

Interpreting the Shakers: Opening the Villages to the Public, 1955-1965¹

by William D. Moore

In 1962, journalist Richard Shanor, writing in the magazine *Travel*, reported on a booming subfield of heritage tourism. "Today," he wrote, "an increasing number of visitors each year are discovering . . . the fascination of Shaker history, the beauty of Shaker craftsmanship, and the amazing number of ways Shaker hands and minds have contributed to the American heritage."² Shanor and the editors of *Travel* recognized the fruits of the efforts of individuals from New Hampshire to Kentucky who were opening Shaker villages to the public as heritage sites.

Established in North America at the end of the 18th century, the Shakers were a religious society with historical roots in the British Isles. Under the leadership of prophet Mother Ann Lee and her successor Joseph Meacham, the group, formally known as the United Society of Believers in Christ's Second Appearing, congregated in celibate, communitarian villages and lived according to a set of strictures, known as the "Millennial Laws," which guided both public and private behavior. According to these codes, all economic resources were shared, individuals worked for the common good, and pairs of male and female leaders attempted to steer the community to spiritual perfection and economic self-sufficiency. The Millennial Laws, grounded in Protestant avoidance of temptation and abhorrence of excess, also guided believers in their material life, leading to architecture and furniture that tended away from extravagant design and ornamentation.

Following the Second Great Awakening, the society grew to comprise 18 villages located from Maine to Kentucky. Within these communities, the Shakers organized themselves into families composed of individuals who were biologically unrelated. Men and women who espoused, and attempted to practice, celibacy slept in chambers in sexually segregated areas of communal dwellings but ate, socialized, and worshipped together. Ecstatic and inspired trembling and shaking during worship, from which the group's popular name was derived, developed into a ritualized liturgical dance practiced by the community as a whole during religious services. The group's emphasis on communal labor as an expression of religious devotion led to prosperity in many communities, as well as to innovative agricultural and manufacturing processes. Shaker villages produced and sold packaged seeds, medicinal compounds, furniture, clothing, and agricultural equipment, including wooden buckets and other containers. The sect reached its largest member-

ship of more than 4,000 members in the 1840s and subsequently declined.³

Between 1925 and 1965, the American public's perceptions of the Shakers changed dramatically. Before 1925, the sect had received little attention or recognition beyond the immediate vicinities of its villages in New England, Ohio, and Kentucky. People from outside these areas who were aware of the Shakers tended to dismiss them as bizarre religious fanatics. By 1965, Americans had come to value the Shakers as exemplars of the virtues of reverence, ingenuity, simplicity, sobriety, and selflessness.⁴

This positive reevaluation of Shakerism and the Shaker legacy coincided with the painful and prolonged collapse of Shakerism within the institution itself.⁵ Journalists frequently predicted the sect's demise. In 1922, a newspaperman reporting on the closing of the Shaker village in South Union, Kentucky, commented that the "picturesque colony of Shakers, that unusual religious sect which takes its name from the peculiar motion they manifest when wrought up to religious ecstasy, at South Union, in Warren, County, Ky., will soon be but a memory. Most of the quaint and deeply religious people who once made up the colony have died."⁶

Similarly, in describing the end of the Shaker village in Alfred, Maine, Karl Schriftgiesser of the *Boston Evening Transcript* wrote in 1931, "Their buildings will be deserted, their farms let go to seed, and an even more deathly silence than usual will settle over their little community where they have worked so hard and lived so long."⁷ Schriftgiesser's prediction proved accurate: By 1951, only three active communities remained, containing just 40 members of the faith.⁸

The decline of Shakerism during these years also coincided with a surge of interest in American history and material culture in general. Collectors, such as Henry Mercer in Pennsylvania and Edna Hilburn Greenwood in Massachusetts, gathered artifacts that spoke to them of the country's past, and preservationists, including William Sumner Appleton of Boston and the Rev. William A.R. Godwin, of Williamsburg, Virginia, organized to protect buildings and sites that could be used to educate the public about America's history.⁹ Meanwhile, others, including photographer William Winter, artist Charles Sheeler, antique dealers Faith and Edward Deming Andrews, and Charles Adams, the director of the New York State Museum, introduced the public to Shaker art and architecture.¹⁰

Between 1955 and 1965, the four Shaker villages of Hancock, Massachusetts; Canterbury, New Hampshire; and Harrodsburg and South Union, Kentucky, were opened to the public as heritage sites. The openings were milestones in the reevaluation of Shaker life and culture. For the most part, Shakers did not play leading roles in these undertakings; rather, they paid close attention as

historic preservationists, economic developers, history enthusiasts, and local elites attempted to reshape the villages to serve, not the needs of the sect, but those of the American touring public. At all four sites, non-Shakers made decisions that advanced the status of the villages as didactic landscapes and tourist attractions rather than as religious communities.¹¹

The people who reshaped these villages into heritage sites were in regular correspondence with each other.¹² They visited one another's sites.¹³ They read and evaluated their press coverage and learned from each other's successes and failures. However, they also functioned within their respective institutional contexts, and even though they had all started with roughly the same raw material (that is to say, declining or abandoned Shaker villages), they achieved markedly different outcomes. Whereas the backers of Hancock Shaker Village in the Berkshires posited a role for Shaker architecture and material culture in the evolution of a modern and distinctly American aesthetic, Shakertown at Pleasant Hill outside Harrodsburg promoted the Shaker village as an agrarian retreat. The Shaker Museum at South Union just west of Bowling Green literally used the village as a stage for celebrating local history, whereas Canterbury Shaker Village nurtured a personality cult that formed around the surviving Shaker sisters there. How site administrators understood their missions affected decisions concerning the restoration and interpretation of the villages. Whereas the Shakers had shaped the villages in accordance with their religious beliefs, the various Shaker village administrators tailored them to fit decidedly different, secular visions.

Whereas the Shakers had shaped the villages in accordance with their religious beliefs, the various Shaker village administrators tailored them to fit decidedly different, secular visions.

Placing the various restorations within their historic contexts helps explain how different interpretations of the Shakers and the Shaker legacy were imposed upon each site. When set against the backdrop of the post-war *pax Americana* and the economic, social, and political circumstances of the 1950s and 1960s, the restorations offer insight into how some Americans, both individually and collectively, negotiated transformative events in the life of the nation, whether it be the Cold War, the Red Scare, the Civil Rights movement, or the nuclear arms race. During these years, Americans also celebrated the Civil War centennial and scored important victories for historic preservation, including the creation of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and the success of the National Trust for Historic Preservation following its establishment in 1949.¹⁴ In many respects, the surge of interest in Shaker history and material culture functioned to ameliorate national anxieties associated with change.

