

“But My City Was Gone”:

Real Estate Development and the Transformation of Moneta, Virginia

Jason W. Johnson

Thesis presented to the Faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Political Science

Charles E. Walcott, Chair

Craig L. Brians

Karen M. Hult

September 8, 2009

Blacksburg, Virginia

Keywords:

Community, Real Estate Development, Civic Associations,
Religious Institutions, Local Government, Moneta, Virginia

Copyright 2009, Jason W. Johnson

“But My City Was Gone”: Real Estate Development and the Transformation of Moneta, Virginia

Jason W. Johnson

ABSTRACT

For over a century, Moneta, a small unincorporated village in rural central Virginia, served as the center of commercial, civic and religious life for the families who lived on a number of area farms. The construction of nearby Smith Mountain Lake in the mid-20th century brought an influx of newcomers to Moneta—a change that has not always been welcomed by longtime residents of the village and its environs. This thesis explores how the concept of community has been affected by the infusion of new people and new ideas into Moneta’s existing civic, religious and political life. After interviewing civic, religious and political leaders in the Moneta area, the author concludes that rather than ending community in Moneta, real estate development and the concomitant migration of newcomers to Smith Mountain Lake has actually had a transformative impact on community in Moneta. Instead of a broader community based on traditional connectors such as kinship and/or shared history, values and experiences, community in contemporary Moneta is narrower, based upon shared common interests, allowing for the creation of a number of smaller communities within the same geographical area. The author concludes with a discussion on the effects such transformations—occurring nationwide as suburbanization accelerates—are having on American democracy.

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my parents, Wayne and Peggy Johnson, for their love, encouragement and patience over the years, and for the stories of their childhood memories, which gave me a window into a village that largely lives only in the memories of those who knew her.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am deeply indebted to the following individuals for agreeing to be interviewed for this thesis. Their time and expertise was invaluable in attempting to understand the transformation that is taking place in Moneta, Virginia:

Glenn Ayers, Lynn Barnes, Chris Barrett, Lynn Foster, Kathleen Guzi, Rev. Rich Hart, the Honorable Chuck Neudorfer, Rev. Mark Odom, Frankie Puckett, Billy Tuck and Calvin Woodford.

Although she was not interviewed for this thesis, Jaci Smith, the office manager at Radford Baptist Church, was kind enough to compile a packet on the history of her church and to provide other data to shore up an analysis that I found wanting.

Special thanks are owed to my committee, Dr. Charles Walcott, Dr. Craig L. Brians and Dr. Karen M. Hult, for their guidance, insights and patience throughout the process of researching and writing this thesis. A finer group of political scientists—and individuals—would be difficult to find.

Much of the background information for this thesis would have been inaccessible had it not been for my mother's extensive scrapbooks chronicling decades of Moneta's history. Much thanks is also owed to her for her invaluable assistance scheduling interviews and being a constant source of inspiration and encouragement.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: Literature Review	6
Chapter 3: Theory and Methods	22
Introduction	22
Observing Moneta	23
Operationalization	24
Defining “Development”	24
Defining “Community”	25
Methods for Observation	33
Civic Life	33
Religious Life	34
Political Life	39
Conclusion	43
Chapter 4: <i>Agora</i> : Civic Life in Moneta	46
Introduction	46
Ruritan Overview	46
“Ruritan” Comes to Moneta	48
Moneta Medical Center, Inc.	49
Moneta Bypass	51
Analysis	53
Conclusion	60
Chapter 5: <i>Organs</i> : Religious Life in Moneta	61
Introduction	61

Catholics and Baptists Come to Virginia	62
The Churches of Moneta	63
Radford Baptist Church	63
Resurrection Catholic Church	66
Analysis	68
Worship	68
Outreach	72
Conclusion	77
Chapter 6: <i>Luxuries</i> : Public Services in Moneta	79
Introduction	79
The Historical Context	80
Growth and Demographics	83
Changes Come to Moneta	86
The Community Responds	89
Chapter 7: Conclusion: The Evolution of “Community”	94
Works Cited	103
Appendices	112
Appendix A: Interview Questions for the Officers of the Moneta Ruritan Club	113
Appendix B: Interview Questions for the Staff of Radford Baptist Church	115
Appendix C: Interview Questions for the Staff of Resurrection Catholic Church	117
Appendix D: Interview Questions for Bedford County Government Officials	118

Chapter 1: Introduction

“I used to know everyone within a 10-mile radius of Moneta. Now I don’t know nobody.”¹ For more than forty years Hanford Watson operated a store and post office in the rural central Virginia village² of Moneta. During that time, he got to know his customers, watching their children grow into adults and have children of their own. To him, they were more than just customers, they were friends and neighbors. An active member of Morgan’s Baptist Church and a charter member of the Moneta Ruritan Club, Watson was a well-respected community leader. By 1997, however, residential development around nearby Smith Mountain Lake had fundamentally changed the Moneta known by Watson; it was no longer the small, closely-knit, agrarian village that it was only a decade earlier. An influx of wealthy retirees from the northeast had changed Moneta from a small, quaint southern village to a far-flung collection of housing developments and shopping centers with a northern accent.

It is no secret why Watson felt like a stranger in his hometown. While traveling through the young American Republic in 1831, Alexis de Tocqueville, almost channeling Aristotle, noted that: “The township is the sole association that is so much in nature that everywhere men are gathered, a township forms by itself. Township society therefore exists among all peoples, whatever their usages and their laws may be...the township appears to issue directly from the hands of God.”³ Because of the physical closeness of individuals to their townships, it is perhaps only natural that a certain love will develop for one’s township and neighbors. Alexander Hamilton noted as much in *Federalist 17* when he wrote: “It is a known fact in human nature that its affections are commonly weak in proportion to the distance or diffusiveness of the object. ... [A] man is more attached to his family than to his neighborhood, to his neighborhood than to the

¹ S.D. Harrington, “Changes May Slow the Heart of Moneta,” *Roanoke (Virginia) Times*, 22 September 1997, A1, A4.

² Moneta is an unincorporated area in southern Bedford County, Virginia. Throughout this thesis, I will use the term “village” to describe Moneta; however, the usage of “village” reflects the colloquial practices of Moneta residents and is not meant to imply any special legal status for Moneta. In some states, village is a legal form of government; such is not the case in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

³ Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, trans. Harvey C. Mansfield and Delba Winthrop (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 57.

community at large....”⁴ Like his peers who were also lifelong residents of Moneta, Watson was part of a something larger than simply a township: he was part of a community. The shared experiences of growing up, learning, working, playing, living, worshipping, celebrating, mourning and perhaps even going to war with the same people creates relationships and promotes both shared values and beliefs about the world. Some, most notably Harvard professor Robert D. Putnam, have labeled these feelings of mutuality “social capital.” Yet, social capital goes beyond the understanding produced by shared life experiences; social capital also includes the “...social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them.” Social capital is not just a feeling; it is also a call to duty.⁵

Robert Putnam quotes one Progressive reformer who succinctly described social capital in West Virginia in 1916: Social capital “...may bear a social potentiality sufficient to the substantial improvement of living conditions in the whole community. The community as a whole will benefit by the coöperation of all its parts....” Thus, as Putnam noted, social capital is both a private good in terms of the benefits that redound to its possessors and a public good in terms of the benefits that accrue to the community at large when its citizens possess a high degree of social capital.⁶ High rates of participation in civic groups, houses of worship and/or local government can be attributed to social capital. Hanford Watson’s Moneta demonstrated indicators of high social capital as, in 1954, a group of local, civic-minded men organized the Moneta Ruritan Club. This club was responsible for numerous quality-of-life improvements like organizing a volunteer fire department and constructing a station for this fire department.⁷ When Moneta’s longtime physician, Dr. Samuel Rucker, retired, the Moneta Ruritan Club actively sought—and found—a replacement lest the area’s residents go without ready access to medical care.⁸

⁴ *Federalist 17*.

⁵ Robert D. Putnam, *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community* (New York, Simon & Schuster, 2000), 19.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 19, 21.

⁷ Lynda Imirie, “Down Home in Smith Mountain Lake,” *Cooperative Living*, 2000 <<http://www.co-opliving.com/coopliving/issues/2000/September/downhome.htm>> (26 November 2008).

⁸ Peter Viemeister, *Historical Diary of Bedford, Virginia, U.S.A. from Ancient Times to U.S. Bicentennial*, (Bedford, VA: Hamilton’s Press, 1993), 114.

Watson and his neighbors certainly were inclined to improve Moneta because it was their home and they only wanted the best for their friends and families, but Tocqueville sees something deeper at work in an individual's affinity for his or her community. Despite the organicity of the township, Tocqueville notes that "[t]he inhabitant...is attached to his township not so much because he was born there as because he sees in that township a free and strong corporation that he is a part of and that is worth his trouble to direct."⁹ The township, according to Tocqueville, is not just where people live—the township is where people learn to be both free men and women and responsible citizens of the Republic. Freedom, Tocqueville notes, is the belief that "...the individual is the best as well as the only judge of his particular interest, and that society has the right to direct his actions only when it feels itself injured by his deed or when it needs to demand his cooperation."¹⁰ Such power is dangerous, especially under a democratic regime, if the people do not learn to temper it. American federalism devolves to states and (by extension) municipalities numerous responsibilities that require the efforts of many people to ensure that the work is performed. Thus, the township presents citizens with multiple opportunities to satiate their will to power while also minimizing the encroachment on the freedom of others and, because of the proximity of the community to an individual and his or her loved ones, compelling the civic leaders to perform the entrusted jobs to the best of their ability. "It is in the township, at the center of the ordinary relations of life, that desire for esteem, the need of real interests, the taste for power and for attention, come to be concentrated; these passions, which so often trouble society, change character when they can be expressed so near the domestic hearth and in a way in the bosom of the family." In short, human ambition invigorates townships without destabilizing them, allowing the nation at large to enjoy both peace and freedom from despotism.¹¹

This system works as long as individuals feel a kinship to and a sense of belonging in their communities, but what happens when the tie that binds is severed or at least severely strained? Watson's Moneta fundamentally changed in 1960 when construction began on a dam in the gap of the nearby Smith Mountains. Six years later, the Staunton River flooded more than 20,000 acres of low-lying land, creating the second-largest human-made lake in Virginia. By the mid-1970s,

⁹ Tocqueville, 51 – 52.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 62.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 64 – 65, 58.

however, the population of Moneta began to grow rapidly.¹² Moneta, which once boasted a population of 400, became one of Bedford County's fastest growing areas as retirees and younger, wealthy couples moved to Smith Mountain Lake. Fueled in part by development at the lake, Bedford County's population increased by 31 percent between 1970 and 1980 (most of that growth occurring after 1975.¹³) Growth continued to accelerate at a decennial rate of approximately twenty-four percent for the next two decades. (Growth tapered slightly to ten percent between 2000 and 2006.) This rapid growth had two major effects on Bedford County in general and Moneta in particular. First, it changed the composition of the community. As a whole, the County became wealthier, whiter and better educated. Many of these newcomers moved from states other than Virginia. Second, it changed the demand for services—a demand not ignored by the County's planning commission when drafting its 1988 comprehensive plan:

The relatively rapid population increase into a previously stable environment can create many forces for change because of the increased demand on public services. Rapid development of land creates land use conflicts and the growing population increases the demand for more and better roads, schools, fire, and police protection and other public services. Adapting to these changes is not easy in an environment that has not had previous experience with rapid population growth.¹⁴

By the late 1990s, Moneta's population, once around 400, stood at approximately 8,600.¹⁵ With such drastic growth occurring at such a rapid pace, Moneta was experiencing the difficult forces envisioned by the planning commission. As the community changed to meet the increased demands of the newcomers, it is little wonder that Hanford Watson felt like a stranger in his own hometown.

Watson's Moneta is not unique amongst contemporary American communities. *Forbes* reports that since the year 2000, 25 counties have experienced tremendous rates of growth. These counties, favored because of their low cost and high quality of living, are booming, but the rapid

¹² Imirie.

¹³ "Population," 1988, in *Bedford County Comprehensive Plan*, <<http://www.co.bedford.va.us/Res/Planning/CompPlan/1988/Population.pdf>> (27 November 2008), 2.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 3.

¹⁵ "24121-Fact Finder," *U.S. Census Bureau*, 2000 <http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/SAFFacts?_event=&geo_id=86000US24121&geoContext=01000US%7C86000US24121&street=&county=&cityTown=&state=&zip=24121&lang=en&sse=on&ActiveGeoDiv=&useEV=&pctxt=fph&pgsl=860&submenuId=factsheet_1&ds_name=null&ci_nbr=null&qf_name=null®=null%3Anull&keyword=&industry=&show_2003_tab=&redirect=Y> (25 November 2008).

rate of growth is straining the existing infrastructure.¹⁶ In the process, though, like Moneta, these burgeoning localities are changing in ways that cannot be quantified easily. This influx of new residents from different areas is changing the long-standing character of the affected communities. What happens when these changes occur? I expect that, at least initially, the newcomers will be concerned about what happens in their new township, but until they develop trust in their new neighbors, they will probably never take an active role in shaping the direction their township will go. This social trust will develop after a sufficient number of like-minded individuals move to the township or they are greeted warmly enough by locals to feel comfortable assuming a place in society. These newcomers will then populate existing institutions and create new ones— institutions which locals may or may not (to varying degrees) feel comfortable joining. In time, unless steps are taken to prevent this balkanization of village life, “community” will devolve from a broader concept encompassing all (or at least all socially acceptable) residents within a specified geographical area, to a narrower concept encompassing only those who share certain common interests. Such a downward revision of the definition of community may not necessarily be a bad thing; smaller, more cohesive communities might actually provide a stronger, more stable support network for its members. However smaller, more cohesive communities might not enjoy as great a degree of legitimacy—especially when tasked with making important decisions regarding the look and direction of the entire township—as the more all-encompassing communities of the past.

In an effort to understand just how real estate development and population growth affects the intangible elements of “community,” I sought to study a village that has recently experienced such rapid, transformational growth and, as a result, has seen profound changes in both the composition and focus of its civic, religious and political life. The formerly rural community of Moneta, located in the Commonwealth of Virginia, provided just such a laboratory. Before I explore the changes Moneta has experienced, a review of the relevant literature is necessary to clarify the issues at work in the reinvention of communities after destabilizing growth occurs. Following that, I will discuss the methodology employed in studying this phenomenon.

¹⁶ Brad Wingfield, “A Surge In The ‘Burbs,” *Forbes*, 22 May 2007 <http://www.forbes.com/2007/03/21/fastest-growing-counties-biz-cx_bw_0322counties.html>.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

No discussion of social capital can begin or end without Robert Putnam. Since publishing his bestselling *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community* in 2000, it seems as if Putnam plucked the term “social capital” out of obscurity and fleshed it out, reigniting the academic discussion of this age-old concept. As stated above, Putnam defines social capital as the “...social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from...” social interaction. Before these reciprocal networks can be established, one key element must be present: social trust. As Putnam notes: “The touchstone for social capital is the principle of generalized reciprocity—I’ll do this for you now, without expecting anything immediately in return and perhaps without even knowing you, confident that down the road you or someone else will return the favor.”¹⁷ Further, there are two distinct forms of trust: “thick trust” is the trust that is shared amongst friends, family and acquaintances (*i.e.* one’s intimates), whereas “thin trust” is the trust shared between strangers or new acquaintances (*e.g.* a Good Samaritan who helps a stranded motorist). Both forms of trust are based upon the similar understanding of community, which is actually far less altruistic than it might appear on the surface. Although you may not know the stranded motorist, you stop to help him or her because you realize that one day, you, too, might be stranded and in need of assistance. Even though this particular individual might not come to your aid, by preserving the system of reciprocity, the odds are good that someone else will help you in your moment of distress.

Amongst intimates, though, there is a slightly different rationale for social trust: because these intimates share social circles; “...they have reputations at stake that are almost surely worth more than gains from momentary treachery.” Even if you are running late for a meeting, it is better for you personally to stop to help your stranded coworker—if just to check that they are safe—because otherwise, he or she might inform your other coworkers that you cannot be trusted in moments of need, which would in turn both diminish the esteem in which you are held by your colleagues and minimize your chances of receiving assistance when you are in need of assistance.

¹⁷ Putnam, 134.

This entire system of social trust sounds highly cynical. Why can an individual not help his or her neighbors, coworkers, parishioners, etc. simply because it is the right thing to do? This is a difficult question, but not one without a practical answer. Surely, the ancients would have noted, like the Roman poet Claudian: *Ipsa quidem virtus pretium sibi* (“virtue is its own reward”),¹⁸ but the early-Americans, notes Tocqueville, were less influenced by the ancients than they were by the moderns. Thomas Hobbes and John Locke—both of whom had a profound influence on the Founders—shared a common belief that the state of nature was a state of almost perfect freedom. To Hobbes, because of this perfect freedom, “...every man has a Right to every thing; even to one anothers body. ... [A]s long as this naturall Right of every man to every thing endureth, there can be no security to any man...”¹⁹ Even though the “generall rule of Reason” is to seek peace, Hobbes noted that humans lived in constant fear for their own safety. All of one’s energies were required to safeguard one’s own life, leaving few—if any—resources for the formation of a civil society. Industry, agriculture, trade, construction, property, education, art, literature (*i.e.* the accoutrements of civilization) could not be developed. Without a common power strong enough to end this state of war, civil society could not be formed, condemning humanity to an existence that was “...solitary, poore, nasty, brutish, and short.”²⁰

Locke’s state of nature was only slightly more harmonious. To Locke, the state of nature was “...a *state of perfect freedom* [in which people can] ...order their actions and dispose for their possessions and persons, as they think fit...without asking leave, or depending upon the will of any other man.”²¹ Here, humanity can acquire property and form a basic civil society, as long as everyone abides by the law of nature (*i.e.* harming no one or his or her possessions).²² Since undoubtedly there will be violations of this law, the aggrieved party is charged with meting out punishment for the offenders. From this arises a problem: justice may not be properly executed

¹⁸ W. Francis H. King, *Classical and Foreign Quotations: A Polyglot Manual of Historical and Literary Sayings Noted Passages in Poetry and Prose Phrases, Proverbs, and Bon Mots*, 3rd Ed. (London, J. Whitaker & Sons, Ltd., 1904), 144.

¹⁹ Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, Richard Tuck, ed., (New York, Cambridge, 1996), 91.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 92, 89 – 90, 89.

²¹ John Locke, *Second Treatise of Government*, C.B. Macpherson, ed., (Indianapolis, Hackett, 1980), 8.

²² *Ibid.*, 9.

when the perpetrator is a friend, relative or acquaintance.²³ To ensure equal justice, the people enter into a social contract “...agreeing together mutually to enter into one community, and make one body politic....”²⁴ In summation, in contrast to the ancients’ view that society is the natural by-product of humanity’s social nature, the moderns believe that society—based on mutual social trust—develops in spite of humanity’s individualistic nature.

Just as the social contract provides the foundation upon which a peaceful civil society can be built, Tocqueville notes that Americans have another practical reason for exhibiting social trust. “In the United States it is almost never said that virtue is beautiful. They maintain that it is useful.... American moralists do not claim that one must sacrifice oneself to those like oneself because it is great to do it; but they say boldly that such sacrifices are as necessary to the one who imposes them on himself as to the one who profits from them.”²⁵ Tocqueville labels this practice “self-interest well understood” and observes that, although it is not “lofty,” self-interest well understood, “...suggests little sacrifices each day; by itself it cannot make a man virtuous; but it forms a multitude of citizens who are regulated, temperate, moderate, farsighted, masters of themselves.... ...[I]t obtains great empire with ease, and preserves it without difficulty because it turns personal interest against itself, and to direct the passions, it makes use of the spur that excites them.”²⁶

Social trust or self-interest well understood: by either name the principle is basically the same, and its importance to the success of the American Republic is not simply pop social science; Madison himself notes its importance in *Federalist 10* when he discussed the problem of factions. Madison defines factions as “...a number of citizens, whether amounting to a majority or a minority of the whole, who are united and actuated by some *common impulse of passion...*” [emphasis added]. Like Aristotle millennia earlier, Madison recognized the social nature of humanity. The tendency to form factions is “sown in the nature of man”—a biological predisposition awaiting an animating, purpose-giving spark.²⁷ Madison believed that these

²³ *Ibid.*, 12.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 13.

²⁵ Tocqueville, 501.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 502.

²⁷ *Federalist 10*

factions, a human predisposition, facilitated by social trust/self-interest well understood and given a *raison d'être* by sundry catalysts (ranging from religion and government to leadership and economic equality) had the potential to get out-of-hand and destabilize the young republic if not kept in-check by rival factions.

This brings us back to Putnam. Robert Putnam notes that these reciprocal social networks facilitated by social trust can be used for good—as in volunteering at the local elementary school—or for ill—as in joining the local chapter of the White Citizens' Council. This is the difference between what Putnam calls “bonding” and “bridging.”

“Bonding” social capital is “...by choice or necessity, inward looking and tend[s] to reinforce exclusive identities and homogeneous groups.”²⁸ Putnam goes on to explain this as the kind of social capital that forms when we choose to associate ourselves with people who are culturally, ethnically, or socioeconomically similar to us. Bonding is valuable in the sense that it deepens preexisting connections between groups of similar people allowing members to grow and thrive in an environment that is both supportive and nurturing. It can also provide its members with moral and economic support. Despite its positive characteristics, bonding can be negative if it is used to reinforce existing stereotypes about groups or individuals outside the organization.

By contrast, “bridging” social capital is formed in organizations that “...are outward looking and encompass people across diverse social cleavages.”²⁹ These organizations make important contributions to society as they bring us together with people with whom we might not ordinarily associate ourselves. Putnam quotes a nineteenth century writer on the topic of bridging social capital: ““While we mingle together in these pursuits, we shall learn to know each other more intimately; we shall remove many of the prejudices which ignorance or partial acquaintance with each other had fostered....”³⁰ In other words, bridging corrects the imperfections of bonding. If Americans are to live together in diverse, democratic communities, the need for bridging organizations is great; how else will the citizens be able to come together to combat the challenges that they face and to decide amongst themselves what kind of community they want to occupy?

²⁸ Putnam, 22.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 23.

Why dwell on the issue of community organizations? Research has shown that community organizations are “classrooms of democracy.” Whether educational, religious or civic-based, organizations are the medium through which we practice of democracy—a tendency Tocqueville observed well over one century ago.

In democratic peoples...all citizens are independent and weak; they can do almost nothing by themselves, and none of them can oblige those like themselves to lend them their cooperation. They therefore all fall into impotence if they do not learn to aid each other freely. If men who live in democratic countries had neither the right nor the taste to unite in political goals, their independence would run great risks...if they did not acquire the practice of associating with each other in ordinary life, civilization itself would be in peril.³¹

More recently, Louis J. Ayala wrestled with the thesis advanced by Verba, Schlozman and Brady that participation in any non-political organizations (NPOs) would increase the likelihood of political participation. According to Ayala, Verba, et al. and other adherents to the “‘political spillover’ thesis,” the type of NPO is irrelevant; anyone involved with an NPO is more likely to get involved in the political process for two reasons: first, “...it is thought that such skills are directly transferable to many forms of political participation, and therefore offer a type of democratic training. ...Additionally, it is felt that the practice of such skills might serve to demonstrate to their practitioners the effectiveness and importance of participation in general, offering a type of educative process.”³² Ayala reviewed the same data set used by Verba et al. in their study, hypothesizing that a difference should exist between individuals who participate in voluntary NPOs and those who participate in *involuntary* NPOs. His reasoning was that “...most of the activities measured as time-based political acts (such as protesting, campaign work, etc.) require a choice on the part of the participant to incur significant costs, their greater congruence with activity in voluntary NPOs makes sense. As opposed to the workplace, where the decision to participate is much more a case of avoiding high penalties for inaction....”³³ In short, although we might learn skills that are useful in the political arena through our jobs, we are more likely to utilize those skills for non-employment-related political action if we are already involved in voluntary associations. Ayala just confirms what Tocqueville witnessed: voluntary associations not only

³¹ Tocqueville, 490.

³² Louis J. Ayala, “Trained for Democracy: The Differing Effects of Voluntary and Involuntary Organizations on Political Participation,” 53 *Political Research Quarterly* 1, 100.

³³ *Ibid.*, 109.

give a voice to the masses in a democratic society, they also provide us with the necessary skills to make the voices heard.

There is another advantage to associations: they bring us together with other members of our community, thus fulfilling the social needs of humanity. If, as some suggest, suburban Americans are becoming increasingly disjointed, civic associations provide us with a forum through which to reengage with our fellow citizens. John Jackson and Chris McDonald investigated the effects that uncontrolled development are having on the “well-being” of adolescents in Melbourne, Australia in “‘They Have Good Intentions’: Young People’s Experiences of Living in Melbourne’s Peri-Urban Areas.” Their conclusions cast some doubts on the *cliché* of a “soulless suburbia.”

Jackson and McDonald administered short surveys to “year 10” students (approximately fifteen year-olds) in Melbourne’s peri-urban areas and then conducted in-depth interviews with two twenty-two year-olds who grew up in peri-urban Melbourne. (“Peri-urban” is the area just beyond a city’s borders, closely approximating American suburbs.) Surprisingly, the authors discovered from the results of their surveys and interviews that living in these peri-urban areas does not necessarily have an adverse effect on children’s sense of well-being. They also advise readers not to infer from sprawling suburban development that society is experiencing a sense of “neighbourhood lost”:

Rather, one can more productively think in terms of “neighbourhood transformed”. The neighbourhoods Jenny and Lee [the two interviewees] know are changing rapidly and they feel an impending sense of loss. But if one can think in terms of “neighbourhood transformed”, as Jenny and Lee try to do, there is scope perhaps to think about more creative outcomes, outcomes in which local people can play a leading role.³⁴

Even though signs of an immediate negative impact have not materialized, Jackson and McDonald caution their readers that life in the peri-urban area might impact the stock of social capital possessed by these citizens *when they become adults*. Since social capital is the very stuff of which society is composed, Jackson and McDonald propose that, in the face of these transforming communities, local planners should create schools in the peri-urban areas with the intent of fostering a sense of community and not just providing a physical location in which

³⁴ John T. Jackson and Chris McDonald, “‘They Have Good Intentions’: Young People’s Experiences of Living in Melbourne’s Peri-Urban Areas,” *Urban Policy and Research*, 23 (December 2005), 493.

children can receive an education.³⁵ (It is an odd proposal in the sense that the well-educated tend to possess more social capital than the less-well-educated.) If this is still true, why should the function of the school matter to the creation of social capital? Is there a distinction between social capital created through education and social capital created through face-to-face interaction? This is a question that Jackson and McDonald fail to address, but their recommendations for infrastructure improvement suggests that they do see a difference and that they prefer face-to-face interaction.

Jackson and McDonald's study of "peri-urban" Australia raises an important question for contemporary, suburban America: who participates? Tocqueville noted that it was within the nature of all democratic people to organize into associations, but do certain types of people tend to associate more frequently than others? Ayala's research certainly seems to suggest that that is the case—at least that there exist two distinct classes of Americans: participants and nonparticipants. Among the participant-class, we can see Putnam's division of social capital into the categories of bonding and bridging; obviously every American has the opportunity to associate with one another, but some choose to associate with anyone and others (for whatever reason) only want to associate with those similar to themselves. This schism in U.S. communities has important repercussions for the future of self-government. Arend Lijphart, a former president of the American Political Science Association, summarized the potential problem well when he wrote: "...unequal participation spells unequal influence...."³⁶ So who has this unequal influence?

