Journal of the Anthropological Society of Oxford-online

New Series, Volume XIII, no. 1 (2021) JASO-online (ISSN: 2040-1876)

SPECIAL ISSUE

LESSONS LEARNT FROM A PANDEMIC: COVID-19 IN PERSPECTIVE

GUEST EDITORS: ELISABETH HSU, PAOLA ESPOSITO, PAULA SHEPPARD, STANLEY ULIJASZEK

SPECIAL ISSUE

LESSONS LEARNT FROM A PANDEMIC: COVID-19 IN PERSPECTIVE

GUEST EDITORS: ELISABETH HSU, PAOLA ESPOSITO, PAULA SHEPPARD, STANLEY ULIJASZEK

CONTENTS

| I. Setting the scene | 2-10 |
|--|-------|
| Elisabeth Hsu, Lessons learnt from a pandemic: outline | 2-4 |
| Sonora English, Staging the COVID-19 pandemic: revisiting Rosenberg's | |
| dramaturgical form of epidemics | 4-10 |
| II. Policies and predispositions | 11-24 |
| Aya Ahmad, Zihan Xu and Yibing Liu, Data surveillance as an ideological | |
| priority? | 11-14 |
| Aya Ahmad, Zihan Xu and Yibing Liu, Mask-wearing as a cultural practice | 14-19 |
| Elisabeth Hsu, Policies and predispositions: reflections on the limitations of | |
| culturalism | 19-24 |
| III. Efficacious metaphors? | 25-51 |
| Yasmynn Chowdhury, The militarization of COVID-19 as a disease and a sickness | 25-34 |
| Gillian Chan, How mild is 'mild' COVID-19? | 35-41 |
| Paola Esposito, Multimodal biosocialities | 41-51 |
| IV. Reproducing inequalities | 52-69 |
| Gillian Chan and Dora Lan, Inequality shaping epidemics, epidemics reproducing | |
| inequality: intersectionality and COVID-19 | 52-60 |
| Sarah Spellman, Clapping for carers: reproducing inequality during COVID-19 | 61-67 |
| Paula Sheppard, Reproducing inequalities | 68-69 |
| V. Outlook: coevolution and ecological public health | 70-75 |
| Sonora English, Stanley Ulijaszek and Anja Selmer, Coevolution and the | |
| emergence of disease: ecological thinking in public health and beyond | 70-75 |

LESSONS LEARNT FROM A PANDEMIC: OUTLINE

ELISABETH HSU

This *Special Issue* on 'Lessons learnt from a pandemic' presents the voluntary collaboration of the entire cohort of first-year medical anthropology master's students at the University of Oxford during the still ongoing COVID-19 pandemic in the 2020-2021 academic year. All lectures, seminars, supervisions and tutorials were held through e-communication during the several months of lockdown. Hence this joint project was envisaged specifically as a way of creating a community while in lockdown, welcoming personal initiative and fostering resilience in this extraordinary year. In medical anthropology at Oxford, a 2500-word essay is written weekly in term time, and tutorials in critical medical anthropology alternate with others on ecological approaches to biomedicine. In the first trimester of this year, of the three essay prompts, every week students received feedback on them in the tutorials. They were then asked to resubmit their essays either revised on their own or in co-authorship in the following term.

This Special Issue presents the essays in five sections: 1. 'Setting the scene'; 2. 'Policies and predispositions' (as they affect the public); 3. 'Efficacious metaphors' (together with individual narratives); 4. 'Reproducing inequalities'; and 5. 'Outlook: coevolution and ecological public health'. It nicely reflects the contents of the teaching in medical anthropology at Oxford in the first term.

As the first essay on Rosenberg's dramaturgical form of epidemics shows, policies to contain the pandemic have been constantly changing globally at very short notice, curtailing civil liberties and collective enterprise, rendering people frustrated and disoriented, and sending some into depression. There has been a lack of co-ordination between countries: each has asserted its own sovereignty, while furtively looking over its neighbour's shoulder and copying how the most influential countries are dealing with this unknown.

The second section on 'Policies and predispositions' thereupon presents three thematically related essays: two on ideological prioritizations regarding 'data surveillance' and 'mask-wearing' respectively, to which the third essay responds with some reflections. From the start, the difference between China, the alleged culprit, and Western 'democracies' has been emphasized, thereby reproducing the age-old orientalist bias that contrasts the collectivist East with the individualistic

West. The assumption is that peoples' willingness to follow guidelines and their educational and religious predispositions are specific to society and subculture, yet the essays raise issues that show, from a critical medical anthropology perspective, that in the case of COVID-19 the policies governments adopted have been just as place-specific and are not always bio-scientifically justified.

