

# **Jung and the Ancestors**

**Beyond Biography,  
Mending the Ancestral Web**

**Sandra Easter**

**mhp**  
muswell hill press  
London • New York

of our lives is the key to becoming conscious of and fulfilling one's destiny—that which is ours and ours alone to realize. Gathering pieces from the past we become more conscious of how the lives of our ancestors are implicated in our personal story in very particular ways. This allows each of us to come into a dynamically co-creative relationship with our individual fate, thus fulfilling our destiny.

## CHAPTER 3

### Beyond Biography

*Every story has many beginnings; in any given moment we choose a place to start the telling.*

—From a dialogue with the ancestors

#### Illustrious Origins

One of the family stories I grew up with was the story my mother told of our illustrious origins on this North American continent—that we were descended from Roger Williams, the man credited with founding Rhode Island. She was very proud of this. I thought this was just a story, one that gave my mother a sense of connection to the past and more meaning and purpose to our ordinary lives. It was my older daughter Melissa who picked up the thread of Roger's story from my mother and handed it back to me.

In a conversation Melissa and I had when she was about five years old, she told me that she had come here to get me on my path. In the moment, her words were out of context and shocking. They were clearly beyond her conscious awareness and outside of anything I expected to hear from my five-year-old daughter. I knew and felt the unconscious reaching out to me through her. Through her interest in Roger I discovered the truth in my mother's story and the deep roots of our family's legacy. Melissa did indeed get me on my path.

My family history and the past mattered little to me until I married and had two daughters of my own.<sup>1</sup> My older daughter Melissa was given a school assignment in the fourth grade to research and report on a famous Maryland historical figure. (We were living in Maryland at the time.) Having heard the story about Roger from my mother, she insisted on doing her report on our ancestor. She's very persuasive and got her teacher's permission to do her research on Roger. Synchronistically, the day Melissa

received her teacher's permission, I received a complete genealogical diagram from my Aunt, my mother's sister. We were, I discovered, directly descended from Roger Williams. I am this man's great-granddaughter times nine. In fact, five generations back, two of Roger's descendants from his son Joseph married each other, bringing that original DNA together again in a new time and place. The connection I thought was imagined was in fact very substantial and real. Melissa and I began to explore the story of Roger's life. This was the beginning for me of consciously reconnecting with the origins of my fate.

The historical context for my life took shape with each new discovery and story. As my journey unfolded, I became aware that the ancestors who had a hand in my fate, whose questions were unanswered, were not limited to my personal ancestry. They included the ancestors of people indigenous to this land, an archetypal figure who haunted the women in my maternal lineage for centuries, and finally, the ancestors and elders of the rich academic tradition of which this work is a part.

The more I learned through historical and genealogical research and through imaginal dialogues, the more I became aware of the way the threads of my personal trauma were intricately woven into the history and memory of this land and the many-layered fabric of the collective story. My symptoms in the present, in the immediacy of somatic and emotional memory, "re-membered" a decisive moment in the collective history of the North American continent and a traumatic event in my ancestor's life. Over time I began to see that "my" trauma, "my" symptoms, the entire story of my life, was continuous with a much longer "chain of events" whose origins were multi-located.

### Ancestral Legacies—Origins Without Cause

On March 29, 1676, after many years of conflict and negotiated peace, Roger Williams walked to the top of a hill overlooking Providence to meet with Cuttanque, one of the sachems who was leading the march of native people up the coast with the intention of destroying every European settlement in their path. King Philip's War had been raging for over a year, but Providence, excluded and separate from the Massachusetts Bay Colony, remained neutral. The Quinitticut sachem told Roger that Providence was to be burned. Providence had been built on land that Roger and others lived on only by agreement with the Narragansett grandfathers and grandmothers of the men who were now destroying it. This land, although purchased from the Narragansett, was in Roger's words, "a gift of love."

In a letter written to his brother on April 1, 1676 Roger wrote, "I asked them why they assaulted us with Burning and Killing who ever were kind Neighbours to them (& looking back) said I this Hous of mine now burning before mine Eyes hath lodged kindly some Thousands of You these ten Years."<sup>2</sup>

I have been told that Williams understood the gift culture of the Indians.<sup>3</sup> His relationship with the Algonquin tribes was unusual for a European of that time. Williams spent much of his time with the Narragansett and Wampanoag Indians. They considered him a man of integrity and wisdom, and a friend. Understanding the native languages and culture, he served as mediator in negotiations and treaties between Indians and Europeans in the northeastern part of what is now America for many years. Canonicus, a Narragansett sachem and one of the men who gave my ancestor the land that he would call Providence, and Roger remained neighbors and friends until Canonicus' death. When Canonicus was dying he sent for Roger and with "the last of that man's breath . . . [said he] desired to be buried in my cloth of Free gift and so he was."<sup>4</sup> Gausstad, in his biography of Williams, using quotes from Roger's letters writes: Williams attended Canonicus' funeral. His relationship with this man was founded on mutual respect. In one of his letters after the funeral he would write, "when the hearts of my countrymen and friends failed me, it was the 'infinite wisdom and merits' of Canonicus that sustained him. This sachem loved him as a son 'to his last gasp.'"<sup>5</sup> According to Gausstad, these two men shared the dream and hope that English and Indian could live together peacefully, generation after generation.

But times had changed since the grandfathers of the sachem he stood with on the hill had given Roger the land. For the people native to this land, King Philip's War was an attempt to rid the land of Europeans, the people who had taken their land and who had through trade and commerce introduced molasses, liquor, small pox, and influenza. Plagues had decimated entire villages. By the time this war began, trading no longer benefited the Indians. They gradually became more dependent on Europeans for their survival. Incurring debts for European goods, they traded more of their land.

For the Indians, Providence was just another English settlement, associated now with Plymouth and Boston, towns that had repeatedly broken treaties and appropriated land at will. Williams reminded the sachems that were present that day—Nahigonsets, Cowwesets, Wompanoag, Neepmucks, and Quitticoogs—that Providence was a "Thoughtfare Town" which "had never acted hostilely" against them. He told Cuttanque, that they (the Indians) had forgotten that "they were Mankind."<sup>6</sup> Cuttanque responded saying that "they were in a Strang Way" which they had been forced into by the English and that "God was [with] them and Had

forsaken us [English] for thy had so prospered in Killing and Burning us far beyond What we did against them."<sup>7</sup> The argument heated up. Roger said that God favored the English and that "God would help us to Consume them Except they Heartned to Counsel. I told them they knew how many times I had Quenched fires between the Bay and them, and Pimoth, and Quanticut, and them."<sup>8</sup>

