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Abstract

The basis for this research project is my belief that the planet is in ecological crisis. This crisis has been brought about by an unhealthy vision for humanity as dominators of the ecosphere. The vision manifests itself in a belief that further scientific and technological advances will result in solutions to the ‘environmental problem’. As a response to this position, this research project examines stewardship, from an Anglican theological understanding, as an alternative to the current paradigm. A stewardship response to the ecological crisis does not look to technology for solutions, but rather bases its strategies in behavioural change at the level of the individual and then the individual in community. I used theological and archival sources as well as accounts from volunteers and staff from two local Anglican dioceses and two parishes to develop a concept of stewardship that might be appropriate for use by planners. I recognized that the stewardship model developed within the thesis is but one of any number of possible alternative paradigms that could and should be pursued. What emerges is an understanding that stewardship is a valid and powerful model for behavioural change, especially when sustainability planning concepts are incorporated into it for use in long-term planning for community vision. When this partnership between disciplines occurs, behavioural change becomes a real possibility and a cause for hope. Transformative theory stands as a rallying point for stewardship alongside many other paradigms to work together to change the balance of power. The role of the planner emerges as one of mediator and facilitator within a context of multiple knowledges working towards a common goal.
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Chapter One
Introducing Stewardship as a Conceptual Basis for Planning:
Stewardship as a Window on Sustainability

One of the most unfortunate aspects of planning practice today is the general denial of
spiritual, moral and ethical ways of knowing in favour of technical and scientific knowledge.
Although the ability to think in spiritual, moral and ethical terms is a key distinguishing
characteristic between humans and non-human beings, the value of this ability often goes
unused or unappreciated. This thesis supports the work of planners (theorists and
practitioners) who search to include non-technical and non-scientific knowledge in their
work by exploring the relevance of ‘stewardship’ in contemporary Anglican theology to
principles of sustainability. The intent is not to suggest that planners must adopt Anglican
theological views in order to be ‘sustainable’, nor is it to suggest that there is a singular,
coherent or unifying concept of ‘stewardship’ in Anglican theology; rather, it is argued that
several Anglican parishes in the Dioceses of New Westminster and British Columbia are
acting towards a holistic interpretation of stewardship (defined below) that demonstrates a
high degree of concordance with principles of sustainability\(^1\). The following exploration
might therefore be of interest to planners involved with social (non-technical) approaches to
addressing sustainability.

1.1 Five Premises
Articulating a place for stewardship in planning thinking was possible only after a process of
reflection that revealed five premises that form my particular worldview. These premises are
based on both academic and spiritual influences.

*Premise 1 – The planet, in its current state, is physically, biologically and socially degraded.*
Depletion of the ozone layer, climate change, declining bio-diversity, contamination of the
soil, air, water, plant and animal matter from pesticides and herbicides, poverty for millions,
and increasing cancer rates, among other examples, are all indicators of a degraded planet.
Increasingly, alarm over this degradation has found its way out of the learned literature into

\(^1\) Here, I am referring to strong sustainability in the context of ecological economics. See, for example, Herman
Daly’s article entitled: “Steady-State Economics: Concepts, Questions, Policies”, or Costanza et. al. *An
Introduction to Ecological Economics.*
the popular press and the consciousness of the average citizen. The Bishop of the Anglican Diocese of British Columbia noted in 1970 that "to walk along the beaches, to breathe the air in certain parts of this city, to be in a stream of traffic, to fly over the Alberni Valley or near any of our pulp and paper outlets, to try to swim in the water off many of our beaches is to encounter pollution dangerous to human life" (Diocese of British Columbia 1970, pp17-18). The examples given above have all been brought on by a human species which has come to dominate the planet without understanding the consequence of that domination (Suzuki, 2002), but which continues to quest for mastery over it (Hall, publication date unknown).

**Premise 2 – The degradation is a result of human arrogance about our place on the planet.**

Lynn White Jr., writing in 1967, laments on the ecological crisis: "with the population explosion, the carcinoma of planless urbanism, the now geological deposits of sewage and garbage, surely no creature other than man has ever managed to foul its nest in such short order" (White, 26). By likening a nest to the planetary home which humans inhabit, White is offering a metaphor that provides insight into the type of relationship that humans ought to have with the planet. Unlike birds (that are able to bring food into the nest and excrete out of the nest) humans are dependent on their nest’s ability to supply resources and assimilate waste for our survival. In other words, humans must deplete the nest and foul the nest only at rates that allow the nest to regenerate and assimilate, respectively, or face scarcity of resources, or harmful and potentially lethal contamination. Despite this warning, however, human arrogance leads us to believe that we can increase the nest’s ability to provide resources and assimilate waste through technological advance brought on by increased economic production.

**Premise 3 – A new understanding about the role of humans on the planet is necessary if the goal of a sustainable planet is to be achieved.**

The Union of Concerned Scientists, sensing the urgency expressed by the situation described above, joined in the call to recognize the limits imposed by a finite planet and sent out a clear message that we can not continue to allow the planet to be ‘ravaged’ (as quoted in Tucker and Grim, 10). This is what Bill Rees (a human ecologist) calls ‘ecologically enlightened self-interest’ (Rees 1997, 52) and what Sallie McFague (a Christian theologian) calls ‘radical
dependence’ (McFague 2001, 102). On the one hand, humans ought to be concerned about
the state of the planet’s resources and assimilative capacity because our own continued
existence depends on it. On the other hand, humans ought not to see the planet as an ‘other’
on which our life depends, rather, we ought to realize that we are in relationship with the
planet and radically dependent on the health of the relationship for our own health. Both of
these approaches reject the kind of human arrogance that leads us to rely on economic
growth and technology to resolve the crisis. Instead, they call for a new understanding or, as
Thomas Berry so eloquently expressed in The Dream of the Earth, a new story: “it’s all a
question of story. We are in trouble just now because we do not have a good story. We are
in between stories. The old story, the account of how we fit into it, is no longer effective.
Yet we have not learned the new story” (Berry, 123).

Premise 4 – Stewardship, as found in contemporary Anglican theology, has potential as a
model for defining an appropriate relationship between humans and the rest of creation.
This thesis argues that stewardship, as interpreted from contemporary Anglican theology, is
one example of a possible new story about ‘how we fit in’. Stewardship as explored in this
thesis is but one example from one denomination of a potentially persuasive story. Tucker
and Grim suggest that religious institutions, more generally, offer a wealth of possibilities in
redefining ‘how we fit’. “As key repositories of enduring civilizational values and as
indispensable motivators in moral transformation, religions have an important role to play in
projecting persuasive visions of a more sustainable future” (Tucker and Grim, 4).

Premise 5 – Planners can, and ought to, learn from and contribute to the stewardship model.
Much has been written in the theological literature with respect to the spiritual response to
the ecological, social and economic ills of this planet. This literature is essentially invisible
to planning students, creating an artificial gap between disciplines which disables planning
students from exploring alternative types of responses to a degraded planet. The fifth
premise suggests that planners ought to be accessing spiritual writings to inform their studies
and future practice – not only to learn from it, but to engage in a dialogue that would
recognize and foster a relationship of mutual learning between sustainability planning and
theological teachings on creation and the role of humans within it. Certainly, there is a desire
on the part of the religious community to engage in dialogue with public policy makers on these issues. The Forum on Religion and Ecology, hosted by Harvard University, for example, has been set up for this express purpose.

1.2 Objectives and Methods
The objectives of the research are three-fold:

- to provide a full and many-layered exploration of the term ‘stewardship’, including its assets and limitation, in order to develop an understanding of stewardship that might be appropriate as a model for planners;
- to uncover how stewardship is practiced in the Anglican church at diocesan and parish levels, drawing on examples from the Diocese of British Columbia (Vancouver Island) and the Diocese of New Westminster (the Lower Mainland);
- to develop a model of stewardship, drawing from the theological and planning literature, that might be appropriate for sustainability planners.

Fulfilling the first objective requires research into the theological literature on concepts of stewardship. The second objective necessitates both interviews and archival research as methods to determine how stewardship is advocated and practiced by stewardship committees at the Diocesan and parish levels. The third objective requires synthesis of what has been learned through the previous two research objectives in order to then focus the discussion on the themes brought out in the exploration of stewardship that are familiar to planners. At this point, it is appropriate to ask what contributions might be made from the planning literature to further develop the stewardship model as discussed in the previous chapters of the paper. This includes a brief exploration of how the term is currently used in planning documents and leads into a concluding section that poses the question of what an appropriate relationship between the church and the planning profession might be.


1.3.1 ‘Anglican’
The Anglican Communion is a world-wide Christian movement, representing approximately 70 million followers in 161 countries. It has roots in both the Catholic Church and Celtic
Spirituality and became, in the 16th Century, the Church of England. The head of the worldwide Anglican Communion is the Archbishop of Canterbury (the Most Reverend Dr. George Carey). In Canada, the Anglican Church is led by the Primate (the Most Reverend Michael Peers), and is divided into 30 dioceses each of which is presided over by a Bishop and assisted by one or several deacons. Each diocese, in turn, is made up of several parishes consisting of one or several individual churches with a Minister who leads worship services. Figure 1 illustrates the organizational structure of the Anglican Communion.

Over half of Anglicans live in the Southern Hemisphere – a far cry from the stereotype of the typical Anglican as being middle-aged, middle-class and white. The spread of the early Church of England around the world occurred simultaneously with efforts towards colonization, a fact with which many Anglicans struggle today. This sets a particular context for the discussion to follow and should be borne in mind by the reader. Evidence of the colonial role of the Anglican Church is found in the residential schools issue which has been in the news across Canada over the past several years. An agreement in principle for settlement of the residential school issue between the students, the Anglican Church and the Government of Canada was signed in November, 2002.

A second important aspect of the Anglican Communion is its devotion to dialogue. The Archbishop of Canterbury, while he is the figure-head of the Anglican Church, does not have supreme authority (such as is granted the Pope in the Catholic Church). Rather, the Anglican churches throughout the world are said to be ‘in communion’ or, engaged in dialogue with the Archbishop. The effect of this is that each Synod can claim to have ‘dispersed authority’,

---

2 The residential schools issue in Canada is perhaps the example of colonialism with which Canadians are most familiar. Recently, the Anglican Church of Canada reached an agreement with the Federal Government with respect to compensation for victims of the residential schools. It is interesting to note that despite the church’s role in the residential school’s issue, the Royal Commission on Aboriginal People’s states that: "Of all the non-governmental institutions in Canadian society, religious institutions have perhaps the greatest potential to foster awareness and understanding between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people. This potential exists even though the Christian churches’ historical role was often that of supporting the dominant society and contributing to the marginalization of Aboriginal people. Religious institutions can make a unique contribution today and in the future." Government of Canada (1996) Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. Indian and Northern Affairs Canada. Volume 5, p 97.
Figure 1 – Organizational Structure of the Anglican Church in Canada
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meaning that it is able to debate and write its own canons. In planning terms, the Anglican Communion exhibits a certain democratization of its governance. While this form of governance is certainly a preferred option within planning circles (see, the theory section in chapter four, based on Friedmann’s conception of transformative theory), it is not borne out easily. The Diocese of New Westminster, for instance, is currently split over the issue of blessing same-sex unions. The bishop and a significant majority of Synod are ‘pro’ blessing of same-sex unions, which recently resulted in a resolution to allow individual parishes to determine whether or not they would offer this ministry. Eight parishes, however, were so opposed to this resolution as to threaten to leave the diocese and seek the leadership of an alternative bishop. The concept of ‘dispersed authority’ and how it relates to stewardship will be revisited in a further section.

1.3.2 ‘Stewardship’

Returning more specifically to the research question, Anglicans believe that they have been given gifts of time, talent and money and that the purpose of these gifts is to use them for the betterment of all Creation. This sharing of gifts is generally understood to be ‘stewardship’.

The term stewardship is traced back to the old English ‘stigweard’, where ‘stig’ is thought to refer to a house, or part of a house, and ‘weard’ to a ward, or keeper. The Oxford English Dictionary defined a ‘steward’ as "an official who controls the domestic affairs of a household, supervising the service of his master's table, directing the domestics, and regulating household expenditure; a major-domo" (OED, online version). This is consistent with many of the uses of steward which are found in Biblical references, and broadly speaking refers to humanity as stewards of God’s creation.

Interesting from a sustainability perspective is the Greek origin of the term translated into English as ‘steward’ in Biblical texts. Biblical scholars used the term ‘steward’ when translating from the Greek oikonomos and ‘stewardship’ for oikonomia. Douglas John Hall noted, in This World Must Not be Abandoned that the same term is the Greek root for economics, where oikos refers to the household, and nemo to the management of said household (Hall, publication date unknown). Furthermore, I would suggest it is important to
note the relationship also to the term ‘ecology’, from the Greek oikologia, (the knowledge, or logos of the household), and to the term ‘ecumene’, from the Greek oikumene meaning inhabited world.

For planners, striving to properly understand and manage the ‘household’ of neighbourhood, city and region is central to achieving sustainability. In planning education, economic and ecological managerial considerations are explored, but not the concept of stewardship. It may turn out, however, that stewardship offers a bridge between economics (the critique of which being that it ignores the biophysical environment within which it occurs) and ecological studies (the critique of which being that the human component is often left out), if stewardship in its broadest sense is understood as the responsibility humans have to care for God’s creation.

1.3.3 ‘Sustainable’
The term ‘sustainability’ in this thesis refers to the concept of strong sustainability, as articulated by ecological economists. ‘Strong’ sustainability is differentiated from ‘weak’ sustainability by the economic concept of substitutability. In weak sustainability human ingenuity, through technology, can substitute for natural systems, as in “it matters little that natural capital is depleted or degraded by economic activity, providing that an equivalent amount of manufactured capital is developed as a substitute” (Victor, Hanna and Kubursi, 78). Strong sustainability, on the other hand, does not subscribe to the substitutability of natural capital with manufactured capital; rather, it requires that natural resources and natural systems be maintained. Herman Daly illustrates the problem of substitutability in the following quote: “we cannot construct the same house with half the lumber no matter how many extra power saws or carpenters we try to substitute” (as quoted in Victor, Hanna and Kubursi). Daly sees natural capital and manufactured capital as complementary to one another (as in, a power saw or carpenter complements lumber in the act of constructing a house), not as substitutes.

1.3.4 ‘Planning’

For the purposes of the paper, the term ‘planning’ and ‘planner’ relates specifically to what John Friedmann refers to as ‘institutional planning’. The planner, in this sense is someone who has “the capacity to think in terms of experience larger than that which comes to any individual, to define distant goals, to arrange highly efficient ways and means of attaining them, and to pursue these distant ends consistently, yet with a flexibility which permits adjustment to changing conditions” (Friedmann, 422). In an increasingly “fragmented and specialized world”, Bill Rees suggests that “planning is the one academic discipline and professional pursuit that explicitly attempts to be holistic or at least integrative at the level of society as a whole. At its best, planning provides a context in which the specialized knowledge of other disciplines comes together and begins to make unified sense” (Rees, 1995, 355). The planner I am thinking of is deeply involved in public process at the community level, and is conscious of her role as (among other things) educator and communicator of sustainability as it relates to the ecological, social and economic dimensions of her community.

1.4 Defining the Scope of this Study

My reason for choosing to focus on the Anglican Church is a personal one – I am a practicing Anglican, and therefore I am most familiar with this expression of faith. As a result of this personal connection, I am also deeply concerned about how the organized institution of my church responds to issues about which I feel deeply, specifically, how I ought to live in this world at both a personal and community level.

The two dioceses and two parishes on which I focus my research (the dioceses of New Westminster and of British Columbia, and the parishes of Christ Church Cathedral and St. Mary’s, Kerrisdale) share a common doctrinal heritage with the broader Anglican Church of Canada (and the worldwide Anglican Communion), such that the Anglican Church’s declarations on stewardship ought to be reflected in the perceptions and practices of the more local manifestation of the Church⁴. At the same time, given the ‘dispersed authority’ model

⁴ The Anglican position on stewardship is explored further in Chapter 2.
of governance which characterizes the Anglican Communion, it is expected that interpretations of how to practice 'stewardship' within and between dioceses will vary.

The interpretations of stewardship as presented in this thesis are not necessarily representative of interpretations of stewardship in the broader Anglican Church of Canada, and are most certainly not representative of interpretations from the broader Anglican Communion which represents an incredibly diverse fabric of cultures and local context. I believe that the following analysis will prove to be worthwhile for consideration by planning students, researchers and practitioners at both a personal level (how does my own belief structure affect the way I learn, research, write policy) and a professional level (how can professional planners and planning agencies contribute to improving the state of the world; ecologically, economically, socially).

1.5 Constraints
Besides the reasons mentioned above for concentrating on the Anglican Church, there are several constraints on the research that resulted in narrowing my research to two dioceses and two parishes. These constraints relate specifically to time and resources available for the project. I defined my scope such that I had fairly convenient access to archival data, interview participants and other research materials in Vancouver, which is home to archival data for the chosen dioceses and parishes. Attempts were made to contact representatives from all six dioceses within the ecclesiastical province of British Columbia and the Yukon, but in the end I was only able to establish contact with the two dioceses already mentioned in order to be able to conduct interviews.

1.6 Introduction of Interviewees
Through structured personal and telephone interviews, I spoke with several Anglican clergy and lay persons about their experience of stewardship in their particular parish or Diocese. In the end, I conducted seven interviews; two at the Diocese of New Westminster, one at the Diocese of British Columbia, one at Christ Church Cathedral in downtown Vancouver, and three at St. Mary's Church in Kerrisdale. The following is a brief introduction to the interviewees.
At the Diocesan level, Shirley Stockdill is the Stewardship Development Officer with the Diocese of New Westminster. She has several responsibilities, including being the staff person for the Stewardship Development Committee and being responsible for fund-raising for Stewards in Action\(^5\). She has been an ordained minister in the Anglican Church for over sixteen years, and has held her current position at the Diocese for just over three years. The position had been vacant for over three years prior to her arrival.

David Dranchuk is the co-ordinator of Societal Ministries for the Diocese of New Westminster and is also the staff person for the Diocesan Justice and Peace Unit. He has held this position for just over one year, before which point the position had been vacant for several years. His role is to keep the church involved in and informed about social justice issues which vary from year to year and range from poverty and homelessness to the war in Iraq, to globalization and to the recent referendum on treaty negotiations in British Columbia\(^6\).

Kathy Hoodikoff is the Planned Giving Officer at the Diocese of British Columbia (Vancouver Island), but has also worked collaboratively with the Diocesan Stewardship Committee. She worked with the national church up until four years ago, when the position she currently holds was created for her.

At the parish level, Donelda Parker is the Chair of the Stewardship Committee at Christ Church Cathedral in downtown Vancouver. Liz Cullen is the current chair of the stewardship committee at St. Mary’s, and Marcia Sauder is the previous chair of the same committee. Kevin Dixon is the rector at St. Mary’s Anglican Church in Kerrisdale, Vancouver, and has been serving at St. Mary’s as either rector or associate priest since 1997. He has been ordained for 16 years. While he oversees the work of the stewardship committee, he is not necessarily directly involved with its planning. His role in the

---

\(^5\) Stewards in Action is a committee that reports to Synod. Its role is explained further in chapter three. The various units of Stewards in Action are outlined in appendix 2.

\(^6\) See the BC Bishops’ pastoral letter on the treaty referendum for information on the Anglican Church’s response to the referendum: (http://www.vancouver.anglican.ca/default.asp?Menu=103&SubMenu=4&Item=0&Content=RTF/Pastoral.htm)
interviews is an important one, however, as he can provide some insight into the changes he has seen at St. Mary’s over the past several years.

It is interesting to note that the holistic stewardship practices that the interviewees are involved with are all fairly recent initiatives. It is therefore difficult to assess what, if any, ‘progress’ they have made in changing parishioners’ attitudes and behaviours, other than the anecdotal evidence and opinions provided by the interviewees. Not a lot of thought has been devoted, as of yet, to determining how ‘progress’ ought to be monitored and assessed, although this was mentioned by several interviewees as a next step. The fairly recent appointment of several of the interviewees, filling vacancies of one or several years, has resulted in a redefinition of these positions, with a new focus towards social and ecological justice. In many cases, the interviewees pointed towards theologians and social commentators who challenged the way they viewed the world and the church’s role in it, and credited these writers with inspiring them to advocate for a more holistic stewardship. Inspiration came from Wallace Stegner (Wilderness Letter, and other essays and novels), Thomas Berry (A Dream of the Earth), from Marcus Borg (Meeting Jesus Again for the First Time), and from speakers at the Episcopal Network for Stewardship conference held in Richmond in May of 2001, among other life-experience influences. Inspiration also came from observing the work of people around them who are deeply concerned with the quality of life of people in their surroundings, with specific mention of the work of many United Church members in Vancouver’s Downtown Eastside.

Besides these interviews, I also spent time at the provincial Anglican archives, which are located at the Vancouver School of Theology. Many thanks to Doreen Stephens for her guidance and support as I searched through the various Synod notes.

