Memories We Inhabit

The Stories That Live Inside Us

“All of us labor in webs spun long before we were born…”
— William Faulkner

The robin chose the corner of our front-door transom for her nest.

Our entryway is framed by glass windows around the door and a transom window above it. One spring morning, we noticed strands of grass and bits of twigs collecting in the upper corner. Over the next several days, we repeatedly removed the material, hoping to persuade the robin to choose another location. She persisted.

Eventually, her determination won us over.

Within what seemed like no time at all, she and her mate had constructed a remarkably well-designed nest in the corner of the transom. We stopped using the front door so we would not disturb her. Each day, when she briefly left the nest, I would quietly step outside and take another picture.

Then the eggs began appearing.

One the first day. Another the next. And another after that.

Four eggs in all.

The speed and precision of the entire process impressed us. The nest itself was elegant in its own way — woven tightly into the corner as though engineered specifically for that space. The laying of the eggs seemed almost matter-of-fact. The robin simply did what robins do.

Then, as the days passed and we neared the expected hatching time, the eggs began disappearing.

One vanished. Then another. Then another.

Eventually we concluded that a crow was likely taking them while the robin was away from the nest.

What struck me most was not the disappearance itself, but the apparent absence of visible distress.

The robin returned. She sat in the nest. She left again. Another egg disappeared. She returned once more.

And then, one morning, the nest was empty. All the eggs were gone.

So was the robin.

What lingered with me afterward was not merely the loss of the eggs, but the contrast between the robin's response and the way a human being would likely experience such a loss.

A human mother would not merely register absence. She would inhabit it.

Fear. Panic. Confusion. Helplessness. Guilt. Grief. Questions. Memory.

Even years later, she might still revisit the loss internally — replaying moments, imagining alternate outcomes, carrying the emotional weight of what had happened into the future.

The robin appeared simply to move on.

I do not mean that the robin felt nothing. Modern understanding of animal behavior has moved well beyond the old assumption that animals are merely instinct-driven machines. Birds clearly recognize patterns, remember locations, respond to threats, and display forms of attachment and awareness.

But whatever the robin experienced, it did not appear to become an inhabited narrative.

That distinction stayed with me.

Humans inhabit memory.

Not merely recollection. Not merely information. Habitation.

We carry the past into the present and project it into the future. We revisit old wounds. We preserve old objects. We replay old conversations. We organize identity around remembered experience. We attach meaning not merely to events, but to what those events came to represent.

An old photograph becomes sacred. A battlefield becomes hallowed ground. An empty room still feels occupied years after someone has died.

Humans live not only in the present, but inside remembered worlds.

And the more I have reflected on that robin's abandoned nest, the more I have come to believe that this peculiar human capacity may explain much about the condition of our public life as well.

Because nations inhabit memory too.

Not merely history. Memory.

And history and memory are not the same thing.

History is the telling of the past. Memory is the living inside of it – inhabiting it.

History can be recorded, revised, expanded, narrowed, taught, simplified, distorted, or forgotten. It lives in archives, textbooks, museums, documentaries, speeches, and public argument.

Memory lives differently.

Memory lives in stories passed across generations. In inherited assumptions. In symbols. In rituals. In songs. In monuments. In regional identity. In family stories. In the emotional atmosphere surrounding what a people believes itself to be.

A nation may possess a shared history while simultaneously inhabiting profoundly different memories of that same past.

And increasingly, that feels like the condition of the United States.

Our arguments today often appear political on the surface, but beneath many of them lies something deeper: competing inhabited memories of the nation itself.

Not simply disagreements about facts. Disagreements about meaning. About identity. About inheritance. About what kind of country this has been, what kind of country it is, and what kind of country it ought to become.

The difficulty is that history and memory do not always move together.

History can challenge memory. Memory can resist history. And when historical understanding weakens, memory becomes vulnerable to myth.

That vulnerability matters.

Because myths are emotionally powerful precisely because they feel inherited. They simplify contradiction. They reduce complexity. They flatter identity. They transform difficult history into morally manageable narrative.

And once memory becomes sufficiently detached from historical honesty, people can begin inhabiting fundamentally different realities while still occupying the same nation.

The American story has always carried tensions capable of producing such fracture.

The Revolutionary period proclaimed liberty while tolerating human enslavement. The westward expansion of the nation carried both aspiration and displacement. The Civil War was fought not only over political structures and territorial questions, but over profoundly incompatible understandings of the nation's moral foundations.

Even after the war ended militarily, its memory did not.

Reconstruction became not merely a political struggle, but a struggle over what would be remembered, what would be emphasized, and what would be suppressed.