LaFantasie, in his notes on this letter, finds this passage, along with other passages in the letter that express more conventional Puritan opinions on the war as "a sign of God's wrath and as divine punishment for the loss of faith," to be contradictory to Williams' understanding as expressed in his other letters and in historical documents. In the past, Williams ordinarily disagreed with the Puritans interpretation of events as god's will, whether punishing or providential.<sup>9</sup> He suggests that Williams's opinions might have changed or that he wrote this to meet his reader's expectations as he had done in other writings. He also notes that the way Williams expressed himself in this letter may more accurately characterize the "tone of his diplomatic encounters"—"more direct, forceful and even challenging" than the mythic, tactful and patient "roving ambassador" that many historians have portrayed.<sup>10</sup>

Roger was a complex, passionate, idealistic man of deep and strict conscience. Moreover, he was a practical man of vision. Over the centuries, he would become known for his ideas regarding "soul liberty," liberty of conscience and the separation of church and state. He was known as a pioneer of religious liberty, an irrepresible democrat, and a friend of the Indians. He had welcomed Indians into his home, had walked with them for hundreds of miles learning their language and customs. Yet, after the war, according to Patricia Rubertone, author of *Grave undertakings: An archaeology of Roger Williams and the Narragansett Indians*, he served on the committee that was charged with the task of "determining the fate of Indian war captives. . . . Although the enslavement of Native peoples was prohibited in Rhode Island, Williams, as a member of the committee . . . helped devise a plan for selling captives into 'involuntary servitude' for periods of years."<sup>11</sup> Rubertone believes that Roger took this war very personally—"a war waged directly against him and his idealism . . . in which he was badly defeated."<sup>12</sup> From my experience in dreams and imaginal dialogues I believe for my ancestor King Philip's War was deeply personal and painful.

As the story of that fateful day continues, Cuttanque came across the river to meet with Williams after asking him to show that he was unarmed. Roger wrote, "We had much repetition of the former particulars Which were debated at the Poynt."<sup>13</sup> Cuttanque told Williams that they had broken their treaties and that "you have driven us out of our own Countrie and

then pursued us to our great Miserie & your own, & we are forced to live upon you."<sup>14</sup> As they spoke, houses were already in flames. Roger "told them there were Wayes of peas [peace] . . . and planting time was accomplishing."<sup>15</sup> Cuttanque told Roger "they cared not for Planting these Ten Years. They would live upon us and Dear."<sup>16</sup>

For these Algonquin, it was too late to negotiate a peace with Providence. There was too great an imbalance in power and resources between the English and Indians. English betrayal was now part of the pattern of colonization and broken treaties. Seeing the inevitable future, the only solution for the people native to this land was to drive the English from it. According to Roger's letter to his brother, the two men parted "civilly" and Cuttanque advised him to go by the waterside and not near particular houses so he and his family would be safe. Roger, now in his seventies, watched as his neighbors were murdered and Providence burned. His home was not spared. I can only speculate as to the "truth" of other scholar's interpretations and understanding of Roger at this particular moment in his life. I can only imagine how the two men standing there on the hill that day felt in the midst of a war that both knew would determine the future of what is now New England. So much was at stake for both of these men, their way of life, and their people.

The consequences of European colonization of this land are still being felt and its echoes reverberate within the American collective psyche. This letter, excerpted above, represents one particular moment in a long complicated history, a moment which was fateful for Roger personally and for this country collectively. Many other conversations had taken place and much happened between the time Roger first set foot on this continent and the day he stood on the hill watching Providence burn. The conversation as shared in Roger's letter between these two men—one Native, one English—in some ways summarized the more complex "conversation" and interactions of that time in the history of this land and its peoples and reflected the complex nature of Williams' longstanding relationship with the Narragansett and other tribes of the region.

King Philip's War was devastating, brutal, vicious, and full of cruelty. The Indians burned more than half of the English colonists' towns and had pushed them back almost to the sea. Although the English suffered losses great enough that they were almost forced to abandon New England, Indian losses were even greater. According to Drake's account of this war in *King Phillip's War: Civil war in New England, 1675-1676*, looking at seventeenth-century New England as "America's origin," this war had the highest casualty rate per capita in America's history.<sup>17</sup> "Both sides suffered tremendous loss of life and property."<sup>18</sup> Thousands of Indians were killed or died of disease or starvation. Those who survived were enslaved.

Any semblance of equality between these two peoples vanished with the removal of a majority of the Indians from the territory. The losses suffered by the English were so great that they became more dependent on England for their survival. According to Drake, this war not only brought an end to a generation of co-existence between colonists and Indians, it fundamentally changed the political, social and economic landscape of the region. This war completely changed the face of the northeastern coast of this continent and the dynamics within the region. The legacy of this war haunted both Indians and colonists for many years. Many other battles and wars on the North American continent would follow.

The postwar reconstruction brought with it new struggles resulting in even more bloodshed and loss. In the ten years that followed, the last of his life, Roger would persist in his argument with other English settlers in Rhode Island who continued to expand the boundary lines of their property into Narragansett land. Roger stated clearly in letter after letter that this was Narragansett land, which the English had no right to based on their written agreement with the Narragansett. But the victors of the battle for land in New England had already been decided in the war.

A Wampanoag woman at the Pimoth Plantation, in sharing her personal story, told me the Narragansett and Wampanoag still suffer greatly from what began then. Her son was forbidden from speaking his native language in the public school. Sitting, talking with her, I witnessed the separation and discomfort felt by many of the white people visiting this Native part of Pimoth Plantation. The relationship between American Indians and the dominant culture in the U.S. continues to be complex and strained in many ways. Although given land as an act of restitution, she and many others had to sell their land because they could not pay the taxes. The “great Miserie” that Cuttaguene spoke of to my ancestor continues today. The European legacy in North America continues. I have been told for American Indians the conflict never ended. They have been resisting for over three-hundred years.

### Reconciling Head and Heart

Ochwiay Bianco tells Jung in their conversation at the Taos Pueblo that the “whites” think with their heads. When Jung asks what he thinks with, Ochwiay Bianco responds, “We think here” as he points to his heart.<sup>19</sup> Centuries before this conversation, my ancestor, Roger Williams, in his encounters with the Wampanoag and Narragansett, experienced the split between “civilized” and “primitive” on an interpersonal and intercultural level. His

book, *A Key into the Language of America*, creates a picture of his experience of two radically different cultures—one English, Christian and civilized, the other, Narragansett, pagan and “savage.”<sup>20</sup> Within his depiction and juxtaposition of these two radically different peoples and cultures, the internal conflict and tension Roger felt personally “between the head and the heart” is poignantly expressed.<sup>21</sup> He could not reconcile the admiration and respect he felt for the men and women native to this land with what he believed theologically.

