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Shakespeare’s Richard II raises the spectre of a kingdom and an environment gone awry because of the failure of good management. The royal gardener lays out the problem: “what a pity is it / That [Richard] had not so trimmed and dressed his land/ As we this garden . . . Had he done so to great and growing men, / They might have lived to bear, and he to taste, / Their fruits of duty (3.4.56-64). In this instance it is clear that the “garden” Richard has mismanaged is his subjects, but continued references to extravagance and land grabs to fund empty royal coffers throughout the play suggest that he has likewise mismanaged the “sea-walled garden” (3.4.42) of England, overtaxing what both the people and the land can give. Indeed, while there is little doubt in the play that Bolingbroke’s invasion and subsequent coup is fueled by ambitious self-interest, the play has him frame his invasion as something very much akin to modern eco-political activism, on behalf of England (2.3.165-66). He arrives to set the garden back in order and return balance to the kingdom.

Prime Minister Justin Trudeau’s ambitious adoption of the Kinder Morgan Trans Mountain Pipeline in British Columbia raises concerns, I argue, that echo Richard II’s preoccupation with eco-political balance. Trudeau and his government continue to represent this move as that of wise stewardship: balancing the needs of the environment against the needs of the economy. He appears to believe that his gift for the “common touch” with his citizens, as well as his optimistic, but relatively toothless, environmental gestures will lead his nation to accept or overlook his endorsement of conflicting initiatives like the pipeline. The escalating dispute over the pipeline between BC (who opposes it), Alberta (who stands to gain from it), and Trudeau’s federal government, suggests that he, like Richard, may have critically underestimated the political climate when it comes to management of the nation. Canadian environmentalists and political commentators are watching the dispute over this pipeline closely, particularly in the wake of the ongoing Dakota Access Pipeline dispute across the border. The last time there was a major grassroots resistance to an industry project in BC (the Carmanah Valley Protests), in the nineties, the end result was a major political embarrassment for the BC government, and there is every possibility that the Trans Mountain Pipeline may be similarly politically disastrous for both the federal and provincial governments. Like Richard II and Bolingbroke before him, now
that he has the political clout to make lasting changes to Canadian policy, Trudeau appears far more interested in consolidating his power base than implementing sustainable practices. His campaign promises of care and wise management of the natural environment sound increasingly hollow.

Comparing these two scenarios—Richard II’s emphasis on wise gardening, and Justin Trudeau’s initially encouraging but increasingly dubious environmental reforms—this paper will explore the ways we respond across time to moments of crisis with similar calls for stewardship and balance in our natural environments. I recognize this linking of two such disparate historical moments may stretch my readers’ willing suspension of disbelief. However, to paraphrase Sharon O’Dair, this paper would not be Shakespearean ecocriticism if it were not presentist, with all the potential problems and complexities that such transtemporal engagement implies. A presentist approach, she notes, is valuable if and only if it “stretches beyond the presentist criticism of the past to find ways to be active in public policy, in changing the ways people live—now.” Ultimately, I question whether the continued failure of good stewardship over the land is caused by a failure of implementation or a failure of conceptualization. Perhaps the Richards and Trudeau’s of the world fail because they are relying upon the wrong metaphor to express our duty of care to the earth. If we really want to achieve a better, more balanced relationship with the natural world, we need to come up with a better way of conceptualizing that relationship.