One of the most important factors in determining who will participate—as might be expected—are individuals from higher-status backgrounds. In "Political Participation and the Neighborhood Social Context," R. Robert Huckfeldt notes that it is the well-educated and the financially stable that are going to be most actively involved in most any association. Citing Verba and Nie, he provides three basic reasons for this phenomenon: "(1) a social environment which encourages participation, (2) resources and skills such as time, money, and knowledge, and (3) psychological characteristics such as political efficacy and awareness."³⁷ It should come as no surprise that people who are more financially secure will likely have more time to devote to

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ Arend Lijphart, "Unequal Participation: Democracy's Unresolved Dilemma," 91 *American Political Science Review* 1 (March 1997), 1.

³⁷ R. Robert Huckfeldt, "Political Participation and the Neighborhood Social Context," 23 *American Journal of Political Science* 3 (August 1979), 580.

associations and other political activities than will people who must work during a majority of their waking hours just to make ends meet. It is also plausible that people with a higher level of education are going to have more knowledge of the way politics work and, as a result, will be more confident in their ability affect a positive conclusion to their political efforts.

Based on a survey of adults in Buffalo, New York, Huckfeldt concludes that "...higher status contexts are related to more active participation among high status respondents..."³⁸ Through the survey data he found support for the incidence of higher-status individuals being more likely to participate because they are embedded within a social circle that encourages if not expects participation from its members. "The social environment can also encourage participation through the informal transmission of group based norms which turn participation into a *social obligation*. So, people can be stimulated to participate both by being around others who participate and by adopting prevalent group norms which encourage participation" [emphasis added].³⁹ This sounds strikingly similar to Putnam's concept of generalized reciprocity: "...I'll do this for you now, without expecting anything immediately in return and perhaps without even knowing you, confident that down the road you or someone else will return the favor."⁴⁰

Huckfeldt seems to propose that such generalized reciprocity is not created in a vacuum; it only forms when we are surrounded by people who embody similar notions of reciprocity. Interestingly, Huckfeldt notes that the presence of low-status individuals in an environment dominated by high-status individuals actually *depresses* rates of participation. He found a similar pattern amongst high-status individuals in environments dominated by low-status individuals.⁴¹ Thus it is not enough to be well-educated or financially-secure; to have the desired effect on rates of participation, we must surround ourselves with people from similar socioeconomic backgrounds. The entire concept of bonding suggests that some associations will be oriented toward reaffirming existing ties, be they based upon race, gender, socioeconomic status, or other dimensions. As Putnam noted, however, such associations help its members "get by," but nothing

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 582.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 581.

⁴⁰ Putnam, 134.

⁴¹ Huckfeldt, 581.

more.⁴² To fulfill their purpose, communities, as Shakespeare might say, “should be made of sterner stuff.”

Huckfeldt was not the only scholar to observe the importance of a participatory-environment on the likelihood of participation in associations or other organized political action. Diana C. Mutz studied the propensity of individuals to participate in the face of cross-cutting networks (i.e. conflicting opinions existing within a given social environment).⁴³ Mutz concurred with the prior research that “...social context appears to make a difference in the extent to which individuals become politically active but,” she asks, “does the homogeneity of beliefs within the social environment also have consequences for political participation?”⁴⁴ The author seems to suggest that the answer is affirmative for two reasons: first, being buffeted by these cross-cutting networks could create a sense of “attitudinal ambivalence” within the conflicted member; second, because of the social pressures to participate that we experience within our social environments, when cross-cutting networks are present, we might feel best if we simply remain neutral in the disagreement.⁴⁵ This makes sense as these conflicts have the potential to damage the reciprocal networks of trust described by Putnam. Choosing the “wrong side” in a conflict could easily damage friendships—even long-standing friendships—and jeopardize one’s image in the community. An analysis of national survey data led Mutz to conclude that rates of participation are diminished when we are exposed to cross-cutting networks; however, she is willing to concede that “...it is plausible that participating in political activities could *lead* one to associate with a more politically homogeneous group of contacts, thus political participation could cause lower levels of cross-cutting exposure....”⁴⁶

What kinds of issues are these community associations dealing with? Research indicates that as the pastures and fields of once-bucolic rural communities are becoming asphalt parking lots, strip malls and residential developments, the hurried rate of growth is straining the existing infrastructure.⁴⁷ County roads that once served tractors now serve SUVs; schools that once were

⁴² Putnam, 23.

⁴³ Diana C. Mutz, “The Consequences of Cross-Cutting Networks for Political Participation,” 46 *American Journal of Political Science* 4 (October 2002), 839.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 839.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 840.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 845.

⁴⁷ Wingfield.

large enough to accommodate all the children in the community are now overcrowded. Such rapid growth has the potential to unsettle these traditionally-rural communities. It also has the potential to alter the expectations that citizens have for their local governments as the community's new residents expect to receive the same level of services that they enjoyed in their previous (largely urban) communities. The responsibility for delivering these desired services falls to the local government and debates over which, if any, new services a locality should provide are some of the principal debates in America's communities today.

In "The Changing Responsibilities of County Governments: Data from a National Survey of County Leaders," Gregory Streib and William Waugh discuss the historical legacy of counties as service providers. Although this article may not necessarily contribute anything unexpected to the study of services provided by American counties, it does offer important background information on the historical level of services provided by American counties prior to the New Deal allowing for an informed comparison to the array of services offered by many American counties today. The authors also note the cultural reluctance of southern counties to provide more than the basic rural services that counties have provided since the American Revolution.

In their attempt to measure how the duties and powers of county leaders (executives, administrators and commission chairs) changed between 1987 and 1991, the authors analyze survey data collected from approximately forty percent of all such leaders. Unsurprisingly, the authors make the ground-breaking observation that "Counties have changed, and further changes are coming fast."⁴⁸ They do note, though, that southern counties are experiencing the most pressure to increase the number of services provided. As creatures of the state, historically counties have only provided those services that were critical to the state, (e.g. law and justice, recording births, deaths, marriages and land transfers, education, highway maintenance, "agricultural functions," etc.).⁴⁹ Today, however, the authors note that the eight most commonly-cited problems facing county governments ("solid waste management, land use and zoning, water supply and sewage, toxic waste management and groundwater contamination") cannot be located on the list of traditional responsibilities.⁵⁰ Such urban concerns are undoubtedly new to county

⁴⁸ Gregory Streib and William L. Waugh, Jr., "The Changing Responsibilities of County Government: Data from a National Survey of County Leaders," *American Review of Public Administration*, 21 (June 1991), 153.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 141 – 42.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 148.

governments that have spent almost two centuries monitoring milk production and attempting to control the spread of gypsy moths. So what is responsible for this shift in priorities?

Among the factors that contribute to the degree of services provided by a local government are the region in which the county is located and the socioeconomic status of the county's residents. These factors were observed by Victor S. DeSantis and Tari Renner in their article "The Impact of Political Structures on Public Policies in American Counties." By analyzing capita spending data gleaned from the 1988 International City/County Management Association's County Form of Government survey, the authors conclude that spending varies based upon the location of the county. Southern counties, maintaining their traditional role as a provider of state services, spend at lower rates than do western counties, which provide a wider array of urban and suburban services to their residents. The socioeconomic status of a county's residents also impacts county spending as wealthier counties spend more than do poorer counties. On the surface, these findings make sense. Since the 1980s, some southern counties (like those surrounding Atlanta) have grown exponentially; however, many areas in the south remained relatively undeveloped until the 1990s or early 2000s. Across the western states, California, Arizona and Nevada (primarily North Las Vegas) have been growing for decades. It should hold that the more developed a community is and the longer that community has been growing, the more services the local government will provide. Similarly, the wealthier the population, the more likely the population will be to demand better schools for their children, better police, fire and emergency medical services and improved sanitation services. Nonetheless, due to the age of the Reagan-era data analyzed by DeSantis and Renner, I am not certain that the data in their article are still relevant today. They do provide readers with some general principles to be aware of while conducting additional research.⁵¹

One of the more interesting findings by scholars in the field of local government as service-provider is that the structure of a county's government also impacts the level of services that government will provide. Edwin J. Benton, an expert in the subfield of local government services, explored the potential impact of government structure on service provision in his article "County Service Delivery: Does Government Structure Matter?"

⁵¹ Victor S. DeSantis and Tari Renner, "The Impact of Political Structures on Public Policies in American Counties," *Public Administration Review* 54 (May/June 1994) 291 – 95.

Government reforms, like the creation of the administrator-commission form of county government, were popular with the Progressive reformers of the late-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The Progressives, who favored science and professionalism, saw the administrator-commission form as a government that would be operated on the basis of professionalism and the tenets of public administration. In other words, the administrator-commission system would eliminate the incompetence and wastefulness (sometimes even fraud) perpetuated by the commission form. If Benton's hypothesis is supported by the data, it would suggest that the professional administrators bring to county government both knowledge about what kinds of services a growing community needs and the kinds of services that are commonly enjoyed in other communities.

Benton attempts to investigate his hypothesis by comparing the spending levels of county governments that have reform "charter" governments to county governments that do not have such governments. By analyzing the 1993 expenditure data for counties with populations in excess of 100,000, Benton finds support for his hypothesis that reform governments (even those without a charter) will spend more per capita than will counties untouched by the Progressive reforms, suggesting that the presence of a charter makes a difference in determining the array of services a county will provide.⁵²

Beyond simply saying that the *form* taken by a local government matters, what else does Benton's research tell us, or at least suggest? If anything, it raises questions of causality: do the residents of rapidly-developing communities want additional services and they must turn to charter governments because they realize that those governments (due to their penchant for professionalism and efficiency) are more willing to provide those services for the citizens than are the traditional forms of government? Do citizens prefer these forms of government because they prefer professional, competent government (not realizing that enhanced services will accompany this change in form)? Or do newcomers to the rapidly-developing communities prefer charter governments—because many of them moved from urban areas that have long employed such professional government—prefer to implement a system with which they are familiar? While these questions are beside the point of Benton's article, they are important if we are to deepen our understanding of *why* people choose more professional governments in the first place.

⁵² Benton, J. Edwin, "County Service Delivery: Does Government Structure Matter?" *Public Administration Review* 62 (July/August 2002): 471 – 79).

Interestingly, these are questions addressed by James Simmons and Solon Simmons in “Structural Conflict in Contemporary Cities.” While Staunton, Virginia calls itself the birthplace of the administrator-commission form of government, that form had spread well beyond Virginia’s Shenandoah Valley by the late-twentieth century; in fact, by 2004, one-sixth of American communities were attempting to restructure their local governments. In their attempt to understand why communities make this change, Simmons and Simmons propose five hypothetical catalysts that they think might explain this contemporary push for government reform: design flaws, political instability, changing demographics, leadership deficits and legitimacy problems. They test their hypotheses by exploring data from both the International City Management Association’s Form of Government survey and U.S. Census reports. Ultimately, the authors conclude that all five factors partially explain the late-twentieth century government reforms, but no single hypothesis provides a stand-alone explanation. They do note, however, that of the five, demographic changes—specifically race and level of education—tend to affect the reforms more than any of the other variables.

That the education of a citizen affects his or her predisposition to support a professional form of government is not that surprising. As the authors note, “The fact that growing education populations favor the CM [council-manager] form is consistent with tendencies in the history of the urban reform movement. The CM form was always seen as a way to clean up politics with an apolitical, professional process that made an appeal to the ‘better class’ of citizens who were most likely to fill the government positions of a professional regime.”⁵³ If, as I suspect, these once rural communities that are being suburbanized are being populated by well-educated professionals and well-educated retirees, this finding would significantly expand our understanding of why communities might choose to adopt reform governments. Perhaps the new residents are not pursuing better *services*, but better *government*; the increased public services are just an added bonus.

What happens if the new government provides a level of services that the public finds unsatisfactory or believes that the current, adequate services are in jeopardy? In “The Three Exit, Three Voice and Loyalty Framework: A Test with Survey Data on Local Services,” Keith Dowding and Peter John seek answers for those questions by devising seven hypotheses that can

⁵³ James R. Simmons and Solon J. Simmons, “Structural Conflict in Contemporary Cities,” *American Review of Public Administration*, 34 (December 2004), 385.

then be subdivided into two, basic groups: First, citizens and groups of citizens will express their concern with the current (or future) level of services when they are dissatisfied or believe they will be dissatisfied in the future. Second, dissatisfaction (present or potential future dissatisfaction) will increase the likelihood that citizens who are considering leaving a locality will actually do so unless relocation is too expensive (both in terms of the financial costs of moving and the emotional costs of severing ties with friends, family and neighbors).⁵⁴ The results of Dowding and John's survey of British Internet users is that citizens who are dissatisfied with the services provided are more likely to express their dissatisfaction either by voting or by participating in some other collective action. Those who for financial reasons do not have the option of relocating to a locality with more favorable services are more likely to be dissatisfied than those who have the means to relocate.⁵⁵ While this study was conducted in the United Kingdom, it is interesting to note that in the United States, as mentioned earlier, Americans are increasingly relocating into communities that heretofore have provided few services. If Dowding and John are correct, how does that explain the sprawling growth in counties that historically provide few services? What makes these people stay until their new community adopts the kinds of services that they would enjoy? These questions are as yet unresolved.

In the aggregate, these articles suggest that first, something profound is happening in U.S. communities. Things are indeed changing in undeniable ways; rural counties (like Bedford) that were once governed by small bodies of citizen-legislators whose primary concern was maintaining law and order are now facing an influx of well-educated citizens who are in search of a home in a lower cost-of-living area. They are simultaneously demanding both a local government led by competent, professional administrators and a local government that will provide them with an acceptable level of "urban services" or suburban services. For these boards of citizen-legislators, these are unfamiliar and, at times, uncomfortable, demands. Increasingly, they are yielding some of their authority to professional manager/administrators who also bring neutral competence and a good-government *ethos* into the administration of county government. Beyond the changing degree of services that these new administrators provide their communities, they are also overseeing potentially destructive forces that, if not controlled properly, have the potential to rend

⁵⁴ Dowding, Keith and Peter John, "The Three Exit, Three Voice and Loyalty Framework: A Test with Survey Data on Local Services," *Political Studies*, 56 (2008), 294 – 95.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 306.

the social fabric of America's communities. Professional administrators who have been trained in land use and zoning are likely better equipped to oversee the transformation of communities in such a way that will ensure the preservation of legitimacy and social capital. Bedford County adopted these structural reforms in the 1970s⁵⁶, so hopefully this county will be well-prepared for the transformation that is to come. If not, the advancing decades will bring more changes to our communities than we dare imagine; not all will be positive.

America, once a land of vibrant communities that would form associations to accomplish various goals including the creation of "...hospitals, prisons, [and] schools,"⁵⁷ now seems increasingly willing to delegate such tasks to an ever-expanding local government. Many of the most active associations in American counties today are not performing services, but exist to demand service. If one believes the literature, this could well be a result of the changing face of our communities. When we lived in more homogeneous, organically-formed communities, we were comfortable working with our neighbors; we felt that sense of reciprocity discussed by Putnam because we knew that our friends and relatives could be counted on for help and support. When you really do not know your neighbor, such an assumption might require a suspension of disbelief.

Over one century later, the sense of self-interest well understood observed and admired by Tocqueville seems to have devolved into self-interest. South African journalist David Cohen retraced Tocqueville's route in the 1990s, publishing his experiences in *Chasing the Red, White, and Blue*. As he traveled through Ohio, he met Gerald Chait, one of the heirs to the Giant Eagle chain of supermarkets. Chait summarized his view of contemporary America by stating: "'This country...started with this kinship that we were all in the same boat. We've gotten away from that. I'm not sure when it happened. ...This country...we've lost our ability to *feel* for the people in the other boat.'"⁵⁸ Chait is not alone in his assessment of contemporary America. Christopher Caldwell, writing for the conservative opinion magazine, *National Review*, lamented that contemporary suburbs, unlike those supposedly homogenizing suburbs of Ward Cleaver's America, have a dearth of public space. As a result, "[t]he problem in affluent 'McMansion'

⁵⁶ Kathleen Guzi, interview by author, Bedford, VA, 4 May 2009.

⁵⁷ Tocqueville, 489.

⁵⁸ David Cohen, *Chasing the Red, White, and Blue*, New York: Picador, 2001, 115 – 16.

suburbs like Littleton [Colorado] is that children grow up in almost hermetic seclusion—a newer and more soul-destroying condition, with dismal implications for democracy. ...This seclusion... creates an abject dependence on parents for automobile travel, and with it, a breakdown in any socialization of children that could be called normal.”⁵⁹ Whether the seclusion preceded the feeling of estrangement or whether the feeling of estrangement preceded the seclusion, the point remains: Americans are increasingly becoming less “little platoons” and more “armies of one.” If we inherit our sense of identity from our communities and if community engagement (through local civic associations) helps to maintain the vitality of our communities, the future of the Republic looks bleak.

⁵⁹ Christopher Caldwell, “Levittown to Littleton: How the Suburbs Have Changed,” *Annual Edition: State and Local Government*, 11th Edition, Guilford, CT: Dushkin, 2003, 140 – 41.

Chapter 3: Theory and Methods

Introduction

The academic literature on social capital and civic associations is instructive, but how does it relate to what goes on daily in the world outside of academe? Have the reviewed authors adequately described the conditions under which “community” thrives and social capital can be formed and utilized? To answer these questions, I returned to return to Moneta, the rapidly-developing village, that was our point of departure. Just as in the U.S., Tocqueville “...sought...an image of democracy itself, of its penchants, its character, its prejudices, its passions...”⁶⁰ I sought in Moneta an image of a community in transition, “its penchants, its character, its prejudices, its passions.” Moneta is but one of thousands of localities across the United States currently undergoing rapid, potentially destabilizing growth. From Moneta, I hoped to observe what many residents of these developing villages can expect; to quote Tocqueville: “I want to become acquainted with it if only to know at least what we ought to hope or fear from it.”⁶¹

In this chapter, I will attempt to explain the methods that I employed during my observation of Moneta. I begin with an explanation of why—of all the rapidly developing villages in the United States—I chose to study Moneta. Next, I will define two of the most frequently used terms in this thesis: “development” and “community.” Then I will explain which aspects of community life I chose to observe and how I did it. Finally, I will discuss the limitations of my chosen methodology.

⁶⁰ Tocqueville, 13.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*

Observing Moneta

When studying communities in transition, Moneta may not be the obvious choice to observe; tucked securely in a bucolic region of western-central Virginia, it is hundreds of miles from the burgeoning suburbs of Richmond, Tidewater and Northern Virginia. Yet Moneta is representative of the thousands of tiny agricultural villages, perhaps comprised only of a few farms, a church, a store, a post office and a school, that until recently dotted the landscape of the Commonwealth. Although ubiquitous, these agricultural villages were not unique to Virginia; they were a staple of rural America. Because of their small size and the kinship of many of the village's residents, social capital flourished in these villages and a spirit of community was almost palpable. Prior to the formation of Smith Mountain Lake, such a distinct community spirit thrived in Moneta as many of the same families lived and worked, side-by-side, for generations. Others could assimilate into it with relative ease, but with the construction of Smith Mountain Lake came a flood of newcomers to Moneta that were culturally distinct from the agriculturally-based natives.

The newcomers do not move to Moneta seeking employment opportunities—there are no Fortune 500 companies in the village and large government contracts (such as the kind that sustain growth in Northern and Tidewater Virginia) are almost as rare as a high-speed Internet connection. People move to Moneta to be near Smith Mountain Lake and to take advantage of the relaxed, recreational lifestyle that the lake offers. Yet, as in every developing community, these “immigrants” are bringing to Moneta a culture and a set of values vastly different from those practiced here for almost two centuries before the lake's formation. The rural crossroads that was “downtown Moneta” now sits idle, slowly deteriorating into oblivion, while, across the railroad tracks, a new “downtown Moneta”—replete with boutique shops, offices, restaurants, and apartments—rises from an excavated hillside pasture. Perhaps Yeats was right, “Things fall apart.”

Smith Mountain Lake's 500 miles of shoreline is ringed with these small, distinctive, Virginia agricultural villages. Moneta, Huddleston, White House, Hardy, Hales Ford, Glade Hill, Union Hall, Penhook are but a few of the names of these villages that survive today. So why, of all of these villages, did I choose to study Moneta? First of all, Moneta is my hometown; my family has lived near the village for more than a century. Because of this personal history, my life is intimately connected to the growth and transformation of Moneta. Second, of all of the Smith

Mountain Lake villages, Moneta is perhaps the most in flux. Hales Ford, which lies directly on the water, has been developed (some would argue *overdeveloped*). Parts of the other villages (because they are more remote) are largely untouched, but Moneta is currently experiencing growing pains as the developers move away from the water in the next phase of development. Some development has been occurring in Moneta for forty years, but in the past decade the pace of development has accelerated. As a result, Moneta presents the best opportunity (of any of the lake communities) to observe the process of development, the pushback or resistance from the community's long-time residents and the halting attempts by the "been-hereers" and the "come hereres" to come together and forge a new community.

At the outset of my observations, I expected to discover that *when confronted by the unsettling forces of real estate development, the community of Moneta, Virginia was not destroyed, but transformed into a new community*. Before I proceed into this in-depth study of how development is changing Moneta, it is essential that I establish some parameters for my observations by operationalizing "development" and "community." Without these definitions, it would be difficult to understand precisely what I am observing and its overall significance to my goal of understanding what to expect from a community in transition.

Operationalization

Defining "Development"

America is awash with development—much of it in the form of strip-malls and "big-box stores" featuring the same retailers regardless of the location—but what exactly is development? Bob and Luke Anderson, partners in the Australian-based development consulting firm, Positive Property Strategies, wrote a comprehensive guide to real development for "up and coming real estate developers" entitled *Residential Real Estate Development: A Practical Guide for Beginners to Experts*. I believe that Anderson and Anderson can provide us with valuable insights into the business of real estate development.⁶²

⁶² Bob Anderson and Luke Anderson. "Introduction to Real Estate Development," *Residential Real Estate Development: A Practical Guide for Beginners to Experts*, 2006 <http://books.google.com/books?id=yUrUg6WtH3oC&pg=PA13&lpg=PA13&dq=%22what+is+real+estate+development%22&source=web&ots=icYuB_ARZ5&sig=VjaWKxhQkotAa_8I3NgWxfY0iP8#PPA13,M1> (12 December 2007), 13.

According to Anderson and Anderson, “[r]eal estate development may simply be thought of as the improvement of a building or a piece of land. Real estate development may include renovating an existing building, subdividing a piece of land, building a townhouse complex, building a shopping centre, or creating a master planned community.”⁶³ More specifically, there are multiple *types* of real estate development, including commercial, industrial, residential, retail⁶⁴ and mixed.⁶⁵ Beyond the construction of new buildings, development also includes making preparations for such buildings by “...dredging, filling, grading, paving, excavating, and drilling.”⁶⁶ The installation of utilities, like water, sewers, electric and telephone service as well as drainage lines also constitutes development.⁶⁷ For the purposes of this study, I want to combine the Andersons’ definition of “development” with the definitions from *Black’s Law Dictionary* and the *Dictionary of Real Estate Terms*: *development is the improvement of a piece of land by dredging, filling, grading, paving, excavating, drilling, installing utilities and/or drainage lines, renovating an existing building or constructing a new building or buildings for the purpose of providing commercial, industrial, residential or retail space as part of a planned community or as a stand-alone project.* This is a relatively all-encompassing definition of development, however, while focusing on several retail projects, for this thesis, my primary interest will be on residential development as that is the development luring new residents—and with them, new values—to Moneta.

Defining “Community”

Residential development segues nicely into the concept of community. Community, village, neighborhood, township—though bearing different names, the concept remains essentially the same: a place where people live in close proximity, sharing certain values and customs.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 13.

⁶⁴ According to Anderson and Anderson, retail development is distinct from commercial development in that retail developments are designed to accommodate shops, restaurants and other businesses, whereas commercial developments are designed to accommodate “wholesale business (eg. Office complexes).”

⁶⁵ Anderson and Anderson, 14 – 15.

⁶⁶ “Development,” Bryan A. Garner, ed., *Black’s Law Dictionary*, 2nd Pocket Edition, St. Paul: West Group, 2001.

⁶⁷ “Development,” Jack P. Friedman, Jack C. Harris and J. Bruce Lindeman, *Dictionary of Real Estate Terms*, 6th Edition, Hauppauge, NY: Barron’s Educational Series, Inc., 2004.

Aristotle was one of the first to write on the formation of communities: "...when several families are united, and the association aims at something more than the supply of daily needs. ... [T]he most natural form of the village appears to be that of a colony from the family, composed of the children and grandchildren, who are said to be 'suckled with the same milk.'"⁶⁸ Edmund Burke expanded this Aristotelian definition of community in his *Reflections on the Revolution in France* by emphasizing the transcendent nature of community.

Society is indeed a contract. ...It is not to be looked on with other reverence; because it is not a partnership in things subservient only to the gross animal existence of a temporary and perishable nature. It is a partnership in all science; a partnership in all art; a partnership in every virtue, and in all perfection. As the ends of such a partnership cannot be obtained in many generations, it becomes a partnership not only between those who are living, but between those who are living, those who are dead, and those who are to be born.⁶⁹

To Burke, the community is far more than just an amalgamation of people, some of whom are related by blood and some of whom are related by shared values. The community is not simply a living arrangement; it is a bulwark for the permanent things against the barbarism of individualism. Community and the concomitant sense that we are all connected in a partnership between those who have passed and those who are yet to be born is what keeps us from behaving as if we are the sole masters of our universe, thus causing "...the whole chain and continuity of the commonwealth...[to] be broken. No one generation could link with the other. Men would become little better than the flies of a summer."⁷⁰

I believe Burke suggests an important element of community—the human desire for a connection to other people or a sense of place. Like Aristotle's observations that humanity's nature is to be social and that only beasts or gods can live a solitary existence, Burke observes that humans want a place where they belong, both horizontally (in relation to one another) and vertically (in relation to both the past and the future). Community provides us with just such a place. Herein lies the potential problem with development: by introducing new members to an existing community, is this vertical connection severed? What legacy do we share with our

⁶⁸ Aristotle, *The Politics and the Constitution of Athens*, ed. Stephen Everson (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 12.

⁶⁹ Edmund Burke, *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, ed., Frank M. Turner (New Haven, C.T.: Yale University Press, 2003), 82.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 81.

ancestors—and what legacy do we have to bequeath to our posterity—if the community is reconfigured and repopulated with people and values foreign to the community? Have we allowed the “...commonwealth itself...[to] crumble away, be disconnected into the dust and powder of individuality, and at length dispersed to all the winds of heaven”?⁷¹

As discussed earlier, Americans made a conscious break from the ancients with a preference for the practical over the theoretical. Tocqueville noted that initially an individual “...is attached to his township not so much because he was born there as because he sees in that township a free and strong corporation that he is a part of and that is worthy his trouble to seek to direct.”⁷² In time, however, the township comes to mean much more than just that. The individual grows to love his or her township because it becomes a part of him or her and *vice versa*: he or she helps to govern it,

...he places his ambition and his future in it; he mingles in each of the incidents of township life; in this restricted sphere that is within his reach he tries to govern society; he habituates himself to the forms without which freedom proceeds only through revolutions, permeates himself with their spirit, gets a taste for order, understands the harmony of powers, and finally assembles clear and practical ideas on the nature of his duties as well as the extent of his rights.⁷³

Thus, in America, the community becomes that transcendent contract neither by nature nor by birth, but by experience. Through the practice of community-life—voting, participating in public meetings, sharing friendships, joining civic groups, learning in schools and worshipping in communal environments—a new community can be formed. Perhaps it is this community dynamism that separates us from the static societies of Europe where the dynamics of community life have changed little since the time of Charlemagne.

All of this is to suggest that there is “community” and then there is “American community,” which, despite beginning at different spots, ultimately ends at the same place. Community, as Burke suggests, disintegrates if one forgets that he or she is a member of a transcendent partnership between the past, present and future. In America, Tocqueville illustrates, communities, though inorganic, are formed by the *mechanism* of community—participation—that

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 82.