It seems trivializing to reduce Roger’s struggle to reconcile his head with his heart to an unanswered question. Meeting him in dreams and through ancestral dialogues, I have felt his anguish, his desire, his despair. Roger spent his life negotiating peace between two radically different peoples. When Providence burned, his idealistic hope for peace and reconciliation between Europeans and the people Native to this land was reduced to ashes along with the homes and gardens that burned to the ground. This was a war that he couldn’t imagine and thought should never have happened. His pain, grief and hope retained its affective potency in the unconscious as I experienced it standing on the hill with him in the transferential dialogue described in Chapter 1.

### “This Uncompleted Work Has Followed Them . . .”<sup>22</sup>

On July 28, 1629, Roger met with other Puritans in England to discuss journeying to America to escape religious persecution.<sup>23</sup> One of the other men at that meeting was John Cotton. This was the first time Cotton and Williams met. My ex-husband Clark is a direct descendant of John Cotton through his mother’s father. Unaware of our ancestry, three-hundred-sixty-one years later, my ex-husband Clark, and I married on July 28, 1990, on land given by King Charles to Lord Baltimore in 1634.<sup>24</sup>

Cotton and Williams, initially shared the same beliefs, dreams, and fears. As time went on they would ultimately find themselves in an ongoing and heated conflict over religious, civil, and political philosophy. Clark’s ancestor was one of the men responsible for exiling Roger from the Massachusetts Bay Colony for religious heresy and for his public denouncement of the English for taking Indian land beyond what had been traded, sold or given. In this time, centuries later, Clark and I were married and living on land that he would inherit that had been given to Lord Baltimore not by the Indians of that region, but by the King of England. The past was present, the story in many ways the same, but with new possibilities as the times had changed and their conflict could be engaged with in the context of these times and our relationship.<sup>25</sup>

I discovered that the synchronicity of the dates of my birth and wedding anniversary are not uncommon indications of specific connections between an individual life and the lives of one's ancestors. Schutzenberger, a French Freudian psychoanalyst who uses a transgenerational approach in work with her clients, coins the term "anniversary syndrome" for the coincidence of dates which she discovered frequently become apparent in this work. She found that a date that is meaningful in the life of an individual in the present marks the anniversary of an event in the past that had a significant effect, positive or traumatic, on the family or a particular family member. She writes, "It seems that the unconscious has a good memory, likes family bonds and marks important life events by repetition of date or age."<sup>26</sup> A birth date is often coincidental with the anniversary of a specific event in the history of the family. Schutzenberger found that these coincidental anniversaries indicate a link between that individual in the present and the event in the past. Discovering this kind of synchronicity can reveal a dynamic and meaningful connection between the individual in the present and a specific event in the life of the historical family or with a particular individual in one's lineage, or both. Theoretically she defines these as expressions of the "family and social transgenerational unconscious."<sup>27</sup> This is similar but not identical to Jung's concept of the collective unconscious.

As a Freudian, Schutzenberger sees the coincidence of dates only as indications of repressed family material that must be made conscious in order for the individual to be free to live her individual life. This, in part, is true. Jung's work provides us with a broader perspective. These synchronicities may also reveal meaningful connections that carry more than repressed family material.

Recognizing the synchronistic connection between my birth date and my wedding anniversary was the beginning of a process that has involved more than bringing a repressed memory to consciousness. Bringing my story into relationship with the other stories which came to light through these synchronicities, *Understanding our ancestors' relationship brought new understanding to my relationship with Clark*. Situated within this ancestral and historical context, the unanswered questions and unresolved parts of this longer story, as they are specifically related to my life now, became more apparent. As time went on, I also began to see the way our relationship was an answer to the past in service to an ever-evolving story and the generations that would follow.

Even though the men and women who left England for this new land had seen and suffered from religious persecution themselves, most of them expected a uniformity of beliefs and worship in America. The Puritans who colonized Massachusetts in the seventeenth century, of which Clark's

ancestor and my ancestor were a part, never intended it to be a place of conflicting opinions. They established a theocracy in which there was one church and religious law superseded and determined civil law. In the eyes of the Massachusetts Bay Company, a heretic was more dangerous than a murderer. The reason, according to Polishook, "the murderer destroyed a person in this life only, but the heretic killed a soul forever!"<sup>28</sup> Williams, unlike his peers, believed that governments, receive their power from the people, not from God. As a Puritan who disputed the sacred right of Kings and the sacred character of government my ancestor, Roger, was not welcome in England. After coming to this land, once again considered a heretic, he was soon not welcome in Massachusetts.

While Roger shared the fundamental principles of the majority of Protestants in New England at the time, his interpretation of the Bible led him to concepts that were in direct conflict with his contemporaries. Williams, unlike Cotton and other Puritans, had become a separatist, severing all ties with the Church of England. His ideas regarding "soul liberty"—that every man and woman should enjoy "liberty of conscience" and the right to worship as they chose—were in radical opposition to the ministers and government officials in Massachusetts. His opinions about the separation between civil and religious law, state and church, challenged the very foundation of the Massachusetts government and clergy. He considered the Indians to be the rightful owners of the land. His continuing declarations that the colonists had no religious or civil right to the lands of the Indians except through direct purchase just added fuel to the already blazing fire of a very public argument.

Cotton, on the other hand, advocated the commonly shared idea of most of his contemporaries of a union of church and state law. He and other Puritans believed that "the essential purpose of society was the glorification of God. . . . They feared the religious purity of the nation could not be achieved without state intervention."<sup>29</sup> Along with most other English colonists of his time, he believed that the English had a sovereign and spiritually ordained right to Indian land. In one of their many public disagreements, Cotton denounced Williams' support of toleration and soul liberty. For Cotton and other Puritans, only one freedom was granted by God—the "freedom to accept His will."<sup>30</sup>

Over time Massachusetts Bay Company was fearful about and confronted with hostility from Indians beyond their borders. Their relationship with England also became dangerously strained. As these tensions mounted, Roger's public protestations and challenges became more and more problematic for the colony. Looking for ways to solidify the new government and the developing colony, the General Court decided to require that every colonist take an oath of loyalty. Williams objected to this oath on religious

principles. His very publicly shared opinion was considered seditious. This was the proverbial straw that broke the camel's back.

Cotton, the most prominent minister in the colony, who had a very good personal relationship with Roger, was called in to help. He was certain that he could get Williams to publicly retract his statements and stop his public protestations. This issue remained unresolved for months. Williams, not surprisingly, refused. Considered to be dangerous to the peace of the colony and "beyond redemption," Roger was ordered to leave Massachusetts. Cotton was part of the company of ministers who, along with the General Court, made this decision. Even with these fundamentally different and publicly debated disagreements, Roger and John remained friends. Living a life of conviction and principle was something they shared and respected in each other.