1.7 Structure of Interviews
Of the seven interviews, five were conducted ‘face-to-face’ and the remainder conducted by telephone. The same basic set of questions was circulated to everyone prior to the interview. These questions were meant to stimulate discussion, but were not meant to limit the
conversation. In many cases, by leaving the door open to deviate from the original questions, the interviews yielded much more information than would otherwise have been the case.

Each interview was prefaced also with a blurb about my research so that the interviewees were aware of my particular interest in the relationship between stewardship and principles of sustainability.

Table 1 outlines the questions that were posed, and relates these to my research objectives. Specifically, the questions were designed to reveal what the interviewees thought stewardship to be, and how they perceived it as being practiced in their particular parish or diocese.

**Table 1: The interview questions in relation to research objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Questions</th>
<th>Research Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is your role at the parish/diocese?</td>
<td>Determine the scope of work in the dioceses studies encompassed by ‘stewardship’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What does your work consist of?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long have you been in this position? Is it a position that has been</td>
<td>Determine the degree of permanency and continuity of ‘stewardship’ work in the dioceses studied, and determine how long stewardship issues have been identified as such and of needing diocesan guidance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>around for a long time, or is it a more recent addition to the work of the parish/diocese?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What, to you, is stewardship? How did you come to understand stewardship?</td>
<td>Contribute to the development of a model of stewardship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your vision for stewardship in the parish/diocese?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is stewardship defined by your parish/diocese? How does this compare with your</td>
<td>Contribute to the development of a model of stewardship and to determine how consistently that model is throughout the parishes and dioceses studied in comparison with other theological interpretations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>own understanding and vision?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you provide me with some examples of how stewardship is practiced in your</td>
<td>Find specific examples of stewardship ‘practice’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parish/diocese?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there anything particularly ‘Anglican’ about stewardship as it has been defined/practiced in your parish/diocese?</td>
<td>Attempt to get at the theology behind an Anglican interpretation of stewardship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What kinds of resources do you use in your work? Are there networks that you use</td>
<td>Determine what connections are between those working on developing/promoting stewardship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in your work? Are there networks that you use in your work?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are associated with? Particular conferences that you attend? Particular organizations whose work you find particularly useful?</td>
<td>stewardship. Determine affiliation to provincial/national/global associations that might influence interviewee’s interpretation of stewardship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why are you involved with stewardship? What, if anything, about stewardship inspires you? Why is stewardship important?</td>
<td>Determine motivation for this type of work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many common themes were extracted from the interviews, and eight of these were found to have strong similarities with themes from the planning literature. For example, notions of dialogue and mutual learning were important concepts in both fields, as was the tension between top-down and bottom-up. These eight themes are explored in greater detail in the fourth chapter.

1.8 Looking Ahead

What follows is an exploration into the stewardship model as a new way for planners to see themselves and their role in achieving sustainable societies. It is perhaps not only in our collective places of worship (specifically Anglican in this case) but also in our places of employment (specifically planners in this case) that the Biblical symbol of the steward has, as Douglas John Hall suggests, ‘come of age’. There is surely much to be discovered and learned along the way that will enrich both the researcher’s and the readers’ understanding of how this might take place. The value of pursuing this research in conjunction with the requirements for a Master of Arts degree at the School of Community and Regional Planning lies in the cross-disciplinary dialogue with Anglican theology. This cross-disciplinary approach challenges both the researcher and the reader to seek new understandings and models, outside of traditional planning education for understanding what the right relationship between humans and ‘earth habitat’ (Hessel and Rasmussen) ought to be, and how that relationship could lead to a sustainable planning practice.
Chapter Two
The Importance of Non-Technical Solutions for Sustainability:
Stewardship in the Tragedy of the Commons

"Thou shall inherit the holy earth as a faithful steward, conserving its resources and productivity from generation to generation. Thou shalt safeguard thy fields from soil erosion, thy living waters from drying up, thy forests from desolation, and protect thy hills from over-grazing by the herds, so that thy descendants may have abundance forever. If any shall fail in this stewardship of the land thy fruitful fields shall become sterile stony ground and wasting gullies, and thy descendants shall decrease and live in poverty or be destroyed from off the face of the earth" (Walter Lowdermilk).

The above quote does two things; it illustrates one interpretation of stewardship (the steward as conservationist-manager) and it underscores the fundamental importance of a specific type of behaviour or attitude toward resources. Failure to adhere to this attitude results in consequences reminiscent of those outlined by Garrett Hardin in The Tragedy of the Commons. A shepherd, thinking of his immediate well-being, will add one additional animal to graze in a ‘full’ common because in so doing he is able to accrue all the benefits for himself (one more animal to sell) and share the negative impact (less grass for grazing) with all of the other shepherds present. Each shepherd is thinking the same way, and it does not take long for this situation to result in ‘ruin’ (Hardin) or, ‘sterile stony ground’ (Lowdermilk).

Importantly, Hardin explains that the context for his writing is an article published by J.B. Wiesner and H.F. York on the future of nuclear war. Wiesner and York end by stating “it is our considered professional judgment that this dilemma [the arms race] has no technical solution”; rather, non-technical solutions such as achieved through diplomacy are to be sought. Their article then opens the way for Hardin and others to explore a ‘new’ class of problems that Hardin has coined ‘non-technical-solution-problems’ (Hardin, 1243).

Humanity’s ‘un’-sustainability toward the planet’s resources, I would suggest, is one such problem, and stewardship is an example of a ‘non-technical’ solution. In a first
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7 And more specifically on William Foster Lloyd’s The Tragedy of Freedom in the Commons, which Hardin uncovers and relates to his readers.

8 Hardin gives the reference to that article as follows: J. B. Wiesner and H. F. York, Scientific American 211 (No. 4), 27 (1964).
instance, stewardship will be placed within a broader category of ‘religious’ responses to the ecological crisis. Three models of stewardship are then presented: the steward-as-manager, the steward-as-enlightened-manager, and the steward-as-partner. A final section begins looking specifically at what an Anglican version of stewardship is, borrowing from the Global Anglican Congress’ Declaration on the Stewardship of Creation.

2.1 Stewardship in the Context of ‘Religious’ Solutions

Lynn White Jr., in his 1967 article entitled *The Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis*, makes an important point about the relationship between religion and science in creating a planetary ecological crisis. His argument that science and technology are “tinctured with orthodox Christian arrogance toward nature” (White 1967, 35) is an important one for Christians to explore, especially in the context of a discussion about stewardship, but so also is his concluding remark that: “since the roots of our trouble are so largely religious, the remedy must also be essentially religious, whether we call it that or not” (ibid.).

His assertion underscores the importance of looking to religious examples, such as the stewardship model (more on this soon), in exploring solutions to the ecological crisis. This is not to suggest that allies for addressing the sustainability issue will be found in only non-technical fields; rather, it is to suggest that non-technical solutions need to be brought to the fore-front in discussions between all those who are keen to be involved in the discussion. One example of this occurred at a conference in Moscow in 1990 that was entitled ‘Preserving and Cherishing the Earth: An Appeal for Joint Commitment in Science and Religion’. In their closing remarks, the authors of the appeal write of their “profound experiences of awe and reverence before the universe” (as quoted in Tucker and Grim, 9). They recognized that instilling a sense of the sacred on the planet’s resources and processes makes it “more likely to be treated with care and respect”, and concluded by suggesting that “efforts to safeguard and cherish the environment need to be infused with a vision of the sacred” (ibid.).

The State of the World 2003 report, published the Worldwatch Institute, has for the first time in the State of the World series recognized the importance of ‘infusing a vision of the sacred’
in its documents and in the "effort to build a sustainable world" (Worldwatch institute, 154). Specifically, they have included a chapter devoted to recognizing the importance of "engaging organized religion in the quest for a sustainable world" (ibid., 152). Gary Gardner, the author of that chapter, highlights five important non-technical assets that world religions can offer as their contribution to creating a sustainable society. These are listed as:

1. The capacity to shape cosmologies, or worldviews (what I have so far presented as an understanding of the role of humans on the planet);
2. moral authority;
3. a large base of adherents;
4. significant material resources; and,
5. community-building capacity (ibid., 154).

Interestingly, the interviewees I talked with touched on all of these points in one way or another. This is encouraging as it suggests that even at the most grass-roots levels of the church, there is a level of consciousness as to the urgency of involving the church in a direct manner. I will return to these in chapter five, once the interviews and archival resources are discussed more thoroughly. What is important to take from this is the fact that there is a growing recognition of the absolute necessity for 'non-technical' contributions and solutions if the story of a "unrestrained science and technology [and of a] human species alienated from its own home" (ibid., 175) is to be re-written to one where people are found to be in an "intimate and caring relationship with their planet, with their cosmos, and with each other" (ibid., paraphrasing Thomas Berry). In the spirit of exploring non-technical solutions to the current state of the world, three models of stewardship are developed below using Biblical references and theological writings on the subject. In chapter three more light will be shed on these models based on the results of the interviews.

2.2 Three Models of Stewardship: Manager, Enlightened-Manager, Partner

2.2.1 Steward as Manager

The most literal interpretation of Biblical references to 'steward' is that of a servant-manager. There are a total of 26 references to 'steward' and 'stewardship' in the Old and New Testaments (Hall 1990, 31). In the Old Testament, these references describe an actual
vocation. The steward is a servant, but a servant with greater responsibility towards the master. “The steward is one who has been given the responsibility for the management and service of something belonging to another, and his office presupposes a particular kind of trust on the part of the owner or master” (ibid.). (See, for example, the following passages from books in the Bible: Genesis 43 and 44, 1 Chronicles 27 and 28 and Daniel 1:11, 16.) The steward must not forget that he is a servant, however and not “behave as though he were himself unambiguously in charge (i.e., not accountable)” (Hall 1990, 33). Such behaviour would have serious consequences, as in Isaiah 22: 15-21 where the misbehaved steward is told he will be hurled away, rolled up “tightly like a ball, and throw[n] into a large country [where he] will die”.

The steward-as-manager model has been interpreted in the Anglican Church, and more broadly in the North American mainline churches to justify the use of the term ‘stewardship’ in reference specifically to the financial management of the Church. It has allowed parishioners to feel that their role in stewardship was simply to donate money to the various causes of the church – from maintenance of church buildings, to stipends for clergy, to church funding for local charities. This interpretation is incomplete and has been significant in shaping contemporary uneasiness in the Anglican Church when the annual ‘stewardship’ campaign gets underway.

The steward-as-manager model is also the model that currently informs planning practice. Knight and Landres, for example, use the terms ‘manage’, ‘manager’, or ‘management’ interchangeably with the terms steward and stewardship in their publication entitled Stewardship Across Boundaries. This includes stewardship as the ‘management’ of natural resources, or the ‘management’ of conservation or bio-diversity. Stewards are ‘managers’ making land-use decisions. They suggest that “it is time for a change in the way U.S. natural resources are managed” across artificial boundaries set for administrative purposes. (Knight and Landres, 2). The governments of Canada and British Columbia have adopted a similar understanding of stewardship. In the publication Stewardship Bylaws: A Guide for Local Government, the two higher levels of government suggest that the document “recognizes an
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9 See for example, Eugene Roop’s book, Let the Rivers Run
opportunity for all local governments to play a part in environmental stewardship, through their traditional role in managing land development” (Government of Canada, 1). Stewards, in this sense, are qualified professional planners, landscape architects, biologists, engineers and legal counsel (ibid.).

Unfortunately, experience has shown that humans make very poor ‘managers’ of earth’s resources and systems. Where human society has attempted the management of natural resources, the result has been loss of health to the surrounding ecosystems. Simon Dalby, for example, writes about the link between arctic ecology (threatened by climate change) and global (over-) consumption. Rachel Carson reveals the threat of pesticides and herbicides in intense agricultural food production in Silent Spring. In The Fate of the Earth, Jonathan Schell chronicles how the world would end in the event of nuclear holocaust. For his part, Larry Rasmussen feels deeply passionate about the loss of biodiversity on an increasingly unhealthy planet. He writes, “biodiversity is the name science gives a fierce ‘ontology of communion’¹⁰, and an intimacy of all life” (Rasmussen, in Hessel and Rasmussen, 6). Rasmussen is suggesting here that biodiversity is the essence of being that is characterized by being in communion, or relationship, with all life forms. He goes on to suggest that rather than being ‘in communion’, all of life is at enmity, “an enmity at the hand of those who, without wincing, dare to call themselves creation’s stewards”. The acts of the manager-steward, in Rasmussen’s eyes, has threatened biodiversity, attacking what makes life beautiful and gives it meaning.

Dalby’s, Carson’s, Schell’s and Rasmussen’s words (among innumerable other authors and activists) are a strong critique of the steward-as-manager model. The enmity Rasmussen describes is reminiscent of Lynn White’s pointed critique of Christianity in its arrogance toward nature. The steward-as-manager model is inappropriate in the contemporary ecological context and not suitable for use by planning practitioners. The following section offers the steward-as-enlightened-manager model as an improvement on the steward-as-manager model.

¹⁰ From the footnote in Hessel and Rasmussen “The phrase is Douglas John Hall’s, from Professing the Faith: Christian Theology in a North American Context (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 317".
2.2.2 Steward as Enlightened Manager

The New Testament references to the steward build on the two Old Testament characteristics of the steward (a servant, but with responsibility) to develop a metaphoric interpretation of Christ’s disciples as stewards of Christ’s household – all of creation (see, for example Luke 12: 42-44). This stewardship includes material well-being for all (food and clothing), but also spiritual well-being; the disciples are stewards of the Gospel (Hall 1990, 37), and more importantly, stewards of God’s grace.

From the Oxford English Dictionary definition of stewardship provided in chapter 1, it is clear that there is a ‘management’ dimension to the concept. However, to suggest that the study of the household (oikos), no matter how narrowly or broadly interpreted, leads to proper financial, social or environmental management puts the steward in the position of assuming full knowledge of a world that is inherently complex and dynamic. The steward may strive to understand and take action accordingly, but must always approach the world with a degree of uncertainty and humility before its awesome complexity.

This requires a shift in perception of the role of humans on the planet. As Douglas John Hall writes in The Steward: A Biblical Symbol Come of Age, Christians (and humanity more generally) “can no longer count (thank God!) on being the darling of power” (Hall 1990, 12).

The power that humanity has assumed it possessed to manage the household of creation has in fact resulted in the degradation of creation and in Hall’s realization that we are in a position of dependence and utter reliance on natural resources and processes; furthermore, our meddling with natural processes has toppled humanity out of a position of power into one of vulnerability at the forces that we have unwittingly unleashed on ourselves. Rachel Carson’s Silent Spring eloquently chronicles the effect of humanity’s desire to exercise power over agricultural processes through the use of pesticides and herbicides and the resulting undesired consequences of a toxic, life-threatening pollution of the water system.

The concept of humanity as ‘powerful manager’ in this light is laughable. Rather, the steward ought to have a powerful dose of humility toward her role as decision-maker (over
her own actions and any actions outside of her own that she can influence) such that she
minimizes the drain on resources and does not overload the capacity of her ‘household’ to
assimilate waste. If the household is taken to its broadest interpretation – the planet – then
she must be aware of how her day-to-day decisions affect the world around her. This image
of the steward as enlightened-manager, aware of her immediate and more global context, is
closer to what Hall describes as the type of vocation which has ‘come of age’.

The steward-as-enlightened-manager understands the world in the following way. Firstly,
she is in a dependent relationship with the rest of creation. Her own survival depends on
ensuring that the systems around her remain healthy and functioning. Secondly, her own
survival is something she cares deeply about, and remains her first priority. Thirdly, she sees
that she has been given the ability to reason, to learn from the past, and is aware that she
must use these tools to make decisions on a day-to-day basis. In summary, she recognizes
the frailty of her own existence at the same time that she sees her species’ existence as being
of utmost value over other life-forms – their value to her is more use-value than inherent.

This discussion is an important one for planners who must also consciously explore their own
assumptions which feed the model through which they view the world. Planners provide
advice to decision-makers and affect policies that shape the economic, social and ecological
landscape. If a critique of past planners was their insensitivity to the human ‘other’ in
planning decision-making, specifically as this relates to marginalized populations (see, for
example, Sandercock 1998a), then contemporary planners would do well to see the
possibility of their own insensitivity to the non-human ‘other’ in their mental model.

To be clear, both the steward-as-manager and the steward-as-enlightened-manager are
models that put the human at centre stage. The steward-as-manager is sure of his power over
nature and exercises it accordingly with little awareness for consequences, while the steward-
as-enlightened-manager is aware that her own survival is dependent on the health of the
natural systems around her. She has a more inclusive and more ‘sustainable’ view on her
role, but is identical to her steward-as-manager counterpart in that both of these positions are
anthropocentric. The goal – a valid one for any life-form - remains her species’ survival.
Note that these two stewardship models do not call on the steward to have any particular religious reverence for the surrounding life-support system; the relationship can remain one of self-interest.

A final stewardship model, the steward-as-partner, offers a non-anthropocentric vision as an alternative to the one outlined above.

2.2.3 Steward as Partner

This final model is different from the first two in that it is unabashedly spiritual in nature. While the steward-as-manager and steward-as-enlightened-manager might easily take place without reference to God, the third model has no meaning without reference to God, as it uses the imagery of a Creation which is embodied by God.

Douglas Burton-Christie uses the analogy of an ecotone, the meeting-ground of two or more ecosystems, to discuss the fluid nature of the space between humans and non-humans, between “matter and spirit, body and soul, heaven and earth, humanity and divinity” (Burton-Christie, 14). He calls his readers to explore the ‘ecotones’ that these relationships represent, and to do away with the dualisms that are the first reaction to seeing the above words together. In order to do this, he suggests, we (North Americans) must learn to experience “intimacy with the living world” (ibid., 17). His article goes on to argue for a recovery of the language of *eros* which he suggests can lead us to realize that the borders “between oneself and another, between human beings and the more-than-human world, between matter and spirit” are permeable (ibid.). The encounters that are possible in these ‘ecotones’ can lead us to “imagine ourselves as fully embodied, erotic beings, touching and responding ecstatically
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11 I chose the term ‘partner’ for use in the third model because of the many-layered connotations of the word. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, a partner can be "one who has a share or part with another or others; one who is associated with another or others in the enjoyment or possession of anything; a partaker, sharer". A partner may also be synonymous with an "associate or colleague", or a partner is, "one who is associated with another or others in the carrying on of some business", or again as "one associated in marriage, a spouse" (OED on-line). The steward-as-partner relationship suggests all of these things; that all life forms enjoy the earth as their home; that all are inter-related in the many ways each contributes to the carrying on of the business of supplying a life-supporting habitat on the planet; and that humans ought to become more in tune with the notion of being in relationship with other life-forms, in the sense of a committed, sensual, emotional relationship. This final bit is perhaps the most challenging connotation of ‘partner’ to come to grip with, but is where most of the emphasis is found in moving from the steward-as-enlightened-manager model to the steward-as-partner model.
to the touch of another" (ibid., 37). Certainly, ‘responding ecstatically’ to the natural world around us is a very different approach than one of ‘managing’.

Importantly, this ecstatic relationship with the earth validates the human role on the planet. Thomas Berry suggests, for example, that there is a danger in seeing the human race “as an addendum or an intrusion and thus find[ing] no real place in the story of the universe. In reality the human activates the most profound dimension of the universe itself, its capacity to reflect on and celebrate itself in conscious self-awareness” (Berry, 131/2). In this sense, the relationship between humanity and the universe is of inter-dependence; it offers a new way of understanding the relationship that is not utilitarian or “empty of feeling and spirit” (Burton-Christie, 14).

Sallie McFague, in The Body of God asks her readers to consider the possibility of God embodied in the world: “what if we dared to think of our planet and indeed the entire universe as the body of God?” This is an attractive metaphor to me, as it calls us to think of ourselves as “spirited bodies among other spirited bodies on our planet” (McFague 1993, 19). We are not ‘managers’ in this way of thinking; we are in relationship with ‘other spirited bodies’ who are infused with the sacred, therefore requiring of us the utmost respect and reverence for the ‘other’. The ‘other’ is no longer simply useful to our survival, but gains its own intrinsic value.

The steward-as-partner shares in the spirit essence of all of Creation and is therefore called to care for the other for its own integrity, not to ensure her own survival. The steward-as-partner, gifted with reason, memory and language, is set apart from the other by her responsibility as a care-giver and nurturer of all life. In this way, she is called to be a servant. In some ways, we have come full circle from the first notion presented of the steward as servant-manager. In order to have meaning in the current ecological context, however, the ‘manager’ aspect must be dropped and the ‘servant’ aspect reclaimed.