Hancock Shaker Village

The effort to preserve Hancock Shaker Village began shortly after the death in 1957 of Eldress Frances Hall, the leader of the sect's central ministry and one of the last of that community's believers. Eldress Emma B. King, a Canterbury, New Hampshire, resident and Hall's successor, decided in 1959 to close and sell Hancock Village, just as the Shaker leadership had disposed of moribund Shaker villages in the past. In July 1960, a group of preservationists headed by Amy Bess Miller, the wealthy wife of the publisher of the local newspaper, the *Berkshire Eagle*, bought the village.¹⁵ Miller surrounded herself with an impressive group that included Dorothy Miller, a curator at the Museum of Modern Art in New York and wife of seminal folk art scholar Holger Cahill; Professor David Potter, Coe Professor of American History at Yale and former chairman of the university's American Studies Program; Carl Rollins, director of Yale University Press; and Philip Guyol, director of the New Hampshire Historical Society.¹⁶ Faith and Edward Deming Andrews, who had established themselves as authorities on the Shakers, were also instrumental in the organization.¹⁷

Miller was able to assemble an august board because the Berkshires had long been a retreat for cosmopolitan sophisticates with an interest in arts and culture.¹⁸ Notable residents included writers Herman Melville and Edith Wharton, sculptor Daniel Chester French, and diplomat Joseph Hodges Choate. Although picturesque, beautiful, and rural, the area is easily accessible from both Boston and New York. *Time* magazine described Hancock's supporters as being "made up largely of well-off summer residents of the Berkshires."¹⁹ The nonprofit organization to preserve the Shaker village established by Miller and her associates complemented others already in the region dedicated to the promotion of classical music, gardening, drama, and sculpture.²⁰

Miller, the Andrewses, and the museum's board were guided in their restoration of Hancock village by a conflation of Shakerism and modern design that the Andrewses and others had cultivated over the preceding four decades. Photographs made in the 1920s and 1930s by William Winter of Schenectady, New York, were central to this contrivance. Winter, in turn, was influenced by the contemporary compositions of photographers Alfred Steiglitz, Paul Strand, and Charles Sheeler. His black-and-white images followed the dictates of the modernist photographic canon that reveled in the formal qualities of images, particularly flat surfaces, straight lines, shadows, and empty spaces.²¹ He frequently arranged furniture in vacant buildings to achieve specific visual affects.²²

Winter's manipulated and largely uninhabited images were broadly reproduced and presented to the public in a variety of contexts. A Winter photograph labeled "Shaker Simplicity" appeared as the frontispiece for the December



FIGURE 1
This photograph by William Winter from the 1930s uses Shaker architecture and furnishings to create a modernist visual composition and was reproduced as Plate 6 in *Faith and Edward Deming Andrews' Shaker Furniture*. (Courtesy of the Winterthur Library, the Edward Deming Andrews Memorial Shaker Collection)

1934 issue of *Antiques Magazine*. Another Winter composition was used in 1935 to illustrate an article in the *New York Times Magazine* celebrating folk art.²³ His images accompanied a 1937 article by Edward Deming Andrews in the *Magazine of Art* concerning Shaker architecture and were featured in a special 1945 Shaker issue of *House & Garden*.²⁴ They were also exhibited to the public at the New York State Museum, the Albany Institute of History & Art, the Berkshire Museum, the Lenox Library, in Lenox, Massachusetts, and the Whitney Museum in New York.²⁵ Most importantly, the Andrewses used 48 of Winter's black-and-white photographs to illustrate their influential *Shaker Furniture: The Craftsmanship of an American Communal Sect*.²⁶

Winter's photographs, like the one reproduced as the sixth plate in *Shaker Furniture*, portray the Shakers as religiously motivated, aesthetically attuned modernists. (Figure 1) For this image, Winter folded and arranged towels on a Shaker towel rack so that they harmonized with the window panes, the shadows on the wall, and the rectangles formed by the stretchers in the chair legs, as well as by the pegboards and the room's other architectural elements.²⁷ The stark black-and-white contrast of the printed image contributes to an aura of restraint and self-denial.

In 1931, Winter photographed the dining room in Hancock's Church Family Dwelling House.²⁸ (Figure 2) This view records the space as the residents knew



FIGURE 2
 This 1931 photograph by William Winter of the dining room of the Church Family Dwelling House in Hancock, MA, illustrates how the Shakers lived in the space in the early 20th century. (Courtesy of the Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division, HABS Collection)

it at the time, with patterned linoleum floor coverings, factory-produced chairs, framed works of art on the walls, a mass-produced stove, and ordinary electrical light fixtures constructed of chain and white glass. Potted plants crowded the windowsills. The mundane, industrial, and institutional aspects of communal existence recorded in this photograph stand in marked contrast to the impression given by the ahistorical image of the ironing room which, ultimately, was an abstracted ideal grounded in Winter's aesthetics and photographic style rather than in the reality of Shaker daily life.²⁹

Winter's photographs of Shaker architecture and material culture are part of a larger early 20th-century endeavor in the United States to create an art that expressed national identity.³⁰ Artists as diverse as Stuart Davis, Georgia O'Keefe, Marsden Hartley, and Joseph Stella were drawn to this mission to create an artistic modernism distinct from that of Europe. Some patriotic, artistic modernists claimed Shaker craftsmen as their spiritual forbears and presented Shaker objects as proof of a distinctly American modernist aesthetic inheritance that predated the European artistic movements introduced at the 1913 Armory Show. Announcing an exhibition of Shaker furniture held at the Whitney Museum in 1935, Homer Eaton Keyes, the editor of *Antiques Magazine* wrote, "The exhibition of Shaker furniture . . . should attract wide attention . . . I shall be particularly interested to observe the reactions of the modernistic tribe . . . This furniture comports, in theory at least, with the ideas of sundry contemporary designers."³¹

Charles Sheeler, Winter's contemporary, simultaneously crafted an autochthonous American modernism from regional materials including Shaker objects, hooked rugs, antique chairs, and Pennsylvania barns.³² Sheeler himself commented, "It is interesting to note in some [Shaker] cabinet work the anticipation, by a hundred years or more, of the tendencies of some of our contemporary designers toward economy and what we call the functional in design."³³ In her influential article, "American Art: A Possible Future," Constance Rourke, the American cultural critic and Sheeler's intimate, hailed, "the spare abstract as this appears in many phases of our folk-expression."³⁴ Rourke's description of unornamented, well-crafted items arrayed in harmonious compositions as distinctively American applied equally to the Shaker antiques and architecture that Keyes and the Andrewses promoted and to Sheeler's paintings and Winter's photographs.

The skewed modernist aesthetic appreciation of Shaker architecture and material culture upheld by the Andrewses, Winter, and others informed the restoration and interpretation of Hancock Shaker Village. The village administrators, including Edward Deming Andrews who served as its curator, did what they could to reshape the village according to their shared vision of how an ideal Shaker village should look. Linoleum flooring was removed. Framed portraits and lithographs were taken down from the walls. Objects manufactured in the world outside the village were banished from view. Rooms that were to be open to the public were furnished with the finest examples of Shaker craftsmanship available. These changes perpetuated an aesthetically pleasing and artistically gratifying, albeit erroneous, representation of the Shakers.