In January of 1636, warned that the government was preparing to ship him back to England, Roger fled south from Massachusetts. Months later, having survived a New England winter "in the Wilderness," he made it beyond the borders of Massachusetts to Narragansett territory where he was given land by Canonicus and Miantonomi, Narragansett sachems. Money was refused in exchange for this land. Williams called this a gift of love and saw it as evidence of the divine providence of God. Thusly named, Williams founded Providence.

In Providence each individual was allocated the same amount of land and the right to worship as he or she so chose. He, along with others who followed him to Providence, created a community, an "experiment," where church was separated from state, and where decisions would be arrived at by mutual consent not dictatorial authority.<sup>31</sup> Founded on his concept of soul liberty, Quakers, Jews, and individuals who were considered heretics found a home there. The first synagogue on this continent was built in Providence. According to the Colonial Women's History Project, Providence was also where "the first legal decision in the seventeenth century New England colonies to uphold a woman's right to 'freedom of conscience,' that in matters of thought and belief, a woman could be seen as independent of her husband's control."<sup>32</sup> Following this momentous decision, Jane Verin's husband Joshua whisked her back to Salem, Massachusetts. According to the Rhode Island Commission on Women report, "Preliminary conclusions indicate that subsequently, Jane actively challenged the authority of the Salem Church and suffered admonishment, removal from church and corporal punishment for her beliefs."<sup>33</sup>

Until his death, Williams continued his argument with other New Englanders about their "right" to American Indian lands. Unlike most of his contemporaries and Cotton, Williams did not see the people native to this land as primitive savages. His friendship with Canonicus was one of the

most important and meaningful relationships in his life. From his letters and books, it seems to me that he considered Amerindians equals. In his first published book, *A Key into the Language of America*, it is clear that he saw them as more authentically Christian than the Europeans who had been baptized as such. He writes,

*Boast not proud English, of thy birth & blood,  
Thy brother Indian is by birth as Good.  
Of one blood God made Him, and Thee & All,  
As wise, as faire, as strong, as personall.*<sup>34</sup>

Teuissen and Hinz, the editors of the 1979 edition of Roger's *Key*, differentiate this book from others that presented and discussed Indian language and culture. In other works there was a tendency to view the people native to this land as exploitable resources.<sup>35</sup> In contrast, *A Key* shows Roger's deep appreciation of these people.

*A Key* was not intended to be a simple dictionary of Indian language. In his introduction to the book, Roger wrote that he intended this book to be "[a] little *Key* [which] may open a *Box*, where lies a bunch of *Keys*."<sup>36</sup> The book is written metaphorically. Williams uses language as a way of framing and contrasting Amerindians and their culture with that of the English. Each chapter begins with language translating Narragansett phrases and concepts into English words, then to cultural observations related to these phrases and finally to Roger's spiritual observations of the Indians. At the end of each chapter he took his observations further into spiritual insights. "Williams comes to the general conclusion that from the 'natural' point of view the 'savage' is in no sense inferior to the civilized European, and that in respect to natural virtue he is undeniably superior."<sup>37</sup>

In his encounters with the Wampanoag and Narragansett, my ancestor experienced the split between "civilized" and "primitive," Christian and pagan, non-native and indigenous, on an interpersonal and intercultural level. His book poignantly expresses the internal conflict and tension he felt between the head and the heart.<sup>38</sup> Fred Gustafson, a Jungian analyst who has "been ceremonially involved with the Brule branch of the Lakota people" for years, states that the "westernized form of the Christian Church" has contributed to separating God and us from the earth.<sup>39</sup> "Earth was not portrayed as our home but as a place to endure, to get through, to be done with. Further, there was no tolerance for the notion of spirits. They were driven away. Matter became inert—dead."<sup>40</sup> He suggests that our alienation from the earth as home is accompanied by an alienation and dissociation from the roots of our being, the roots of consciousness, the "Indigenous Ancestor," the archaic man of which Jung has written.

Roger's experiences with the people native to this land brought him face to face with this fundamental Christian separation of spirit and matter.

In the seventeenth century, at the height of the Enlightenment, Roger struggled with the irreconcilable nature of his theological understanding and his experiences of the people native to this land. He could not reconcile his admiration for these men and women and what he believed theologically.<sup>41</sup> Nor could he reconcile the differences between cultures. No amount of successful or unsuccessful negotiations would lead to the kind of peaceful co-existence Roger hoped for. His dreams for the way we could live in relationship with this land and its Native people have yet to be realized.

What Roger experienced as an irreconcilable conflict between cultures and between his head and his heart I experienced in the present as an intrapsychic conflict in consciousness. Born into a culture that is described by cultural historian Richard Tarnas as one that roots us to the limited consciousness of our egos even while it separates and isolates us from the rest of nature, including our own "primal" psychic roots, I found myself struggling with a split in my experience of consciousness that has existed for centuries between head and heart, right and left brain, Logos and Eros, modern and primitive, reason and instinct, evolved and primordial, masculine and feminine, science and art, human and nature, man-made and natural. I believe what Roger was unable to realize personally was the recovery of a spirituality that was more indigenous and of the heart, one in which Pagan and Christian are reconciled. That recovery and reintegration would continue through me.

According to Tarnas, in the worldview of modern Western culture, intellect reigns and effects have their explainable causes. The universe is defined empirically. The modern self and the human mind are "fundamentally distinct and separate from an objective external world that it seeks to understand and master."<sup>42</sup> Subject and object are split in a seemingly irreconcilable way. The world itself and the things of the world are viewed and experienced as impersonal, devoid of soul and without consciousness. The modern human split from the rest of the unconscious material universe, exists in a world which is "devoid of spiritual purpose . . . ruled by chance and necessity, without intrinsic meaning."<sup>43</sup> The world itself is merely and essentially a construct. This vision "emerged fully in the course of the European Enlightenment of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, though its roots are as old as Western civilization itself."<sup>44</sup> The emergence of this historical paradigm happens to coincide with the time my ancestor Roger Williams and other Europeans uprooted themselves and their families and traveled, partly out of necessity and partly out of a new vision, across the ocean to this, for them, "new world."