The third section on 'Efficacious Metaphors?' discusses how policies affecting the public impact on individual experiences of the pandemic. It highlights how issues studied in medical anthropology are framed, critically and bioculturally examining what people do when they speak of health and well-ness, of illness, disease and dis-ease, of sickness and local biologies, or situated biologies. Routine though these questions may appear, and however much of an exercise in definitions they may seem, the two essays presented in this section highlight how the disease paradigm informed the understanding of COVID-19 as a sickness and its treatment through current public health and biotechnological measures. Meanwhile, they also show how very little is yet known about COVID-19 as an *illness*, how it affects individuals, and what kinds of home-based remedies, self-help techniques and primary care facilities its sufferers have made use of.



Photo 1. Photo by Mike Erskine on Unsplash (https://unsplash.com/s/photos/capitalism)

The fourth section addresses the persistent problem of health and social inequality. A pandemic causes a crisis situation; the old collapses, you would have thought, and the new takes off. So, if capitalism (Photo 1) is to be blamed for the ruthless encroaching on our companion species' habitats and for fragmenting the bases of their livelihoods, why is no further radical and

fundamental re-thinking happening? Where are the platforms for defining a world that does not encroach as relentlessly on the habitat of wildlife whence zoonotic pandemics originate? Why is there no discussion of reducing flights, or the shipping and transport industry? Why is the problem of speed not questioned but rather cultivated through ever fancier electronic gadgets? The UK was unprepared a year ago, but it has become a world leader with its vaccination scheme (after Israel). Why is the technocratic solution winning again and thereby reproducing given structures of inequality? Given the monthly £1 increase in salary for essential care-workers in the NHS, why do gender and other discriminations of all sorts persist, all exacerbated by increased constraints and structural violence, rather than turning this health crisis into an opportunity to address our chronic social ills?

It is important not to be tunnel-visioned and not to focus merely on humans, human health and human ecology, but to care for biodiversity. The *Special Issue* ends, in its final and fifth section, with a plea to foreground considerations of co-evolution and to cultivate a sensitivity for biodiverse ecologies in public health as well.

STAGING THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC: REVISITING ROSENBERG'S DRAMATURGICAL FORM OF EPIDEMICS

SONORA ENGLISH

Epidemics are biosocial events. However diverse their biology may be, they share a common dramaturgical form (Rosenberg 1992); each epidemic has a beginning, follows a plot of increasing and revelatory tension, approaches a climax of crisis, and eventually fades to an end. Rosenberg described this dramaturgical form of the epidemic in response to the AIDS crisis in the USA, an epidemic that served as a stark reminder that the Global North was also susceptible to the perils of infectious disease. Now the COVID-19 pandemic has again reminded us of our collective vulnerability. The emergence of and responses to SARS-CoV-2 have differed greatly between countries. Some, such as China, have carried out well-coordinated responses to coronavirus, minimizing excess deaths and successfully containing transmission after the initial outbreak. Others, in contrast, have seen high rates of excess mortality due to incoherent and poorly directed response strategies; the UK should be placed among the latter. This essay will argue that the diversity in local responses to SARS-CoV-2 can be meaningfully examined through the lens of Rosenberg's dramaturgical model of the epidemic by comparing the emergence of and responses

to COVID-19 in China and the UK respectively. In so doing, it will reveal the pandemic as at once a localized and a globalized biosocial phenomenon.

Act I. Emergence of an epidemic

According to Rosenberg's model, in Act I of an epidemic, suspicious cases start to arise, but the aetiology of the illness remains unclear. During this act, experts may suppress their anxieties or be silenced by the authorities, who remain unwilling to acknowledge the looming threat publicly. Public acknowledgement inevitably threatens the institutional and economic interests of the authorities, as well as the emotional assurance of ordinary people and the maintenance of public order. Nevertheless, the public is not necessarily naïve to the mounting risks, especially as increasing fatalities occur. It is often not until deaths and suffering have patently accumulated that a threat is officially recognized. With this recognition, the act ends (Rosenberg 1992).

