

PART -V DOCUMENTATION

This year's documentation section brings to our readers a significant set of data from our annual conference. Following the schedule itself of the 2002 annual conference of the *Society*, we include Stephen Krason's presidential report, highly useful information on a new family database from member Pat Fagan, and an eye-opening address from Prof. Joseph Falvey. Again this year we are pleased to present a sampling of some of our members' publications and accomplishments. Finally, we renew a past custom of including brief histories of major Catholic archives across the nation, this time from the Archdiocese of Santa Fe.

Anyone desiring to submit articles, reprints, announcements, or short materials for publication consideration in the Documentation Section should submit a Word or Wordperfect file to assistant editor Dr. Mark Lowery, Department of Theology, University of Dallas Irving, Texas 75062, phone 972-721-5357, fax 972-721-4007, e-mail Lowery@mail2.udallas.edu. All materials will be reviewed by the associate editor, Dr. Patrick Foley, 1113 Idlewood Ave., Azle, TX 76020-3647, fax 817-515-7007, phone 817-237-9602.

Patrick Foley, Associate Editor for Documentation
Mark Lowery, Assistant Editor for Documentation

Society of Catholic Social Scientists Tenth Annual Meeting

October 18-19 2002

Ave Maria School of Law, Ann Arbor, Michigan

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 18, 2002

8:00 - 8:30 a.m.

Regularly-scheduled Law School Mass

9:00 - 10:15 a.m.

Catholic Social Science Review Editorial Board Meeting

10:30 - 1:00 p.m.

Society of Catholic Social Scientists Board Meeting

10:30 - 12:00 p.m.

Sessions and Panel

Session: *Selected Issues on Crime and Punishment*

1. Gary Ashby, Diocese of Lansing - "Restorative Justice"
2. Andrew C. Pollard, State University of New York at Buffalo - "What's Catholic in Criminology?"

Moderator: Eugene R. Milhizer, Ave Maria School of Law

Session: *Reflections on Celibacy and the Clergy Sexual Abuse Crisis*

1. Rev. David G. Songy, O.F.M. Cap., St. John Vianney Theological Seminary - "Pastoral Counseling for Individuals Who Struggle with Celibate Chastity: A Catholic Model"
2. D. Paul Sullins, The Catholic University of America - "The Social Virtues of Celibacy"
3. Philip M. Sutton, Samaritan Center of Southwest Michigan - "The Psychology of Forgiveness: Implications for Forgiveness and Reconciliation of the Clerical Sexual Abuse Crises in the Church"

Moderator: Mark S. Latkovic, Sacred Heart Major Seminary

Session: Selected Issues on Education

1. Eduardo Echeverria, Conception Seminary College - "Catholic Schools: Where Faith and Learning Meet"
2. Stephen Sharkey, Alverno College - "'Unwrapping Our 'Best Kept Secret': A Critical Review of Major Textbooks in Catholic Social Teaching"

Moderator: Theresa K. Gerson, St. Thomas of Villanova College

Session: Reflections on the Work of Pope John Paul II

1. Christopher Beiting, Ave Maria College - "History in *Fides et Ratio*"
2. Randall Woodard, Our Lady of Good Counsel High School - "Prophet of Justice and Hope: John Paul II and the Dignity and Rights of Workers"

Moderator: Rev. John J. Conley, S.J., Fordham University

Panel: NOW v. Scheidler: The Inside Story

1. Thomas Brejcha, The Thomas More Society, Chicago
2. Ann & Joseph Scheidler, Pro-Life Action League

Chair: Nora O'Callaghan, Ave Maria School of Law

12:15 - 12:45 p.m.

Regularly-scheduled Law School Mass

1:15 - 2:45 p.m.

Sessions

Session: Foundational Issues and Catholic Social Thought

1. Rev. Mr. Gerald DeMauro, New York State Education Department - "A Christocentric Anthropology: Challenging the Assumptions of the Social Sciences in the Culture of Death"
2. Mark Lowery, University of Dallas - "Fr. Anthony Zimmerman's Fresh Perspective on the Preternatural Gifts of Adam and Eve and Its Impact on Catholic Social Thought"
3. Carmine Gorga, Gloucester Community Development Corporation - "Relational Metaphysics"

Moderator: Richard Rolwing

Session: *Marriage and Family Issues*

1. Roy Barkley, Texas State Historical Association - "Catholic Marriage Preparation and Lay Evangelization of Society"
2. Nester C. Kohut, Marian Family Communiversity - "A Multidisciplinary Commentary on Pope John Paul's Recent Call to Catholic Lawyers in Divorce Litigation"

Moderator: Rev. Edward Krause, Gannon University

Session: *Ethical Issues and Catholic Health Care*

1. Gerard M. McKeegan, Trinity Health System - "Duty vs. Conscience: Increasing Moral Dilemmas for the Catholic Health Worker"
2. Michael J. O'Dea, Christus Medicus Foundation - "Financing a Health Care Culture of Life: What We Pay For Is What We Get!"

Moderator: Joseph M. Mauceri

Session: *The Ethics of Business*

1. L. Michael Farrell, University of Quebec - "The Meta-Ethics of Business in the Twenty First Century"

Moderator: Leo Clarke, Ave Maria School of Law

Session: *Catholic Social Thought*

1. Rev. Rodger Charles, S.J., University of Oxford - "Understanding the Church's Social Teaching as the Church Understands it"

Moderator: Rev. Michael P. Orsi

3:00 - 4:00 p.m. Plenary Session

Patrick Fagan, Heritage Foundation - "The Family Findings Database an International Cooperative Project by the Heritage Foundation"

Moderator: Richard S. Myers, Ave Maria School of Law

4:15 - 5:15 p.m. Plenary Session

Glenn Olsen, University of Utah - "The Role of Religion in the Twenty-First Century: Epoch of Secularization or Cosmos Regained?"

Moderator: Kimberly Georgedes, Franciscan University of Steubenville

5:30 - 7:00 p.m.

Panel and Sessions

Session: *Selected Topics on Historical Issues*

1. John F. Quinn, Salve Regina University - “Three Cheers for the Abolitionist Pope: American Reaction to Gregory XVI’s Condemnation of the Slave Trade, 1840- 1860”
2. Edward Smith, University of Guelph - “Catholics and Community: Hamilton, Ontario 1880-1914”

Moderator: Christopher J. Beiting, Ave Maria College

Session: *Globalization*

1. Kamran Mofid, Plater College - “The Role of Religion and Spirituality in Conflict Resolution and Globalization: A View from an Economist”
2. Ernesto R. Gonzales, Pontifical and Royal University of Sto. Tomas - “The Economics of Ecological Anthropology in Pateros, Metro-Manila and its Implication to Sustainable Development in the Philippines”

Moderator: Michael L. Coulter, Grove City College

Panel: “*Virtual Reality, Post Traumatic Stress Syndrome, and Maria Montessori*”

1. G. Daniel Harden, Washburn University
2. Scott Eaton Smith, Kansas State Department of Education Chair: Theresa K. Gerson, St. Thomas of Villanova College

Session: *Marriage and Family Issues*

1. Maurizio Ragazzi, - “Domestic Partners’ Benefits: A Critical Reflection”
2. Rev. John J. Conley, S.J., Fordham University - “Familial Right”
3. G. Randall Lee, Widener University School of Law - “From Words to Sacrament, from Sacrament to Flesh: Reflections on the Concept of Marriage”

Moderator: Jane Adolphe, Ave Maria School of Law

Panel: “Strengthening the Ecclesial Fabric: Psychology at the Service of the Church”

1. Rev. Joseph M. Walsh, Immaculate Heart Counseling Center
2. Kathryn Benes, Immaculate Heart Counseling Center
3. Keith Ficke, Immaculate Heart Counseling Center
4. Luke Niewald, Immaculate Heart Counseling Center

Chair: Kathryn Benes, Immaculate Heart Counseling Center

7:30 - 10:30 p.m. Dinner and Reception, Holiday Inn

Stephen Krason, Franciscan University of Steubenville - President’s Remarks
Speaker - Joseph L. Falvey, Jr., Ave Maria School of Law “Operation Enduring Freedom - A Catholic Military Lawyer’s Perspective”

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 19, 2002

7:30 - 8:00 a.m. Law School Mass

8:00 - 9:30 a.m. Panels and Sessions

Panel: “Tocqueville and Catholicism”

1. Robert Phillips, Wheeling Jesuit University - “Tocqueville’s Loss of Faith in the Political Efficacy of Catholicism in American Democracy”
2. James L. Holmes and Jeremy Holmes - “From Politics as the Architectonic Art to the Separation of Church and State”
3. Bruce Frohnen, Ave Maria School of Law - “Tocqueville and the Catholic Moment in American Conservatism”

Chair: Gary D. Glenn, Northern Illinois University

Session: *Sociology I*

1. R. Lawrence Barbuto - “Transformation of Social Structures: The Sixth Essential of the New Evangelization, and a Perfect Task for the Lay Faithful of the Abrahamic Peoples”
2. Rev. Monsignor George P. Graham, Church of St. Bernard - “Sociology and Faith: The Witness of Paul Hanly Furfey”

Moderator: Rev. Michael P. Orsi, Ave Maria School of Law

Session: *Sociology II*

1. Barbara Zajac, Indiana State University - “Islam and its Challenges from a Sociological Point of View: a Presentation and Discussion”
2. G. Alexander Ross, Indian River Community College - “Spiritual Suicide: Durkheim’s Undeveloped Theory of Unbelief”

Moderator: Stephen Sharkey, Alverno College

Session: *Selected Topics on Life Issues*

1. Keith Cassidy, University of Guelph - “Pro-Life Direct Action as Tactic and Strategy: A Preliminary Evaluation”
2. Rev. Edward Krause, Gannon University - “On Cloning and Stem Cell Research”
3. Nathan Schlueter, St. Ambrose University - “Legal Agnosticism in the Abortion Decisions: Unborn Persons and the Fourteenth Amendment”

Moderator: Elizabeth Ring-Cassidy, The DeVeber Institute for Bioethics and Social Research

9:45 - 11:30 a.m. Plenary Session

Panel: “New Questions in Bioethics”

1. Duane Kraemer, Texas A & M University
2. Rev. Robert J. Araujo, S.J., Gonzaga University School of Law
3. Mark S. Latkovic, Sacred Heart Major Seminary
4. Joseph M. Mauceri

Chair: Joseph M. Mauceri

11:30 - 12:00 p.m. Disciplinary Section Meetings

1. Economics/Business, Philip Crotty
2. History, To be announced
3. Law and Jurisprudence, Nicholas C. Lund-Molfese
4. Philosophy/Theology/Health Care Ethics, Mark Lowery
5. Political Science, Thomas Droleskey
6. Psychology/Psychiatry/Mental Health/Social Work, John P. Nelson
7. Social Communications, Richard W. Cain, Jr.
8. Sociology/Anthropology, Stephen Sharkey

12:15 - 2:00 p.m. Lunch, Holiday Inn

Bishop Allen Vigneron, Rector, Sacred Heart Major Seminary -Remarks

2:30 - 4:00 p.m. Plenary Session

Panel: “The Integral Perspective: Developing a Faith-Based Social Science.” Part I.