Table 2, below, summarizes the various characteristics of the steward models presented above.
Table 2: Characteristics of the three models of ‘stewardship’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of stewardship</th>
<th>Value of humans</th>
<th>Value of other life</th>
<th>Type of knowledge</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steward-as-manager</strong></td>
<td>Anthropocentric</td>
<td>Humans are managers who can manipulate and control nature towards their own ends.</td>
<td>Utility value. Humans take a more humble approach to controlling nature, realizing that they are dealing with a complex and dynamic system.</td>
<td>Scientific (rational)</td>
<td>Humans control nature. No change required – status quo. Not inspiring for behavioural change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steward-as-enlightened-manager</strong></td>
<td>Anthropocentric</td>
<td>Humans are manager who are aware of their limitations and approach the management of the earth with a certain degree of humility.</td>
<td>Utility value. Humanity is in a dependent relationship with ‘nature’, therefore, the steward recognizes the importance of ensuring healthy life-systems outside of humanity in order that humanity might survive.</td>
<td>Scientific (rational)</td>
<td>Humans can not control nature because of the complexity of life, specifically the interconnected ness of all life. Humanity is in relationship with the ‘other’. Change in perception of role of humans on planet leads to complete change in behaviours (towards more sustainable).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steward-as-partner</strong></td>
<td>Biocentric. Stewards are in relationship with the world around them and ‘respond ecstatically’ to it.</td>
<td>Intrinsic value. Other life forms have value beyond their utility to human survival.</td>
<td>A balance of scientific (rational) and spiritual/moral. Stewardship as a non-technical solution to a non-technical solution problem (i.e. sustainability).</td>
<td>Humans take a more humble approach to controlling nature, realizing that they are dealing with a complex and dynamic system.</td>
<td>Change in perception of role of humans on planet leads to complete change in behaviours (towards more sustainable).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Applicability to Sustainability Planning

The second and third models presented (steward-as-enlightened-manager and steward-as-partner) are the only ones that have relevance to sustainability planners. The first one most
closely resembles the status-quo of humanity’s understanding of its role vis-à-vis nature, the result of which has been an attitude of ‘dominate and subdue’. This is not a sustainable approach, and its story must be refuted, rewritten and retold in a new iteration of the stewardship story. Interestingly, as mentioned above, it is in this sense – steward-as-manager – that the planning profession has come to use the term ‘stewardship’.

The distinction between the enlightened-manager and partner models rests on the centrality of humanity in the first, and the centrality of the spirit in the second. Strictly speaking, both approaches ought to result in a sustainable planet; the first due to the steward’s ‘enlightened self-interest’ and the second due to a radically different understanding of the place and role of humanity in nature. The first remains anthropocentric, while the second approach is what Cobb and Daly term ‘biocentric’ (Daly and Cobb, chapter 20). The fourth chapter deals more specifically with the appropriate link to be made between planning and stewardship, insisting that the possibilities offered by the last model for defining a new vision for humanity’s role in creation should not be understated.

For Christians, the steward-as-partner model is the model that most approaches their calling as followers of Christ. The Biblical message is clear: “The Lord your God is one Lord; and thou shalt love the Lord your God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul and with all thy mind and with all thy strength. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like it: thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets” (General Synod, 69). Loving God, if God is embodied in the world, requires Christians to love the planet and all its complexity; while loving one’s neighbour calls on Christians to be aware of the well-being of the ‘other’, as one is aware of one’s own well-being.

2.4 ‘Anglican’ Stewardship – the Official Position

“[The stewardship education unit’s] primary purpose has been to increase the awareness and understanding of the meaning and implications of Christian Stewardship on the part of all members of the Christian family in the Diocese of New Westminster. We believe that while our first efforts must be directed towards a wide acceptance of the fact that Christian Stewardship is really the
practice of the Christian Gospel, it is also legitimate for us to offer assistance to parishes who are struggling to interpret and apply stewardship principles, especially as they relate to the raising of money for the work of the church” (DNW 1974).

The above quote from the stewardship education unit at the sixty-eighth session of the Synod of the Diocese of New Westminster provides a context for the current understanding and practice of stewardship in the Diocese of New Westminster, and is indicative of how ‘stewardship’ has been practiced in the broader Anglican Church of Canada. Note that the education unit recognizes at the outset that stewardship is “really the practice of the Christian Gospel”, but that by the end of the quote they have narrowed their focus to stewardship as “raising money for the work of the church”. This concept of stewardship is widespread. As John Douglas Hall writes, “for the majority of churchgoers stewardship signifies a way of thinking about (one could almost say of rationalizing!) the acquisition and management of ecclesiastical monies and properties. [...] Stewardship is the material means by which the spirit end is achieved” (Hall 1990, 12). This interpretation is starting to lose its predominance in the minds of church-goers, but the lingering connotation of stewardship with financial campaigns is one which those who work and volunteer in stewardship initiatives are forced to face.

In a more recent Anglican context, the 1998 Lambeth Conference (a conference of Anglican Bishops from around the world) ventured to make several resolutions on the state of peace, justice and care of creation. Though these resolutions do not use the term ‘stewardship’ directly, it is these resolutions which are the basis in doctrine for what would become the Global Anglican Congress’ Declaration on the Stewardship of Creation, as discussed below. The Congress states that:

“in 1998, the Bishops of the Anglican Communion resolved to face [unjust economic structures, ecological crisis, etc...] and provided the scriptural and theological justification for the involvement of the Church in caring for creation. We recognize this and other ongoing work of people in the communion. Such work needs our support. However, it is not enough” (see appendix 1 for the full text of the declaration).
The Congress’ declaration called on Anglicans to be stewards of creation in response to the “planetary crisis […] characterized by deep poverty: impoverished people, an impoverished Earth” (Global Anglican Congress). Fifteen specific actions were listed, and are reproduced here as context for an Anglican interpretation of ‘stewardship’.

“As brothers and sisters in Christ’s Body and as fellow Anglicans seeking to fulfill our baptismal covenant and witness to the power of the Holy Spirit in Christ, we ask you, in your parishes, dioceses, or provinces, acting at the most appropriate level, and in cooperation with ecumenical and interfaith partners wherever possible to undertake the following:

- To acknowledge that the Church’s mission must now take place in the context of a life and death planetary crisis whose impact affects all aspects of the Church’s life and mission.
- To bring prayers and actions concerning ecology, environmental justice, human rights, and sustainable development to the forefront of public worship as well as private and corporate reflections on the Holy Scriptures.
- To support the struggle of indigenous peoples to maintain their cultural heritage, natural heritage, and human rights.
- To encourage all members of our congregations to understand that God calls us to care for the creation by making our communities and environments better places for the next generation than they were in our lifetime.
- To actively support initiatives in all Churches and communities that are concerned with the planetary crisis.
- To help publicize and network information, developments, events, publications and all sources of knowledge among our friends, neighbours, congregation members, Church leaders, and government officials.
- To encourage links among our provinces, dioceses, and parishes worldwide to increase understanding of the many issues involved and how they are interrelated.
- To support opportunities for younger people to experience first-hand how people in their own and other congregations and communities are affected by the planetary crisis and how they can work to change the world in which they live.
- To promote training and educational programs in all aspects of the planetary crisis even as they relate to our worship and community life.
- To encourage diligently our secular and Church leaders, lay and ordained, in all parts of the Anglican Communion to place the planetary crisis at the highest level of their concerns.
- To encourage and support public policies that reflect the principles of sustainable community.
- To request all bodies within the communion to undertake an environmental audit and take appropriate action on the basis of the results. To commit ourselves both to energy conservation and the use of sustainable energy sources.
To demonstrate simplicity of lifestyle in our patterns of consumption to counteract greed and over-consumption. Such greed dictates so much of our economic past that it must be transformed into generosity and compassion”.

Note that this call to Anglicans for stewardship practice does not mention financial stewardship to the church (although another section on the Anglican Church of Canada website, where the Declaration was pulled from, is devoted to financial stewardship), but focuses on environmental and social justice issues, and is seen as having to take place in an inter-faith context. It will be impossible, in the scope of this thesis, to chronicle the inter-faith stewardship movement, but it must be understood that stewardship is not a uniquely Anglican movement.

The above ‘call to prayer and action’ (ibid.) in the Anglican Church is indicative of a widespread uneasiness in society that science and technology (tools of domination), along with the global economy (tool of wealth and power), have done very little to address the growing social, ecological and economic ills threatening the world today. A growing number of individuals and organizations with religious or non-religious affiliation see the need to explore Hardin’s ‘non-technical’ solutions by changing the lens through which we view the world from one of ‘no limits’ (WCED, 45) to one of ‘enoughness’ (McFague 2001, 33), simpler living (Michael Schut: Simpler Living Compassionate Life), and relationships (for example, Bill Rees’ 1997 article “How a Parasite Should Value Its Host”). Note that these action items do not ignore the place of science in informing decision-making, but that they are very clear the solutions rest with lifestyle change. Science is good at answering certain questions, it seems to say, and provide people with information about how their actions affect the world; but the solutions to these consequences are to be found in our own behaviour, not in technical fixes. Note that this reliance on behavioural changes places the Congress’ Declaration within the realm of either the steward-as-enlightened-manager or the steward-as-partner. Further, the language used conveys a definite concern for the planet beyond its utility to human beings. The survival of humanity is not mentioned, but the planetary crisis is referred to several times. This would point to a model of stewardship closer to ‘partner’ than ‘enlightened-manager’.
2.5 Looking Ahead

The actions that Anglicans are asked to consider are no small matter. They represent a real challenge to both clergy and lay members of the church for community worship and individual habits and life-style choices. Recall that the Anglican Church operates on the principle of dispersed authority, so these are not dictums from the highest level of government; rather, they represent the work of a group of committed Christians that is being offered to their fellow Christians as food for thought. The next chapter looks specifically at the practice of stewardship in the dioceses and parishes outlined in chapter one. A concluding section of that chapter will revisit the declaration to see if stewardship as practiced ‘on the ground’ resembles the stewardship that the Congress is calling for.
Chapter Three
From the Interview Files:
What is a Practice of Stewardship?

While the second chapter looked to several sources in the theological literature to answer the question 'what is stewardship?' this chapter turns to the interviewees – all of whom are involved with some aspect of stewardship in the Anglican Church at the Diocesan or Parish level – to answer the question 'how is stewardship practiced?'

The second part of the second chapter started to delve into this question by exploring what advice was being given from the 'high-end' Anglican Communion with regards to how stewardship ought to be practiced. The declarations and resolutions explored painted a picture of high moral and ethical standards, calling on Anglicans to seek out ways of educating themselves and of facilitating the dissemination of information about the interrelated facets of the 'planetary crisis', and to seek a simplicity of lifestyle. These high standards are 'top-down' in the sense that they are a response by a high-level committee to the planetary crisis, as they perceive it, suggesting ways for individual lay and clergy as well as their congregations to take positive steps toward addressing that crisis. What follows is an exploration of the response from the more grass-roots levels of the church hierarchy to the ways stewardship can address the perceived needs of the local community.

I first present the structure of stewardship committees from an organizational perspective in order to gain an understanding of how ideas about stewardship are transferred within the church. A second and third section presents specific examples of how stewardship is practiced in the dioceses and parishes represented by the interviews. A fourth section explores one resource that has been created by the Diocese of New Westminster’s environment working group for parish stewardship committees for the advancement of stewardship. A final section will discuss the stewardship practices explored in the chapter in relation to the Global Anglican Congress’ declaration. A table at the end of the chapter (which may be referred to at any point) outlines the themes that emerged from the interviews and the responses of interviewees to each of these.
3.1 The Organizational Structure of Stewardship

Besides the Global Anglican Congress and other interested global committees in the Anglican Communion, there are also national, provincial, diocesan and parish level committees and working groups that deal with stewardship issues. These include stewardship committees, eco-justice committees, financial management and development committees, planned giving committees, ecology and theology working groups, social justice working groups, and so on. These groups report to their respective Synods (national, provincial or diocesan), and at the parish level they report to their vestry.

Networks between these groups are more or less formalized, and are most developed with respect to financial management and planned giving. The social justice community is networked through a Canadian ecumenical initiative called Kairos which was formed in July of 2001. No formal network exists for the stewardship development community, although individual members have formed their own, informal, networks.

Within the Diocese of New Westminster, I was in contact with members representing two main committees that report to Synod with respect to stewardship. Stewards in Action (SIA) is the “outreach and good works” (Shirley Stockdill) arm of stewardship in the Diocese that concentrates on shared stewardship efforts which are beyond the capacity of a single parish. The Stewardship Development Committee is a separate unit that concentrates on the educational component of stewardship. Within the Diocese of British Columbia I was in contact with the Planned Giving Officer who is a resource person to the Planned Giving Unit, and who has also collaborated with the stewardship development committee there.

3.1.1 Diocesan Committees

Stewards in Action

The “primary guiding principle, passion and premise for Stewards in Action is that together we can do ‘more than we can ask or imagine’\textsuperscript{12} for the people in the world around us… more

\textsuperscript{12} This is a reference to a doxology said after Communion during a worship service. The prayer is as follows: “Glory to God, whose power working in us, can do infinitely more than we can ask or imagine. Glory to God from generation to generation, in the Church and in Christ Jesus, for ever and ever. Amen. (Anglican Church of Canada, 214)
than we can do as individuals” (DNW 1999) Stewards in Action provides support to shared ministries to “build up parish ministry in such areas as youth programming, church school, evangelism, adult and youth Christian education, stewardship education and financial giving; launching, and assisting others to launch outreach programs to help the local community through programs to alleviate poverty and violence in the community, through grief support and hospice programs, chaplaincies and assistance to refugees; relief and development help for those in need in Northern Canada and overseas” (ibid). There are many working groups within Stewards in Action, each of which deals with one of the ministries mentioned above. The Peace and Justice Unit led by David Dranchuk, falls under the umbrella of Stewards in Action. For a full list of Stewards in Action units as of 1999, see appendix 2.

This year (2003) two groups will receive significant funding from Stewards in Action: the Coming Home Society and the South Fraser Community Services Society. The first (affiliated with St. James church) is a treatment centre for up to eight young aboriginal women just out of detoxification centres which will continue treatment programs for addiction, offer job training skills and attempt to train them with family life skills with the ultimate goal of reuniting them with their families. The South Fraser Community Services Society (St. Helen’s Surrey) offers shelter for women during the winter, health treatment, a community kitchen and is a referral centre for full service community support. It is located in Walleye, which has the largest growing number of homeless families in the Diocese of New Westminster. These are both ‘related groups’, meaning that these groups receive some funding from the Diocese, although it is not guaranteed, but they are able to use the name and logo of the Anglican Church which can be influential in their attempts to raise funds from other sources, including various levels of government (Shirley Stockdill).

Stewardship Development Committee

The Stewardship Development Committee is the educational arm of the organizational structure at the Diocesan level, and works with individual parishes to develop stewardship in their local context. The Stewardship Development Committee is led by a volunteer chair, but has access to the Diocesan Stewardship Development Officer who provides expertise. The Officer has a multi-faceted job which includes working with parishes to determine their sense
of vision and to take stock of what is happening in their community. “I work with the parish to evaluate where they would like to be, and how to get there. Once they have a clear vision, everything else falls into place” (Shirley Stockdill). The language used in this last quote is evocative of the language used in community development (and in other disciplines whenever a plan is implemented, no doubt), and the link between community vision and stewardship is explored further in the fourth chapter.

Planned Giving Unit
The Planned Giving Unit of the Diocese of British Columbia offers training for volunteer planned giving officers in each of its 56 parishes. They deal strictly with the financial side of stewardship, including meeting with donors and working out complicated gifts such as securities or charitable remainder trusts. Kathy Hoodikoff has held this position since it was first created four years ago. In that time she has come to realize that there is a fundamental premise about stewardship that needs to be understood if planned giving is to even get off the ground: that God gave us everything. In other words, our gifts of time, talent and treasure are not ours to keep to ourselves, but are meant to be shared with others. Planned giving, in this sense, is the end result of a whole attitude about stewardship. As a result of this realization, her work has tied in more holistically in the past year with stewardship.

3.1.2 Parish Level Committees
Most parishes in the Diocese of New Westminster have a stewardship committee that is led by volunteers from within the church community, with guidance from a clergy representative. The role of the committee has traditionally been to lead a financial ‘stewardship’ campaign in the fall of each year in order to solicit pledges from parishioners which would then form the backbone of the budget for the upcoming year (the ‘charity’ understanding of stewardship). In all the interviews I conducted, it became apparent that this role is now perceived to be too narrowly-focused, and many parishes are looking for ways to expand the role and vision of their stewardship committee to include social and ecological stewardship beside their current economic focus.
3.2 Stewardship Practice: Diocesan Level

3.2.1 Defining Stewardship

The interviewees suggested, in several separate conversations, that they do not know of any statement by their respective bishops that provides any clear definition of stewardship. “To just say what stewardship is would be un-Anglican” suggests the Reverend Shirley Stockdill. Indeed, as it turns out, it would be completely ‘un-Anglican’ for any individual or body of the Anglican Communion to make such a statement. Recall that the Anglican Communion has adopted as its modus operandi the notion of ‘dispersed authority’. No one person or committee can dictate the individual practices of members of the Anglican Communion and this extends to stewardship. There are declarations about what groups of Anglicans think of stewardship (specifically, the Global Anglican Congress’ declaration on the stewardship of creation), but no single definition. In other words, arriving at a working definition and interpretation of stewardship is left to those who work most closely on it.

The Diocese of New Westminster’s Stewardship Development Committee, for example, came up with a working definition for stewardship at its meeting in February, 2003. It was pulled from John Piper’s work, Desiring God and states: “why does God bless us with abundance? So we can have enough to live on and then use the rest for all manner of good works that alleviate spiritual and physical misery. Enough for us; abundance for others” (Piper). The concept of ‘enoughness’ is central to stewardship development in the Diocese of New Westminster, and is reminiscent of the final action item of the Anglican Congress’ Declaration, asking Anglicans “to demonstrate simplicity of lifestyle” (Global Anglican Congress).

It is interesting to note the parallels between the Stewardship Development Committee’s focus, and the concept of ‘enoughness’ argued by Sallie McFague in her latest book, Abundant Life. In her book she notes that ‘abundance’ in a North American sense is equated to accumulation of material possessions. As North American Christians, the challenge we must face is to adopt an “alternative vision of abundant living” (McFague 2001, 14) that includes curbing the consumption habits of North Americans so that others can share in the resources that otherwise fuel the consumption economy. She suggests that few churches
have been up to this. In her Manifesto to North American Christians, she calls on Christians to adopt a new story for telling of the role of humans on the planet; one that is more amenable to the alternative vision of abundance. She suggests that human beings “are not individuals with the power to use nature in whatever ways they wish. Rather, we are dependent on nature and responsible for it. In a sharp reversal, we do not control nature, but rely utterly on it” (ibid., 208 with original emphasis).

3.2.2 Stewardship Vision: Re-visioning the Practice of the Christian Gospel

In the conversations I had, the connotation of stewardship as purely about financial campaigns was discussed as being a challenge to initiating more holistic programs at both the parish and diocesan level. In the Diocese of New Westminster the link between stewardship and financial campaigns can be traced back to the diocesan Stewardship Education Unit’s statement at the 1974 Synod which legitimized that unit’s role as one of offering assistance to struggling parishes “especially as [these] relate to the raising of money for the work of the church” (DNW 1974).

In order to return to the true mandate of that unit, which it recognized as “increase[ing] the awareness and understanding of the meaning and implications of Christian Stewardship […] as the practice of the Christian Gospel” (ibid.), a major education campaign is needed at the parish, diocesan and higher orders of church governance to reconnect with this vision of the Christian Gospel. Many of the prayers, Bible readings and hymns associated with weekly worship are infused with this type of vision, but get lost in the routine of worship. Revisiting the role of humans as stewards of God’s creation (as per the steward-as-partner model) using the familiar words and tunes may be an effective bridge to exploring how Christians ought to react to contemporary issues.

This is not to suggest that financial stewardship campaigns are out-of-step with a new vision of the practice of the Christian Gospel, but rather to recognize that financial stewardship is incomplete without other kinds of stewardship.
Assessing the ‘success’ of stewardship campaigns must also move beyond a tally of pledges (monetary success) to explore other measures as well. Kathy Hoodikoff suggests that a ‘successful’ stewardship campaign might also be measured in terms of the level of involvement of parishioners in the church (for example, through the many ministries of the church) and spiritual development (through Bible study, for example). Monetary success is important in order to keep the church running (this includes fundraising for roof repairs or a new organ) and serving the community, but involvement in ministries and spiritual development of parishioners is what gives meaning to the church in society; if the church does not offer ministries and opportunities for spiritual growth, then parishioners are less inclined to support the church financially. The relationship between ecological, social and economic stewardship is becoming increasingly evident and relevant to the church in a day when parishioners are bombarded on a daily basis with various deserving charities soliciting for donations.

Shirley Stockdill is committed to developing a more holistic approach to stewardship at the Diocese of New Westminster. “I have always recognized that stewardship for the longest time has lost its direction here. It has been considered to be fund-raising. We are poor therefore we have to practice good stewardship, but in that very narrow sense of financial stewardship”. Her work focuses on raising awareness at the diocesan and parish levels for a holistic interpretation of stewardship.

Her efforts so far have been concentrated on education at both the parish and diocesan level, and she suggests that she is starting to see a change in attitude towards stewardship, and a new vision for the role of the Church in society. “We are gradually beginning to change the face of stewardship in the Diocese. It still implies money; however, it implies a different use of our resources which is more than money, and as parishes are beginning to recognize that they see that, in fact, holistic stewardship pays off in all sorts of ways. Healthier parishes, more outreach, more opportunities – and not just to evangelize, but that they actually are seeming to be doing what they always wanted to do, which is to be good Christians, and to reach out with the Good News. And so they see it as something beyond that [just money]”. Note the link being made here between the vision for the church community (to be good
Christians reaching out with the Good News), and its awareness about the role of stewardship. This theme will be explored further in chapter four.