Jim Crow itself functioned not only as a system of social control, but as an architecture of enforced memory. It attempted to regulate not merely behavior, but historical meaning. Who belonged. Who mattered. Who could speak. Whose suffering counted. Whose story defined the nation.

The Civil Rights movement did more than seek legal reform. It forced confrontation between inherited myth and lived memory.

And today, many of our fiercest public arguments still revolve around memory, even when we pretend they concern only policy.

Monuments. Flags. Curriculum. Language. Public symbols. Historical framing. Even which stories are emphasized and which are omitted.

These disputes are not merely academic. They are struggles over inhabitation. Over what kind of moral house Americans believe themselves to live in.

That is why the phrase “culture war” often feels too small.

Cultures can disagree while still inhabiting a recognizable shared memory. What increasingly troubles many Americans is the sensation that we are becoming people who occupy the same territory while inhabiting different inherited realities.

And when shared memory fragments deeply enough, public trust begins to erode as well. Because a people cannot reason together for very long if they no longer recognize one another inside the same story.

At this point, it becomes tempting either to romanticize the past or to abandon memory altogether. Both temptations are dangerous.

The first produces nostalgia. The second produces rootlessness.

Nostalgia edits memory until the past becomes morally comforting. Rootlessness discards memory until the present becomes the only remaining authority.

Neither produces wisdom.

The answer is not less memory. The answer is more truthful memory.

That distinction matters.

Not every inherited memory deserves preservation. Some memories distort. Some excuse cruelty. Some sanctify grievance. Some narrow moral imagination rather than deepen it.

A corrupted memory can become as destructive as a forgotten one.

And perhaps one of the central struggles of any society is learning how to distinguish between memories that sustain truthful inhabitation and memories that deform it.

That process is difficult because people rarely experience their own inherited memory as corruption. Most of us experience our memory simply as reality itself.

Which is why historical honesty matters.

History cannot fully heal fractured memory, but it can expose distortion. It can widen awareness. It can recover voices that were silenced. It can challenge myths that became emotionally convenient. And it can remind a people that complexity is not the enemy of belonging.

Still, historical knowledge alone is insufficient. Facts by themselves do not create inhabitable societies. Human beings require meaning as well.

That may be why so many public arguments today feel exhausted before they even begin. We often debate one another as though information alone will solve what are actually crises of memory and identity.

But information rarely changes people whose inherited memory already supplies emotional certainty.

Memory forms identity. And identity shapes what people are willing to see.

Which brings me back again to that robin's nest.

After the final egg disappeared, the robin simply left.

The nest no longer served its purpose.

Humans are not so capable of departure.

We remain.

We remain among battlefields and monuments. We remain among old grievances and old promises. We remain inside inherited stories — some noble, some distorted, some truthful, some incomplete.

And because we remain, we also inherit responsibility.

Not responsibility to preserve every memory exactly as received. Nor responsibility to erase difficult inheritance in pursuit of emotional comfort.

But responsibility to inhabit memory truthfully enough that the house remains livable.

Perhaps that is the better metaphor for where we now find ourselves.

Not a nation standing outside history.
Not a people capable of beginning again untouched by what came before.
But a household that has grown difficult to inhabit.

Rooms once filled with shared memory now feel strained by suspicion, silence, resentment, and incompatible understandings of reality itself.
Conversations once taken for granted become fragile.
Certain subjects become impossible to approach without fear of rupture.
People who once recognized one another easily now speak as though from different worlds.

And yet the household remains.

That may be what is most unsettling about our present moment.

Not simply disagreement, but the growing sense that common memory itself has fractured.
That stories once shared have become distorted differently by different people.
That moral assumptions once broadly understood can no longer be presumed.

The temptation in such moments is either denial or abandonment.
To pretend the fracture is not real.
Or to conclude that living together is no longer possible.

But restoration is neither denial nor nostalgia.

A restored household does not become identical to what it once was.
Some losses remain permanent.
Some illusions cannot survive honest reckoning.
Some patterns of speech, behavior, and memory must be confronted for what they became.
Some things discarded.
Others repaired.
Others patiently relearned.

Yet the work continues because people still belong to one another.

Perhaps that is the real task before any society hoping to remain morally coherent across time.

Not recovering innocence.
Not enforcing unanimity.
Not constructing comforting mythology.

But undertaking the slower, more difficult labor of truthful inhabitation.

Of learning again how to live together inside a shared moral memory honest enough to hold both inheritance and correction.

The robin left the emptied nest behind.

Humans do not leave so easily.

We continue inhabiting what came before us.
For good and for ill.

And perhaps civilization itself depends upon whether households — families, communities, and nations alike — can remember truthfully enough to remain inhabitable.

Michael T. “Terry” Bradfield
Winchester, Virginia
May 2026