1. Lisa Lickona, Ave Maria College - “Whose Truth? Which Epistemology? Questions Faith Poses to Social Science”
2. Paul Vitz, New York University - “A Thomist Support for the Psychology of Person”
3. Barry V. Johnston, Indiana University Northwest - “Sin and Sociology: The Loss and Recovery (?) of a Concept”
4. Lawrence T. Nichols, West Virginia University - “The Integralist Perspective: Implications for the Scientific Study of Deviance”

Chair: Vincent Jeffries, California State University, Northridge

4:30 - 6:00 p.m.

Panels and Session

Panel: “The Integral Perspective: Developing a Faith-Based Social Science.” Part II.

1. Guillermo Montes, University of Rochester - “Is Catholic Economics Possible?”
2. Vincent Jeffries, California State University, Northridge - “The Concept of Virtue and Integral Social Science”

Chair: Vincent Jeffries, California State University, Northridge

Session: Reflections on the Thought of St. Thomas Aquinas

1. Joseph M. deTorre, University of Asia and the Pacific - “The Role of Aquinas in the Breakthrough of Modern Science”
2. Jude Chua Soo Meng, National University of Singapore - “Distinguishing to Unite: Looking at the Bright Side of Legal Positivism as a Theory Attentive to the Dark Side of Law (With a Thomistic Appraisal)”

Moderator: Stephen J. Safranek, Ave Maria School of Law

Panel: “The Future of School Choice”

1. Richard S. Myers, Ave Maria School of Law
2. Peter Hutchison, Landmark Legal Foundation

Chair: Scott W. Gaylord, Ave Maria School of Law

Panel: “United Christian Charity International: Performing the Works of Mercy for the Culture of Life”

1. Thomas M. LaBreche, Woodridge Psychological Association
2. Rev. Mr. Eugene G. McGuirk, Immaculate Conception Church

Chair: Thomas M. LaBreche, Woodridge Psychological Association

Panel: “Vital Organ Donation: Medical Homicide”

1. Walt F. Weaver, St. Elizabeth Regional Medical Center
2. Paul A. Byrne, Medical College of Ohio

Chair: Walt F. Weaver, St. Elizabeth Regional Medical Center

6:15 - 7:00 p.m. Anticipatory Mass

**7:15 - 7:45 p.m. Society of Catholic Social Scientists Chapter Presidents Meeting
Stephen Krason, SCSS President**

Report of the President on the 10th Anniversary of the
Society of Catholic Social Scientists

Stephen M. Krason
President, Society of Catholic Social Scientists

Presented to the 10th Annual Meeting-Conference of the Society of Catholic Social Scientists, Ave Maria School of Law, Ann Arbor, Michigan, October 18, 2002

Survey of the Society's History

The Society of Catholic Social Scientists was started formally in September 1992 at the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Convention in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, after a mailing was done to Fellowship members the previous spring to solicit initial members. A beginning Board of Advisors of outstanding Catholic scholars was assembled and, more slowly, a Bishops advisory board was organized. By the time of the Pittsburgh meeting, about 80 members had joined. At the meeting, an initial slate of officers was selected and initial directions for the SCSS charted. During the following several months, a Constitution was drawn up and adopted by a vote of the membership, the only membership referendum the SCSS has ever had. The Constitution and the accompanying initial set of By-Laws established the framework for the election of officers—which was mandated to take place every two years—and the selection of members of the Board of Directors. The organizers of the SCSS, Dr. Joseph A. Varacalli and myself, sought to resume an effort that seemed to have largely ended in any kind of a concerted way after Vatican II: to build up, in the words of Pope Pius XI, “a true Catholic social science.” Before Vatican II, there had been a number of discipline-specific Catholic social science organizations, but afterwards they either disbanded or secularized. We sought to meet Pope Pius’s challenge with an interdisciplinary organization that would, first, be fully faithful to all the Church’s teachings and, second, emphasize solid, objective scholarship.

Our first annual national meeting-conference was held the following March at Franciscan University of Steubenville, which established the pattern of our annual meeting-conference of attempting to maximize participation by sending out a call for papers to the entire membership and accepting proposed presentations and papers that met broad subject guidelines and showed quality scholarship. It attracted about 20 presenters.

During its first few years, the SCSS was a part of the Catholic Central Union of America (CCUA). They had offered this arrangement to us to make it easier for us to operate. In 1995, after problems developed, the SCSS separated from the CCUA, incorporated, and applied for and received a tax exemption as a 501 (c) (3) organization.

During these early years, besides establishing our annual meeting-conference as a regular feature (after the first one the Board of Directors voted to have the conference in the fall), the SCSS focused its attention on expanding membership, small research projects (which resulted in a few short publications), and public and Catholic Church affairs statements. A number of public affairs statements were issued in these early years, often as letters to all the members of Congress or of one of its houses. A number of the annual conference papers were published in the CCUA's *Social Justice Review*.

In 1996, as a separate newly-incorporated organization, we launched our most ambitious project to that time, the establishment of the annual *Catholic Social Science Review*, the SCSS's refereed scholarly journal. *The Review* became the only interdisciplinary scholarly Catholic journal in the social sciences in North America. *The Review* was initially edited by Dr. Varacalli (issues I-IV), and then by Dr. Ryan J. Barilleaux (issues V-present). Dr. Dominic Aquila "brought the first issue home" when he filled in for Varacalli in 1996 for health reasons. Besides members' dues, Franciscan University of Steubenville has helped fund the *Review*. Villanova University assisted also for several issues in the *Review's* production through the efforts of Dr. Jack Schrems' office. The fact that the *Review* is compiled without any full-time staff—it is a volunteer effort, and we pay outside individuals and a printer for production and publishing—is itself a considerable achievement. Although we have much on-going work to do to promote it, it is being subscribed to by numerous academic libraries in addition to our members receiving it. We have made two major mailing efforts to promote it to academic libraries around the country. The most recent—a very intense effort, with initial contacts and then follow-ups with specific staff at libraries—was by John Crowley, its Assistant Editor for Promotion, about two years ago. It, along with our other publications, was also for several years promoted through the catalog of Franciscan University Press. Significantly, the *Review* is abstracted by *Religious and Theological Abstracts* and is indexed in the *Catholic Periodical and Literature Index*. In the near future, we are planning a renewed effort to get the *Review* indexed in the *Social Science Index*.

Many outstanding articles have appeared over the years in the *Review*. The current issue (Volume VI - 2002) includes an article about the results of a major study of the effects of natural family planning, which had been commissioned by the Family for the Americas organization. *The Review* is the main academic publication the results have been published in.

The SCSS established two major awards, the Pope Pius XI Award for Contributions toward the Building Up of a True Catholic Social Science (named after the pope who gave this charge to Catholic scholars in *Quadragesimo Anno*, a reward for scholarship which in 2002 has been given out for the eighth year in a row), and the Blessed Frederic Ozanam Award for Catholic Social Action. There were also predecessor awards given out for the latter, as well as awards we have given out for contributions to Catholic higher education.

Since 1997, the SCSS has also had a much smaller spring conference on a specific theme at different locations that has coincided with our spring Board of Directors meeting (since 1996 we have had two Board meetings each year). We have worked successfully to build up the Bishops advisory board to the point where its current eleven members is an all-time high. This, plus letters of support we have received from Rome, have enabled us to demonstrate ecclesiastical support. Our general Board of Advisors, made up mostly of leading Catholic scholars, now has over thirty members.

In 1997, the SCSS sent a letter to all the U.S. bishops expressing concern about the trend in establishing “homosexual ministries” in various dioceses, which espoused, among other things, a “gay spirituality.” Drafted by Dr. Joseph Nicolosi, this letter generated national attention for the SCSS.

In 1998, the SCSS published a full-length book, an anthology edited by Dr. Paul C. Vitz and myself, *Defending the Family: A Sourcebook*. In 1999, the SCSS filed an *amicus curiae* brief in the U.S. Supreme Court, which was co-authored by our member Richard Garnett of Notre Dame Law School and myself, in *Troxel v. Glanville*, the Court’s most noteworthy parental rights case of recent years. Both this brief and the anthology generated additional public attention to the SCSS. These two projects followed from the decision of the Board of Directors some years ago to give special focus, especially in our public and Church affairs efforts, to family and economic justice issues.