⁷² Tocqueville, 64 – 65.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 65.

erases prejudices, builds bridges, fosters trust, marginalizes individualism and creates a new partnership based upon the universally-held, democratic values of our Republic (*i.e.* equality, justice and self-government).

Staking out the middle-ground between the high-minded idealism of Burke's transcendent partnership and the prosaic practicality of Tocqueville's ward politics are the Communitarians. This motley crew of thinkers who span the ideological spectrum appear to be doing the most research into communities today. In attempting to define "community," Robert N. Bellah warns us of the most common pitfall—the tendency to associate "community" with neighbors, block parties, picnics (*i.e.* "nostalgia") thus lapsing into a futile sentimentalism. Instead, he reminds us that community, while certainly encompassing those elements, is much more substantial. The community is "...the place where we communicate with others, deliberate, come to agreement about standards and norms, pursue in common an effort to create a valuable form of life...."⁷⁴ It is no coincidence that the center of ancient Athens was the Agora, for there the city gathered to have such discussions. Community, then, is the American Agora.

Bellah's editor and fellow communitarian, Amitai Etzioni, provides us with the most useable definition of community: a "social entity" in which "...the members...involved have formed a core of shared values (*i.e.* a moral culture) and a web of bonds of affection."⁷⁵ Etzioni elaborates on these "shared values" in his book *The New Golden Rule*. To Etzioni, having shared values means "...most members of the society, most of the time, *share a commitment to a set of core values*, and that most members, most of the time, will abide by the behavioral implications of these values because they believe in them, rather than being *forced* to comply with them."⁷⁶ As an example, Etzioni cites the problem of crime in America. Some will argue that crime indicates the need for an enlarged police force to ensure public order. To Etzioni and the communitarians, however, the need for an enlarged police force indicates that social values have broken down;

⁷⁴ Robert N. Bellah, "Community Properly Understood: A Defense of 'Democratic Communitarianism,'" *The Essential Communitarian Reader*, ed., Amitai Etzioni (Lanham, M.D.: Rowman & Littlefield, 1998), 15, 17.

⁷⁵ Amitai Etzioni, "The Community Deficit," 45 *Journal of Common Market Studies* 1, 2007, 24.

⁷⁶ Amitai Etzioni, *The New Golden Rule: Community and Morality in a Democratic Society*, (New York: Basic, 1998), 13.

people no longer respect the lives and property of others and, perhaps, those that do so are only doing so because they are compelled to obey these social values by the police.⁷⁷

David W. McMillan and David M. Chavis George are also interested in defining community. To McMillan and George, community has four elements: membership, influence, integration and fulfillment of needs and shared emotional connections. “Membership is a feeling that one has invested part of oneself to become a member and therefore has a right to belong... It is a feeling of belonging, of being apart.”⁷⁸ Just as there are “members” of a community, there are necessarily nonmembers of a community. Perhaps this “feeling of belonging” is created by Etzioni’s shared values; when we share a set of core values, as Etzioni proposes, we feel an affinity with others who share our values. Those who do not share our values are viewed with suspicion; therefore it becomes necessary to distinguish who is like us. Ultimately, these “[b]oundaries established by membership criteria provide the structure and security that protect group intimacy.”⁷⁹

The shared values and membership boundaries that work together to create a sense of the community as an intimate group of like-minded individuals also creates a sense of personal duty/obligation to the community. Similarly, McMillan and George note that “...working for membership will provide a feeling that one has earned a place in the group and (b) that, as a consequence of this personal investment, membership will be more meaningful and valuable.”⁸⁰ Although they do not present any examples of this tendency, it might be safe to assume that membership in a service-oriented civic group or participation in a community campaign or movement would provide an adequate level of personal investment to justify one’s membership in the community.

Influence, McMillan and George state, “...is a bidirectional concept. In one direction, there is the notion that for a member to be attracted to a group, he or she must have some influence over what the group does.... On the other hand, cohesiveness is contingent on a group's ability to

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 13.

⁷⁸ David W. McMillan and David M. Chavis George, “Sense of Community: A Definition and Theory,” 14 *Journal of Community Psychology* 1 (January 1986), 9.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 4.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

influence its members.”⁸¹ They remind us that members who are least likely to conform to a group’s norms are also unlikely to be influential. As Tocqueville and Madison both observed, in a democracy, the voice of one individual is likely to be ignored by government bodies, but when that individual joins with other voices in community associations, the refrains of this chorus of united citizens becomes more difficult to ignore.⁸² McMillan and George observe a similar phenomenon: by joining these community associations, the political “environment” becomes “more responsive” to the association’s desires and the members feel both more influential and efficacious. These feelings increase their sense of membership in the community and their overall sense of connection to other members.⁸³

Integration and fulfillment of needs requires that “...for any group to maintain a positive sense of togetherness, the individual-group association must be rewarding for its members.” McMillan and George identified a number of “reinforcers” that serve to make association rewarding, including “status,” “competence” and “shared values.” Members must believe that their memberships are benefiting them in some way or that they could at some point in the future. Not unlike Putnam’s observations about reciprocity, McMillan and George note the seemingly obvious: “People are attracted to others whose skills or competence can benefit them in some way.” A business owner might join a local business association for the twin purposes of improving the community’s business environment and benefitting from the networking opportunities and business-friendly regulations promoted by the association. Again, harkening to Putnam, the authors state that this attraction to others is heightened when we discover that we believe similar things and cherish similar traits.⁸⁴ These shared values cement existing divisions within the community, while also “...reinforc[ing] exclusive identities and homogeneous groups.”⁸⁵

Echoing Burke’s transcendent partnership, McMillan and George label the fourth and final element of a sense of community a *shared emotional connection*, which they say is “based, in part, on a shared history. It is not necessary that group members have participated in the history in order

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 5.

⁸² Tocqueville, 490.

⁸³ McMillan and George, 6.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 8.

⁸⁵ Putnam, 22.

to share it, but they must identify with it.” Seven factors enrich this emotional connection: frequency of interaction, quality of interaction, absorption, magnitude, degree of investment and reward. Any one of these factors will have the effect of drawing associated individuals closer together and enriching their interaction.⁸⁶ The tendency to be drawn to those with whom one has endured a struggle is nothing new; it was observed and memorialized in Shakespeare’s *Henry V*, when, before the Battle of Agincourt, England’s King Henry V rallies his forces by calling them a “band of brothers”: “For he today that sheds his blood with me/ Shall be my brother . . ./ And gentlemen in England now abed/ Shall think themselves accursed they were not here.”⁸⁷ Similarly, it would not be uncommon for members of a community association who were involved in a major fight to experience all seven factors. These shared emotional factors, in conjunction with the values shared by members of the association and the barrier of membership serves to further isolate “these happy few” from nonparticipants. This can pose a distinct challenge for developing communities: obviously, the community had a history before the new wave(s) of development occurred, and the new residents were not present to experience that history. If the residents cannot relate to this history for ethnic, cultural, religious or socioeconomic reasons, their ability to assimilate into their new community will be diminished.

From Aristotle to Burke, Tocqueville, McMillan and George and the Communitarians, many thinkers have attempted to define “community,” but all of their attempts appear to emphasize many of the same general ideas: relationships, history, shared values, opportunities for involvement and a sense of belonging. For the purposes of this thesis, I want to synthesize these recurring elements to form a definition of community that is both academically sound and immune from charges of nostalgia. Additionally, I want to address the process that I hope to observe in Moneta: how “community” changes and is reinvented—if it is reinvented—as real estate development transforms existing communities. To that end, I shall define community as *a relationship among people who live within a specified geographical area, share a common history and possess a common set of values. These shared experiences and values help to create an open, trusting environment in which the members trust one another and feel comfortable communicating with one another about the quality of life they hope to create and share together.*

⁸⁶ McMillan and George, 8 – 9.

⁸⁷ *Henry V*, IV, iii.

Both Burke and Tocqueville wrote in a time long before automobiles, television, iPods, videogames, personal computers or the Internet enveloped us in a blissful world of our own interests. Before Americans were wealthy enough for high-tech cocoons, we relished the public life for its entertainment value. Public meetings—government, civic and religious—provided welcome opportunities to leave the farm and engage with neighbors. This era was not without the seeds of twenty-first century materialism, though, as Thoreau observed just one decade after Tocqueville: “... [M]en labor under a mistake. ...By a seeming fate, commonly called necessity, they are employed, as it says in an old book, laying up treasures which moth and rust will corrupt and thieves break through and steal.”⁸⁸ These treasures, Thoreau notes, include fashionable clothes and extravagant homes.⁸⁹ In pursuit of these niceties of life, Thoreau “...perceive[d] that this so called rich and refined life is a thing jumped at, and I do not get on in the enjoyment of the *fine* arts which adorn it, my attention being wholly occupied with the jump...”⁹⁰

If the men and women of nineteenth century America were jumping for the “rich and refined life,” they are leaping for it in twenty-first century America. Somewhere along the way, however, Putnam observed, we landed off-course. The timeless principles of community that have sustained humanity since the dawn of civilization appear to have been drowned out by the roar and hum of contemporary life. We find it increasingly difficult to unplug and reengage our neighbors in this “social entity.” Deliberation is difficult when there is a myriad of monologues. Deliberation has become so rare that, as Jonathan Chait observed, ““This country...started with this kinship that we were all in the same boat. We’ve gotten away from that. ... [W]e’ve lost our ability to *feel* for the people in the other boat.””⁹¹ It is in Moneta that I hope to discover whether, in one small corner of the contemporary United States, despite the potentially destructive forces of real estate development and the resulting population growth, community thrives or if it has been crushed into the “dust and powder of individuality.”

⁸⁸ Henry David Thoreau, *Walden and Civil Disobedience*, ed., Jonathan Levin (New York: Barnes & Noble, 2003), 9.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 27, 26.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 33 – 34.

⁹¹ Cohen, 115 – 16.

Methods for Observation

The social ties that facilitate community can often be created through two sources: civic clubs and religious institutions. When seeking to understand what effect real estate development is having on community in Moneta, investigating the changes that development and population growth has helped bring to the longstanding civic and religious institutions of Moneta was a natural starting point. In this section, I will explain why I chose to focus my observations upon the particular group and churches that I did, provide the reader with some general background information on them and describe the methodology I employed while observing these groups.

Civic Life

Almost sixty years after its founding, the Moneta Ruritan Club continues to play an active role in the civic life of the Moneta village. From supporting educational programs at Moneta Elementary School to raising money for the construction of the Moneta/Smith Mountain Lake Library to advocating the construction of the Moneta bypass, the Moneta Ruritan Club is unquestionably the village's most accomplished civic organization. It was clear that if I wanted to understand how development is affecting Moneta, observing how it is affecting the Ruritan Club, its membership and its projects was a must.

In deciding who to interview, I knew that I wanted to speak with individuals possessing knowledge of the true health of the Moneta Ruritan Club. The club's officers appeared to be the natural choice, however, I had difficulty getting the officers to return my calls requesting an interview. One reason for the difficulty, I was told, was that many of the members are involved with multiple groups in the Moneta/Smith Mountain Lake area, thus severely restricting their spare time. Calvin Woodford, the club's last active charter member and a former president, agreed to be interviewed and encouraged me to come to his house approximately one hour after I called on the afternoon of Friday, May 1, 2009. As the club's historian, Woodford maintains a treasure trove of documents, photographs and newspaper clippings chronicling the 55-year history of the Moneta Ruritan Club. While I tried not to stray from the prewritten questions, Woodford's memories and

fascinating stories of his childhood in rural Moneta, frequently led me down fruitful, but unexpected trails. Woodford also recommended that I interview another longtime Ruritan Billy Tuck. Tuck also came highly recommended by one of the club's former presidents, Frankie Puckett, whom I remembered from my years as a student at Moneta Elementary School and from subsequent civic involvements of my own. Both Tuck and Puckett were full of insights about the Moneta Ruritan Club and observations about how Moneta has changed since the mid-1960s. Tuck, invited me to come to his Moneta farm (which has been in his family for over 100 years) for the interview on the evening of Sunday, May 3, 2009. Frankie Puckett became very animated when I called to ask for an interview—she even started answering questions and telling stories over the phone. We agreed to meet in the deli at the White House Corner Store, a convenience store in the nearby village of White House, a few minutes later. That interview was also conducted on Sunday, May 3, 2009. Even after the interview, which lasted more than one hour, Puckett and I continued exchanging emails as she located two electronic files that she thought might be of interest to me as I continued my research on the Ruritan Club. All three interview subjects were eager to assist me in my research and to reminisce about their lives and work (both civic and professional) in Moneta. The task of building rapport with these individuals might have been aided by the fact that our families have been friends for many years and, to some degree, all three individuals watched me grow up.

At the beginning of each interview, I gave the interview subject a brief verbal overview of the thesis for which I was conducting research. Then, I gave the interview subjects a cover letter providing a slightly more detailed overview of the thesis and the informed consent form, explained the process, answered any questions that they might have and waited for them to officially consent to the interview. After the administrative elements were completed, I proceeded with the interview. The prewritten questions for each group interviewed can be found in Appendix B.

Religious Life

Moneta has long been a deeply religious community. Its first church was formally organized in 1771 and nearby, in 1756, a Quaker congregation petitioned King George III for the right to assemble on the banks of Goose Creek. Ever since, a variety of Christian denominations—

ranging from mainline Protestant to evangelical and African-American Baptist—have operated freely in the community. Today, the largest and most active congregations are found at Radford Baptist Church, a Southern Baptist church just off Moneta’s main thoroughfare, and Resurrection Roman Catholic Church, a relatively new arrival to the village.

Then, as now, religious institutions bring people together. Religious institutions remain one of the most common associations in contemporary America, with forty-two percent of Americans reporting that they attend religious services on a weekly (or almost-weekly) basis.⁹² This “body of believers,” as St. Paul analogized the Church, serves as a medium through which we connect not only to God, but also to our fellow humans. We gather to worship in corporate settings in part to encourage our fellow believers along their spiritual journey, but also to receive encouragement from them, thus creating a special bond between parishioners: when we face challenging circumstances like the loss of a job, loss of a loved one or, as C.S. Lewis calls it “the dark night of the soul,” we know that in our house of worship we will find love, support and empathy. When our fellow parishioners face challenges, we, too, are expected to provide them with love, support and empathy. Even though we do this willingly and out of a sense of love, there is an expectation that we will “bear...one another’s burdens” as a reflection of the new spiritual life within us.

Interestingly, the interpersonal connections facilitated by these religious institutions can also serve secular purposes by forming “multiplex relationships,” which James Coleman defines as “persons...linked in more than one context (neighbor, fellow worker, fellow parent, coreligionist, etc.)....” These relationships can then serve a secular purpose—reinforcing social capital⁹³—because they “...allow[] the resources of one relationship to be appropriated for use in others. Sometimes, the resource is merely information... sometimes, it is the obligations that one person owes a second.... Often it is resources in the form of persons who have obligations in one context that can be called on to aid when one has problems in another context.”⁹⁴

⁹² Frank Newport, “No Evidence Bad Times Are Boosting Church Attendance,” <<http://www.gallup.com/poll/113452/Evidence-Bad-Times-Boosting-Church-Attendance.aspx>> (14 March 2009).

⁹³ I say “reinforce” because it takes a degree of existing social capital to choose to attend a house of worship in the first place.

⁹⁴ James S. Coleman, “Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital,” 94 *The American Journal of Sociology* Supplement (1988), 109.

Robert Putnam observes a similar phenomenon; echoing Ayala, Putnam notes that churches—like most voluntary associations—instill within members a variety of skills applicable to the political life of the community.

Religiously active men and women learn to give speeches, run meetings, manage disagreements, and bear administrative responsibility. They also befriend others who are in turn likely to recruit them into other forms of community activity. In part for these reasons, churchgoers are substantially more likely to be involved in secular organizations, to vote and participate politically in other ways, and to have deeper informal social connections.⁹⁵

This is not just an academic theory; Andrew Greeley, among others, studied the relationship between religious participation and volunteerism and discovered that, indeed, a positive relationship between the two exists. In fact, he concludes that religion was the *single* largest motivator for volunteerism—for both adults and teenagers—in a wide variety of endeavors, ranging from education and youth to politics and health.⁹⁶ Greeley’s findings make C.S. Lewis’s observation from his 1952 book, *Mere Christianity*, seem prescient: “If you read history you will find that the Christians who did the most for the present world were just those who thought most of the next. ... Aim at Heaven and you will get earth ‘thrown in’: aim at earth and you will get neither.”⁹⁷

In light of this community formed both within congregations and between congregations and the surrounding neighborhood, the health of a village’s churches is a good barometer of the health of the community itself. To this end, I decided to focus my observation of Moneta’s religious institutions on two of its most dynamic congregations: Radford Baptist Church and Resurrection Roman Catholic Church. Since Radford Baptist Church was organized almost one century before Smith Mountain Lake was formed, its congregation was well-established by Moneta “natives.” Today, however, Radford, which is described on its website as a “... Baptist church that is on steroids or forgot it was Baptist”⁹⁸, is one of Moneta’s fastest-growing congregations with much of this growth coming from new members who came to Moneta from

⁹⁵ Putnam, 66.

⁹⁶ Andrew Greeley, “Coleman Revisited: Religious Structures as a Source of Social Capital,” 40 *American Behavioral Scientist* 5 (March/April 1997), 590 – 92.

⁹⁷ C.S. Lewis, *Mere Christianity* (New York, Harper Collins, 1952), 134.

⁹⁸ “Frequently Asked Questions,” *Radford Baptist Church*, <http://www.radfordbaptist.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=18&Itemid=31> (11 March 2009).

other areas and an assortment of other Christian sects. To grasp how the existing congregation reacted to the entry of so many new members from outside of Moneta and to the transition from a traditional, rural Baptist congregation to a burgeoning “Baptist-on-steroids” mini-mega-church, I interviewed two members of the pastoral staff on ___day, June 8, 2009.

My interview came at an inconvenient time for Radford’s pastoral staff as the church’s senior pastor, Rev. Mark Odom, was transitioning out as pastor and the church was in the process of searching for a replacement. Multiple phone messages left with the church secretary went unanswered. Finally on June 8, after reading through the historical information provided by the office manager, Jaci Smith, I decided that I absolutely wanted to include Radford Baptist Church in this thesis, so I drove to the church—unannounced—walked into the church office and introduced myself to the Smith who remembered me from our phone conversations. She arranged for me to meet with both Rev. Odom and Rev. Rich Hart, Radford’s Pastor of Youth and Families. Despite my unexpected visit and their busy schedules (in addition to the extra work prompted by Rev. Odom’s forthcoming departure, the church was making final preparations for the following week’s vacation Bible school), both ministers agreed to be interviewed and made time to talk with me that afternoon. Rev. Odom could only meet for a 30-minute block so I tried to select my questions carefully, focusing primarily on those dealing with how the congregation reacted to the growth and changing worship styles during his tenure as senior pastor. Rev. Hart’s afternoon was less hectic, so we were able to talk for approximately one hour. What interested me so much about Rev. Hart was that his perspectives on development and growth were not exclusively from the minister-congregant perspective that I expected, but also from the perspective of a real estate developer—the business opportunity that originally brought Rev. Hart and his family to the Moneta area.

Similarly, Resurrection Catholic Church in Moneta has undergone dramatic changes in the last twenty years. As an organized faith, Catholicism is relatively new to Bedford County; the first Mass was not celebrated *anywhere* in the county until 1874 and even then, for many years, the only Catholic parish was located in Bedford—more than twenty miles from Moneta.⁹⁹ It would be almost one century before Moneta had enough Catholics to establish a parish of its own. Thus, unlike Radford, Resurrection’s congregation is comprised almost entirely of new arrivals to Moneta. I wanted to understand how accepting the predominantly Protestant Moneta community

⁹⁹ Lula Jeter Parker, “The Churches of Bedford County,” *Parker’s History of Bedford County, Virginia* (Bedford, VA: Hamilton’s, 1988), 72.

was of a Catholic congregation initially and how these Catholics interact with their Protestant (and secular) neighbors today, as well as how successful the pastoral staff at Resurrection had been at forging a unified congregation from the regionally diverse parishioners it attracts.

In pursuit of an interview, I called Resurrection's church office and spoke with a volunteer secretary (who, incidentally, proudly informed me that she was a member of the Moneta Ruritan Club) then connected me to the office of Chris Barrett, Resurrection's pastoral coordinator. Due to the size of the parish and the priest shortage in the Richmond Diocese, Resurrection is forced to share two priests with two other Catholic churches in the area, so the priests rarely spend time in the office at Resurrection. Barrett handles most of the day-to-day duties of a priest so, for the purposes of my thesis, he seemed the natural choice to interview. Immediately, I was able to establish a positive rapport with Barrett, whom I once met while he was employed by my *alma mater* Lynchburg College. After he signed the consent form, Barrett took me on a tour of the sanctuary to illustrate the physical growth that Resurrection has experienced since the early-1990s. This tour, he said, would give me a better sense of the dynamic growth the parish has experienced than any verbal answers he could provide. Indeed, the tour provided a beneficial object lesson that helped to frame much of our subsequent conversation.

Ultimately, Barrett was my only contact at Resurrection as Monsignor Joseph Lehman never returned my call. A follow-up conversation with Barrett and background research on Resurrection suggested that Monsignor Lehman was not avoiding me, but instead the heavy workload of serving three parishes places such severe demands on his time that he never had time to respond to non-church related business. The fact that I could only speak with Barrett—a lay leader—serves to reinforce a central theme that emerged from my observations of Resurrection: a parish led by the laity. Tocqueville's travels in the 1830s convinced him that Roman Catholics are "...the most republican and democratic class there is in the United States."¹⁰⁰ This democratic temperament has prompted generations of Roman Catholics to pursue lives of service to their Church and their communities; a dedication replicated today by Moneta's Catholic parish.

¹⁰⁰ Tocqueville, 275.

Political Life

After considerable reflection, Thoreau concludes that “[t]he necessities of life for man in this climate may, accurately enough, be distributed under the several heads of Food, Shelter, Clothing, and Fuel....” All else, Thoreau believes, are “luxuries” which are “...positive hindrances [*sic*] to the elevation of mankind.”¹⁰¹ As an agricultural community, Moneta was capable of producing the “necessaries of life”: the fertile fields, rolling pastures and bountiful forests surrounding the community were wellsprings from which the raw materials for food, fuel, shelter and even clothing could be drawn. All that was lacking was the security for which both Hobbes and Locke believed humans were willing to trade the absolute freedom of the state of nature. This security, as well as other functions necessary for the preservation of civilization, was provided by the Commonwealth of Virginia through its agents in Bedford, the county seat.

As stated above, historically, counties have been considered “creatures of the state,” basically meaning that they possess little or no autonomy, but operate primarily as administrative districts of the state government. The state government, therefore, has the constitutional authority to determine the size and structure of counties and to “regulat[e] the internal affairs of counties” including telling the counties “...which county officers are to be elected or appointed, their term of office, method of election, and their specific function and powers.”¹⁰² Perhaps Tocqueville summed it up best when he stated bluntly: “The county therefore has...no political existence.”¹⁰³

Streib and Waugh, citing the work of H. James, list the most common “functions and powers” executed by the traditional county: assessment and collection of property taxes, recording deeds, administering elections, enforcing laws, prosecuting criminals, administering public schools, constructing and maintaining public roads, assisting the poor, maintaining health statistics, controlling public health and “agricultural functions.”¹⁰⁴ These basic services were adequate for the residents of Moneta prior to the construction of Smith Mountain Lake, but as rural villages

¹⁰¹ Thoreau, 14, 15 – 16.

¹⁰² Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, “Structure and Organization of County Government,” *Profile of County Government*, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972), 9.

¹⁰³ Tocqueville, 66.

¹⁰⁴ Streib and Waugh, 142.

change, so too do their expectations from county government—even though the county is not always capable or permitted to meet these expectations.

Forbes observed that as land adjacent to major cities becomes saturated by development, the developments inch farther outward beyond the suburbs into the outlying rural counties. These counties (not unlike Bedford), favored because of their low cost and high quality of living, are booming, but the hurried rate of growth is straining the existing infrastructure.¹⁰⁵ Pastures and fields in once-bucolic rural communities are becoming asphalt parking lots, strip malls and residential developments. County roads that once served tractors now serve SUVs; schools that once were large enough to accommodate all the children in the community are now overcrowded. Real estate development is necessitating infrastructural upgrades as well as demanding new services that heretofore were unnecessary and unimaginable in rural communities like Moneta.

Streib and Waugh note that these new services tend to resemble those enjoyed by urban dwellers: public utilities (*e.g.* water, electricity, gas and sewers), garbage and recycling collection, professional fire departments and emergency medical technicians, public parks, public libraries, enhanced parking options, environmental protection and cleanup, etc.¹⁰⁶ Responsible public administration demands that, “[a]s population, economic and social changes occur, a continuing evaluation of governmental structural and procedural adaptations for the provision of public services and functions is required.”¹⁰⁷ With urban services comes the need for professional, urban-style governance that is competent to oversee the complex, day-to-day function of urban government. Bluntly stated, the unprofessional¹⁰⁸, part-time, citizen-legislators on county commissions and boards of supervisors—that were perfectly capable of overseeing the “record-keeping” duties of rural counties—are “...too fragmented, and incapable of handling the new functional responsibilities and concomitant priority setting of modern county governments.”¹⁰⁹ So in addition to changing the appearance and composition of the community, real estate development

¹⁰⁵ Wingfield.

¹⁰⁶ Streib and Waugh, 142; Benton, 473, 476.

¹⁰⁷ Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, 25.

¹⁰⁸ The term “unprofessional” is not intended to disparage the citizen-legislators of local government; it merely reflects the general absence of a full-time administrative staff that is trained in public administration.

¹⁰⁹ DeSantis and Renner, 291.

also has the effect of promoting a change in the organization of the community's government. Gone are the "county machines" and the "good old boy" networks that frequently dominated rural politics with equal doses of corruption, populism and *noblesse oblige*. The "reform governments," first proposed in the early-twentieth century by the Progressive reform movement, are committed to the principles of efficiency, neutral competence and democratic accountability.¹¹⁰

These reforms are generally reducible to two areas: structure and scope. Structurally, reform governments adopt a single county executive, administrator or manager (either appointed by the county commission or board of supervisors or directly elected by the county's voters) to oversee county functions specifically designated to his or her supervision. The county executive's duties can include preparing the county budget, reports on county business, policy proposals and draft ordinances (for the commission's review and approval), as well as "...assuming responsibility for the proper administration of the county along policy lines established by the board."¹¹¹ This executive, the reformers believed, "...would bring the flexibility, centralization, and professionalization necessary for counties to function successfully in a rapidly changing society."¹¹² The scope of reform governments pertains directly to the increased appetite for services in transitional communities. It includes "...permitting counties to provide optional services (that is, services not mandated by the state) and to consider alternative service-provision arrangements would give counties the flexibility to adapt and respond to new service demands and complex issues, something they cannot do as administrative arms of the states." It also includes "financial flexibility."¹¹³

Bedford County adopted the county administrator plan through the Virginia Code of 1950. The Code specified the method for selection of county administrators and outlined the responsibilities of the administrator. §15.2-407 B summarizes the role of county administrators as:

The county administrator shall, insofar as the board requires, be responsible to the board for the proper administration of all affairs of the county which the board has authority to control. He shall keep the board advised as to the financial condition of the county and

¹¹⁰ Benton, 473, 472.

¹¹¹ Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, 11.

¹¹² Benton, 473.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 473.

shall submit to the board monthly, and at such other times as may be required, reports concerning the administrative affairs of the county.¹¹⁴

Perhaps because of the adoption of a reform government decades before the construction of Smith Mountain Lake, Bedford County was not caught unprepared for the onslaught of requests for infrastructural upgrades and enhanced services; the county's comprehensive plan was anticipating the need for such upgrades and enhancements as early as 1988.