COVID-19 first emerged in Wuhan, China, as the story goes, in December 2019. A patient with a pneumonia of unknown aetiology was identified on 8 December, and soon a cluster of patients with this diagnosis emerged (He et al. 2020). By 31 December the cluster had grown to 27 cases, and the WHO China Country Office was alerted to the existence of this unknown disease. These cases were all traced to a wet market in Wuhan. On 1 January 2020 the market was closed (AlTakarli 2020). This, however, did not mark an official acknowledgement of the pandemic-to-be, as no further measures were implemented. On 9 January the causative agent of the patient clusters was identified: SARS-CoV-2 (ibid.). Despite warnings from whistle-blowers, no measures to curtail the spread of coronavirus were implemented until 10 January, and even then they were insufficient (Pan et al. 2020). The imposition of COVID-19-specific measures can be considered to mark official recognition of the threat from the disease in China.

SARS-CoV-2 has now created a global pandemic, or an epidemic impacting on the global community. However, the dramaturgical form of COVID-19 has played itself out differently in different countries, with each epidemic progressing through its dramaturgical course in its own way. For example, the emergence and acknowledgement of COVID-19 in China did not prompt acknowledgement of the epidemic threat in the UK. Globalized information networks allowed the UK government to follow the spread of the pandemic and anticipate its arrival but did not prompt it to take significant action. In fact, while the first UK local transmission of SARS-CoV-2 appeared on 28 February 2020, the UK government did not raise its threat level to high until 12 March or give official advice on social distancing until 16 March (Drury et al. 2020). The bar for action that would constitute recognition of COVID-19 in the UK is admittedly higher than that previously described for China. However, I believe that this is a reasonable distinction to make, given that the

UK had witnessed the severity of countless COVID-19 epidemics in other countries, providing the government with insights into what policies would constitute genuine action.

Act II. Conceptualization of arbitrariness

Following acknowledgement that there is an epidemic, a framework for understanding its arbitrariness must be established. These frameworks of understanding help people rationalize their susceptibility through risk factors such as behaviour, lifestyle and the environment. For example, by conceptualizing the mode of transmission of a disease, a measure of understanding and a sense of control is acquired (Rosenberg 1992).

During the COVID-19 pandemic, many conceptualizations of the disease have emerged. This essay focuses on the scientific frameworks that were developed to understand COVID-19 due to their relevance to the national responses seen in China and the UK. The events in Act II that are most significant to policy decisions were the confirmation of human-to-human transmission of the SARS-CoV-2 virus in China and the recognition of its transmission through aerosol droplets (He et al. 2020; Lupton 2020). In this understanding of COVID-19, people of all social groups and geographical regions are at risk of infection if they leave their homes or interact with potentially infected persons (Lupton 2020). Nevertheless, the risk of severe illness and mortality from the disease is not equally distributed: the risk is much higher for people aged sixty and over and for those with pre-existing conditions (Liu et al. 2020; Aveyard et al. 2021).

While frameworks of understanding COVID-19 are based predominantly on scientific research and advice, conceptualizations do differ between countries. For example, in the UK the government initially conceptualized COVID-19 as posing a limited local risk. This conceptualization of COVID-19, like all frameworks developed to understand it, has had significant effects on the public response (Drury et al., 2020).

Act III. Response

In Act III, the sense of crisis produced by the epidemic elicits moral and political pressure for a decisive and visible community response. The response is predominantly guided by the conceptualizations of the epidemic developed in Act II, but significantly the public health responses that were adopted also reflect cultural attitudes (Rosenberg 1992).

While the COVID-19 pandemic has undeniably unfolded on a global stage, the differences in its local forms can be seen most clearly through national response strategies. Strategies have varied significantly between countries, as can be seen below through the examples of China and the UK (Hale et al. 2020).

China

COVID-19-specific restrictions were first put in place in China on 10 January 2020, the first day of the Spring Festival travel season, or *Chunyun*. During *Chunyun*, millions of people were expected to travel around the country for holidays and to visit their families for the Chinese New Year. Nevertheless, restrictions implemented during *Chunyun* were limited and did not restrict movement within or between cities (Pan et al. 2020). Following confirmation of human-to-human transmission, and facing medical shortages and patient crowding in hospitals, more forceful response policies were put in place (ibid.). On 24 January, Wuhan and the whole of Hubei province went into lockdown, with airports, public transportation and non-essential shops closing (AlTakarli 2020). It may now seem that China delayed responding to the emergence of COVID-19; considerable controversy has emerged on this point and the lack of initial transparency in the response (He et al. 2020). Nevertheless, while hindsight may confirm that stricter measures should have been introduced sooner, China was dealing with a new, unknown disease. Any intrusive response such as a lockdown carries a high burden of proof, and responses must be proportionate and evidence-based (Nuffield Council on Bioethics 2020).