We have periodically raised additional money for publications, though our main source of funds by far is the members’ dues, which have stayed at \$25. We have successfully maintained fiscal responsibility by insuring that our annual meeting-conference pays for itself with the registration and meal fees and working to raise money for extra, large projects that we have undertaken. The registration costs for our meeting-conference have stayed in the \$20-\$23 range for members and \$30-\$33 for non-members. Since we have wanted to encourage members to come to the meeting-conference, we have tried to keep the cost low. Another big help has been that Franciscan University of Steubenville has provided financial assistance to the production of the *Review* each year. Their funding, along with \$10 of each member’s dues, makes production of the *Review* possible. The SCSS has received strong support from both Franciscan University presidents over the course of our existence, Frs. Michael Scanlan and Terence Henry. In fact, both—along with the president and acting president of Ave Maria College and Dean Bernard Dobranski of Ave Maria School of Law—sit on our Board of Advisors.

Our treasury, as of mid-September 2002, is at about \$24,000, though this fluctuates with expenses during the year, especially after expenses for the meeting-conference are met. Fund-raising is an area that we need to work on in the future, as we attempt special projects. We especially want to raise additional funds to provide financial security for the *Review*. One reason why we have been able to accumulate this large of a treasury is the very fact that

we have sought to raise extra money when we have had special projects instead of using our revenues from dues. Still, the growth of our treasury means that we may be able to do some extra projects in the future with the funds on hand. We also now have our funds in two interest-bearing accounts, so that we add to our money—even if only a little.

The annual meeting-conference for the last several years has averaged about 50 presentations, mostly in breakout sections. Most of the time, we have had one or more plenary session speakers, usually made possible through funding assistance by the institution where we have the meeting-conference. The SCSS normally gives out its Pope Pius XI and Blessed Frederic Ozanam Awards at the meeting-conference and we often feature the award winners as plenary session speakers, as well. The annual meeting-conference over the years has been held seven times at Franciscan University of Steubenville, twice at Ave Maria School of Law, and once at Christendom College. Such considerations as location, facilities, a member present to handle organizing, and local staff support have determined where to hold it.

Since the beginning of the SCSS, the President has tried to communicate with the membership regularly by three or four general mailings per year.

Current Projects, Membership, and Subsidiary Groupings in the SCSS

Now, the SCSS has embarked upon what may become its most significant and influential scholarly project: the production of *Catholic Social Thought, Social Science, and Social Policy: An Encyclopedia*, a one-volume reference work which we are under contract with Scarecrow Press to bring out by 2006. The contract with Scarecrow, which came about largely through the efforts of Dr. Varacalli, who is serving as lead editor of the encyclopedia and pouring much time into it, will enable us to do this project at little cost to ourselves. This effort is well underway, with numerous members of the SCSS and the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars volunteering to write entries for the work. Co-editors with Dr. Varacalli are Professor Richard Myers, Dr. Michael Coulter, and myself. The volume, which will be fully loyal to the Church's orthodox teaching and will be careful not to subordinate Catholic social teaching to ideological predispositions, should become a standard reference work on this subject for years to come.

The SCSS's membership seems to have stayed in the range of 350 the last few years. This is both a blessing and a disappointment. In spite of the aggressive efforts at recruiting new members undertaken by Dr. Varacalli when he resumed the Membership Chairman position a few years ago, which briefly brought us to 400 or so members, we have not been able to permanently stay at that plateau. This has been because we have roughly averaged around 40 nonrenewals of membership each year. This has been in spite of our sending of

four official notices about dues payment over a six-month period each year, and my sending of personal appeal notes and the making of other contacts by Dr. Varacalli and me to many of those who have not paid their dues by the time we get near to the end of that period. It is also despite the efforts to make renewed mail appeals to former members to rejoin a year or two after they let their membership lapse.

Another area we need to work on is getting more members active in our projects. Here, the response to the encyclopedia project has been very heartening. Many of our members will be writing articles for it. We need more people to help with such things as: writing reports about our conferences and activities that could be sent out to the Catholic press (publications such as *The Wanderer*, the *National Catholic Register*, and the *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Quarterly*, at minimum, are likely to run them), drafting public and Church affairs statements, fund-raising, proofreading assistance on the *Review*, and working on local and regional chapters and disciplinary section activities. On the latter, we have some active local and regional chapters, but others have only started up and we want to try to get them active. About two years ago, I encouraged a shift away from a local base to a broader regional base for our chapters, since in only a few individual metropolitan areas are there enough SCSS members in to form a viable chapter. So, e.g., we are now working to form a Chicago Regional Chapter which encompasses the northern half of Illinois and Indiana and the southern half of Wisconsin, and a regional chapter for Texas which would include all of our members in that large state. Such chapters perhaps can orient themselves toward one significant event per year, perhaps a small regional conference or a seminar. Some chapters, such as the Mid-Continent Chapter (northeast Kansas, northwest Missouri, and southeast Nebraska), have piggybacked on existing events which certain members already have in place at their universities. Eleven local or regional chapters have been recognized by the Board of Directors, but some have yet to have any events which is a prerequisite for continued recognition.

We have had meetings of disciplinary sections at each annual meeting-conference. They have discussed ideas, but activating sections during the rest of the year has been a challenge—probably because there are not a large number of members in some of the disciplines and members are scattered throughout the U.S., Canada, and even abroad. The Political Science Section, which is one of the largest, has gotten a niche for itself by having from one to three panels, which its members organize and sometimes co-sponsor with other organizations, at the annual American Political Science Association Convention each Labor Day weekend.

At their meetings at the 2002 SCSS annual meeting-conference, I placed two possible project proposals before the sections which may help them become more active. One of these projects is immediate, the other more long-term. The immediate one is to enlist a few of the members of each section

to write articles for a symposium, which I am willing to coordinate, in the 2003 or 2004 issue of the *Review*. The symposium will essentially be an examination and critique of the state of each of the social science disciplines, both from a general professional and a Catholic standpoint. The longer-range one is to have the sections consider whether, in the future, they might be able to function as minor accrediting bodies in their disciplines, wherever feasible. The idea is simply this: Under the influence of *Ex corde Ecclesia*, more Catholic college administrators and faculty are going to realize that they have to try to regain some of their Catholicity. They will have to make a choice: simply secularize or take steps to recover their Catholic heritage, at least to some degree. They may, here and there, be interested in looking to a distinctively Catholic scholarly/professional organization to come in to examine their social science programs and advise them about how they might make them more “Catholic,” as a supplement to the general evaluation of certain of their programs by various secular mainstream professional organizations. I am encouraging those of our disciplinary sections who think they can do something like this to prepare themselves for it and we will then put them forward to the Catholic academy as able to act as such informal evaluative bodies. As time goes on, I believe that at least some Catholic colleges may call upon them. This idea, by the way, came from my bringing in two SCSS members from our Political Science Section—Drs. Ryan Barilleaux and Gary Glenn—to do an evaluation of our Political Science Program at Franciscan University as part of our self-study prior to our regional accreditation visit in 2004.

The SCSS’s web page has made significant progress. Originally based at and an appendage of Franciscan University’s web page, we have now established a separate site with our own web page address. Thanks to the efforts of Dr. Paul Sullins, it is hosted by The Catholic University of America, though it still has a link to Franciscan University’s page. It is now managed by Dr. Michael Coulter from his base at Grove City College, and has expanded its scope to now include the full text of issues of the *Review*, other scholarly articles submitted by members, and public affairs articles and statements. We have also asked members who are seeking or know of social science positions in the academy or elsewhere which might interest our members to so inform Dr. Coulter, so they can be listed on the web page in a special job opening section. Recently, we were also asked to post positions available in one of the federal executive branch agencies.

The SCSS’s By-Laws call for us to have several specific committees. As the organization has developed, they have not played as significant of a role as expected. The Chairmen of the Membership and Public and Church Affairs Committees play an important on-going role in those areas, but the full committees have not had to be called upon much. Part of the reason for this limited utilization of the committees has been that when we have done different projects they have not required the standing committee structure.

FUTURE PROJECTS

Three of the ideas for major initiatives for the future are actually things that we have done at different times or which I had suggested for the SCSS in my *5-Year Report* in 1997. Other tasks and projects intervened to make it difficult to pursue these, however. It would be desirable to reemphasize organizational statements, through the Public and Church Affairs Committee, about different public and Church affairs questions in which particularly we could bring to bear our expertise and could seek to apply Catholic social teaching. We made a number of statements, as noted, on public issues in our earlier years. To do this, however, we need members who would be willing to undertake to draft these, on short notice, when their area of expertise needs to be called upon. On the public affairs front, we should also consider doing more *amicus curiae* briefs in other future Supreme Court cases, especially in the pro-family area, which would make to the Court the kinds of Natural Law arguments they will not otherwise hear. We should try to testify before Congressional committees and governmental advisory bodies on important public questions where our perspective and expertise would be valuable.

Early in our history, we briefly attempted to start a “rapid response” project to comment quickly on particular public developments or attacks on the Church or on spurious social science studies which might be released. In my *5-Year Report*, I also said that I as SCSS President would like to try to do periodic commentary pieces that could hopefully find their way into the general media and would both promote Catholic social teaching and our organization. What might be considered for the future is the starting of an actual commentary service in which interested SCSS members could write timely commentary pieces—attempting to examine and respond to current public questions in light of Catholic social teaching—to send out to both the Catholic and secular media with regularity. We might call this the “Catholic Social Commentary” or CSC Service. Obviously, only a limited number of such pieces would be picked up by newspapers or newsmagazines, but we could also routinely include them in both the “Public and Church Affairs” section of the *Review* and on our web page. Over time, we may be able to get enough pieces published to be able to make a valuable contribution to public debate. The Public Relations Office at Franciscan University has told me they would be willing to help to send these out for us.