If Bedford County has been slow to provide these services, it is not for want of a reform government. The most likely culprit is two-fold: until quite recently, Bedford County has lacked both the demand for enhanced services and the political will necessary to finance them. The accelerated growth in Moneta—as the developers moved into the village—perhaps has created a catalyst for change by concentrating an ever-increasing number of people (many of whom come from suburban areas in the northeastern United States and the Washington, D.C.-metro area) in the rural village. Ultimately, Bedford County's planning officials concluded that, for better or worse, development was going to occur around Smith Mountain Lake, so rather than try to stop it, the best way to deal with this development is to manage it. The first step in this containment process was acceding to the request of developers, like George Aznavorian, for public utilities. With a loan from local developers, the Bedford County Public Service Authority began construction of a sewage treatment plant in 2005 "...designed to centralize growth along the three-mile corridor of Virginia 122 between Virginia 608 and Hales Ford Bridge." Both county officials and developers concede that this will hasten the transformation of Moneta from a rural village into an urban/suburban hub of new homes, shops and restaurants.¹¹⁵ This is almost certainly the first of many requests to come.

To observe how Moneta's expectations of services from the county government have changed, I interviewed the village's current representative on the board of supervisors, Chuck Neudorfer (himself a relative newcomer to the Moneta area), the former supervisor, a longtime Moneta resident and local institution, Glenn Ayers, the village's appointed representative on the county's planning commission, Lynn Barnes and Bedford County's administrator, Kathleen Guzi. Neudorfer, Ayers and Barnes each offer distinctive insights that made their interviews invaluable.

¹¹⁴ Code of Virginia § 15.2-407b.

¹¹⁵ John Cramer, "2 Paths, 1 Goal: Moneta's New Wastewater Treatment Plant Spurs Growth," *Roanoke (VA) Times*, (15 April 2007), A4.

As an officeholder, Neudorfer was able to elaborate upon the process of providing new services for the county, including the citizen-input phase in which Neudorfer and his fellow supervisors must weigh the competing interests of newcomers and longtime residents. Longtime resident Glenn Ayers was valuable in the institutional memory that he brought to the thesis, both as a local historian and as a member of the planning commission that approved Bedford County's first attempt at managing growth, the Land-Use Guidance System (LUGS). Serving more than one decade after Ayers, Lynn Barnes is immersed in Smith Mountain Lake's current development projects. Finally, Guzi, who has served in Bedford County's administration since 1986, has witnessed much of Moneta's evolution from small agricultural village to burgeoning tourism-centered suburbia. Both her education in public administration and current position as county administrator gives Guzi a unique understanding of how the disparate pieces of growth and development, service provision come together to form a cohesive community.

Conclusion

Any methodology has its limitations and this one is no different. The responses I received might have varied depending upon the groups—and the individuals—that I interviewed. Had I chosen to interview members of the Moneta Lions Club instead of the Moneta Ruritans, I might have observed similar trends (increasingly large percentages of the membership are newcomers, focus of service projects changing from the Moneta village itself to the greater Smith Mountain Lake area, etc.), but in doing so, I would be ignoring part of the story this thesis is recounting: Moneta's longstanding institutions, like Moneta itself, are being transformed by the inward migration of new residents. To select a group, or a church, that had not been as integral to Moneta's history as the Ruritan Club or Radford Baptist Church would be to start at a disadvantage.

Some might also critique the small number of individuals that I interviewed and argue that in choosing the individuals I did, I received different responses than I would have had I interviewed more, and more diverse individuals. In that, my critics are right: my sample was small and those I interviewed were or currently are in positions of leadership within their respective institutions. Had I interviewed rank-and-file members (especially longtime residents) it is almost

certain that I would have received responses far different from the ones I have got. There are voices in Moneta that go unheard in these pages, like the area's younger population and Moneta's small but strong African-American community. Not interviewing younger Monetans or persons of color was neither an oversight nor a slight and certainly their voices could have introduced a new perspective on the development of Moneta that my interview-subjects could not. This thesis was not intended to gauge public opinion (although public opinion certainly comes into play in chapter six); it was designed to analyze how development is affecting longstanding community institutions. Unfortunately individuals in these groups are not as engaged in the institutions being most affected by development, so their input, though informative, could not have provided as much insight of that which I gleaned from my interview-subjects.

I chose to focus on civic, religious and political leaders because they are most likely to have access to concrete information, like membership rosters and project lists that can support or refute the claim that Moneta is changing in significant ways. I did not want this thesis to be a history of Moneta or a 21st century "southern manifesto" railing against the destructive forces of growth and development. Instead I wanted it to be a clear-eyed assessment of how Moneta is being changed (and it *is* changing) and, whether, on a larger scale, this change poses a problem for thousands of other Americans whose hometowns are also becoming "boomburbs" before their very eyes. While this thesis is far from perfect, I believe it succeeds in realizing these basic goals.

The next three chapters record my observations from the ground in Moneta. Chapter four, "Agora: Civic Life in Moneta," chronicles the Ruritan Club's formation in the early-1950s, the central role it played as an agenda-setter in village life and a discussion of its decline from Moneta's "unofficial town council" to being "one among equals" in the area's civic life. Chapter five, "Organs: Religious Life in Moneta," follows the change experienced by Radford Baptist Church from a "part-time" church in the 1960s to one of the Smith Mountain Lake area's fastest-growing churches and the formation of Resurrection Catholic Church—a parish that would have been unthinkable in Protestant Moneta only a few decades ago. This chapter also follows the efforts made by the leadership at both churches to merge a disparate band of believers into the cohesive Body of Christ. Chapter six, "Luxuries: Public Services in Moneta," tracks the provision of services by Bedford County's government from the sparse services provided by a rural county to the smorgasbord of services offered to the residents of an increasingly suburbanized county.

Discussions on how this increased level of services is being received by residents of Moneta and how their leaders, both elected and appointed, attempt to reconcile rivaling visions for the village are also included in this chapter. Finally, in chapter seven, I conclude with a discussion of how growth and development are changing what it means to be part of a community in Moneta. What Moneta is doing right and wrong on that front can serve as both a model and a warning to residents of other suburbanizing villages.

Chapter 4: Agora: Civic Life in Moneta

*Tho' much is taken, much abides; and tho' / We are not now that strength which in old days /
Moved earth and heaven, that which we are, we are; / One equal temper of heroic hearts, / Made
weak by time and fate, but strong in will / To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield.*

—Alfred, Lord Tennyson, “Ulysses”

Introduction

For more than 50 years, the Moneta Ruritan Club has maintained a high profile in village life. They have championed projects that are meaningful to area residents including establishing a new medical clinic in Moneta after the retirement of the village’s longtime doctor and advocating the construction of a new railroad overpass over the village’s often congested railroad crossing. The growth that is occurring in and around Moneta as a result of the development of Smith Mountain Lake is having an effect on the Moneta Ruritan Club, both in the composition of its membership and in the degree of influence that it wields in the village and its environs. In this chapter, I will discuss the ways in which the growth of Smith Mountain Lake is changing the Moneta Ruritan Club from the village’s most influential civic group to an organization that, though it remains significant, is no longer the agenda-setter that it once was. To illustrate this transition, I begin with a history of the Moneta Ruritan Club and then I highlight two of the club’s most significant projects: the Moneta Medical Center, Inc., and the Moneta Bypass. Finally I discuss some of the changes that the club is experiencing today and how the club’s longtime members are responding to these changes.

Ruritan Overview

As the Articles of Confederation were proving insufficient for governing the newly-independent American states, America’s political elite were debating the future. Thomas Jefferson, writing of his vision for the new nation to John Jay, described the ideal citizen: “Cultivators of the earth are the most valuable citizens. They are the most vigorous, the most

independent, the most virtuous, & they are tied to their country & wedded to its liberty & interests by the most lasting bands.”¹¹⁶ Despite their purported value, vigor, independence, virtue and loyalty, in 1920, the census revealed that Jefferson’s beloved “yeoman farmers” were a minority: for the first time in American history, a majority of Americans lived in cities, not on farms. Ironically, this decade would also produce an icon of many small, rural towns (particularly in the south): the Ruritan Club.

Emblematic of the tensions that can arise when societies undergo rapid transformation, in the small Nansemond County, Virginia village of Holland, Jack Gwaltney, Holland High School’s agriculture teacher, observed a troubling trend when talking to parents: rising hostility between the residents of Holland and the farmers surrounding Holland. ““It was a farming area with a little city in it, with livestock running wherever they wanted to go.... The town people who were trying to maintain their nice, pretty yards didn’t appreciate cows and pigs running through.””¹¹⁷ Gwaltney and his supervisor on the school board, Tom Downing, convened a meeting of local citizens to resolve the conflict before it could escalate. This new organization, first chartered over a dinner meeting in the Holland Hotel on the evening of May 21, 1928, would encompass a broad cross-section of Holland’s citizenry (women *excluded*¹¹⁸). One woman was in attendance that evening: Daisy Nurney, a reporter from the nearby Norfolk *Virginian-Pilot*, who had been invited by the organization to cover the meeting. Nurney was asked to provide a name for the new organization. To symbolize the organization’s union between residents of both the town and the country, Nurney combined the Latin “*ruri*,” for “open country” and “*tan*,” for “small town” to create the name “Ruritan.” The assembled men unanimously adopted Nurney’s proposal and have taken the Ruritan ideals of “Fellowship, Goodwill and Community Service” to 17 states in the subsequent 81 years.

Today, the Ruritan Club boasts 32,000 members in approximately 1,200 local chapters from New York to Florida and Kansas.¹¹⁹ Unlike many other national service organizations, local

¹¹⁶ John P. Kaminski, ed., “Agriculture,” *The Quotable Jefferson*, (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press), 2006, 9.

¹¹⁷ Denise Watson Batts, “What’s In a Name? Ruritan, Suffolk,” [Norfolk, VA] *Virginian-Pilot*, 9 February 2009 <<http://hamptonroads.com/2009/02/whats-name-ruritan-suffolk>> (3 May 2009).

¹¹⁸ Females would not be allowed to join the Ruritan Club until 1978.

¹¹⁹ “The Ruritan Organization,” < http://ruritan.org/2_about_ruritan.php > (3 May 2009).

Ruritan chapters enjoy a wide degree of latitude from the club's national organization. The club's website states that "each club surveys its own community as to the needs of that community and then works to meet some of those needs."¹²⁰ For some chapters, like the original chapter in Holland, Virginia, this included hosting barbecue dinners to raise money to buy school lunches for the children of low income families. Other Ruritan chapters sponsor local Boy (and/or Girl) Scout troops, 4-H clubs or Future Farmers of America chapters.¹²¹ Sometimes, as is the case with the Moneta Ruritan Club, the projects undertaken can fill voids in the area.

"Ruritan" Comes to Moneta

The Moneta Ruritan Club, ironically enough, has its origins on the campus of Virginia Tech. In 1946, a 22 year-old Moneta native, Calvin Woodford, who had been discharged recently from naval service during World War II, enrolled at Virginia Tech (when it was still known as Virginia Polytechnic Institute, or "V.P.I.") to study Poultry Husbandry. Woodford's roommate, Griffin Hardy, was studying agriculture. When the pair was graduated in 1950, Hardy moved to Moneta to accept a position teaching agriculture at Moneta High School. While studying agriculture at V.P.I., Hardy learned about the Ruritan Club movement that was thriving in the small farming villages of the Commonwealth and brought that knowledge with him to Moneta. Four years later, on May 17, 1954, Hardy, Woodford and 35 other male Moneta residents chartered the Moneta Ruritan Club. Their ranks included farmers, salesmen, merchants and a Baptist minister, among others.¹²²

To Watson, the last charter member to remain active in the chapter, the Moneta Ruritan Club took on a greater role in Moneta's civil society than anyone perhaps expected: "I always felt the Ruritan Club was like a town council because it was responsible for so many projects in Moneta." One of its first projects was the formation of a volunteer fire company. Raising money in the Moneta area, the Ruritans purchased a fire truck, constructed a simple cinder-block firehouse

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, Batts.

¹²² Under the bylaws of the Ruritans' National Organization, one-third of all members of a local chapter had to be farmers. This rule almost certainly prevented the local chapters from being controlled entirely by the local elites who traditionally controlled localities.

in “downtown” Moneta across from Hanford Watson’s store that would remain in use through the late-1990s and volunteered as fire fighters. Woodford himself served as fire captain for a number of years. During the early years of the Cold War, the Ruritans also constructed and manned an award-winning civil defense post just outside Moneta that was one of a series in the area to track low-flying enemy aircraft.

Not all of the Ruritans’ projects were as critical as the fire company or the civil defense post. When members noticed that the old brick sidewalks at Moneta High School were settling such that they would fill with water after a rain, the Ruritans mixed and poured concrete on top of the existing brick sidewalks. Woodford notes that when Ruritans observe a problem in the village, they bring it up in a meeting, and this might initiate some action from the chapter.¹²³ Perhaps the two most significant achievements of the Moneta Ruritan Club involve the creation of the Moneta Medical Center, Inc., and the construction of the Moneta bypass.

Moneta Medical Center, Inc.

During Tocqueville’s travels around the United States in the 1830s, he observed the tendency of Americans to form associations to tackle every problem that arises—including access to medical care: “Americans of all ages, all conditions, all minds constantly unite. Not only do they have commercial and industrial associations in which all take part, but they also have a thousand other kinds...Americans use associations to give fêtes, to found seminaries, to build inns, to raise churches, to distribute books, to send missionaries to the antipodes; in this manner they create hospitals, prisons, schools.”¹²⁴ In this manner, too, the Moneta Ruritan Club created the Moneta Medical Center, Inc.

Dr. Sam Rucker, Jr., affectionately known throughout Bedford County as “Dr. Sam,” was born in Moneta in 1905 to the village’s doctor, Sam Rucker, Sr. Having matriculated at both Randolph-Macon College and the Richmond Medical College, the younger Dr. Rucker returned to Moneta to practice medicine after his father’s unexpected death in 1931. For most of the next 45 years, Dr. Rucker examined patients in a small, one-room office on the lawn of his Edwardian-era

¹²³ Calvin Woodford, interview by author, Moneta, VA, 1 May 2009.

¹²⁴ Tocqueville, 489.

home near downtown Moneta. Dr. Rucker never married, instead devoting countless hours to the medical care of the Moneta area. Cars would often line his driveway as early as six a.m., waiting for him to open his office. His services were frequently performed *pro gratis*, even while incurring great personal expense.¹²⁵ Dr. Rucker's diagnostic abilities are the stuff of local legend; without the assistance of advanced equipment or a pathology lab, he was able to diagnose a variety of medical conditions on the basis of a few direct questions, the color of one's eyes or the feel of one's chest while breathing. All of this, combined with his love and active support of Moneta High School athletics, endeared him to the village. When his cars started to age, the Moneta Ruritan Club would solicit money from Dr. Rucker's grateful patients to buy the doctor a new car and then *force* him to take it as a token of the village's appreciation for his hard work and dedication.

Having suffered multiple strokes and on the verge of blindness, by the mid-1970s, it was becoming obvious that Dr. Rucker would be unable to continue practicing medicine and, unfortunately, there were no other doctors in the village to replace him: once Dr. Rucker retired or passed away, Moneta and, by extension much of southern Bedford and eastern Franklin counties, would be without ready access to medical care. As it had with so many projects in the past, the Moneta Ruritan Club decided to find a solution to the problem vexing the village.

What may have started as a simple search for a new doctor became more ambitious after the Ruritan Club decided to improve the quality and array of medical services offered to Moneta residents. With the assistance of the National Health Service Corps (NHSC), the Ruritans brought Dr. David Brechtelsbauer to Moneta from Michigan in 1975. Independent of the NHSC, however, the Moneta Ruritans envisioned a medical complex in the village housing multiple doctors and a pharmacy. The Ruritan Club raised money from Moneta residents to purchase a house and seven acres of land across Route 122 from Moneta Elementary School. This house became the first Moneta Medical Center.

The Ruritans provided the impetus to create the Moneta Medical Center, Inc., a Moneta-based non-profit organization charged with ensuring medical care in the village, and even provided many of the organization's board members. The next project was to construct a new medical

¹²⁵ Dr. Rucker logged more than 350,000 miles on his Model-A Ford making house calls throughout Moneta and other surrounding unincorporated areas of Bedford and Franklin Counties.

facility for Moneta. Receiving no financial assistance from the NHSC, the Ruritan Club and Moneta Medical Center, Inc., turned to the community for support. The Moneta residents responded by donating time, money and talent to the construction of a new, larger clinic on the seven-acre tract the Ruritans purchased in 1976. Looking back on the Ruritans' efforts, Calvin Woodford said that this is the project he is perhaps proudest of. Today "[w]e have one of the best medical facilities in any rural community—a medical clinic with five doctors, a pharmacy, a dentist and a physical therapist all in the same building. Even today it is still owned by the community."¹²⁶

Moneta Bypass

As it was with the fire department and the medical center, the Moneta bypass was envisioned in response to a problem observed by members of the Ruritan Club. The Virginian Railroad came to Moneta in 1908 and with it almost certainly came the promise of a quicker and easier method of transporting crops (and people) from the farms around Moneta to the markets in Bedford, Lynchburg, Richmond and beyond. Interestingly, though, by the 1980s, the railroad crossing in Moneta was becoming problematic: traffic was getting heavier along Route 122—especially on weekday mornings as workers were commuting to jobs in Bedford, Roanoke and Lynchburg—and a train passing during these critical hours could cause a long delay for commuters and significant congestion along Moneta's main thoroughfare. To make matters worse, when a fire truck or an ambulance had to make a call, waiting for a train to pass could cost critical time, and potentially a life. On Sunday, January 9, 1977, that is exactly what happened.

Mr. and Mrs. Mark Davis left their house, just a few feet north of the railroad crossing, to pick up a few quick items from Ross's Store across the street. Since they thought they would only be gone for a short time, they left their 19 month-old baby, Mark Anthony Davis, Jr., at home alone. While they were gone, a fire ignited in the house, quickly engulfing it. Someone called the fire department, but, due to the smoke and heat, neither the Davis's nor their concerned neighbors were able to enter the burning house to rescue the baby. Just as the Moneta Volunteer Fire Department assembled a crew to extinguish the house fire, a train approached the Moneta crossing.

¹²⁶ Woodford, 2009.

The fire fighters had to wait helplessly just a few feet south of the crossing as the fire destroyed her home and took the life of Mark Davis, Jr. Discussions about the construction of a railroad overpass had been going on since at least 1965, but it was not until that Super Bowl Sunday that according to Glenn Ayers, political momentum in the village shifted in favor of the overpass; a grade crossing was no longer acceptable for the village's residents.¹²⁷

The Moneta Ruritan Club had tackled safety problems involving Moneta's railroad crossing before. In 1954, one of the club's first projects was to press the Virginian Railway to install safety lights at the crossing. Perhaps not unsurprisingly, the Ruritans now saw what they perceived to be a major safety issue at the crossing—an issue only exacerbated by increased traffic flow to and from the residential subdivisions and marinas south of Moneta. They decided to spearhead the movement to persuade the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) to build the overpass.

Before VDOT would even consider the overpass, however, the Ruritan Club had to demonstrate that this improvement was necessary. In March and June 1989, the club conducted week-long traffic counts.¹²⁸ Calvin Woodford remembers members taking shifts sitting in the back of trucks parked near the railroad crossing 24 hours a day for a seven-day period. They continued the counts in 1990, finding that an average of 6,455 cars per day passed over the crossing. These counts were then forwarded to VDOT, which conducted its own study in 1991 – 92.¹²⁹ After four years of study, planning and community meetings, the Commonwealth Transportation Board approved construction of the overpass—and an accompanying 1.8-mile bypass of downtown Moneta—on August 17, 1995. Construction commenced one year later.

Initially, it appeared that the Ruritan Club had won another great victory for the village they desired to improve, but unbeknownst to them as they were promoting the project was an agreement made between VDOT and the Norfolk Southern Corporation¹³⁰ to close the railroad

¹²⁷ Glenn Ayers, interview by the author, Moneta, VA, 3 May 2009.

¹²⁸ "Ruritans Win Award for Counting Traffic," *Roanoke Times & World News*, 23 February 1990, B2.

¹²⁹ "Moneta Car Counter to Send Tallies to State," *Roanoke Times & World News*, 13 July 1990, SMT-8.

¹³⁰ The Virginian Railway (which owned the tracks in downtown Moneta) merged with the Norfolk & Western Railway in 1959. Norfolk & Western then merged with the Southern Railway in the 1980s to form the Norfolk Southern Corporation.

crossing to automotive traffic two years after the bypass opened to motor traffic, essentially placing downtown Moneta at the end of two cul-du-sacs.¹³¹ Downtown merchants, like antique-shop owner Steve Williamson, feared that, by obstructing through-traffic in Moneta's downtown business district, the closure would "...kill our little town...." To preserve the vibrancy of downtown, the Ruritans now found themselves fighting their former allies to keep the crossing open; they attended meetings of the Commonwealth Transportation Board, private citizens contacted Moneta's representatives in the U.S. House and the Virginia House of Delegates, and the Bedford County Board of Supervisors *twice* voted not to endorse the closure, but all to no avail.¹³² The bypass opened to traffic in the summer of 1998 after a ribbon-cutting ceremony attended by U.S. Rep. Bob Goodlatte and other local officials. Two years later, VDOT quietly erected large barriers and "Road Closed" signs at the railroad crossing.¹³³ Ultimately, the Moneta Ruritan Club was victorious in its decade-plus-long quest for a railroad overpass, but by 2000, its victory appeared Pyrrhic.

Analysis

Promoting the bypass was the Moneta Ruritan Club's last major project; however, it remains highly visible in the civic life of the village. Every year members of the Moneta Ruritans pick up trash around Moneta Elementary School, maintain the landscaping around the firehouse, host three fundraising breakfasts and a spaghetti supper, help set up computers at the village's schools and maintain and award the C. Eldred Mauldin Scholarship¹³⁴ for a graduating senior at nearby Staunton River High School. These are important tasks that make life in Moneta easier (not to mention more aesthetically pleasing), but on the scale of tracking Soviet fighter jets, protecting homes from fires or lobbying a state agency for a new traffic pattern through the

¹³¹ Richard Foster, "Smith Mountain Lake Road to Get \$6.6 Million Bypass," *Roanoke Times & World News*, 18 August 1995, B3.

¹³² Harrington, A4.

¹³³ "It's Officially Closed!" *The Lake Bullet* (Bedford, VA), 18 September 2000.

¹³⁴ The Mauldin scholarship memorializes the life and work of C. Eldred Mauldin, an educator, former principal at Staunton River High School and longtime member of the Moneta Ruritan Club. The scholarship's original endowment was collected from businesses and individuals in the Moneta area by the Ruritans between 1990 and 1991.

downtown business district, pulling weeds from the shrubbery at the firehouse is low-key work. What explains this change in the regular activities of the Ruritan Club? While it appears to be the product of development, that explanation alone is insufficient; development does play a role in the changes experienced by the Moneta Ruritan Club, but not in the ways I had expected. Perhaps a better explanation would include an aging membership, lower rates of participation amongst younger generations, modernization *and* development.

When the Moneta Ruritan Club convened its first meeting on May 17, 1954, the 37 men who were the club's first members were young—many of them, like Calvin Woodford, were part of “the Greatest Generation”; their lives had been shaped by the Great Depression and two world wars. They were accustomed to hard work, communal effort and a sense of duty. As boys on the farms of Moneta, they learned the necessity of self-reliance and the value of team work. As adults on the battlefields of Europe and the Pacific, they learned dedication and commitment to a cause greater than self. These men, farmers, businessmen, educators, ministers—upstanding citizens and pillars of the community—implemented these lessons by organizing a civic group that would improve the quality of life in their beloved village.

Maintaining such an organization during its early years was relatively simple. To employ Putnam's terminology, the Moneta Ruritan Club was at once a bonding and a bridging organization: bonding in the sense that it united similar types of people, bridging in the sense that it united people from different occupations and educational backgrounds. Yet, despite their differences, these members, like Calvin Woodford, were all “natives” of Moneta or, like Griffin Hardy, southerners roughly conversant with the southern culture shared by Moneta's residents. Five decades later, Woodford estimates that 70 to 80 percent of the Moneta Ruritan Club's membership was either born or lived outside of Moneta. In fact, Woodford, notes, “Some had never even heard of the Ruritans before moving here.”¹³⁵ This, however, has not stopped these newcomers from assuming leadership roles within the organization and from having a sense of ownership in the club. The list of 2009 committee assignments reveals transplants involved with every committee.

Based upon the nostalgic sentiments of native Monetans like Hanford Watson, one might be inclined to believe that this influx of new members could cause tension to rise within the

¹³⁵ Woodford, 2009.

organization; interviews of active members of the Moneta Ruritan Club suggest that that has *not* been the case. Billy Tuck, a farmer, former Bedford County School Board Member and 15-year member of the Moneta Ruritan Club, had nothing but praise for his fellow Ruritans: “You couldn’t ask for a finer group of people to be together.”¹³⁶ He continued by observing that the transplants are among the hardest working members of the Moneta Ruritan Club, because they tend to have more spare time to dedicate to community service. Tuck’s sentiments were echoed by Moneta’s representative on the Bedford County Planning Commission, Lynn Barnes—himself a transplant to the Smith Mountain Lake-area—who argued, from personal observation, that transplants tend to be well-educated retirees with work experience in industries that require active participation in workplace affairs and encourage civic engagement outside the office.¹³⁷ So conflict was perhaps averted because the new Ruritans do their “fair share” of the work within the organization. Nonetheless, Woodford has observed a difference in the style and priorities of non-native Moneta Ruritans, but mentioned another important factor: even if the natives had a disagreement with the transplants, “...there’s not enough of us to cause problems.”¹³⁸

Perhaps the best example of the native-born Ruritans accepting change came with the election of the club’s first female president in 1999. Frankie Puckett has taught remedial reading classes at Moneta Elementary School for 17 years. Her work has made her a familiar face to countless alums of Moneta Elementary School, and it also introduced her to the Moneta Ruritan Club. Not long after arriving in Moneta, Puckett lobbied Bedford County’s school superintendent for money to teach after-hours adult education classes in Moneta. She operated a similar program in a different school with impressive results and wanted to continue her work in her new school. After it was approved by the superintendent, Moneta principal Al Vincent, himself a member of the Moneta Ruritan Club, invited Puckett to present a proposal for the Ruritan club to sponsor adults wishing to take the Graduation Equivalency Degree (GED) exam, but who are unable to afford the examination fee. Her presentation so impressed the Ruritans that Puckett was invited to join the club. She was not the first female member, but in 1999, she was approached by another member about becoming president. Puckett accepted and became not only the Moneta Ruritan Club’s first female president, but also the first president in the club’s (then) almost 50-year history

¹³⁶ Billy Tuck, interview by author, Moneta, VA, 3 May 2009.

¹³⁷ Lynn Barnes, interview by author, Huddleston, VA, 3 May 2009.

¹³⁸ Woodford, 2009.

to use an agenda at meetings. Interestingly, although Puckett enacted multiple reforms to the relaxed, “country” atmosphere at the club’s monthly meetings, she experienced no animosity from other members.