3.3 Stewardship Practice: Parish Level

3.3.1 Defining Stewardship

When I spoke with people involved with stewardship at the parish level, they defined stewardship in two steps. First, they said things such as: “stewardship is everything I do, with everything I have, all of the time”, or “stewardship is everything I do after I say ‘I believe’”, or “stewardship is the living out of my Baptismal Covenant”. These are statements that suggest that stewardship is a way of looking at the world; it offers a way of interpreting the world and appropriate ways of acting in and reacting to that world. The use of first person, singular suggests that stewardship is a personal commitment. Indeed, some responses were very personal in nature, such as Kevin Dixon’s suggestion that stewardship is “my response to God’s generosity”. He went on to suggest that by being a steward he was “responding to God’s generosity by being a fraction as generous as God is”. In 1997 he was a bone marrow donor; a point in his life when “a whole lot of lights went on” regarding stewardship of his own body, and how this might extend to stewardship of other aspects of his life. In the most literal sense, if he took care of his body, it could be a potential life-saver to someone else; more broadly speaking, stewardship of all of one’s gifts of time, talent and treasure allows for the potential to be of service to the ‘other’.

After reflecting on these broad definitions of stewardship, the interviewees talked about the details of specific actions, ministries and campaigns that they were undertaking in their local context. These include, for example, soup kitchens, community lunches, seniors’ programs, Sunday school and other educational programs, music programs, and gardening, to name but a few. Certainly, the focus on financial stewardship through the stewardship campaign was also a major activity.

In defining stewardship, Kevin Dixon was clear about the link between stewardship and individual development needs. Stewardship at St. Mary’s is a very different context than stewardship in the Anglican Church in the third-world, for example. “We’re not dealing with
the kind of basic stewardship issues like getting water into people’s homes, or firewood or electricity or whatever; it’s dealing with stewardship at a higher level on the hierarchy of need. How do you make sure that you are using your life well?” He continued by suggesting that “in an affluent community like [St. Mary’s] you have to proclaim a message of simplicity because people can so easily fall prey to thinking their stuff is going to give them a sense of hope and consolation”.

At Christ Church Cathedral, Donelda Parker notes that for the last few years they have included an ecological component in their vision of stewardship. The stewardship committee at that parish has been quite direct with its challenge to parishioners to “‘lead unconventional lives of dedication, service and sacrifice – to present an alternate view’ to that of middle class society” (Barna in Durall, as quoted in a committee leaflet entitled: Stewardship Information for Newcomers).

3.3.2 Financial Stewardship and Vision
Traditionally the stewardship campaign is held in the fall of every year, and focuses on the need for the church to garner a financial commitment from its parishioners for the upcoming year. They culminate in a ‘commitment Sunday’, when parishioners submit their financial pledges. At both St. Mary’s and Christ Church Cathedral, efforts have been made to extend the stewardship campaign to other times of the year. At Christ Church Cathedral, for example, the year-round stewardship focus follows the church calendar. In Advent (leading up to Christmas) the parish as a community celebrates the coming of God’s son as a gift to them. During Lent (leading up to Easter) the parish looks inwardly to focus on stewardship of the soul and inner life. After Easter and into the summer months, the parish focuses on stewarding of their outer life - God’s gifts of time and talent. In the early fall, the stewardship committee organizes a stewardship event focusing on stewardship of the earth, with a focus on voluntary simplicity. The financial stewardship aspect occurs later in the fall, but quite evidently is but one component of a more holistic approach.

At both St. Mary’s and Christ Church Cathedral, efforts have been made to connect financial stewardship with people’s sense of spirituality through the use of narrative budgets.
According to Liz Cullen and Marcia Sauder, the narrative budget was pursued because it was a way of refocusing the budget (away from hard numbers) to determine how the use of physical resources and employees’ time at the church relates to six key areas of ministry: worship, fellowship, pastoral care, outreach, diocesan support, and Christian formation. In presenting this document to parishioners, they were able to tell the story of the budget as it relates to the church’s mission statement. A similar approach was used at Christ Church with the aim of demonstrating to parishioners how the income they provide goes to support the mission of the church. An important aspect of their financial stewardship campaign is the example set by leadership, whereby parish council, trustees, clergy, the stewardship committee and the cathedral staff submit their pledges in advance of the parish. This commitment by the staff, volunteers and clergy is then communicated to the parish. This practice was started last year (fall 2002), and will continue this year (fall 2003).

More recently, at St. Mary’s, a capital campaign has been launched to raise funds for repairing the roof, stabilizing the belfry, renovating the kitchen and the entrance. The challenge for stewardship committee members is to make the link between these physical repairs and the underlying vision of the church. It requires the committee to educate the parish with respect to the question “how does the vision, of what God is calling us to do and be, justify the actions we take in the world?” (Kevin Dixon). As far as the financial aspect of stewardship is concerned, the question is: how do you use your resources (including physical resources of the church) such that the Kingdom of God is fostered?

Increasingly at St. Mary’s there’s an understanding that stewardship relates to the vision of the church. In my interview with Kevin Dixon, he related how the process of determining a mission statement for St. Mary’s, including objectives, priorities and actions to live out the vision statement related directly to stewardship activities. He suggested (without any prompting from this planning student, I might add) that stewardship spawns “a sense of long-term planning”. This relates back to Shirley Stockdil’s approach to stewardship development in congregations, as explored above, whereby she works with the church to determine its vision, and from there “everything else falls into place”.
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3.3.3 Stewardship Education and Vision

At St. Mary's and Christ Church Cathedral there was a commitment on behalf of the stewardship committees to educate their parishioners with respect to stewardship as not being limited to ministry within the church, but also extending to include the kinds of commitments of time, talent and money that parishioners offer in the broader community. As part of their education campaign at St. Mary’s the stewardship committee placed a drawing of a tree with bare branches in the church. Parishioners were invited to write out, on paper leaves, the types of stewardship activities they were involved in – and not limited to the church. The overall image of the tree, once the leaves had been placed on it, showed the involvement of St. Mary’s (community) and St. Mary’s parishioners in the community. “Some people resisted, because they thought that as a Christian you never say ‘I’m so great’, but we wanted people to understand that stewardship includes all of these things as well and to appreciate all the different ways in which we give” (Liz Cullen).

At Christ Church Cathedral, a brochure handed out to newcomers regarding stewardship asks them to consider their options for being good stewards. This includes suggestions about leading a life of voluntary simplicity (stewardship of creation), as well as pointing out several ministries offered at the church where newcomers have the opportunity to become involved in order to foster other types of stewardship (stewardship of humankind; sharing gifts of time, ability, skill, experience and finances).

Both churches have also tried to raise awareness in the church by asking individuals and groups to share their ministry with the rest of the community. This includes regular ‘stewardship moments’ as part of the service, when an individual is asked to share their experience of stewardship with the rest of the community. At St. Mary’s this included a ‘share the joy’ brunch where every ministry was asked to put together a poster presentation on their activities and be present to explain them as members of the congregation browsed over a brunch provided to them by the committee. These presentations focus on everything from “parenting to gardening to stewardship of clergy to stewardship of time and priorities” (Liz and Marcia). Not only do these types of activities raise the profile of stewardship, as it relates to the vision of the church, but it raises awareness within the community about the
types of activities that go on at the church, and can instill a sense of pride and better understanding about the role of the church for those involved directly and those in the broader community who benefit from the various ministries.

Other types of stewardship initiatives found in the two parishes relate to procurement policies (buying fairly-traded, organic coffee, for example); donation policies (following up with organizations who receive funds from the church to ensure that the money is being spent in ways that are in sync with the church’s vision); and participating in larger initiatives of the Anglican Communion, such as the Jubilee initiative and the Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund.

### 3.4 Stewardship Education: Sharing the Vision

It is not possible to extrapolate to suggest that the work being done by the two dioceses and parishes that I interviewed is present elsewhere in the Anglican Communion. It is possible to suggest that the vision of the church and its parishioners as stewards, as is being pursued in these places is encouraging and a cause for hope. A crucial step would be missing, however, if that vision was not communicated to other dioceses and parishes. The Diocesan Environmental Commission (DEC) of the Diocese of British Columbia has produced a document entitled *The Footprint Files* that does just that.

The ‘footprint’ image references several ideas. Firstly, the authors reference an exchange between Moses and God as Moses stands in front of the burning bush. God tells Moses to take off his shoes because he is standing on holy ground. This conveys the idea that we need

---

13 The Jubilee 2000 initiative is a global campaign to have the debt of the planet’s poorest countries forgiven by creditor nations. The Biblical tradition is explained in the Old Testament (Leviticus 25, 910) as a 'sabbath of sabbaths’, whereby once every 49 years “slaves were to be set free, debts were to be forgiven, wealth was to be fairly and generously shared among all, and the land and the people were to be given rest” (Canadian Ecumenical Jubilee Initiative). In the New Testament, the tradition continues in “Jesus' ministry to ‘bring good news to the poor ... to proclaim release to the captives and ... to let the oppressed go free' (Luke 4:18)”. For more information, see the Canadian Ecumenical Jubilee Initiative.

14 The PWRDF started in 1959 in response to the need for the Anglican Church to be able to channel funds quickly to communities in distress (specifically, 167 coal miners in Springhill, Nova Scotia had died the year before in a mine explosion, causing Anglicans to want to respond with gifts of money). The Fund has since evolved to include international development work. The Fund’s guiding principle is to “listen and learn from partners in its development work. It remains a Christian organization, committed to a vision of international development and global justice that is founded on theological reflection and a faith based analysis” (PWRDF).
to be “closer to the rhythms of the earth” (DEC, i). Secondly, it refers to the architectural concept of a building’s physical shape. Thirdly, the authors reference the work of Bill Rees and Mathis Wackernagel on the ecological footprint; a concept whereby the material and energy flows required to support an individual’s standard of living are equated to an area of land. It calls to attention the fact that it would take more land than is available on the planet in order for everyone on earth to achieve the standard of living of the average Canadian. Finally, the word ‘footprint’ calls to mind Margaret F. Powers’ well-known poem, Footprints\(^{15}\). In this last image we are given hope in realizing that the path to a less-consumptive, more sustainable lifestyle may be a challenging one involving sacrifice, but that it is not a path we walk alone.

The Footprint Files is a resource designed for “clergy, youth group leaders, Sunday school teachers, social action committees, parish councils and parishioners” (ibid.). It attempts to do three things. First, it presents four themes (praise - paying attention to creation; being outside - feeling our connection to the web of creation; the covenant – what does the Lord require of you?; and St. Francis – living a life of simplicity and community) and provides resources for individuals and parishes to explore them.

Its second focus is on presenting an environmental audit for churches and an adapted one for parishioners to use at home. The audit looks at the outer shell of the building (checking for draughts), as well as lighting, heating, water, equipment, refrigerators, greenspaces, transportation, the three ‘R’s and toxins. For the most part, these categories deal specifically with the stewardship of the church’s physical infrastructure. The ‘transportation’ category, however, is particularly interesting from a behavioural change point of view as it is a challenge to churches to take on a certain responsibility for promoting transportation alternatives to the personal automobile for its parishioners. This includes providing information about local bus routes, creating a system to match people for car-pooling, and providing amenities to encourage cycling.

\(^{15}\) In the poem, a man sees two sets of footprints in the sand, but during a part of the journey that was particularly difficult, there is only one set visible. The man questions Jesus as to why he (Jesus) abandoned him (the speaker) during this difficult passage. In response, Jesus says that he did not abandon the man; rather, he carried the man on his shoulders to get him through. For the full text of the poem see: Powers, Margaret F (1998). Footprints. San Francisco: Harper
The personal audit for parishioners follows along the same lines, but also includes a questionnaire developed by Ten Days for Global Justice that calculates an individual’s ‘ecological footprint’. There are also activity ideas for individuals or families that include calculating your ecological footprint, committing to New Year’s resolutions, a challenge to look at packaging in the products that parishioners buy, and making signs for windows, doors, or lawns that describe how the household is caring for the earth.

The third focus of the *Footprint Files* is to provide ideas and resources to “help maintain creation stewardship momentum” (DEC, 7-0), including a six-step process for planning a group to deal with a particular focus. The resources included at the back are aimed both at individual stewardship and stewardship in the church community, and include activity and study guides, books “for information and inspiration” (DEC, 8-0) and web resources.

On the whole, the resource contributes to the challenge the church faces in becoming actively engaged in becoming an alternative vision to the consumption-oriented lifestyle that its parishioners are bombarded with day after day.

Fortunately, the *Footprint Files* was not created out of a vacuum. There are many examples of diocesan committees or of church-related groups that have devoted much in the way of time and effort to challenging the church in similar ways. The Anglican Diocese of Ottawa’s Ecology and Theology Working Group (ETWG), for example, has created a guide called *Renewing our Relationship with the Earth: What you and your church can do*. It includes a section on environmental education and awareness, followed by ideas for actions that can be taken at church, at home and in the garden, as well as ideas for challenging transportation and shopping habits of individual parishioners. Once again, the message is clear:

> “[the planetary crisis] is not simply another issue. It is a concern that lies at the heart of the theologies of all people of faith. Like the Gospel that proclaims justice for the oppressed, concern for the environment is not an optional extra for those who feel so inclined. It is not only a matter of self-interest, though it is surely that, but it is a matter of who we are in God’s intention for all creation” (Bishop Peter Coffin, as quoted in ETWG, 4).  
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Both the *Footprint Files* and *Renewing our Relationship with the Earth* are examples of a vision that calls for Anglicans to be stewards of God’s creation in a more-than-self-interested way.

There are many other resources available to the church, which were pointed out to me by the interviewees, to help it realize the steward-as-partner vision. One of the most important resources I came across was a group called *Earth Ministry*, whose mandate is “helping individuals and congregations connect Christian faith with care for the earth” (http://www.earthministry.org/). They are based out of Seattle, Washington, and are an ecumenical group that produces study guides, a *Handbook for Creation Awareness and Care in Your Congregation*, and disseminates information about upcoming conferences and educational opportunities that they provide in the Seattle area.

In the brief time that I have been researching for this thesis I was also pointed towards *Arocha* (a Christian nature conservation organization), *The Regeneration Project* (an organization committed to developing a holistic sense of stewardship which got its start as Episcopal Power and Light, a coalition of Episcopal churches aggregated to purchase renewable energy) and a conference in Vancouver by a group of SFU students (which I attended) that explored world religions and their perspectives on the environment. These are but a drop in the bucket of all the initiatives that are available to inspire individuals, parishes and dioceses to explore a new vision for their role as stewards in the broader community.

3.5 Vision for Stewardship – the Link Between Bottom-Up and Top-Down

The above examples – from the two dioceses and parishes explored in the interviews to the *Footprint Files* and the other resources briefly introduced – are all indicative of the potential for developing a steward-as-partner vision for the role of the church and its followers. They are also examples of ‘bottom-up’ strategies whereby the church is seen to respond to the

---

16 The Episcopal Church is the American equivalent of the Anglican Church, and is part of the Anglican Communion.

17 The ‘bottom’ in the ‘bottom-up’ approach includes parish and diocesan committees, as these are made up of individual volunteers from parishes. They are often supported by a parish priest or a diocesan officer, but are
challenges and issues that it perceives around it in a local context. Importantly the church is recognizing through these examples that local actions are not made in isolation from their impacts more globally, as in the ecological footprint analysis referred to in *The Footprint Files*. As Shirley Stockdill suggested when asked what Anglicans would be involved in if her vision of stewardship were fulfilled: “they’d be very much involved in looking inward to be the best that they could be, and looking outwards to offer that to the world”.

Kathy Hoodikoff, for her part, would like to see Anglicans recognizing stewardship as the involvement of our “entire selves – every part of our lives” in the “recognition that God gave us all things, and all things come from Him”. The response to the realization of that generosity would be to give back through spiritual and financial commitment to ensure the viability of “abundant, vibrant ministries that are doing the work of Christ”.

Kathy’s thoughts capture the essence of the Global Anglican Congress’ Declaration on the Stewardship of Creation, as presented in chapter two, although it is interesting to note that none of the work explored in this chapter makes reference to the work done by the Congress. This is worth noting because is seems to indicate that the arrows of causation (in terms of where the inspiration for stewardship comes from) point from the bottom-up, rather from the top-down. The role of the Congress’ declaration (the ‘top’) is not to inspire the actions of the average Anglican, but rather provides a context and a justification for the work at the diocesan and parish level (the ‘bottom’), allowing the ‘bottom’ to get on with its efforts, rather than having to convince Anglicans or the broader community at every step of the way that the link between faith and care of creation is a legitimate one. The ‘top’ offers a communication tool which ‘spreads the word’ of the stewardship vision across the entire Anglican Communion – something which would not be easily possible for more local levels of the church – and it challenges those working on stewardship to incorporate both social and ecological concerns in their vision. The link between development in the third world and consumption reform in the first world is a well-established one in the theological and ecological literatures (see, for example Daly and Cobb, Rees and Westra, Westra and Wenz, fueled by the ideas and energies of the local parishioners who come together on these important topics of mutual interest.
Hessel and Rasmussen and McFague, 2001), but is not always clear at the local level of the church. A broad contextual perspective is an important contribution from the ‘top’ that ought to act as a resource to the ‘bottom’ as each parish and Diocesan committee develops its vision for stewardship.

Table three looks back to the Global Anglican Congress’ Declaration on the Stewardship of Creation and relates it to the interview findings.

### Table 3: The Global Anglican Congress’ Declaration on the Stewardship of Creation as it Relates to Interview Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action item in the Congress' Declaration</th>
<th>Corresponding finding from the interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledge planetary crisis as context for Church’s mission</td>
<td>Mention of the need to revision the church’s mission in terms of responding to the planetary crisis. Recognition that it is necessary to see the church’s response as being holistic i.e. not concentrated on the charity model, but on encouraging parishioners to take action to reduce their ecological footprints. Recognition of a need for long-term planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring planetary crisis to forefront of worship, personal and in community</td>
<td>Sharing stewardship moments during the worship service; relating stewardship activities to the church calendar; challenge of the personal audit; inviting guest speakers to share with the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support struggle of indigenous peoples to maintain cultural and natural heritage, and human rights</td>
<td>Comments regarding the need for the church to address its colonial roots and be engaged in promoting the cause of indigenous culture and heritage. Mention also that there is a staff person at the Diocese of New Westminster whose job it is to work with the First Nations community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education re: leaving the world a better place for future generations than they were in our lifetime</td>
<td>Many education initiatives! Guest speakers; documents (new-comers pamphlets, Footprint Files); stewardship moments; focus on holistic approach to stewardship; narrative budget initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively support initiatives in Church and in community that are concerned with planetary crisis</td>
<td>Procurement policies as well as policies regarding the tracking of moneys donated to community groups. Recognition of the important role the church can play in facilitating political discourse through use of its buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help publicize and network information, developments, events, publications and all sources of knowledge among friends, neighbours, congregation members, Church leaders and government officials.</td>
<td>David Suzuki speaking at Christ Church; the use of church buildings as forum for community discussions around topics of interest; articles in local newsletters; pastoral letters to the church community and to government officials; Global Anglican Congress’ declaration on the stewardship of creation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage links among provinces, dioceses, parishes worldwide to increase understanding of the many issues involved and interrelations.</td>
<td>Specific examples of this not related in interviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support opportunities for younger people to experience first-hand how people in their own and other congregations and communities are affected by the planetary crisis and how they can work to change the world in which they live.</td>
<td>Directly engaging children and youth through education opportunities and 'children’s moments' during worship service; encouraging parents to do an environmental audit with their children and discuss what they as a family to well or poorly, and how to address that; Stewards-in-Action sponsors youth exchanges to other parts of the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote training and educational programs in all aspects of the planetary crisis even as they relate to our worship and community life.</td>
<td>The primary example of this is the Footprint Files.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage diligently our secular and Church leaders, lay and ordained, in all parts of the Anglican Communion to place the planetary crisis at the highest levels of their concerns.</td>
<td>Example of clergy and staff leadership at Christ Church Cathedral, especially with respect to the financial stewardship campaign; work by stewardship committees to involve and engage the clergy in seeing the importance of fostering holistic stewardship in the context of worship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage and support public policies that reflect principles of sustainable communities.</td>
<td>No specific examples, but again, recognition of the need for the church to engage in public discourse. On a global level, a version of the Global Anglican Congress’ Declaration on the Stewardship of Creation was drafted and distributed to world leaders during the Rio+10 meetings in Johannesberg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request that all bodies within the communion undertake an environmental audit and appropriate response based on results.</td>
<td>The Diocese of British Columbia's Diocesan Environmental Commission has responded to this call through the creation of the audit in the Footprint Files.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate simplicity of lifestyle in our patterns of consumption.</td>
<td>Newcomers brochure at Christ Church Cathedral, which encourages newcomers to adopt a lifestyle of simplicity; a recognition that stewardship in the context of relatively wealthy populations requires a message that is clear about the inability of material possessions to provide fulfillment or happiness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.6 Looking Ahead