In my *5-Year Report*, I also suggested periodic seminars in Washington geared to Catholics on Capitol Hill and the executive branch. I have had this in mind for some time, and have recently received some advice and assistance from Patrick Fagan, an SCSS member who is on the staff of the Heritage Foundation. The hope is that the SCSS might be able to plan one or more special small conferences or seminars for Hill staffers, in a way that might aid

the pro-family efforts in Congress and educate them on certain pro-family issues. I am turning my attention to this currently. Thus, as we keep our scholarly activity up with the *Review*, the *Encyclopedia*, and our regular conferences, we can at least turn a bit of our attention to bringing Catholic social teaching right into the public arena and to address, where indicated, concerns within the Church.

We have tried to keep the U.S. bishops aware of our existence and our willingness to serve them, but they have not called upon us and this is not something that we should anxiously await. We shall keep our organization before them by occasional communications to them and trying to have information about ourselves appear in the Catholic press. We try to keep our Bishops Board members fully informed about our activities—they receive all our mailings and the *Review* and all our publications, and sometimes write to acknowledge them—and will try wherever we can to involve them in our programs. To this end, Dr. Varacalli has been successful in scheduling Bishop William Murphy of Rockville Centre for a luncheon talk at our coming spring conference at Varacalli's Catholic Center at Nassau Community College.

As we look to the future, it is important that the SCSS keeps its mission in focus: of proclaiming the Church's social teaching in full, not diluting or reshaping parts of it to fit secular ideological imperatives, and engaging in scholarly and professional work which bears this out. We must be very clear about our Catholic commitment, even while making the case about the wisdom of the Church's teaching in a way that may be best geared to reaching the different people we may be called upon to address or witness to along the way. We must not be afraid to proclaim the truth *fully* and be led to where the evidence leads us, even if it means tackling unpopular issues or coming to unpopular conclusions. Ultimately, it does not matter what the world thinks of us, but only what God thinks of us. We obviously must realize that there can be different prudential approaches, but we must not be reluctant to make sober-minded decisions about the application of the Church's social teaching (as we are attempting to do in some of our *Encyclopedia* articles). This teaching is not something that can exist only in theory or on the level of general principles. We must always keep in mind that the "building of a true Catholic social science" called for by Pope Pius XI was meant, like all things, to be in the service of "reestablishing all things in Christ" (Eph 1:10).

THE FAMILY AND SOCIETY DATABASE

Patrick Fagan

Introduction

Pat Fagan, a member of the Society of Catholic Social Scientists and the William H.G. FitzGerald Fellow at The Heritage Foundation is directing a database project at Heritage that will be of keen interest to many other members of the society.

The Family and Society Database is an Internet based searchable database of social science findings on the family and religion (www.familydatabase.org). It is free to all users of the Internet and as of November 2000s had 1,200 discreet empirical findings. These are continually being added to, and over time the database will grow in size.

Database Unit

The key unit used in the database is an empirical finding, not a summary, nor an abstract from an article. The main sources will be peer-reviewed journals, though books by leading academics will be used, as well as government research publications.

The jargon language of the social sciences is translated into ordinary English while staying true to the empirical description of the original finding. Where available the finding reference carries an Internet link to the original article. (Where that is not available there is at least a link to the journal web site.) Where possible there will also be a description of the sample size and the population from which the sample is drawn, as well as the year of sampling.

Here is an example of a “finding” as it appears in the database:

This finding looks at the relationship between parental divorce and behavioral factors that contribute to offspring divorce.

Finding: *Parental divorce had a direct impact on children’s interpersonal behaviors that make marriage less rewarding and increase the risk of divorce. “Compared with peers from intact families, adult children of divorced parents are more likely to have an interpersonal style marked by problematic behavior (problems with anger, jealousy, hurt feelings, communication, and infidelity), and these interpersonal problems in turn increase the risk of divorce.”*

Sample or Data Description 1,118 adults married in 1980

Source: Paul R. Amato, "Explaining the Intergenerational Transmission of Divorce" *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. Vol. 58, Number. August, 1996. Page(s) 628-640.

Intended Audiences

The primary audiences for all of Heritage's works are Congressmen, their staff, and journalists. However this database will also be marketed to students to accomplish an "end run" around professors who are so ideological in their work they do not expose their students to the literature on family and religion that the database makes accessible.

Students will find the database useful. For term papers and essays they will be able to search by key words and print out the findings they want to use. These give them the facts on which to build their personal work.

Other audiences will receive attention also: clergy, teachers, home-school parents, high school students and debate teams. And when the database grows in size graduate students and academics will be drawn to it also.

Internet Collaboration

The Heritage Foundation intends to cooperate with other institutions and specialist scholars to make the database grow. Scholars and institutions can contribute to the database from anywhere in the world, because it is Internet-based. (They get special password entry to the 'back-end of the database.) With such collaboration the database can become a world wide, "common-good" project with many contributing and all benefiting. The more this happens the greater the number of findings and the more powerful the database will become.

The Rockford Institute was the first to join in the cooperative effort. Rockford, under the guidance of Dr Allan Carlson, has been producing monthly digests of key findings on the family from the social science literature for 15 years. The findings it has used were a significant portion of the original findings used to launch the database.

Negotiations are underway with at least one major university that had planned to build its own database, but seeing this one decided to cooperate rather than compete.

Civitas, the Institute for the Study of Civil Society in Great Britain and producer of many fine studies on the family, has also begun to contribute findings. Other institutions in Canada, the United Kingdom and New Zealand are already indicating that they want to become partners in the project, and should that happen it will expand the data being fed into the database and help illustrate the universal good of marriage and religious worship, to name but two of the major themes being tracked in the database.

The Heritage Foundation makes the database available to other institutions interested in carrying it on their web site.

While cooperation by many others will lead to a much bigger database, The Heritage Foundation will maintain quality control of all aspects of the database: fact-checking, editing, key word indexing, and computer management of the database. This will ensure continuity and quality control.

Philosophy Behind the Project

The aim of the database is to illustrate natural law from the findings of the social sciences and in so doing to correct the relativist bias and promote a more reasoned appreciation of the family, marriage and religion among college faculty, students, journalists, researchers, legislators and other policy-makers.

If natural law is a reality, then the social sciences well done cannot but illustrate divine natural law. And the more robust the methodological developments of the social sciences the more clearly will the social sciences so illustrate natural law. One can say that the role of the social sciences is to illustrate divine natural law and to stimulate the philosophical discourse on the relationship between man's behavior and man's nature. In this manner the database will help correct the relativist pattern so frequent among social scientists.

These developments point to an optimistic future for the relationship between the quantitative social sciences, philosophy and the continuing public discourse.

Future Extensions of the Database

As the database grows, each major area of study will need synthesis papers, papers that integrate these myriad findings. Such papers are akin to mosaics which are made from thousands of chips of marble. In this case the discreet empirical finding is akin to the chip and the synthesis paper is the mosaic—a mosaic that illustrates natural law in action in this area.

How to Collaborate

The simplest form of collaboration is as an Internet, remote contributor to the database. This involves occasional entries of findings that are significant and which the social scientist judges worthy of bringing to the attention of the world at large.

A more intense collaboration would be a review of a particular literature to make the database robust in that particular area. Such collaboration could involve the use of interns or graduate students under the direction of the academic. Computer programming permits the supervision of such entries by students before the academic forwards them to the database.

For those interested in exploring modes of collaboration, contact Pat Fagan at Pat.Fagan@heritage.org.

CAREER TRACK INTERNSHIP FOR SOCIAL SCIENCE STUDENTS AT THE HERITAGE FOUNDATION

Patrick Fagan

The Heritage Foundation launched a special intern program in the Spring of 2002: a semester long (spring, summer or fall) \$6,000 internship designed to help launch a career in shaping a conservative social policy. Those who have just finished their undergraduate studies, and who have taken quantitative social science courses and are somewhat familiar with statistics, are ideal candidates.

Because many social science students obtain little practical experience of public policy work during their undergraduate and graduate years they do not conceive of public policy as a career option. The Heritage program, operated by the nation's leading conservative public policy research foundation, is designed to provide a small number of interns with a hands-on introduction to the public policy work involved in reshaping social policy. The internship is available primarily to graduate students in the social sciences—students who have studied sociology, or psychology, and statistics. In special cases undergraduates may be accepted.

Those who take this internship will have the continued mentoring of Heritage personnel during and after the internship and the backing of the Heritage Foundation to help them launch and establish their careers, using the myriad contact resources of the foundation to do so—a major benefit for a young professional seeking to become established in this field.

Why the Program was Started

The Left currently dominates social science research, university departments, journals, and the career structure of the social sciences. While conservatives have been quite successful in beginning to reshape social policy, it has been with very few committed people and with the institutional structure stacked heavily against them. Moreover, their ability to make a strong case for such things as faith-based approaches, education choice and a host of other policy changes is seriously hampered by the lack of conservative experts and players in the field. It is time to bring bright young social conservatives to Washington to make a career of making the country a better place to live in.

Structure of the Program

The internship is worth a total of \$6,000, disbursed to the intern at \$750 every 2 weeks over the 16 week semester. The intern must reside in the Washington DC area during the internship, and must be available 40 hours per week for the full length of the internship.

Interns spend approximately half their time at the foundation, engaged in policy projects chosen in conjunction with Heritage research staff.

The other half of their time is spent working at the offices of a congressional committee or Member of Congress with a strong interest in social science issues, an appropriate Administration agency, at another research institution in Washington, or a similar venue. The placement is chosen in conjunction with Heritage research staff. An intern may have more than one placement during the semester.

Interns have a series of meetings with individuals who have been successful in shaping social policy and learn from them how their individual careers evolved—staff of Congressional leaders, former Heritage interns who are in the Administration, even in the White House, and with key civil servants who have made a quiet but powerful career inside the bureaucracy. These meetings will also enable the interns to build helpful contacts in Washington that may assist them in their public policy career.

Applications

Students interested in the internship program should contact:

Ann Bula,
Intern Coordinator,
The Heritage Foundation
214 Massachusetts Ave NE
Washington, DC 20002 ann.bula@heritage.org

The applications for the Summer and Fall Internship should be mailed or e-mailed before the previous November and should include:

- A resume.
- A list of social science courses taken.
- A letter of recommendation: the best one possible related to this type of internship.

