

9<sup>th</sup> February 2006

Dear Mike,

Sorry for not getting back to you sooner on this.

I did bring up the advertising issue at the Shiatsu society (SS) meeting in Jan, and we discussed it at length. Thank you very much for the info you sent me; many of the new MC members were very interested to see all the details.

The result of all the discussion was that the SS is now trying to work within the Committee of Advertising Practice (CAP) guidelines, and feels that we did breach the code in operation at the time, and did not really have a leg to stand on.

The best way forward, most members feel, is to try and undertake more rigorous research and publish some statistical data that can be peer-reviewed etc. We have already commissioned some of this, and there are more projects in the pipe-line. There has also been a journal publication from a GP who received treatment, and of course, because he is a GP, he is within the CAP guidelines as a PROPER medical practitioner! so he can make claims, because he has the accepted credentials!

Anyway, we believe that the best way forward will be to get some larger scale studies which provide the basis for good statistical analysis, so that any robust trends in healing can be seen and trusted as fact rather than just possibly subjective or coincidental events, which is always the scientific argument when just one case study is presented. In science, one case study is not evidence.

I hope this wont make you feel abandoned. I think your work is much appreciated. This was just an unfortunate red flag to some bull out there. And unfortunately, our flag was not quite the right shade of red to comply with the guidelines.

With the spectrophotometer calibrated to some agreed standard, we can't really do anything about it, except lose a lot of money and a lot of credibility by trying to fight it more. That's the MC feeling, anyway. And that's what the MC wanted me to convey to you.

With very best wishes

Elizabeth

Dr Elizabeth Davies

18<sup>th</sup> February 2006

Dear Elizabeth

Thank you for a full and frank reply, it is greatly appreciated.

If you are happy to accept that each time you treat a client who has come to you with an illness, that the ASA may consider you to be fraudulent ( A deception deliberately practiced in order to secure unfair or unlawful gain) then that is your choice, however it is not mine.

Testimonial from a GP or anyone else ( as your longstanding MC colleagues already know) is unacceptable to the ASA, neither are statistics, only 'scientific' evidence!! I suggest that you speak to Samantha and get all the letters and notes on this case for yourself. However you have all the notes on what is acceptable, and not acceptable from the ASA and CAP therefore you already know this.

You may not, of course have the exchange of emails that took place between members of the MC on this matter.

There **was** 'a leg to stand on', only the MC chose not to stand on it. Have a look at the earlier letter I proposed we should sent to the ASA, and the information I sent to you and Katherine at your request; this was overruled by other members of the MC and another tack was decided upon which did not play on the weakness in the ASA's argument, which was in an area that they were not prepared to discuss (again, please look it up).

The ASA, not surprisingly, decimated the Society's choice of argument.

"The best way forward, most members feel, is to try and undertake more rigorous research and publish some statistical data that can be peer-reviewed etc".

Which members are these, as the membership has not been advised of your decision yet?

As to whether I feel abandoned?

I do not feel abandoned by the Society, which has absolutely no idea what the MC has decided on their behalf, and although the MC has known about this for nearly five months it appears to have not considered that the members should know of it, and have a say in this.

It is their future the MC is playing with.

Perhaps it was too close to membership renewals to let them know, but the renewals are in, so what is the hold-up now??

Whatever the reason, the members, whom the MC is supposed to serve, have been kept in the dark about something which is going to greatly effect them as students, practitioners and Teachers; no-one is untouched by this decision.

As one teacher who I talked to about this said " To comply with the ASA, all that is required can be taught in one weekend; how do we justify to students a three-year syllabus and training which also includes A, P and P?"

How can a SS practitioner demonstrate their abilities, if they are prevented from advertising what they can do, unless they are prepared to be labelled as fraudulent?

This sums up the reality of it all; and is a decision that you are going to have to explain to the members of the Society, that is, when you get around to it!

In an email to David Home, dated the 9th November 2005, I asked when the members were going to be informed of this, and I did not receive an answer.

As I am not renewing my membership of the Shiatsu Society it now no longer matters if David decides to reply, however I feel for the members of the Society who are completely oblivious of the MCs decision in this matter.

"With the spectrophotometer calibrated to some agreed standard, we cant really do anything about it, except lose a lot of money and a lot of credibility by trying to fight it more"

How the standards were arrived at, and (agreed?) by whom is certainly very questionable, and as you know the ASA do not want to discuss this; however £25,000 still left in the SS marketing budget when I left the MC at the end of last year is a reasonable amount of the member's money to use on their behalf if needed.

In my opinion, the credibility of the Shiatsu Society has been lost by **not** fighting the case on behalf of its members, and protecting Shiatsu as the powerful healing therapy that we know it to be.

With best wishes Elizabeth

Mike