

Safe ... in whose hands?

Don't let advertisers restrict your choice in
healthcare.

25 June 2013

11 a.m. to 1 p.m.

Protest Advertising Standards Authority

Mid City Place, 71 High Holborn

London, WC1V 6QT

From 2.30 p.m.

Lobby of Parliament

In 2010 Homeopathy: Medicine for the 21st Century (H:MC21) put an advert in a 'Care' supplement of *The New Statesman* arguing for an increase in existing spending on homeopathy on the NHS. The Advertising Standards Authority (ASA) is rejecting the evidence from studies of thousands and millions of people in favour of the conclusions of a single discredited study.

If you are a member of the public, you need to know that:

- The ASA is endorsing a position opposed to the regulator of medicines and with dangerous consequences for public health.
- The ASA is threatening patient choice and informed consent by undermining access to information.
- The ASA is ignoring the available scientific knowledge and so breaking its own guidelines.
- In New Zealand recently the Press Council ruled **against** the argument that the ASA is now using.

If you are a supporter of any complementary therapy, you need to know that this case is just the tip of the iceberg. The ASA is using the same invalid argument against chiropractors, acupuncturists, osteopaths, naturopaths, craniosacral therapists, herbalists and others. Even statutory regulation does not protect a profession from ASA censorship.

If you are a homeopath, you need to know that the ASA is establishing the following precedent:

- That the Shang et. al (2005) meta-analysis is correct in stating that there is no evidence for the efficacy of homeopathy.
- That the Commons Science and Technology Committee *Evidence Check 2: Homeopathy* is reliable and showed that there is no evidence for the efficacy of homeopathy.
- That the Swiss Health Technology Assessment has no bearing on the evidence for homeopathy.
- That the only valid evidence for any medical treatment is randomised control trials.
- That information from patients is not valid medical information.

All these claims are scientifically and medically wrong.