
Henry George and the Shakers: Evolution of Communal Attitudes Towards Land Ownership

Author(s): John E. Murray

Source: *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, Apr., 1996, Vol. 55, No. 2 (Apr., 1996), pp. 245-256

Published by: American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Inc.

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3487086>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*

JSTOR

Henry George and the Shakers:

Evolution of Communal Attitudes Towards Land Ownership

By JOHN E. MURRAY*

ABSTRACT: The influence of *Henry George* on the *Shakers* has been misunderstood. The most prominent late nineteenth century Shaker elder was *Frederick W. Evans*, brother of *George Henry Evans*, the *land reformer* of the second quarter of the century. Similarities in the programs of G. H. Evans and Henry George have been recognized, but the two proposed different kinds of land reforms. Evans promoted quantitative restrictions on *land ownership*, while George was known for his advocacy of a *single tax* on land. The New York Shakers, as large land owners, successfully resisted early G. H. Evans-type land reforms. Later, Shakers led by F. W. Evans embraced Henry George-type policy proposals and supported George for mayor of New York City. F. W. Evans himself, however, conflated Henry George's proposals with those of his brother, never realizing the contradiction between the two, much less resolving it. The consequences of Shaker ambivalence toward their large *landholdings* persisted well into the twentieth century.

I

Introduction

THE INFLUENCE OF HENRY GEORGE on the United Society of Believers in Christ's Second Appearing, better known as the Shakers, has been misunderstood. By the late nineteenth century, the New York Shakers owned several thousand acres of land, on which ever fewer Shakers were available to work. Other eastern Shakers were developing interests in social issues of the day. It was natural that Shaker concerns would gravitate toward land reform as the single tax proposed by Henry George offered the possibility of more equitable land distribution. Shaker enthusiasm for George's work (Desroche, 1971) was encouraged by Elder Frederick W. Evans, the most prominent Shaker of the day. Evans tirelessly wrote pamphlets and letters to newspapers urging both the Society and the outside world to adopt George's ideas.

The Shakers were (and are) a Christian communal group. They owned their property communally, refused to join local militias because of their pacifism, and lived celibately so as to concentrate on more spiritual matters. Eighteen

* [John E. Murray, PhD, is assistant professor of economics at the University of Toledo, University Hall 4110, Toledo, OH 43606-3390.]

of their communes, scattered in an arc between Maine and Kentucky, lasted at least 75 years. Although best known for their music and furniture, the interaction of their religious beliefs and the economic incentives created by their communal structure makes them eminently suitable for study by social scientists (Murray 1995).

Motivations behind Shaker writings on Henry George were complex. Shaker support for George has hitherto been attributed to the very real concern of Elder Evans that administration of Shaker land holdings was diluting the Society's spiritual life. More personal reasons lay behind Evans's passion for land reform, however, which can explain his confusion regarding Henry George. Earlier in the century Evans had energetically aided his brother, George Henry Evans, in creating the most effective of the antebellum land reform movements, the National Reform Association. National Reform featured demands for limits on the amount of land any one person could own and limits on the amounts of land that could be bequeathed to heirs. The Shakers, among whom by this time was Frederick Evans, reacted ambivalently to a movement that in some small way was directed against them as large landowners.

By the time of Henry George, land was as much a burden for the shrinking number of Shakers as it was an asset. Frederick Evans, now a prominent Shaker Elder, saw in George's popularity a way to force the Society to do what it seemingly lacked the will to accomplish on its own: sell off its excess land. Evans thought that George would endorse laws to limit Shaker land ownership that would require the Shakers to sell off much of their holdings. Why Evans thought this is unclear, as George had no interest in the land reforms that had first been proposed earlier in the century. The plans of both G. H. Evans and Henry George bore some similarities (Zahler, 1941, 197; Perlman, 1928, 183–86; Ely, 1886, 41–43).¹ But the single tax, according to George, would make ownership restrictions unnecessary. Evans's support for Henry George seems to have been due to his spiritual beliefs: he wrote that Henry George was a reincarnation of George Henry Evans. Elder Frederick thus promoted Shaker support for Henry George's land reform program for reasons otherworldly as well as worldly.