This chapter has explored specific examples of how stewardship is practiced. As a brief summary, the majority of efforts at this stage have included efforts by the diocesan and parish committees to educate parishioners and clergy with respect to a holistic interpretation of stewardship, including its social and ecological dimensions. Efforts have also included creating a new vision for the church (parish by parish) with stewardship of creation at its centre, and has caused parishes to look inwardly at the service that its members provide to their local community (in- and outside the church) and see that service in the light of their Christian beliefs about stewardship. The table on the following pages summarizes the responses given by interviewees with respect to the themes brought up in the interviews.
The following chapter will elaborate on several of the concepts that were touched on in order to explore the link between ‘stewardship’ and ‘planning’. These are concepts that are shared between the two disciplines (such as mutual learning, democratization, the tension between top-down and bottom-up initiatives, and between being reactive or proactive to a given issue); concepts that stewardship might offer planning (how to develop a vision that allows people in community to look inwardly at their own gifts of time, talent and money and outwardly at how these can contribute to the ‘abundance’ of the larger community); and concepts where the planning field can and does contribute expertise. This discussion will lead into the final chapter where the appropriate connection between the church and the planning profession will be explored.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee(s) (Represents diocese or parish)</th>
<th>Job description</th>
<th>Definition of Stewardship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reverend Shirley Stockdill (Diocese)</td>
<td>Stewardship Development Officer, Diocese of New Westminster</td>
<td>Diocesan Definition pulled from <em>Desiring God</em> by John Piper: “Why does God bless us with abundance? So we can have enough to live off and use the rest for all manner of good works that alleviates spiritual and physical misery. Enough for us, abundance for others”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Dranchuk (Diocese)</td>
<td>Coordinator of Societal Ministries, Diocese of New Westminster</td>
<td>Stewardship is caring about the wider world and the people in it, outside of our church, outside of the parish boundaries, in the whole world. It’s being actively engaged in the church – in our own communities in poverty and social housing, for example. Stewardship of lands around the church, including old church buildings – convert lands/buildings into social housing (examples exist in the Diocese).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Hoodikoff (Diocese)</td>
<td>Planned Giving Officer, Diocese of BC</td>
<td>Stewardship is a joyous response to all God has given me. Three areas: relationship with God and community; environment; money. The three are interrelated such that one’s attitude about one is reflected in the other two.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donelda Parker (Parish)</td>
<td>Chair, Stewardship Committee, Christ Church Cathedral</td>
<td>Stewardship is the living of our faith – what we are after we say “I believe”. It is an integral part of our Christian life. We are God’s stewards, entrusted with the care of the earth, its people and ourselves. At Christ Church Cathedral we strive to live the life of stewards. In addition to our concerns and actions around care of the earth, our parishioners share their gifts of time, personal skills and abilities and regular financial gifts. We encourage our people “to lead unconventional lives of dedication, service and sacrifice – to present an alternate view” to that of middle class society. (Barna in Durall).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverend Kevin Dixon (Parish)</td>
<td>Rector, St. Mary’s Kerrisdale</td>
<td>Stewardship is my response to God’s generosity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz Cullen (Parish)</td>
<td>Current Chair, Stewardship Cmte., St. Mary’s</td>
<td>Stewardship umbrellas all the work that goes on at the church, hoping that the treasures of time, talents and treasure of all people within the community are effectively being used, and developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia Sauder (Parish)</td>
<td>Past Chair, Stewardship Committee, St. Mary’s</td>
<td>Stewardship is about how we make decisions about what to do…to be a steward is to use resources wisely and to make people understand that the resources that they have at their disposal is not just what they have in their wallet; it’s the time they have available on their calendar, the things they have within their control, whether that’s people or physical things, and how they use their gifts, whatever their talents are.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewees</td>
<td>Themes from Interview Questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverend Shirley Stockdill (Diocese)</td>
<td>Focus is on moving away from a financial focus to a holistic focus. Developing a stewardship vision in parishes. Awareness raising that stewardship is not something new that parishioners have to do – recognize their outreach work (for example) as stewardship.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Dranchuk (Diocese)</td>
<td>David’s work focuses on social justice. He tries to keep the church involved and informed about issues, and involved in a helpful way that gives some profile and visibility to the issue. Because we’re not supposed to be inward looking we’re supposed to get our there and be involved – the church is part of the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Hoodikoff (Diocese)</td>
<td>Stewardship as a process rather than a program. Education and awareness raising are the main focus, including two resource manuals: Building Blocks to a Parish Stewardship Process and The Footprint Files. Opportunities for individuals to perform personal audits; understand stewardship in holistic terms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donelda Parker (Parish)</td>
<td>The focus changes in concert with the church calendar. Christmas: Thanks for God’s gift to us of Jesus’ life. Lent: focus on inner life. After Easter: stewardship of outer life (gifts of time, talent and money). Fall: financial stewardship.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverend Kevin Dixon (Parish)</td>
<td>(From preaching perspective: How do you make sure that you are using your life well?” […] “in an affluent community like [St. Mary’s] you have to proclaim a message of simplicity because people can so easily fall prey to thinking their stuff is going to give them a sense of hope and consolation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz Cullen and Marcia Sauder (Parish)</td>
<td>Education/awareness raising focus at the parish level. Liz: Stewardship for me is a way to live as opposed to something you think about once a month in a committee meeting. That was really huge for me, because it was the way I was living, but I hadn’t acknowledged it as ‘this is stewardship’ and it made a big difference in my life.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewees</td>
<td>Specific Examples of Stewardship</td>
<td>Anglican-ness of Stewardship?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Reverend Shirley  | - Talking responsibility (rather than simply rights)  
- Looking inwardly at the best that they can be, and outward to offer that to the community. Many projects that started out as a parish are now ecumenical or have lost their obvious church affiliation and have moved on to become something much bigger. E.g. St. James Social Services, 127 Housing Society. | Nothing specifically ‘Anglican’ about stewardship, other than Anglicans tend to be involved in church ministries and in community service. Anglicans work closely with Luthers/United Church on stewardship and social justice. |
| Stockdill (Diocese) | |                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| David Dranchuk    | The church showing leadership in issues in the broader community. For example, letter from the Bishops regarding the treaty referendum. Also, conversion of old or excess church buildings to social housing (examples of this exist in the diocese). | Nothing specifically ‘Anglican’. More generally, parishioners are called to be involved with stewardship and social justice – we’re told, as Christians following the way of Jesus. |
| (Diocese)          | |                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Kathy Hoodikoff   | - Parishioner who have adopted the voluntary simplicity movement.  
- Footprint Files with specific actions for people to take. | Concern for the earth/creation is an extension of Celtic spirituality roots where God is viewed as all around, on the earth. Not like fundamental religions concerned with saving souls. |
| (Diocese)          | |                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Donelda Parker    | - Sandwich Project – Christmas dinner.  
- Volunteer opportunities for other ministries.  
- Financial pledges.  
- Welcoming visitors and new parishioners.  
- David Suzuki speaking from pulpitz re: care of creation. | Legacy of the Anglican church as a colonizing faith. This has implications in terms of the international development aspect of stewardship. |
| (Parish)           | |                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Reverend Kevin    | - Community use of church buildings.  
- Development of a mission statement that embodies stewardship vision of church.  
- Long-term planning. | (Liz) Anglicanism lacks boundary of rules and regulations of other faiths. The stronger the boundaries, the stronger the stewardship to the church. It’s a challenge to get people to understand the stewardship of their faith in that light. |
| Dixon (Parish)     | |                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Liz Cullen and Marcia Sauder (Parish) | - Community lunch every other week.  
- Chancel guild.  
- Bread makers and all other involvement in ministries.  
- Sharing stewardship moments once a month in the service (education and awareness-raising). | (Marcia) Anglicans tend to be reluctant about talking about their faith, about money, and especially not about how the two relate. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Networks/Resources</th>
<th>Vision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reverend Shirley Stockdill (Diocese)</td>
<td>Authors John Piper, Thomas Berry, Peter Drucker, Wallace Stegner, work with the Lutheran Church.</td>
<td>Stewardship is a caring/sharing of the earth and its resources of which we have huge … I think the world wouldn’t be perfect, because we’re not perfect, but the world would be a lot better place, and there would be far fewer tyrants able to take hold of government and countries and peoples because people would know how to take control of their own lives and enable one another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Dranchuk (Diocese)</td>
<td>Magnificat (Diocesan) and Kairos (ecumenical). Collaboration with United Church.</td>
<td>Stewardship is caring about the wider world and the people in it, outside of our church, outside of the parish boundaries, in the whole world. It’s being actively engaged in the church – in our own communities in poverty and social housing, for example.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Hoodikoff (Diocese)</td>
<td>Network of planned giving officers, also Canadian Association of gift Planners, authors John McNaughton, Richard Foster.</td>
<td>it would be the involvement of entire selves – every part of our lives (social, work…) involved in recognition that God gave us all things, and all things come from him. Personal rather than corporate – corporate would be culmination of all that. The other part of that is more than just green attitude – it’s deeper and includes entire lives and selves. It would reflect in the spiritual commitment, financial commitment in parishes and would reflect all the way up. As people understand stewardship, the joyful response is to give back – wonderful abundant, vibrant ministries that are doing the work of Christ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donelda Parker (Parish)</td>
<td>Mike Durall (course at Vancouver School of Theology), John McNaughton (author).</td>
<td>Holistic vision – voluntary simplicity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverend Kevin Dixon (Parish)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz Cullen and Marcia Sauder (Parish)</td>
<td>TENS conference.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter Four
Stewardship: Relevant Theories and Concepts in Planning
Achieving Sustainability: the Need for a Cross-Disciplinary Approach

The first three chapters of this thesis have established that the (Anglican) theological literature, several examples of the planning literature and the interviewees sense that there is a need to address the ‘planetary crisis’ by redefining the relationship between humanity and the planet. The new relationship, from a stewardship perspective, is one in which humanity recognizes both the sacredness of God’s creation, and the responsibility that rests with being stewards of that creation. This fourth chapter poses the question of the relevance of that assertion to the planning profession.

The planner, as described in chapter one, is someone who is theoretically able to see the big picture, to set distant goals and ways of achieving those goals. The steward, as explored in chapter two, is someone who uses his gifts of time, talent and money in the service of the ‘other’ and in so doing is cognizant of the intrinsic value of non-human life.

The urgency of the planner’s role as ‘big-picture’ thinker is captured in a quote from Limits to Growth: “as soon as a society recognized that it cannot maximize everything for everyone, it must begin to make choices. [...] To do that society will need better means than exist today for clarifying the realistic alternatives available, for establishing societal goals, and for achieving the alternatives that are most consistent with those goals. But most important of all, long-term goals must be specified and short-term goals made consistent with them” (Meadows et. al., 186).

I would suggest that the ‘better means’ for clarifying alternatives, establishing goals and achieving the desired long-term and short-term goals rest in a commitment from planners to mutual learning and dialogue with world religions, scientists, other policy makers, politicians, communities of the advantaged and disadvantaged, and so on. As a professional with the mandate to “think in terms of experience larger than that which comes to any individual” (Friedmann, 422), the planner is well-placed to see the desirability of such a multi-disciplinary approach to sustainability.
Recognizing the need for mutual learning and cross-disciplinary dialogue in the pursuit of a ‘new story’ that redirects the dominant worldview towards a more sustainable model, this fourth chapter is organized around several concepts that are potential areas of cooperation between the church and the planning profession. In some cases, as in community building, the church has much to offer the planning community in terms of experience and expertise. In other cases, such as long-term planning to implement a vision, the planning community has much to offer the church. In all cases the concepts mentioned are recognized by both communities as being an essential part of their practice. The list of shared concepts is long, which is an encouraging outcome of the research, as it shows the strong connection between the planning profession and an alternate vision for achieving sustainability. The concepts explored below include mutual learning (cross-disciplinary approach), democratization and community building (including the tension between top-down and bottom-up approaches as well as the tension between being proactive and being reactive), advocacy for the marginalized (both at home and in an international development context), and the need to rely on non-technical solutions to move towards a sustainable earth.

4.1 Stewardship-as-Partner in the Context of Transformative Theory

4.1.1 Introduction of the meta-theory

Let us take a moment to step back and review what has happened up until this point. In a first instance, I proposed that the world is in a state of planetary crisis. In order to address this planetary crisis, two general types of approaches were postulated. The current paradigm of control over nature and of recourse to scientific and technological fixes was dismissed outright as having no hope in the context of sustainable solutions. A second paradigm of behavioural change was proposed as more desirable, with specific attention paid to developing a stewardship model. It was acknowledged early on that the steward-as-partner model, based in contemporary Anglican theology, is but one possibility as an expression of a worldview of behavioural change.

If the steward-as-partner model is to have any impact with respect to addressing the planetary crisis, it must be expressed through the actions of people who hold that particular worldview.
In the context of the discussion so far, those who are associated with stewardship at the parish and diocesan level have been involved in educating parishioners in regards to the planetary crisis and interpreting their possible reaction to it through their common faith. In other words, they feel that the interpretation of their common faith, in the light of acquired knowledge about specific characteristics or aspects of the planetary crisis holds answers to the question of how one ought to live in the world. As many of the interviewees expressed, this results in a renewed vision of the church as actively engaged in society for the purpose of societal change directed at caring for, and being stewards of, creation.

As Anglicans start to articulate how they ought to act in their community and in the world, they start to recognize in people around them a similar drive for change around a given issue. The particular issue that they have in common is a point of entry for dialogue and cooperation. For example, Anglicans may become aware that their ability to choose public transit over the private automobile is hampered due to lack of service on many routes in the evening. University students, night-shift workers, and low-income residents (among others) may share this concern. They may have completely different worldviews that have caused them to come to the conclusion that something must be done to increase evening bus service on certain routes, but they decide to work in concert toward their common goal.

When groups with various worldviews act together on a specific issue to cause change to existing social structures, they are demonstrating what John Friedmann refers to as transformative theory. Transformative theory suggests that addressing power imbalances in society is accomplished through the challenging of social structures. This challenge, furthermore, is possible only through the direct action of politicized members of society, working together and learning from each other. What follows is that not only is the steward-as-partner model (indicative of a worldview of behavioural change in response to the planetary crisis) but one entry point for talking about transforming social structures, but transformative theory insists that other worldviews must be engaged in partnership with stewardship in order for the goal of transformation to occur. It insists, then, on what Leonie Sandercock refers to as an “epistemology of multiplicity” (Sandercock 1998b, 76).
Consider Figure 2, (on the following page) which illustrates what I have attempted to explain above.

In the figure, the inner-most dot represents the issue that is the rallying point for action between several groups. The circle that encloses that dot represents the domain of transformative theory, and the metaphorical table around which the various groups sit down (or perhaps they overturn the table?) to discuss the issue and decide on action to try to affect change. The three arrows pointing into this circle represent the points of entry of the three groups represented. These points of entry are informed by each group’s worldview, which they carry to the table with them, and which theoretically enrich the discussion through a process of mutual learning and dialogue.

Further to the discussion presented above, I have included an arrow in the diagram that is labeled as ‘emergent properties of the dialogue and mutual learning’. This is to take into account the likely situation that by coming together to work on a particular issue, the groups involved will become influenced by each other’s contribution, and will perhaps find further areas for cooperation (or perhaps as likely, areas of dissent).

4.1.2 Access to bases of power

So far, it has been assumed that there are no barriers to an individual’s or a group’s participation in engaging in dialogue for the purpose of transforming social structures, but as Friedmann points out, this is unlikely to be the case. Specifically, he suggests that households (or individuals) must have access to “bases of social power” (Friedman, 396), in order to participate in any challenge to the balance of power. He lists the bases of power as knowledge and skills, space, financial resources, informal networks, relevant information, time, tools of production and social organization. Without any access to one or more of these bases of power, it is difficult for households to engage in efforts to upset the balance of power. Access to these, then, is often the point of struggle for cooperative work among
Figure 2: The steward-as-partner model in the context of transformative theory
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groups. In terms of the steward-as-partner model, the struggle for access to one or more bases of power may take place within the context of the Anglican church, as the community attempts to better the lives of its members through shared ministries, or it may take place as the various groups attempt to come together for change, only to realize that they must first overcome lack of access to relevant information, for example.

4.1.3 The role of the planner
Transformative theory involves the challenging of dominant power dynamics and the transformation of social structures that facilitate the concentration of power. The role of the planner, then, can not be one of protecting the existing bureaucratic structures. Rather, the planner is engaged in mediating and facilitating the exchange between the various groups who wish to cooperate in challenging the status quo around a particular issue. Friedmann points out the many pitfalls associated with this role, including the emotional and physical toll that follows from constantly going against the grain, and the predictable minimal financial compensation (“not surprisingly, the money is always with those who uphold the status quo” ibid., 411). He also points to the challenges associated with professional integrity insofar as it is difficult to maintain a critical distance around issues that are of deep concern to the planner, and also difficult to maintain an open mind to the views of others. However, he maintains that the role of the planner who engages in this type of ‘radical’ practice (his words) is essential to “wrest from the political terrain still held by state and corporate capital expanding zones of liberation in which the new and self-reliant ways of production and democratic governance can flourish” (ibid., 412).

Returning to the steward-as-partner model, it is within these ‘zones of liberation’ and of democratic governance where there is substantial potential for the vision of the church to be realized as being relevant to social change in the name of care of creation.

4.2 Concepts to Move Sustainability Forward
4.2.1 The Importance of Dialogue and Mutual Learning
As a ‘church in dialogue’, the Anglican Church ought to be pre-disposed at being effective in engaging in dialogue with other partners around specific issues. Recall that the church-in-
dialogue identity stems from the dispersed authority model of the Anglican Communion, and is practiced not only between the various members of the Anglican Communion, but also in a strong tradition of ecumenical work (across world religions), and in social activism. The pulpit is often used as a platform for community social activists to speak directly to a congregation on a particular topic (for example, when David Suzuki spoke to the congregation of Christ Church Cathedral on December 1, 2002 with respect to his book *The Sacred Balance*), ideally causing them to reflect on the relevance of the church to their own work.

Besides the pulpit, the Anglican Church (and other churches) has the opportunity to express its dialogue through other means. In a web forum with Gary Gardner, author of the chapter in the *State of the World 2003* report on engaging world religions, the notion of churches as demonstration grounds for energy conservation was explored. He suggested that in the United States, “houses of worship account for more than 5 percent of commercial building floor space [and are] regularly visited by some 44 percent of the population of the US” (Worldwatch Institute, on-line). He noted the work of the Episcopal Power and Light program in encouraging individual churches to both retrofit their buildings and to buy their electricity from renewable energy power companies, and the potential these types of initiative might have as tools for educating followers on “the ethical and spiritual foundations of sustainability, including the need for greater energy conservation” (ibid.).

Examples of dialogue in the dioceses studied included ecumenical work with the Lutheran and United churches. David Dranchuk mentioned his collaboration specifically with the United Church on social justice issues, and Shirley Stockdill mentioned her work with both the Anglican and Lutheran churches on “training and raising up lay leadership” (Shirley Stockdill). This spring she will present a workshop to a Lutheran gathering on stewardship; “what it means and how we actually act it out in parishes or with congregations” in the Anglican Diocese of New Westminster.

More broadly speaking, a good example of inter-disciplinary dialogue can be found in the Earth Charter. The Earth Charter is a “declaration of fundamental principles for building a
just, sustainable, and peaceful global society in the 21st Century" (Earth Charter
Commission). The document is "an authoritative synthesis of values, principles, and
aspirations" and is the result of extensive global consultation with "contemporary science,
international law, the wisdom of the world’s great religions and philosophical traditions, the
declarations and reports of the seven UN summit conferences held during the 1990s, the
global ethics movement, numerous nongovernmental declarations and people’s treaties
issued over the past thirty years, and best practices for building sustainable communities”
(ibid.). This kind of comprehensive approach to problem-solving is a skill that planners are
trained to appreciate.

The Earth Charter project recognizes that the ‘solution’ to the planetary crisis does not lie in
technology alone, but rather in defining and enforcing planetary “values and principles for a
sustainable future” (ibid.). This includes articulating these values and principles in such a
way that religious or spiritual vocabulary is not treated with suspicion, but embraced. For
example, the Earth Charter document talks of human responsibility towards humans and non-
human creatures, saying: “the spirit of human solidarity and kinship with all life is
strengthened when we live with reverence for the mystery of being, gratitude for the gift of
life, and humility regarding the human place in nature” (ibid.).

The wording of the charter speaks eloquently of the place of human beings in nature as
bearing a significant burden of responsibility to ensure both human and non-human life for
generations to come, calling on humans to “respect the earth and life in all its diversity” by
recognizing that “all beings are interdependent and every form of life has value regardless of
its worth to human beings” (ibid.). The Charter recognizes the important place of world
religions (among other concerned groups, such as the deep ecologists) in describing a vision
of humanity that is not one of domination, but one of radical dependence. Without being
overtly spiritual or religious in its wording, the charter calls on humans to be something akin
to what I refer to as stewards of creation. As such, the Earth Charter offers a model to
planners about how to incorporate ‘religious’ vision alongside more established sources for
planning processes; namely economic, scientific and technical.
In taking inter-disciplinary learning to its fullest extent, the Anglican Communion in partnership with the planning profession has the potential of responding to the call of the Earth Charter, which asks humanity to “search for common ground in the midst of our diversity and to embrace a new ethical vision that is shared by growing numbers of people in many nations and cultures throughout the world” (ibid.).