Ruritan Club meetings are divided into three parts: a meal, a presentation from some speaker or entertainer and a business meeting. Each part is not scheduled to last longer than 30 minutes, but that does not mean that any part—especially the business meetings—cannot extend beyond the allotted time. Such was the case before Puckett introduced an agenda at the first meeting over which she presided. The other members accepted the agenda without complaint and after that first meeting one Ruritan even complimented Puckett on the organization and business-like atmosphere she brought to meetings. That year, Puckett also required the members to document every minute they spent on community service projects. Puckett collected these monthly tallies at every meeting, compiled them and submitted them to the national organization. That year, the Moneta Ruritan Club won an award for the number of community service hours its members accumulated together.¹³⁹

Puckett’s presidency almost appears to have been to the Moneta Ruritan Club what Theodosius’s reign was to the Roman Empire. Not long after her presidency, the club quit hosting its largest annual fundraiser, “The Picnic on the Lawn.” The Picnic was held annually in August on the grounds of Moneta Elementary School; serving country ham biscuits and barbecued chicken, it attracted large crowds from the areas surrounding Moneta and even many state and local officials and other dignitaries. By the time of Puckett’s presidency, however, the Ruritans were having difficulty hosting The Picnic: the combined effects of an aging and dwindling membership made the necessary planning and work difficult. Calvin Woodford estimated that the youngest member of the Moneta Ruritan Club was at least middle-aged—an estimation confirmed by Frankie Puckett. Thanks in part to their retired (or, in the case of some members, semi-retired) status, the older Ruritans have more time to devote to their civic involvements; however this abundance of spare time is often mitigated by other commitments (other civic associations, religious institutions, etc.), family obligations and health issues. Additionally, the size of the club is decreasing: Puckett estimates the club’s current membership is 25; one decade ago, the club’s membership was approximately 40. With fewer members—almost all of whom are over the age of

¹³⁹ Frankie Puckett, interview by author, Huddleston, VA, 3 May 2009.

65—and no recent infusion of new, younger members, the Moneta Ruritan Club lacked the staffing to continue hosting the Picnic.¹⁴⁰ Today, the Ruritans finance their projects through a series of smaller, less time-consuming fundraising meals, including pancake breakfasts (one of which is held across South Old Moneta Road from Moneta Elementary School—an electoral precinct—on the morning of Election Day) and a spaghetti supper.

One of the more telling anecdotes related to the demise of The Picnic involves the Moneta Ruritan Club’s famous country ham biscuits. Every year in advance of the The Picnic, the male Ruritans would ask their wives and other women in the Moneta area to bake biscuits that would then be stuffed with country ham and sold at The Picnic. As the years passed, fewer and fewer volunteers were physically able to bake dozens of biscuits. Increasing numbers of local women did not even know *how* to make biscuits—long a staple of rural cuisine. Ultimately, the Ruritans were unable to continue relying on donated biscuits and had to purchase frozen biscuits. Purchasing these frozen biscuits reduced both their already limited time and their profit margin, thus contributing to their decision to discontinue The Picnic.¹⁴¹

Perhaps the most significant factor affecting the Moneta Ruritan Club is a product of development, but not development itself. During its heyday, the Moneta Ruritan Club was the central player in the civic and political life of the village and its environs. As described in the above examples, the club was either directly responsible for or a major contributor to (both in terms of membership and funding) community-improvement projects. This intense involvement prompted Calvin Woodford to compare the Moneta Ruritan Club to an unofficial governing body. As Smith Mountain Lake grew, the center-of-gravity in the Moneta area shifted south from the village to the housing subdivisions of Smith Mountain Lake. This shift only accelerated after the Norfolk Southern Corporation closed the railroad crossing, eliminating all through-traffic in downtown Moneta, effectively killing the village-proper as the remaining downtown merchants closed their businesses or relocated to new locations along Route 122. Without a “community center”—as downtown Moneta had long been—Moneta residents no longer had a symbol that bound them together in Burke’s “transcendent partnership”; traffic bypassed the village and as local radio host Timothy Ernanides wrote: “...many newcomers [are] not even aware of the

¹⁴⁰ Puckett, 2009.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*

village's storied past...."¹⁴² Meanwhile, the old Meador-Watson Store, which local historian Ben Martin referred to as the "grand old lady of Moneta," once the focal point of the village (and the set of the 1994 movie *What About Bob?*), now vacant, was falling into disrepair.¹⁴³

Historically, Moneta High School was the focal point of life in the village. Today, with a smaller percentage of Moneta residents having children enrolled in school, Moneta's two schools have lost some of their former salience to the village. As both Calvin Woodford and Frankie Puckett observed, Bedford County's decision to consolidate its public high schools in the mid-1960s had a deleterious effect on the role of the village high school as a community center. Prior to the consolidation, each of Bedford County's major villages (e.g., Moneta, Huddleston, Forest, Boonesboro, Montvale) had its own public high school serving grades one through 12 and fielding its own athletic teams. Athletic rivalries quickly developed between neighboring villages and, Woodford reminisced, these rivalries encompassed more than simply the student body: these rivalries extended beyond the campus of the community high school and throughout the surrounding village. A game between two fierce intracounty rivals would attract large crowds and great interest from both villages. These contests truly reinforced one's loyalty to his or her village. These rivalries were slow to die after many of these rival village high schools were consolidated.¹⁴⁴

Frankie Puckett observed that vestiges of these village rivalries still existed as late as the early-1990s, but today almost nothing remains of those once-vigorous rivalries as many of today's students are the children of parents who did not attend the defunct village high schools; to them, alums of the consolidated high schools, living in Moneta is no different than living in Huddleston, Stewartsville, or any of Bedford County's other unincorporated areas.¹⁴⁵ As a consequence of this consolidation, Woodford notes that the individual village elementary schools no longer have the same unifying quality that they once did. The three central county high schools, because they serve multiple villages, are not really iconic for any particular village, at least not in the way the old village high schools were. Without these shared symbols of Moneta, the individuals and

¹⁴² Timothy Erlandes, "What About 'Old Town' Moneta?" *Discover Smith Mountain Lake Magazine*, July – October 2008, 17.

¹⁴³ Ben Martin, *The Images of America: Bedford County*, (Charleston, S.C.: Arcadia, 2008), 10.

¹⁴⁴ Woodford, 2009.

¹⁴⁵ Puckett, 2009.

families who live in the Moneta zip code had to look beyond the village for unifying symbols. They found one in Smith Mountain Lake.

By the early-2000s, village life gave way to lake life. Moneta High School was replaced by the regional Staunton River High School in September 1963.¹⁴⁶ The prime focus of Moneta residents was no longer improving life in the village and its immediate environs. Just as Tocqueville observed that village residents want to see their village succeed because it is theirs and they have a stake in its success, Moneta residents who live on Smith Mountain Lake had a stake in the success of the lake¹⁴⁷; their property values depend on it, plus the lake is a source of pleasure: they fish on it, boat on it, swim in it and simply enjoy the views of it—they have a compelling interest in keeping the lake safe, clean and beautiful. To actualize these goals, Moneta’s lake residents have joined with lake residents from other villages (and even from other counties¹⁴⁸) to form lake-specific organizations like the Smith Mountain Lake Association, the Smith Mountain Lake Chamber of Commerce and the Tri-County Lake Administrative Commission. These organizations have taken an active role in encouraging smart growth around the lake, promoting safe boating practices, identifying and eradicating invasive aquatic vegetation, removing litter and other debris from the lake and moderating public forums on development and American Electric Power’s proposed shoreline management plan.

Improving the village-proper of Moneta is no longer the foremost concern of most of Moneta residents; improving Smith Mountain Lake is and that, as Calvin Woodford observed, is forcing a change. The Moneta Ruritan Club is no longer the primary impetus for change in contemporary Moneta; it is but one of many community-improvement associations in an increasingly pluralistic village. “I always felt the Ruritan Club was like a town council because it was responsible for so many projects in Moneta. That’s not so anymore; there are so many other organizations doing things and taking the lead on other projects.”¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁶ Woodford, 2009.

¹⁴⁷ Tocqueville, 51 – 52.

¹⁴⁸¹⁴⁶ Puckett, 2009.

¹⁴⁹ Woodford, 2009.

Conclusion

Development has indeed affected the Moneta Ruritan Club, though not in the manner I expected. I thought development would bring an influx of new individuals to the Moneta area, many of these newcomers would join existing associations, like the Ruritan Club, and the infusion of outsiders would prompt internal strife between the natives and newcomers. However, I found no evidence to support such an expectation. Instead, I found evidence that the natives and the newcomers are working well together as they attempt to make life easier and more aesthetically pleasing in the village. That is not to say that development is not affecting the Moneta Ruritan Club. It is shifting focus and loyalty from the village-proper to the village's waterfront environs, and with this shifting focus comes the need for new civic associations whose *raison d'être* is focused upon improving the quality of life at Smith Mountain Lake, not in the disappearing village of Moneta. This is not to say that the Moneta Ruritan Club is obsolete or performing unimportant work; to the contrary, the club is a hardy band of concerned residents who continue to volunteer numerous hours to improve the quality of life for those who live and attend school in Moneta. Their only problem is they are an increasingly small band of citizens serving an increasingly small village.

Development is, in many cases, doing to Moneta what the European Union is doing to Europeans: replacing provincial loyalties with a broader, more regional identity. Perhaps Billy Tuck said it best when he chided his fellow native Monetans to accept the reality of Smith Mountain Lake: "The lake is here. We've got to face it and work with it."¹⁵⁰ If this lake-spawned transformation of Moneta is evident in anything, it is the religious life of Moneta: indeed, as Seeger sang, "the times they are a-changin'."

¹⁵⁰ Tuck, 2009.

Chapter 5: *Organs*: Religious Life in Moneta

*“Christianity thinks of human individuals not as mere members of a group or items in a list, but as organs in a body—different from one another and each contributing what no other could.”*¹⁵¹

—C.S. Lewis, *Mere Christianity*

Introduction

To both Burke and Tocqueville, religion is the great civilizer, tempering the base human instincts that would otherwise obstruct the formation of a civil society. No doubt playing on Aristotle’s famous assertion, Burke contends that humans are, by nature, a “religious animal; that atheism is against, not only our reason, but our instincts; and that it cannot prevail long.” When atheism fails and religion bears its fruits, civil society is born, for “...religion is the basis of civil society, and the source of all good and of all comfort.”¹⁵² Complementing Burke’s argument, Tocqueville states that Christianity unified the disparate and “barbarous” peoples of Europe during the Middle Ages under a common civilization.¹⁵³ Even in Moneta, religion played an important role in creating a civil society and a shared culture.

For much of its history, Moneta’s religious population was almost exclusively Baptist or Methodist; it was not until the mid-20th century—particularly *after* the construction of Smith Mountain Lake—that other Christian denominations began appearing in the Moneta area. Today, two of the fastest growing churches in Moneta are Radford Baptist Church (formally established in 1889) and Resurrection Catholic Church (formally established in 1984). The stories of how these churches were formed and how they are responding to the ongoing development around Smith Mountain Lake can be beneficial in understanding the way development is impacting religious life in the village and, as Burke might argue, the civil society of Moneta itself.

¹⁵¹ Lewis, 185.

¹⁵² Burke, 77.

¹⁵³ Tocqueville, 394.

Catholics and Baptists Come to Virginia

The first Catholics arrived in Virginia in 1570. Led by a converted Amerindian named Don Luís, eight Jesuit priests and a young boy left Havana to establish a mission along the York River. Virginia's Jesuit mission lasted only five months before Don Luís and his people massacred the priests.¹⁵⁴ The next Catholics would not settle in the Commonwealth until 1651 when, fleeing persecution in Maryland, Giles Brent was given land in Virginia to establish a settlement for other persecuted Catholics and an edict of toleration from King Charles II. His nephew became the first Roman Catholic office holder in Virginia history when he was elected to a seat in the House of Burgesses in 1688.

Initially, the Baptists did not find Anglican Virginia receptive to its theology, either. Not long after the arrival of the first Baptists in Virginia, Baptist ministers were arrested in Spotsylvania County for preaching in public. Baptists were forced to pay taxes to the Church of England, Baptist services were targeted by mobs and Baptist marriages were not recognized by Virginia's colonial government. A young attorney named James Madison made a name for himself by defending imprisoned Baptist clergy.¹⁵⁵ Neither Catholics nor Baptists would find the degree of liberty that they sought in Virginia until 1786 when Virginia's General Assembly passed the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom, declaring that:

Whereas, Almighty God hath created the mind free...no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burthened [*sic*] in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief, but that all men shall be free to profess, and by argument to maintain, their opinions in matters of Religion, and that the same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge or affect their civil capacities.¹⁵⁶

Although both sects would continue to face *de facto* discrimination (Catholics in particular), *de jure* discrimination would no longer interfere with the religious practices of Virginia's Catholic

¹⁵⁴ James Horn, *A Land As God Made It: Jamestown and the Birth of America*, (New York: Basic Books, 2005), 5 – 8.

¹⁵⁵ Ralph Louis Ketcham, *James Madison: A Biography*, (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 1990), 57.

¹⁵⁶ "The Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom, 16 January 1786," < <http://www.lva.virginia.gov/whatwedo/k12/bor/vsrftext.htm> > (-- May 2009).

and Baptist citizens. It is nonetheless ironic that despite their tumultuous arrival in the Commonwealth, self-professing Catholics and Baptists today form the two largest Christian sects in Virginia, which combined comprise a significant percentage of Virginia's religiously active citizens.¹⁵⁷

The Churches of Moneta

Radford Baptist Church

Although the Church of England was Virginia's official church, the closest Anglican church for the frontier farmers in the Moneta area, Russell Parish, was located about 30 miles away in the county seat of New London.¹⁵⁸ That is not to say, however, that these farmers were unchurched. A small band of Quakers who lived in the vicinity of Moneta petitioned the Crown for permission to assemble on the banks of Difficult Creek in 1756. Presbyterian churches were established in the northern and eastern regions of Bedford County by the Scots-Irish merchants and planters who settled there. Neither the Quakers nor the Presbyterians would make a lasting impact in the Moneta area; Baptists and Methodists—relative latecomers—would dominate religious life in Moneta for more than two centuries, until the construction of Smith Mountain Lake.

The first Baptist congregation in Bedford County was established in 1771 when 20 individuals met near Goose Creek in Moneta under the ministry of Rev. Nathaniel Shrewsbury. Goose Creek Meeting House (later renamed Morgan's Baptist Church), as it was originally known, grew as it reached out to the residents of Moneta, even those who lived on remote farms, well beyond the village's boundaries.¹⁵⁹ Similarly, Bethlehem Methodist Church served Moneta's far-flung Methodist residents. Attending services became challenging when long trips on poorly maintained roads was required. To that end, about a decade after the Civil War, Baptists and Methodists in Moneta's Radford Ford neighborhood began conducting services in their

¹⁵⁷ *U.S. Religious Landscape Survey: Religious Affiliation: Diverse and Dynamic*, (Washington, DC: Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life, 2008), 103.

¹⁵⁸ Lula Jeter Parker, "The Churches of Bedford County," *Parker's History of Bedford County, Virginia*, Peter Viemeister, Ed., (Bedford, VA: Hamilton's, 1988), 49.

¹⁵⁹ Alpha Nance, "Moneta," *Bedford Villages—Lost and Found, Volume III*, (_____: Peaks of Otter Chapter, DAR, 2000), 187.

neighborhood while maintaining their previous affiliations with their respective churches. These services were held in a shop and a school near Radford Ford until 1889, when the Baptists and Methodists formally organized themselves and constructed a Union church on donated land. In perhaps one of Moneta's first acts of ecumenicalism, Radford Church's Board of Trustees was comprised of two Baptists, two Methodists and one outsider. Services were not held in Radford Church during the winter months until a ceiling was installed in 1902. Revivals in 1914, 1931 and 1933 increased the membership of Radford Church as did the ministry of Rev. Hubert L. Cooper.¹⁶⁰

Rev. Cooper, or "Preacher Cooper," as he was known, has been described as "a good preacher and a powerful singer." Yet those qualities were probably not what drew most of the crowds to Radford Baptist Church during his time there; the most interesting elements of Preacher Cooper's life occurred outside the church. When not preaching or singing, Preacher Cooper enjoyed farming, hunting, politics and horseracing. Cooper even spent a number of years representing Moneta on the Bedford County Board of Supervisors. Local historian Glenn Ayers summarized the effects—positive and negative—that Preacher Cooper's recreational activities had on his reputation:

It can be assumed that his various avocations brought him in constant contact with enough fallen angels to form a potential hell's brigade. And, of course, it's because of this that Cooper's reputation suffered. You can't run with fox hunters (not the "tally-ho" kind) and dog traders without rubbing shoulders with a few thieves and scoundrels. You can't race a sulky at the West Virginia State Fair without mingling with gamblers and boozers.

Yet, despite his reputation (or perhaps because of it), Preacher Cooper was able to reach out to a new and different demographic. He was, Ayers notes, the choice of those who did not attend church (or who did so only occasionally) when, getting married or burying a loved one, they needed a minister.¹⁶¹ It was also during his tenure as pastor that Radford experienced its greatest rate of growth since the church's reorganization in 1927.¹⁶²

¹⁶⁰ "History of Radford Church, Moneta, Virginia," (Unpublished Document, Archives, Radford Baptist Church), 1 – 4.

¹⁶¹ Glenn Ayers, "Preacher Cooper," [Untitled Manuscript].

¹⁶² "History of Radford Church, Moneta, Virginia," 3 – 4.

Ayers warns that we cannot know for certain how much of this growth is directly attributable to Preacher Cooper's "unorthodox" outreach efforts; nonetheless, by 1935 the growth of the Baptist congregation at Radford Church, led by Cooper, outpaced the growth of the Methodist congregation and a larger sanctuary was needed to accommodate the crowds. Rather than pay their share of the expansion, the Methodists (who were no longer conducting services in Radford Church) asked the church's Board of Trustees to buy their interest in Radford Church for \$150. The Board of Trustees agreed, the remaining Methodists moved their membership to Bethlehem Methodist Church and the Baptists continued with their plans for expansion. The expansion was completed one year later, but Radford *Baptist* Church did not become a full-time church with a fulltime pastor until 1965.¹⁶³

When Smith Mountain Lake filled to capacity in 1966, the lake came within two miles of Radford Baptist Church. Its proximity to the lake made it convenient for lake dwellers who were Baptists or who were receptive to Baptist theology; this included Methodists, Catholics and an assortment of Charismatic Protestants. On the strength of locals and newcomers like these, Radford Baptist Church continued to grow throughout the late-1960s and into the 2000s, embarking on four separate building projects. Most recently, in 1999 after sustaining tremendous growth, the church constructed a 23,000 square-foot building, making it one of the largest churches in Moneta.¹⁶⁴

Perhaps the greatest irony of the Baptists' history in Moneta is that it is not the oldest church (Morgan's Baptist Church) that experienced such tremendous growth, but Radford, a church that until 1965 was not even considered a "fulltime" church. While the vigorous outreach efforts of Rev. Nick Shaffer during his tenure as pastor (1998 – 2004) no doubt contributed to the growth at Radford Baptist Church, it also appears to be a product of the church's location: situated in such close proximity to Smith Mountain Lake made Radford Baptist Church more convenient for lake dwellers than Morgan's or any of Moneta's other Baptist churches.¹⁶⁵ Furthermore,

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*, 4, 8.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 10 – 15.

¹⁶⁵ There are four Baptist churches in the village of Moneta: Morgan's Baptist Church, Promised Land Baptist Church, Radford Baptist Church and Moneta Baptist Church. The Dwelling Place, a nondenominational church in Moneta, emerged from Radford's congregation in 20007. At least three additional Baptist churches are located within Moneta's 24121 zip code.

Radford fully embraced the contemporary worship music movement at a time when many of Moneta's other Baptist churches were still struggling to reconcile the more traditional preferences of their older members with the contemporary leanings of their younger members. Was this a result of the development around Smith Mountain Lake and the subsequent infusion of new ideas or did Radford grow and change because of its aggressive outreach to the youth of Moneta?

Resurrection Catholic Church

As stated above, by the early-19th century, the Baptists and the Methodists dominated religious life in Moneta. Throughout the 20th century, however, new Christian sects established themselves in Moneta, but all were grounded in the Protestant Christian tradition. There was no native Catholic population in Moneta, or, for that matter, in all of Bedford County. It was not until after the Civil War that the Irish-Catholics who were constructing the railroad came to Bedford (then called Liberty) and brought Catholicism with them. There were not enough Catholics in Bedford to establish a parish until 1874 when Holy Name of Mary was constructed on South Bridge Street. For the next century, Bedford County's Roman Catholics had to make the trip to Bedford to receive Communion.¹⁶⁶ This trip did not prove burdensome until after the construction of Smith Mountain Lake when a small, but vigorous Catholic community began forming in Moneta. In 1978, Pat Marlar, of northern Virginia, moved to the Moneta area with her husband. After spending considerable time in prayer on the dock of her lakefront home, Marlar, who was tired of making the weekly drive to Bedford, asked Father Michael McLaren if he would visit her home and offer Communion to seven families who live around the lake.¹⁶⁷ As more Catholics moved to Smith Mountain Lake, the lake's nascent Catholic congregation quickly outgrew Marlar's makeshift sanctuary. Approximately one year after Father McLaren began celebrating Mass in Marlar's lake house, Moneta's Bethlehem United Methodist Church offered the now 70-person congregation use of its sanctuary in an act that Marlar contends initiated "an ecumenical movement in Moneta."

¹⁶⁶ "History of Holy Name of Mary Roman Catholic Church," *The Heritage of Bedford County Virginia, 1754 – 2003*, (Marceline, MO: Walsworth Publishing, 2003), 51.

¹⁶⁷ Jean Denton, "Resurrection, Moneta: *Reverence, Not Rigidity, at Smith Mountain Lake*," *The Catholic Virginian*, Volume 82 Number 20, 30 July 2007 <<http://www.catholicvirginian.org/archive/2007/2007vol82iss20/pages/parishprofile.html>> (3 May 2009).

Although continuing to grow, the congregation was still too small to have its own priest. Father Daniel Mannen drove from Holy Name of Mary in Bedford to celebrate Mass in Moneta until 1987 when the Moneta Catholics finally were able to complete construction on their own church just south of the village. The Bishop of Richmond, Walter Sullivan, had established a formal parish in Moneta three years earlier and appointed Marlar “pastoral coordinator,” a lay leadership position fulfilling several duties that would otherwise be performed by priests. Under the lay leadership of Marlar, membership at Resurrection Catholic Church continued to increase, outgrowing its 100-seat sanctuary and necessitating expansion by the mid-1990s. Today Resurrection Catholic Church occupies a large, architecturally contemporary structure that can seat as many as 540 individuals; yet it still lacks a full-time priest of its own.¹⁶⁸

Reflecting on the immense growth the 25 year-old parish has experienced, Chris Barrett matter-of-factly stated: “Growth has its challenges.” What he means by that statement has some bearing on the religious life of the entire village of Moneta; before the construction of Smith Mountain Lake, Moneta had no Catholic parish and for that matter, effectively no Catholic residents. Today Moneta is home to one of the Richmond Diocese’s fastest-growing parishes. 505 families were listed in the most recent census conducted by Resurrection Catholic Church, and of those families, Barrett estimates that between 90 and 95 percent of them are transplants from other states (most notably New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts) or from northern Virginia.¹⁶⁹ Somehow—perhaps united by a shared faith and a dedication to a Church that is catholic in every sense of the term—these transplants have come together to create something new and, by all accounts, special in Moneta: a church that is open, inviting, loving and willing to reach out to the Moneta area.

Furthermore, they have created a religious community that lacks continuity and is constantly changing. Unlike Radford Baptist Church with its large youth group and heavy emphasis on youth ministry, Resurrection has only 70 school-age students enrolled in its Faith Formation Classes, indicative of the approximate age of the congregation. Yet because new Catholic families are frequently retiring to Smith Mountain Lake, the parish remains active and vigorous, and the exchange of new ideas and worship styles is endless. Development around

¹⁶⁸ Chris Barrett, interview by author, Moneta, VA, 2 May 2009.

¹⁶⁹ Barrett, 2009.

Smith Mountain Lake created Resurrection Catholic Church and development around Smith Mountain Lake sustains it. Resurrection Catholic Church is rejuvenating itself with a steady stream of new retirees, meaning that in perhaps two or three decades, an entirely new congregation will direct the affairs of the parish. How Resurrection deals with this phenomenon of development may speak to how the Moneta village responds to development and may offer a glimpse into the future of Moneta as development continues to bring new families from different backgrounds and new ideas into the area.

Analysis

Worship

Ever since Martin Luther left the Roman Church, the basic elements of a Protestant worship service have remained essentially unchanged: hymns, prayer, liturgy, sermon. By the mid-to-late 20th century, however, a major development occurred on the U.S. west coast that would shake the foundation of (Western) Christendom: the Contemporary Worship Movement. Characterized by its informality, “free worship,” contemporary (“praise and worship”) music, drama and dance, contemporary worship has been described as relying upon “three power sources: ‘the sound system, the Holy Spirit, and contemporary culture.’”¹⁷⁰ This syncretism of the sacred and the secular has been embraced by many churches within the sphere of evangelical Christianity, but this embrace has not come without controversy: some evangelical leaders, like Charles Colson, have characterized the “praise and worship” music of contemporary worship as “musical mush” with lyrics containing “...zero theological content and [that] could be sung in a nightclub.”¹⁷¹ Despite the raging debate within Christendom, contemporary worship, or “blended worship” (the spiritual equivalent of the “third-way”), is becoming increasingly common in America’s churches. A 1999 study conducted by YOUR CHURCH, a service of the popular Christian magazine *Christianity Today*, found that 62 percent of American churches employ either contemporary or blended worship music in their weekly services. This phenomenon is attributable to the popularity

¹⁷⁰ Tim Keller, “Evangelistic Worship,” <<http://www.redeemer2.com/resources/papers/evangelisticworship.pdf>>, June 2001, (12 June 2009).

¹⁷¹ Charles Colson, “Musical Mush: Are We Impairing Our Capacity to Think?” *Prison Fellowship*, <<http://www.breakpoint.org/listingarticle.asp?ID=713>>, 6 February 2006, (12 June 2009).

of contemporary worship styles amongst teenagers and young adults, who prefer the informality and cultural relevance of contemporary worship to the perceived “elitism” and irrelevance of traditional worship.

In the late-1990s, the pastoral staff at Radford Baptist Church, led by Rev. Nick Shaffer, noticed that a large demographic in the Moneta area was being underserved. Almost without exception, Moneta’s churches were traditional, employing “short, tight services” consisting of some combination of hymns, announcements, offerings and a sermon. Rev. Shaffer saw the 20,000 people who live around Smith Mountain Lake—but who are not regular church-goers—as an untapped resource for growth in the still-small congregation at Radford Baptist Church. To him, incorporating elements of contemporary worship into Radford’s weekly services was a “way to reach a niche that other churches weren’t reaching.”¹⁷²

Once the decision was made to implement a more contemporary worship style at Radford Baptist Church, the church started to experience significant growth. On a typical Sunday, Radford’s attendance averaged 60 to 70; within a five to six year period, the church’s average weekly attendance more than quadrupled to over 300 (the church hosted even larger crowds during the summer months—attributable to tourism—averaging approximately 350). Today, weekly attendance has dipped slightly from its highs in the early-to-mid-2000s, but still averages between 200 and 300. The current pastor, Rev. Bob Odom, describes this 200 – 300 as a combination of three groups: the “homegrowers,” native Monetans who live in off-water (particularly rural or agricultural) areas, middle-aged entrepreneurs, who “either own businesses at the lake or travel” and retirees, primarily from northern states, who have homes on Smith Mountain Lake. Currently, he says, these groups are almost evenly balanced, but he predicts that the number of “homegrowers” will continue to decline as residential development around Smith Mountain Lake continues.