II

The Evans Brothers and Early Shaker Experience with Land Reform

FREDERICK EVANS AND GEORGE HENRY EVANS emigrated in 1820 from England. They settled with their father in Binghamton, New York. Both boys served craft apprenticeships, George Henry as a printer and Frederick as a hatter. After experimenting with membership in an Owenist community in Ohio, Frederick

moved to New York City in 1830. There, he briefly rejoined George Henry, who was beginning his life's work.

George Henry Evans was a publisher of reformist newspapers. In them, he stressed the need for land as a safety valve for labor: the easier it was for land to draw off surplus urban labor, the greater the possibilities for workers to earn more than subsistence wages. The message met an uneven reception. Financial problems, in addition to George Henry's ill-health, kept his papers out of print from 1835 to 1841. In his papers of the 1840s, he developed a consistent theory to support his land reform proposals. He claimed that since land was not the result of human labor and was necessary to human life, therefore the principles of equality enshrined in the Declaration of Independence required that it not be made into alienable private property. By this reasoning, the public domain should be thrown open to settlers, land bequests should be sharply limited, a maximum quantity of land that could be owned by any one person should be set (usually 160 acres was proposed), and creditors should no longer be able to seize a debtor's homestead (Zahler, 1941; Evans, 1888). These were the essential ideals of the National Reform Association, founded by George Henry Evans and colleagues in Feb., 1844.

Frederick Evans was not among the National Reform founders. In 1830, still seeking an opportunity to live out radical reforms, he visited the Shaker community at New Lebanon, New York. He was impressed by the Shakers, calling them "a society of infidels, which was the highest compliment I could pay them." In addition, he experienced three weeks of spiritual visitations at night that convinced him to become a Shaker (Evans 1888). Frederick urged his brother, George Henry, to consider life as a Shaker, offering the prospect of "perfect happiness," but to no avail.²

While Frederick Evans was rising to a position of leadership among the Shakers, George Henry Evans was on his way to becoming "the leading land reformer in the country" (Cross, 326–27, 1950). One of the first important alliances of George Henry Evans's National Reform Association was with the Anti-Rent movement. As a result of land tenure arrangements that pre-dated the Revolution, the Van Rensselaer estates in New York were organized semi-feudally. After the death of Stephen Van Rensselaer in 1839, tenants, angry at attempts of his heirs to collect rent in arrears and to charge exorbitant prices for the conversion of their leaseholds into freeholds, organized into the Anti-Rent movement. The lack of sympathy shown the movement by the governor and legislature made George Henry Evans hopeful of winning the cooperation of Anti-Rent. By 1845, it appeared to the press that National Reform and Anti-Rent had indeed joined forces (Zahler, 1941).

Outbreaks of Anti-Rent violence induced the governor to appoint a special legislative committee to investigate. Chairing the committee was a young lawyer from Columbia County, home of some of the disgruntled tenants. He produced a report described as a "lucid analysis" of the Anti-Rent disturbances. Cognizant of tenants' complaints but seeking to avoid further violence, his compromise proposal arranged for long-term leaseholds to be converted to mortgages that would lead to ownership. He was Samuel J. Tilden, future governor of New York and nearly President of the United States.³

Tilden was interested in land reform too, especially if his former Columbia County neighbors, the New Lebanon Shakers, could be among the reformed. In 1839, the legislature produced a Trust Act to limit Shaker land ownership, around the same time that visitors to the New York Shakers began to write about their growing acquisitions of land.⁴ Fighting to avoid limitations on the number of acres they could own, the Society pushed for a compromise that would limit the income they could earn from their land. Tilden responded with a pamphlet entitled "Considerations in Regard to the Applications of the Shakers for Certain Special Privileges" (Andrews and Andrews, 1974). As the title suggested, Tilden argued that the Shakers could hold the legal status of either a religious organization or a business, but not some special hybrid. Although the compromise passed despite strenuous lobbying efforts by Tilden (Bigelow 1895), his "Considerations" would inspire future efforts to restrict Shaker wealth.

The late 1840s were years of great growth and promise for National Reform. At the New York State constitutional convention of 1846, George Henry Evans in vain proposed making his land reform program part of state law: one 160 acre farm per person, alienable only to a landless person. National Reform activity in support of homestead exemptions from debt execution resulted in a limited exemption law in New York in 1850. An 1847 legislative committee considered 160 acre ownership limitation for natural law reasons similar to those given previously by George Henry Evans. Attacks on land monopoly and recommendations for quantitative ownership limitations were included in an 1851 report of the legislature's public lands committee. The movement's historian writes: "Evans himself might have written these reports. The reasoning, the remedies, and the hopes are his, expressed almost in his words" (Zahler, 1941, 83–91).