In a process of mutual learning, the most important contribution that planners can make is to participate by sharing their ideas about how sustainability is best achieved. In other words, planning brings to the table openness to learn from and share with other disciplines about strategies for attaining a sustainable society.

In *Towards Cosmopolis* Leonie Sandercock argues that planners need to be equipped with an “epistemology of multiplicity”, learning to rely not only on scientific and technical ways of knowing, but also “knowing through dialogue; from experience; through gaining local knowledge of the specific and the concrete; through learning to read symbolic, non-verbal evidence; through contemplation; and through action planning” (Sandercock 1998b, 76). She celebrates the knowledge traditions of native peoples of Australia and North America as alternatives to the technocratic ways of knowing that are most commonly found in planning schools. The steward-as-partner model is another example of a different ‘way of knowing’ about the world around us. That planners might appreciate this different way of knowing is an invaluable contribution to developing a stewardship model that might have broader applicability than the Anglican Communion. Validating spiritual and contemplative inquiry is essential to lending legitimacy for the development of an alternative story to the current consumerist one.

A second contribution – beyond participating in dialogue – that planners can bring to developing the steward-as-partner model is in helping to develop the process by which a community (church or otherwise) can determine, and then carry out, its vision. As Peter Boothroyd suggests, planning is the answer – no matter what the question! His seven-step recursive model of planning, as described in ‘Developing Community Planning Skills: Applications of a Seven-Step Model’, is an example of a process, developed with expertise
from the planning field, which is accessible to community planning processes. As previously mentioned, the process skills that planners possess are invaluable to community planning processes because they offer a broad overview on how to move ahead with the task at hand, borrowing where necessary from other disciplines, and ensuring that the process is holistic and comprehensive in scope.

Related to the holistic approach from planning is the ability that planners have to seek out solutions to identified problems across many disciplines. This not only makes planners open to spiritual ‘ways of knowing’, but provides access to non-spiritual ways of knowing to those whose specialty is spiritual knowledge. Already, the stewardship community has seen the potential for harvesting other forms of knowledge by, for example, referencing ecological footprint analysis (developed by Bill Rees and Mathis Wackernagel at the School of Community and Regional Planning) in The Footprint Files.

Planners, through community processes and dialogue with other disciplines, are in the unique position of being able to disseminate spiritual ways of knowing to more technical fields of knowledge and, by the same token, share technical tools with those communities which are more keenly in tune with spiritual ways of knowing. This type of cross-disciplinary, comprehensive approach to problem-solving is an increasingly legitimized approach, with broad acceptance across many sectors as the only way to address complex issues.

4.2.2 Democratization and Community

In the Anglican Church in Canada, in particular, there has been a recent movement to expand the concept of ‘ministry’ beyond the acts of the clergy to include the laity of the entire congregation. In planning jargon, this is the ‘democratization’ of ministry, and is recognition that all Anglicans are responsible for ensuring that the mission of the church is realized through their acts of ministry. In this sense, ministry is not reserved to the functions of a deacon, priest or bishop, but extends to “intercessory prayer, leadership, participation in public works and the sacraments, seeking justice and reconciliation, caring for the sick, the troubled or the oppressed, demonstrating our care of the earth’s resources and its people or wherever we foster ‘wholeness’, truth and love” (Synod Notes, DNW 1998, 6).
Democratization in the Anglican Church is also found in its principle of dispersed authority. Although my personal bias is that this type of democratization is a positive thing for the church, it has proven to be divisive in the church (at least in the short-term), especially as it relates to complex issues such as same-sex union. Democratization is an especially difficult and divisive issue in the face of a diverse, or catholic, communion. Certainly, not everyone is going to see eye-to-eye on how to resolve disputes or disagreements. However, in an ideal world, the principle of catholicity is the answer to democratization. As the Bishop of New Westminster stated to Synod in 1999, “I think there is a theological principle at stake here we have lost sight of in an internally competitive church. [between evangelicals, feminists, liberals, charismatics, anglo-catholics, etc...]. It’s the principle of catholicity. […] It’s about diversity, necessary diversity, the manifold variety which reflects the vast majesty and creativity of God. It’s about the sacramentality of the universe, in which all things in their beauty and uniqueness reveal the hand of the living God at work in the infinite profusion of the created order. And it’s about the plurality and variety of gifts in the church which together reflect the Glory of God”.

Democratization, (“increased social power”, in Friedmann’s words) as it relates to public process and input into policy and decision-making is a desirable attribute of planning processes, but the danger of a poorly run process is that democratization can degrade into individualism. Where control over resources is given to an individual (or group) who sees only short-term gain, there is a danger in that resource suffering in ways described by Hardin in The Tragedy of the Commons. The key to avoiding this unfortunate occurrence is two-fold: developing a strong sense of community among participants and between participants and the larger community context; and of long-term planning. While the first component is especially the domain of the church and the second is in the realm of expertise of the planner, the crucial point is that planning theory is moving in the direction of recognizing the importance of community-based decision-making, and the church (especially in terms of holistic stewardship) has recognized the importance of vision and long-term planning to

19 See, for example, the Richard Dimbleby Lecture for 2002, as delivered by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Rowan Williams in which he asks the question: “why should we do what the government tells us” (http://www.anglicancommunion.org/acns/articles/32/25/acns3236.html)
remain relevant in today’s society. In this way, the planning profession is recognizing the centrality of ‘religious’ solutions to the ecological crisis, “whether we call it [religious] or not” (White 1967, 36), and the church is grounding its theology in the relevance of its teachings to issues of the ‘here and now’, rather than the ‘hereafter’.

4.2.3 Tension Between Top-Down and Bottom-Up

The importance of democratization, as it relates to sustainability and stewardship, and the danger of individualism points to the tension between top-down and bottom-up approaches to community development. In both planning and the Anglican Church, the preferred arrows of causation point from the ‘bottom’ to the ‘top’ when it comes to addressing local community needs. In both cases, however, there is also pressure from the ‘top’ to implement policies which it perceives as being good for the ‘bottom’, with or without much in the way of consultation.

In the context of the Anglican Communion the principle of dispersed authority has the built-in ability to erode some of the ability of the ‘top’ to enforce its agenda on the ‘bottom’. This has the effect of allowing more local levels of the church to decide what is appropriate in their context. Given the plurality of the Anglican Communion, the necessary and difficult implications of this situation is that only through respect for diversity can there be unity. Neither the liberals nor the conservatives are completely happy as their agenda can not be pushed through if local levels are unwilling to let it be so; but to those who are more dedicated to the process as opposed to the program, there could be no other way. In the Diocese of British Columbia, the commitment to process is indicated by way of a resource manual put together by the stewardship development committee entitled: Building Blocks to a Parish Stewardship Process. The manual outlines twelve steps to implement a stewardship process, and includes many resources.

In terms of planning theory, the ideal of ‘bottom-up’ strategies is expressed by the principle of subsidiarity. According to this principle, “problems are best solved in the subsystem where they arise. […] Subsystems are encouraged to resolve their conflicts themselves without referring them to higher authority. Whatever solution is adopted, the subsystem will
have to carry it out. Since their consent is essential, the optimum condition is for them to resolve their conflicts independently. If a solution is worked out by the subsystem, appeal to authority is not necessary” (Wheeler 1970, 133, as quoted on the Web Dictionary of Cybernetics and Systems). The planner’s role in this instance revolves around her ability to facilitate the community in its ability to express and address solutions to problems that are perceived at that level. It also requires of planners to be aware of the ‘multiplicity of epistemologies’ (Sandercock 1998b, 76), whereby they acknowledge technical and scientific ways of knowing, but also recognize the potential contribution of other ways of knowing\textsuperscript{20}, including religious ones.

Certainly, it is difficult to imagine anyone – planner or Anglican – to be so devoted to a process as to let go of deeply held beliefs about what the ‘right’ answer is to any given problem. Imagine a planner faced with a community that did not believe in any connection between use of the private automobile and climate change, for example, or that believes that it is their right to drive as big and gas-guzzling an automobile as they please, wherever they please, and would the planner please just design the roads. Imagine, furthermore, that this is in fact the situation that most planners face every day of their career, including Vancouver’s planners.

As much as the planner might attempt to educate the community on emissions and other implications of a city built for the private automobile I can not imagine, when push came to shove, that the planner would be pleased with having to carry through with what she sees as the irrational desires of the ‘bottom’. In this case, the temptation would be very strong to want to intervene in the system. Having never personally been in the situation described above, it would be hypocritical to suggest I have the answer for planners or stewardship workers with respect to how to ease the tension between ‘top’ and ‘bottom’. I can only suggest that what I have learned, and what I hope to carry with me into my practice, is that the ideal of a ‘rational’ world, where people make rational decisions based on perfect information is the product of wishful thinkers. In the end, a decision made by emotional

\textsuperscript{20} Leonie Sandercock outlines six ‘other’ ways of knowing, including: knowing through dialogue; from experience; through gaining local knowledge of the specific and concrete; through learning to read symbolic, non-verbal evidence; through contemplation; and through action planning.
beings with imperfect information is the best we can arrive at, and only through recognizing
the emotive nature of decision-making can a process arrive at a solution that might be
workable. In this situation, the planner must eventually let go of her conviction that she has
the ‘right’ answer, or that it is her job to convert a selfish or ignorant community to her way
of understanding the situation. That conversion (to use explicitly religious language) is the
domain of the churches, where moral suasion is part of the mandate, and where issues of
contemporary importance, like ecological consciousness, are becoming central to the
theology expressed through sermons, ministry (volunteer) opportunities and Sunday school.

Recall the principle of catholicity, described above, whereby appreciating diversity is the key
to the church’s existence through the “plurality and variety of gifts in the church which
together reflect the Glory of God” (Synod Notes, DNW 1999). The principle of catholicity is
easily extended to the planning realm whereby an ‘epistemology of multiplicity’ is necessary
to arrive at any kind of conclusion. In social activism (which, under social mobilization, is
part of the tradition of transformative theory), a diversity of tactics – from non-participation
or non-compliance to direct confrontation – is necessary to get the point across to the ‘top’
decision-makers of unhappiness at the ‘bottom’. While this is not to suggest that ‘anything
goes’, it does suggest that planners are not responsible for pushing through their solution to
any given problem, but to appreciate the messiness and controversy that comes along with
having voices representing different ways of knowing around a table on a given issue. The
focus, then, is not on having the right answer, but on facilitating a dialogue.

4.2.4 The Tension Between Reacting to a Situation and Being Proactive
Another tension that is shared by both stewardship workers and planners is that of reacting to
a need that is perceived in the community (people without food or shelter) and being
proactive in advocating for changes to the systems that create these needs.

Consider a quote by Michael Zinzun from Leonie Sandercock’s Cosmopolis:

“People always want to be a saviour in the community. It’s like they see a
baby coming down the river and want to jump in and save it. We need to stop
being so reactive to the situations that confront us. Saving babies is FINE for
them [other organizers/organizations] but WE want to know who’s throwing the goddamn babies in the water in the first place” (Zinzun in Sandercock, 1998b).

While this quote is directed at teaching planning history and theory to planning students, there is relevance also for it in the Anglican Church. The immediate response to perceived needs is a charity response (i.e. donate money, food or clothing), while it takes a more coordinated and perhaps theoretical approach to challenge the underlying system that sustains the need for charity.

The quote suggests that the more urgent task for US (planners) is to be pro-active in figuring out how the babies are landing in the water, and that the reactionary response ought to be left to THEM (whoever that might be). The Anglican Church, as an institution with many volunteers with diverse backgrounds and expertise, is well-poised to work at the problem from both ends. It plucks the babies out of the water when it donates to charity, or organizes community lunches to feed the hungry; and it finds out who’s throwing the babies in the water when it does such things as are outlined in the Global Anglican Congress’ Declaration on the Stewardship of Creation. This includes informing themselves and disseminating information throughout the broader community on how to approach the planetary crisis through a simplicity of lifestyle, or using whatever influence or pressure it can muster to support public policies that “reflect the principles of sustainable community” (Congress’ Declaration), or again in promoting youth exchanges in order to provide a hands-on education about the disparities between the ‘haves’ and the ‘have-nots’ of the world.

A spiritual equivalent to Michael Zinzun’s quote is a story related by Shirley Stockdill. Just prior to the first Gulf War, an Anglican priest and journalist interviewed a Buddhist monk who was holding a prayer vigil. The journalist wanted to know what good a prayer vigil might do in the face of war, and asked the monk what he thought would have happened if no one had gone to war against Hitler. The Buddhist replied by suggesting that (in Shirley Stockdill’s words) “if there was no reason to have bread lines, if everything hadn’t depended upon a currency rather than love for one another, there never would have been a Hitler”.

Again, the importance of getting at the root cause of the situation (lack of basic needs being met, lack of love) is stressed as a central role of anyone or any organization concerned with
finding solutions to problems at hand. This calls to mind the role of the steward as servant to the ‘other’. In this sense of service, both the steward and the planner are called on to actively question the system in which they are embedded as it relates to creating inequity and injustice for the poor and marginalized.

4.2.5 Advocacy for the Marginalized (Local and Global)
In both theology and planning theory there is a current of awareness that ecological, economic and social sustainability are interdependent. In theology this awareness has come out of liberation theology and focuses most strongly on the concept of eco-justice. In planning theory, the issue focuses on the social implications of scarcity. When either resources or the assimilative capacity of the planet become scarce, someone ‘wins’ and someone will ‘loses’ with respect to access.

This type of situation is the central tenet of ecological footprint analysis. Humans have become especially adept at appropriating energy and resources from the planet. According to Bill Rees, “humankind is now a major consumer species in all the significant ecosystems of the world. The human enterprise already appropriates or otherwise diverts 40 percent of terrestrial and 25 percent of continental shelf photosynthesis to its own use” (Rees 1995, 343). From a steward-as-partner standpoint, this type of appropriation is inappropriate, as it subordinates the needs of other living creatures to access their own share to ensure survival. Furthermore, the footprint analysis led researchers to conclude that “industrial regions, and even whole countries, survive by appropriating the carrying capacity of an area of land vastly larger than the areas they physically occupy […]. We would need at least two additional earths to bring just the present human population up to North American ecological standards” (Rees 1995, 351-2). The implications of these findings, he goes on to suggest, point not only to global ecological limits, but to inequity between the North and South with respect to the sharing of the limited resources.

To illustrate this point, consider an account of an internal memo sent by Lawrence Summers, chief economist of the World Bank in 1991/2, to several of his colleagues.
The memo opens with the question: “just between you and me, shouldn’t the World Bank be encouraging more migration of the dirty industries to the [lesser developed countries, or LDCs]?” (Economist, original emphasis). He elaborated on three reasons for this migration; firstly that the cost of “health-impairing” pollution is measured in lost earnings, and because wages are lowest in LDCs, then “I think the economic logic behind dumping a load of toxic waste in the lowest-wage country is impeccable and we should face up to that”. Secondly, under-populated countries are under-polluted (specifically because it is not possible to transport smog, a type of pollution that increases with the number of people using private automobile, for example). Thirdly, “a clean environment for aesthetic and health reasons is likely to have very high income-elasticity”; where income is high (western, developed countries), the demand for a clean environment is high, so by economic logic the supply of a clean environment should also occur there.

This is quite plainly what Peter Wenz refers to as environmental racism; a practice whereby racial minorities and “people of color around the world [are exposed to] disproportionate shares of environmental hazards” (Wenz, 57). Not only is the health of the ecosystem related to the social integrity of the community, but the root of the ecological degradation is brought on by greed – for control of resources for consumerist purposes. The eco-justice movement in theological circles is the church’s response to the “abuse of power that results in a situation where poor people suffer the effects of environmental damage caused by the greed of others” (Conradie et. al, 140). This movement recognizes that women of colour are especially affected by this type of racism, such that the struggles for eco-justice must be rooted “not only among black communities under black leadership, but also among black women under the leadership of black women” (ibid.). Planners and those concerned with Anglican stewardship ought to share in being outraged by statements such as those made by Summers, above. The effects of consumerism in western, developed countries on the general health of lesser developed countries (ecologically, economically, socially) is one front on which planners and stewards can stand solidly side-by-side in expressing outrage at the resulting inequities and injustices.
As suggested by both Shirley Stockdill and Kevin Dixon, stewardship is a vision for the church community as engaged in social, ecological and economic action in an effort to ensure abundance\textsuperscript{21} for all. David Dranchuk suggested in his interview that this approach is very much rooted in the actions of Jesus Christ. He saw Jesus as a “radical feminist, someone who clashed with the religious authorities of the day; who questioned the system – it’s not enough to just lament how bad things are, or apply bandaids, you need to question the system that keeps people poor and tied down, and that’s the kind of fellow that Jesus Christ was”. This vision of the church is not one that churches have fully embraced, although evidence of it can be found in cities and towns across Canada. In Dawson Creek, British Columbia, for example, St. Mark’s Anglican Church offers a soup kitchen every Tuesday that feeds (in a town of approximately 10,000) close to 100 men, women and children on a regular basis. This service is part of a broader initiative in the community to ensure that everyone in that community is guaranteed at least one hot meal, five days a week. Examples similar to this one can also be found in the two dioceses that are the focus of this thesis. The vision of the church as a servant in the community is very much in line with the steward-as-partner model.

These inequities and injustices are addressed in many ways; from encouraging parishioners to curb consumerism in western, developed countries (through the voluntary simplicity movement, for example) to development work in the affected areas. The Anglican Church is not completely blameless in the appropriation of resources from lesser developed countries to fuel the consumerism of western, developed countries given its connection with colonialism in the past two centuries. Much reflection in more recent decades has resulted in the Anglican Church recognizing its role in colonialism and attempting to reverse some of its effects through the work of the Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund and the local development works it organizes and funds. The development approach, as expressed through the Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund (PWRDF), is one which offers tangible benefits to the communities in which it works. In the 1970s the PWRDF recognized that as a consequence of deforestation and defoliation, women, in particular, were hard hit by having

\textsuperscript{21} “Abundance” in this context refers to abundant living as “every creature fully alive” (McFague 2001, 3). Abundance does not equal excess; rather, abundance is every creature having enough to live a healthy life.
to walk increasingly longer distances to gather water. The organization used a liberation theology approach of developing base communities (networks of local grassroots organizations that drive initiatives) in order to address this issue. The resultant focus of development work in the Anglican Church is on satisfying the basic needs of food and shelter.

In one sense this is missionary work, although not in the sense of attempting to convert the local populations. Rather, the focus is on satisfying the basic needs of food and shelter before being able to address more complex, spiritual needs, which is something the church believes to be important for developing sustainable communities.

From a planning perspective the actual projects look much like local technology and micro-credit strategies that are currently understood to be the most appropriate type of development in the third-world context. In both cases, there has to be a high level of integrity on behalf of the intervening agent, because the dependency that development work creates leaves communities susceptible to theological teachings on the one hand, and to western ideals about democracy and its relationship with consumerism on the other.

I recall being at a conference organized by the Canadian International Development Agency in Ottawa in the summer of 2001 where Stephen Lewis was fielding questions after his plenary address on the HIV/AIDS epidemic in Africa. A woman (I can not recall which African country she was from) approached the microphone and pointed out that in many communities throughout the African continent, the church plays a central role in the social life of the community. Furthermore, she suggested, the international community seemed oblivious to the church’s role, but if they continued to exclude the local churches in their development strategies and programs there would be only limited success. Her remarks point to the heart of the matter — quite literally — that development at the basic end of Maslow’s hierarchy of needs (physiological and safety) is a pre-requisite for, but incomplete without, development at the higher end (love, self-esteem, self-actualization). While planners’ skills are well-adapted to providing for physiological and safety concerns, the co-operation of the churches is necessary if higher needs are to be met. Not only that, the church is often well-
positioned to help in the delivery of basic needs through programs such as the Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund.

4.2.6 Non-Technical Solutions

The steward-as-manager, -enlightened-manager, and -partner models which were developed in chapter two have very different views on the appropriate role of humans on the planet. The view that humans are the ultimate fulfillment of evolution and that they must subdue and dominate the planet in order to fulfill their needs and desires (the steward-as-manager model) is soundly rejected based on both scientific evidence of a finite planet and religious conviction that other life forms have intrinsic value.

The second view (enlightened-manager) is problematic to theologians because although it recognizes the integrity of other living creatures, that integrity is protected only because it serves human purposes. While this view appears to get the job done in terms of ensuring the ecological sustainability of our finite planet, it does not go far enough. It fails to speak to people’s sense of belonging and purpose; it is spiritually bankrupt. While spiritual bankruptcy may not seem of concern to planners, I would argue that it is a spiritual understanding of the place of humans on the planet that is the key to developing a new ‘story’ for human purpose and existence. This is the domain of expertise of the religious community – expressing what would be the appropriate, or ‘right’ relationship between humanity and the cosmos.