The Church Family's brick dwelling house, furnished with objects from the Andrewses' personal collection, was the first space opened to the public.³⁵ Sympathetic journalists and connoisseurs of art and architecture from across the country repeated the aesthetic judgments concerning the Shakers that they had heard from curators, commentators, and scholars over the course of the previous 30 years. In describing the Hancock project for the *New York Times* in 1961, Richard Shanor noted that "[the] Typical Shaker living quarters . . . will show graphically why the clean, simple Shaker look is so admired by modern decorators. Their craftsmen designed with function uppermost, built well and never spoiled their straight-grained maple or pine with unnecessary weight, ornament or finishes."³⁶

Shakertown at Pleasant Hill

Hancock Shaker Village served as a site through which the educated elite of Massachusetts and New York constructed a modernist and nationalist genealogy to challenge the continental aesthetics of European modernism.³⁷ At Shakertown at Pleasant Hill, outside Harrodsburg, Kentucky, the circumstances were different. In 1935, James Isenberg, a visionary heritage tourism

entrepreneur, recognized the economic potential of the Shaker legacy and attempted to establish a Shaker-themed settlement house at recently abandoned Pleasant Hill that would generate revenue by making and marketing craft work.³⁸ Although Goodwill Industries ran a home for girls and an income-producing hand weaving program on the site into the 1940s, Isenberg's vision faded following his untimely death in 1938.³⁹

Isenberg's efforts, however, bore fruit, when Jane Bird Hutton, the boosterist newspaper editor of the *Harrodsburg Herald* and the daughter of Isenberg's closest associate, drew Barry Bingham, the wealthy philanthropic editor of the *Louisville Courier*, into a movement to consider anew economic development strategies for Pleasant Hill.⁴⁰ Bingham, in turn, brought Earl Wallace, an influential petroleum executive and Wall Street financier, into the project.⁴¹

A self-described "history buff" who dismissed the Shakers as "misfits and eccentrics," Wallace nevertheless fell in love with Shakertown because it offered "an oasis" of peace from the transformations Kentucky was undergoing in the 20th century.⁴² Under Wallace's leadership, a nonprofit organization was formed in 1961 composed of many of the state's most prominent families. In 1963, the group secured an economic development loan from the U.S. Department of Commerce to help transform the Shaker village into an economic engine for the region.⁴³

The fact that the Shakers had not relied upon slave labor to support their agricultural endeavors allowed Shakertown at Pleasant Hill to celebrate Kentucky's antebellum, pre-industrial society without broaching the fractious issue of slavery in the midst of the national debate over segregation.

Although the Shakers themselves had exploited industrial technologies, Wallace envisioned a pre-industrial, pre-modern village. He hired James Cogar, who previously had worked at Colonial Williamsburg, the nation's leading purveyor of picturesque history, to implement that vision.⁴⁴ Besides having significant experience at Williamsburg, Cogar was a native of Kentucky, and held a B.A. from the University of Kentucky and M.A. from Harvard University.⁴⁵ Cogar, in turn, brought in Peter A.G. Brown, director of presentation services for Colonial Williamsburg, to confer on how to configure the site to realize its maximum potential as a tourist attraction.⁴⁶

Wallace and Cogar's plan, which was implemented beginning in 1965, focused on erasing late-19th- and early-20th-century modifications from the landscape. Utility lines were buried, Victorian porches were removed, and missing architectural elements were replaced. Guest rooms, conference facilities, and

simple craft shops were created within an Arcadian setting.⁴⁷ Just as John D. and Abby Aldrich Rockefeller maintained Basset Hall as a residence at Colonial Williamsburg, Bingham and his wife established a residence in a renovated building on the property at Pleasant Hill.

Wallace and Cogar reshaped Pleasant Hill into a bucolic landscape undisturbed by the strife, conflict, and technological transformations of the 20th century. Even though the Shakers were technological innovators, the site's 20th-century stewards chose not to restore or interpret the village's water-powered fulling and saw mills. According to Cogar, Pleasant Hill would be attractive for conferences because large organizations demanded a quiet place away from the rush and noise of metropolitan areas for study and reflection.⁴⁸ The fact that the Shakers had not relied upon slave labor to support their agricultural endeavors allowed Shakertown at Pleasant Hill to celebrate Kentucky's antebellum, pre-industrial society without broaching the fractious issue of slavery in the midst of the national debate over segregation.⁴⁹

Following James Isenberg's lead in understanding heritage tourism as a springboard for economic development, many Mercer County residents, including Jane Bird Hutton, saw a direct connection between the work at Pleasant Hill and efforts to address rural poverty in the region.⁵⁰ In 1961, the *Lexington Leader* noted—

*Kentucky's Shakertown can easily become as famous as Virginia's Williamsburg, Ford's Dearborn Village and the comparatively few other restorations of this kind. The successful preservation and operation of Shakertown will bring to Lexington and other central Kentucky cities many, many times the amount of money they invest in this campaign.*⁵¹

Similarly, that same year, the Kentucky Travel Council chairman, Alex Chamberlain, endorsed the Shakertown project “both for its economic advantages to the Commonwealth as a major tourist attraction and as an important cultural agency of the region.”⁵² In response to the news that the Shakertown restoration had received a federal Economic Development Administration loan, the *Harrodsburg Herald* predicted that the village would develop into a “tourist attraction that will pull in at least 150,000 people a year and provide jobs for more than 280 people.”⁵³

Although Pleasant Hill was successful as a tourist attraction, some critics said that its research and interpretation lacked intellectual rigor. In 1964, for example, Robert Meader, the director of the Shaker Museum at Old Chatham, New York, wrote—

Pleasant Hill seems to be a gung-ho for the fast buck and the superficialities. They are plowing ahead at a great rate without either researching what they are doing

or being interested in doing so. . . I have little use for Cogar, and find that use decreasing. He's just a shallow tourist-maniac, for my money, interested in the externals and without much of an idea what to look for."⁵⁴

Meador's comments may reflect professional enmity, but they also highlight the endemic concern for balancing historical research and interpretation with commercial exploitation of a village that is both an historic site and a tourist attraction.

South Union, Kentucky

The result of a long-term local interest in the site shared by two friends, Mrs. Curry Hall and Miss Julia Neal, the Shaker Museum at South Union, Kentucky, opened to the public in 1960. Hall's contribution was largely antiquarian, whereas Neal's was literary. In the late 1930s, Hall, known informally as Deedy, had started collecting materials that had belonged to the Shakers of South Union. In 1960, she installed her holdings in a vacant church located on property previously owned by the Shakers. She labeled this structure "Shaker Museum."⁵⁵ Aware of the vogue for costumed interpreters, Hall arranged to have a home economics class at Auburn High School, located in the town adjacent to the Shaker settlement, produce "costumes" evocative of Shaker traditions for the museum's "hostesses," or docents.⁵⁶

Like Deedy Hall, Julia Neal had grown up near South Union and interacted with the last Shakers living on the site before the village closed in 1923. Although not formally trained as an historian, she wrote a celebratory history of the local Shaker village while a graduate student at Western Kentucky State Teacher's College in nearby Bowling Green, which was later published in 1947 by the University of North Carolina Press under the title *By Their Fruits, the Story of Shakerism in South Union, Kentucky*.⁵⁷ Neal was teaching English at Florence State College in Florence, Alabama, when Hall asked her to assist with the museum's interpretation of Shaker life.⁵⁸