A suite of responses to COVID-19 were implemented in China with great success; focusing on those implemented in Hubei allows them to be described at greater depth. The introduction of a cordon sanitaire in Hubei on 23 January was accompanied by compulsory mask-wearing in public places and a ban on all social gatherings. From 2 February a universal and compulsory stayat-home policy was implemented throughout Hubei (Pan et al. 2020). These policies were enforced by half a million Chinese Communist Party volunteer community enforcers, who also provided material support to vulnerable groups such as the elderly and disabled (He et al. 2020). Lockdown measures in Hubei included a centrally enforced quarantine policy, with treatment of all presumed and confirmed cases and their close contacts in designated hospitals and facilities. Further, from 16 to 18 February the government initiated door-to-door symptom-screening of all Hubei residents, allowing it to identify any additional cases (Pan et al. 2020). The components of the COVID-19 response in Hubei described here illustrate the comprehensive, well-enforced responses implemented in China. These measures were successful in curtailing the local spread of the virus, with large-scale domestic SARS-CoV-2 transmission coming to an end on 31 March and Wuhan's lockdown being eased on 8 April. SARS-CoV-2 cases in China have remained remarkably low since then (He et al. 2020).

United Kingdom

The first transmission of COVID-19 within the UK was documented on 28 February 2020. By this time, the devastating effects of COVID-19 in China were clear, and the outbreak had been classed as a Public Health Event of International Concern by the WHO for almost a month. Nevertheless, meaningful official action was not taken in the UK until mid-March (Drury et al. 2020). The initial response to the COVID-19 pandemic in the UK, and arguably the response throughout, has been characterized by underestimates of the risk and an unenthusiastic response, resulting in a mortality rate that was disproportionately higher in the UK than in most other European countries (Drury et al. 2020). In the UK, health is a devolved matter, and the four nations' responses have to the COVID-19 pandemic have consequently differed. However, in the initial response to the pandemic that is discussed in this essay, only minor differences arose (Sargeant and Nice, 2021). As such, this essay considers the overall UK approach.

The UK response to COVID-19 began with public-health messaging encouraging better hygiene practices, including hand-washing. Nevertheless, the national response did not begin in earnest until mid-March, after COVID-19 had been declared a global pandemic. The public was requested (not compelled) to avoid all unnecessary social contact and travel, to work from home if possible and to avoid pubs, restaurants and other venues (Nuffield Council on Bioethics 2020). Following this limited response, cases continued to rise, prompting a national lockdown that began on 23 March (Drury et al. 2020). Legislation was introduced to allow the authorities to isolate or quarantine people infected with SARS-CoV-2 forcibly, though very limited enforcement was carried out, and instead the response focused on voluntary action (Nuffield Council on Bioethics 2020). A successful response was also hindered by unclear public-health messaging that initially failed to communicate in collectivist terms (Drury et. al. 2020). In contrast to China, the UK has not managed to control SARS-CoV-2 transmission (Pollock et al. 2020). Following the first nationwide lockdown, public-health messaging remained confusing, and contact-tracing efforts were beset by failures. To date (July 2021), implementation of new measures has continued to be characterized by delay. Over a year since the emergence of SARS-CoV-2, the UK is nowhere near the end of Act III. While the country is slowly emerging from its third national lockdown with the support of a successful vaccination campaign, it faces continued threats from new variants of the SARS-CoV-2 virus at home and abroad.

Act IV. The End

According to Rosenberg (1992), Act IV sees the inevitable end to the epidemic; it fades away with a whimper as the biosocial incidence gradually declines. Unfortunately, the global community is

currently (July 2021) stalled in Act III, with no end to this crisis in sight. Although cases of SARS-CoV-2 remain low in China and have rapidly declined in the UK, we will not see Act IV of this pandemic until cases decline in every country. In recent months, this has been laid bare by the massive global inequalities in vaccine distribution and the emergence of new SARS-CoV-2 variants with the potential to evade vaccine-acquired immunity. According to the WHO, the best way to end this pandemic and stop the emergence of new variants is to limit the spread of the virus through vaccinating quickly and equitably. Nevertheless, as rich countries hoard vaccines, many low- and middle-income countries continue in crisis and without access to any vaccines (WHO, 2021). Such inequalities create the conditions for the emergence of additional SARS-CoV-2 variants, posing a continued threat to all, even the vaccinated. Due to the globalized, interconnected nature of our world, every country is put at risk by the persistence of SARS-CoV-2 elsewhere.