The notion of ‘right’ relationship has been eloquently explored by Martin Buber in his book I and Thou (Buber, 1970). He describes the anthropocentric approach to human-other relationships as being ‘I-It’, or subject-object. A more appropriate relationship, he argues, is ‘I-Thou’, or subject-subject. This is a challenge to which planners will have to prove they are able to rise. Planners have been open to accepting and responding to the critique of male-centredness, they are becoming increasingly aware of western-centric critiques, and perhaps ought to be anticipating the critique of planning as human-centred.

If nature is to be looked on as subject, rather than object, planners will need to look outside their profession for examples of this. Certainly, the religious community has something to
contribute to this line of thought, especially at a time when theologians are reclaiming a vision of the earth community as being valued by, and even the embodiment of, God.

In their introduction to the *Christianity and Ecology*, Dieter Hessel and Rosemary Radford Ruether suggest “Christian theology has rediscovered that all of the earth community is valuable to God, who continues to create, sustain, and redeem the whole. God, understood in wholistic [sic], organic terms, relates directly to and cares for the well-being of everykind, not just humankind. Otherkind exist to enjoy being in their own right, not only to function as companions or helpers of humankind” (Hessel and Ruether, xxxv). This insight is valuable to planners and critical for arriving at a persuasive story for the redefinition of humanity and the planet.

Organized religion appears to be a natural fit for exploring ‘new ways of imagining’ ourselves. It is up against some steep competition for this role, however. Folz suggests in the introduction to his edited volume *Worldviews, Religion and the Environment* that “more and more, the prevailing worldview among the general public is shaped by the multi-billion dollar advertising and public relations industries – hardly disinterested enterprises! – which together probably constitute the most massive and successful apparatus for mind control in the history of the human species” (Folz, 4). This thesis is bargaining on the fact that living according to the consumerist story does not result in a fulfilling or satisfying life – it is spiritually and morally bankrupt. An increasing awareness that consumption does not equal happiness (see, for example Cobb, Haltstead and Rowe’s article ‘If GDP is Up, Why is America Down?’) represents an opportunity for organized religion and planners to consciously engage in a story-telling exercise which acts as an antidote to the consumption-oriented story offered by the corporations.

4.2.7 Building Community

---

As mentioned earlier, Gary Gardner feels that the churches have much to offer in the effort to achieve a sustainable society. He suggested five specific assets that the church brought to the sustainability movement: the capacity to shape worldviews; moral authority; a large base of adherents; significant material resources; and, community-building capacity (Worldwatch Institute, 154). If I am reading between the lines correctly from my interviews, the first priority for stewardship development work is in community building. Building a sense of community, the interviewees suggested, goes hand-in-hand with developing a vision for the community, which then allows the community to move ahead on accessing its other assets for use by the wider community. This can take shape in many ways, one of which is in developing a vision for the physical church as demonstration ground for energy conservation projects or for green building design, or responsible use of resources (such as the conversion of parking lots into affordable housing). Gardner argues that churches are influential in creating social capital (community building) also through their presence in most societies and in rural areas and because they “bring people together frequently, and they encourage members to help one another as well as the dispossessed” (Worldwatch Institute, 158).

An integral component of community-building is the raising of consciousness that occurs when members are informed of each other’s needs, and when the dispossessed are identified along with their specific needs. In order to foster sustainability, however, the consciousness-raising for Christians needs to be broadened to reimagine the relationship between God and the world. This step is a precedent for a change in the actions of parishioners. Shirley Stockdill noted that communication of the relationship between God and the world is key before action can be undertaken, and the communication will occur in different ways, at different paces among groups; “there are a lot of people who have been excited about the holistic perspective, and a lot of people have no idea what I’m talking about!” As religious institutions introduce holistic stewardship into their teachings and operations, the planning community must also be pushing from their end to encourage people in the communities they work in to see a broad perspective and range of possibilities when discussing issues and potential solutions. This includes being open to acknowledging other ways of knowing and most pertinently to this thesis, religious ways of knowing.
4.2.8 Responding Ecstatically to the World

The implications for viewing the non-human ‘other’ as ‘thou’ or subject rather than object are far reaching. Recall Burton-Christie’s challenge to Anglicans to redevelop a sense of *eros* when faced with the surrounding environment such that they might be open to responding ecstatically to it. This implies an intimate, personal relationship with God in the surrounding environment. God exists in me, in the trees outside my window, in the plants that become the food I eat, and in the air I breathe. It implies the sacredness of the world around me, and therefore my reverence towards it. It implies, finally, that I must take care not to degrade the world around me, or compromise its existence for my own benefit, but to appreciate the intrinsic value of the ‘other’.

This type of challenge offers an opportunity for Anglicans to be inspired by a new way of seeing their relationship with the world around them. It turns on its head the purely utilitarian notion of the forest having value only as timber. Instead, the forest is a place to explore the relationship that exists between myself and the tree, and the birds, and the stream. It also validates the human role in that relationship. The world would not be better off without humanity; rather, as Jonathan Schell suggests, humans have a responsibility as the consciousness of the world: “in extinction a darkness falls over the world not because the lights have gone out but because the eyes that behold the light have been closed” (as quoted in McFague 1987, 76).

If I am to believe that the path to a sustainable society starts with developing and presenting a new story about the role of humanity on the planet (and I do), then it seems to me that the story of the steward-as-partner has tremendous potential for inspiring those who might be exposed to it. From a theological standpoint, the story of the steward-as-partner, who sees relationship with God in trees, plants, air, etc., is found in a theory of sacramentalism, whereby Jesus (sacrificed by God on the cross) is the incarnated form of God. This incarnational aspect of sacramentalism extends the religious conviction that God is present in Jesus to include “a wider incarnational interpretation [whereby] God is in nature as well as in Jesus” (McFague 2000, 31). Furthermore, “God is incarnate in and as the cosmic body of the universe, although not reduced to it” (Ruether 2000, 612). Ruether describes her vision for...
the church as including green design for its buildings, through recycling and conservation initiatives, through the preservation of natural grasses and plants in landscaping, through permaculture gardens to provide food for the poor, through church justice advocacy work directed at public policy. “Only by embodying the vision of ecology and justice in its own teaching, worship, and praxis, can the Church make itself a base for an environmentally responsible ministry to the larger community in which it stands” (ibid, 613).

Planners, likewise can use a strategy of embodying the vision of ecology and justice in its own teaching and practice. While planners do not have a history of ‘responding ecstatically’ to the world around them, there is an opportunity to tap into this kind of emotional and spiritual response to the world around them. Whereas a spiritual and emotional response is primarily a reactive one to a given situation, planners might also bring into this response an understanding, based on dialogue with the scientific community, of the complexity of the observed phenomenon or relationship. This kind of expanded dialogue – between planners, the scientific community and the religious community – is invaluable in reaching a population characterized by its catholicity.

4.3 Looking Ahead

The focus of this fourth chapter has been on exploring several concepts that link stewardship and planning, and on the valuable contribution that each brings to the debate about how to achieve a sustainable society. The last chapter will focus more specifically on what the appropriate relationship ought to be between the planning profession and a steward-as-partner model for achieving sustainability.

As an introductory thought to that final chapter, consider that the ultimate objective of a spiritual approach to stewardship is in redefining what is meant by the ‘good life’. “What we need, it seems to me, is a radical re-definition of the good life we pursue” (Rev. Tom Harries, as quoted on the Minnesota Episcopal Environment Stewardship Commission website). To Sallie McFague, the ‘good life’ is an ‘abundant life’ for all, to David Dranchuck, the ‘good

\[23\] Recall discussion above, whereby ‘abundance’ does not equal excess, but rather ‘enough’ for every living creature to lead a healthful life.
life' is found in the good news, which is the care of creation, “of all that God has given us”. Note that the pursuit of a 'good life' is not at all foreign to the objectives a planner might give when working on any given project. This perhaps forms the most important bond between planning and the stewardship model. In other words, pursuit of the 'good life' (especially as this relates to a good quality of life) for all is a common objective to both planners and those theologians, clergy, and lay members of the Anglican church who are dedicated to developing a holistic sense of stewardship in the communities they influence. Bearing this commonality in mind, the final chapter revisits the arguments made in the previous chapters in order to answer the question derived from the purpose of the research: is there relevance to be found in the steward-as-partner model for those planning practitioners committed to working towards sustainability?
Chapter Five
The Relevance of Stewardship to Planning:
What is an Appropriate Response from Planning to Stewardship?

The purpose of this last chapter is to bring back to the forefront the question that was implied in the purpose statement; that is, what is, if any, the relevance of stewardship to sustainability planning?

Consider the following quote from Shirley Stockdill, the stewardship development officer with the Diocese of New Westminster. It was her response to a question regarding her ultimate vision of stewardship fulfilled on earth.

“To me, that’s what Stewardship is, it’s a caring for and sharing of the earth and its resources of which we have huge abundance – not just food, but rather education, an openness to what others have to walk with and building on that I think the world wouldn’t be perfect, because we’re not perfect, but the world would be a lot better place, and there would be far fewer tyrants able to take hold of government and countries and peoples because people would know how to take control of their own lives and enable one another” (Shirley Stockdill).

Planners, it seems to me, are ideally involved with the three themes that Shirley suggests are of deep concern to the steward. Firstly, planners are implicated in many ways with issues of equity in the caring for and distribution of resources. Who (including both the human and non-human sphere) gets what? Where? When? Secondly, planners often feel called to ‘walk with’ the marginalized in society acting whenever possible as advocates, enablers and educators. Thirdly, planners care deeply about the ability of communities to ‘take control of their own lives and enable one another’. This third theme highlights especially the recognition by planners and stewards that human dignity lies in having control over your life and in being in a position to contribute to the overall betterment of one’s community.

What Shirley’s quote does is point out a common front that stewards and planners can take in creating more socially, ecologically and economically sustainable – or ‘good life’ – societies. In a very basic way, stewardship is relevant to planning because stewards and planners are involved in much of the same work in the face of inequity and injustice, including inequity
and injustice heaped on the non-human world to serve the consumption habits of a select group of humans.

The balance of this chapter will be organized under two main headings. A first section will place the Anglican concept of stewardship that was developed in chapter two within a broader context of the appropriate relationship between the church and the planning profession. The second section will pull together several of the findings from previous chapters to present a model of stewardship that would be appropriate for planners.

Before proceeding, however, it is imperative to correct what might be seen as an underlying assumption that has carried the thesis thus far. That is, that the steward and the planner are separate actors. There are, of course, many planners who have no affiliation whatsoever with any of the world’s religions. There are, on the other hand, many practicing Anglicans who are planners, and many more planners who are associated with one or another of the world religions. For those planners who are spiritually inclined, this thesis offers the challenge to recognize that it is not necessary to separate the two spheres of professional life and spiritual life in order to be an effective planner. An Anglican-inspired stewardship belongs to the myriad 'epistemologies of multiplicity' that Leonie Sandercock suggests is necessary to planning theory in the formation of well-rounded, progressive planners.

5.1 Stewardship in a Broader Context of ‘Religious’ Response; the Relationship Between Church and Planning

This is not to suggest that planners ought to be overtly ‘religious’ in their practice; rather, planners need to be open to spiritual ways of knowing (including their own). The Anglican model of stewardship developed is but one example, of course. It is not within the scope of this essay to attempt to provide an overview of the equivalencies of this model in other world religions, but some context as to the necessity for a broad range of spiritual responses is appropriate.

Lynn White Jr. suggests that “human ecology is deeply conditioned by beliefs about our nature and destiny – that is, by religion” (White, 37). This study on stewardship acts as a
starting-off point for studying the possibilities of ‘religious’ responses for informing the work of sustainability planners. The relevance of the steward-as-partner model to planners in this sense is as one example of a spiritual response (Anglican) that points to the possibility of broader cooperation between planners and the work of the churches (synagogues, temples, mosques, etc...) on developing, informing and inspiring the faithful in a new understanding about humanity’s ‘nature and destiny’.

Gary Gardner suggested that “a sustainable world cannot effectively be built without full engagement of the human spirit” (Worldwatch, 153). White’s and Gardner’s point has been mentioned before, but bears repeating in this final chapter: that technological fixes will not solve the ecological crisis; rather, people’s beliefs about their place in the cosmos, reflected in their behaviours and actions, will. The absolute necessity of a shift in worldview, or ‘story’ about the human place on the planet cannot be overstated. This has important consequences for planning education. It is interesting to note that the ability to love, empathize, think in a moral and ethical manner are uniquely human characteristics, and yet it is precisely these uniquely human abilities that are denied when it comes to decision-making processes. Not only that, our planning education continues to rely on economic models as the baseline for analysis, further perpetuating the problem in the professional field. Planning education must heed Gardner’s call to ‘engage the human spirit’ in terms of encouraging students to engage in a dialogue with their own spirit, in explicitly basing decision-making analysis on compassion-based or spiritually-based models rather than economic ones, and in providing students with the tools to do the same in their professional practice.

White articulates his feelings on the issue when he states: “I personally doubt that disastrous ecologic backlash can be avoided simply by applying to our problems more science and more technology […] Despite Copernicus, all the cosmos rotates around our little globe. Despite Darwin, we are not, in our hearts, part of the natural process. We are superior to nature, contemptuous of it, willing to use it for our slightest whim” (White, 35). This latter attitude reflects the worldview of the steward-as-manager model, which has been rejected in this thesis as inappropriate for planners. The steward-as-partner model, on the other hand, is explicit in its understanding that a change in perception of the role of humanity on the planet
is key for changes in behaviour to occur followed eventually by the ability of humanity to live sustainably on the planet.

Planners, like everyone else, need to learn a new story (Berry) and learn to be proponents of 'good' stories – those which advocate a more appropriate role for humanity in the cosmos – and thus must be exposed to and knowledgeable of such stories. “If we are to achieve this purpose [a radical reassessment of the human situation], we must begin where everything begins in human affairs – with the basic story, our narrative of how things came to be, how they came to be as they are, and how the future can be given some satisfying direction. We need a story that will educate us, a story that will heal, guide and discipline us” (Berry, 124).

Berry’s suggestion could well be heard by many planning educators. This might take the form of a values assessment course, whereby students are encouraged to reflect on their personal values and express those in a formal way. Planning students, in this way, would be made aware of how their personal values reflect what they see as being ‘good’ stories.

Besides stories that ‘guide and discipline us’, planners also need stories that give us hope. As big-picture thinkers planners need to hear that they have a role to play in helping to create a new story. Already, theologians have become aware and knowledgeable of the ecological theory informing planners (see, for example, Sallie McFague’s Life Abundant and her references to the ecological economists or the Harvard series on religions and ecology, including the volume edited by Dieter Hessel and Rosemary Radford Ruether Christianity and Ecology). Aspiring planners need to be made aware of theological literature in order to be inspired by its stories and instilled with a sense of hope regarding the possibilities for a renewed and sustainable planet earth.

Outside of their formal education, planners can become involved in valuing the spiritual ways of knowing in the works that they oversee. Take, for example, the following quote from John Haines: “I have come to feel that there is here in North America a hidden place obscured by what we have built upon it, and that whenever we penetrate the surface of the life around us that place and its spirit can be found” (Haines, in Burton-Christie, p. 14). Planners might be inspired by this to rediscover the hidden places Haines refers to by
insisting that ‘place and its spirit’ are found in the designs and plans for buildings, municipalities and regions.

Or consider Rasmussen’s suggestion that “the point of all this is the effort to fashion and share normative common ground” (Rasmussen 18, original emphasis). The sharing he is referring to is between the “varied expressions of Christian faith” (ibid.) with respect to eco-justice, but the challenge could (should) be extended to planners as well. He refers to four norms, developed by Dieter Hessel, that help shape the dialogue around eco-justice: “(a) solidarity with other people and creatures in Earth community; (b) ecological sustainability, that is, environmentally fitting habits that enable life to flourish; (c) sufficiency as a standard of organized sharing; and (d) socially just participation in decisions about how to obtain sustenance and manage the common good” (Rasmussen, 18, 19). Rasmussen and Hessel are both challenging the church to become “ecologically reformed” (ibid, 19), but again the challenge ought to be heard throughout the planning community as well. Planners, trained among other things in dialogue and mediation, are well-placed to act on ensuring that the norms Hessel outlines are understood and incorporated into the planning process at the local, municipal and regional levels. Planners are especially invested in process, and can relate to the need for ‘socially just’ participatory approaches to planning decision-making. For example, in ensuring that participation around a particular topic is ‘catholic’ in its approach, or in other words, that participation encompasses a wide diversity of voices. Also, planners ought to take care to ensure that values (spiritual, moral, ethical) are explicitly introduced into public discourse. Instead of perpetuating the myth of ‘rational’ public debate (i.e. based on sound economic, scientific and/or technological evidence), we should be encouraging public discourse to take on an entirely different tone.

Effectively, I am suggesting that planners need to be explicit in their attempts to move beyond economic analysis for decision-making to include values-based analysis. In my interview with Kevin Dixon, we discussed the appropriate connection between church and the political process. He suggested that politics could be understood in two ways; partisan politics, in which the church has no place; and politics as public interaction and relationships among people. According to this latter interpretation, the church ought to have significant
involvement in community politics. Examples of this include holding town hall meetings, taking a stand with respect to doctrine and how it relates to issues of public policy (the referendum question for negotiation of native land treaties, for example, or the Global Anglican Congress’ Declaration on the Stewardship of Creation) and engaging other community leaders in dialogue. Planners, as players in the political process (specifically, the latter understanding of politics), need to cooperate more intentionally with church leaders in order to facilitate and encourage community dialogue on issues of concern in an effort to validate the presence of a spiritual voice.

Just as stewardship is an important component for informing the planner’s multi-disciplinary approach to sustainability, so planning is an important component of any stewardship activity or program. In other words, the potential for the relationship between stewardship and planning is one of mutual learning and collaboration. Stewardship requires planning in order to be effective, and planning increasingly requires an infusion of the sacred in relating to humanity’s role on the planet in order to develop processes and programs that are sustainable and relevant to society. The steward-as-partner model, as presented, is overtly spiritual in orientation. It bears repeating that the point of presenting this model is not to suggest that all planners ought to adopt it specifically as their worldview. On a personal level, it is quite appropriate for a planner to be inspired by his or her own spirituality, but at a community level, it would be inappropriate to hoist an Anglican interpretation of stewardship as the only valid one (even according to the steward-as-partner model, which values a diversity of approaches to caring for creation). The final section looks at the steward-as-partner model and takes from it elements that might be useful for developing a corporate interpretation of stewardship.

5.2 What is an Appropriate Model of Stewardship for Planners?

5.2.1 The Appropriate Role of Religion

There are perhaps two approaches to developing a model of stewardship in a community setting. The first is to secularize the model, removing all references to a God (Christian or otherwise) or religious practices. The second is to infuse the model with language that is
more inclusive of other (spiritual) perspectives – to extend the applicability of the steward-as-partner model beyond a purely Anglican focus.

This latter approach is the one adopted here. The former approach would essentially recreate a steward-as-enlightened-manager model, which is still very much an anthropocentric way of understanding the place of humanity on the planet. Certainly, if my own survival feels threatened, I may be motivated to change certain behaviours in self-defense, but this possibility lacks the inspiration needed to maintain such behaviour once the threat has passed. Consider the words of Bishop Hanns Lilje, in 1952. He suggested, “to know that with all that we are and all that we have we are God’s stewards is the answer to a particularly deep yearning of the time in which we live, namely, the yearning for a vita nova, a complete renewal of our life” (quoted in Kantonen, 1). An anthropocentric or managerial approach simply does not come anywhere close to being able to inspire people to change behaviours to lessen their ecological footprint in the same way that a spiritual interpretation can and does.

What is likely becoming obvious, as far as my line of argument goes, is that the steward-as-(enlightened)-manager concept is unlikely to be helpful in the pursuit of sustainability because it misrepresents the appropriate relationship between humanity and the rest of the planet. Certainly, Christianity is not the only world religion that can be used for inspiration in creating sustainable communities. The work of the Harvard University Centre for the Study of World Religions, in hosting the Religions of the World and Ecology conference series has looked for and been inspired by teachings in Buddhism, Confucianism, Shinto, Hinduism, Indigenous Traditions, Judaism, Christianity, Islam, Taoism and Jainism. Each of these religions and traditions offer a more appropriate interpretation of the relationship between humanity and the planet than the anthropocentric view that dominates current ‘stewardship’ practices in planning (recall the discussion in chapter two on the current use of stewardship in planning documents).

---

24 More information on the Harvard Centre or the conference series can be found at: http://www.hds.harvard.edu/cswr/ecology/
While no single interpretation of ‘stewardship’ will be able to summarize the position of all world religions, an appropriate model for planners will appreciate the diversity of approaches offered by the various religions and traditions. In practice, planners would need to recognize how various approaches fit within the overall vision for ‘stewardship’ and be accepting of the diversity of tactics this would imply.