As large landowners, the Shakers were not immune to this wave of land reform activity. Organized efforts to limit New York Shaker land ownership were encouraged by a reprinting in Albany of Tilden's "Considerations." The legislature appointed a committee to investigate whether the Shakers were, in their words, "buying land so fast that, they were forming a dangerous monopoly of the lands of the State." The "Report of the Select Committee on the subject of the Shakers" was very favorable to the Society. Its authors leaned heavily on Shaker sources

in describing the history and doctrine of the Society. The legislators found that the New York Shakers owned some 10,000 acres, which was only about 10 acres per person. The Shakers, as a religious society, deserved to enjoy "the free exercise of their religious devotions" and presented "no cause for legislative interference." A skeptical Senate nonetheless required the Shakers to itemize their real estate wealth and annual additions to it since 1839. The Shaker response reported that in the period since the 1839 Trust Act, they had acquired 3000 more acres in New York, 122 of which had been purchased, ironically, by the New Lebanon Shakers from the heirs of Elam Tilden, Samuel Tilden's father.⁵

Legislative attacks on Shaker wealth slowly diminished. In 1852 the legislature received petitions from both the Shakers asking to loosen reporting requirements and, on the other side, from their New Lebanon neighbors claiming such exemption would further expose their farms to Shaker encroachment (Andrews, 1963). The Assembly responded by quintupling the Shaker real estate income allowance. An 1855 attempt to regulate religious land holding that was considered to be an "annoyance" by the Society died in the Senate (Richmond, 1977). But what had been an annoyance to the Shakers in 1855, became, properly translated, an enthusiasm two decades later.⁶

III

Shaker Land Policies under Frederick Evans

IN THE EASTERN STATES land reform was gradually displaced on the political stage by issues of nativism, abolition, and labor organizing. Land policy remained an important issue, of course, in the west, with speculative activity peaking in the mid-1850s. Increasingly, however, land reform became subject to nativist concerns that flows of immigrants into the United States would end in the east unless more western land were opened up. Easterners who were competing with cheap immigrant labor, on the one hand, and even cheaper slave labor in the south, began to emphasize the abolition of slavery and restriction of immigration as beneficial. Land reform became one cause among many (Fogel 1989).

The subsuming of land reform within this larger agenda may, in part, have been due to the premature death of George Henry Evans. In February 1856 at the age of 50, Evans, following a series of outdoor speeches in the wet and the cold, became ill and died soon thereafter (Zahler 1941). The conflagration that was the Civil War pushed land reform even further to the background. On the issues of land ownership and monopoly, the Shakers were no longer annoyed by fearful neighbors.

Within the Society, however, land was becoming an urgent issue in the later nineteenth century. The continuing decline in Shaker population was leaving ever more land to be worked by ever fewer Shakers. By 1874, it was estimated that the eighteen Shaker Societies proper owned 49,335 acres, exclusive of out of state investment holdings (Nordhoff, 1966). The latter were not insubstantial; the Watervliet, New York, Shaker community, for example, owned some 30,000 acres in Kentucky. The New York Shaker communities consisted of 675 Believers on 9,780 acres. Thus, while acreage owned by the New York Shakers had not changed since the 1849 report to the legislature, the number of Shakers had so fallen that acres per Shaker had increased from 10 to nearly 15. Since the proportion of Shakers between 15 and 59 years of age was declining (Brewer 1986), the acreage to be worked by each Shaker was really greater still.

Thus the Shaker land situation in the 1870s was clearly different from that in 1850. Shaker writers were lamenting the decline in their population, due to which several communities were "trying to sell their property, and move, and help fill up some other Society," according to Brother Philemon Stewart in 1871. Stewart, a New Lebanon Shaker, went on to criticize "the Extravagant Buildings that we do not need . . . a standing monument to our disgrace" (Brewer 1986, 181-90). Four years later Frederick Evans was negotiating the sale of the Tyringham, Massachusetts, Shaker community site after its closing (Stein, 1992). Around 1870, Thomas Damon, an Elder at the Hancock, Massachusetts, Shaker community proposed a different tack. Hoping to limit financial losses stemming in part from unsupervised real estate investments of Trustees (financial officers), he proposed to restrict the Trustees' discretion and ability to act in secret. Thus Trustees would be required to report financial data such as annual income and expenses to members, and would not be permitted to buy or sell land without approval of their Shaker Family, a semi-autonomous unit within a community (Brewer 1986). Such reforms were not widely adopted.