Conclusion

Rosenberg's model of the dramaturgical form of epidemics provides a useful lens for comparing the emergence of COVID-19 and the response to it of different countries. It has been applied in this essay to the examples of China and the UK. In Act I, recognition of the epidemic in China eventually became inevitable, followed by a much-delayed recognition in the UK months later. Act II saw the conceptualization of COVID-19, where the common belief in scientific frameworks brought countries onstage together, albeit briefly. In Act III, China and the UK diverged even more significantly than before: China's forceful response efficiently addressed the epidemic and has maintained low case numbers ever since, while the UK has managed its response poorly, resulting in very high case numbers more than a year after the emergence of COVID-19. In accordance with Rosenberg's model (1992), the comparison of China and the UK presented in this essay has demonstrated that even global epidemics are experienced and responded to locally. Nevertheless, due to the global character of this crisis, we will not reach Act IV, the end, until cases are controlled everywhere. The persistence of SARS-CoV-2 in any country poses an enduring threat to the rest of the world.

References

- AlTakarli, N. 2020. China's response to the COVID-19 outbreak: a model for epidemic preparedness and management. *Dubai Medical Journal*, 3(2), pp. 44-49.
- Aveyard, P., Gao, M., Lindson, N., Hartmann-Boyce, J., Watkinson, P., Young, D., Coupland, C., Tan, P., Clift, A., Harrison, D., Gould, D., Pavord, I. and Hippisley-Cox, J. 2021. Association

between pre-existing respiratory disease and its treatment, and severe COVID-19: a population cohort study. *The Lancet Respiratory Medicine*, 00095-3(21), pp. S2213-2600.

- Drury, J., Reicher, S. and Stott, C. 2020. COVID-19 in context: why do people die in emergencies? It's probably not because of collective psychology. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 59, pp. 686-693.
- Hale, T., Angrist, N., Cameron-Blake, E., Hallas, L., Kira, B., Majumdar, S., Petherick, A.,
 Phillips, T., Tatlow, H. and Webster, S. 2020. *Variation in government responses to COVID-*19. Blavatnik School of Government Working Paper Series. Oxford: University of Oxford.
- He, A., Shi, Y. and Liu, H. 2020. Crisis governance, Chinese style: distinctive features of China's response to the COVID-19 pandemic. *Policy Design and Practice*, 3(3), pp. 242-258.
- Liu, Y., Mao, B., Liang, S., Yang, J., Lu, H., Chai, Y., Wang, L., Zhang, L., Li, Q., Zhao, L., He, Y., Gu, X., Ji, X., Li, L., Jie, Z., Li, Q., Li, X., Lu, H., Zhang, W., Song, Y., Qu, J. and Xu, J. 2020. Association between age and clinical characteristics and outcomes of COVID-19. *European Respiratory Journal*, 55(5), p. 2001112.
- Lupton, D. 2020. Contextualising COVID-19: sociocultural perspectives on contagion. In: D. Lupton and K. Willis, ed., *The COVID-19 Crisis: Social Perspectives*, 1st edn. London: Routledge.
- Nuffield Council on Bioethics. 2020. *Ethical considerations in responding to the COVID-19 pandemic*. Rapid Policy Briefing. London: Nuffield Council on Bioethics.
- Pan, A., Liu, L., Wang, C., Guo, H., Hao, X., Wang, Q., Huang, J., He, N., Yu, H., Lin, X., Wei, S. and Wu, T. 2020. Association of public health interventions with the epidemiology of the COVID-19 outbreak in Wuhan, China. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 323(19), pp. 1915-1923.
- Pollock, A., Roderick, P. and Cheng, K. 2020. COVID-19: why is the UK government ignoring WHO's advice? *British Medical Journal* 368: m1284.
- Rosenberg, C. 1992. *Explaining epidemics and other studies in the history of medicine*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sergeant, Jess, and Alex Nice. Coronavirus lockdown rules in each part of the UK. *Institute For Government*, 2021: https://www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/explainers/coronavirus-lockdown-rules-four-nations-uk. Accessed 24 June 2021.
- WHO 2021. *Declaration: we must accelerate vaccine equity for all health workers now*. World Health Organization.