to me.

To avoid the prison of reacting to racism, is a problem of the very first order. Where the mind dwells on changing the minds of racists is a very dank place. Where the spirit hangs limp. Where the will that you allow to be eroded day by day by consistent assaults of racists, the will just settles into a tiny heap of sand.

Racial ignorance is a prison from which there is no escape because there are no doors. There are old men and old women running institutions and organizations all over the world who need to believe in their racism. And need to have the victims of racism concentrate all their creative abilities on them. They thrive on the failures of those unlike them. They are the ones who measure their wealth by the desperation of the poor. They are in prisons of their own construction and their ignorance and stunted emotional growth consistently boggles the mind. But the artist knows that we are human.

If you look at the world as one long brutal game between us and them, then you bump into another mystery. And that's the mystery of the tree-shaped scar. There seems to be such a thing as grace, such a thing as beauty, such a thing as harmony. All of which are wholly free and available to us.

-- After her speech, Ms. Morrison was asked the following question. Her answer follows:

Q: How can the black artist exercise any influence and control in spite of the fact that media is controlled of white people?

A: One has a tendency to have tremendous awe for "it." As if it were some magic. The television or the book review. It really is of no consequence when it comes to doing important work. The media originates nothing. It simply digests what exists. It can enlighten and it can distort. But it does not initiate and it does not create.

The best analogy can be found in music. Black people's music is in a class by itself and always has been. There's nothing like it. The reason for that is because it was not tampered with by white people. It was not on the media. It was not anywhere except where black people were. And it is one of the artforms in which black people decided what is good in it. Nobody told them. What surfaced and what floated to the top, were the giants and the best. And it was done without the media. In spite of the control.

That is true of any artform that is A) not imitated. B) does not seek to justify or explain anything. The black artist must do what all the other artists do. Talk to each other. I love Russian literature. It never occurred to me that Dostoyevsky needs to explain something to me. He's talking to other Russians about very specific things but it says something very important to me and was an enormous education for me. When black writers write, they should write for me. Richard Wright isn't talking to me. He's talking to some white people. Same with Leroi Jones and the Dutchman. He's explaining something to them. It may have been very necessary and it is well done. But it wasn't about me and wasn't talking to me. And I know when they are talking just past my ear. When they are explaining something. Justifying something. Defining something.

But when that's no longer necessary and you write for all those people in the book who don't even

pick up the book. Those are the people who justify it. Those are the people who make it authentic. Those are the people you have to please. All those non-readers. All those people in *Sula* who A) don't exist and B) if they did wouldn't buy it anyway. They are the ones to whom one speaks. Not to the NY Times. Not to the editors. Not to media. Not to anything. It is a very private thing. They are the ones who say "yea, uh huh that's right." And when THAT happens, very strangely or actually very naturally what also happens is that you speak to everybody. And even though it begins as very inward and private, the end result is its communication with the world at large.

I don't really care about that control. Life is short. Freedom is in my mind. That's where one is free. There's always some other constriction. But the very important point is to do the work that one respects and do it well. And to make no compromises in its authenticity. And to do it better next time.

And the key - the artist's role is to bear witness, to contribute to the record, the real record of life as he or she knows it. Perceptions that are one's own... You exercise control only when you assert control.

To me, all art is political. And I don't make a distinction between the artist and the real work a day world. I don't subscribe to the idea of the artist as a separate aesthetic being sitting in an ivory tower just suffering and talking about beauty. It is work. It is hard work. There is a lot that needs to be done. It's not about sitting under willow trees and being inspired. It has something to do with work... I approach my work the same I expect a chairmaker to make theirs. I find out about the wood. All about my craft. I have to look at the human body. Try to make it beautiful and comfortable and try to make it long lasting. And that's what writers ought to do. Find out all they have to know about their craft. Find out all you have to do about that - then do your work. And as a human being you have responsibilities to the community, whether you make a chair or make a book.

