A later statement was, "That drugs with possible preventive vaso-constrictor action regularly administered (methysergide, inderal)* are useful once status migrainus sets in has not yet been established." (* Sansert, Propranolol).

In the first paragraph of the manuscript I originally had some rather strong statements suggesting mismanagement of headache based on faulty conceptions of mechanism, which might assuage the physician's conscience but dupe the patient and the fact that patients often improved temporarily and non-specifically in response to any management, which protracted the unintentional charlatanry. I later spontaneously realized this language was too strong and deleted it, substituting entirely innocuous language.

This all took place before an abrupt and unexpected letter of rejection from a Miss Sylvia Covet, Editorial Director, in a position apparently to supersede the decisions of Dr. John H. Rosenow, the Senior Medical Editor, with whom I had been corresponding. Just two days prior to receiving her letter, we had a long distance telephone call from the Editorial offices requesting a different photograph, since the one sent was too dark for reproduction. About this time I also learned of the pressure Sandoz was under to substantiate its claims for Fiorinal by the FDA and also Sandoz's solicitation of investigators for alleged sound experimental trials of therapy utilizing this drug with the very inviting proposition of payment of \$200 for each subject so investigated. I have enclosed copies of my remonstrance to Editor Covet and her replies. Nevertheless, in view of the specific provisions in the initial solicitation to the effect that any stated opinion would be acceptable, the hours of time and of effort I devoted to the project, my nationally known insistence on integrity in experimentation, especially trials of therapy, the cavalier and discourteous and disrespectful action taken by Editor Covet, I frankly was outraged and strongly suspicious of spoken or unspoken collusion between Modern Medicine and Sandoz. Whether I am correct about the latter or not, there is no question that the initial promise was not held to and the agreement not kept. Therefore, I would like to see this matter pursued further if it is within the province of the FDA to do so. As I indicated in the letter to Miss Covet, this sort of bias on drugs indulged in by a magazine that subsists entirely on advertising revenues and distributes its issues free to physicians all over the country should perhaps come as much under the scrutiny of the FDA as do the manufacturers and pseudo-scientific clinicians who carry out their experimental trials of therapy.

If you would like further indications of my experience with problems of headache, previous experimental work with H. G. Wolff at Cornell over many years, and published papers of mine in connection with aspects of experimental trials of therapy in other areas, I should be glad to supply them. I would be glad to send you a copy of the first version of the manuscript, but my request to the Editor to return copies of the revised manuscripts which I sent have never been complied with.