

Anthropology and Birth Activism

What Do We Know?

ROBBIE DAVIS-FLOYD
CASE WESTERN RESERVE U

A few days ago, I attended a dinner for birth activists in Seattle. The 14 women (and one man) gathered held our glasses aloft as a doula (a woman trained to provide support to the laboring mother) made the last toast—"for all the women who don't know."

My reactions trembled on the existential brink. As both an anthropologist and a birth activist, I am trained to honor and respect women's choices and the knowledge systems on which they base those choices, but also to deeply question the cultural conditioning underlying all "choice." And in both roles, I heard just as deeply the pity in the doula's voice, the regret, the sadness—this was not a toast of celebration made "to" these women, but rather one of longing, a hope "for" these women (who constitute over 90% of the American childbearing population) that they may come to "know"—to see the light and truth of what birth activists are sure they are missing—the deeply embodied, tremendously empowering experience of giving birth on one's own, without the artificial aids of drugs and technologies.

COMMENTARY

The Fault Line

The sadness and pity that birth activists feel for women who "miss out on birth" is unappreciated or unnoticed by most American birth-giving women. The 100 interviews I conducted in the late 1980s and early 1990s clearly showed that only about 25% of my US interviewees even wanted a fully natural childbirth, while 75% either desired or were relatively content with their highly technologized birth experiences. These data have been recently amplified by a 2002 Harris poll survey of 1,800 American women designed by the Maternity Center Association, which showed that 63% of survey respondents received epidurals, 93% received electronic



Debra Pascali Bonaro, a doula, supports a mother during labor. Photo by Nick Macilvaine

fetal monitoring and many other forms of technological intervention during labor, and over 90% expressed satisfaction with their childbearing experiences (www.maternitywise.org).

There was a 10-year period during which "natural childbirth" as a social movement flourished in the US and women welcomed the efforts of birth activists, who succeeded in achieving humanistic rights in hospitals to the supportive presence of family, friends and doulas; more comfortable environments for labor and birth; and breastfeeding support. The current generation of US birthing women takes these rights for granted, right along with the epidural and the fetal monitor, which have served to ensure that American mothers use their choice and agency to reinforce biomedical hegemony and the increasing technologization of birth.

The endless dialogues birth activists engage in about how to effect changes in childbirth center around the need for education: If women "only understood" the disadvantages and indeed dangers, to their bodies and their babies from drugs and technologies, then surely they would be asking for better births. They would seek out mid-

wives who can offer these better births, and who presently attend only 9% of American births because women don't demand them and doctors don't want the competition. They would give birth at home and in birth centers, where a holistic model of birth prevails and the focus is on facilitating women to give birth on their own and on avoiding unnecessary interventions. But in spite of the demonstrated safety of out-of-hospital birth, it has remained for the past 25 years at under one percent (.006).

Evidence vs Practice

Birth activists have mountains of scientific data on their side, but this data has made little difference in the practice of birth. Routine electronic fetal monitoring remains pervasive, even though it does not improve outcomes but does raise the incidence of unnecessary cesareans. Induction of labor increases prematurity

and labor complications, but its use has skyrocketed in the past decade to over 53%. Epidurals can slow labor, generate fevers and necessitate further interventions for both mother and baby (who will end up in the NICU if the mother does develop a fever). Cesareans generate higher rates of infection and other complications (including death) than vaginal birth, but the cesarean rate in the US is at an all time high of 27.6%. The cesarean rate in Brazil (39%) has long been cited as the highest in the world, but it is not. The cesarean rate for Mexico is 40%; for Chile, 43%; for Puerto Rico, 48%; and for Taiwan and China, 50%. Cesarean rates in rural areas "underserved" by modern medicine are generally low, so in urban areas the rates are much higher, especially in private hospitals, where they often range between 70% and 90%.

Given that much of what I have long called technocratic birth emerged and was transmitted around the world from the American technocracy, it is ironic that the US cesarean rate is lower than that of various Third World countries. Birth activists claim the credit for this fact, noting that there have been (until quite recently) no large

and organized activist networks in the countries with the highest cesarean rates. They believe that their outcries against unnecessary interventions were what held obstetricians back from raising the US cesarean rate beyond 23% for 23 years (from 1979 until 2002). The present increase in the US can be traced to recent studies generating a decline in the once-popular vaginal birth after cesarean (VBAC) and the growing number of women choosing elective cesareans, an option the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists recently declared ethical.

Ethnography as Activism

Interestingly enough, although feminists sometimes accuse birth activists of essentialism, the large and growing body of anthropological ethnography about birth supports birth activist positions, often from feminist perspectives.

From the 1960s to the present, anthropologists have reported similar responses to biomedical birthways from women in developing countries around the world: "They shave you, they expose you, they cut you, they leave you alone to suffer and don't let your family members be with you, they give you nothing to eat or drink, and sometimes they yell at you and slap you." In the remotest rural clinics and the biggest urban hospitals, impoverished laboring women lie on narrow cots as (sometimes-reused) IV needles drip pitocin into their veins. The pain from pitocin-induced contractions can be terrible, and there are no doulas to mitigate it or epidurals to take it away.