Frederick Evans was well aware of the Shaker land problem. In 1874 he granted an interview to the journalist, Charles Nordhoff, that appeared in Nordhoff's survey (1966) of American communal societies. Evans recalled the legal threats to limit Shaker land ownership in the fifties, and noted that "the society had come generally to favor a law limiting the quantity of land which any citizen should own to not more than one hundred acres." Evans disclosed his hopes that the Shakers would sell their out-farms, which required non-Shaker hired hands for field work and some of the more capable Shakers for their supervision. While Evans' comments on land formed a small part of the printed version of the interview, they provide the earliest published evidence of a reversal of Shaker opinion on whether land ownership should be limited. Until then, the Shakers had concentrated on efforts to protect their own land.

Spurred on by the encounter with Nordhoff, Evans continued to write on the issue of land limitation. After a series of extensive and violent strikes that began among Pennsylvania and West Virginia railroads in 1877, the Shaker *Manifesto* carried an article by Evans (1877) suggesting that the root cause of labor unrest was the lack of available land. Land, he wrote, not having been created by man, could not be owned by man. The concentrated ownership of land by the few had as its natural result the impoverishment of the many. To avoid a workers' rebellion, a limit to land bequests and ownership would, without dispossessing anyone in the current generation, lead to the realization of the ideals of equality held by the framers of the Declaration of Independence. It will be noted that his reasoning was identical to that of George Henry Evans earlier in the century. Frederick Evans did not, in this essay, suggest that the Shakers themselves were a part of the concentration of ownership problem. Nor did he do so in a later *Manifesto* article (Evans, 1884) that offered a similar proposal, specifying 160 acres as the maximum bequest. The goal was to break up the holdings of "land monopolists" without directly dispossessing them.

Frederick Evans was also concerned about the collection of outstanding debt, an issue closely related to land holding. In letters to the New York *Tribune* and Albany *Evening Journal* (Evans, 1883), he suggested that debt collection simply not be legally enforced. To support his argument, he cited the *Tribune's* founder, Horace Greeley, on the subject. Encouraging non-repayment of debt was a curious position for a Shaker leader, as the Society scrupulously repaid debts contracted semi-fraudulently by corrupt Trustees (Stein, 1992). The *Evening Journal* noted in response that Evans' letter "attracted wide attention," thus contributing to the popularization of an issue brought to the fore by Henry George, "but which Elder Evans elaborated before George was born" (Richmond 1977). Indeed, George proposed in *Progress and Poverty* that abolition of laws to enforce debt collection and private contracts was only "common sense" (George, 1940, 455) Debt collection was not the last issue which would bring Frederick Evans and Henry George together.

IV

The Shakers and Henry George

FEW WORLDLY FIGURES drew as much appreciation from the Shakers as did Henry George. Shakers wrote a series of pamphlets, articles, and letters to outside publications that offered support for George's proposals and consolation in his defeats. The timing of the Shaker discovery of George is uncertain; *Progress and Poverty*, published in 1879, did not begin to attain its eventual fame until 1881. George himself was not prominent in New York until late 1882 (Barker

1955). The first published Shaker mention of him that I have found was an epigraph in Daniel Fraser's April 1884 *Manifesto* article, "Eternal Life."⁷

After George ran unsuccessfully for mayor of New York in 1886, Daniel Fraser defended him in a letter in the New York *Tribune* (Fraser, 1886). Fraser was responding to a *Tribune* editorial concerning Archbishop Michael Corrigan's pastoral letter that had censured George's *Progress and Poverty*. The pastoral letter had made front page news, and undoubtedly made Fraser, as a leader of the staunchly anti-Catholic reform wing of the Shakers, see red. Fraser wrote that George favored the cause of the working poor, while the Church was leaving workers "in the lurch, as she has done for hundreds of years." Fraser said little directly about George's program. This event was misinterpreted by Desroche in his history of the Shakers (Desroche, 1971, 277–79). He described Fraser's letter as a political endorsement of George, which would have been the first Shaker endorsement of a political candidate. Since Fraser's letter was written 23 December 1886, and, according to Desroche himself, the letter appeared in the *Tribune* on 26 December 1886 while the mayoral campaign had ended on 2 November 1886, the letter was an endorsement of George's policies, not of his candidacy.