Drawing upon the tradition of early-20th-century civic pageantry and hoping to replicate the popularity of summer tourist theatricals such as Paul Green's *Unto These Hills* and *The Lost Colony* in North Carolina and *The Stephen Foster Story* presented in nearby Bardstown, Kentucky, residents from the Auburn area produced a pageant during the summer of 1962 based on Neal's book.⁵⁹ Adapted by Russell H. Miller, director of Speech and Dramatics at Western Kentucky State College (formerly Western Kentucky State Teacher's College and currently Western Kentucky University), the pageant debuted in the Auburn High School gymnasium under the title "Shakertown Revisited."⁶⁰ Performed during the Civil War centennial, the pageant's central scenes focused on the Shakers' interaction with both the Union and Confederate Armies. (Figure 3) Ruth Morris, also on the faculty of Western Kentucky State



FIGURE 3
 In 1962, the Shaker Museum at South Union, Kentucky, presented a pageant entitled *Shakertown Revisited* in a local high school gymnasium. (Courtesy of the Shaker Museum at South Union Library Collection, South Union, Kentucky)

College, arranged and directed the music and choreography based on Shaker precedents.⁶¹

The pageant received positive reviews.⁶² George M. Chinn, director of the Kentucky Historical Society, wrote to Russell Miller: “By your genius, you have reached the highest form of the art by weaving into the fabric of entertainment a simple but colorful pattern. This is by far the most outstanding presentation of its kind in existence and its flawless interpretation by local folks is truly remarkable.”⁶³

Even Edward Deming Andrews, often a harsh critic when it came to the work of others in the field, gave it a positive, albeit lukewarm, review. Writing to Barry Bingham in the summer of 1963, Andrews said of the South Union production: “Though the pageant at Auburn may leave much to be desired, it shows what can be done with cooperation and enthusiasm. At least it was a beginning, and more than we have been able to do here [at Hancock] pageant-wise.”⁶⁴

For decades, the summer Shaker pageant was the defining event for the Shaker Museum at South Union. The musical performance took place regularly until 1991, moving from the high school to the historic Shaker complex even before the museum purchased it in 1971.⁶⁵

Canterbury Shaker Village

Whereas the Shaker village at South Union largely served as a stage for reenacting local history, the stars of the show at Canterbury Shaker Village were the surviving Shakers themselves. Motivated in part by economic necessity, the remaining Shaker sisters actively welcomed visitors to the village beginning in the 1950s.⁶⁶ In June 1962, Sister Mildred Barker noted that she looked forward to an increase in visitors at Canterbury once the schools closed. "Sister Ethel has a party of four at the museum right now," she wrote to Julia Neal in Kentucky; "I wish it were forty."⁶⁷

Charles "Bud" Thompson, a non-Shaker in the sisters' employ, played a central role in opening the village to the public. A folk singer from the Boston suburb of Roslindale, Thompson was enamored of Shaker music and arrived in Canterbury in the late 1950s seeking new songs.⁶⁸ The Shakers befriended Thompson and hired him as a factotum and man of general purposes.⁶⁹ He lived in the village with his wife and family and helped the Shaker sisters maintain the facility, escorted them to business meetings, drove them to church, and performed other tasks.⁷⁰ Over time, Thompson acquired authority and responsibility and was referred to as the village's curator and director of interpretation, among other honorifics.⁷¹

In 1960, Thompson established a museum of Shaker objects in the village's meeting house.⁷² Next to items created in the village, he displayed artifacts that had been brought to Canterbury as other villages folded. In describing the installation in 1961, the *New Hampshire Sunday News* reported, "Hundreds of items, representative of Shaker life in years long past, have been gathered from many of the former villages. They are on display daily, except Sunday and Monday."⁷³

Although the Canterbury Shakers had allowed visitors to the village since the first half of the 19th century, Thompson's museum marked a turning point in the life and history of the community. With Thompson's help, the residents of Canterbury grew increasingly aware of the village's potential as a tourist attraction. The Shaker sisters themselves, particularly Marguerite Frost, Aida Elam, and Ethel Hudson, worked with Thompson by incorporating tours into their communal work. By 1966, the Shakers were reporting approximately 4,000 visitors annually.⁷⁴

For many visitors to Canterbury, the surviving Shakers were more of an attraction than the museum or the village itself. These women, however, were not representative of the sect's historical mainstreams. Although they practiced celibacy and lived communally, their lives differed in many respects from those of their institutional predecessors. Notably, they lived in a village that was much more homogenous in terms of age and gender than most previous



FIGURE 4
 In 1970, the Historic American Buildings Survey photographed Bertha Lindsay and another Shaker sister, possibly Miriam Wall, on the porch of the Trustee's Office as part of their effort to document the Canterbury Shaker Village. (Courtesy of the Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division, HABS Collection)

Shaker settlements. They were no longer engaged in large-scale agriculture or manufacturing. They had even stopped performing the sect's characteristic dances during worship.

Yet, in the eyes of many of their admirers, they epitomized the Shaker experience.⁷⁵ (Figure 4) The sisters became central to the interpretation of Canterbury Shaker Village, and a cult of personality quickly formed around them. Repeat visitors to the site curried favor with their favorite Shakers, who on occasion gave spiritual and personal guidance. The "regulars" also competed with each other to see who could gain greatest access to the private spaces of the dwelling house.⁷⁶

For the Shaker sisters themselves, the role of the village—and their roles in the village—remained largely unchanged. Canterbury was their home *first* and a tourist attraction *second*, even after the establishment of Thompson's museum. It was also the backdrop against which they observed and applied Shaker traditions and beliefs as they understood them at the time.⁷⁷ As Stephen J. Stein has shown, Shaker belief was not static: The group's theology had shifted and transformed over the centuries, and the beliefs held by the last sisters at Canterbury were but one temporally-grounded version of the faith.⁷⁸ As long as they were alive, though, their personal experiences, religious worldviews, and "serene presence" were what mattered most to the steady stream of visitors who returned time and again to interact with them in their residential setting.⁷⁹ The ways in which they lived and worshipped—and, perhaps most importantly, their first-person accounts of their lives and beliefs—trumped all non-Shaker interpretations of Shakerism and the Shaker past at Canterbury no matter how nuanced, researched, or historically accurate.⁸⁰

The cult of personality endures at Canterbury. Years after the death of Ethel Hudson, the last of Canterbury's Shakers, the Canterbury tour guides still reinforce perceptions of a personal connection to the sisters. The gift shop sells postcards with portraits of them. In the restored 18th-century dwelling house, Sister Ethel's room remains as she left it at her death.

Two Legacies

The ways in which these Shaker villages were interpreted to the public during their formative years as heritage sites and tourist attractions continue to influence how Americans understand the Shakers and the Shaker legacy today. While Shaker architecture and material culture were presented as antecedents to American modernism in art and architecture as at Hancock, the Shakers themselves were portrayed as picturesque pre-modern agrarians (Shakertown), treated as local history (South Union), or marketed as living relics (Canterbury). Visitors came away from these villages with composite impressions of the Shakers that went beyond the schematic interpretations of the sect and its legacy that were implemented by the site administrators and their sponsors. In collecting materials for South Union, for example, Deedy Hall and Julia Neal were drawn particularly to items that fit the modernist interpretation of Shaker life and material culture even if the objects did not have a Kentucky provenance. In the restoration of Hancock Shaker Village, Victorian alterations to the trustees' house were retained because Amy Bess Miller, the president of the museum's board, fondly remembered meeting there with the last Hancock sisters.⁸¹

To a certain extent, the outcomes at each village were a function of geography. Hancock, located in a resort community convenient to New York and Boston, was heavily influenced by major cultural institutions, including magazines like *House & Garden* and museums such as the Whitney and the Museum of Modern Art, and by cultural elites who were involved in international artistic movements and visual culture. Pleasant Hill, which was located in a poor agricultural region but not too far from Louisville and the state capital of Frankfort, had access to local leaders such as Jane Bird Hutton, for whom regional economic development was a priority, as well as to urbanites, such as Barry Bingham and Ed Wallace, whose nostalgia for simpler times drove many of their decisions. South Union, located farther from Kentucky's seats of power, struggled to attract support and visitors from outside the immediate area and thus remained largely a community institution. Of the four sites, Canterbury had the distinction of serving as the Shakers' home while simultaneously functioning as a museum. The remaining Shaker sisters shaped it in its formative years and left their enduring mark on the institution.