Division over worship style is not a problem that is unique to the Protestant churches. Ever since Pope John XXIV enacted the *Sacrosanctum Concilium*—Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy—in 1963, a debate has pitted the supporters of the Church’s traditional liturgy against proponents of a more contemporary, vernacular liturgy and a more active, engaged laity. These changes were enacted, according to the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, such that “...the Christian people, so

¹⁷² Rev. Bob Odom, interview by author, Moneta, VA, 8 June 2009.

far as possible, should be enabled to understand them [“both text and rites”] with ease and to take part in them fully, actively, and as befits a community.”¹⁷³ Although an ostensibly simple change, to traditional Roman Catholics, the Second Vatican Council had the practical effect of changing what it means to be a Catholic: “From a theological or canonical perspective, none of these changes was revolutionary, but many of them had more dramatic psychological and sociological consequences than the word *reform* suggests. The everyday self-consciousness of Catholics was altered....”¹⁷⁴ American dissenters of the Vatican II reforms compiled a list of their grievances in 1974 that included:

We want the Catholic Mass and the priests of God, not the “Meal” and the updated “Presidents.” We want the organ and the Gregorian Chant, not folk songs and guitars. ... We believe in the Gospel, not Godspell; we adore Christ the Lord, not Jesus Superstar. ... And we want our priests to wear the Roman collar and the cassock, not a tie with a suit. We want to be able to address them as “Father,” not as “Fred” and “Bill.”¹⁷⁵

According to these dissenters, Catholic worship and the very nature of Catholicism itself was so dramatically changed after the Vatican II (and “spirit of Vatican II”) reforms were enacted, that Catholic students—born after the reforms—are ignorant of some practices that, only decades ago, would have been familiar to all practicing Catholics.¹⁷⁶

Since Resurrection Catholic Church was established more than two decades *after* Vatican II convened, the parish was spared the initial upheaval that accompanied some of the reforms; however, preferences for different worship styles might vary as Resurrection unites Catholics from many parts of the nation who ultimately move to the Moneta area. These individuals bring to Resurrection expectations forged by the Catholicism that they knew from their home parishes. Rarely, however, do these differing expectations produce discord. Chris Barrett, Resurrection’s Pastoral Coordinator, observes that the parishioners at Resurrection hold varying opinions on liturgical issues, but are able “adapt quite nicely” to the prevailing worship style at Resurrection. As an example of this adaptation, Barrett cites the pre-service ritual: at some churches, the

¹⁷³ *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, Art. III, §21

¹⁷⁴ Joseph A. Komonchak, “Interpreting the Council: Catholic Attitudes toward Vatican II,” *Being Right: Conservative Catholics in America*, Mary Jo Weaver and R. Scott Appleby, Ed., (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1995), 18.

¹⁷⁵ Komonchak, 27 – 28.

¹⁷⁶ Komonchak, 18.

congregation remains quiet and reflective before services commence; at others, the congregation mingles freely and sometimes loudly. The pastoral staff at Resurrection has sought to combine the two approaches by allowing—even encouraging—visitation prior to services and then, just before the service begins, Barrett approaches the altar and says to the parishioners: “Now that we have visited and recognized Christ’s presence in one another, let us recognize His presence in silence.” Nonetheless, a few parishioners at Resurrection prefer the Latin Mass, but they are a minority. According to Barrett, proponents of the traditional liturgy seek a certain “mystique” in the Latin Mass that they do not believe exists in the English Mass. True to the spirit of the Vatican II reforms, Barrett states that there is enough mystique in the Church already (*e.g.* transubstantiation, the Virgin birth, *etc.*); instead, the Church needs to make the faith more approachable and easier to understand.¹⁷⁷

One aspect of the Vatican II reforms that has been embraced by the parishioners at Resurrection is an increased role for the laity in services. This, however, is as much practical as it is a result of the reforms. Resurrection shares two priests with two other churches: Our Lady of Nazareth in Roanoke and Francis of Assisi in Rocky Mount. Monsignor Joe Lehman and Father Nixon Negparanon share pastoral duties at the three parishes thanks in part to a pastoral shortage in the Diocese of Richmond. In the Diocese, 158 priests must minister to the spiritual needs of a burgeoning flock currently estimated at 223,595. Their work is aided by lay leaders like Chris Barrett, a graduate of Notre Dame’s School of Divinity, who, although married, can perform most of the traditional duties of a priest, including visiting sick and homebound parishioners, performing funerals, delivering homilies, overseeing the administrative functions of the church—everything *except* celebrating the Mass.¹⁷⁸ The congregation of Resurrection has embraced the challenge of operating a church without a full-time priest: Pat Marlar describes Resurrection as “a do-it-yourself church” where the parishioners, largely independent of the Church, have taken ownership in the parish’s ministry and outreach efforts (to be discussed below). A group of volunteers meet at the church every Tuesday to perform maintenance on the church.¹⁷⁹ These efforts are almost entirely staffed, funded and overseen by the laity.¹⁸⁰

¹⁷⁷ Barrett, 2009.

¹⁷⁸ Rob Johnson, “Catholic Priests in Massive Demand,” *The Roanoke [Virginia] Times*, 8 September 2008 <<http://www.roanoke.com/news/roanoke/wb/176055>> (3 May 2009).

¹⁷⁹ Denton.

¹⁸⁰ Barrett, 2009.

Outreach

When asked to define “community,” Chris Barrett said that community is “seeing Christ in one another—especially those in poverty and in need.”¹⁸¹ This definition is probably more appropriate to describe a Christian church than either a geographic area or a political subunit. Nonetheless, forming *this* kind of community is easier said than done, for it requires an understanding that the members of a church are not, as C.S. Lewis observed, “. . .mere members of a group or items in a list, but. . .organs in a body—different from one another and each contributing what no other could.”¹⁸² Such recognition is easier when the members are related, old friends or share a common culture, but when the members are strangers or share a different culture, coming together to form a new body can be a test of faith. How have Radford Baptist Church and Resurrection Catholic Church attempted to come together as one body?

For Radford Baptist Church, the transition from a relatively small, traditional church to a large, contemporary church was not without its challenges. Before the surge in weekly attendance, Radford was a “country church where everyone knew each other and many members were related.” Rev. Shaffer and the young staff that he brought in to assist with the transition were young and *not* native Virginians. As the church grew, newcomers began taking lay leadership roles that had previously been held by longtime members. Some homegrowers initially resisted Rev. Shaffer’s vision. Rev. Odom notes that one of the most visible manifestations of this resistance was a preference for hymnals instead of lyrics projected onto a screen. Ultimately, momentum shifted away from the homegrowers as, what started as an “intentional” effort by the pastor and his staff was soon reinforced by the new congregants who were drawn to Radford by its contemporary worship (many of whom came from contemporary churches in other parts of the United States). The staff attempted to reconcile these differing preferences by opening channels of communication between the divergent camps. Caleb’s Company, a senior ministry, was launched to integrate the church’s retirees with the older middle-aged members. The church’s pastoral staff has also tried to ease the transition by blending contemporary praise and worship songs with

¹⁸¹ Barrett, 2009.

¹⁸² Lewis, 185.

hymns during services, continuing to visit hospitalized members (among other things) in an effort to maintain the kinds of outreach ministries that the homegrowers were accustomed to. These efforts, simple though they may seem, were actually critical to ensure that the homegrowers “don’t feel like outsiders in their own church.”¹⁸³ Nonetheless, some members did feel as if their church had changed too much for them to remain in its fellowship, although the church has no official estimate of how many members actually left for that reason.¹⁸⁴

This transition is perhaps best illustrated by the two sanctuaries that sit adjacent to one another just off Radford Church Road in Moneta. On the east, is a small, white frame sanctuary with stained-glass windows (which the staff calls “the chapel”); on the west is a large brick sanctuary, with clear windows, that is surrounded by professional landscaping. To Rev. Rich Hart, Radford’s Pastor of Youth and Families, this change is indicative of the shift from the rural Moneta of the homegrowers to the increasingly suburban Moneta of the young entrepreneurs and the retirees. Radford Baptist Church “reflects, in a unique way, what the lake has become.” Rev. Hart is, himself, a reflection of what Smith Mountain Lake is becoming. A native of New York, Rev. Hart moved to Florida as a child where he grew up and, after attending college in Pennsylvania, returned to become a youth pastor at his childhood church. After 18 years at this church, he realized that he wanted his seven year-old young son to grow up in a slower-paced, more family-oriented area. By coincidence, an opportunity to invest in development property in nearby Franklin County in 2006 brought Rev. Hart and his family to central Virginia.

Although Rev. Hart had no prior experience in real estate development, the opportunity to make a profit subdividing farmland that could be purchased for the approximate cost of one 80-foot by 100-foot lot in Florida was highly attractive. Ultimately, though, the cooling housing market prevented Rev. Hart and his associates from proceeding with their plans. Far from being bitter, Rev. Hart is now grateful that the project did not go forward. The time he has spent living and working in the Moneta area has taught Rev. Hart to appreciate the beauty of the rural landscape that can still be found in some areas near Smith Mountain Lake. Soon he no longer saw the land’s development potential, but instead saw its rustic beauty and allowed it to “stir his heart.” In a rural environment, he says, “people reconnect with the question of ‘what was I made for?’”

¹⁸³ Odom, 2009.

¹⁸⁴ Rev. Rich Hart, interview by author, Moneta, VA, 8 June 2009.

The hurried, materialistic nature of 21st century American culture, he believes, fills our lives with so much activity that the modern (or perhaps *postmodern*) individual has little time to reflect on such questions or to develop his or her relationships with God and his or her fellow humans. To Rev. Hart, one of the most important functions that the 21st century Church has to offer is as relationship facilitator—among families, between neighbors and neighborhoods—and that is the perspective that Rev. Hart has brought into his ministry as Pastor of Youth and Families.¹⁸⁵

After spending 18 years as a youth pastor in Florida, Rev. Hart did not plan to work as a youth pastor when he and his family moved to the Moneta area, but eventually he was asked to join the pastoral staff at Radford Baptist Church. Since joining the staff, Rev. Hart has decided to expand his position's traditional focus beyond just the youth and instead to focus on how to build relationships across the generational lines that sometimes divide congregations. In a church that is still experiencing growing pains from its sudden growth, building and developing relationships is critical, too, if as Radford's senior pastor, Rev. Odom, says an important goal is to ensure that congregants "don't feel like outsiders in their own church." To Rev. Hart, relationships are what make churches; however, one of the first challenges he faced was that many members of his high school-aged youth group were home-schooled, did not even participate in recreation-league sports and otherwise had little contact with the Moneta community. Since he was accustomed to meeting other youths and their families at high school or recreation league sporting events, he had to engineer a new system for taking his ministry outside the church. One of those ways was to focus on less structured activities in which the church would go out into the community and reach out to the unchurched without feeling that they were being "worked" by the church. Examples of this outreach include a Father's Day picnic at nearby Smith Mountain Lake State Park and Family Fun Nights, held monthly at the church, that include games, "blow ups" and food. These events are completely free, include few (if any) attempts at proselytizing and are "based on an informal 'we're your neighbors'" philosophy. The desire is to build relationships with the unchurched population in and around Moneta through these fun and relaxed activities in the hope that these relationships will then allow people to feel comfortable attending services at Radford Baptist Church.

¹⁸⁵ Hart, 2009.

Resurrection Catholic Church faces many of the same challenges as Radford in terms of creating relationships among people who are relative newcomers to the Moneta area. The primary difference in the two churches is that much of the growth occurring at Radford has been the result of targeted outreach to the youth via contemporary worship, family fun nights, and other activities. Resurrection has grown as a result of the number of families—particularly retired families—moving into the Moneta area.

Led by a belief in salvation through faith and not through works, Protestant churches (particularly evangelical churches) traditionally have deemphasized the principles of the “social gospel.” Starting five years ago, however, Radford Baptist Church developed a relationship with the non-profit Agape Center in an effort to reach out to the residents of Moneta by providing for their material needs. Named after the ancient Greek term for the highest form of love, the Agape Center was born in 2004 when two female members of Radford felt a burden for the underprivileged residents of Moneta. They approached Rev. Odom about helping them start an outreach ministry for these underprivileged neighbors and, from that initial meeting, the Agape Center was organized.¹⁸⁶ When the Agape Center first opened, its two founders served a small number of families from the basement of Radford Baptist Church. Today, the Agape Center, with the assistance of almost 200 volunteers, serves between 230 and 240 families every month from a 12,000 square-foot facility just north of the village. Recently, in an attempt to access more resources, the Agape Center incorporated with two other Moneta-area churches (interestingly, both churches were organized within the past five years).¹⁸⁷

Moneta also is served by Lake Christian Ministries—an ecumenical outreach ministry assisted by multiple congregations in and around Moneta, including Bethlehem United Methodist Church, Resurrection Catholic Church and Trinity Ecumenical Parish (three churches linked by a shared history of ecumenicalism). What distinguishes the Agape Center from Lake Christian Ministries, according to Rev. Odom, is that the Agape Center emphasizes the *spiritual* dimension of assistance.¹⁸⁸ According to its mission statement: the purpose of the Agape Center is “To reflect God’s love by the giving of ourselves and our resources as we submit to the leadership of the Holy

¹⁸⁶ Odom, 2009.

¹⁸⁷ “Local Ministry Incorporated as Nonprofit,” *Bedford (VA) Bulletin*, 29 April 2009, 16A.

¹⁸⁸ Odom, 2009.

Spirit to mentor and help individuals turn or return to a Christ-centered life.”¹⁸⁹ In an effort to fulfill this mission, Rev. Odom and a staff of untrained counselors offer each family that enters the Agape Center an opportunity to receive both spiritual counseling and life coaching. This counseling has been instrumental in helping approximately 10 to 15 families get back on their feet. One family that no longer needs assistance from the Agape Center continues to visit the center because of the positive impact that the counseling had on their lives. Only one individual has ever refused the counseling and, Rev. Odom emphasizes, no one would ever be turned away because of their unwillingness to receive spiritual counseling from the Agape Center’s staff.

Unlike Radford, Resurrection Catholic Church has long engaged in ecumenical outreach in Moneta and around the world. In the early-1990s, when a local group of Lutherans, Episcopalians and Presbyterians decided to organize their own ecumenical church, Resurrection’s parishioners welcomed them into their sanctuary until they were able to construct their own facility. After several of Resurrection Catholic Church’s members visited *Foyer des Filles de Dieu* (Home of the Daughters of God)—a Christian orphanage for girls in Port-au-Prince, Haiti—the church decided to partner with the orphanage by sending monthly contributions and investing in capital improvement projects. Locally, Resurrection, along with other churches and individuals in the Moneta area, contributes to Lake Christian Ministries. Lake Christian Ministries, organized in 1992, is a Moneta-based ecumenical organization that provides support (food, clothing and one annual donation of monetary assistance for rent, medical bills, etc.) for low-income residents of the Smith Mountain Lake-area. Resurrection, in addition to providing volunteers, is also responsible for providing “spaghettio’s, tuna, cereal, and pork and beans”¹⁹⁰ to Lake Christian Ministries. Because Lake Christian Ministries’ restriction on financial assistance makes paying the bills even tougher for some families, Resurrection maintains its own St. Vincent de Paul Society. When a family needs additional financial assistance, the church sends a team of volunteers to the family’s home to meet with them and to discuss their needs before providing them with any assistance. Finally, in addition to hosting a number of community functions in its fellowship hall (including the Moneta Ruritans’ annual pancake breakfast), Resurrection also conducts three annual

¹⁸⁹ “Our Mission,” *The Agape Center* (Brochure).

¹⁹⁰ *Heavenly Hash: The Newsletter of Resurrection Catholic Church*, Volume 17 Issue 1 (February 2009), 11.

ecumenical prayer services with Bethlehem United Methodist Church and Trinity Ecumenical Parish.¹⁹¹

Conclusion

As both Burke and Tocqueville suggest, religious institutions are critical to the establishment of civil society in a nation or a village. It is not only that in religious institutions we are instructed in a practical morality that allows us to coexist peacefully with our neighbors, but religious institutions also play a social role by providing a forum through which we meet our neighbors, see them regularly and receive a common identity. Moneta is no different. From the earliest days of European settlement in Moneta, a Christian church of some sect has functioned in or near the village. As the village's population grew throughout the 19th century, so too did the number of churches, although they were almost exclusively Baptist or Methodist. The construction of Smith Mountain Lake brought an influx of new residents, many of whom were religious practitioners, but not all of whom were Baptist or Methodist. To the established churches, like Radford Baptist Church, that they chose to attend, they brought new ideas for how to worship and how to interact with the wider Moneta area. These ideas were then implemented by pastoral staffs that, increasingly, were not natives to Moneta. This combination of non-native pastors and new members with new ideas helped to give these established churches new identities. Sometimes these new identities have been embraced by longtime members; other times, the longtime members have rejected them. Still others have sought to bring new sects to Moneta, most notably Catholicism, but also Lutheranism (ELCA), Episcopalianism, Presbyterianism (USA) and Seventh-Day Adventism. These churches have won the support of some longtime Monetans who adhere to these sects, but before had to drive to Bedford, Lynchburg or Roanoke to attend services. Most of their membership, however, is comprised of newcomers who were drawn together by Smith Mountain Lake and a shared love for Christ.

Despite whatever differences may divide them, the Christians of Moneta have found a way to come together in their respective churches, create new identities that reflect the changing face of

¹⁹¹ Trinity Ecumenical Parish is the name of the church formed by the union of Moneta's Lutherans, Episcopalians and Presbyterians. Although technically in Moneta (it has Moneta's 24121 zip code), Trinity Ecumenical Parish is located in Franklin County, across Smith Mountain Lake from the village.

Moneta (and of contemporary Christianity, in general) and reach out to their underprivileged neighbors throughout the Moneta area. Together, these disparate people have created, of all unlikely things, a community within their churches. Calvin Woodford, when asked to define community, said that community could be defined in four words: people with common interests. Where people share interests, they will also share an identity, which will, in turn, unite people. “Schools were the center of interest (as well as the churches). Not so anymore. Churches and clubs are what bring people together anymore,” Woodford said.¹⁹² As more retired individuals and households without school-aged children move to Smith Mountain Lake, naturally their ties to the village’s schools are weaker. Without an active village-center (as was the case before the Moneta bypass was constructed), their ties to the concept of the village itself is also weakened. Humans, being the social animals that they are, desire human interaction, and if they cannot find it in the village or in the school, they will find it in the clubs and religious institutions. Moneta is no different. The challenge, then, is to understand how this quest for a sense of place is changing Moneta. In short, it appears that new communities are being formed in the sanctuaries and fellowship halls of Moneta’s churches by blending the longtime residents with the newcomers; old ideas with new ideas. If a longtime resident does not like the transformation of his or her church, he or she can easily attend a different church that might be more to his or her liking.

¹⁹² Woodford, 2009.

Chapter 6: Luxuries: Public Services in Moneta

*“Some things are really necessities of life in some circles...which in others are luxuries merely, and in others still are entirely unknown.”*¹⁹³

—Henry David Thoreau, *Walden*

Introduction

By 1930, a group of southern intellectuals with connections to Vanderbilt University, having witnessed the effect decades of industrialization had had on the United States, concluded that industrialism was an “evil dispensation” that must be discarded. These men, known collectively as the “Southern Agrarians,” preferred that industrialization be replaced with what they termed agrarianism, which they defined in the introduction to their epic manifesto *I’ll Take My Stand* as a belief that “...the culture of the soil is the best and most sensitive of vocations, and that therefore it should have the economic preference and enlist the maximum number of workers.”¹⁹⁴ Not unlike Jefferson almost a century earlier, the agrarians longed for what they perceived as a simpler time—a time uncluttered by surplus commodities, unhurried, predisposed to art and religion and beneficial to the “amenities of life” (*i.e.* “...manners, conversation, hospitality, sympathy, family life, romantic love...the social exchanges which reveal and develop sensibility in human affairs”¹⁹⁵). For better or worse, the Agrarians lost their bid for the hearts and minds of Southerners. Thirty-five years after the publication of *I’ll Take My Stand*, Smith Mountain Lake filled to capacity and a metamorphosis of sorts commenced in Moneta.

As described earlier, until the construction of Smith Mountain Lake, Moneta was a rural crossroads; the village, such as it was, existed only to supply basic provisions to the scattered farms between the Staunton River and the Rocky Mount Turnpike in southern Bedford County.

¹⁹³ Thoreau, 12.

¹⁹⁴ Twelve Southerners, “Introduction: A Statement of Principles,” *I’ll Take My Stand: The South and the Agrarian Tradition*, Susan V. Donaldson, Ed., (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 2006), li.

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, xlvii.

Largely isolated, at least until the arrival of the Virginian Railway in 1908, Moneta was a long, difficult journey to the relatively close cities of Roanoke and Lynchburg. The difficulty of the journey prevented frequent trips into the cities and forced Monetans to become both close and self-sufficient. Billy Tuck reminisced how, during his childhood, “almost everybody had cows or a small farm, a milk cow and maybe a few chickens.”¹⁹⁶ Calvin Woodford remembered his father maintaining a large vegetable garden on his family’s farm during the Great Depression.¹⁹⁷ This self-sufficiency included everything from growing one’s own food to making one’s own clothes; it also included drawing one’s water from a well, disposing of one’s refuse and sewage and expecting little in the way of services from the county government in Bedford.

Today, with perhaps a temporary, recession-driven resurgence of self-sufficiency (which *Wall Street Journal* columnist Peggy Noonan has termed “authenticity chic”¹⁹⁸), the spirit of self-sufficiency that prevailed in Moneta throughout most of its history appears to be waning as more people move to Smith Mountain Lake with an expectation of services that were heretofore unimaginable for a rural county with an agriculturally-based economy. Whether this metamorphosis is the culmination of the Agrarians’ concern over industrialization, modernity arriving in Moneta or a “clash of civilizations” is unknown. What is known for certain is the veracity of Thoreau’s reflection on the true needs of humanity from his time spent at Walden Pond: “Some things are really necessities of life in some circles...which in others are luxuries merely, and in others still are entirely unknown.”¹⁹⁹ Perhaps no statement could better summarize the public discourse on the topic of increased services in post-Smith Mountain Lake Moneta.

The Historical Context

When Governor George Yeardley convened the first session of the House of Burgesses in Jamestown on July 30, 1619, he set in motion a political movement that would invigorate the

¹⁹⁶ Tuck, 2009.

¹⁹⁷ Woodford, 2009.

¹⁹⁸ Peggy Noonan, “Goodbye Bland Affluence,” *Wall Street Journal*, 17 April 2009, <<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB123992073614326997.html>> (22 May 2009).

¹⁹⁹ Thoreau, 12.

North American continent and give the world a rebirth of democracy. It would also, according to V.O. Key, Jr., be the defining moment in Virginia's political history—a moment almost frozen in time. So much so that by 1946, Key described Virginia's political system as a “political museum piece,” dominated by a well-intentioned, albeit undemocratic, oligarchy (that which Aristotle would describe as an “aristocracy”). To Key, this oligarchic rule seemed little changed from the 18th century when, debating the proposed federal constitution, Patrick Henry scoffed at the seemingly unnatural division of power wrought by federalism:

You are not to have a right to legislate in any but trivial cases: You are not to touch private contracts: You are not to have the right of having arms in your own defence [*sic*]: You cannot be trusted with dealing out justice between man and man. What shall the States have to do? Take care of the poor—repair and make highways—erect bridges, and so on, and so on. Abolish the State Legislatures at once. What purposes should they be continued for? Our Legislature will indeed be a ludicrous spectacle—180 men marching in solemn farcical procession, exhibiting a mournful proof of the lost liberty of their country—without the power of restoring it.²⁰⁰

Patrick Henry's concerns notwithstanding, Virginia ratified the constitution on June 25, 1788 and the Commonwealth's government began overseeing the duties it was reserved with solicitude.

This continued essentially unchanged until 1850 when population shifts from Virginia's Tidewater region to the Piedmont prompted a revision to the state constitution. The new constitution of 1850 allowed for the direct election of county justices,²⁰¹ which in turn had two effects: first, by directly electing justices, the county court “...came to reflect more accurately the social and economic structure of the county.” Second, this more accurate reflection of the county brought greater attention to the needs of the county's poor residents and the condition of the county's roadways.²⁰² This system survived the Civil War and the early days of Reconstruction, but was replaced by a board of supervisors with the first postbellum constitution in 1870. This

²⁰⁰ Herbert J. Storing, Ed., “Federal v. Consolidated Government,” *The Founders' Constitution*, Vol. 1, Ch. 8, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), ___.

²⁰¹ Prior to the commission-manager system or even the board of supervisors system, Virginia's counties were governed by the county court. Comprised of a specific number of male citizens elected from districts that were approximately similar in population, the court oversaw not only the functions of county government, but also many other issues that “...touched practically every phase of the life and activities of the people of the county” including issuing business licenses, setting tax rates, overseeing probate and assigning caretakers for the minor children of decedents (Daniel 1985, 9).

²⁰² W. Harrison Daniel, *Bedford County, Virginia, 1840 – 1860: The History of an Upper Piedmont County in the Late Antebellum Era*, (Richmond, VA: University of Richmond Press, 1985), 22 – 23, 26.

constitution did not greatly expand the role of the county government in the provision of services: it provided for a county sheriff, Commonwealth's attorney, clerk/clerk of court, treasurer, superintendent of the poor and a superintendent of schools and, at the township level, a commissioner of roads, but that was all: justice, taxation, poor relief, education and minimal transportation. In comparison with the old county court, the board of supervisors' role was also minimal: it was required to meet only once per year "...to audit the accounts of said county, examine the books of the assessors, regulate and equalize the valuation of property, fix the county levies for the ensuing year, apportion the same among the various townships, and perform other such duties as shall be prescribed by law."²⁰³

All the while, Virginia's political structure remained firmly under the control of the oligarchy well into the 20th century. "...[T]he little oligarchy that rules Virginia demonstrates a sense of honor, an aversion to open venality, a degree of sensitivity to public opinion, a concern for efficiency in administration, and, so long as it does not cost much, a feeling of social responsibility."²⁰⁴ Perhaps most of all, the oligarchy sought to preserve its own power; a feat accomplished by minimizing the size of the electorate and reducing the citizens' expectations of government (a feat, not coincidentally, assisted by the historical libertarianism of Virginians as evidenced by the strength of anti-Federalist sentiment among the Commonwealth's smaller landowners). The political machine of Harry F. Byrd continued this legacy into the mid-20th century and, according to Key, structured itself in such a way as to minimize the risk of losing control. This, however, was not uncommon for the southern states throughout much of their history.

In identifying the dominant American political cultures, Daniel J. Elazar discovered that the so-called "traditionalistic" culture was predominantly located in the southern states. This culture is predicated upon a belief in a natural order, or social structure, which must be preserved through government action. "...[T]he traditionalistic political culture accepts government as an actor with a positive role in the community, but it tries to limit that role to securing the continued maintenance of the existing social order." This requires restricting power to a small group of political elites (not unlike the oligarchy that Key identified in Virginia) and minimizing the role

²⁰³ Virginia Constitution of 1870.

²⁰⁴ V.O. Key, Jr., *Southern Politics in State and Nation*, (Knoxville, TN: University Press, 1984), 19.

played by those who occupy lower strata in the social order. Furthermore, as evidence of the paucity of services offered to the citizens by the counties, Elazar notes that in traditionalistic political cultures “...political leaders play conservative and custodial rather than initiatory roles unless they are pressed strongly from the outside.” Their primary duty is to preserve the existing social order—however necessary—or change it as minimally as possible.²⁰⁵

Development at Smith Mountain Lake occurred in two waves: the first brought residents (predominantly part-time residents) from the Midwest, the Mid-Atlantic states and other parts of Virginia; the second brought residents from the Northeast, particularly from New York, New Jersey and Connecticut—all states that do not share the south’s traditionalistic culture.²⁰⁶ Far from the “organic characteristics of the preindustrial social order,” the newcomers to Bedford County (as was the case in northern Virginia, as well) came from political cultures that do not value any particular social order and that expect more of government than that it simply play a custodial role. To the individualistic culture dominant in much of the Northeast, “...government is instituted for strictly utilitarian reasons, to handle those functions demanded by the people it is created to serve.”²⁰⁷ To the moralistic culture dominant in the upper Midwest, government is a means to the end of establishing a “good society,” thus producing “...a greater commitment to active government intervention in the economic and social life of the community.”²⁰⁸ When these three cultures with distinct views of the nature and role of government converged on the Moneta area, a conflict was almost certain to emerge.