More useful to the Shakers were George's writings on the role of land in the good society. George's theory of land right was perfectly consistent with the earlier writings of both Evanses. In Georgist theory, the right to ownership in general was vested in the producer. Since land was not produced, no one had a right to private ownership of land. The thrust of George's efforts to discredit private ownership of land, to the extent that the alternative was common ownership, must have pleased the communalist Shakers. Indeed, George expected that a natural outcome of the single tax on land would be equalization of the distribution of wealth and "a great co-operative society," (George, 1940, 456) perhaps seen by the Shakers as not unlike a large Shaker community.

Frederick Evans consistently ignored the greatest difference between his own plans and George's system. In each of his next two pamphlets, addressed as open letters to George, Evans urged him to favor quantitative land limitation laws. "I would suggest none but citizens of the United States may hereafter become freeholders," Evans wrote, "but no such citizen . . . shall . . . become possessed of more than one hundred acres of land" (Evans 1886). Evans foresaw a veritable intergenerational free lunch. By limiting land bequests, "nobody now living would be hurt. And the newcomers would be blest" (Evans 1887). George, however, believed that quantitative ownership restrictions were doomed to fail (George, 1940, 321–27), placing him squarely against the centerpiece of policies proposed by earlier land reformers, including Frederick Evans.

Evans persisted in seeing only similarities between George's program and his own. After George's defeat in the mayor's race, Evans (1886) offered him "congratulations for the good fight you have made in the interest of the new earth in the coming millennium." To Evans, Henry George was "a servant of higher powers," better off unspoiled and out of office. Thus could George organize the masses to pass a land limitation law identical to those recommended in the past by land reformers such as George Henry Evans, involving ownership and bequest restrictions. "Think of it, George," urged Evans, "Take hold of it, as 30 years ago we took hold of things. We got the freedom of the public lands—'voted ourselves a farm.'" Evans alluded to one of the most familiar antebellum political slogans: "Vote Yourself a Farm," which George Henry Evans and National Reform had promoted to New Yorkers in 1845. It was the most memorable of their proposals; conservative opponents derided National Reform as the "vote yourself a farm party" (Zahler, 1941, 207–8). Frederick Evans urged Henry George to "do something besides theorize and talk . . . to prove to the whole world that amongst all your varied talents you do also possess 'common sense' at this crisis of American national life."

The association between the life work of George Henry Evans and that of Henry George was clear in the mind of Elder Frederick Evans. He could see a strong relationship between their lives as well. In one of the open letters to Henry George, Evans (1887) wrote bluntly and unselfconsciously about a relation that was entirely consistent with Shaker spiritualism: "I think George Henry Evans has materialized in Henry George." Evans noted that in scripture earlier prophets were thought to have appeared in the person of another prophet, or had materialized in another form, as at the Transfiguration. As a true prophet would, George had entered into George Henry Evans' labors and was "teaching the truths which cost George Henry his life" (referring to his illness that had followed his outdoor speaking).

These truths had put the Society in an uncomfortable position. Frederick Evans noted with some pride that the Shakers, consistent with George's system, had no private property, but held their land and its products in common. The position of the Shakers within the larger economy, however, was anomalous. They had become, according to Evans (1887), sinning land monopolists themselves. He sought external help: "We monopolize it [land] without limit. Cannot the Legislature help us to do right by passing a Shaker Land Limitation Law?" Limiting the amount of land held by the Society itself would "help the Shakers to resist the temptation to society selfishness—help us to obey our faith." Evans hoped, as noted above, that Henry George might help persuade the lawmakers thus to redistribute land. Perhaps the legislature could help the Society do right

by their own principles in order that “no Shaker, or other community, be a land monopolist.”