Mismanaging the Sea-walled Garden

When Richard II callously announces that, since his proposed “Irish wars . . . do ask some charge,” he will seize the recently deceased Duke of Lancaster’s lands and goods “towards [his] assistance” (2.1.156-160), he ignores the fact that a king should not need to dispossess his retainers to fund state affairs. While it is clear that the present need of the Irish wars is an excuse to justify repossessing Bolingbroke’s wealth, the Duke of York’s response to Richard’s plan makes equally clear that the King has been improvident with the royal funds. Neither blinded by excessive partiality nor rendered suspect by concealed grudges, York is perhaps Richard’s most evenhanded observer. He immediately responds to Richard’s announcement with a comprehensive list of all the injustices he has witnessed the king carry out. While Bolingbroke’s plight features prominently, most damning of all are York’s concluding accusations: Richard’s father, he reproves, “did win what he did spend, and spent not that/ Which his triumphant father’s hand had won” (2.1.180-82). The fact that Richard shrugs off an accusation made to his face that he has neither earned the funds he spends nor won new wealth through his own efforts suggests that Richard himself is incapable of understanding the gravity of the problem. As chief steward of England, he is failing in his divinely appointed task. Moreover, he naively believes that, despite failing to husband the land or win the loyalty of his most powerful subjects, the same divine appointment will protect his throne without any additional effort on
his part: “Not all the water in the rough rude sea/ Can wash the balm from an anointed king. / The Breath of worldly men cannot depose/ The deputy elected by the Lord” (3.2.50-53). This firm belief is his fatal mistake, as the rest of the play reveals. And yet, one might ask, why should Richard believe so adamantly that God and the natural world will defend his right to kingship when he has so signally failed to fulfill his appointed task? It is easy to argue that Richard is both too arrogant and too naïve to recognize that he has failed at stewardship. But what if, instead, Richard misses the point because he has been a good steward according to his calculations, and his calculations simply include the sacrifice of certain resources under his care as an acceptable loss?

The play returns repeatedly to the theme of good stewardship over the garden that is England. Upon his return to England, Bolingbroke claims that not only will he take back his birthright, but also that he will clear up England’s pest problem. He accuses Richard’s favourites, Bushy and Baggot, of being “[t]he caterpillers of the commonwealth, / Which [he has] sworn to weed and pluck away” (2.3.165-66). Richard’s own palace gardeners take a similar view. Their notion of proper management of gardens and of nations is identical: “Go thou,” orders the head gardener, “and, like an executioner, / Cut off the heads of too fast-growing sprays/ That look too lofty in our commonwealth./ All must be even in our government” (3.4.34-37). The inference could not be more pointed: good stewardship of nations and gardens requires attention to balance and planned circumscription of all the living things within the “garden” walls. Indeed, Lynne Bruckner notes that the garden scene in Richard II closely echoes the principles of Tusser’s popular sixteenth-century book Five Hundredth Points of Good Husbandry. The play suggests that good kings must be good gardeners (figuratively and literally), employing the principles of good husbandry to order, contain, and balance the otherwise wild, unruly nation into an orderly and hospitable (to humans) garden. One of the under gardeners irritable asks why they should bother “keep[ing] law and form and due proportion” in the palace garden when their nation’s “sea-walled garden . . . is full of weeds . . . and her wholesome herbs / Swarming with caterpillars” (3.4.40-47). Calling Richard “the wasteful King,” the head gardener laments, “what a pity is it / That [Richard] had not so trimmed and dressed his land/ As we this garden . . . Had he done so to great and growing men, / They might have lived to bear, and he to taste,/ Their fruits of duty (3.4.56-64).

If Richard had only learned his lesson and carefully minded his garden, the nation would not be in this crisis, the gardeners argue. Yet this confidence that good husbandry leads to a healthy environment, and a peaceful nation, is more problematic than it might first appear.

Bruckner notes that Richard II and Bolingbroke both afford England’s natural environment most attention and respect when they are least sure of their power over it: “It is only when out of power that Bolingbroke and Richard connect to (and value intrinsically) the earth. The further Richard is from the crown, the more he aligns himself with the land as a living entity.” Meanwhile, Bolingbroke claims that he returns to England to “weed and pluck away” all the country’s ills, but he is far from certain of success when he makes that claim—he has not yet even successfully reclaimed his ancestral holdings. Once his power is solidified, he
turns his attention (and his metaphors) to a commodification of the land without the same close personal relationship, just as Richard did when his rule was still undisputed. Bruckner astutely notes that this repeated interaction with the earth as living and valuable entity only when a ruler has not yet solidified his or her power, is part of a larger pattern: “Richard II evinces how the living earth too often is held hostage to a combination of financial mandates and politics as usual.”

Managing the nation’s garden, then as now, often gets overlooked in the rush towards personal political survival and expediency, two principles that rarely integrate well with long-term environmental care.

