



# AIMS during the 1990s

Received 22 FEB 1990



## AIMS QUARTERLY JOURNAL

Association for Improvements in the Maternity Services

Vol. 2 No. 1 1990 £2

---

American obstetric care is in fact not as likely to get worse before it gets better. There is a veritable explosion of medical and health information appearing in American newspapers, magazines, radio and television shows. Often the information is critical of obstetric care. Many of the articles find fault with the American obstetrician's reluctance to withhold from their pregnant patients the known risks and areas of uncertainty of obstetric related drugs. However not intended, the obstetrician's general reluctance to admit to the adverse effects of the drugs which have long been a part of their arsenal have led obstetricians between the rock and the hard place. Obstetricians are expected to advise their patients to accept the medication of a newborn rather than an avoidable substance of childbirth. She is likely to want a careful, detailed explanation of her medicine which requires medication or a caesarean operation.

Hospital based obstetricians in the US because of their obstetric case rather than obstetric. Lay obstetricians, also confined to the hospital world of America,

### AMERICAN WARNING

**"One of every four women in the United States has her baby surgically removed"**

During her European visit in 1988, **Doris Haines, President of the American Foundation for Maternal & Child Health** raised the steady state of obstetric drugs and their effects. It was to avoid following in American footsteps, we must start listening to her voice.

The obstetrician's general reluctance to admit to the adverse effects of the drugs which have long been a part of their arsenal have led obstetricians between the rock and the hard place. Obstetricians are expected to advise their patients to accept the medication of a newborn rather than an avoidable substance of childbirth. She is likely to want a careful, detailed explanation of her medicine which requires medication or a caesarean operation.

Hospital based obstetricians in the US because of their obstetric case rather than obstetric. Lay obstetricians, also confined to the hospital world of America,

which rather than this standard American hospital based obstetric care.

Obstetric health care is not for seeking alternatives to traditional American obstetric care. One of every four women in the United States has her baby surgically removed.

American obstetricians frequently contend that the high rate of caesarean sections in the US is an attempt to forestall medical malpractice suits being filed against obstetricians. They need to ignore the fact that in the US there has been only a 15% increase in the medical malpractice suits filed against doctors over the past 30 years. They also need to ignore the fact that in Canada, despite a 30% increase in caesarean sections it is almost identical to that in the United States, despite the fact that Canada has a legal system which makes it substantially easier for an

Carrying obstetricians are distressed by the apparent signs of a growing number of American women who feel that their obstetricians misled them into a false sense of safety regarding the obstetric drugs and procedures offered them. Without making a well-informed obstetrician here patient themselves into a corner.

receive from their obstetrician only superficial information regarding the risks inherent in the use of obstetric drugs. As a result, when they become aware of the risks they are likely to be ill prepared to deal with women who no longer trust a doctor's obstetrician here patient themselves into a corner.

to bringing up to me most difficult conversations. My own daughter five her mother in from London for a hour

signed patient to file a malpractice suit against a negligent doctor. Continued page 7

VOL 32 NO 3 AUTUMN 1990 £3.00

# AIMS JOURNAL

ASSOCIATION FOR IMPROVEMENTS IN THE MATERNITY SERVICES

---

## Where's the Good News?

The last two AIMS Journals have dealt with a very serious topic - the destruction of midwifery both locally and on a world-wide scale. It was therefore interesting to monitor comments from some midwives at the recent Midwifery Today conference about the journal. At the one extreme some stopped by our table to ask 'what can we do to help?'. At the other, were those who remarked 'why would I want to read about that - it's too depressing!' It seems the schism in midwifery is as large as ever.

**Lately at AIMS we have had to remind ourselves to celebrate the little victories. The good news at AIMS is when an individual mother calls and says "thank you - you helped me get the birth I wanted."**

Indeed it may be that the only hope for change in the maternity services is for women to take the initiative and "take up" to change the drugs which underlie obstetric care and instead of what is happening in these so-called "kitchens" say not only yes please at AIMS that a lot of routine maternity care is now so gross and common to us many important procedures which cause unnecessary pain to a labouring woman that many cannot get through a "normal" hospital birth without drugs.

Hope may also be found amongst in those women who agree their care with doctors had increasingly midwifery who provide obstetric care in some cases (especially in obstetricians) - but because they benefit the greatest but because they do not study into the hospital world.

There is hope in the role of obstetricians which seem to do more than just obstetric practice. They instead focus on pregnancy and birth as a total experience for the woman. And there is hope among the growing numbers of women who take up with help obstetrician to prepare, advise and pain relief to women and pain. In so doing they often get out of a world with that regards pregnancy as an illness. With will help can come with knowledge and a growing level of competence and confidence among women.

The bond towards the use of obstetric medicine in pregnancy and birth is gradually eroded and positive in the article on page 3 suggest. An obstetric medicine is not primary. It is to accept that I am a keen supporter of many aspects of obstetric medicine and through my research into the topic have gained some of the knowledge about

**VISIT AIMS ON THE WEB AT WWW.AIMS.ORG.UK**



by Nadia Higson  
AIMS Trustee

I chose to revisit the Journals from the 1990s because it was the decade in which I gave birth to my sons, and also the decade in which I joined AIMS, and so I was reading many of these issues as they came out.

At times it has been dispiriting to read about concerns which were current then and remain familiar issues today as discussed below, but there are things that have changed for the better too.