- A short essay (1,500 words max.) on the social policy change he/she would work to bring about if in a powerful political office today.
- A list of favorite social policy areas in order of interest, highest interest first.
- A letter explaining why this career track internship is of interest, why he/she should be selected.

OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM: REFLECTIONS OF A CATHOLIC MILITARY LAWYER

Joseph L. Falvey, Jr.

Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Associate Professor of Law at Ave Maria School of Law, Ann Arbor, Michigan. B.A. , University of Notre Dame; J.D., Notre Dame Law School; LL.M. The Judge Advocate General's School of the Army. Dean Falvey is also a lieutenant colonel in the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve. From September 13, 2001, to September 30, 2002, he served as Assistant Staff Judge Advocate for Operational Law at U.S. Central Command in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

As some of you know, I recently completed a year of active duty as a U.S. Marine Corps reservist activated in support of Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) as Assistant Staff Judge Advocate for Operational Law, at U.S. Central Command, including five weeks in Afghanistan. In this capacity, I was responsible for providing legal advice to this joint command on issues related to operational, international, and criminal law issues arising out of the war on terrorism.

During my tour of duty, I heard many criticisms from the media, academia, and the international community regarding our conduct of OEF. For example, some organizations and individuals have taken issue with the U.S. government position that we are engaged in an armed conflict with al Qaida. Their position is that only states can be engaged in international armed conflict, and a private organization such as al Qaida cannot engage in armed conflict. Some have even claimed that our operations in Afghanistan against al Qaida and its state-sponsor, the Taliban regime, constitute an unjust war.

A substantial amount of public misinformation also exists regarding the processing, interrogating, and holding of detainees at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba (GTMO). Some critics have speculated that a large proportion of the GTMO detainees are prisoners of war or innocent non-combatants. Such speculation may stem in part from the court pleadings on behalf of some detainees who claim that they were performing humanitarian or religious activities in Afghanistan when they were captured by coalition forces hoping to profit from the transfer of enemy combatants to U.S. government control. Some see the lack of criminal prosecutions as support for the allegation that some detainees have been detained by mistake. There is also a widespread assumption that the law requires the U.S. government to charge the detainees with crimes or release them.

Those who are familiar with the Geneva Convention on prisoners of war, military regulations, and past practice are especially concerned about the

U.S. government's failure to convene so-called Article 5 tribunals to make status determinations. Some organizations and members of the press have even speculated that the U.S. government may be using torture, or allowing other coalition partners to use torture, as an interrogation tactic. Consequently, the U.S. government is under ever-increasing pressure to permit greater judicial or outside scrutiny of some kind, cease interrogations, accelerate and finish investigations, and prosecute or release the detainees.

Others have an entirely different perspective. For example, some supporters of U.S. policies and practices have become frustrated by what they perceive as a lack of progress or success in gathering information from detainees and punishing the perpetrators of the September 11 attacks. Unfortunately, because of my position, I was never able to respond to these critics or engage in the debate over these issues-until now. This evening, I would like to address some of these misperceptions.

In my view, much of the criticism demonstrates a fundamental lack of understanding of some basic points relevant to the war on terrorism. Contrary to what some believe, the conduct of the war on terrorism is based on sound legal policy and we are determined to do the right thing in this war, as in all wars, notwithstanding the truly unique nature and challenging circumstances of this war.

First, regarding our conflict with al Qaida, and the justness of our cause, there can be little doubt that al Qaida is engaged in a protracted armed conflict against the United States, our citizens, and our allies, which began as late as 1998 and perhaps as early as 1992.

Al Qaida itself "claims to have shot down U.S. helicopters and killed U.S. servicemen in Somalia in 1993 and to have conducted three bombings that targeted U.S. troops in Aden, Yemen, in December 1992."

It has been linked to multiple unsuccessful conspiracies involving the assassination of various world leaders.

As early as 1998, al Qaida's leader, Osama bin Laden, called upon Muslims everywhere, including his al Qaida organization, "to kill U.S. citizens-civilian or military and their allies everywhere." Shortly thereafter, al Qaida killed at least 301 individuals and injured thousands in August 1998 when it bombed the United States Embassies in Kenya and Tanzania.

In October 2000, al Qaida directed an attack on the USS Cole in the port of Aden, Yemen, killing 17 U.S. Navy members, and injuring another 39.

Most recently, as you all know, on September 11, 2001, 19 al Qaida suicide attackers hijacked and crashed four U.S. commercial jets, two into the World Trade Center towers in New York City, one into the Pentagon, and a fourth into a field in Pennsylvania, leaving about 3,000 individuals dead or missing.

These events lead to only one conclusion: a foreign, private terrorist network has issued a declaration of war against the United States, and has organized, campaigned, and trained for, and over the course of years has repeatedly carried out, unlawful and indiscriminate armed attacks against innocent civilians and military forces, including the largest attack in history against the United States. These latest attacks were of sufficient magnitude to persuade most of the world, including NATO and even the United Nations, that the United States was warranted in invoking its right to use force in self-defense.

Although we have eliminated the Taliban regime in Afghanistan and we have al Qaida on the run, at this point, there is no indication that al Qaida and its supporters have relented in their so-called “holy war” against the U.S. and its citizens. They have neither surrendered nor withdrawn their declaration of their intent to kill U.S. citizens—civilian or military and our allies everywhere. As recent events in Bali demonstrate, Al Qaida continues to wage war. As long as this state of active hostilities continues, the U.S. government has the right under international law—and the responsibility under the U.S. Constitution—to defend its citizens against further attacks. Moreover, as long as hostilities continue, we must—as a matter of national security, military necessity, and common sense—continue to detain enemy combatants who would rejoin the fight against us if given the chance.

A second area of misperception relates to the Geneva Conventions and the status of detainees in U.S. custody. Critics have raised concerns about our interpretation of the Geneva Convention on POWs, focusing on so-called “Article 4 status determinations” and the alleged requirement to convene “Article 5 tribunals” in cases of doubt. Some continue to assert that the Taliban is covered by Article 4(A)(1) of the Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War (GPW), which refers to “members of the armed forces of a Party to the conflict.” They also contend that a “competent tribunal” under Article 5, GPW, should make the status determinations.

Under the Geneva Conventions, only lawful armed forces are legally entitled to take part in hostilities (and receive “combatant immunity”) and neither the Taliban nor al Qaida is a lawful armed force. Regarding the Taliban, captured Taliban fighters are not entitled to prisoner of war status because they were not the regular armed force of Afghanistan, which was disbanded in the mid-1990’s. Moreover, the Taliban “militia” did not meet the four criteria for lawful combatants. Most notably, they did not wear uniforms or other easily

recognizable insignia and they did not adhere to the laws and customs of war. Nor is al Qaida a lawful armed force. They are a private terrorist organization unlawfully engaged in armed conflict. They are not a state party to the Geneva Conventions and they flagrantly violate even the most fundamental laws and customs of war.

In addition to unlawfully targeting and killing civilians, al Qaida's methods and means of waging war are at odds with every requirement applicable to lawful armed forces, i.e., the requirement to carry arms openly, use responsible military command, follow laws and customs of war, and wear uniforms or other insignia recognizable at a distance. Accordingly, the U.S. government's view is that, because there is no doubt about the status of the detainees, there is no need to convene so-called Article 5 tribunals, which are only required in cases of doubt. This issue, however, is largely academic because the detainees, by Presidential order, have been treated consistent with the GPW and enjoy many of the protections and benefits afforded to bona fide prisoners of war. Even so, some critics of the U.S. government have suggested that detainees in U.S. custody have been mistreated and subjected to poor conditions of detention. For example, in Sweden it was recently reported that combatants "are being held in cages" with "corrugated roofs" with no protection from the intense heat and humidity.

We have constructed new housing units with ventilation systems for the detainees at GTMO and each detainee has his own bed, toilet and running water.

We are providing the detainees with three culturally appropriate meals a day, shelter, new clothing and shoes, showers, and beds and blankets.

We are providing them excellent medical care—the same type of medical care available to U.S. troops in GTMO and Afghanistan.

The detainees have been given personal toiletries, new towels and washcloths, and may take showers regularly.

They have been given the opportunity to worship freely and those who so desire have been given copies of the Koran in their native language.

The detainees are permitted access to an exercise area several times per week. The average weight gain has been about 15 lbs per person.

We are not subjecting the detainees to physical or mental abuse or cruel treatment.

The detainees are not being held incommunicado. Representatives of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) regularly visit detainees individually and privately. The detainees have regular access to a chaplain of Muslim faith and can meet privately with him. All who so desire have communicated by mail with their families and some have met with government officials from their country of nationality.

As the treatment of Daniel Pearl, a civilian, demonstrates, our treatment of the detainees goes well beyond what our forces could expect were they to fall into enemy hands.

A third misperception is the suggestion that the U.S. lacks the authority to detain enemy combatants unless it brings criminal charges against them. Some apparently believe that the U.S. is violating domestic and international laws that prohibit the indefinite detention of individuals. They assume that detainees must be criminally charged and tried in a court of law or set free. As a result of this faulty assumption, some are pressuring us to expedite interrogations and investigations, and quickly decide the fate of all the detainees. There is a related misperception, fueled perhaps by recent U.S. District Court decisions properly denying habeas jurisdiction over alien enemy combatants held outside U.S. sovereign territory, that the U.S. government is intentionally operating outside of its own legal system and not within any other discernable legal framework. In this regard, it is important to remember some basic points:

First, we are engaged in a war, not a law enforcement operation.

Second, the U.S. is well within its authority to detain enemy combatants and other hostile forces for the duration of hostilities.

Third, the U.S. and its coalition partners have a collective interest in preventing detainees from returning to the battlefield in an ongoing war.