However, while Bruckner’s argument is compelling, it points to an interesting complication: stewardship, of an estate or a nation, implies the balancing of a variety of competing needs. Early modern husbandry and good stewardship do cover land management and sustained crop production, but they cover much more than just engagement with the “living earth.” In the early modern period, husbandry could be related to “the administration and management of a household; domestic organization,” as frequently as it was to gardening and land management. Wendy Wall notes that in “Fitzherbert’s 1523 Boke of Husbandry, housewifery formed a subset of household management, which included animal care, agriculture, grafting, gaming, timber production, accounting, surveying, distillation, gardening and physic.”

Fitzherbert’s is not the only manual to place all levels of household management and housewifery within the scope of husbandry, and indeed husbandry manuals of the period often linked husbandry in the private household to state husbandry. As Benjamin Bertram illustrates, these texts emphasized “the husbandman as ‘master of the earth’ who ‘maintained and upheld’ the commonwealth by turning barrenness to fruitfulness.”

The figuration of what Wall calls “national husbandry” at this early date further reinforces the idea that husbandry could be used to cover all forms of careful management of one’s perceived possessions, in both the private and state household.

According to this definition of husbandry, Richard might be said to be actively engaging in his role as steward of the nation, even if he is achieving unpopular results. As highest liege lord, all his retainers, even the Duke of Lancaster, technically hold their land in trust, for its true owner, Richard II. When he confiscates Bolingbroke’s inheritance, he is picking and choosing how to dispose of his possessions, as surely as when he orders his arms to Ireland or apricots planted in his gardens. One may question the wisdom of his actions, or hold up the Magna Carta as reasonable legal challenge, but the fact remains that officially England is Richard’s to manage and prune. Until his subjects rebel, Richard himself has not seen any direct ill-effects of his management choices, and taking a long view, it is hard to imagine that any change in rulership would result in more sustainable engagement with the natural world. Thus, Richard’s firm belief in his protected status as steward of the nation begins to appear a little less foolish. He is not oblivious to his role as king; he has simply failed to recognize that if he is to survive politically, his stewardship must please the nation as well as himself. Yet, if Richard’s failure is caused as much by unpopular stewardship as by bad stewardship, is engaging with the environment as “good” stewards, as has been
fondly supposed, truly an effective way to achieve a balanced interaction with the natural world? Or is this vision of our role as stewards the root of the problem? Rebecca Laroche and Jennifer Munroe offer a slightly different explanation of Richard’s mistakes, although they still emphasize the steward/gardener role. They note that “the material and the cultural are ultimately inextricable,” suggesting that both Richard II and modern scholars fail to recognize the importance of the material reality of gardening in Richard’s England. Laroche and Munroe argue that too much attention has been paid to the metaphor of gardening, and not enough to the practice, in Richard II. Richard (and his Queen), fail to govern well because they do not recognize that stewardship of a nation or a natural environment, to be successfully applied, must be taken literally, not merely metaphorically. Modern scholars, Laroche and Munroe suggest, make a similar error when they only attend to gardening as a metaphor for good governance. By their reasoning, Richard’s failure is still that of stewardship, but it is the failure to put the theory of stewardship into practice.

Sarah Ensor offers a third version of ideal stewardship that might account for Richard’s failure. Drawing upon the work and life of Rachel Caron and Sarah Orne Jewett, Ensor reframes the idea of the good steward as that of someone with no obvious or direct investment in the future: the spinster. Ensor theorizes that “the figure of the spinster . . . practices an avuncular form of stewardship, tending the future without contributing directly to it.” Her vision of the spinster replaces more traditional characterizations of environmental stewardship. Ensor challenges her audience to attend to frequently overlooked “nonreproductive (and indirectly invested) figures like the spinster” and consider how such subject positions might offer unique insights to a very old problem:

By redefining where and how we see the future, the spinster also alters our sense of how we might best move toward it, no longer permitting us to understand the present and future as mutually delimiting terms. The result is a model of care that allows distance, indirection, and aloofness to persist and that transforms the vexed concept of “enoughness” from a chastening limitation to a quietly affirmative state.