More broadly, however, these Shaker villages speak to larger cultural issues of the mid 20th century. Faith and Edward Deming Andrews, Barry Bingham,

James Cogar, Deedy Hall, Jane Bird Hutton, Amy Bess Miller, Julia Neal, Earl Wallace and their colleagues and supporters all believed that Shaker villages should be preserved and that Americans would want to visit them. The Shakers—pacifists and communitarians—resonated with them and others at a time of sweeping economic and social change. When the Shakers were presented as precursors to modernism, American culture as a whole was vindicated as being something other than crass or gauche. Shaker material culture challenged the long-standing European notion of Americans as being uncultivated vulgarians. This sect's furniture, widely recognized for its design and fine craftsmanship, was presented as proof of a distinctly American tradition in the decorative and applied arts. The reevaluation of Shaker architecture and material culture coincided with the New York School of abstract expressionism's ascendancy in the art world, and it established cultural legitimacy for the United States' position as a leader on the world political stage.

When site administrators presented Shaker villages as bucolic, classless, raceless, and pre-modern, they were responding in part to societal anxieties about economic and social transformations. Similarly, when the villages were used as stage sets for the reenactment of local history, organizers were asserting the continuity of both local and national traditions in the midst of change. Shaker villages allowed visitors to ground themselves comfortably in a stable and unchanging past.

During this period, many Americans whose extended families might have been split by corporate relocations or rising divorce rates claimed Canterbury's surviving Shakers sisters as adoptive grandmothers.⁸² Buffered from worldly affairs, living virtuous, celibate lives and seemingly financially secure, they were treated like convenient relatives whom experience-seekers could emulate and visit when they desired without being burdened by familial responsibilities.⁸³ The sisters projected a strong, historically-grounded female identity that could not be undermined by either the new role for women posited by Helen Gurley Brown or the feminist critique of Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique*.⁸⁴ The postcards bearing their images, which still sell briskly in the Canterbury gift shop, testify to their enduring value as role models.

While these Shaker villages are important as places where the Shakers lived out their communal experiment, they also have histories as museums and cultural institutions. As institutions, they are significant in their own right as testaments to the ideologies and perspectives of the first generation of curators, preservationists, and enthusiasts who, whether they realized it or not, inscribed new layers of meaning upon them. By understanding, maintaining, and interpreting Shaker villages in this more complex light, researchers, curators, site administrators, and the visiting public can better distinguish the Shaker legacy from 20th-century interpretations of that legacy and learn, perhaps, to appreciate both.

William D. Moore, Ph.D., is director of the Public History program at the University of North Carolina at Wilmington. From 1999 to 2001, he served as executive director of the Enfield Shaker Museum in Enfield, New Hampshire. His book, *Masonic Temples: Freemasonry, Ritual Architecture, and Masculine Archetypes*, is forthcoming from the University of Tennessee Press.

Notes

1. This study was inspired by the call of cultural historians Delores Hayden, Dell Upton, and others to examine buildings and landscapes over their entire histories, to think of forms shaped by human culture as palimpsests upon which meaning is inscribed serially and repeatedly. The argument also has been shaped by the growing literature in the field of public history, by authors including Patricia West, Chris Wilson, David Lowenthal, James Loewen, and others who have sought to enrich our understanding of historic places by examining the contexts in which they were preserved. These authors assert that sites often carry messages concerning the individuals who introduced them into the public realm as well as information about those who originally created them.

See, for instance, Dell Upton, *Architecture in the United States* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1998), 12; Delores Hayden, *The Power of Place: Urban Landscapes as Public History* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1995); John R. Stilgoe, *Outside Lies Magic* (New York, NY: Walker and Company, 1998), 6. See also Patricia West, *Domesticating History: The Political Origins of America's House Museums* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1999); Chris Wilson, *The Myth of Santa Fe: Creating a Modern Regional Tradition* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1997); David Lowenthal, *Possessed by the Past: The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History* (New York, NY: The Free Press, 1996); James W. Loewen, *Lies Across America: What Our Historic Sites Get Wrong* (New York, NY: Touchstone, 1999). See also Max Page and Randall Mason, eds., *Giving Preservation a History* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2004).

This work was made possible in part by fellowships at the Winterthur Museum, Winterthur, DE, and the Filson Historical Society, Louisville, KY. The University of North Carolina at Wilmington supported this work, in part, with a Charles L. Cahill Award, a Summer Faculty Research Initiative, and an award from the History Department's William Moseley Fund. Galen Beal, Michael Ann Williams, Virginia Stewart, and Scott Swank assisted with discussions and collegiality. An earlier version of this article was presented at the 2004 meeting of the Vernacular Architecture Forum in Harrisburg, PA.

2. Richard Shanor, "Shaker Country," *Travel* 118 (July 1962): 50.
3. An extensive current literature exists concerning the Shakers, their history, and culture. Notable works include: Stephen Stein, *The Shaker Experience in America* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992); Elizabeth A. De Wolfe, *Shaking the Faith: Women, Family, and Mary Marshall Dyer's Anti-Shaker Campaign, 1815-1862* (New York, NY: Palgrave, 2002); Priscilla J. Brewer, *Shaker Communities, Shaker Lives* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1992); Clarke Garret, *Spirit Possession and Popular Religion: From the Camisards to the Shakers* (Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press, 1987); John T. Kirk, *Shaker World* (New York, NY: Harry N. Abrams, 1997); Scott T. Swank, *Shaker Life, Art, and Architecture: Hands to Work, Hearts to God* (New York, NY: Abbeville Press, 1999); Julie Nicoletta, *The Architecture of the Shakers* (Woodstock, VT: Countryman Press, 1995); Suzanne Thurman, "O Sisters Ain't You Happy?": *Gender, Family, and Community among the Harvard and Shirley Shakers, 1781-1918* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2002). The range of documentary materials available for the study of Shaker history is indicated in Mary L. Richmond, *Shaker Literature: A Bibliography*, 2 vols. (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1977). For concise statements concerning the Shakers, see Stephen J. Stein, "Shakers," in *Encyclopedia of American Studies*, vol. 4 (New York, NY: Grolier Educational, 2001), 109-110; Lewis Perry, "Shakers," in *Dictionary of American History*, ed. Stanley J. Kutler, 3rd ed., vol. 7 (New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, 2003), 333-335; and Gerard C. Wertkin, "Shakers," in idem, *Encyclopedia of American Folk Art* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2004), 479-482.