In this current age, which Tarnas characterizes as "an age between worldviews," our highly differentiated, Logos oriented, egoic consciousness is reconnecting with nature.<sup>45</sup> Jerome Bernstein identifies this as a necessary and compensatory evolutionary shift in the western psyche. This evolution is occurring within the consciousness of individuals who Jerome Bernstein refers to as "Borderlanders." According to Bernstein, "the western psyche is being forced to integrate the transpersonal and *transrational* dimensions of life from which I propose it split some three-thousand years ago."<sup>46</sup> (Italics added) Bernstein uses the term "'transrational' to refer to . . . observable phenomena and connections that do not 'make sense' by generally accepted scientific and rational criteria."<sup>47</sup>

Bernstein's conceptualization of the psyche was challenged as he listened to the experiences his patients shared with him. Their experiences did not fit into "our rational construct of the universe" or known psychological, clinical models.<sup>48</sup> It necessitated creating a clinical container that "was more accepting and less judgmental of transrational experience."<sup>49</sup> Working within Jung's description of and framework for the psyche, Bernstein describes the transrational consciousness experienced by Borderlanders as a dynamic process in collective consciousness "that is moving the Western psyche to reconnect our overspecialized ego to its natural psychic roots."<sup>50</sup> This evolutionary shift, as Bernstein describes it, is one in which the "runaway western ego" is not only reconnecting with its psychic roots, it is also reconnecting to its relationship to nature. As we evolve, we reconnect with what Jung calls the "Archaic Man," and Gustafson, calls the "the Inner Indigenous One."<sup>51</sup>

An experience of transrational consciousness rooted in our "Indigenous Mind" is available to each of us. David Peat describes his experience of his first Sun Dance at the Blood Reserve, with the Blackfoot Confederacy in Lethbridge, Canada. In this annual celebration of one part of the cycle of nature, he found himself led into a profoundly different reality from that which he encountered in his everyday Western world.

To enter into this domain is to question what we mean by space and time, by the distinctions between the living and non-living, by the individual and society, by dreams and visions, by perception and reality, by causality and synchronicity, by time and eternity.<sup>52</sup>

Slowly his Western-oriented consciousness freed itself from its "rigidities and fixed patterns of response" and he opened, through his participation in this ceremony, to a different way of seeing.<sup>53</sup> He remembered the other times in his life when "everything was truly alive . . . vibrating with power."<sup>54</sup> As he sat in that Sun Dance ground, surrounded by people whose experience of the world had always been rooted in nature, he realized that



“we had all, as children, seen the world in that sense of numinous animation and direct connection of the cosmos that is hidden deep within us.”<sup>55</sup>

Our conditioning and view of the world often limit our openness to encounters such as this. Our beliefs about the nature of reality act as filters which govern what we are open to noticing. Gregory Cajete, a Tewa Pueblo, scholar and educator, describes “a worldview [as] a set of assumptions and beliefs that form the basis of a people’s comprehension of the world.”<sup>56</sup> Our worldview pervades every aspect of our perceived reality, inner and outer, and acts as a filter and interpretive lens for our experiences. Our worldview is embedded in the way we perceive, think about, imagine, and story the reality of our world. It shapes the creation and interpretation of the stories we tell of our experiences. The stories that we tell and how we tell them, our concepts of good and evil, of what is real and what is not, our values, our concepts of what can be and is known and how we know—all reflect and are reflections of our worldview.

Malidoma Some believes that pathologizing or explaining away the kinds of experiences that Bernstein describes as transrational only serves to reinforce the conceptual divisions Peat describes above. Rather than an actual difference between what is real and not real, or imagined, these divisions are a result of the separation between the modern, logos oriented consciousness and the archaic part of consciousness with its roots in nature. If we approach experiences with an open consciousness, one that can hold complexity, contradiction, and the disorientation of not knowing, it is possible to relax the constraints of our Western worldview. In doing so we open ourselves to a different way of seeing and being in the world.

Peat’s story is offered as an example of how transrational consciousness can be awakened in an individual, who is, in this case, a traditionally trained Western scientist. Peat’s participation in the Sun Dance allowed him to reconnect with a way of perceiving and being in relationship with himself and the world that compensated for and corrected the point of view of his Western, differentiated, one-sided consciousness. Through the ceremony of the Sun Dance, he reconnected to a way of seeing that we all have access to. In Jung’s words, Peat connected with the “laws and roots of his being.”<sup>57</sup>

As a child the transrational, Borderland consciousness that Bernstein describes was a natural part of me. However, with experience, I learned that these experiences were not common to my family or peers. I learned to keep experiences like this to myself at an early age. Studying psychology in college, I began to worry that these experiences were pathological, regressive and compensatory. Like Roger, I found myself in unfamiliar territory, looking for ways to live with two seemingly irreconcilable ways of knowing and being—a rational and transrational consciousness.

My first awareness of the difference between the way I experienced reality and the way the rest of the world did, which at the time was my family, happened when I was 5 years old. I “stopped” the rain. My family, mother, father, younger sister and I were at the drive-in watching *Bambi*. It was pouring rain. My sister was whining, my mother was complaining and my father, unable to find a solution to make everyone happy, was getting more and more frustrated. Watching the drama in the car I very naturally thought, “Why don’t they just ask the rain to stop?” Then I thought, “I’ll just do it myself. This experience occurred before I learned to read and write, and before I would have developed a strong, differentiated ego. I was connected to the natural way of things.”

I will describe what I did from my adult perspective. However, what I did in the moment was as natural as breathing and required no thought about how to do it. I felt my heart, and with my heart, felt into the heart of the rain. When the connection was made I said out loud, “Rain Stop.” At that moment the rain stopped. After a long time of a solid sheet of rain pounding on our windshield drowning out the sound from the speaker hanging from our car window, suddenly not a drop was falling from the sky. I held the connection with the rain easily and naturally, with reverence and gratitude. I didn’t have the concepts of reverence or gratitude when I was 5 years old. It’s only now, of course, as an adult remembering, that I recognize these qualities. My parents’ heads turned toward me. I expected them to be happy. Instead, I saw the fear in the expression of alarmed astonishment on their faces. I thought I had done something terribly wrong and immediately released my heart to heart connection with the rain. Of course, the downpour began again. It was a confusing experience that eventually fell into the category of all the things I, according to my mother and teachers, only “imagined.”

Some of you may be thinking that this was mere coincidence. I understand and appreciate healthy skepticism. I couldn’t do this work if I didn’t ask questions about the validity of my perceptions and experiences. What I can say to those of you who are wondering right now about my memory of a childhood experience, is that the connection I felt with the rain was so embodied and palpable, that I felt the rain stop in complete congruence with my request, and start again in complete congruence with the moment I thought I had done something wrong and I released it. I experienced this very physically in my heart. It was so natural; I would never have been conscious of this experience had it not been for my parents’ reaction. It was completely unforgettable.

As an adult, Jung’s recognition of an “archaic” aspect of human consciousness and Bernstein’s conceptualization of Borderland consciousness provided the framework of understanding that I needed to accept and

understand my experiences and to reconcile the split within my own consciousness. As a Borderlander, my process of integration of these two aspects within my own consciousness is an ongoing dialogical process in which I find that the center, as I perceive it, is always shifting. In my ancestors' dialogues I have experienced Roger's rapt attention, enthusiastic curiosity and support, and his relief as I consciously engage this "conflict" intrapsychically and in my work.<sup>58</sup>

My understanding of and approach to this phenomenon of the presence of the ancestors in the present reflects my attempt to find ways to engage as a human being with the world from a more integrated consciousness. An integration of the modern rational aspect of consciousness with the "primitive" archaic aspect was facilitated by and necessary for engaging with the "brighter, more dynamic and expansive energetic world" of nature, which Some refers to as the place where the ancestors dwell.<sup>59</sup> In this way, what was irreconcilable interculturally and personally for Roger—the split he experienced between head and heart—begins to find its answer, reconciliation, expression, and application through me.