According to Ensor, the subject position of the spinster gives her space to engage in an ethics of care for the future world without any investment in furthering population growth, mass consumption, and family bloodlines which might obscure the importance of attending to the environment in favour of short-term economic expediency.

Shakespeare’s Richard II can be reasonably accused of any and all of these shortcomings in stewardship: he does not understand the importance of popular support, he does not respect the land, he is too caught up with self-aggrandizement and not enough with the future or well-being of his nation, and he does not recognize he must take an active, practical role in the management of his kingdom. Ensor, Laroche and Munroe, and Bruckner’s visions of stewardship all find him wanting. Yet far more competent and well-meaning rulers than Richard have failed.
and continue to fail in their duty of care to the environment under their jurisdiction, suggesting that “bad” stewardship is only half the problem.

**Justin Trudeau’s New Gardening Plans for Canada**

*Richard II*’s grappling with sustainable land management and good stewardship continue to resonate in current political debates over appropriate environmental management. Bruckner argues,

> In the very way that *Richard II* may have sparked political concerns about land management and forests for Elizabethans, the play can readily evoke similar concerns in a contemporary audience. Richard’s failure to make appropriate use of the national land along with his violation of Bolingbroke’s property, especially the felling of his forests, is analogous in too many ways to current environmental incursions on our federal and state lands.

Bruckner was writing in 2013, when the present US administration had yet to be envisaged, but the parallels she draws are more relevant now than ever. Bruckner observes, “Even those politicians who run on an environmental platform, it appears, are required by economic and/or political pressure to exploit the biotic world.” Her points of reference are American, but they apply equally well to Canada’s current situation.

In many ways, Canadians are experiencing a political situation that is the reverse of their neighbours south of the border. Canadians voted in Liberal party leader Justin Trudeau in 2015 after a decade of Conservative party rule by a prime minister (Stephen Harper) that openly doubted climate change and withdrew Canada from the Kyoto Accord and numerous other green initiatives. Trudeau came to power on a progressive platform that included a strong environmental initiative. He promised commitments to clean energy and stringent emissions reduction plans. For example, he promised to reduce oil tanker traffic on the North Coast of British Columbia. After years of federal resistance or active attacks on environmental sustainability, these promises seemed to signal a new direction for Canada as a leader in green initiatives.

However, one early comment by Trudeau should have revealed the contradictions inherent in his approach. While touting his platform in the run up to the election, Trudeau is quoted as optimistically stating, “The environment and the economy, . . . [they] go together. They go together like paddles and canoes. If you don’t take care of both, you’re never going to get to where you’re going. Because you can’t have a strong economy without a healthy environment.” The problem, of course, is that they do not go together. At least, if they do, we have yet to find an approach that does not privilege one over the other, and when it comes to a contest between the environment and the economy, our current national stewards always choose economic husbandry over environmental
husbandry. In the long term, Trudeau is quite right: environmental collapse will also bring about economic collapse. In the short term, however, it is easy to have an apparently good economy while mistreating the environment. Politicians are elected for the short term, and businesses care most immediately about annual profit. It is hardly surprising that we have reached such a level of environmental crisis in the current era. Thus, Trudeau’s about-face, after the election, to ratify the Kinder Morgan Pipeline (which, while not increasing tanker traffic on the North Coast, will certainly triple tanker traffic on the southern part of the same coast), returns to the venerable pattern of privileging economic husbandry over environmental husbandry.24

The Trans Mountain Pipeline would carry bitumen from Alberta’s oilsands to a seaport on the South Coast of BC, were it could be shipped to international markets, a plan that would be highly lucrative for Alberta’s energy sector but poses increased risks of oil spills and environmental degradation in BC’s most highly populated region. A spill could compromise the viability of BC’s fishing and tourism industries, endanger the rights of local Indigenous communities, and leave the citizens of Burnaby (the second-largest city in BC), through which the proposed pipeline would run, at risk of exposure to an extremely toxic and flammable substance.25 In January of 2018, BC’s recently elected New Democratic Party and Green Party coalition government “announced a propos[al] to limit bitumen shipments through B.C., pending a scientific review on spill protection.”26 The Premier of Alberta, New Democrat Rachel Notley, has responded with a threat of legal action, and enacted a temporary boycott of BC wines and the suspension of a proposed purchase of BC’s hydro-electric energy.27 BC’s government argues that it has every right to ensure that sufficient protections are in place to prevent or clean up pipeline failures, while Alberta’s government argues that slowing the implementation of the pipeline may cause Kinder Morgan to withdraw from the project and hence damage Alberta’s economy. Both sides argue that Trudeau’s federal government should support their position.

