MOTION:

“COMPLEMENTARY AND ALTERNATIVE MEDICINE SHOULD NOT BE AVAILABLE ON THE NHS”
In May 2006 a group of scientists and doctors led by Professor Michael Baum wrote a letter calling on the NHS to stop providing complementary and alternative medicine (CAM) [Ref: Times Online]. A further letter a year later restated their case [Ref: Times Online]. Their campaign provoked an outcry from complementary medicine groups, and the Prince of Wales joined those who hit back [Ref: Times Online]. Accusations of state-funded ‘witchcraft’ were met by criticism of the arrogant superiority of doctors. Both sides agree that because the NHS is funded by taxpayers, and the treatments it provides are generally free at the point of delivery, the NHS should be accountable for the way it spends its money. But while CAM’s supporters see its provision as a question of health freedom and fairness, ensuring it’s not just available to those who can pay for it privately, its detractors say it’s a scandal that public money is being wasted on untested and unproven treatments. The NHS provides around 10 per cent of complementary services in the UK [Ref: BBC Health], and a survey of local primary care trusts in England found around two-thirds offered complementary medicine services. One reason that CAM might be attractive to the NHS is that it is claimed to be cheaper than conventional treatments. CAM is also popular, and in a system in which patients are increasingly seen as consumers with a right to choose their treatments it might seem only right that they should be able to choose CAM. In response to a petition asking for CAM to be provided alongside conventional medicine, the government has said this is up to primary care trusts, but that in providing local services trusts could explore this opportunity as part of patient choice. Would increased provision of CAM on the NHS be something to be welcomed or would it represent a betrayal of scientific medicine that must stop?
What is complementary and alternative medicine (CAM)?
This umbrella term refers to treatments that differ from conventional medicine – medicine based on scientific testing that is taught to medical professionals. However, while alternative medicine is used in place of conventional medicine, complementary medicine is used alongside it. There has been a shift towards seeing CAM as a complement rather than an alternative. The term integrated (or integrative) medicine is used by its advocates to describe use of CAM for which there is ‘some high-quality evidence of safety and effectiveness’ combined with conventional medicine. Leading examples of CAM include homeopathy, osteopathy, acupuncture, hypnotherapy, nutritional therapy, massage and reflexology. CAM is often practised as part of a holistic approach to medicine, a central part of which is the ‘human effect’ of individual treatment [Ref: Guardian].

Should all treatments be subject to the same standard of proof?
Critics of CAM argue the NHS should only provide treatments that are scientifically proven, principally by meeting the gold standard of randomised controlled trials. Put bluntly, ‘there is no alternative medicine. There is only scientifically proven, evidence-based medicine supported by solid data or unproven medicine’ [Ref: Journal of the American Medical Association]. CAM’s supporters say it suffers from a lack of research into how it works – pharmaceutical companies ignore it because they can’t make money from it. More fundamentally, they say, it would be unfair to expect all treatments to meet the same standard of proof. It would result in a ‘medical apartheid’ where treatments that cannot be explained by the standard bio-medical model are excluded by the NHS, despite all the evidence from patients that they work [Ref: BBC News]. Critics do not deny that treatments may make people feel better, but where they are effective, as may be the case with therapeutic massage, they say this can be measured by orthodox science [Ref: RCGP], whereas treatments like homeopathy just have a placebo effect. CAM’s supporters say the placebo effect is a legitimate treatment, but also want to leave open the possibility of alternative explanations for efficacy that current science might fail to identify. But critics say that prescribing placebos is unethical and that advocates of CAM are intellectually dishonest to go on believing in a treatment when it lacks evidence.

Homeopathy: ‘worse than witchcraft’ or of proven benefit to patients?
Homeopathy is a particular focus of criticism: doctors expressed alarm at a new system for its licensing and the NHS has cut back on treatments. Because it involves diluting an active ingredient in water to such an extent that not one drop of it may remain, there seems to be no scientific explanation of how it could work. But supporters point to its popularity. They say the evidence is not conclusive and because homeopathy relies on individualised treatments it’s not suited to assessment through narrow conventional scientific trials.
If CAM is unlikely to cause harm to patients, then what’s the harm of providing it on the NHS?
Supporters say treatments like St John’s Wort can be not only more effective and cheaper than conventional treatments like antidepressants, but also have fewer side-effects. Baum, though, argues in the case of homeopathy that the safety argument is like ‘licensing a witches’ brew as a medicine so long as the bat wings are sterile’; money spent on homeopathy would be better spent on cancer drugs. But is this, as some suggest, simply a patronising and old-fashioned attitude that shows a lack of respect for patients?
The great health debate: Complementary medicine
*Daily Mail* May 2006

Head-to-head: Complementary medicine
Michael Baum vs Peter Fisher *BBC News* May 2006

**For**

Quackery and superstition - available soon on the NHS
Polly Toynbee *Guardian* January 2008

Sticking a needle in alternative medicine
Stuart Derbyshire *Spiked* November 2007

Homeopathy is worse than witchcraft - and the NHS must stop paying for it
Michael Baum *Daily Mail* 01 May 2007 May 2007

Complementary medicines are useless and dangerous, says Britain’s foremost expert
Barbara Rowlands interviews Edzard Ernst *Daily Mail* December 2006