Growth and Demographics

From 1880 (with the first land rush) until 1970, Bedford County’s population remained remarkably steady, varying between a high of 31,213 in 1880 and a low of 26,278 in 1970. Then

²⁰⁵ Daniel J. Elazar, *American Federalism: A View from the States*, 3rd Edition, (New York: Harper & Row, 1984), 118 – 119.

²⁰⁶ Ayers, 2009.

²⁰⁷ Elazar, 115.

²⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 117, 118.

between 1970 and 1980, the county's population leapt to 34,927, a 57 percent increase in just one decade.²⁰⁹ Local historian and former Moneta representative on the Board of Supervisors, Glenn Ayers, stated that there were two distinct phases of development in Moneta: the first, from the late-1960s to the 1980s, primarily brought new residents to Moneta from the Midwest, Mid-Atlantic and other parts of Virginia. The second phase, from the 1980s to the present, brought new residents from the Northeast and other parts of Virginia.²¹⁰ The early wave of development brought county officials angst as they anticipated the imminent increase in services demanded, but these newcomers accepted life in Moneta as it was without agitating for new services.

Throughout the 1980s, 1990s and 2000s as the second wave of development commenced, Bedford County continued to grow at an average decennial rate of 31 percent such that by 2008, the Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service at the University of Virginia estimated the current population of Bedford County at 66,274.²¹¹ Not all of this growth was occurring at Smith Mountain Lake, however. An analysis by the Bedford County Planning Department concluded that the Lakes District (the magisterial district encompassing Moneta and all of Bedford County's lake communities) was actually the second fastest-growing area of the county from the 1980s. The first fastest-growing area was the Jefferson District, adjacent to the City of Lynchburg and the third fastest growing area, the Blue Ridge District, is adjacent to Roanoke County and is convenient to the City of Roanoke. What, then, makes the growth occurring at Smith Mountain Lake significant is not just its rate (it grew by 67 percent between 1980 and 2000), but also its location: Bedford County's other rapidly developing districts are located within a short drive from small metropolitan areas. "Bedford County's location between two urban areas, Lynchburg and Roanoke, had a substantial impact on population growth during the late twentieth-century. ... Bedford County offered a suburban setting close to the area's major employment centers with the added attraction of scenic amenities...."²¹²

²⁰⁹ "Census Counts for Virginia Localities (1790 – 2000)," Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service, <http://www.coopercenter.org/demographics/sitefiles/documents/excel/census2000/historiccensus/historic_census.xls> (27 May 2009).

²¹⁰ Ayers, 2009.

²¹¹ "Total Population Estimates for Virginia Counties and Cities: 2007 Final and 2008 Provisional (Released January 27, 2009)," Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service, <http://www.coopercenter.org/demographics/sitefiles/documents/excel/populationestimates/va_pop_estimates_2008.xls> (27 May 2009).

The development of Smith Mountain Lake during the 1960s also had an impact; Smith Mountain Lake, although equidistant to Lynchburg and Roanoke, is more remote, located in the county's southern tip. People do not come to Smith Mountain Lake to live in a suburban development close to their employers; they come to Smith Mountain Lake to live beside a lake. Furthermore, what distinguishes Lakes District residents from the residents of either Jefferson District or the Blue Ridge District is that the lake residents are generally older and tend to immigrate from states and areas outside of central Virginia. Lynn Barnes, Moneta's representative on the Bedford County Planning Commission—himself a lake resident and a newcomer to the area—describes his constituents as an “interesting mix”: Smith Mountain Lake draws “[m]any retired upper-middle class families...from the business world in northern Virginia and the Northeast.”²¹³ Chuck Neudorfer, Moneta's current representative on the Board of Supervisors, affirmed Barnes's description by stating that the lake residents are largely retired business people from outside central Virginia who “...probably have good educations and have been in jobs that require going to meetings and saying what's on one's mind.”²¹⁴

In fact, both Barnes and Neudorfer are prime examples of the type of people moving to Smith Mountain Lake today; Barnes is a retired vice president of human resources from Ericsson and Neudorfer is a retired special agent with the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Their neighbors, mostly retired as well, include civil engineers, an emergency room doctor, and executives from Verizon, Motorola and Sears. This demography is significant for three reasons: first, as professionals, the newcomers have most likely spent a considerable amount of their lives in either urban or suburban areas and have grown accustomed to an array of public services (like water, sewer, curbside garbage removal) that are generally unavailable in rural areas. Second, their education, profession and/or prior civic engagements provided many of the newcomers with a set of skills that are useful in pursuing a greater assortment of services. Third, since many of these newcomers are retirees, they have an almost unlimited amount of time to dedicate to the causes of their choice. Neudorfer stated that these three factors combine to make Moneta's magisterial

²¹² “History and Demographics,” *Bedford County 2025 Comprehensive Plan*, (Bedford County Planning Commission, 2007), 17.

²¹³ Barnes, 2009.

²¹⁴ Chuck Neudorfer, interview by author, Huddlestone, VA, 4 May 2009.

district unique in all of Bedford County because of the high degree of citizen activism at Smith Mountain Lake.²¹⁵ This activism has contributed to the transformation of Moneta.

Changes Come to Moneta

Far from being the “agrarian Valhalla” that the Southern Agrarians liked to suggest was true of life in the rural South, farm life in Moneta was difficult and progress was slow to materialize. Glenn Ayers notes that with the exception of the deaths of merchants and the subsequent transfer of ownership of their stores, Moneta changed relatively little between his childhood in the early 1940s and around 1975. Billy Tuck, a lifelong resident of Moneta, longtime Ruritan and career farmer bluntly declared: “Most young people wouldn’t be interested in living the old Moneta way. Most people would be moving out, not in, because there would be nothing to do.”²¹⁶

Change eventually came and today there is considerably more to do in Moneta due to a new development called “Downtown Moneta at Smith Mountain Lake,” located on Moneta Road just south of the village, that seeks to resurrect the spirit of old Moneta with the flair of New Urbanism. Its *piece de resistance*, “Celebration Square,” offers residents and visitors alike: “Luxurious townhomes overlooking Main Street with a variety of cafés, shops, restaurants and entertainment just outside your door. So you can grab a cup of coffee on the way to work or pick up dinner on the way home. Run daily errands or join friends for a quick cocktail all within minutes of Smith Mountain Lake.”²¹⁷ Such opportunities for upscale shopping, dining and living in the heart of the village would have been almost unimaginable ten years ago. What happened in that short period of time to so fundamentally change the character of Moneta? The answer, according to Lynn Barnes, is attributable to a change in residential patterns at Smith Mountain Lake.

²¹⁵ Neudorfer, 2009.

²¹⁶ Tuck, 2009.

²¹⁷ “Welcome to Downtown Moneta,” *Downtown Moneta at Smith Mountain Lake*, <<http://www.downtownmoneta.com/>> (28 May 2009).

After a career with General Electric and later Ericsson that took him from upstate New York and Connecticut to Virginia and Florida, Barnes and his wife Linda moved to Smith Mountain Lake in 1989 in search of a community of senior adults where they could also indulge their passion for sailing. When they arrived, Barnes estimates that approximately 70 percent of lake residents were only part-time residents of the Moneta area. Today, Barnes puts the number of part-time lake residents at 30 to 40 percent. One of the factors cited as the primary factor for this increase in the number of full-time residents was the burgeoning economy (driven largely by increasing property values) that the United States enjoyed during the intervening years. So because land was increasingly viewed as a good investment, more people started retiring to Smith Mountain Lake, not simply maintaining vacation homes there as was the case during the first rounds of development in the 1970s and 1980s. Because they were spending more time in Moneta, they wanted the same kinds of services that they had enjoyed where they lived before including public water and sewers, curbside garbage pickup, libraries, professional fire fighters and emergency medical technicians. The most recent addition to this list is widespread access to high-speed Internet service. These requests, explained Bedford County Administrator Kathleen Guzi, are to be expected as areas become more suburbanized. An aging population also has unique needs that will require more services.²¹⁸ Often the need for these services comes as a surprise to the residents.

Kathleen Guzi, who came to Bedford County as a budget analyst in 1986, has watched the county grow and change. Since becoming County Administrator in 2004 (the first female administrator in Bedford County history and the third administrator), Guzi frequently hears requests for curbside garbage pick-up, lawn debris removal and emergency medical services. One of the more interesting comments came from a citizen who was unaware that the county still lacks a professional fire and emergency medical service. When this individual was informed that the county almost exclusively relies upon volunteer services, s/he was surprised: “I didn’t know they still existed!”²¹⁹ This citizen’s reaction is not surprising to Chuck Neudorfer. In his capacity as Moneta Supervisor, he occasionally hears requests for sewer maintenance from people who were unaware that they were on a private septic tank. Some people, Neudorfer theorizes, “...come to an

²¹⁸ Guzi, 2009.

²¹⁹ Guzi, 2009.

area because of aesthetics but don't really understand the [existing] infrastructure."²²⁰ For many residents of Moneta's lake neighborhoods, this is their first experience living in a rural area, and they do not always understand what that entails. Unfortunately, once they discover what they are *not* receiving, they believe they are paying too much in taxes for what they are actually receiving in services from the county. These citizens then come to the county administrator, board of supervisors and/or planning commission requesting services.

Largely in response to pressure from residents in the Moneta-Smith Mountain Lake area, Bedford County has made changes to the smorgasbord of services it offers, include an enhanced parks and recreation department, a library system, a public service authority, some taxpayer-funded fire and rescue personnel and a vigorous planning and zoning department. Glenn Ayers offers a prime example of this growth in services from his own personal experience. When he returned to Bedford County to teach in 1962, the school board, board of supervisors, electoral board, social services, Red Cross, sheriff's department, Bedford City police department and the Bedford City/County museum were all located inside the county courthouse. Today, Bedford County owns numerous buildings in downtown Bedford from which it administers an increasing array of services "to serve an expanding population."

Of those services, Chuck Neudorfer believes the Planning and Zoning Department is the one that benefits the most citizens, even if they do not see any direct benefits. It is also a service that was offered in response to the demands of county residents. Lynn Barnes notes that in multiple surveys commissioned by Bedford County, a majority of the county's residents wanted to protect both the scenery and rural character of Bedford County. In a futile attempt to curb the seemingly runaway development that threatened to jeopardize this rural character, the planning commission developed the Land-Use Guidance System (LUGS). To Barnes, who is currently assisting in the revision of the county's zoning ordinance, LUGS was "pretty much an open book" that allowed almost unfettered development.²²¹ To Glenn Ayers, who as a member of the Planning Commission that drafted LUGS, LUGS was Bedford County's first systematic attempt "...to guide development to areas where population growth could be supported by [infrastructure]." The problem was not with uncontrolled development, but with "...the uncontrolled type of people who

²²⁰ Neudorfer, 2009.

²²¹ Barnes, 2009.

develop. [You] can't stop shysters."²²² In response to an annual growth rate that exceeded the state average, Bedford County adopted a zoning ordinance in 1998. The zoning ordinance has more teeth than did LUGS and it conforms better to the preferences of the county residents as codified in the county's Comprehensive Plan. Nonetheless, it has not stopped the "shysters."

Almost everyone cited "Project A" as a prime example of reckless development, yet it started out with such promise. Spanning over 700 acres in Moneta, "Project A" (also a product of the New Urbanism movement), to be modeled after The Villages in Florida, was projected to integrate residential and commercial development with a golf course. On paper "Project A" appeared to have been well-planned, was being overseen by experienced developers and was described by Lynn Barnes as "an appealing project." The fact that construction on the development would provide steady employment to Moneta's construction industry also was attractive to Bedford County officials. Three years after construction commenced on "Project A," however, the company funding the project filed for bankruptcy. Only seven of the high-end homes slated for construction were ever completed. Today they sit unoccupied in the middle of an empty field overlooking the also-vacant strip mall that was to be the cornerstone of "Project A's" business district.

Ultimately, the demise of "Project A" is attributable to two factors: first, features of the project that would have made it more appealing to potential homebuyers were not installed, and second, the homes in "Project A" came with a "high price tag, but no market."²²³

The Community Responds

To lifelong Monetans, like Billy Tuck, old Moneta was "...a topnotch community that was hard to beat." They remember a slower-paced time when Hanford Watson provided most of the needs that the land could not, when families lived by the sweat of their brow and knew everyone for miles. For them, the increased services are nice to have, but often go unused and almost certainly come too quickly. They remember when Moneta was a low-tax area; today, Tuck jokes

²²² Ayers, 2009.

²²³ Barnes, 2009.

that Smith Mountain Lake “has made us rich in taxes!”²²⁴ To the newcomers to Moneta, change is something that is long overdue. Lacking the historical perspective of longtime residents, newcomers often want new services posthaste. “They don’t see the impact the way longtime residents do. They are ready to get new services available.”²²⁵ This failure to see change in the same light occasionally causes conflicts to arise between the longtime residents and the lake residents (groups that Ayers calls “River People” and “Lake People,” respectively).

Lynn Foster, a prominent Monetan, observes that to some longtime residents, there is a residual “undertone of resentment”: they can accept the changes that Smith Mountain Lake has wrought on Moneta, but they do not like what their village has become because of it. Traffic has increased, making road-front homes noisy—especially in the summer when windows are raised to let in fresh air—and trips across the street to check mailboxes become perilous. Furthermore, Foster states that many of her neighbors believe the services received do not outweigh the inconvenience they have brought to Moneta. “The services haven’t really improved the lives of the natives.”²²⁶

Foster appears to have located the central point in the debate over increasing the array of services offered to Bedford County residents: many longtime residents view the new services as unnecessary (and unnecessarily expensive) whereas many newcomers view them as the basic necessities of life. This debate is the living incarnation of Thoreau’s observation from the 26 months he spent at Walden Pond: “Some things are really necessities of life in some circles... which in others are luxuries merely, and in others still are entirely unknown.”²²⁷ The lifestyle of the longtime residents holds such services as public water unnecessary. They are an industrious people who do not always have time to indulge in cultural activities. When they do, they generally prefer country music or bluegrass. Their “ideas of happiness usually center around family—the patriarch and matriarch—get-togethers at Christmas, etc.”²²⁸ They are almost exclusively Protestant (predominantly Baptist and Methodist) and many look down on those who consume

²²⁴ Tuck, 2009.

²²⁵ Neudorfer, 2009.

²²⁶ Lynn Foster, interview by author, Moneta, VA, 4 May 2009.

²²⁷ Thoreau, 12.

²²⁸ Ayers, 2009.

alcoholic beverages. By contrast, the lake residents live a very “peripatetic lifestyle,” playing golf, attending wine tastings, boating and otherwise enjoying their retirement. They have time for community activism (or whatever else they choose). They do not always have space for wells, septic tanks or trucks that would otherwise be required for the maintenance of homes in Moneta. Their families often live long distances from Moneta and they themselves make frequent trips to visit as well as to shop in Roanoke, Lynchburg and other surrounding cities and towns.²²⁹ To them, Moneta may not necessarily be as central to their lives as it is to the lives of the longtime residents.

Interestingly, even though longtime residents and newcomers often live in the same neighborhoods, attend the same churches and belong to the same clubs and civic groups, the longtime residents remain separate from the “lake society.” Ayers theorizes that the main causes of this are most likely both socioeconomic and cultural—many newcomers, retirees from white-collar jobs, tend to be wealthier than the largely blue-collar longtime residents. The longtime residents are, of course, southern; many of the newcomers tend to come from the northeastern United States, particularly New York and New Jersey—people who are (still) not always well-received by the descendents of the men who fought under Jubal Early in defense of the Commonwealth during the “War of Northern Aggression.”

As important as these distinctions may be, perhaps the most significant deals with the remnants of the traditionalistic political culture Elazar and Key observed in Virginia during the 20th century. To them, Virginians, like most other southerners, expected few services from the government as the government essentially existed only to preserve the prevailing social order.²³⁰ Although holding highly nuanced beliefs, many northerners, however, believed that government existed to do the people’s bidding and when the people required a higher standard of living, it was the duty of the government to assist in that.²³¹ Today, more lake residents are running for local offices and volunteering to serve on local boards and commissions. Notably, Glenn Ayers (who can trace his ancestry to one of Moneta’s first families) lost a race for the board of supervisors to

²²⁹ *Ibid.*

²³⁰ Elazar, 118 – 19.

²³¹ *Ibid.*, 115.

Chuck Neudorfer (a native of Pennsylvania) in 2004. “Newcomers taking office has led to change.”²³²

Lynn Foster remembers living in Moneta during the 1960s when she and her husband burned their household garbage in a barrel behind their house. Today, she laments, Bedford County has erected “monuments to trash collection” in the form of garbage collection stations. She blames television and Madison Avenue for creating an insatiable demand for consumer goods that have little practical value. “The Sears and Roebuck catalogue has always been there, but it didn’t have as significant of an impact as the TV.”²³³ Glenn Ayers agrees, stating that today everyone has an unrealistically, and unsustainably, high expectation of what a proper standard of living should be. The great irony, he believes, is that the amount of money necessary to enjoy our conception of the proper standard of living increases in tandem with our conception of the proper standard of living. To afford this standard requires more work, which leaves less time for the enjoyment of this standard. In essence, we are working longer and harder to attain something that we lack the time to enjoy and that in his view is artificial anyway.²³⁴

Meanwhile on Smith Mountain Lake, Chuck Neudorfer tries to employ Solomonic wisdom in the quest to balance the competing demands of longtime residents and newcomers—for a reasonable price. It is not an easy task: some longtime residents think he is too submissive to the newcomers, whereas some newcomers think he is obstructing progress. What Neudorfer is overseeing, though, might be more than just development. Kathleen Guzi notes that in previous decades, leaf-burning was an acceptable method for disposing of lawn debris. Today, however, we know that burning leaves is harmful for people with respiratory problems and for the environment. Therefore Bedford County is being pressured to offer lawn debris removal services to its residents. Modernity has caught up with Bedford County. Eventually modernity would have come to Moneta—the rejection of Agrarianism predestined it—but development perhaps hastened its coming.

Is it entirely fair for development and its cheerleaders to be blamed for something that would have happened eventually? In time, diminishing water tables and other concerns about

²³² Barnes, 2009.

²³³ Foster, 2009.

²³⁴ Ayers, 2009.

pollution and contamination will no doubt catch up with Bedford County, forcing it to extend the public service authority's (PSA) service area far beyond the "rural service districts" that it currently services. Similarly, international competition for businesses and industries will compel Bedford County to intervene in the extension of broadband access. These issues would have arisen whether Bedford County remained an "agrarian Valhalla" or developed into a bustling suburban county. The issue then is not whether development and the accompanying explosion of services provided by the county government are changing the face of the Moneta community. New development lining parts of the State Route 122 corridor currently serviced by the PSA serves as evidence of the changing face of Moneta. Nonetheless, it is also highly likely that at least some of those changes would have occurred eventually. As these changes continue, it is permissible to ask: how can Monetans preserve the spirit of community that existed in the village prior to the construction of Smith Mountain Lake? Doing so might require a reconceptualization of "community" in Moneta, but, as Calvin Woodford admonishes his fellow Monetans: "The world is changing; we just have to change with it."²³⁵

²³⁵ Woodford, 2009.

Chapter 7: Conclusion: The Evolution of “Community”

Approximately two miles south of the village on Morgan’s Church Road, John Moorman Jacobs’s garage looks more like the filling station from the *Andy Griffith Show* than it does the high-tech, commercial garages ubiquitous along interstate exits. Yet this small, seemingly abandoned garage is a hub of activity, serving as an impromptu gathering spot for a regular group of Moneta natives—all middle-aged males—who come together to share the news of the day, exchange stories from their childhoods and solve the world’s problems. According to Glenn Ayers, one topic is noticeably absent from their conversations: Smith Mountain Lake. To listen to the regulars at Jacobs’s Garage, the lake does not exist.²³⁶ Both Ayers and longtime resident Lynn Foster note that such self-imposed cultural segregation is not unique to the regulars at Jacobs’s Garage; generally lake residents and native Monetans—although attending many of the same churches or belonging to many of the same service organizations—rarely interact socially. In fact, the only place where one can frequently find these two groups together in a social manner is on one of Smith Mountain Lake’s numerous golf courses. Why do these two groups not interact more regularly?

The answer, Ayers suggests, is not antipathy or even condescension, but, as described in chapter six, a mutual recognition of differing cultures and relatively few common interests. From my observations of Moneta, it appears that the centuries-old northern-southern divide is a veneer for something deeper. The stereotype of small town residents being suspicious of outsiders is not a stereotype for no reason. To some degree, everyone is resistant to change: we like the ways things are and with few exceptions feel at the minimum a twinge of nostalgia when something we have grown to love (perhaps the house we grew up in or a favorite hang-out from adolescence) is altered. Native Monetans are no different. As Ayers notes, downtown Moneta changed little throughout the 20th century. Moneta residents grew up in a village that (physically) looked almost identical to the village their ancestors left behind to fight the First World War. On a personal level, like Hanford Watson reminisced, the residents largely knew everyone in the village. The residents

²³⁶ Ayers, 2009.

felt a connection to each other not only because of this familiarity, but also because they shared similar backgrounds, educations, occupations, religious views and political views. Today, Moneta looks very different as the bypass, new strip malls and residential subdivisions surround the deteriorating remnants of downtown Moneta. Constructed both in response to the influx of new residents and to lure even more new residents, much of this development has occurred within the past two decades. To those who grew up in a village that appeared to have been frozen in time, the rapid pace of change almost certainly seemed disorienting. Perhaps more central to this thesis, however, is the way Moneta has changed on a personal level. Generally speaking, the newcomers tend to be well-educated professionals with religious and political views that might differ from those held by longtime Monetans.²³⁷ From my interviews, I believe the difference between longtime residents and newcomers has more to do with both this influx of change-oriented “outsiders” and the cultural differences between the two groups than does the simplistic northern-southern divide.²³⁸ The unanswered question, then, is can a community still exist in Moneta if two separate groups coexist, but rarely interact?

Based upon the existing research on community, for the purposes of this thesis, I defined community as *a relationship among people who live within a specified geographical area, share a common history and possess a common set of values. These shared experiences and values help to create an open, trusting environment in which the members trust one another and feel comfortable communicating with one another about the quality of life they hope to share together.* There is no question that Moneta is a specific geographical region. Ever since Mildred Thaxton, the wife of Moneta’s first postmaster, named the small agricultural village in 1882, “Moneta” has been the designated name of a particular area in southern Bedford County. Today Moneta’s 24121 zip code encompasses a broad area in two counties and on both the northern and southern shores of Smith Mountain Lake. Anyone wishing to locate Moneta also could look on any detailed map of the Commonwealth of Virginia, or, if driving, look for the small, green “Moneta” signs erected along North Old Moneta Road by the Virginia Department of Transportation. In light of this, Moneta’s

²³⁷ This is mitigated by the post-Nixon realignment that made southerners much more likely to identify themselves as Republicans.

²³⁸ That having been said, I do not completely discount the power of this divide in the minds of some residents of the Moneta area. Even if the term “northern” is an imprecise catch-all for the differences between newcomers and longtime residents, I suspect that stereotypes of both northern (perhaps more likely “northeastern”) and southern people have the tendency to affect the perception of both newcomers and longtime residents.

existence as a defined geographical area should not be in contention. What remains unclear, however, are the other elements of community as enumerated in my definition: shared history, culture and values. After two decades of explosive growth around Smith Mountain Lake that has brought a steady stream of newcomers—from numerous states (and even nations)—into an already established community, can we still call Moneta a community?

In the preceding chapters, I attempted to analyze the history, culture and values of contemporary Moneta, as well as its avenues for communication and cooperation, like service organizations and religious institutions. From this analysis I have reached the interim conclusion contemporary Moneta is schizophrenic; two distinct groups call Moneta home. These groups worship together and work together for the common good of Moneta, but these groups cannot necessarily agree on what constitutes the common good for the unincorporated area they call home. This disagreement on the common good appears to stem from the fact that Moneta is an amalgamation of cultures and values that are not always congruent. Distinct elements of Daniel Elazar's various political cultures manifest themselves in both groups of Monetans: many of Moneta's long-time residents, exhibiting hallmarks of the traditional political culture so common to the rural American south, are often ambiguous at best about the increased services offered to Moneta residents by Bedford County's government (like public water and sewer systems); whereas many newcomers to Moneta, exhibiting elements of the individualistic culture of the northeastern United States, are often highly vocal in their support for these increased services. On a more personal level, Glenn Ayers classifies native Monetans as simpler people who live lives closer to the earth and their families, while newcomers, often expatriates from urban and suburban areas in the northeast, tend to live more sophisticated lives and are less connected to their extended families.²³⁹

The more challenging component of the definition of community involves "shared history." Moneta easily predates the construction of Smith Mountain Lake: the first European settlers established farms in what would become Moneta as early as the 1740s. The village itself started to develop in 1859—growth that accelerated throughout the late-19th century until the arrival of the Virginian Railway in the early 20th century. With few exceptions, Moneta changed relatively little during the intervening years until the Smith Mountain Dam was constructed by Appalachian

²³⁹ Ayers, 2009.

Power Company in the 1960s. The newcomers—and their ancestors—were absent for much of Moneta’s history. Beyond the simple fact that Moneta’s history is not “theirs,” the newcomers were absent for some of the great struggles in the village’s history: the newcomers’ ancestors did not fight side-by-side with the natives’s ancestors when the Confederacy mustered a regiment just south of the village; nor did the newcomers help establish the volunteer fire department or rescue squad. To many native Monetans—whose families have been working together to improve their community for decades (if not centuries)—the newcomers are simply insufficiently Monetan; the village’s history is not their own history and when the community struggled in the past, they were not present. These ties that ordinarily serve to forge bonds of community simply do not exist to join the natives and the newcomers. The newcomers have succeeded in immersing themselves into traditional Moneta institutions like the Ruritan Club and Radford Baptist Church, but in the process they have taken leadership roles in these institutions and made them their own as, in membership, they often outnumber their native peers. The act of making these institutions their own no doubt contributes to the latent resentments of some longtime residents, described by Lynn Foster, that these people have moved into their village, taken it over and are turning it into something new and foreign. Herein lies the problem confronting contemporary Moneta: native Monetans, not unlike Hanford Watson, still see Moneta as a closely-knit, rural village comprised of relatives and other allied families, whereas newcomers see Moneta as a prime piece of real estate, poised for explosive residential and commercial growth. To put the problem in classical terms: to some, Moneta is Aristotle’s organic community—the village. To others, Moneta is Locke’s *tabula rasa*. Thus, without a shared vision for the future, the potential for reunifying all of Moneta’s residents (off the golf course) appears dim.