Trudeau, on the other hand, has made the bold claim that the pipeline will go through regardless of BC communities’ objections, but has yet to intervene directly in the dispute. Instead, in a series of statements at Town Hall Meetings he has been holding across the country, Trudeau continues to assert that good economic practices and strong environmental policy go together. He argues that “the pipeline expansion and the two key environmental programs [the Oceans Protection Plan and the reduction of national carbon emissions] sought by B.C. are a package deal . . . As I’ve said for a long time, we need to make sure we’re both protecting the environment and growing the economy at the same time.”28 BC MP Murray Rankin claims that the blame for this conflict lies not with Notley, who is simply advocating for her province’s economic interests as her role dictates, but rather Trudeau, who, he argues, is not living up to his governmental duty of care to BC. Rankin questions Trudeau’s assertion that the pipeline has his support because it “serves the national interests,” adding that not only is its role in national economic support uncertain, but also that BC is “part of the nation too,” and implementing it is like “playing Russian roulette with [BC’s] coastline.”29
This debate does not have only environmental and economic repercussions. It also has a very tricky political element. Observers note that all three politicians—Trudeau, Notley and BC premier John Horgan—could potentially lose their jobs depending on how they handle the pipeline. Notley is the head of the first NDP government to run Alberta, a historically Conservative-voting province. If the pipeline gets scuttled, observers note she will almost certainly lose the next election. Conservative party members have already been accusing her and her party of being soft on the economy. The BC NDP barely beat out the incumbent Liberal party, and only managed to form a government through forming a coalition with the Green Party, who strongly opposes the Trans Mountain Pipeline. If Horgan does not continue to fight the pipeline, the Green Party could choose to walk away from the coalition, triggering a new election with uncertain results. Finally, no matter what Trudeau does, he risks alienating the voters of one province, and possibly both, placing his own re-election in jeopardy.

Richard II, Bolingbroke, Barack Obama, Donald Trump and Justin Trudeau may all have begun their rule with the best of intentions to govern and sustain their gardens wisely, but the principles of good stewardship were both more difficult to balance against each other and more difficult to champion in the face of the bottom line, than any monarch’s, prime minister’s or president’s optimism alone could overcome. Bruckner notes of Richard II, “While stewardship of the earth was understood differently in the [early modern] era, the play nonetheless underscores how political leadership encourages and perhaps requires the misuses and exploitation of the natural world.” As O’Dair observes, moving to more environmentally sustainable practices that go beyond mere “small gestures” is neither popular nor convenient under our current social-economic structure. Yet most politicians rely upon the popular and the convenient to ensure their political survival.

Transtemporal Gardening and the Problem of Stewardship

Again and again, across vast expanses of time, when faced with crisis or simply disgusted with the conditions of our current living arrangements, we, at least in the West, return to the metaphor of the good steward, when speaking of reordering and revitalizing our natural world. What is the Biblical New Jerusalem if not a better managed, purified garden, an Eden where the husbandmen do not neglect the pruning and pest control? Bruckner believes the answer is in maintaining that close tie to the “living earth” and refusing to relinquish the duties of environmental stewardship: “Such affiliation with the ecological world is essential if humans, especially those in power, are to do more than give mere lip service to environmental stewardship.” Laroche and Munroe argue we must turn away from the “masculinist” privileging of metaphor and theory over material reality and practice, and pay more attention to traditionally female ethics of care (such as physic), when seeking successful models of stewardship. Ensor claims that freeing stewardship from its ties to reproduction and perpetuation of family
bloodlines will offer the necessary corrective to our vexed relationship with the natural environment. Unfortunately, none of these reorientations of stewardship excise the metaphor of humans acting on behalf of the nonhuman world while presuming to know what is best for it. Mystic, scholar and politician all call for good stewardship as the answer to our problems, particularly our problems with abusing our natural environment. Yet, these calls do not seem to ever have the desired effect. Rulers threaten or implore their people to avoid overtaxing their land while abusing it themselves, and in the end, real change is rarely achieved before a complete environmental collapse forces that change or relocation.