Finally, although some detainees may ultimately face charges, all may be detained for the duration of the war, with or without criminal charges.

As noted previously, the U.S. and its coalition partners are at war—hostilities are ongoing—we continue to fight against enemy combatants who are planning and conducting operations against us.

Just as we have the legal authority to target lawful military objectives such as enemy combatants, so too we have the authority to capture and detain them. This is a universally recognized principle under international humanitarian law—enemy combatants engaged in war may be captured and detained for at least the duration of hostilities and even longer in individual cases where criminal proceedings are ongoing. Such detention prevents enemy combatants from continuing to fight against us and removes them to a place of safety. The capture and detention of enemy combatants—as opposed to the targeting and use of deadly force against them—directly serves the humanitarian purpose of sparing the lives of individuals engaged in hostilities against us. As such, the U.S.

is well within their right under international law to capture and detain enemy combatants, just as the U.S. and its allies have done in every modern war.

The detainees in question—enemy combatants being held in Afghanistan and at GTMO—were captured while engaged in active hostilities against the U.S. or other coalition members. They were bearing arms against us or were otherwise acting in direct support of hostile al Qaida or Taliban forces. Many have pledged that they will rejoin the fight or otherwise provide support to al Qaida if given the chance to do so. We simply cannot release enemy combatants who would rejoin the “jihad” and fight for al Qaida or the Taliban and their supporters. Accordingly, we must detain them while hostilities are ongoing.

This leads to two obvious questions: when do hostilities end and who gets to decide this? In the war against al Qaida—just as in every other war in our history—it is impossible to predict during the war exactly when the war will come to an end. And the uncertainty in this war is perhaps even greater because here, unlike in past wars against other countries, it may be very difficult to say when al Qaida has surrendered or been defeated. Under international law, only the parties to the conflict—in this case, the U.S. government and its coalition partners—can determine when hostilities have ceased. This too has been true of all modern wars.

The act of detaining enemy combatants, however, is not an act of punishment. Rather, the act of detaining is intended first and foremost to prevent enemy combatants from continuing to fight against us. There is no international law that requires the detaining power to “accuse” enemy combatants of crimes, bring charges against them, or put them on trial. Nor is there any law requiring the detaining power to release enemy combatants and send them home prior to the end of hostilities. At the end of traditional wars between nations, combatants typically are released and repatriated to their home country (which becomes responsible for ensuring that hostilities do not resume) unless criminal proceedings were pending against them in the detaining country or elsewhere. While there may be criminal charges filed in some cases while hostilities are ongoing, nations at war traditionally have waited until the end of hostilities to bring charges.

If charges are brought against some individuals during the course of hostilities, this does not mean that these individuals are receiving better or preferential treatment. It simply means that, in addition to being detained enemy combatants, they are also charged with specific acts that violate the criminal laws of the detaining power or the international law of armed conflict. The decision whether to bring charges against a given individual may turn on a variety of factors. For example, it may depend upon the availability of evidence, the scarcity of military resources in wartime, the location of the individual, the nature of the evidence, intelligence and national security concerns, or other factors related to the war effort.

It has also been claimed that we are denying detainees their right to counsel. To the contrary, in this war, as in every modern war, enemy combatants (even those who are bona fide prisoner of war) have no legal right to counsel or to the courts for the purpose of challenging their detention while hostilities are ongoing prior to being charged with a crime. If and when a detainee is charged, he would then have the right to counsel and be afforded other fundamental procedural safeguards. To date, however, no detainee has been charged with a particular crime.

Besides not being required by international law, providing detainees access to counsel in the absence of criminal charges would directly interfere with our ongoing efforts to gather and evaluate intelligence about the enemy, its capabilities and its plans. Such intelligence exploitation is critical to the conduct of the war effort and the prevention of further attacks. Many detainees may have information regarding al Qaida or the Taliban, their past unlawful conduct, or their plans to carry out future attacks. Thus far, we have been successful in obtaining and exploiting this intelligence. For this reason, we must continue to interrogate enemy combatants who may have information relating to al Qaida's past or present capabilities, or means and methods of war.

Unfortunately, the process of interrogating detainees, especially those trained in resisting, and gathering and analyzing intelligence is extraordinarily time consuming and difficult. This is due to a number of factors, including language barriers and translation requirements, security concerns, operational and logistical challenges, coordination with allies, and the difficulty of gaining the cooperation of individual detainees. Patience is important in this process. No one can reasonably expect us to bring charges against the detainees or alternatively, release them any time soon. Moreover, the unnecessary and inappropriate insertion of counsel into the intelligence exploitation process would undermine our efforts to prevent future attacks and defeat al Qaida.

Finally, some have expressed strong opposition to the potential use of military commissions. They contend that military commissions would not afford defendants their due process rights in accordance with international norms. They have also suggested that military commissions would be unprecedented in modern war and inherently biased and unfair. Others have claimed that military commissions would result in so-called "victors' justice" and would inevitably be subject to unlawful command influence. To the contrary, military commissions have been used in this country and in many others for over two hundred years. This is not a novel concept.

In light of changes to the U.S. military justice system since World War II, there is every reason to expect fair judicial outcomes from our professional military, particularly in this instance, where convictions and sentences would be automatically appealed to a civilian review panel and subsequently, directly to the President. There is little reason to doubt that any commissions would be fair, just, and consistent with U.S. and international law.

In closing, it is important to recognize that there are many challenges in applying the rules that govern traditional wars in this very unconventional situation involving armed conflict against a private terrorist organization that evidently is not fighting for territory or material gain, but instead is fighting a “holy war” with the purpose of destroying us and our way of life. However, our commitment to the rule of law and legal process remains unchanged. This is one obvious but very important distinction between Al Qaida and us—the U.S., unlike the enemy, will continue to uphold its legal obligations under both international and domestic law—even in wartime against an enemy committed to our very destruction.

MEMBERS' ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Chrisopher J. Beiting, Ave Maria College published the following in the *St. Austin Review*: review of *Triumph: The Power and the Glory of the Catholic Church—a 2000-Year History* (Dec. 2002), 42-43; “Science and Temptation in C.S. Lewis’ Space Trilogy”, *Saint Austin Review*, 2 no.6 (Jun. 2002), 14-18; “Hostage to the Devil: Beyond its Silver Anniversary” (Jul./Aug. 2002), 13-16; “Apocalypse Then: R.H. Benson’s Lord of the World Revisited” (Jan. 2002), 33-34. He also published “The Hidden Treasures of Byzantine Catholicism”, *New Oxford Review* (Sep. 2002), 28-30; “Thomas More: Man of Principle”, *Modern Age*, 44 (2002), 83-86; entries on “Duns Scotus”, “William Langland”, “John Stratford”, “John Wycliffe”, *Historical Dictionary of Late Medieval England*, (Greenwood Press, 2002).

Dr. Michael Casey, Permanent Fellow in Sociology and Politics at the Australian Session of the John Paul II Institute for Marriage and the Family, and Private Secretary to Archbishop Pell of Sydney, published *Meaninglessness: the Solutions of Nietzsche, Freud and Rorty* in 2002 (Lexington Books). His recent published articles include “Has American Individualism Gone Too Far?” *Crisis* (May 2001); “Authority, Crisis and the Individual,” *Society* (Jan-Feb 2002); and “How to think about Globalization,” *First Things* (October 2002), which won the Acton Institute’s 2001 Novak Award.

Frank J. Forline, Jr., M. D., published two articles, on “Chronic Lower Body Negative Pressure,” and “Atrial Overdrive Suppression of Atrial Fibrillation,” in *Europace* vo. 3, supplements A and B respectively, 2002.

Carmine Gorga published *Economic Process: An Instantaneous non-Newtonian Picture* (Lanham, Md. and Oxford: University Press of America, 2002).

Randy Lee, Professor of Law at Widener University School of Law, Harrisburg Branch, was elected chairperson of the Association of American Law School’s Section on Professional Responsibility and appointed to the Pennsylvania State Bar Association’s Professionalism Committee for 2003.

William E. May published “The Father’s Indispensable Role,” *The NaProEthics Forum* 6.1 (January 2001) 2-3; “Marriage: A Common Endeavour,” *Faith* 33.1 (January-February 2001) 12-18; “The Christian Moral Life and Evangelization: Contemporary Culture, Conscience, and the Magisterium,” in *With Mind and Heart Renewed: Essays in Honor of Rev. John F. Harvey, O.S.F.S.*, ed.

Thomas Dailey, O.S.F.S (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2001), pp. 59-77; “Contraception and the ‘Culture of Death,’” in *Marriage, the Common Good*,

and Public Policy: Proceedings of the 22nd Convention of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars, ed. Kenneth Whitehead (South Bend, IN: St. Augustine's Press, 2001), pp. 171-203; "The Vocation of a Catholic Teacher/Scholar," *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Quarterly* 24.2 (Spring, 2001) 8-16; "'Jodie' and 'Mary': Separating the Maltese Twins," *The National Catholic Bioethics Quarterly* 1.3 (Autumn, 2001), 407-416; "Contraception, Gateway to the 'Culture of Death,'" *Faith* 33.4 (Jul/Aug 2001) 7-15; *Catholic Sexual Ethics* (New Haven, CT: Knights of Columbus Veritas Series, 2001); translation of Livio Melina, *Sharing in the Virtues of Christ* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2001); "The Mission of Fatherhood," *Josephinum: Journal of Theology*, New Series, 9.1 (Winter/Spring 2002) 42-55; "Dio, la vita morale e la coscienza," *Rivista Teologica di Lugano* 7.1 (2002), 85-97; "The Difference Between a 'Right' and a 'Liberty' and the Significance of This Difference in Debates over Public Policy on Abortion and Euthanasia," *Catholic Social Science Review*, 7 (2002) 115-127; "The Body, Sex, and Advertising," *NaProEthics Forum* 7.6 (November, 2002) 2-3; "Nuevas Tecnología as Reproductivas y Enseñanza Católica," in *Vivir y Morir con Dignidad: Temas fundamentales de Bioética en una sociedad plural*, eds. Ana Marta Gonzalez Gonzalez, Elena Postigo Solana, Susana Aulestiarre Jimenez. Pamplona: EUNSA, 2002, pp. 47-78; "a and the Problem of the Lesser Evil," *National Catholic Bioethics Quarterly* 2.4 (Autumn, 2002), 577-579. During 2002 Prof. May taught courses at the John Paul II Institute in Ballina, Co. Mayo Ireland, the John Paul II Institute in Melbourne Australia, and at the Università della Santa Croce in Rome. In Melbourne he also delivered the Harman Lecture on Bioethics.