In Africa, people would make beautiful sculpture and they wouldn't sign it. It didn't have anything to do with signing. They had to get the crops in and feed the family. The marketplace separates art from the people. Makes an artist separate and special. The artworld has been separated from the poor despite the fact that all art emanated from the poor. Dance. Theater. All of it. All started with poor people. Whether it's through religious rites or what have you. And someone who makes a tapestry but cannot write a word is somehow made to feel that they can't go to museums and understand anything. The separation of the artist from politics is artificial, wholly dependent on finances - when you have people making distinctions outside of the tradition of art.

When black artists speak to each other and to black people, what happens is that the message is received by people outside the group BETTER. Richard Wright made a significant statement. It didn't do any good. It changed the language a little bit, the metaphor. Didn't change anyone's heart or mind at all. At all. Educating the conqueror is not our business. But if it WAS important, the best way to do it is NOT to explain anything to him. But to make ourselves strong. To keep ourselves strong.

You can't consistently think of the power as a formidable power. It's really nothing. It really isn't anything at all.

What can social innovators learn from the power of personal testimony?

<http://socialinnovationexchange.org/categories/read/six-speaks-with-sandra-tabares-duque-from-quipu-project>

What can social innovators learn from the power of personal testimony? Lessons from the Quipu project in Peru



Photo Credit: Quipu project

We spoke with Sandra Tabares-Duque from [Quipu Project](#) about the power of storytelling. The Quipu project is currently featured on Guardian Documentaries [here](#). Also, find out more about Quipu project and hear more testimonies on [their interactive platform](#).

What is storytelling for you? Why do you think it is important?

I think that storytelling is something that belongs to all of us as human beings. Storytelling is a way to relate to who we are, it's a way to describe who we are, and it's a way of understanding where we come from. It's a way that helps us to create identity and also to create stories that help us to engage compassionately to other human beings. I think that stories help us to connect to the rest of the

What can social innovators learn from the power of personal testimony?

world and the universe around us. So storytelling is a way of expressing what we see and what we believe we are. It helps us build our own identity and the perception of the world we live in basically.

Do you think that in recent years that storytelling has taken on more importance than before?

I don't think that in modern times it has become any more important than it was in the past. I think that storytelling has had different platforms. For many years we had literature, which is a part of storytelling, so books were read and they were very political. We also had songs and poetry that described the world and that have been able to amplify the messages of people. So there have been different ways and different expressions that have different ways of telling story using a range of narrative forms.

Lately, we have had more access to storytelling through video and audio outlets. This, to me, has a larger impact because it is much more immediate. It brings images directly from those who live experiences. Straight away we get a faster connection to that particular experience. I think because of this we are in the era of visual storytelling, and by using tools like films, what we do is spread a message easily and widely in terms of number of people reached. This generates a social reaction that, thanks to other platforms available right now, also generates a social movement that can be more powerful than a piece of theatre performed for just a few hundred people, for example.

What is the social impact of storytelling? What is the value?

In any case when someone tells a story that can reach someone else's heart that has a huge amount of value. If I tell a story and I can be compelling enough for you to create an image in your head or to touch your heart in a way that helps you identify with what you are hearing, it's more likely that you are going to do something about it. It allows the person on the other side of the story to put on someone else's shoes, or to experience someone else's experiences and emotions. As I said before, I think the impact is much more immediate than just reading a big report. It's much more emotional. Through audio-visual storytelling, we use elements that help us highlight the emotions we want to highlight. It is about trying to have an objective point of view, but no story that has been told by a third person will ever be completely objective. So there is something subjective about it, and by that subjectivity, what we use are elements that touch on our emotional side, such as the use of music or powerful colours.

We are always editing in our lives. We edit our conversations with friends, we edit our relationships with partners, we edit everything. So that's exactly what we do as well. We edit to create powerful narratives that we believe are going to get other people to engage in the message we want to build. You try to inspire people to come on board with a viewpoint, idea or a message that you have. It helps a lot to get other people to buy into and believe in that idea as well. It adds weight to your work if it is supported by the voices of other people, especially the voices of the people you are talking about. Images, voices, colour, music and text together are extremely powerful and can generate a powerful impact when used together.

