EXHIBIT 4

[From the New York Times, Feb. 2, 1969]

STUDENTS SEND BACK DRUG MAKER'S GIFTS

One-third of the first-year medical students at Columbia University's College of Physicians and Surgeons said yesterday that their "dissatisfaction with the exploitative pricing and promotional practices of the American drug industry" had compelled them to return gift stethoscopes to Eli Lilly & Co.

This follows a similar move announced Friday by 45 second-year students at Harvard Medical School. The Harvard students, returned to the Lilly company a black bag and kit of diagnostic instruments—including a stethoscope.

Robert S. Pynoos, spokesman for the protesting Columbia students, said his group had written a letter to Lilly in which they had expressed disapproval with "the motivation behind these gifts."

The letter said in part: "Promotional programs of this sort are obviously intended to initiate the establishment of close ties between physician and pharmaceutical house, for mutual benefit."

"Such a relationship" the letter continued, "relegates the needs of the patient to a role of secondary importance."

Henry F. DeBoest, vice president of corporate affairs for Lilly, said yesterday that the medical instruments "have been offered with the prior approval of the medical schools." The gifts were "a mark of appreciation for their [the students] willingness to undertake the long, difficult road of an education as a physician."

EXHIBIT 5

[From the New York Post, July 10, 1961]

AMA DELIRIUM

Speaking of the real and the unreal, we wish that we could get rid of the feeling that the American Medical Association is out of this world.

We know better. But the miasma floating from the Senate Caucus Room as the mighty medics battle the Kefauver drug bill did little to clear our heads.

Dr. Hugh H. Hussey, there to speak his piece as chairman of the AMA's Board of Trustees, is dean of a medical college and by all accounts a literate, gracious gentleman. Yet there he sat, through three long sessions, pursuing an argument which went roughly like this:

It is better that a worthless drug be marketed than run the risk of a worthwhile drug being lost so therefore the Food and Drug Administration shouldn't be given power to rule on drug usefulness because the AMA is doing it better in a program that will be working by 1963 and is the only wholly objective agency able to handle the chore since more than half its income comes from the drug industry, the job being one that cannot and should not be done because no company tries to market a worthless drug and FDA already has power to stop them and is making adequate and effective judgments now inasmuch as FDA is incompetent to evaluate at all because drug evaluation is a highly complex and technical matter requiring skilled teams of test designers, pharmacologists, clinicians and statisticians and therefore has to be left to the individual family doctor treating you and me.

Is everythting clear?

EXHIBIT 6

[From the Medical Tribune, Mar. 24, 1969]

CHALLENGE TO FDA

Editor, Medical Tribune:

Below is a copy of a letter sent to Herbert L. Ley, Jr., M.D., Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Washington, D.C.:

"1. The editorial from the MEDICAL TRIBUNE, January 30, 1969, is self-explanatory. Mycolog is produced by Squibb.