Lawrence F. Roberge, M. S., published two educational articles in the e-journal *Teachers.Net Gazette*: "Teaching Perseverance Through Adversity—A History Lesson" (<http://teachers.net/gazette/APR02/roberge.html>) and in May 2002 "A Lesson in Economics by Alan Greenspan." He was interviewed on the radio talk program "American Breakfast" about the former article.

Mary Shivanandan, MA, STD., published "The Pope, Man and Woman" in *The Achievements of John Paul II, Occasional Papers: vol 3* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Chaplaincy, 2001); "Subjectivity and the Order of Love," *Fides Quaerens Intellectum*, Vol. I, No. 2; "The Anthropological Background of *Fides et Ratio*," *Anthropotes*, 17/1, 129-148; "The New Evangelization of John Paul II," in *Hear O Islands: Theology and Catechesis in the New Millennium* (London, UK: Veritas, 2002). She presented the following: with Joseph Atkinson, STD, "The Person as Substantive Relationship and Reproductive Technologies," *Annual Conference, 2001, Society of Catholic Social Scientists*, Ann Arbor, MI; "Theology of the Body," *Catholic Family Life Conference*, Diocese of St. John, New Brunswick, Canada, 2001; "Chastity as Freedom," Diocese of Pittsburgh, 2001; "Original Unity of Man and Woman," "The Redemption of the Body," "Marriage, Celibacy

and the Language of the Body,” 2002 Institute, Diocese of Cheyenne. “Our Bodies, Our Gift of Selves,” Moss Program for Christian Social Thought and Management, Center for Catholic Studies, University of St. Thomas, St. Paul MN.;

Thomas D. Watts, The University of Texas at Arlington, School of Social Work, published the following: “Freedom and the Welfare State,” *Social Justice Review* (Nov-Dec., 2002) 167-172 (originally delivered at the 2002 Conference of the Scholars for Social Justice, San Antonio, TX); “Islam and Social Welfare,” in Jon K. Loessin, ed., *The Year 2002 Proceedings of the Association for the Scientific Study of Religion-Southwest*, pp. 43-47 (delivered at the ASSR-SW meeting, 2002); review of *An Author’s Guide to Social Work Journals*, 4th ed., ed. Henry N. Mendelsohn, in *New Global Development: Journal of International and Comparative Social Welfare XVII* (2002) 188-189; review of *Social Work with the First Nations: A Comprehensive Bibliography with Annotations*, comp. by Joyce Z. White, in the same journal, XVIII (2002) 178-181. Prof. Watts was elected every two years from 1978-2002 as Precinct Chairperson, Democrat Precinct 2181, Arlington, TX., 1978-2002. He was elected as a Delegate or Alternate and attended all Texas State Democratic Party (and Tarrant County, TX) conventions over that period. He is a member of Texas Democrats for Life.

ARCHIVES OF THE ARCHDIOCESE OF SANTA FE

Marina Ochoa

On February 8, 1678, Jose de Mena and Polonia de Tapia completed a *diligencia matrimonial* (pre nuptial investigation) at the mission at the Pueblo of Santo Domingo. The mission there served as the headquarters of the Franciscan Custody of the Conversion of St. Paul. The prospective bridegroom was a native of Puebla in Mexico and was the son of Francisco de Mena and Nicolasa Ontiveros. The bride to be was the daughter of Pedro Tapia and Maria Salazar and it is likely that she was from the area of Isleta.¹ Several pages of handwritten testimonials from people who knew the bridegroom and the bride attesting to their character accompany this document and declares that both were free to marry and was sufficient to allow the wedding to proceed. This document, catalog number LDDM (for Loose Documents, Diligencias Matrimoniales) number 1 is the earliest document in the Archives of the Archdiocese of Santa Fe and is only one of five extant documents in New Mexico that pre-date the Pueblo Indian Revolt of 1680. The Pueblo Indian Revolt in New Mexico began on August 10, 1680. On this day and the days following, twenty-one Franciscan Priests and many Spanish settlers were killed. Those that survived the revolt were forced out of New Mexico.

Three Franciscans, Fray Juan de Talaban, Fray Jose Montes de Oca and Francisco Antonio Lorenzana were killed in the Pueblo of Santo Domingo² where the Franciscan Archive and Library were located. The Franciscan Custody of the Conversion of St. Paul had been established in New Mexico in the early 1600s and Custodial headquarters had been set up at this Pueblo, located about 25 to 30 miles south of the present day city of Santa Fe, the capital of New Mexico since it was officially established in 1610. On the retreat from Santa Fe and northern New Mexico, Governor Otermin and the surviving Spanish saw the destruction of the missions along the Rio Grande, including the custodial headquarters at Santo Domingo. The Spanish did not stop long enough to collect any Franciscan material that may not have been destroyed in the revolt, and the numerous volumes of books and documents collected in the archive and library until that time were left behind. Soon after the reconquest of New Mexico in 1692-93, many of the missions were re-established and rebuilt. The Franciscan headquarters of the Custody of the Conversion of St. Paul was re-established at Santo Domingo but also maintained headquarters in El Paso where the custodial headquarters had been established after the Pueblo Revolt.³ It is not known what was recovered of the pre-1680 documents, but it is certain that not all had been destroyed.

On September 4, 1775, Fray Francisco Atanasio Dominguez, a Franciscan Friar, visited the Friars in El Paso in preparation for his trip to New Mexico and a report he was to prepare on the missions there. Fray Francisco

Atanasio Dominguez was born in Mexico City about 1740 and joined the Franciscan Order in about 1757 when he was just 17 years old. In 1772, at the age of thirty-two, he was serving as Commissary of the Third Order at the Convent of Vera Cruz and had been in the Franciscan Order for fifteen years. His appointment as Commissary Visitor of the missions and his instructions were to make a detailed report on both the spiritual and economic status of the missions of New Mexico and to search for a new route to Monterey in California. Fray Dominguez arrived in Santa Fe on March 22, 1776 accompanied by Fray Jose' Mariano Rosete y Peralta and Fray Jose' Palacio who was to serve as his secretary during the visitation that took place during the months of April, May and June of that year. He did not visit the Pueblo of Santo Domingo until late May-early June of 1776. An entry in the book of Baptisms at the mission at Santo Domingo *de los Queres* dated May 30, 1776 states that "the baptisms are in good order and conform to the guidelines of the Council of Trent."⁴ At that time, Fray Mariano Rodriguez de la Torre served as minister there as well as Vice-Custos of the Custody.⁵

Dominguez makes mention of the "library of this Custody and a chest that serves as the archive (that) is said to be located in the sacristy of this mission."⁶

The Dominguez report was discovered at the National Archives of Mexico by Dr. France V. Scholes, a historian of Colonial Hispanic America, in 1928. Eleanor B. Adams and Fray Angelico Chavez, a Franciscan priest, worked many years on the translation of this document. It has proved invaluable to the student and researcher of New Mexico mission history. In describing the archive and its contents at Santo Domingo Pueblo, Fray Dominguez simply states that "A large chest with a lock" serves this purpose. The disorder of the material in the chest made it impossible, due to time restraints, to list the contents systematically. Fray Dominguez feels it is important enough, however, to make a listing of the contents which includes six bundles of matrimonial investigations dating from 1619 to the present year (1776).⁷ This comment on the number of matrimonial investigations, or *diligencias matrimoniales*, found during his inventory makes one wonder why there were only the two found when a complete inventory of the material in the archives was made after the entire collection was deposited with the Archdiocese of Santa Fe in 1934.⁸ Other inventoried items were:

- one bundle and a number of loose sheets of patentes (official letters from Franciscan Superiors, such as the Commissary General of the Indies, the Minister Provincial of the Holy Gospel Province, and the local Custos or the Vice-Custos in charge⁹),
- seven volumes and a number of loose sheets of baptismal records beginning in 1694,
- three small volumes and a number of loose sheets of burial records

- beginning with the year 1701,
- two volumes of marriage records beginning in 1694,
- three volumes containing inventories and convent dispositions of various missions, papers dealing with matters pertaining to the Custody, the villas or cities of the province of New Mexico, and
- other items of interest and importance.¹⁰

This collection of material, except for the matrimonial dispensations, make up the “mission period” portion of the archival collection of the Archives of the Archdiocese of Santa Fe.

In 1933, the Reverend Rudolph Aloysius Gerken was appointed the seventh Archbishop of Santa Fe. He immediately set about establishing up-to-date administrative guidelines and norms for the Archdiocese of Santa Fe. He was instrumental in having the archival material collected and placed with the Archdiocese of Santa Fe’s administrative offices in Santa Fe. The importance of the collection was immediately recognized and it has been stated that many of the local historians and scholars wanted access to it for research once it was made aware of. The importance of the collection and the need to catalog it before access for research was granted was considered essential by the Archbishop, and he asked a well respected local citizen of Santa Fe, Colonel Josç D. Sena, to organize and catalog the material. Colonel Sena set about the task but his age and his limitations to knowledge of archaic Spanish church language and paleography kept him from progressing at a steady and quick pace. Fray Angelico Chavez, ordained to the Franciscan Order on May 6, 1937 and a native New Mexican, undertook and completed the task sometime during the early years of the episcopacy of Archbishop Edwin Vincent Byrne, D.D. (1943-1963), who also understood the importance of such a project. Fray Angelico’s personal interest in the history of the Franciscans in New Mexico, his knowledge of church matters and his familiarity with the Spanish language gave him a clear advantage in undertaking this task.