I cannot help but think the problem is in the metaphors we employ. We need to stop thinking of the earth as something we are in charge of managing “well,” whatever that may mean. The problem is that with a sense that we are responsible for stewardship of the land comes the attendant notion that we can know best how it ought to be treated. No steward, self-appointed or otherwise, sets out to destroy the land he or she manages, but good intentions can be just as disastrous as malicious intentions. I entirely agree that “If we do not come to understand (and get those in office to understand) that our survival depends on our affiliation with the natural world, if we continue to lay waste to the earth even as we generate more waste, we will indeed be consumed by our ‘consuming means.’”36 However, I no longer believe that re-emphasizing stewardship is the answer to the problem.

We rely upon metaphors to make sense of our world, but they can fail us, sometimes catastrophically. A recent article on brain function by Robert Epstein, senior research psychologist at the American Institute for Behavioral Research and Technology in California, makes the startling assertion that in referring to the brain as a kind of organic computer, we have been depending on an entirely inapt metaphor to characterize brain function: “Your brain does not process information, retrieve knowledge or store memories. In short: your brain is not a computer.”37 Epstein argues that historically we have assigned the brain an analogous function to the leading technological innovation of the era: hydraulic function in ancient Greece, mechanization under Descartes, electrical flows in the eighteenth century, and finally, in the twentieth century, during WWII, the computer.38 Epstein argues that every one of these metaphors were helpful in a way but largely inadequate for understanding the brain itself and eventually counterproductive as we came to rely upon forcing the brain to conform to what we knew was possible for our technological metaphor of choice. Perhaps stewardship, and husbandry in general is the inadequate and obstructive metaphor of environmental protection.

It will be no easy feat to replace stewardship, the governing metaphor of millennia, with something new, but it is becoming increasingly urgent that we do so, or at least regard the stewardship metaphor with a healthy dose of skepticism. I would suggest we pay attention to the successful coexistence of indigenous communities with the land in North America, and think of the environment as an ancestor we serve rather than a child we mind. Perhaps then the Trudeaus and Obamas of the world can finally escape the inevitable trap of the bottom line.
Reasonable people do not poison their relations no matter how politically expedient or financially lucrative it might be to do so.

New Zealand has already taken a step in this direction, by granting the Te Awa Tupua river the same legal rights as a person. The Whanganui Maori won their 140-year battle to have the river legally recognized as their ancestor in 2017, and a joint guardianship of the river will be shared by a representative of the Whanganui and the New Zealand government. These guardians will evaluate threats to the river’s well-being, and if necessary, will be able to take legal action against any person or body that infringes upon its rights. It remains to be seen how effective this new legislation will be in protecting and preserving the health of the river, but it does seem to be a step in the right direction. Conversely, because no such legislation exists in Canada, the indigenous Ktunaxa Nation in BC recently lost a battle to prevent the construction of a private ski resort on their traditional territory (recognized by the Canadian government as Crown land). The Ktunaxa argued that the resort would destroy grizzly habitat and drive away the Grizzly Bear Spirit “essential to their faith,” and that this destruction would infringe upon their Charter right to freedom of religion. The Supreme Court of Canada ruled against them, asserting that protection of freedom of religion did not include “protection of the focal point of worship.” If The Grizzly Bear Spirit, or the habitat necessary to it, had been granted legal personhood, the Ktunaxa could have argued for the same protections afforded any legal person.

Richard II offers a cautionary tale that is as relevant to modern world leaders and their electorate as it was to Shakespeare’s England. None of Richard’s declarations of divine appointment over the kingdom, or assertions of his unique connection to the land refilled the country’s coffers, fed his people, or saved his throne. If we do not attend to the environment as seriously as we would a cherished family member, and make appropriate corrections to our engagement with it, all the assertions in the world that the end justifies the means will not prevent us destroying it, and ourselves.
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