4. An analysis of why and how this change occurred is beyond the scope of this essay. The author currently is at work on a book addressing this subject.
5. Stein, *Shaker Experience*, 356-370.
6. "The Approaching End of the 'Shakers,'" *Literary Digest* 74 (September 30, 1922): 37.
7. Karl Schriffigiesser, "Alfred Sad as Shakers Pack up to Leave Old Home Forever," *Boston Evening Transcript* (April 25, 1931): 2.
8. Stein, *Shaker Experience*, 360. A discussion of the causes of the Shakers' collapse is beyond the scope of this essay. Stein, Thurman, and others treat it at length.
9. Elizabeth Stillinger, "From Attics, Sheds, and Secondhand Shops: Collecting Folk Art in America, 1880-1940," in *Drawing on America's Past: Folk Art, Modernism, and the Index of American Design*, ed. Virginia Tuttle Clayton (Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art, 2002), 45-59; James M. Lindgren, "A Spirit that Fires the Imagination: Historic Preservation and Cultural Regeneration in Virginia and New England, 1850-1950," in *Giving Preservation a History: Histories of Historic Preservation in the United States*, ed. Max Page and Randall Mason (New York, NY: Routledge, 2004), 107-129. See also Michael Kammen, *Mystic Chords of Memory* (New York, NY: Vintage Books, 1991).
10. Stein, *Shaker Experience*, 372-380.
11. The public's sustained interest in these complexes is indicated by the publication of Stuart Murray, *Shaker Heritage Guidebook* (Spencertown, NY: Golden Hill Press, 1994). For a discussion of the shaping of a didactic historic landscape, see James W. Baker, "'As Time May Serve': The Evolution of Plimoth Plantation's Recreated Architecture," *Old Time New England* 74, no. 261 (Spring 1996): 49-74. See also, Barbara Burlison Mooney, "Lincoln's New Salem: Or, The Trigonometric Theorem of Vernacular Restoration," *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture* 11 (2004): 19-39.
12. See, for example, correspondence between Barry Bingham and Edward Deming Andrews while Bingham was planning the restoration of Kentucky's Pleasant Hill and Andrews was involved in establishing Massachusetts' Hancock Shaker Village as a museum. Box 18, Folder: Pleasant Hill (1) Correspondence, Pamphlets, Clippings; Edward Deming Andrews Memorial Collection, Winterthur Library, Winterthur, DE. See also undated letters from Julia Neal to Mac (E. L. McCormick), manuscript nos. Moo-102hh and Moo-102jj, Collection of the Shaker Museum at South Union, South Union, KY.
13. "Shaker Project in Kentucky Plans \$1.5 Million Restoration," *Berkshire Eagle* (November 11, 1961).
14. Diane Lea, "America's Preservation Ethos: A Tribute to Enduring Ideals," in *A Richer Heritage: Historic Preservation in the Twenty-First Century*, ed. Robert E. Stipe (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 8-10. See also William J. Murtagh, *Keeping Time*, rev. ed. (New York, NY: Preservation Press, 1997), 39-61. For the Civil War Centennial, see Kammen, 590-610.
15. "Shaker Property Sale for Museum Approved," *Berkshire Eagle* (July 18, 1960); Eric Pace, "Amy Miller, 90, a Founder of Shaker Village," *New York Times* (February 26, 2003): A23; Ruth Bass, "Amy Bess Miller: A Believer in Shakers," *Berkshire Week* (August 8, 1964). See also, Stein, *Shaker Experience*, 364-366.
16. Amy Bess Miller, *Hancock Shaker Village/The City of Peace: An Effort to Restore a Vision 1960-1985* (Hancock, MA: Hancock Shaker Village, 1984), 164-165.
17. Stephen J. Stein, "Andrews, Edward Deming," *American National Biography*, vol. 1 (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1999), 493-494; "Edward D. Andrews, Expert on Shakers," *New York Times* (June 13, 1964). For a glowing portrayal of Faith and Edward Deming Andrews, see Gerard C. Wertkin, "Andrews, Edward Deming and Faith," in idem, *Encyclopedia of American Folk Art* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2004), 20-21. For the couple's memoirs, see Faith and Edward Deming Andrews, *Fruits of the Shaker Tree of Life* (Stockbridge, MA: The Berkshire

- Traveler Press, 1975). See also Stein, *Shaker Experience*, 374-378, and Scott F. DeWolfe, "Simply Shaker: The Rise and Development of Popular Images of the Shakers" (master's thesis, University of Southern Maine, 1991), 24-34.
18. For a description of one such figure see Charlotte Emans Moore, "Another Generation's Folk Art: Edward Duff Balken and His Collection of American Provincial Paintings and Drawings," in *A Window into Collecting American Folk Art: The Edward Duff Balken Collection at Princeton* (Princeton, NJ: The Art Museum, Princeton University, 1999), 11-23.
 19. "The Shakers," *Time* 78 (July 28, 1961): 53.
 20. Moore, 15; "Berkshires Live Anew: Old Colonists' Love of the Hills is Shown in the Spread of Cultural Projects," *New York Times* (July 28, 1935).
 21. For examples of Winter's modernist photographs of subjects other than Shaker material culture, see David A. Schorsch, *The Photographs of William F. Winter, Jr., 1899-1939* (New York, NY: David A. Schorsch, 1989).
 22. Stein, *Shaker Experience*, 375-376; Hugh Howard and Jerry V. Grant, "Reinventing the Shakers," *The Eastfield Record* 11 (winter 2002-2003): 1-16. William F. Winter, "Shaker Portfolio: A Picture Record of an American Community," *U.S. Camera* 1, no. 3 (March-April 1939): 22-25, 73.
 23. Walter Rendell Storey, "Folk Art Inspires the Designer," *New York Times Magazine* (November 24, 1935): SM14.
 24. Edward Deming Andrews, "Communal Architecture of the Shakers," *The Magazine of Art* 30 (December 1937): 710-715; "Shaker Bouquets," *House & Garden* 87 (March 1945): 108-112.
 25. John L. Scherer, ed., *A Shaker Legacy: The Shaker Collection at the New York State Museum*, rev. ed., New York State Museum Circular 63 (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000), xii-xiii; Walter Rendell Storey, "Native Art from Old Shaker Colonies," *New York Times Magazine* (October 23, 1932): 14; "Mode of Shaker Life Preserved in Museum," *Springfield (MA) Sunday Union and Republican* (February 11, 1934); "Lenox is Interested in Shaker Exhibition," *Springfield Republican* (August 26, 1934); Harriet Dyer Adams, "Whitney Museum Shows Shaker Handicrafts," *Brooklyn Daily Eagle* (November 24, 1935).
 26. Edward Deming Andrews and Faith Andrews, *Shaker Furniture: The Craftsmanship of an American Communal Sect* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1937). For a review of this important work, see Constance Rourke, "Authentic American Commune," *New York Herald Tribune* (May 16, 1937).
 27. A Winter photograph of Shaker material culture held in the Andrews Collection is self-consciously labeled, on the verso in pencil, "A Study in Angles and Shapes." Photograph No. SA677, Edward Deming Andrews Memorial Collection, Winterthur Library.
 28. This image is now in the Library of Congress as part of the holdings of the Historic American Buildings Survey. It was probably acquired from Winter, who produced the image before the establishment of HABS. For the role of photographers in the Historic American Buildings Survey, see Lisa Pfueller Davidson and Martin J. Perschler, "The Historic American Buildings Survey During the New Deal Era," *CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship* 1, no. 1 (fall 2003): 62-65.
 29. Winter was producing his Shaker images just as the expatriate modernist painter Piet Mondrian was developing the geometric abstract style that culminated in works such as *Broadway Boogie Woogie*. For a mid-20th-century statement concerning abstraction in American art, see Edwin Morgan, "American Art at Mid-Century," *American Quarterly* 1, no. 4 (winter 1949): 326-330.
 30. Art historian Wanda Corn has noted that in this period, "American artists, supported by Europeans such as Marcel Duchamp and Fernand Léger and by writers such as D.H. Lawrence, Van Wyck Brooks, Lewis Mumford, Matthew Josephson, and Paul Rosenfeld, envisioned a new art, distinctively modern and American." See Wanda Corn, *The Great*