The collection was at that time arranged into several categories as follows:

- diligencias matrimoniales*;
- mission documents (Loose Documents, mission);
- bound volumes including books of *patentes*, books of accounts, books of baptisms, marriages and burials
- diocesan documents (Loose Documents, diocesan).

The largest category (over 3,500 items) was the *diligencias matrimoniales* or pre-nuptial investigations that were a much more formal and detailed inquiry than what is used by the church at present. Individuals who knew the bride and groom were questioned and asked to give testimony on the character of the parties and to insure that the parties were who they said they were, that they were not already married and more importantly that they were

not closely related to one another. Two of these documents are the earliest documents in the *Archives of the Archdiocese of Santa Fe*. As already mentioned, the earliest is the *diligencia matrimonial* of Jose de Mena and Polonia de Tapia dated February 8, 1678. The other is from the mission convent of San Francisco de Sandia dated April 26, 1680. The next category is the loose documents from the mission period (1680-1850). This group was chronologically arranged by date, with the earliest of these being copy of a fragment of Governor Otermin's journal of the withdrawal of the Spanish from Santa Fe and New Mexico in 1680. It details the events during the days following the revolt and their eventual arrival in Paraje, near present day El Paso. The majority of these documents are dated from the time of the return of the Spanish in 1692/93 to the end of the mission period in 1850. The information contained in this material is generally administrative in nature and includes letters from the Heads of the Franciscans in New Mexico to the Governors of New Mexico relating to a number of items, as well as providing information on the missions. The next category is the collection of bound volumes that include the books of patentes already mentioned and described, books of accounts and sacramental registers dating from 1694 to about 1850. An example of these is a beautiful volume of marriages from the Pueblo of San Ildefonso north of Santa Fe that dates from 1703 to 1720. The volume is bound in soft buckskin and painted with Indian motifs in pigments of red, yellow and green. All entries are formally handwritten in black ink and the information is recorded in Spanish. The paper was probably produced in Mexico since a caravan from Mexico brought supplies to the missions every two years during that time. The Spanish in Mexico had been producing paper since 1580 when a twenty-year privilege for making paper in New Spain was granted by royal decree on June 8, 1575.¹¹ The handwriting of most of the Friars is quite legible and even today the information can be easily read. Many of the later documents, unfortunately, were written with diluted ink on poor quality paper that allowed the ink to penetrate the paper from one side to the next making what was written on the back of the page almost indiscernible.

After the early material was collected and organized it was decided to include loose documents from the Diocesan period beginning in 1850. Bound volumes of sacramental records from that period were also included and combined with the overall collection of books of baptisms, marriages and burials. Once cataloguing of this part of the collection was completed it was submitted for publication to the Academy of American Franciscan History and it was published in 1957 under the title *Archives of the Archdiocese of Santa Fe, 1678-1900*.

Since the establishment of the Office of Historic-Artistic Patrimony and Archives in 1983, it has served as a repository not only for archival material, mostly paper based, but also for church related material as well. This material ranges from pieces of altarscreens and alter stones to relics of saints

acquired from the Vatican, as well as from vestments and vessels to furniture and many personal effects of people associated with the church. Among the furniture in the collection is a day bed that belonged to our first Bishop/Archbishop, John Baptist Lamy. Another item of interest is a First Holy Communion dress worn by a niece of Fray Angelico Chavez at his ordination. All of this material culture of the church, although extremely important as part of its patrimony, has taken up much needed space in the collection storage area and has made it necessary to creatively prepare storage space for the different types of objects. The material in the collection is used extensively for research and for exhibition purposes in the Archdiocese of Santa Fe Museum administered by this office. The museum was established in 1993 and is housed in a building that was one of several that once comprised the Archbishop's compound. Much of what was once part of this compound included the Chancery Office, located in Santa Fe until 1967 and the Archbishop's house, torn down at about the same time have been relocated or demolished to make room for other things. The building where the Office of Historic-Artistic Patrimony and Archives and the Archdiocesan Museum are now located was also a part of this compound. Parts of the historic building date back to 1832 and have served many purposes since that time. The historic building was remodeled and an additional facility for storage of the archives was added. The museum serves as the visible arm of the Office of Historic-Artistic Patrimony and Archives and exhibits reflect the types of material in the collections of the Archdiocese of Santa Fe. Recently Archbishop Michael J. Sheehan, Archbishop of Santa Fe, deposited material received by Bishops and Archbishops attending the canonization of Juan Diego by Pope John Paul II in Mexico City on July 30, 2002. The material is being catalogued and will be placed on display sometime in the near future.

The collection of unanticipated or unexpected cultural material continues to grow and may one day need a storage facility of its own. Other objects of this type have also in the past been collected but deposited, on loan, with the Museum of New Mexico. This includes material of an archaeological nature, unearthed during excavation projects for the building of new churches or church buildings. Much of this material is Native American from the pre-Spanish period (pre 1598) and includes collections of potshards and miscellaneous household objects as well as some building materials. Other material belonging to the Archdiocese of Santa Fe and on loan to the Museum of New Mexico includes altarscreens, statuary and other religious art known as *bultos* (carved wood statues) and *retablos* (flat painted panels). Many older vestments, vessels, books, furniture and other such items are also on loan to the Museum of New Mexico. The staff uses these items for research and for its own exhibitions.

The Office of Historic-Artistic Patrimony and Archives continues to research and catalog material that it acquires. Expanded research of material in

the catalogued collections as covered in the book *Archives of the Archdiocese of Santa Fe, 1678-1900*, continues to provide information and knowledge of church history and administration. A recent conservation project of artwork at the famous Santuario de Chimayo was assisted by an 1818 inventory of the chapel in the archives that listed the images in the church at that time. This inventory provided information on the artwork and related material currently in the church and provided dates for many of the pieces needing conservation. The archives also provide historic information for churches and parishes. Licenses to build churches was one of the documents needed from the Diocese in Durango in Mexico before the building of a church could be undertaken and many of these have been found in the archives. We can therefore determine at about what time the church was built. This material has proved invaluable in providing historical documentation on churches, especially those undergoing preservation. The Archdiocese of Santa Fe also benefits from the material in the archives especially when specific celebrations are being planned. On July 29, 2003, the Archdiocese of Santa Fe will be celebrating its 150th anniversary as the Diocese of Santa Fe. A document establishing the Diocese of Santa Fe in 1853 is being researched and will possibly be translated for this event. Photographs of the document have been taken and are being used for various projects of the sesquicentennial. The archives are also used by numerous persons interested in genealogy and family history and many persons have been able to trace their family back to the late 1600s and early 1700s.

The Office of Historic-Artistic Patrimony and Archives is vital to the Archdiocese of Santa Fe and provides a much needed and important service to its parishes, offices and its people. The museum generates interest in all types of church programs and in the long history of the church in New Mexico. The museum is open to the public Monday through Friday from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., and is visited by people both Catholic and non-Catholic alike. Material up to 1932 is open for research and can be accessed by appointment. The documents, or related material, is catalogued by date and separated by the dates of service of each of the Archbishops. Sacramental material post 1900 is held at the parishes and all non-genealogical requests are directed to the parishes. The sacramental material is on microfilm up to and including 1955 with some material dating to the early months of 1956. Genealogical requests are referred to the microfilm available at various public institutions in New Mexico and the Family History Centers of the Genealogical Society of Utah, a branch of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, throughout the country. Genealogical Societies interested in the records have also assisted this effort by providing extractions of specific mission or parish records.

The Archives of the Archdiocese of Santa Fe are extremely important to the student or scholar interested in the history of New Mexico. The area that now comprises the Southwestern United States, now divided into the States of

New Mexico, Arizona, and parts of Utah, Colorado and even Texas, were established as mission fields first and as civil entities second. The crown of Spain supported the missions and their activity and the civil government served as support and guardian of the missions. The church provided people who came to New Mexico spiritual support and needed services. People were born and baptized, married and buried in these far reaches of the Spanish realm. Documentation of these important events in their lives and a record of their deaths was left to the church and it is through the church that their names and the important events in their lives are recorded and preserved.

Notes

1. New Mexico Roots, Limited, Fray Angelico Chavez, O.F.M. Vol. VII (Mena) p. 1217
2. St. Francis and Franciscans in New Mexico, Rev. Theodosius Meyer, O.F.M. *The Historical Society of New Mexico*, El Palacio Press, 1926.
3. *The Missions of New Mexico 1776, A Description* by Fray Francisco Atanasio Dominguez, translated and annotated by Eleanor B. Adams and Fray Angelico Chavez, Historical Introduction, p. xv, The University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque, 1956.
4. Archives, Archdiocese of Santa Fe. Santo Domingo Baptisms 1776.
5. *The Missions of New Mexico 1776, A Description* by Fray Francisco Atanasio Dominguez, translated and annotated by Eleanor B. Adams and Fray Angelico Chavez, Historical Introduction, p. xiv, xv, The University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque, 1956.
6. *Ibid*, p. 137
7. *Ibid*, p. 234
8. *Ibid*, p. 234 n.2
9. Archives of the Archdiocese of Santa Fe, 1678-1900, Fray Angelico Chavez, O.F.M., p. 149. Academy of American Franciscan History, Washington, D.C., 1957.
10. *The Missions of New Mexico 1776, A Description* by Fray Francisco Atanasio Dominguez, translated and annotated by Eleanor B. Adams and Fray Angelico Chavez, p. 234-235, The University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque, 1956.
11. Papermaking, *The History and Technique of an Ancient Craft*, Dard Hunter, p. 470, Dover Publications, Inc., New York, 1943.