

LETTERS

TVA and The Valley So Wild

In her article "Critical TVA scholarship hard to come by" (News and Comment, 21 Jan., p. 274), Deborah Shapley

... TVA [the Tennessee Valley Authority] engaged Carson Brewer, a reporter for the Knoxville News-Sentinel, to write a book on the Little Tennessee River Valley. While Brewer and his wife held a \$10,000 contract for the book, Brewer was also covering TVA for the paper-a conflict of interest situa-

I encountered absolutely no conflict of interest in that situation.

TVA first asked my wife Alberta whether she would be interested in writing the book. She declined. Then TVA asked if she and I would write the book as co-authors. Because the Little Tennessee Valley is one of my favorite regions, I voted to accept. Alberta agreed. But we weren't immediately able to agree with TVA on the money. It is my understanding that TVA then searched for other possible authors. I don't know the details of that search. At any rate, several months later TVA approached us again, and we agreed on \$10,000, a sum we later realized was ridiculously small for the work involved. (If you wonder why these details are relevant, they are to show that TVA's purpose was to hire someone to write a book, not-as some reading the article might suspect—to use a book contract as a cover for paying a reporter for favored news treatment.)

When TVA approached us, I had not been on the News-Sentinel's TVA beat for several years. I was not on it during any of the discussions about the contract. However, several months after we signed the contract and started research for the book, the reporter covering TVA left the paper. The city editor (then, Don Ferguson) asked me to take the beat. I reminded him that Alberta and I were writing a book for TVA.

"That wouldn't make any difference in your coverage, would it?" he asked.

"No, it wouldn't," I replied.

And it didn't.

Though this is something we didn't discuss beyond the two-sentence conversation quoted above, I am certain there was no thought in the minds of my editors and TVA officials that the book contract would have any effect favorable to TVA on stories I wrote for the News-Sentinel. Nobody in TVA ever sought, directly or indirectly, favored treatment in stories.

Paul Evans, then the TVA information



Circle No. 103 on Readers' Service Card

officer and the official who dealt with us on the book, expressed some concern about the "appearance" of the situation when I went on the TVA beat. We discussed it only briefly, for we both knew the book job was secondary to my career with the News-Sentinel and should not interfere with any assignment the editors might give me.

Within a few months after we began our research, Alberta and I realized this kind of book was going to require much more time than we'd guessed when we agreed to do it for \$10,000. We sometimes joked about the painful fact that we were the only people working for TVA paid less per hour than the janitors. (We now estimate we devoted 6000 to 8000 man-hours to the project.) We consoled ourselves that most of the work was interesting, and we determined to make the book that would bear our names a good one.

Incidently, it's not a book that glorifies TVA. Only two of the 38 chapters deal very much with TVA. These two are about TVA building Fontana Dam.

The author makes a point of the fact that the current Tellico Dam controversy is not mentioned in the book. Our manuscript contained two chapters on Tellico, but the publisher, the East Tennessee Historical Society, decided to omit them, on the theory it should not be involved in current controversy.

The book Valley So Wild was published late in the fall of 1975. So far, 5000 copies have been sold, and the society has recently ordered 3000 more. I'm told this is exceptionally good for a regional book. Many have praised it, and among these have been several who oppose Tellico Dam. In what I took to be a kind of testimonial to the book's accuracy, the lawyer who represents the group now involved in the lawsuit against the dam said he cited information from it in a recent property condemnation case, and that the opposing TVA lawyer cited another portion of it in support of a point he was making.

CARSON BREWER The Knoxville News-Sentinel, 208 West Church Avenue, Knoxville, Tennessee 37901

Vaccination: An Acceptable Risk?

The article by Philip M. Boffey, "Guillain-Barré: Rare disease paralyses swine flu campaign" (14 Jan., p. 155) was a useful and timely review of an unfortunate situation. It is distressing that the lay press and public in general do not have (or make use of) the facts and rea-

soned interpretations of scientific and medical events as presented therein. There is, however, another and related public health conundrum that desperately needs discussion and widespread recognition, and we in preventive medicine have a grave responsibility that is not yet being met.

Three phenomena in our society, because they are inconsistent, lead to confusion, controversy, and the ineffectiveness of public health programs. This triad consists of (i) the availability of a highly effective epidemiological surveillance system; (ii) the presence of a vigorous, effective, and rapid news gathering and dissemination system; and (iii) the absence of general public recognition of and a social consensus on the balance of benefits and risks in disease preventive programs.

The United States is one of few countries in the world where the detection and systematic investigation of rare medical events is likely to be done rapidly and comprehensively. With the leadership and coordination of the Center for Disease Control, and effective public health organizations in many states, we learn about problems that would simply be missed in many other places.

Little need be said about the effectiveness of our news media; we are fortunate they work well in reporting events. But, with few exceptions, reporters and commentators are far less effective in *interpreting* medical events for the public, partly because they don't seek expert assistance often enough and partly because we don't offer it or make ourselves available often enough.

The third component of our problem creates a dilemma. The public has been led to expect that doctors do "good," and when they don't, it is because of personal negligence or bad practice. The public (and even much of the medical profession) has not been sufficiently educated to realize that there is some measurable risk in every medical intervention, and when that risk is spread over thousands or millions of persons subject to the intervention, it results in countable numbers of individuals paying the whole price for the benefit provided to the larger population.

After recognition of the phenomenon of risk, there must be a social consensus, informed consent if you will, that the risk is acceptable. Is our society willing to substitute several hundred cases of Guillain-Barré syndrome, caused by an act of man (assuming the still-unproved causal relationship), for the potential tens of thousands of deaths from influenza, an act of God? Or the one case of vaccine-induced paralytic disease per million of