The decade opened with Doris Haire bringing us an “American Warning” ([1990, Volume 2, No 1](#)). She talked about the backlash from “a growing number of American women who feel that their obstetricians misled them into a false sense of security regarding the obstetric drugs and procedures offered them” as a result of “general reluctance to call attention to the adverse effects of the drugs which have long been a part of their armament” including pethidine, the local anaesthetics used in epidurals, and oxytocin drips. We now have the NICE guideline on Intrapartum care for healthy women and babies ([www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg190](https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg190)) making recommendations to “Assess the woman's knowledge of strategies for coping with pain and provide balanced information to find out which available approaches are acceptable to her”, to give information about the side effects of drugs and to “support her in her choice”. However, as calls to the AIMS Helpline regularly show, this “reluctance to call attention to the adverse effects” is still apparent amongst many obstetricians in the UK today. Only last year, Linn Shepherd was writing in the AIMS Journal ([2019, Volume 31, No 4](#)) to warn that “currently no-one is informing women that when synthetic oxytocin is recommended, it is likely to be prescribed and administered in unlicensed dilutions and increments, with regular disregard for the benefits and safety measures built into the licensed instructions”.

One thing that doesn't seem to have changed is concern over the rising caesarean rate – but back in 1990 Nancy Stewart reviewed a report from the Maternity Alliance revealing that “In 1982 the caesarean rate was 10.5% of all births, but by 1985 it had reached 11.6%” ([Volume 2 No 2 1990](#)). The latest statistics for England and Wales from NHS Digital ([digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/nhs-maternity-statistics/2018-19](https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/nhs-maternity-statistics/2018-19)) showed that it had reached 29%!

Back in 1990 vaginal birth after caesarean (VBAC) was still viewed by doctors and midwives as a risky process. It was commonly described as a ‘trial of scar’ and those ‘attempting’ it were routinely starved and put on an intravenous drip in case they needed a caesarean, as Yvonne Williams found when she decided on this option for her second birth ([1990, Volume 2, No 2](#)). Now the NHS website states that “Most women who have had a caesarean section can safely have a vaginal delivery for their next baby” - although doctors and midwives are frequently wary of VBACs taking place outside an obstetric unit or without continuous monitoring ‘just in case’.

In the 1990s, waterbirth was still regarded as a novel practice, and was meeting resistance from many in the medical establishment – one of them warning that “If we become mesmerised by the eccentricities proposed by these aquatic fanatics, we undermine social and technological advances and run the risk of turning the clock back decades” ([1995, Volume 7, No 1](#)). Even when labouring in water was considered ‘acceptable’

people were usually expected to get out in order to birth. AIMS scored a success when in 1995, at the request of Beverley Beech, the UKCC (United Kingdom Central Council for Nursing, Midwifery and Health Visiting - forerunner of the NMC) issued a statement recognising that *“waterbirth is preferred by some women as their chosen method of delivery of their baby. Waterbirth should, therefore, be viewed as an alternative method of care and management in labour and as one which must, therefore fall within the duty of care and normal sphere of practice as a midwife”*.

Although birth-pools were becoming more widely available in hospitals through the 1990s, it didn't always mean that they were being used. In the middle of the decade ("Waterbirth: False hopes, False promises", p17, [1996, Volume 8 No 3](#)), Jean Robinson reported on findings from a survey by the National Perinatal Epidemiology Unit showing that *“nearly half the hospitals that have pools virtually never use them”*

Although we know that access to waterbirths is still patchy, and often limited to so-called 'low risk' women and birthing people, at least it is now viewed as a mainstream choice and the NICE guideline on Intrapartum care for healthy women and babies recommends *“Offer the woman the opportunity to labour in water for pain relief.”*

For all those with an interest in supporting physiological birth and the individual's right to choose, the big story of the 1990s was the publication first of the Winterton Report on Maternity Services in 1992, and then the Cumberlege Report “Changing Childbirth” in 1993. ([1993, Volume 5, No 3](#)). The recommendations gladdened our hearts, for example:

- services should be woman-centred, accessible to all and geared to individual needs
- they should provide appropriate, locally based antenatal care, known carers, a relaxed and private environment for birth and the moments after birth, and accessible help in the weeks after birth
- women should have the right to book with a midwife or GP, change their booking or plans for the birth at any stage during pregnancy, choose different forms of care and be respected by professionals.

Wonderful! So why did we need Baroness Cumberlege to lead another National Maternity Services review leading to the Better Births report in 2016?

To be fair, some of the recommendations of Changing Childbirth were implemented, but others fell by the wayside. For example, in 1994 Sandar Warshall ("Moving forward on Cumberlege", p18, [1994, Volume 6, No 2](#)) reported on an RSM (Royal Society of Medicine) Forum which celebrated three innovative models of midwifery care: a midwife-led unit in Bournemouth with a 96% 'normal birth rate', a case-loading scheme at Queen Charlotte's providing one-to-one care including to those labelled 'high risk', and the South East (London) Midwifery Group Practice, which was to become the inspirational - and much-lamented - Albany Practice. Over the years, further midwife-led units have opened, but some have closed, and access to them is frequently limited to those who fit within narrow guidelines. Innovative schemes offering continuity of carers, such as Neighbourhood Midwives and One-to-One have secured NHS contracts and then been unable to survive. The struggle continues.

Will the Better Births recommendations fare any better than those of Changing Childbirth? This time, the recommendations have been formally adopted into the NHS long-term improvement plan and a national Maternity Transformation Programme put in place to implement them. You can be sure AIMS will be watching, contributing our views and continuing to campaign for genuinely 'better births' in the future.

To end on a positive note, towards the end of the decade the Journal's editorial asked "Where's the good news?" ([1999, Volume 11, No 3](#)) and concluded that "*The good news at AIMS is when an individual mother calls and says, "Thank you - you helped me get the birth I wanted."* As an AIMS Helpline volunteer, I can confirm that that's as true now as it was thirty years ago. Whatever the national picture may be "It is [still] better to light a single candle than to curse the darkness."