How, then, do we revive Moneta’s endangered community spirit amidst the process of development? Some people would counter that there is no dearth of community spirit in Moneta. Bedford County Administrator Kathleen Guzi believes, despite the odds, the community spirit in Moneta is still healthy. To her, community is formed “...when people have a sense of place and feel they have a responsibility for that sense of place.”²⁴⁰ Certainly a shared place, or symbol, of Moneta would be a step in the right direction. As the village deteriorates, its condition and location at the end of a cul-de-sac makes it an unlikely symbol for the burgeoning Moneta. George Aznovorian’s New Urbanism development “Downtown Moneta” might be a more obvious symbol;

²⁴⁰ Guzi, 2009.

however, it remains unclear whether native Monetans will embrace the high-end shops and restaurants that fill the development, especially those individuals who fondly remember (perhaps somewhat romantically) the simplicity and organicity of old Moneta. Smith Mountain Lake itself might also be a plausible symbol for the Moneta community; it has certainly impacted Moneta, it is nationally-recognized and with a plethora of public access points, Smith Mountain Lake is a resource that can be shared by everyone. Nonetheless, some native Monetans blame the lake for the changes it brought to the village. It is doubtful that those who resent the lake will embrace it as the symbol of the village they believe it has destroyed. Perhaps the best we can do is accept a redefinition of “community” in Moneta.

If the Moneta Ruritan Club was Moneta’s unofficial “town council,” Calvin Woodford was the village’s unofficial mayor. As a charter member and a long-time president of the club, Woodford devoted countless hours of his life to the improvement of Moneta, so his definition of “community” promised to be insightful. To my surprise, he defined community in four words: “People with common interests.”²⁴¹ When Moneta was an agriculturally-based village, the residents’ common interests were their farms and the village where they could purchase supplies, receive mail and transport their produce. Today, however, with the improvement of the area’s highways, Moneta residents can easily drive to the nearby cities of Roanoke or Lynchburg where more shopping opportunities are available; the postal service offers home delivery of mail and with a dwindling number of farms (coupled with the Norfolk-Southern Corporation’s decision to suspend use of its Moneta station), the village has lost much of its relevance to area residents.

Moneta retained a glimmer of hope before the bypass rerouted traffic around the village. Today, however, the only people for whom the village remains the object of interest are those who still live in the village-proper, who seek to preserve the historic buildings “downtown” or who remember the village with the fondness that comes from nostalgia. Most Moneta residents today are interested in perfecting that which is closest to them—their church, school, club or neighborhood.

More broadly, the former, singular interest in Moneta is giving way to a less parochial sense of attachment to the broader region surrounding Moneta. Longtime educator Frankie Puckett recalls a time early in her career when a heated rivalry still existed between her students from

²⁴¹ Woodford, 2009.

Moneta and from Huddleston. Today, however, such rivalries are either nonexistent or, at least, severely muted.²⁴² If “community” is an issue of interest, it seems highly improbable that one should continue to refer to Moneta as a community. Even the Moneta Ruritan Club has ended its longtime reluctance to work on projects across Halesford Bridge on the Franklin County shore of Smith Mountain Lake.²⁴³ Moneta’s churches draw congregants from well outside of the village’s borders and the village’s schools are not growing at the rate of the suburban schools in eastern Bedford County. The ties that connect Moneta residents to one another increasingly are becoming weaker. Left in their wake is a group of people who share the same geographic area, but little else.

Much could be extracted from the decline of community in Moneta, but the primary lesson appears to be that all is not lost: although Moneta residents may not always identify themselves as “Monetans,” they still take an active interest in the affairs of the Moneta area. Chuck Neudorfer, who represents Moneta on the Bedford County Board of Supervisors, observes that Moneta residents—perhaps due to the percentage of retirees in Moneta—are engaged in the affairs of the county and are prone, perhaps more than residents of other areas of Bedford County, to get involved with issues that arise in the area.²⁴⁴

Those citizens who take an active role in the decision-making process do so not because they share some familial ties with the affected parties, as was the case in Hanford Watson’s Moneta, but because, as Tocqueville observed in the 1830s, “[t]he inhabitant...is attached to his township not so much because he was born there as because he sees in that township a free and strong corporation that he is a part of and that is worth his trouble to direct.”²⁴⁵ The newcomers to Moneta care enough to help direct the future of their home not because they belong to it, but because Moneta is something they are a part of and they need to ensure that it remains a “free and strong corporation” if for no one’s sake but their own.

This point is not unique to Moneta; as numerous small towns and unincorporated areas around the United States develop into larger, less organic localities than they once were, it is

²⁴² Puckett, 2009.

²⁴³ *Ibid.*

²⁴⁴ Neudorfer, 2009.

²⁴⁵ Tocqueville, 51 – 52.

critical that community leaders emphasize to residents the importance of continued civic engagement. It matters not just to the sense of community itself, but is also important to the continued survival of the Republic. As stated earlier, Edmund Burke described community as "...a partnership not only between those who are living, but between those who are living, those who are dead, and those who are to be born."²⁴⁶ Such a partnership cannot thrive in a vacuum; it must be nourished by almost constant interaction with other members of this partnership. Civic engagement is a good instrument for reinforcing the ties that bind us together with the other members of this transcendent partnership, but such ties alone cannot constitute community. How are we to learn to relate to others if we only relate to those who share our interests? Unless we develop an affinity to the broader village or township, we are severing our ties to the partnership and potentially subjecting ourselves to the dangers of individualism. Aristotle warns us about those who can exist outside the political life and, millennia later, I believe his admonition remains valid: when we live lives that center upon our own interests, we experience difficulty interacting with those who do not share our interests. In a society filled with interests that often conflict, we must learn to work with those who are different and to compromise with them in pursuit of the greater good. If we cannot learn these skills, we might be stuck with a political system that is the inverse of Bismarck's famous line. Tocqueville argues that in the township we learn the political skills necessary to be good citizens. By having something to which we belong, whose course we can help guide and whose destination impacts us personally, we are drawn out of our own narrow interests and come to see other people as neighbors—not just rivals. These skills are transferable to the broader political context, as well. The nation becomes an even larger transcendent partnership; we are no longer just Virginians or Californians, but Americans, and on the largest scale, citizens of the world. This should make us consider the impact of our actions and inactions, whether it is not voting or refusing to recycle.

Being part of a broader community, even when it reinforces groupthink, teaches us the necessary precondition for membership in a polity: ownership. The question then arises: can one be a member of a community without that feeling of ownership? One of the great challenges facing Moneta today is the perception of the native Monetans that they are no longer welcome in the village in which they grew up. Solving this challenge will require the natives to accept that Smith Mountain Lake has permanently and irrevocably transformed Moneta. Gone is the small

²⁴⁶ Burke, 82.

agricultural settlement of allied families and in its place is born a small, but growing suburban enclave united not by ancestry or even acquaintance, but by common interest (*i.e.* Smith Mountain Lake). Reconciling these disparate groups will also require the newcomers to acknowledge that Moneta existed *before* the construction of Smith Mountain Lake. Therefore a greater degree of sensitivity to the concerns of longtime residents is in order. Although some newcomers might like to recreate in Moneta a microcosm of the urban/suburban communities in which they once lived, they need to adopt a go-slow approach. When development occurs too quickly, those who are left behind can develop feelings of resentment that will poison the community spirit of the developing area. Moneta has the potential to redevelop its Moneta-wide community spirit, but before that is possible, there is much work to be done—by all involved parties.

While governing bodies that are tasked with developing and implementing comprehensive plans need to be sensitive to the impact development is having on those who will be most seriously affected, they also need to understand the limits of their abilities. Government is certainly important to community life, but it is not *the* community. Government policy cannot create or regulate community any more than, as Madison notes in *Federalist 10*, government can regulate the formation of factions. Attempts at regulation might well stifle the very freedom from which community springs. As free associations, civic groups are the greatest ambassadors that our communities have. If community is going to be fostered, it must start with the renewal of civil society in our localities, and because of their ability to include many people, civic groups, not governing bodies, are best positioned to initiate this renewal. To be effective, these civic groups need to focus on improving the entire village, township or city. When they focus on a particular segment of that locality, they must explain how doing so will, by extension, benefit everyone within the locality. Furthermore, these civic groups must reach out to a representative sample of that locality's residents. Civic groups have the potential to be the bridging institutions necessary to renew the sense that "we're all in the same boat,"²⁴⁷ but unless they bring together members from different "boats" who share a willingness work together for the greater good, any hope of revitalizing the transcendent partnership appears dim.

Ultimately Moneta was an idyllic village. It was far from perfect; Jim Crow lived there, too. Yet for more than two centuries the families that occupied the farms just north of the Staunton

²⁴⁷ Cohen, 115 – 16.

River in southern Bedford County, Virginia had something strong and special: a place where almost everyone (at least almost all male Caucasians) could feel a sense of belonging. They worked together, played together, worshipped together, fought together and were educated together. These connections forged lasting friendships, resulting in the knowledge (and expectation) of Putnam's reciprocity; that when one person was in trouble, someone would come to his or her assistance.

According to those who have lived in Moneta for decades, the population boom experienced by Moneta after the construction of Smith Mountain Lake (particularly in the past 20 years), has altered this feeling of oneness.²⁴⁸ Some of these changes, the product of modernity reaching the formerly remote Moneta, almost certainly might have arrived had it not been for Smith Mountain Lake, but no one questions the fact that the lake has brought significant changes that have altered the Moneta area—and the sense of belonging that native Monetans used to enjoy. Reigniting that old community spirit in Moneta is going to require more than simply hoping to recreate what was lost, but perhaps a downward revision of community. Community might no longer be thought of as *all* of the 24121 zip code, but perhaps one's neighborhood, subdivision, church or general environs. Wherever people feel that they belong and are cared about, a community exists. Monetans are caring people as evidenced by the countless hours they dedicate to service organizations like the Ruritan Club, so I feel confident predicting that "community" will always exist in Moneta, just not, perhaps, in the incarnation that it once did.

²⁴⁸ Peggy Johnson, interview by author, 11 September 2009.

Works Cited

- Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, "Structure and Organization of County Government," *Profile of County Government*, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972).
- Anderson, Bob and Luke Anderson, "Introduction to Real Estate Development," *Residential Real Estate Development: A Practical Guide for Beginners to Experts*, 2006
<http://books.google.com/books?id=yUrUg6WtH3oC&pg=PA13&lpg=PA13&dq=%22what+is+real+estate+development%22&source=web&ots=icYuB_ARZ5&sig=VjaWKxhQkotAa_8I3NgWxfY0iP8#PPA13,M1> (12 December 2007).
- Aristotle, *The Politics and the Constitution of Athens*, ed. Stephen Everson (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1996).
- Ayala, Louis J. "Trained for Democracy: The Differing Effects of Voluntary and Involuntary Organizations on Political Participation," 53 *Political Research Quarterly* 1.
- Ayers, Glenn. Interview by author. Moneta, VA, 3 May 2009.
- Ayers, Glenn. "Preacher Cooper." Untitled Manuscript. Photocopy.
- Barnes, Lynn. Interview by author. Huddleston, VA, 3 May 2009.
- Barrett, Chris. Interview by author. Moneta, VA, 2 May 2009.
- Batts, Denise Watson. "What's In a Name? Ruritan, Suffolk," [Norfolk, VA] *Virginian-Pilot*, 9 February 2009 < <http://hamptonroads.com/2009/02/whats-name-ruritan-suffolk> > (3 May 2009).

- Bellah, Robert N., "Community Properly Understood: A Defense of 'Democratic Communitarianism,'" *The Essential Communitarian Reader*, ed., Amitai Etzioni (Lanham, M.D.: Rowman & Littlefield, 1998).
- Bears, Sara B., *The Story of Virginia: An American Experience* (Richmond, V.A.: Virginia Historical Society, 1995), 4.
- Benton, J. Edwin, "County Service Delivery: Does Government Structure Matter?" *Public Administration Review* 62 (July/August 2002): 471 – 79).
- Burke, Edmund. *Reflections on the Revolution in France*. Frank M. Turner, ed. New Haven, C.T.: Yale, 2003.
- "Census Counts for Virginia Localities (1790 – 2000)." Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service.
<http://www.coopercenter.org/demographics/sitefiles/documents/excel/census2000/historiccensus/historic_census.xls> (27 May 2009).
- Code of Virginia § 15.2-407b.
- Cohen, David, *Chasing the Red, White, and Blue*, New York: Picador, 2001.
- Christopher Caldwell, "Levittown to Littleton: How the Suburbs Have Changed," *Annual Edition: State and Local Government*, 11th Edition, Guilford, CT: Dushkin, 2003.
- Coleman, James S., "Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital," 94 *The American Journal of Sociology* Supplement (1988), 109.
- Colson, Charles. "Musical Mush: Are We Impairing Our Capacity to Think?" *Prison Fellowship*.
<<http://www.breakpoint.org/listingarticle.asp?ID=713>> 6 February 2006. (12 June 2009).
- Constitution of Virginia. 1870.

- Cramer, John, "2 Paths, 1 Goal: Moneta's New Wastewater Treatment Plant Spurs Growth," *Roanoke (VA) Times*, (15 April 2007), A4.
- Daniel, W. Harrison. *Bedford County, Virginia, 1840 – 1860: The History of an Upper Piedmont County in the Late Antebellum Era*. Richmond, VA: University of Richmond, 1985.
- Denton, Jean. "Resurrection, Moneta: Reverence, Not Rigidity, at Smith Mountain Lake." *The Catholic Virginian*. Volume 82 Number 20. 30 July 2007. <<http://www.catholicvirginian.org/archive/2007/2007vol82iss20/pages/parishprofile.html>> (3 May 2009).
- DeSantis, Victor S. and Tari Renner, "The Impact of Political Structures on Public Policies in American Counties," *Public Administration Review* 54 (May/June 1994) 291 – 95.
- "Development," Bryan A. Garner, ed., *Black's Law Dictionary*, 2nd Pocket Edition, St. Paul: West Group, 2001.
- "Development," Jack P. Friedman, Jack C. Harris and J. Bruce Lindeman, *Dictionary of Real Estate Terms*, 6th Edition, Hauppauge, NY: Barron's Educational Series, Inc., 2004.
- Dowding, Keith and Peter John, "The Three Exit, Three Voice and Loyalty Framework: A Test with Survey Data on Local Services," *Political Studies*, 56 (2008) 288 – 311.
- Elazar, Daniel J. *American Federalism: A View from the States*. 3rd Edition. New York: Harper & Row, 1984.
- Ernandes, Timothy. "What About 'Old Town' Moneta?" *Discover Smith Mountain Lake Magazine*. July – October 2008.
- Etzioni, Amitai, "The Community Deficit," 45 *Journal of Common Market Studies* 1, 2007.

Etzioni, Amitai, *The New Golden Rule: Community and Morality in a Democratic Society*, (New York: Basic, 1998).

Federalist 10.

Federalist 17.

Foster, Richard. "Smith Mountain Lake Road to Get \$6.6 Million Bypass." *Roanoke (Virginia) Times & World News*. 18 August 1995.

"Frequently Asked Questions," *Radford Baptist Church*, <http://www.radfordbaptist.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=18&Itemid=31 > (11 March 2009).

Greeley, Andrew, "Coleman Revisited: Religious Structures as a Source of Social Capital," 40 *American Behavioral Scientist* 5 (March/April 1997).

Guzi, Kathleen. Interview by author. Bedford, VA, 4 May 2009.

Harrington, S.D. "Changes May Slow the Heart of Moneta," *Roanoke (Virginia) Times*, 22 September 1997.

Hart, Rev. Rich. Interview by author. Moneta, VA, 8 June 2009.

Heavenly Hash: The Newsletter of Resurrection Catholic Church. Volume 17 Issue 1 (February 2009).

"History and Demographics." *Bedford County 2025 Comprehensive Plan*. Bedford County Planning Commission, 2007.

- “History of Holy Name of Mary Roman Catholic Church.” *The Heritage of Bedford County Virginia, 1754 – 2003*. Marceline, MO: Walsworth, 2003.
- “History of Radford Church, Moneta, Virginia.” Unpublished Document. Radford Baptist Church Archives.
- Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. Richard Tuck, ed. New York: Cambridge, 1996.
- Horn, James. *A Land As God Made It: Jamestown and the Birth of America*. New York: Basic, 2005.
- Huckfeldt, R. Robert. “Political Participation and the Neighborhood Social Context.” *23 American Journal of Political Science*. 3 (August 1979).
- Imirie, Lynda. “Down Home in Smith Mountain Lake,” *Cooperative Living*, 2000
<<http://www.co-opliving.com/coopliving/issues/2000/September/downhome.htm>> (26 November 2008).
- “It’s Officially Closed!” *The Lake Bullet* (Bedford, VA). 18 September 2000.
- Jackson, John T. and Chris McDonald. “They Have Good Intentions:’ Young People’s Experiences of Living in Melbourne’s Peri-Urban Areas.” *Urban Policy and Research*, 23 (December 2005) 477 – 95).
- Johnson, Peggy. Interview by author. Moneta, VA, 11 September 2009.
- Johnson, Rob. “Catholic Priests in Massive Demand.” *The Roanoke [Virginia] Times*. 8 September 2008.
<<http://www.roanoke.com/news/roanoke/wb/176055>> (3 May 2009).
- Kaminski, John P., ed. “Agriculture.” *The Quotable Jefferson*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton, 2006.

Keller, Tim. "Evangelistic Worship." <<http://www.redeemer2.com/resources/papers/evangelisticworship.pdf>>
June 2001, (12 June 2009).

Ketcham, Ralph Louis. *James Madison: A Biography*. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia, 1990.

Key, V.O., Jr. *Southern Politics in State and Nation*. Knoxville, TN: University Press, 1984.

King, W. Francis H. *Classical and Foreign Quotations: A Polyglot Manual of Historical and Literary Sayings Noted Passages in Poetry and Prose Phrases, Proverbs, and Bon Mots*, 3rd Ed. (London, J. Whitaker & Sons, Ltd., 1904),

Komonchak, Joseph A. "Interpreting the Council: Catholic Attitudes Toward Vatican II." *Being Right: Conservative Catholics in America*, Mary Jo Weaver and R. Scott Appleby, Ed.
Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, 1995.

Lewis, C.S. *Mere Christianity* (New York, Harper Collins, 1952).

Lijphart, Arend, "Unequal Participation: Democracy's Unresolved Dilemma," 91 *American Political Science Review* 1 (March 1997).

"Local Ministry Incorporated as Nonprofit." *Bedford (VA) Bulletin*. 29 April 2009.

Locke, John. *Treatise of Government*, C.B. Macpherson, Ed. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1980.

Martin, Ben. *Images of America: Bedford County*. Charleston, S.C.: Arcadia, 2008.

McMillan, David W. and David M. Chavis George, "Sense of Community: A Definition and Theory," 14 *Journal of Community Psychology* 1 (January 1986).

“Moneta Car Counter to Send Tallies to State.” *Roanoke Times & World News*. 13 July 1990.

Nance, Alpha. “Moneta.” *Bedford Villages—Lost and Found, Volume III*. ____: Peaks of Otter Chapter, DAR, 2000.

Neudorfer, Chuck. Interview by author. Huddleston, VA, 4 May 2009.

Newport, Frank, “No Evidence Bad Times Are Boosting Church Attendance,”
<<http://www.gallup.com/poll/113452/Evidence-Bad-Times-Boosting-Church-Attendance.aspx>>
(14 March 2009).

Noonan, Peggy. “Goodbye Bland Affluence.” *Wall Street Journal*. 17 April 2009. <<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB123992073614326997.html>> (22 May 2009).

Odom, Rev. Bob. Interview by author. Moneta, VA, 8 June 2009.

“Our Mission.” *The Agape Center* (brochure).

Parker, Lula Jeter, “The Churches of Bedford County,” *Parker’s History of Bedford County, Virginia*.
Bedford, VA: Hamilton’s, 1988.

“Population,” 1988, in *Bedford County Comprehensive Plan*,
<<http://www.co.bedford.va.us/Res/Planning/CompPlan/1988/Population.pdf>> (27 November
2008).

Puckett, Frankie. Interview by author. Huddleston, VA, 3 May 2009.

Putnam, Robert D. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community* (New York,
Simon & Schuster, 2000),

“Ruritans Win Award for Counting Traffic.” *Roanoke Times & World News*.

23 February 1990.

Sacrosanctum Concilium, Art. III, §21

Simmons, James R. and Solon J. Simmons, “Structural Conflict in Contemporary Cities,”

American Review of Public Administration, 34 (December 2004) 374-88.

Storing, Herbert J., Ed. “Federal v. Consolidated Government.” *The Founders’ Constitution*. Vol. 1, Ch. 8.

Chicago: University of Chicago, 1981.

Streib, Gregory and William L. Waugh, Jr., “The Changing Responsibilities of County

Governments: Data from a National Survey of County Leaders,” *American Review of*

Public Administration, 21 (June 1991) 139 – 56.

“The Ruritan Organization,” < http://ruritan.org/2_about_ruritan.php > (3 May 2009).

“The Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom, 16 January 1786,” < [http://www.lva.virginia.gov/whatwedo/k12/](http://www.lva.virginia.gov/whatwedo/k12/bor/vsrftext.htm)

[bor/vsrftext.htm](http://www.lva.virginia.gov/whatwedo/k12/bor/vsrftext.htm) > (-- May 2009).

Thoreau, Henry David. *Walden and Civil Disobedience*, ed., Jonathan Levin (New York: Barnes &

Noble, 2003).

Tocqueville, Alexis de. *Democracy in America*, trans. Harvey C. Mansfield and Delba Winthrop

(Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000).

“Total Population Estimates for Virginia Counties and Cities: 2007 Final and 2008 Provisional (Released

January 27, 2009).” Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service. <[http://www.coopercenter.org/](http://www.coopercenter.org/demographics/sitefiles/documents/excel/populationestimates/va_pop_estimates_2008.xls)

[demographics/sitefiles/documents/excel/populationestimates/va_pop_estimates_2008.xls](http://www.coopercenter.org/demographics/sitefiles/documents/excel/populationestimates/va_pop_estimates_2008.xls)> (27 May 2009).

Twelve Southerners. "Introduction: A Statement of Principles." *I'll Take My Stand: The South and the Agrarian Tradition*. Susan V. Donaldson, Ed. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University, 2006.

U.S. Religious Landscape Survey: Religious Affiliation: Diverse and Dynamic. Washington, DC: Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life, 2008.

Tuck, Billy. Interview by author. Moneta, VA, 3 May 2009.

Viemeister, Peter. *Historical Diary of Bedford, Virginia, U.S.A. from Ancient Times to U.S. Bicentennial*. Bedford, VA: Hamilton's Press, 1993.

"Welcome to Downtown Moneta," *Downtown Moneta at Smith Mountain Lake*,
<<http://www.downtownmoneta.com/>> (28 May 2009).

Wingfield, Brad, "A Surge In The 'Burbs," *Forbes*, 22 May 2007. <http://www.forbes.com/2007/03/21/fastest-growing-counties-biz-cx_bw_0322counties.html> (18 December 2008).

Woodford, Calvin. Interview by author. Moneta, VA, 1 May 2009.

"24121-Fact Finder," *U.S. Census Bureau*, 2000 <http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/SAFFFacts?_event=&geo_id=86000US24121&_geoContext=01000US%7C86000US24121&_street=&county=&_cityTown=&_state=&_zip=24121&_lang=en&_sse=on&ActiveGeoDiv=&_useEV=&pctxt=fph&pgsl=860&_submenuId=factsheet_1&ds_name=null&_ci_nbr=null&qr_name=null®=null%3Anull&_keyword=&_industry=&show_2003_tab=&redirect=Y> (25 November 2008).

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Interview Questions for the Officers of the Moneta Ruritan Club

Appendix B: Interview Questions for the Staff of Radford Baptist Church

Appendix C: Interview Questions for the Staff of Resurrection Catholic Church

Appendix D: Interview Questions for Bedford County Government Officials

APPENDIX A

Interview Questions for the Officers of the Moneta Ruritan Club

- 1.) Would you tell me a little about yourself?
- 2.) How would you describe your generation?
- 3.) What do you do for a living?
- 4.) Do you know what your neighbors do (or did) for a living?
- 5.) How long have you lived in Moneta?
 - a. Where did you live before that?
 - b. Were you active in any civic groups where you lived before?
- 6.) What prompted you to join the Moneta Ruritan Club?
- 7.) What do you hope to achieve for the community joining the Ruritans?
- 8.) What are your meetings like?
 - a. How often do you meet?
 - b. Are these meetings professional, or are they also social in nature?
 - c. How many of your closest friends are also members of the Ruritan Club?

- 9.) How would you describe the interaction between Ruritans who are lifelong residents of Moneta and Ruritans who are relative newcomers to the community?
- 10.) In general, is there a difference in the priorities of your members who are longtime-residents and members who are relative newcomers to the community?
- a. Is there a difference in the preferred methods of your members?
- 11.) About one decade ago, the Moneta Ruritan Club was at the forefront of the community effort to construct the Moneta bypass. How do you believe the bypass has changed Moneta?
- a. Do you believe these changes have been positive or negative and why?
- 12.) How would you assess the health of the community spirit in Moneta?
- 13.) How would you define “community”?

APPENDIX B

Interview Questions for the Staff of Radford Baptist Church

- 1.) Can you provide a brief demographic profile of your congregation?
- 2.) What percentage of your congregation lived in Moneta twenty years ago?
- 3.) Where—outside of Virginia—were most of your members born?
- 4.) How different was the worship style at Radford Baptist Church twenty years ago than it is today?
 - a. When did this change occur?
 - b. How was it received?
- 5.) How did the longtime members react to the influx of new members from outside of Moneta?
- 6.) Did the new members bring new ideas (organization, worship, ministries, etc.) or did they adapt to the status quo?
 - a. If they brought new ideas to the church, how did the longtime members react?
- 7.) Did you see a loss of members because of this influx?
 - a. If so, do you know if these former members attend religious services at another church?
- 8.) Do any of your longtime members feel alienated at Radford Baptist Church?

9.) I am familiar with the Agape Center that Radford Baptist Church opened recently. What other outreach ministries is your church current maintaining?

a. How have these been received by the community?

10.)How would you define “community”?

APPENDIX C

Interview Questions for the Staff of Resurrection Catholic Church

- 1.) Can you provide a brief demographic profile of your congregation?
- 2.) What percentage of the congregation lived in Moneta for at least twenty years?
- 3.) Where—outside of Virginia—were most of your members born?
- 4.) How well do the members who were longtime residents interact with the members from outside of Moneta?
- 5.) How was Resurrection Catholic Church organized?
 - a. I know initially your parish received assistance from Bethlehem United Methodist Church. Does your church maintain a relationship with Bethlehem UMC today?
 - i. How would you characterize this relationship?
- 6.) Did the parish receive any anti-Catholic sentiment from this largely Protestant community?
- 7.) As your parish continues to grow, do you find that new members bring new ideas (organization, worship, ministries, etc.) or did they adapt to the status quo?
 - a. If they brought new ideas to the church, how did the “older” members react?
- 8.) What other outreach ministries is your church current maintaining?
 - a. How have these been received by the community?
- 9.) I know there is a strong social justice component to Catholicism. How strongly is that emphasized here?
 - a. Do you believe the parishioners implement this component in their everyday lives?
 - i. If so, how?
- 10.) How would you define “community”?

APPENDIX D

Interview Questions for Bedford County Government Officials

- 1.) Could you provide a brief, demographic profile of your constituents?
- 2.) Historically counties—especially in the southern United States—have provided a minimal number of services. Is this still the case in Bedford County (particularly in the Moneta area)?
 - a. What do you believe prompted this increased level of services?
 - i. When did this increase begin?
 - b. Why don't you believe this level of services been increased?
- 3.) Have you personally witnessed an increased demand for county government involvement in local issues (services, controversies, etc.) during your time in office?
 - a. What seem to the most common demands?
 - b. Are a majority of these demands coming from individual citizens or from civic groups?
 - i. Which groups?
 - c. Why don't you believe the demands have not increased?
- 4.) How involved are individual citizens and civic groups in the process of governing?
 - a. Has the degree of involvement from either individual citizens or civic associations (including business associations) changed during your time in office?
- 5.) In your opinion, what are the hot-button issues affecting the Moneta area today?
 - a. How do you feel about these issues?
- 6.) How would you define "community"?