

is eminently worth further exploration. That is why I have favored the Doob¹ experiments. So it is to be hoped that Bryant Wedge and others so qualified and so motivated will continue their intercessions for peace.

II. MELVIN GUYER. *When Is Intercession Science?*

The paper by Bryant Wedge is bewildering. There seems to be a great disparity between what is claimed and what was done. As far as I can tell, the "Psychiatric Model" of the title refers to the assumption that disputing parties, if brought together, may find some small area of common interest which may produce a cooperative interaction. This in turn could provide a basis for subsequent cooperation on other issues. In this I see neither a model nor anything which is particularly "psychiatric."

Perhaps the best way to proceed in these remarks is to deal separately with the events Wedge reports and his interpretations of those events. The events reported seem fairly clear: Wedge was invited by a State Department official in the fall of 1965 to come to the Dominican Republic ". . . to establish contact with young Dominican revolutionaries in order to determine whether there were any way satisfactory to them to open communication between them and the United States diplomatic Mission in that country; possibly even to reduce the violence and killing that was taking place in the country." He accepted the invitation, with the understanding that he could act "as a wholly independent consultant. . . ." And so, according to Wedge, began "a real-life experiment in psychiatric intercession in violent intergroup conflict." He goes on to describe his arrival in the Dominican Republic, coincident with the return of Juan Bosch. This "real-life experiment" in intercession apparently began when Wedge got into a

1. See Doob, Foltz, and Stevens (1969) with reference to Walton (1970) in Wedge's References in this issue.

conversation with some "guys" who were in a crowd listening to a speech being given by Bosch. These guys told Wedge how they felt about the revolution and introduced him to some of their friends who also told him what they thought about it. All of this presumably took place while Bosch's marathon speech was going on. Wedge subsequently met members of other youth groups and mentions "33 interviews-in-depth" but says nothing about the nature, content, design, or purpose of these interviews. As the three weeks' visit was drawing to a close, Wedge was able to report that each of the two opposing sides was expressing some interest in cooperating with the other. However, neither side would consent to meet with the other (which is a little odd since, according to Wedge, the U.S. State Department originally contacted him so as "to open communication between [revolutionaries] and the United States diplomatic Mission . . .").

Upon leaving Santo Domingo, Wedge wrote a report on his activities and "findings," which was sent "directly to the American Ambassador in Santo Domingo." (One wonders whether copies of this report were simultaneously made available to the other party to the intergroup conflict; presumably in his role as a "wholly independent consultant" Wedge should have given even-handed treatment to each party to the conflict.) Unfortunately, Wedge fails to mention whether the revolutionary group, like the Ambassador, generally endorsed the findings of his report. At any rate, the report included the recommendation that the Embassy support an academic exchange program which would be of interest to the Autonomous University in Santo Domingo. Some six months later a decision was made—in Washington and/or Santo Domingo—to undertake the academic exchange program. Again, Wedge was enlisted as a consultant and accompanied a group of five visiting scientists to Santo Domingo in the summer of 1966. During that summer the visiting scientists were invited to have luncheon with the American Ambassador. This occasion provided an opportunity for bringing persons from the Embassy and persons from the University administration and faculty together socially. These individuals had not been seeing one another socially for quite a while, and it was not clear whether

they would "get along" or not, since there had been a revolution 15 months previously. Well, it turned out that these two groups did get along, there was lots of conversation, and those in attendance generally seemed to respect one another. This first party was followed by a couple of others, and so, in Wedge's words, "substantial contact had been established between the leadership of the two groups. . . ."

These seem to be the essential details of Wedge's activities in Santo Domingo. Now, what is puzzling is the use of the language of science to describe any of it. For example, it seems a fiction to describe these activities as an "experiment." There is simply no conventional sense of this word which would describe activities that involved no testing of hypotheses; no systematic gathering of data; no reporting of data; no identification, manipulation, or control of relevant independent variables; and no objective identification, observation, or recording of dependent variables relating to whatever phenomenon was under study. I am also puzzled by the description of these activities as "psychiatric intercession." It is not at all clear where or when intercession occurred and, if it did, what made it psychiatric rather than something else, say, social or political.

Other objections include the fact that it is never clear, from what Wedge says, to whom he addressed himself when talking with the Dominican revolutionaries. Was there an organization; were his "informants" leaders, members, negotiators, spokesmen, hangers-on? Did his *conversations* with Embassy officials and his in-depth interviews constitute the "intercession" of the paper's title? Certainly, during his first visit, Wedge did not tell anybody anything that the leaders of these groups did not already know; and the opposing factions— young revolutionaries and Embassy officials—were never brought together. So it is hard to see where the intercession model applies. During his second visit to Santo Domingo, a prolonged luncheon was arranged, complete with servants carrying trays of drinks, that brought members of the Embassy and the Autonomous University together. Somehow, the Revolutionary Youth Movement "informants" of September 1965 failed to appear on the luncheon invitation list, their position as one of the two opposing parties having been usurped by

the Autonomous University administration. Thus, the group which had been of prime interest to the intercession effort, the Dominican Youth Movement group, failed to be present on the occasion which Wedge considers as proof that intercession was successful. One wonders whether the success somehow depended upon the youths' being supplanted by their Establishment elders. For one cannot but feel that the luncheon meeting of visiting professors, Embassy personnel, and the University officials has taken us very far from what Wedge described at the beginning of his paper as "a real-life experiment in psychiatric intercession in violent intergroup conflict." So the "experiment" becomes elusive, as does any sense of "violent intergroup conflict."

What remains is Wedge's description of events. Their significance as a contribution to applied social science can be judged by each reader for himself. For me, the attempt to cast these events into the form and language of an "experiment" is a disservice to the field of applied social science. Better to call it diplomacy or negotiations than to pass it off as science by alluding to data rather than presenting organized data, by claiming that experiments have been successful when no behavioral measures are taken or hypotheses stated, and by speaking of "models" when referring to common sense procedures.