Ezekiel's words to Jung in *The Red Book* in Liber Secundus, Nox Secunda speak to the effect "the dead" have on us and the effect being in a more conscious relationship with "the dead" has on them. Ezekiel tells Jung that one of "the dead" stands behind him

paning from rage and despair at the fact that your stupor does not attend to him. He besieges you in sleepless nights, sometimes he takes hold of you in an illness, sometimes he crosses your intentions.<sup>60</sup>

Jung is told that he must redeem "those roaming dead" and restore what was "created and later subjugated and lost. . . . Every step upward will restore a step downward so that the dead will be delivered into freedom."<sup>61</sup> Malidoma Some would put it more simply. We will see the ancestors smile when we are listening and being responsive to them in ways which restore balance and harmony.

From all the historical records and his letters, Roger seemed to be a highly spirited, vigorous and expressive man. This was not my experience of him in our imaginal dialogues until recently. When I encountered Roger for the first time as an imaginal figure in the transferential dialogue presented in the first chapter, he wore black, was old, haggard, lame, bent over and emanated a feeling of resignation—the kind of resignation one has when one is utterly defeated and without hope. He remained this way for over nine years. I don't know what Roger's relationship with God was after Providence was burned. I can imagine that he may have felt betrayed by God in the way Job had. I also imagine that his experiences during and after that war were far from experiences of divine providence. In fact, I

would guess that he had a difficult time with theological ideas about the ways God demonstrated his favor in this world. I know that the story of Job was one that he spent a significant amount of time contemplating. When I entered therapy for the first time I realized at the heart of my suffering was feeling betrayed and abandoned by God. As I do this work of reintegration, Roger, as an imaginal presence, appears to be transforming. He is more joyful. I've even seen him dancing and smiling.

Stephen Aizenstat, who created the practice of Dream Tending, suggests that as we tend our dreams and the figures who inhabit that landscape, both we and the figures individuate.<sup>62</sup> Aizenstat states that these figures, in particular

those who carry the intelligence of the ancestors, are at the core of our personal maturation. As they open to their own depth, we open to ours. As we witness their changes, we understand the forces that influence our behavior.<sup>63</sup>

The relationship between the ancestors and their living descendants, as Aizenstat observes, is reciprocal. If this is true it suggests that bringing consciousness to the ways my story is connected and an answer to Roger's, engaging in an ongoing dialogue and taking appropriate action in the present in response, is transformative for both of us. What is most important to me is that he is smiling for the first time in a long time as the weight of history is lifted.

Roger died sometime in the winter of 1683. He was buried in his family plot next to his wife Mary at his farm on the hill overlooking Providence. The Rhode Island Historical Society decided to exhume his body so they could give him a more elaborate burial befitting the man who they credited with founding Rhode Island. Great care was taken in this exhumation. They found greasy soil where Roger had been buried which indicated there had been human remains in the ground, but not a single bone or vestige of bone was discovered. Instead of a body there was the root of an apple tree. The root grew into the grave entering where Roger's head would have been and grew down through his remains. As documented in the historical papers of the Rhode Island Historical Society the root followed

the direction of the back bone to the hips, and thence divided into two branches, each following a leg bone to the heel, where they both turned upwards towards the extremities of the toes of the skeleton.<sup>64</sup>

The body of this man, whose concept of Christianity and worldview were challenged in this new world, transformed into the root of an apple tree in the land that he perceived as "a gift of love." His body would gradually become one with this tree, literally rooted in this land. This root, severed

and exhumed, is now on display in the carriage house behind the John Brown House, a well-known historical landmark and museum.

Malidoma Some describes the way Dagara ancestors are represented on their ancestor altars. The female ancestors are represented by a wooden stool, male ancestors by a wooden stick shaped like an upside down Y.<sup>65</sup> The root that stands in a case in the old carriage house, the root of the apple tree that incorporated itself into Roger's body, is in the shape of a male ancestor. For over a century and a half, his body went through a process of transformation in the land that had been given to him under the same kind of tree that Eve and Adam had eaten the fruit from in the Garden of Eden. His body naturally became, in the truest sense of nature-ally, the shape the Dagara use to represent and provide a place for the spirits of their ancestors. For the Dagara, an object like this tree root is not merely a representation of the ancestor; the spirit of the ancestor is actually in the root. From this perspective and given all that has been projected onto this root in the many times it has been viewed, I would imagine it is full of spirit.

His body becoming rooted in this land is a striking metaphor for being indigenous to the land. That it was the root of an apple tree is especially interesting given its association with wisdom, knowledge, the fall from grace, and expulsion from Paradise.<sup>66</sup> It is as if through his body, after death, the opposites he struggled with in life—nature and heaven, heart and head, “savage” and civilized, Pagan and Christian, good and evil—were symbolically and literally reconciled. For me, discovering the story of the tree root, given Roger's personal struggle between Pagan and Christian, was quite amazing in its metaphorical significance. Its shape, exactly formed by nature into the Dagara representation of a male ancestor, places this discovery in the realm of mystery. Roger was an important elder during his life. It would seem that in his death he became an ancestor not only in memory and spirit, but in the actuality of his newly formed “body.”

This root remained in the basement of the Historical Society, unavailable for public viewing, until 2007. One hundred-and forty-seven years after it was exhumed from the grave, it was finally moved to the old carriage house behind the John Brown House and placed on display. The timing of this second “exhumation” from the underground part of the house that has the responsibility of gathering and holding pieces of Rhode Island History is personally meaningful. It occurred as I was writing my dissertation, becoming consciously aware of these previously unconsciously experienced ancestral connections, discovering and exploring the ways Roger's story was present in my own.

Many biographies have been written about Roger in the centuries following his death. Rubertone sees Roger as more than a historical figure, for

he has taken his place among “folk heroes in American mythology.”<sup>67</sup> His image would change over time, reflecting popular collective ideas and the interpretive needs of the times.<sup>68</sup> Tracing the cultural imagination of Williams over time, he has been identified as “the favorite son, the hero of the Revolution, the statesman of the Republic, the man of impeccable character to American Anglophiles, the ordinary person, the democratic visionary and the leader in the cause of freedom.”<sup>69</sup> How he is remembered and how his story is told is mythic even in its depiction of his personal and America's cultural history. I would suggest that our family stories as they are created and shared and the stories of our ancestors as they are passed down through the generations become mythic in nature. They are in the particularities of remembered “facts,” myths that are rooted in our personal and collective history.