Tell us about an example of powerful storytelling that brings all these elements together and has imparted a positive impact?

I can definitely talk about the Quipu project.

What can social innovators learn from the power of personal testimony?

The impact we have created is first at the level of community. The impact we have seen with the project is through the way in which we engaged with communities. We used technology to enable this. The first impact we saw was when all the women affected by forced sterilisation, recorded their voices and listened to their own messages -- the moment they recorded their own voices and listened to what they were saying. It was amazing. It was very simple but they had never listened to their own voices before. That generated something at a personal level for those people that had been fighting for justice for a long period of time. They listened to their own messages and this provided the first level of healing. They had told their story many times before, but had never listened to their own voices. It was slightly shocking for them, in a way, to hear that story coming out in their own voices.

The second thing that happened with them was that they realised that they were telling the story in a way that was probably not benefitting the legal case. They managed to practice, over the phone, how to tell their story better so that the prosecutor would be able to engage better with them. So that's the first level of impact that we created, and it occurred without any expectations from our end.

The second level of impact, from a very basic level that we identified, was the phone line and use of technology as a way to put people in touch. This forced policy of sterilisation was a national issue. But the different communities, because of the distance, thought that the sterilisation policy had occurred in just one place. They believed it had just affected their own small community, rather than the reality -- which was a policy that affected thousands. So the possibility of communicating from community to another through these telephone lines meant that they could come together as a collective of thousands asking for justice. This was an extremely important impact, because the project allowed them to go to Lima, and march for justice together. That created a different atmosphere in their fight also, because many voices, from many different parts of the country started to work together in order for their collective voices to have a bigger impact. On a different level, it also generated an emotional healing impact for the people involved in the project.

The project also brought attention to the issues from different areas. If this story had been told as a report and put on a website, it's likely only few people would have engaged with it. But the fact that it has the platform that it does, means that it has gone and has been spread around over 110 countries around the world. More people have also been able to relate to these stories as well due to the fact that the testimonies of these victims were translated into English. That has brought the issue to the attention of the international community, and this sentiment has now returned to Peru, where before people were uninterested by these stories and put little importance. This topic has now risen directly to the top of political priorities in Peru, and in fact, in the last two presidential elections, the issue of forced sterilisations has been fundamental in electing the president of the country. We can't claim that we have been directly responsible for this with the Quipu project, but we have certainly helped bring attention and understanding at the level of political decisions and policies.

What are some of the challenges of collecting personal testimonies and stories on film?

There are many. With different types of testimonies being collected, one needs to be aware of what legal repercussions are there in the world. One also needs to think about how best to protect identities, how to protect the dignity of people, and to know how much you can share. You have a legal duty as a citizen to protect the rights of the people you are interviewing. There is also a moral responsibility as well in the intention of wanting to tell a story that is powerful, and there are a number of ties and connections between documentary-makers and journalists in this regard. It is about how you can create stories and how can you treat people and their testimonies in a way that

What can social innovators learn from the power of personal testimony?

they are respectful, that they do not victimise them further. We talk a lot about victims, but when we do, what kind of language are we using? How are we portraying people? At what level are we putting them as empowered human beings? So language and context, although complicated, are hugely important.

Through the Quipu project, we tried a number of different testimony collection techniques, primarily surveys and questionnaires. However after trying a number of different methods, we realised, by far that the best way of getting the real and whole story, was through the simplest means, personal testimony. People know how to tell their stories, and we, as intermediaries, tend to believe that they need us to be able to bring those stories in a compelling way to the Western world. This belief that we are the decoders, that we are the ones that allow this communication, is ludicrous. Just allow the testimony of people speak for itself. That to me is significantly more powerful, because the cameras, the recorders, do not intimidate them and they are just able to be themselves.

What can social innovators learn about storytelling?