The Shaker self-image had thus completely metamorphosed. Only a generation earlier, they worried about protecting their real estate wealth from state legislators who were lobbied by worried neighbors of the Society to do exactly what Evans was now recommending—limit Shaker land ownership. Now Evans, fully aware of the increasing burden of Shaker land holdings, sought the help of the most prominent land reformer of the day, Henry George, to rein in Shaker land hunger. But why would Evans have expected the sympathy of George, whose program of reform centered on the taxation of rents from land, and who wrote of the inevitable failure of quantitative ownership restrictions to counter land monopoly?

Certainly, the reform programs of Henry George and George Henry Evans were remarkably similar, as writers before and since Frederick Evans have noted (Zahler, 1941; Perlman, 1928; Ely, 1886). Beyond the affinities in their writings, Frederick Evans seemed to have discerned a deeper similarity between the two men. He urged that George seize the moment after his electoral loss in 1886 to act on Frederick’s program, to create a mass movement that George Henry Evans had not accomplished. Frederick Evans hoped that Henry George, who embodied more than George Henry Evans’ ideals, but perhaps even his soul, would change the world as the young Evans brothers had tried to do, but failed.

v

Afterword: Shaker Ambivalence Toward Land Wealth

FREDERICK EVANS fought an uphill battle to convince other Shakers of the wisdom of land reform. Some were persuaded. An essay by one “C. Rowley” in the second edition of Evans’ *Autobiography* (1888) described the Shakers as “all ardent land reformers.” Which Shakers Rowley was describing is unclear but the North Family at New Lebanon, where Evans lived, was the center of reform-minded Shaker activity, so it is easy to believe that they approved of Evans’s land reform ideas.

Putting these ideas into practice was another issue. Shaker investment in real estate pre-dated the Civil War. By late in the nineteenth century, the number of Shaker land transactions was large (Stein, 1992). While some land may have been for the use of the purchasing villages, much real estate far from the Shakers was purchased purely for speculative investment purposes. New York Shaker investments included over 25,000 acres in eastern Kentucky and also lots in Illinois and Michigan. Any inconsistency of such purchases with Shaker principles may not have been clear to Believers at the time. After all, Frederick Evans’s

own negotiations in the sale of the Tyringham site led to Shaker acquisition of a large tract of Pennsylvania timberland.

Such land wealth had its uses. One consequence of the aging of the Society's membership was the need for cash to cover living expenses. Shaker land proved to be an asset sufficiently liquid to serve this need. Land sales of small lots for hundreds of dollars, or entire communities for tens of thousands of dollars kept Believers out of poverty (Stein, 1992). The Shaker reputation for wealth tended to be side-stepped by Believers themselves, who ignored the liquidity of their land and claimed that they were land poor (Evans, 1887).

Some communities really were wealthy, and much of this wealth was in one form of land or another. Charles Hawkes, a New England mortgage broker who lent extensively in Kansas, came to represent several Shaker societies, including New Lebanon (Miller, 1958). The mortgages he held for his main Shaker client, the Alfred, Maine, community, were valued at \$42,755 in 1877. Hawkes also solicited loans, apparently without success, from Elder Thomas Damon, who earlier had been so concerned with Trustees' autonomy in investing. In addition to mortgages, the New Lebanon Shakers by the 1930s held tens of thousands of dollars worth of blue chip securities.

Shaker wealth led to the great crisis of twentieth century Shakerism (Stein, 1992). Knowledge of the extent of Shaker land holdings among the Shaker rank and file seems to have been limited until the middle of the twentieth century, despite Thomas Damon's early proposals to make such information known. Fearing that they would be unable to distinguish between prospective novices with spiritual motivations and those more interested in financial security, the Lead Ministry at Canterbury, New Hampshire, closed membership rolls in 1962. Membership status of those who became Shakers after that time was, at least in Canterbury's eyes, unclear. The result was a schism between the Canterbury Shakers, liberals in the spirit of Frederick Evans, and the more traditional Sabbathday Lake, Maine, Shaker community. The last Canterbury sister died in 1992, leaving about a dozen Shakers at Sabbathday Lake who continue to live on their communally owned land.

Notes

1. Schwartzman (1979) sees similarities in the work of George Henry Evans and that of anarchist critics of Henry George.

2. Letter from Frederick W. Evans to George Henry Evans, 11 June 1830, in Western Reserve Historical Society Shaker Collection manuscript set IV:A-36.

