

fessional disgruntlement because, despite American military aid, tight control of the military budget has slowed the outfitting of Spanish forces with sophisticated equipment.

While even harder to establish, there are reports that some officers are thinking about the future and are restive about the army's image as reactionary and repressive. A trial of Basques on charges of terrorism in Burgos in 1970 received wide and critical coverage in the European press. A number of death sentences were handed out, and the point was made that the trials were held before a military rather than a civil court. Reportedly, some officers objected when instructions came down that the army was to conduct the trials, but, naturally, orders were followed. The point is that the army is not monolithic. But politically, the army seems uncommitted except to Franco, which, of course, is how Franco wants it.

In the event of serious unrest in post-Franco Spain, the response to

watch would, of course, be that of the army. The army appears to retain its ingrained impatience with university intellectuals and liberal politicians. But probably because of the social origins of many of its officers, the army has a new strain of radicalism and populism of its own mixed up with an older nationalism and puritanism. It is a combination that in other developing countries has produced "colonels' revolutions," and it is probably the tendency to watch. Junta is, after all, a Spanish word.

If the army in Spain is an enigma, it seems widely agreed that the best chance any future government has of keeping the peace lies in maintaining economic momentum. Here some difficulties arise. The virtually unanimous finding by international experts is that Spain is at a point where science and technology can contribute crucially to growth. The situation was analyzed most fully in a 1971 report by the Organization for Economic Cooperation

and Development.* The OECD analysis notes that Spain has inherited an essentially literary culture that is resistant to adaptation to science. The university system still conforms to the classic European model, with the professor, called *catedrático*, or holder of a chair, operating independently with a varying number of assistants. A 1965 law prescribed a departmental system, but the degree to which the law has been carried out varies greatly.

Spanish universities remain weak in research and in graduate education, and most research and development (R&D) is carried out in small government research centers. A Higher Council for Scientific Research, established after the civil war, funds most basic research, and applied research for specialized purposes such as agriculture or mining is carried out in a variety of laboratories financed by the govern-

* *Reviews of National Science Policy: Spain* (OECD Publications, 2, rue André-Pascal, Paris 16^e. \$2.50).

The CEQ Papers: Secrecy Is a Sometime Thing

The President's Council on Environmental Quality last week abruptly clamped a lid of secrecy on some highly critical letters from scientists concerning a major White House study of stream channelization in the United States. Then just as abruptly, the CEQ decided to put the letters back on public view, along with dozens of other comments on the study, after a reporter began inquiring into the matter. The council's unusual vacillations of policy brought accusations from environmentalists of an attempt to cover up criticism, but the council staff claimed it was all the scientists' idea.

The spat arose from \$157,000 study the CEQ commissioned the Arthur D. Little company to perform last year on economic, engineering, and environmental aspects of stream and river reconstruction for purposes of flood control and farm drainage. Last March, Little produced a draft report of its findings, and, ever since, the whole project has become something of a political tar baby for the CEQ (*Science*, 26 May).

In the past few months, the CEQ has received a flood of complaints about the study from federal agencies, environmental groups, and state conservation officials, many of whom thought it was gravely biased in favor of continued stream "improvement" projects. (Even an A. D. Little executive conceded privately the report was flawed.)

All of this critical commentary has been open to public inspection at the CEQ offices near the White House. Not the kindest of the criticisms came from the five scientists the CEQ had enlisted as advisers to the study.

Suddenly last week, the scientists' comments, some of them rather pungent, disappeared from the open file. An

attorney for a Washington, D.C., public-interest law firm tried to obtain them and was refused.

"A couple of the scientists indicated they didn't want their remarks made public," explained Boyd H. Gibbons, III, the CEQ's staff director, early Thursday afternoon. "We're not sure how to handle this, but it seems unfair to say, 'That's tough,' and release them anyway. We'll have to talk about this some more."

The law firm thought this was a bit peculiar, if not devious, since Gibbons had promised in writing that any and all comments would be available to the public. "Kind of a slimy thing," the lawyer said.

A few phone calls to the scientists soon dispelled elements of the sinister, however. Two of them really had objected, although mildly, to having their remarks released. One didn't know his letter had already been put on display. The other only wanted a few "personal" lines deleted. Obliging, the CEQ had lifted them all out of the public file.

A third scientist said he didn't care who read his letter, and two others couldn't be reached. One was said to be on a reef in British Honduras.

Late Thursday afternoon, Gibbons said that "we've talked it all over" and that all the letters would be released. "I guess that makes it hard to write a story about how the Administration suppresses information," he mused.

In the end, the residue of the 3-day imbroglio was a small lesson in the genesis of misunderstandings between scientists, government agencies, and an environmental movement with inclinations toward paranoia.—R.G.