American Thing: Modern Art and National Identity, 1915-1935 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), xv; see also Kannen, 302-327.

31. Homer Eaton Keyes, "The Coming Shaker Exhibition in Manhattan," *Antiques* 28, no. 5 (November 1935): 204.
32. Corn, 293-337.
33. Charles Sheeler, quoted in Karen Lucic, "Charles Sheeler and Henry Ford: A Craft Heritage for the Machine Age," *Bulletin of the Detroit Institute of Arts* 65, no. 1 (1989): 44.
34. Joan Shelley Rubin, "A Convergence of Vision: Constance Rourke, Charles Sheeler, and American Art," *American Quarterly* 42, no. 2 (June 1990): 191-222; Constance Rourke, "American Art: A Possible Future," *Magazine of Art* (July 1935), reprinted in idem, *The Roots of American Culture and Other Essays*, ed. Van Wyck Brooks (New York, NY: Harcourt Brace, 1942).
35. The dwelling house first opened to the public in June 1961. See "Shaker Community Museum Opening Monday Represents Work of More Than 50 Persons," *Berkshire Eagle* (June 29, 1961); Richard Happel, "'Miracle' in Hancock," *Berkshire Eagle* (July 1, 1961).
36. Richard Shanor, "Berkshire Shaker Village to be Museum Town," *New York Times* (June 18, 1961). See also Richard V. Happel, "Shaker Simplicity-A Modern Trend," *The Eagle's Summer Calendar* (1963): 13.
37. Hancock Shaker Village has recently been working to revise its earlier interpretation. See Matthew Cooper, "Representing Historic Groups Outside the Mainstream: Hancock Shaker Village," *CRM Magazine* 24, no. 9 (2001): 36-37.
38. Carolyn H. Grimes, "Isenberg . . . Leader and Citizen," *Harrodsburg Herald*, Bicentennial Edition (June 1974): AA-5; "City Joins Shakertown Subsistence Plan; Isenberg Tells of Shakertown Industry Plan," *Danville Daily Messenger* (February 19, 1935). The Shakers abandoned Pleasant Hill in the 1920s.
39. "Pleasant Hill Begins Craft Industry," *Harrodsburg Herald* (January 17, 1964); Clavia Goodman, "Old Shakertown Revived," *Sunday Herald-Leader* (Lexington, KY) (January 11, 1942); Alex Bower, "Goodwill Industry Revives Ancient, Successful Crafts at Shakertown, Where Celibate Workers Once Wrought," *The Lexington Leader* (July 30, 1940). See also photographs in *Louisville Courier-Journal* (May 26, 1940).
40. "The Sacred 'Yea' and 'Nay' of the Shakers Remained in Mercer's Heart," *Harrodsburg Herald*, Bicentennial Edition (June 1974): D-11. For an obituary of Bingham, see Alex S. Jones, "Barry Bingham, Sr. is Dead at 82; Louisville Newspaper Publisher," *New York Times* (August 16, 1988): D-22.
41. "Earl D. Wallace," *Louisville Courier-Journal* (April 4, 1990).
42. Ed Ryan, "Of Shakertown Savior Wallace," *Louisville Courier-Journal* (October 23, 1982).
43. Earl D. Wallace, *Shakertown at Pleasant Hill: The First Fifteen Years* (Harrodsburg, KY: Shakertown at Pleasant Hill, Kentucky, Inc., n.d.), 3-6.
44. For a thoughtful history of the Colonial Williamsburg restoration, see Anders Greenspan, *Creating Colonial Williamsburg* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2002).
45. "Williamsburg Curator to Restore Shakertown Village," *Harrodsburg Herald* (June 22, 1962). See letter from Barry Bingham, Sr. to Frederick Haupt III of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, nominating James Cogar for the Crowninshield Award, February 26, 1971, Barry Bingham Papers, MSS A B613a 816, Filson Club Historical Society, Louisville, KY.
46. "Present Shaker Story Simply, Consultant Says," *Harrodsburg Herald* (July 20, 1962).
47. For a celebratory history written by Pleasant Hill's director of marketing and public relations, see Diana B. Ratliff, "The Preservation of Pleasant Hill," *CRM Magazine* 24, no. 9 (2001): 38-40.