Snake oil - or NHS tool?
Michael Hanlon *Daily Mail* May 2006

**Against**

Who’s confused about alternative medicine?
Robert Verkerk *Alliance for Natural Health* December 2006

Not so complementary
Nicola Sturzaker *Guardian Society* September 2006

Complementary Medical Association Response
Complementary Medical Association May 2006

Best of both worlds
Michael Dixon *Observer* July 2001

It’s cheaper and has no nasty side-effects
Peter Fisher *Daily Mail* May 2006

**In Depth**

Paying a complement: Should the NHS fund alternative medicine?
Michael Baum vs George Lewith *The New Generalist* 4(3)
October 2006

The role of complementary and alternative medicine in the NHS: Summary and guide to the report
Christopher Smallwood *FreshMinds pp. 8-18* October 2005

The rise and rise of CAM
Brid Hehir *Spiked* March 2001

**ESSENTIAL READING**

**COMPLEMENTARY MEDICINE:**
“Complementary and alternative medicine should not be available on the NHS”
**THEME:**

"Complementary and alternative medicine should not be available on the NHS"

**BACKGROUNDS**

- The dangers of complementary therapy
  Michael Baum *Breast Cancer Research* December 2007

- CAM - junk science or genuine alternative?
  *Battle of ideas debate*

- In defence of scientific medicine
  Michael Baum *Spiked* October 2007

- Letter calling for homeopathy boycott
  Gustav Born *Times Online* May 2007

- Academic doctors’ views of complementary and alternative medicine (CAM) and its role within the NHS

- Petition for complementary and alternative medicine (CAM) on the NHS
  *IvyRose Holistic* March 2007

- Implausible claims against homeopathy
  Melanie Oxley *Primary Care Today* July/August 2006

- Should the NHS fund complementary medicine?
  *NHS Networks* May 2006

- All in the mind?
  Anjana Ahuja *The Times* May 2006

- Q&A: Complementary therapies
  *BBC News* May 2006

- What’s wrong with complementary medicine?
  *BBC Breakfast* May 2006

- Should the NHS pay for alternative medicine?
  *Times Online Debate* May 2006

**ORGANISATIONS**

- Healthwatch
- Sense about Science
- The Prince’s Foundation for Integrated Health
- The Society of Homeopaths
IN THE NEWS

Hard-up NHS trusts cut back on unproven homoeopathy treatment
The Times May 2007

Doctors renew drive to ban NHS homeopathy
Guardian May 2007

Alternative therapy put on trial
BBC News February 2007

Alternative medicine is defended
BBC News November 2006

Homeopathic licensing alarms doctors
Guardian September 2006

Charles defends holistic medicine
Daily Telegraph May 2006

Doctors’ letter sparks NHS alternative therapies row
Guardian May 2006

Prince defiant over alternative medicine after doctors’ attack
Times Online May 2006

Keep complementary medicine out of NHS, say leading doctors
Guardian May 2006

Doctors attack ‘bogus’ therapies
BBC News May 2006

NHS told to abandon alternative medicine
The Times May 2006

New study is boost to homoeopathy
BBC News November 2005

Alternative therapies ‘cost more’
The Times October 2005

Prince backs alternative treatments on the NHS
The Times October 2005

Alternative therapies ‘could benefit’ NHS
Times Online October 2005

Charles study backs NHS therapies
BBC News October 2005

Homoeopathy’s benefit questioned
BBC News August 2005

Complementary cancer therapy call
BBC News November 2004

Complementary medicine on NHS
BBC News October 2004
ABOUT DEBATING MATTERS

Debating Matters because ideas matter. This is the premise of the Institute of Ideas & Pfizer Debating Matters Competition for sixth form students which emphasises substance, not just style, and the importance of taking ideas seriously. Debating Matters presents schools with an innovative and engaging approach to debating, where the real-world debates and a challenging format, including panel judges who engage with the students, appeal to students from a wide range of backgrounds, including schools with a long tradition of debating and those with none.

FIND OUT MORE

Debating Matters engages a wide range of individuals, from the students who take part in the debates, the diverse group of professionals who judge for us, the teachers who train and support their debaters, and the young people who go on to become Debating Matters Alumni after school and help us to continue to expand and develop the competition. If you enjoyed using this Topic Guide, and are interested in finding out more about Debating Matters and how you can be involved, please complete this form and return it to us at the address below.

Debating Matters Competition
Academy of Ideas Ltd
Signet House
49-51 Farringdon Road
London
EC1M 3JP

Yes, I’d like to know more. Please send me further information about the Debating Matters Competition:

☐ I am a teacher and would like further details about events in my area and how to enter a team

☐ I am a sixth form student and would like further details about events in my area

☐ I am interested in becoming a Debating Matters judge

☐ I am interested in sponsoring/supporting Debating Matters

☐ Other (please specify) __________________________________________________________________________

First name __________________________________________ Surname _______________________________________

School/company/organisation ____________________________________________________________

Professional role (if applicable) ______________________________________________________________

Address ___________________________________________________________ Postcode _______________________

Email address ___________________________________________________________ School/work phone ______

Mobile phone ___________________________________________________________
“TEENAGE CITIZENS THINKING DEEPLY ABOUT...SOCIAL ISSUES”

IAN GRANT, CEO, BRITANNICA