Using Roger's story to understand and amplify my own, in a way similar to the way one would use myths or fairy tales, provides meaningful insight into my personal suffering and the questions that inform my life.<sup>70</sup> His struggle between head and heart, between “savage” spirituality and Christianity, his wish that two very different cultures could co-exist and benefit and learn from each other, couldn't be resolved peacefully in his time. Held in the unconscious, in the land of the dead, it found its way into this time through me.<sup>71</sup> What my ancestor Roger Williams began in his book, *A Key into the Language of America*, originally published in 1643, as a dialogue between two languages and cultures, exists now in me as a living dialogue of consciousness, as irreconcilable differences in my marriage and as a deeply rooted grief that is the legacy of a collectively shared history and cultural and ecological wound. Adding my life, my story, may contribute in some small way to the evolution of this deeply rooted conflict. My hope is that as our consciousness evolves collectively, the dream Roger had will also evolve and take root in this land much as Roger's body did.

I learned from Clark's mother that, following John Cotton's death, there was a comet in the sky for several days. She said people saw this as his soul, bright and shining, on its way to heaven. Cotton died on December 23, 1652. There was indeed a comet associated with his death. According to White, comets, from the point of view of the Bible, were seen by Samuel Danforth of Massachusetts as “portentous signals of great and notable changes.”<sup>72</sup> The comet that appeared in 1652 was especially noted as such. Appearing just before Cotton became sick and disappearing seven days after his death, it was seen as “testimony that God had then removed a bright star and a shining light out of the heaven of his Church here into celestial glory above.”<sup>73</sup> Cotton ascended to heaven and Williams became rooted in this land. It seems our ancestors had different paths in life that are

reflected in the stories of their deaths. Their stories in life and in death, and now centuries later, continue to speak to aspects of the story of Europeans on this continent—historically, theologically, and psychologically, and to the evolution of consciousness that is occurring according to Bernstein.

The story of our ancestors in the actuality of its history is mythic even as this myth is rooted in history. These men were significant enough in their time to be remembered and written about centuries later by historians. After discovering Clark and I had ancestors who had known each other well and shared in a part of this country's history, I realized that their initial meeting and originally shared spiritual beliefs and vision as well as their eventual passionate disagreements were mirrored in Clark's and my relationship. Clark and I reenacted some of the spirit and substance of our ancestors' relationship.

Clark and I met each other through a spiritual group that was outside the mainstream of organized, traditional religion. It was based in California, a continent rather than an ocean away from where we lived. Eventually, Clark would decide to move to California to be closer to the center of this spiritual community. After our decision to get a divorce, we decided, for the sake of our daughters, that it would be best if I moved too. Clark stayed in Maryland for a time and I moved across the country to continue studying depth psychology at Pacifica Graduate Institute. I ended up living in a community called Painted Cave in the mountains within walking distance of many painted Chumash caves. My ancestor in exile moved to the land of the Narragansett. I found it interesting that after leaving Maryland and "Our Lady's Manor," the new home I found, after looking at many, was less than a mile from a preserved Chumash cave. I'm very grateful that I didn't have to spend months walking through the woods in the middle of a New England winter to get to my new home!

Just as our ancestors had, Clark and I initially shared the same beliefs, but, as time went on, our spiritual beliefs and political philosophies diverged. My roots in Christianity were authentically strong. After all, I was descended from a long line of ministers. Christ continued to appear to me in dreams, even as my spiritual practice became more and more rooted to the land and nature. Clark's spirituality remained rooted in transcendence. Although we do not share all the particularities of our ancestors' opinions or beliefs, of course, it seemed to me that something essential to the nature of the disagreements, which tied our ancestors together in the past, continued in the present in new ways through our relationship.<sup>74</sup> Using Jung's energetic model of the psyche and the differentiated levels of the collective unconscious, it appeared to me that the emotional remnants of their relationship still had potency, which produced effects in the present in Clark's and my relationship.

Although I feel a personal connection with Roger Williams, Clark does not feel this with Cotton. It seems that what is most relevant for him in our ancestors' story is the interpersonal connection. If individual lives are informed by the unanswered questions of our ancestors, it is also possible that this is the case on an interpersonal level as well. When I was writing this book I discovered an interesting fact about the ongoing very public debate between Cotton and Williams. When Roger was writing his response to Cotton's *The Bloody Tenet Washed*, Cotton was in the last year of his life. He died before it was published. Gaustad believes "[had] it not been for his death, the argument might have gone on for another thirty years, each convinced of the rectitude of his own position, each convincing the other of very little."<sup>75</sup> It seems that their debate although temporarily put to rest by Cotton's death continued a few centuries later in Clark's and my relationship.

Our relationship was a new book being written about an old story or a revised edition of works, so to speak, that had been published over three centuries ago. Having this perspective made a difference in my experience of our marriage, separation, divorce, and our relationship in the years that have followed. I keep in mind the history that seems to be carried in our bones and psyches and hold an intention that in some way our relationship will move the story forward rather than unconsciously reenacting the past, even if past tensions have resurfaced in the present time.

**"The Dead Need Salvation"<sup>76</sup>**

I conducted many ancestor dialogues inviting both of our ancestors into the conversation.<sup>77</sup> I saw, imaginably, and felt the real substance of the ties that bound these two men. I felt bound to and by their history together. It seemed that in some way the process of our divorce was tied to their relationship. The divorce took time and seemed to move forward as I conducted the dialogues. I wondered what it was that was being asked of us by the ancestors at this moment in time in response to their past relationship. During one of our conversations about the specifics of our divorce agreement, I jokingly said to Clark that Roger had lost more than one home as a result of his ancestor's actions and that he owed me some kind of reparation for the losses. That day he was reading the *New York Times*, and came across a book review of a newly released book written about Roger. He considered it a synchronicity and called to tell me about it. Understanding the way our story was related to the story of our ancestors gave us a broader perspective from which to consider the choices we were making as we moved out of the marriage.

In an ancestor dialogue I conducted involving these two men as imaginal figures during our divorce negotiations, I stood facing the ocean, leaning for support against a large boulder. Objects from nature—stones, sticks, shells—representing various ancestor figures including Cotton and Williams were placed in a circle in the sand in front of me. I was part of the circle. During the dialogue, I experienced an intensity of feeling which I had come to know was ancestral and collective as well as personal. I brought my full attention to these feelings. As I did this, the feelings intensified. I closed my eyes, turning my focus to this very real imaginal reality. I saw our ancestors and I saw and felt the tie that bound them. I stayed with the complexity and intensity of feelings that seemed to connect them to each other and me to them as I leaned against the rock for support. In one moment, the tie broke and dissolved. It just happened. There were no actions, no particular dialogue was taking place, just my willingness to fully experience the nature and reality of their connection and my hope, intention, and prayer that somehow, by bringing conscious awareness to this, something in this centuries-old tie might be revealed that would help with the story as it was being lived in the present. As the tie between them dissolved, I felt a personal sense of release.