3. *Dictionary of American Biography*, third edition, s.v. "Tilden, Samuel Jones." Tilden became the democratic nominee for President in 1876, when he outpolled Rutherford Hayes but lost in the Electoral College. See also (Bigelow, 1895).

4. Compare State of New York in Assembly Apr. 2, 1839, "Amendments . . . on the . . . bill . . . entitled 'An act in relation to certain trusts.'"

5. State of New York in Assembly Apr. 2, 1849, "Report Of the Select Committee on the subject of the Shakers"; State of New York in Senate Feb. 8, 1850, "Resolution Passed in Senate Concerning Property in Trust in U.S."; State of New York in Senate Mar. 19, 1850, "Report Of the Trustees of the United Society of Shakers in the town of New Lebanon, Columbia Co., N.Y."

6. State of New York in Senate Jan. 25, 1855, "An act in relation to conveyances and devises of personal and real estate for religious purposes."

7. The quote attributed to George was "We cannot conceive of a means without an end, a contrivance without an object" (Fraser, 1884).

References

- Andrews, Edward Deming. 1963. *The People Called Shakers: A Search for the Perfect Society*. New York: Dover Publications.
- Andrews, Edward Deming and Faith Andrews. 1974. *Work and Worship Among the Shakers: Their Craftsmanship and Economic Order*. New York: Dover Publications.
- Barker, Charles Albro. 1955. *Henry George*. New York: Oxford U.P.
- Bigelow, John. 1895. *The Life of Samuel J. Tilden*. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Brewer, Priscilla J. 1986. *Shaker Communities, Shaker Lives*. Hanover: University Press of New England.
- Cross, Whitney R. 1950. *The Burned-Over District: The Social and Intellectual History of Enthusiastic Religion in Western New York, 1800-1850*. Ithaca: Cornell U.P.
- Desroche, Henri. 1971. *The American Shakers: From Neo-Christianity to Presocialism*. Amherst: U. of Massachusetts P.
- Ely, Richard T. 1886. *The Labor Movement in America*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.
- Evans, Frederick W. 1877. "Land Limitation," *The Shaker* 7: 74-75.
- Evans, Frederick W. 1883. "Elder Evans on Collecting Debts," *Shaker Manifesto* 13:284-285.
- Evans, Frederick W. 1884. "Land Limitation Law," *The Manifesto* 14: 90.
- Evans, Frederick W. 1886. "Elder Evans to Henry George," Pamphlet, New Lebanon, NY.
- Evans, Frederick W. 1887. "Shaker Land Limitation Act," *The Manifesto* 17:67-68.
- Evans, Frederick W. 1888. *Autobiography of a Shaker, and Revelation of the Apocalypse*, new and enlarged edition, New York: American News Co.
- Fraser, Daniel. 1884. "Eternal Life," *The Manifesto* 14:73.
- Fraser, Daniel. 1886. "Shaker Support for Henry George." Pamphlet, New Lebanon, NY.
- George, Henry. 1940. *Progress and Poverty*. New York: Robert Schalkenbach Foundation.
- Miller, Glenn H. 1958. "The Hawkes Papers: A Case Study of a Kansas Mortgage Business, 1871-1880," *Business History Review* 32:308-09.
- Murray, John E. 1995. "Human Capital in Religious Communes: Literacy and Selection among the Nineteenth Century Shakers," *Explorations in Economic History* 32:217-35.
- Nordhoff, Charles. 1966. *The Communistic Societies of the United States from Personal Observations*. New York: Dover Publications.
- Perlman, Selig. 1928. *A Theory of the Labor Movement*. New York: Macmillan.
- Richmond, Mary L. 1977. *Shaker Literature*. Hancock, Massachusetts: Shaker Community.
- Schwartzman, Jack. 1979. "Ingalls, Hanson, and Tucker: Nineteenth Century American Anarchists," (Robert V. Andelson, ed.), *Critics of Henry George: A Centenary Appraisal of Their Strictures on Progress and Poverty*. Rutherford, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson U.P.
- Stein, Stephen J. 1992. *The Shaker Experience in America: A History of the United Society of Believers*. New Haven: Yale U.P.
- Zahler, Helene Sara. 1941. *Eastern Workingmen and National Land Policy, 1829-1862* (New York: Columbia U.P.