If stewardship in a community setting can incorporate a spiritual way of knowing, then it ought to also be assumed that stewardship would incorporate non-technical solutions to planning issues. As an example, recycling strategies are largely a technical fix that does little to address the underlying cause of waste; namely, excessive consumption. The focus should turn to other types of ‘Rs’, such as reducing consumption and reusing items rather than throwing them away. Recall, once again, the five areas of strength that Gary Gardner sees for the church in cooperating with the broader efforts to achieve sustainability. The following table revisits those five areas, relating them to expressions of this offered through the interviews.

**Table 5: Five Areas of Influence of the Church in Working Towards Sustainability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Strength of the Church</th>
<th>Manifestations of this from Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity to shape cosmologies</td>
<td>Several of the interviewees stressed the importance of engaging in a revisioning of the church as actively engaged in the politics of social change. The starting point for this is in the articulation of faith-inspired ways of living and of approaching specific problems or issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Authority</td>
<td>Many of the interviewees felt strongly that a revisioning of the church towards societal action would renew its moral authority, which some felt had been tarnished, especially as it relates to the historical role of the church in colonization. Certainly, it was felt that there was a need for the church to engage the broader community in discussions with the specific intent of articulating moral arguments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A large base of adherents</td>
<td>While nobody spoke specifically about numbers, it was suggested that the church needs to reach out to the many parishioners who rarely shadow the doors of the church. This was referred to in one interview as the critical point at which one stops referring to the church community as ‘us’ and refers to it as ‘them’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mention was made by several interviewees about the potential for church structures as forums for political discourse or (in the event of decommissioning) conversion into affordable housing. Many parishes are also able to raise significant sums of money in support of community initiatives.

Evidence of community-building came in many forms. For example, the informal networks of people interested in promoting stewardship, or efforts to develop a community vision based on a stewardship vision. Community building was also seen as an end-result of stewardship, whereby parishioners are more engaged in ministries, outreach and in spiritual development. It was also noted that a broader conception of community, which encourages people to think about the link between local actions to and implications on a global scale.

In summary, the search for answers must be accomplished in such a way that the contribution of many disciplines might be recognized. Thomas Berry suggests that “all our human affairs – all professions, occupations, and activities – have their meaning precisely insofar as they enhance this emerging world of subjective intercommunion within the total range of reality” (Berry 136). In cooperating with other disciplines beyond the traditional economic and technological ones allows for “a new, more integral language of being and value [to] emerge” (ibid.).

5.2.2 The Appropriate Role of Community: Relationship With the ‘Other’

Already planners are aware of, and work actively to promote, the idea of community. The planning process is designed (if not always carried out) in such a way that (geographic) community input is meant to guide the direction of planning for that area. This is a good start, but the notion of community – of being in relationship – needs to be extended. In a first instance, the notion of community needs to be expanded such that the human ‘other’ is incorporated. This includes the marginalized of the local community, and also the ‘other’ who lives half a world away but who resides next to the buried toxic waste that was shipped there as a result of industrial processes that create the consumption goods sold in the first-world community.
Also, importantly, the notion of community needs to be expanded to include the ‘non-human’ component. Planners could be inspired by the steward-as-partner model by incorporating a subject-subject, rather than subject-object, perspective when dealing with the non-human ‘other’ (Buber). Planners might also be inspired to share Rasmussen’s urgency in protecting biodiversity as the “ontology of communion” and an intimacy of all life (Rasmussen, in Hessel and Rasmussen, 6). The steward-as-enlightened-manager can see that biodiversity is worth protecting in the sense that humanity relies on biodiversity as a protection mechanism against disease in the food supply, for example; but the steward-as-partner (and perhaps the inspired planner) understands that biodiversity has value in and of itself; that the loss of any single species is a loss to the ‘communion’ as a whole, and the community suffers as a result.

Stewardship in a community setting would also encourage people to become intimately knowledgeable about the natural elements around them. They ought to be encouraged to touch and be touched by trees, bushes, streams, and so on; thereby encouraging an ‘ecstatic’ response and understanding of connectedness between the human and non-human world. Rather than promoting the current unhealthy perception of the relationship between humanity and the world around them, planners ought to be aware of and promote the relationship between humanity and ‘nature’ and the special role that each brings to that relationship. In this sense, planners ought to be able to articulate a role for humanity – avoiding the dark and ultimately uninspiring suggestion that the planet would be better off without humanity – of “activating the most profound dimension of the universe itself, its capacity to reflect on and celebrate itself in conscious self-awareness” (Berry, 131/2).

Fostering this sense of relationship is important not only in a local context, but also in the development context of community planning. Helena of Norberg-Hodge, for example, speaks of the traditional Buddhist worldview of the Ledakhi people in northern India as allowing for a “dialogue between human beings and their surroundings, a continuing coevolution that meant that, during two thousand years of trial and error, the culture kept changing […] within a framework of compassion and a profound understanding of the interconnectedness of all phenomena” (Norberg-Hodge, 575). The notion of change in a discussion about ‘sustainable’ development is an important one as it shatters the notion that
the goal is to 'sustain' current trends and experiences. This quote also highlights the importance of compassion and interconnectedness as qualities that must be present in any planning effort to create sustainable communities.

5.2.3 Appropriate Vision for the Role of Humanity

Stewardship at a community level, inspired by the steward-as-partner model should also retain the role of humanity, gifted with reason, memory and language, as set apart from the non-human 'other' by her ability to act as a care-giver and nurturer of all life. The care-giver and nurturer imagery also calls to mind the responsibilities of being a servant. The servant imagery is essential to instilling a sense of humility in the planner's daily actions. As a public servant devoted to the public planning process, a healthy dose of humility is perhaps good protection against abuse of power resulting in the compromising of process in the face of desired outcomes.

Hope is a final element that a community understanding of stewardship must incorporate. From an Anglican perspective, there is a strong sense of hope for sustainability to be found in a God "whose power working in us can do infinitely more than we can ask or imagine" (Anglican Church of Canada, 214). The concept of hope is not uniquely Anglican, however, and is found in all world religions. In a spiritually-infused stewardship, there is hope to be found in the work of planners who, using their gifts of reason, memory and skill, continually strive to care for and nurture the human and non-human communities in which they are implicated.

5.3 Looking Ahead: The Planner as Steward

I have proposed that the current paradigm is one that sees the role of the planner as a steward-as-manager and have advocated that the desired paradigm is one whereby the role of the planner is akin to the steward-as-partner model. The question remains – how might the desired paradigm be achieved?

Firstly, it must be reiterated that the goal is not to see all planners have a conversion of the heart and adopt an Anglican theology. It would not be stretching it to suggest, however, that
within this thesis is a challenge to individual planners, and more specifically to planning educators, to introduce the role of the heart within public discourse. That is to say, planners and planning educators ought to validate discussions around the importance of love, empathy, morality, and ethics whenever they are involved in public debate. Educators, especially, must recognize that reliance on ‘rational’ debate based on economic analysis has led to the degraded state of the planet, and it is only by explicitly basing analysis on love, compassion, ethics and so on that sustainability is possible. The goal, then, is to make planners seek out spiritual, ethical and moral presentations on specific issues and to value those ways of knowing equally with other (traditionally ‘rational’) ways of knowing. As discussed in the theory section, the role of the planner is as a mediator and facilitator when groups and individuals representing a diversity of worldviews come together to challenge existing social structures. Transformative theory holds up mutual learning in this type of forum as well as individual empowerment as a form of radical democracy. The planner acts as a steward when she is able to foster the relationships of those represented around the table and create space for a dialogue to occur. The planner is not, as a facilitator and mediator, a valueless automaton. Rather, she also comes to the table with a particular worldview and ideas about how to move forward for social change. The steward-as-partner approach to the planner’s role, however, puts the planner in a position of mutual learning – as both teacher and learner.

In order for the planner to be able to fulfill the facilitation and mediation role, she needs skills. Not only will she need skills in the process of facilitation and mediation, but also skills for expressing the value of ‘other’ ways of knowing. Surely, the ideal of economic analysis is so embedded that it would require special skills on behalf of the planner to justify and carry out a process based on love or ethics analysis. Partly, the planner will need some natural ability in this area and partly, she will need training through planning education. For example, planners ought to be challenged to pursue other ways of knowing about their role in the world around them – perhaps reaching into their own spiritual background, or researching another spiritual background, or again by taking on a utilitarian view of the world around them. Sharing these perspectives with other planning students might serve as an eye-opener as to the variety of views that might be encountered ‘in the real world’. Discussions around
the merits of each of these views with respect to what is known about the current ecological crisis would challenge the planner to overcome the mire of absolute relativity of views in order to probe more specifically how each student might articulate his or her own worldview.

Once students have an understanding of their own worldview and those of others, then students must be supported in their search for concrete skills to appreciate and encourage spiritual, ethical and moral ways of knowing in public processes. I can not say with any confidence that I know specifically what those skills might be. Certainly, a planner as public servant (in the spirit of steward-as-partner) would need facilitation and mediation skills as well as an ability to seek answers and ways of describing problems from other disciplines. Furthermore, planners would need to learn to feel out the fine line between educator and imposer of personal or professional bias on a given issue. Exploring that fine line also implies that the planner needs skills in building (legitimate) trust in a community setting.

This is not to suggest that the more technical skills often associated with planning education (such as Geographic Information Systems or design specifications) are irrelevant, but rather that there ought to be an explicit attempt by educators to make the link between these skills and their underlying assumptions about the context of humanity in a wider world, or about aesthetics, or again about the durability versus the dispensability of building materials or designs. The value of GIS or statistics needs to be understood in terms of the specific questions that these tools are able to answer. They should not be used in the absence of a love-based or ethics-based or spiritually-based analysis.

From a theoretical standpoint, planners need to be able to see their efforts within a broader conception of transformation. There is undoubtedly a lot of messiness around a table where people with different worldviews have come to talk about ways of forging ahead on an issue of common interest. Keeping one eye on the overall theory of transformation while attempting to facilitate and mediate the discussion is also a skill that ought to be fostered and developed in planning school.
Integrating public policy with theology is another aspect of the roadmap to achieving sustainability. Planners ought to engage more intentionally with bodies concerned with the relationship between policy and theology. Specifically, I mentioned in chapter one the Forum on Religion and Ecology hosted by Harvard University, which has been set up with the purpose of engaging in the discussion relating public policy to theological teachings.

The discussions that such forums present do not imply that public policy makers need to become theologians, and visa versa. Rather, they are a forum for mutual learning on issues of importance to both planners and theologians. The Earth Charter, as explored in previous chapters, offers a model to which planners might turn for guidance in developing a vision for a given community that engages as broad a ‘catholicity’ as possible and creates a space that legitimizes non-technical and non-scientific ways of knowing.

As another piece of the puzzle (a final thought for this thesis, but only a starting-off point for further discussion) is in furthering research into the effectiveness of the churches as tellers of a new story with respect to the ecological crisis. Although this research puts forward the thesis that there is relevance in (Anglican) theology to planning theory and practice, it remains to be seen how well that theology and stewardship practice has done in shaping parishioners’ worldviews. It also remains to be seen just how broadly-based an ecological vision of the church’s mission is within the national Anglican Church and other religions more generally. Furthermore, the more practical dimensions of a relationship between theology and planning remain to be explored as the dialectical process of integrating experience and further research is undertaken. Further opportunities for reflection on this process ought to be sought and shared.

5.4 Looking Back: Some Concluding Thoughts

At your command all things came to be: the vast expanse of interstellar space, galaxies, suns, the planets in their courses, and this fragile earth, our island home; by your will they were created and have their being. From the primal elements you brought forth the human race, and blessed us with memory,
reason, and skill; you made us the stewards of creation. (Anglican Church of Canada, 201)

Not only are humans blessed with memory, reason and skill, but we are also blessed as being the only creatures capable of empathy, compassion, morality and ethics. Unfortunately, most analysis for public decision-making (and it is planners supplying the decision-makers with such analysis) ignore empathy, compassion, morality and ethics, relying almost entirely instead on ‘rational’ economic analysis. My challenge to the planning community, through this thesis, is to re-prioritize analysis for decision-making by emphasizing empathy, compassion and so on, and de-emphasizing ‘rational’ economics-based analysis. This challenge extends to the planning education field, where educators are challenged to facilitate in their students an opportunity to articulate personal values, and explore how these will inform their planning practice.

The stewardship model was developed here as only one example among a myriad of other possible examples of the potential for cooperation between the churches and the planning profession in moving towards behavioural change in the face of what Hardin has called ‘non-technical-solution problems’ (Hardin, 1243). Planners must be given the skills to recognize and encourage spiritual values within public discourse.

This thesis has been, in part, a response to the challenge to recognize my “urgent professional duty to consider the evidence supporting various alternatives with exceptional care before committing to a particular sustainable-development path” (Rees 1995, 358). It is also an attempt to introduce the reader to the steward-as-partner model in hopes that it might inspire the reader to recognize in it a new story about the role of humanity in the face of the cosmos. In particular, I should hope that planning might find in this ‘new story’ a seriously viable alternative to the economics-based analysis that is currently the basis for planning decision-making. Also, I would hope that planning educators might read into this thesis a challenge to become more familiar with the works of theologians (Anglican, Christian, and otherwise) as they relate to planning theory and practice and to incorporate spiritual ‘ways of knowing’ into their lectures and classroom discussions. This ought to include efforts to have students
reflect on and clarify the values that they hold and how these values affect their own decision-making.

Finally, by introducing planning students and educators to the notion of stewardship in the Anglican Church, specifically as it is practiced at the diocesan level in the Dioceses of New Westminster and British Columbia and at the parish level at St. Mary's and Christ Church Cathedral, I hope to have addressed (in a small but at least initial way) the gap in the planning literature with respect to spiritual responses to the ecological crisis.
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Appendix 1

Global Anglican Congress on the Stewardship of Creation. Declaration to the Anglican Communion

Brothers and Sisters in Christ, we greet you and speak to you in the name of our Trinitarian God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit: Creator, Redeemer, and Life Giver.

We write as representatives of the provinces of the Anglican Communion gathered in response to the planetary crisis and immediately prior to the World Summit on Sustainable Development. With the blessing of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the General Secretary of the Anglican Consultative Council, and the chair of the Anglican Consultative Council, our purpose is to consider the Communion's responsibilities to God and God's creation at this critical time. At the last Lambeth Conference in 1998 our Bishops again identified the environment as one of the key moral and religious issues of our time and their principles have been part of our reflection.

We have come together as a community of faith. Creation calls us, our vocation as God's redeemed drives us, the Spirit in our midst enlivens us, scripture compels us.

Where were you when I laid the foundations of the earth? Tell me if you have understanding. Job 38:4

All things came into being through him, and without him not one thing came into being. John 1:3

We know the whole creation has been groaning in labour pains until now. Romans 8:22

Our planetary crisis is environmental, but it is more than that. It is a crisis of the Spirit and the Body, which runs to the core of all that we hold sacred. It is characterized by deep poverty: impoverished people, an impoverished Earth. As people of faith, Christ draws us together to share responsibility for this crisis with all humanity.

In the twentieth century, the human impact on the earth increased enormously. In the last thirty years alone, human activity has destroyed many of the planet's natural resources. Climate change, flooding, habitat destruction, desertification, pollution, urban expansion, and famine have all played their part. A third of all fish species and a quarter of all mammal species are in danger of extinction. One billion people now suffer from a shortage of fresh water. Scientists have said the web of life is unravelling.

People must be willing to face change and participate actively in the decisions before us all. Unjust economic structures have taken from people and the land without giving in return, putting at risk all life that is sustained by the planet. Greed and over-consumption, which have dictated so much of economic development in the past, must be transformed into generosity and compassion. Transformation is, at its heart, a spiritual matter; it includes every aspect of our lives. As members of the Anglican Communion, at all levels of its life,
we must play our part in bringing about this transformation toward a just, sustainable future. Now is the time for prayerful action based on the foundation of our faith.

In 1998, the Bishops of the Anglican Communion resolved to face these challenges and provided the scriptural and theological justification for the involvement of the Church in caring for creation. We recognize this and other ongoing work of people in the communion. Such work needs our support. However, it is not enough.

We urge you to acknowledge the gravity of our call to prayer and action. Both individuals and decision-making bodies of the Church at all levels need to be actively involved in addressing these problems. As brothers and sisters in Christ's Body and as fellow Anglicans seeking to fulfill our baptismal covenant and witness to the power of the Holy Spirit in Christ, we ask you, in your parishes, dioceses, or provinces, acting at the most appropriate level, and in cooperation with ecumenical and interfaith partners wherever possible to undertake the following:

- To acknowledge that the Church's mission must now take place in the context of a life and death planetary crisis whose impact affects all aspects of the Church's life and mission.
  
To bring prayers and actions concerning ecology, environmental justice, human rights, and sustainable development to the forefront of public worship as well as private and corporate reflections on the Holy Scriptures.

- To support the struggle of indigenous peoples to maintain their cultural heritage, natural heritage, and human rights.

- To encourage all members of our congregations to understand that God calls us to care for the creation by making our communities and environments better places for the next generation than they were in our lifetime.

- To actively support initiatives in all Churches and communities that are concerned with the planetary crisis./p>

- To help publicize and network information, developments, events, publications and all sources of knowledge among our friends, neighbours, congregation members, Church leaders, and government officials.

- To encourage links among our provinces, dioceses, and parishes worldwide to increase understanding of the many issues involved and how they are interrelated.

- To support opportunities for younger people to experience first-hand how people in their own and other congregations and communities are affected by the planetary crisis and how they can work to change the world in which they live.

- To promote training and educational programs in all aspects of the planetary crisis even as they relate to our worship and community life.

- To encourage diligently our secular and Church leaders, lay and ordained, in all parts of the Anglican Communion to place the planetary crisis at the highest level of their concerns.

- To encourage and support public policies that reflect the principles of sustainable community.
• To request all bodies within the communion to undertake an environmental audit and take appropriate action on the basis of the results. To commit ourselves both to energy conservation and the use of sustainable energy sources.

• To demonstrate simplicity of lifestyle in our patterns of consumption to counteract greed and over-consumption. Such greed dictates so much of our economic past that it must be transformed into generosity and compassion.

Christ has no hands but ours, and he calls us to offer ourselves to share in his work of healing and reconciliation so that all creation may know that, “The truth shall set you free.”

_released Aug. 18-23 2002_

Appendix 2

Units reporting to Stewards in Action


- The Next Step (training for ministry to youth)
- Riding on a Donkey...Diocesan Children’s Festival (child faith development)
- Young Youth Intensive
- Jars of Clay (youth leadership development programme)
- Day of Dialogue – Preparatory (exploring differences in understanding Scripture between Christians)
- InFormation (Journal for sharing information at the Parish level re: training)
- Education for Ministry (theological education for lay program)
- Sorrento Centre (Conference Centre for educational and spiritual development)
- Camp Artaban
- Christian Formation Consultant
- Christian Formation Strategy Group
- Retreat Unit (provides retreats to serve everyone in the Diocese)
- Ministry and Congregational Development Committee (strategic use of physical resources; new models of ministry; support to parishes for visioning and planning)
- Stewardship Development Committee (stewardship as financial, as management of time and talent; as ‘stewardship of creation’, “which explored our Christian responsibilities as stewards of creation and what we, as individuals and communities can do to care for the environment”, DNW 1999, 52)
- Planned Giving Unit (a Unit of the stewardship development committee – focus on financial stewardship)
- Evangelism Unit
- Report of the Anglican Chaplain to St. Paul’s Hospital
- Report of the Chaplain to Vancouver Hospital and St. Jude’s Anglican Home
- Report of Aboriginal Rights Coalition (local working group of the national inter-church Aboriginal Rights Coalition)
- Community Meal at St. Alban’s Hall
- Downtown Eastside Working Group (exploring a Detox Centre and a recovery/treatment houses)
- Family Life Unit (supporting and affirming families)
- St. Helen’s Surrey Community Outreach Program
- Justice and Peace Unit (Includes Peace Working Group, Environmental Working Group, Local Poverty Working Group, Central America Working Group, Economic Working Group)
- St Mark’s Community Meal Program
- The Missions to Seamen ("To promote the spiritual, moral and physical well-being of seafaring persons without distinction of race, creed or nationality in community with The Missions to Seamen of London, England, and to provide recreation facilities, and sponsor recreational activities in the Diocese of New Westminster" (ibid., 64)
- New Westminster Reachout (relationship between Anglican Community and New Westminster)
- Partners in Mission Unit: "We continue to seek out and address every way in which our diocese can be in significant partnership with others in support of the mission of the Church" (ibid., 66)
- St. Paul’s Advocacy Office: “The principle objective for the Advocacy Office is to help members of the community at large who are not able on their own to settle concerns about the income, housing, and health benefits to which they believe they may be entitled. Individuals can bring their questions and worries to one of the Office workers and not only find a friendly ear, but someone who can help them discover what can be done to remedy their situation” (ibid., 67)
- Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund
- Prison Ministry Unit
- Refugee Unit (sponsoring refugees)
- Seniors Ministry Unit (educational, recreational and many provide pastoral support)
- Report of the 127 Society for Housing (subsidized housing)
- Unit Against Violence and Pornography: “This Unit opposes violence and pornography and affirms the sanctity of human life through education and intervention” (ibid., 73)