Skeptical, as always, I wondered if this was just my imagination. I heard “open your eyes.” It was not a human voice, but the voice that I have come to know as an energetic, not physically embodied, presence. Still needing time to recover from the emotional intensity of the dialogue, I wanted to gain a sense of balance and return to full waking, daylight consciousness gradually. I heard again, “open your eyes.” As I opened them, I saw a white Scottie dog walk through the council circle of objects. He moved toward the two stones that represented John and Roger. Brushing past them, “Roger” fell into the circle toward me. “John” fell out of the circle toward the ocean. No other object in the circle, even those that were beside the objects representing John and Roger, was moved. Shortly after this, Clark and I, four years after we had separated, signed our divorce agreement.

What do I make of this? Without moving into metaphysical territory but trying to stay within the context of depth psychology, and at the same time pushing at its edges, here is my current way of thinking about what this one example might suggest. Is it possible that there is a resonant connection between the emotional reality of our ancestors’ past and our relationships in the present? And, if that is so, what is the particular nature of that connection and how is it expressed? Is there an ancestral level or component to our complexes? My experience of release suggests that this might be so. The integration of the unconscious, shadow aspects of complexes may be facilitated by bringing awareness to this level.

Going through the process of the divorce and in the years that followed, I wondered if my feelings of betrayal by Clark echoed those of Roger’s by John Cotton. I discovered that just as my personal trauma was a portal into the historical and collective trauma, my personal sense of betrayal and loss in my relationship with Clark, was the portal and connection to Roger’s sense of betrayal.

Roger hoped that the English and Native Americans could live side by side in a peaceful coexistence. This vision informed the way the division of land, the government and the right to freely worship which included non-conversion of the Indians, was conceived and implemented in Providence. He devoted much of his energy and time to negotiating peace between the English and Indians. He watched as treaty after treaty was violated and witnessed Europeans misappropriating more and more land. The conflict between the English and people native to the North American continent was at the heart of the conflict between Clark’s and my ancestors.

While writing this chapter I reconnected with the betrayal Roger felt when he was exiled from Massachusetts. The dreams that came, the ancestor dialogues I conducted and what was actually occurring in my relationship with Clark while I was writing this chapter, all served to bring consciousness to the reality of that part of Roger’s experience. Doing the psychological work at the personal biographical level was important. Connecting my experience of betrayal with Roger’s and with the people native to this land was necessary for the multi-leveled aspects of this complex to be transformed. Until I experienced the ancestral and cultural level of this betrayal, nothing would have been enough to counter that centuries old wound. As the integration of the particular pieces of this complex occurred, more meaningful reparative and restorative actions could be imagined and taken.

I would guess that many readers have questions about whether or not this is mere fantasy and projection. It is a question I continue to ask. If it is, there is still therapeutic value in engaging in dialogue with the ancestors in this way. Personally, I have come to experience and understand the ancestors in a way that is similar to that of the Dagara or the Sioux, and, the way it seems that Jung experienced them as depicted in the dialogues in *The Red Book*. One of the questions people often ask when they begin to work with me is if their experiences of the ancestors are really real. There are many times when something comes to light in a dialogue that a person then discovers actually happened in the life of an ancestor. The are many examples of this in the other stories shared in this book. Each reader will have to come to a personal understanding from their own experience.

As of this writing, four more years have passed since the dialogue described above took place. Signing the divorce agreement, from this

vantage point, appears to have been an ending as well as a beginning. While the tie that bound Roger and John was severed in an instant during the ancestor dialogue, the threads of those ties in the reality of embodied physical time and space have taken more time to be released and, I would suggest, reconfigured and transformed. In the process of writing this book, I've been revisiting the experiences I'm sharing on these pages. It is clear to me now that there was more work to do, more that needed to happen in this time, in response to what had happened between our ancestors in the seventeenth century. As I learned from Malidoma, a sacrifice was necessary—one which was proportional to the energetic "heat" that characterized the conflict between our ancestors and specific to the nature of the betrayal and wounding.

The details of this sacrifice are extremely personal. For many reasons I choose to keep them private. Through insights gained from ancestor dialogues and dreams, I have come to realize that the salvation for Roger, and, I would suggest, for future generations in my lineage, comes from making a willing sacrifice that is proportional and homeopathically formulated to the centuries old ancestral wound. In his dialogue with the spirit of the times and the spirit of the depths in *The Red Book*, Jung struggles with the split within the image of God, science, and faith. The spirit of the depths tells Jung, "Sacrifice is not destruction, sacrifice is the foundation stone of what is to come."<sup>78</sup>

Always the skeptic, I wondered if this notion of sacrifice was merely a rationalization that would help me deal with the necessary losses. A few months after writing this section, as I neared completion of the book, my younger daughter Margaret was in Detroit doing service work in community gardens. She called me late one night very excited and left a message to call her immediately. She had talked with a man who talks with the ancestors and wanted to share what he said with me.

Having just met her and without knowing anything about her family, he began talking about me. He identified some very specific things that were unknown to anyone except close family and friends. One of the things he told her was that the relationship between Clark and me had to be severed. He didn't understand why, if we were divorced, we were still so connected. He said that it was important and necessary that this be done completely and finally. He said it would require a sacrifice on my part. Once that was done and the ties that bound us were released, Clark and I would both be happier, life would be easier, and each of us would be more successful with our work. The information was synchronistic and stunningly validating.

### Gathering Up the Loose Ends of the Ages

In *The Red Book*, in the section called "One of the Lowly," Jung encounters a man dirtily clothed, with only one eye and a black stubble beard. Regarding his "companion with feeling," Jung sees that "he lives the history of the world."<sup>79</sup> From the content of the conversation it appears that it is the history of the European world. I wondered if, would even suggest that, the figure of Roger as I first encountered and have known him over these last nine years, like this figure in *The Red Book*, was living the history of his times. Roger was an important figure in the seventeenth century in both England and New England. While a man of his times he also seemed to have ideas that have come to be associated with the ideals of the United States and democracy as well as its shadow. In the centuries that followed he, his ideas, and his story have continuing relevance and have become part of our collective story.

Ezechiel, in their dialogue in *Liber Secundus, Nox Secunda*, tells Jung, "I see behind you . . . the crush of dangerous shadows, the dead, who look greedily through the empty sockets of your eyes, who moan and hope to gather up through you all the loose ends of the ages, which sigh in them."<sup>80</sup>

Perhaps "telling the story," as I was invited to do in that first dialogue, contributes in some small way to gathering up some of the loose ends of our collective story.