Not surprisingly, many rural women resist hospital birth, leaving development planners to shake their heads over this regressive unwillingness to use modern facilities, attributing it to ignorance and close-mindedness. But Soheir Morsy notes that in Egypt's Nile Delta, the choice to birth at home with a traditional midwife is not a result of being tradition-bound, but rather a "measured judgment" about the inadequate care provided to the rural and urban poor in modern clinical settings—a conclusion confirmed by my own research on urban Mexican traditional midwives and by that of many others.

All anthropologists engaged in cross-cultural birth research criticize

See *Birth Activism* on page 38

Birth Activism

Continued from page 37

development policies that foster increased biomedicalization, often taking activist roles by working to improve these policies, to support traditional midwives to remain viable in the contemporary world, and to end the biomedical abuse of Third World women.

Coercion and Choice

In contrast to women's Third Worldly experiences, American women seem to have all the choice and agency in the world. These choices and agencies are the result of real struggles by resourced activists, from contemporary middle-class women seeking to bring humanism to technocratic birth, back to the Boston upper-crust ladies who worked hard in the 1920s to bring scopolamine from Germany to the US and to convince doctors to use it. Such choices were denied for decades to the American poor and underserved (who were "supposed to suffer"),

who then turned around to demand all the technology they could get as soon as they had access to it. Because the privileged women had it, they "knew" it was the best.

Now that knowledge blankets the planet, convincing women that they should want technobirth and justifying its infliction if they don't. What is choice and privilege in one setting becomes an almost invisible coercion in another. What obstetricians know is that women are choosing drugs and technology, so forcing drugs and technology on women who don't choose them can be easily coded as "giving women what they want" and "respecting women's choice." Choice in the "First" World—the world of the resource-rich in every country—paradoxically serves to obscure and mystify coercion in the "Third" World of the resource-poor.

Doctors "know" that they are giving women "the best care," and "what they really want." Birth activists, including myself, know that this "best care" is too often a travesty of what birth can be. And yet on that existential brink I tremble at the birth activist coding of women as "not

knowing." So much anthropological research on reproduction highlights the carefully thought-out strategies behind the decisions women make within the context of their lived realities—an insight that must apply as equally to the American woman who schedules a cesarean as to the Tanzanian woman who returns to the traditional midwife. Teasing out the difference between birth activism and anthropology, I return to the core of our discipline: birth ethnographers only really know what the women they study show and tell them. It is our job to specify, contextualize and render meaningful the choices these women make in all their diversity, so that we can tell the world what women know. ☐

Robbie Davis-Floyd is an adjunct associate professor of anthropology at Case Western Reserve University and a senior research fellow in the department of anthropology at the University of Texas Austin. She is author of Birth As an American Rite of Passage (1992, 2004); and most recently co-editor of Cyborg Babies: From Techno-Sex to Techno-Tots (1998); Reconciving Midwifery (2004); and Mainstreaming Midwives: Politics and Professionalization (forthcoming).



ESSAY COMPETITION

The AnthroSource Steering Committee (ASSC) challenges users and would-be users of AnthroSource to consider the current and future impact of this new resource on the scholarly enterprise.

Submissions will be reviewed by the ten-member ASSC for creativity, innovative use of resources available through AnthroSource, and clear demonstration of impact and needs.

The first prize paper will be awarded \$500, second and third prizes will earn \$250 each.

Deadline: August 1

www.aaanet.org/anthrosource/essay_comp.htm

The Society for Applied Anthropology

announces and congratulates the following award winners for 2005

Malinowski Award

Paul L. Doughty
University of Florida

Margaret Mead Award

Donna Goldstein
University of Colorado

Sol Tax Award

Gilbert Kushner
University of South Florida

Peter K. New Student Research Award

Bryan Tilt
University of Washington

The Awards will be presented on April 8, 2005 at the 65th Annual Meeting of the Society in Santa Fe, New Mexico

For additional information please visit www.sfaa.net or call (405) 843-5113

ANTHROSOURCE STEERING COMMITTEE

Call for Applications

Are you committed to the objectives and development of AnthroSource, AAA's innovative electronic portal and service for anthropologists? (www.aaanet.org/anthrosource/faq_mbr.htm.)

The AnthroSource Steering Committee (ASSC), a dynamic working group, is seeking applications from AAA members to fill vacancies left by members of the committee whose terms expire at the end of this year.

As the portal's editorial board, the ASSC recommends policies and practices related to the content, design and functionality of AnthroSource, and is responsible for furthering the assessment plan, measuring the progress toward established goals and for outlining plans for future developments.

ASSC is looking for applicants who have demonstrated knowledge of the trends in scholarly communication and a commitment towards developing new tools for authoring and disseminating the scholarship of anthropologists. Expertise in program assessment, user evaluation and experience with multimedia technology is particularly relevant. Students and younger scholars, as well as those with expertise in scholarly publishing in developing countries, are particularly encouraged to apply.

Please submit a resume of your experience as it pertains to AnthroSource, plus a one-page statement of interest by July 1, 2005, to Alison Pryor (apryor@aaanet.org).