There are a lot of ways in which the paths cross. We all want to contribute towards society and generate ways to approach an issue or challenge in order to solve it creatively or differently. Sometimes these fantastic ideas get lost in a lot of paperwork and a lot of reports that only relate to statistics. Quite often these reports are much more closely related to academia, which is of course is important, but can sometimes be less engaging. So with these alternative ways of storytelling, we can connect more to the human being behind the story than just the facts and statistics. You are connected at a much more identifiable, human level. I keep saying this, but this emotional connection is extremely powerful. And I think in order for social innovation to be able to bring more understanding of what they are doing, it is important to adopt some of these connecting techniques, and learn the value of a simplified message.

What projects are you working on currently?

We are going to expand the Quipu project to the jungle region, and continue collecting testimonies from the Andean regions. This will allow us to demonstrate that the policy of forced sterilisation was systematic and widespread within the country.

Another trans-media project I will be taking part in is called *[Mi Casa My Home](#)*, which looks on the symbolism and significance of home, belonging and ownership. Huge numbers of people have to leave their birth country or their hometown, to work in different countries, in order to be able to get the money to build a house back home. There is huge paradox there, that in order to construct a home for yourself and your family, you must leave those two things behind for an unknown period of time. A number of these people never return home, because of perhaps legal, or safety reasons, or due to the fact that many of them are fundamentally changed by the migration process and experience, to the point that they feel they cannot go back home. Obviously this has an impact on a number of levels, particularly on those of identity and belonging.

Thank you so much for taking the time to speak to us Sandra, it's been really fascinating!

(Photo Credit: [Quipu project](#))

14 February 2017 By Duncan Collins-Adams & So Jung Rim for SIX

The Mask
BY MAYA ANGELOU

We wear the mask that grins and lies.
It shades our cheeks and hides our eyes.
This debt we pay to human guile
With torn and bleeding hearts...
We smile and mouth the myriad subtleties.
Why should the world think otherwise
In counting all our tears and sighs.
Nay let them only see us while
We wear the mask.
We smile but oh my God
Our tears to thee from tortured souls arise
And we sing Oh Baby doll, now we sing...
The clay is vile beneath our feet
And long the mile
But let the world think otherwise.
We wear the mask.
When I think about myself
I almost laugh myself to death.
My life has been one great big joke!
A dance that's walked a song that's spoke.
I laugh so hard HA! HA! I almos' choke
When I think about myself.
Seventy years in these folks' world
The child I works for calls me girl
I say "HA! HA! HA! Yes ma'am!"
For workin's sake
I'm too proud to bend and
Too poor to break
So...I laugh! Until my stomach ache
When I think about myself.
My folks can make me split my side
I laugh so hard, HA! HA! I nearly died
The tales they tell sound just like lying
They grow the fruit but eat the rind.
Hmm huh! I laugh uhuh huh huh...
Until I start to cry when I think about myself
And my folks and the children.
My fathers sit on benches,
Their flesh count every plank,
The slats leave dents of darkness
Deep in their withered flank.
And they gnarled like broken candles,
All waxed and burned profound.
They say, but sugar, it was our submission
that made your world go round.

There in those pleated faces
I see the auction block
The chains and slavery's coffles
The whip and lash and stock.
My fathers speak in voices
That shred my fact and sound
They say, but sugar, it was our submission
that made your world go round.
They laugh to conceal their crying,
They shuffle through their dreams
They stepped 'n fetched a country
And wrote the blues in screams.
I understand their meaning,
It could an did derive
From living on the edge of death
They kept my race alive
By wearing the mask! Ha! Ha! Ha! Ha! Ha!

An adaptation of the poem *We Wear the Mask*
BY PAUL LAURENCE DUNBAR

We wear the mask that grins and lies,
It hides our cheeks and shades our eyes,—
This debt we pay to human guile;
With torn and bleeding hearts we smile,
And mouth with myriad subtleties.

Why should the world be over-wise,
In counting all our tears and sighs?
Nay, let them only see us, while
 We wear the mask.

We smile, but, O great Christ, our cries
To thee from tortured souls arise.
We sing, but oh the clay is vile
Beneath our feet, and long the mile;
But let the world dream otherwise,
 We wear the mask!