48. "Harrodsburg's 188th Birthday Celebrated at Shakertown," *Harrodsburg Herald* (June 22, 1962).
49. For lovely, luminous photographs presenting the restored Pleasant Hill as a pre-modern utopia, see Ross Bennett, ed., *Visiting our Past: America's Historylands*, rev. ed. (Washington, DC: National Geographic Society, 1986), 220-229.
50. "Shakertown a Must," *Harrodsburg Herald* (August 11, 1961); "Mercer's Part in Shaker Project is Explained," *Harrodsburg Herald* (August 18, 1961); "Mass Meeting on Shakertown," *Harrodsburg Herald* (August 25, 1961); see also "Full Scale Drive to End Rural Poverty," *Harrodsburg Herald* (August 18, 1961).
51. "What Others Think," *Harrodsburg Herald* (November 17, 1961).
52. "Shakertown Support Urged," *Harrodsburg Herald* (December 29, 1961).
53. "\$2-Million Loan Approved for Restoration Project," *Harrodsburg Herald* (January 10, 1964). In the late 1980s, the site reportedly had an annual visitation of approximately 250,000. See "Earl D. Wallace," *Louisville Courier-Journal* (April 4, 1990).
54. Robert F.W. Meader to Brother Thomas Whitaker, August 31, 1964, Francis J. Whitaker Papers, Box 1, Folder 8, Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green, KY.
55. Marion Porter, "Dedication of Shaker Museum Recalls Flourishing Auburn Colony," *Louisville Courier-Journal* (May 29, 1960); "Revisiting the Shakers," *Courier-Journal Magazine* (July 21, 1963): 12-15; Ray Glenn, "Shaker Museum Dedication is Scheduled for May 28," *Park City Daily News* (May 1, 1960): 24.
56. Porter, "Dedication." Photographs of these costumed guides appear in the Local News section of the *Louisville Courier-Journal* (May 29, 1960).
57. Neal received both her Bachelor's and Master's degrees from Western Kentucky State Teacher's College. See D.W., "Julia Neal Showed Early Interest in Kentucky Shakers," *The Shaker Messenger* (summer 1989): 8-9; Julia Neal, *By Their Fruits, the Story of Shakerism in South Union, Kentucky* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1947).
58. D.W., "Julia Neal Showed Early Interest in Kentucky Shakers."
59. For pageants, see David Glassberg, *American Historical Pageantry* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990). For Green, see John Herbert Roper, *Paul Green: Playwright of the New South* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2003); "Revisiting the Shakers," *Courier-Journal Magazine* (July 21, 1963): 12-15.
60. Julia Neal, "Shaker Festival," *Kentucky Folklore Record* 8, no. 4 (1962): 127-135; "Russell H. Miller to Direct Shaker Pageant," *College Heights Herald* (July 18, 1962). A typescript of the pageant's script exists in the Russell Miller Papers, Box 1, Folder 6, Kentucky Room, Western Kentucky University. For Miller, see Cyndi M. Chaffin, "Russell Miller and his Contributions to the Theatre in Bowling Green from 1947-1968," typescript research paper, archives, Western Kentucky University.
61. Al Smith, "'Shakertown Revisited' Like Seeing an Old Friend," *News-Democrat* (July 11, 1963); "Shaker Festival Underway," *News-Democrat* (July 8, 1976). A 33 1/3 rpm lp recording of the pageant is in the holdings of the Shaker Museum at South Union, KY.
62. See, for example, "'Gentle Folk' Live Again in 'Shakertown Revisited,'" *Auburn News* (July 16, 1963).
63. George M. Chinn, director, Kentucky Historical Society, to Dr. Russell Miller, July 12, 1963; Collection of the Shaker Museum at South Union, KY.
64. Edward Deming Andrews to Barry Bingham, August 10, 1963, Andrews Archives, Box 18, Folder: Pleasant Hill (1) Correspondence, Pamphlets, Clippings; Winterthur Library.
65. Robyn L. Minor, "Shaker Festival," *Park City Daily News* (June 21, 1991).

66. Bertha Lindsay to Julia Neal, February 4, 1962, June 30, 1962, and November 13, 1962, Julia Neal Papers, Box 4, File 2, Western Kentucky University. See also Earl O. Anderson, "Shakers Dwindling But Impact Still Felt," *New Hampshire Sunday News* (Manchester) (September 24, 1961): 13.
67. Mildred Barker to Julia Neal, June 30, 1962, Julia Neal Papers, Box 4, File 2, Western Kentucky University.
68. William R. Bibber, "The Amazing Shakers," *Boston Sunday Herald* (September 20, 1964): 17.
69. Marguerite Melcher to Clarice Carr, February 17, 1957, collection of Mr. and Mrs. John Carr, Enfield, NH; Bertha Lindsay to Julia Neal, November 1, 1964, Julia Neal Papers, Box 4, File 2, Western Kentucky University; Robert Meader to Brother Thomas Whitaker, September 27, 1964, Francis J. Whitaker Papers, Box 1, Folder 8, Western Kentucky University; June Sprigg, *Simple Gifts: A Memoir of a Shaker Village* (New York, NY: Knopf, 1998), 23.
70. Anderson, 13. For reminiscences of living in the Shaker village by Darryl Thompson, Charles Thompson's son, see Linda Landry, *Classic New Hampshire: Preserving the Granite State in Changing Times* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 2003), 150-154.
71. Earl O. Anderson, "NH Shakers Turn Village into a National Shrine," *New Hampshire Sunday News* (August 6, 1970): 29.
72. N. Morrison, "Shakers Open Museum of Old Craftsmanship in Canterbury," *Concord Monitor* (June 7, 1960); M.S. King, "Shaker Village [Canterbury, NH]," *Boston Sunday Globe Magazine* (September 4, 1960); Sprigg, 43.
73. Anderson, "Shakers Dwindling," 20.
74. David Strickler, "Last of Shakers Sure Faith Will Live On," *New Hampshire Sunday News* (April 17, 1966): 19.
75. Sprigg's *Simple Gifts* is a book-length exposition of her personal experience with this phenomenon.
76. Although visitors were welcomed to the village and encouraged to tour the museum set up in the meetinghouse, they were usually barred from entering the sisters' dwelling house. See Sprigg's glowing account of her 1972 tour of the dwelling house led by Sister Ethel Hudson in Sprigg, 139-147.
77. Jane O'Shea, "Canterbury Shaker Village is Ghost of Earlier Days," *Manchester Union Leader* (August 7, 1959): 7; Strickler, 13.
78. Stein, *Shaker Experience*, 353.
79. Jeanette Prosser, "The Shakers of Canterbury," *New Hampshire Profiles* (August 1960): 26-31.
80. Archeologist David R. Starbuck has long challenged the dominant interpretation of Canterbury. See David R. Starbuck, *Neither Plain nor Simple: New Perspectives on the Canterbury Shakers* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 2004).
81. Miller, 19.
82. Sprigg, 9; Landry, 152.
83. Irene N. Ziegut, "Our Shaker Collection and How it Started," *Yankee* (April 1970): 127; Helen Meritt Upton, "Collecting Shaker," *Russell Sage Alumnae Quarterly* 34, no. 2 (winter 1964): 4-5; Charles and Helen Upton, "Living with Antiques," *Antiques* 90, no. 1 (July 1966): 85.
84. Betty Friedan, *The Femme Mystique* (New York, NY: Norton, 1963).

National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior



CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship

Volume 3 Number 1 Winter 2006



CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship
Winter 2006
ISSN 1068-4999

CRM = cultural resource management

CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship is published twice each year by the National Park Service to address the history and development of and trends and emerging issues in cultural resource management in the United States and abroad. Its purpose is to broaden the intellectual foundation of the management of cultural resources.

The online version of *CRM Journal* is available at www.cr.nps.gov/CRMJournal. Back issues of *CRM* magazine (1978–2002) are available online at <http://www.cr.nps.gov/crm>.

Guidance for authors is available online at <http://www.cr.nps.gov/CRMJournal>.

Manuscripts, letters to the editor, and all questions and recommendations of an editorial nature should be addressed to Martin Perschler, Editor, email martin_perschler@nps.gov, telephone (202) 354-2165, or fax (202) 371-2422. Incoming mail to the Federal Government is irradiated, which damages computer disks, CDs, and paper products. These materials should be sent by a commercial delivery service to Editor, *CRM Journal*, National Park Service, 1201 Eye Street, NW (2286), Washington, DC 20005.

Views and conclusions in *CRM Journal* are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as representing the opinions or policies of the U.S. Government. Acceptance of material for publication does not necessarily reflect an opinion or endorsement on the part of the *CRM Journal* staff or the National Park Service.

CRM Journal is produced under a cooperative agreement between the National Park Service and the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers.

To subscribe to *CRM Journal*—

Online <http://www.cr.nps.gov/CRMJournal>
email NPS_CRMJournal@nps.gov
Facsimile (202) 371-2422

U.S. Mail—
CRM Journal
National Park Service
1849 C Street, NW (2286)
Washington, DC 20240-0001