

Chapter 2

Anthropological Perspectives on Health and Disease

CHAPTER GOALS

- To understand the concept of health and the challenge of defining it as a universal concept
- To be able to distinguish among disease, illness, and sickness and their relationship to each other
- To understand the concept of adaptation in relation to health and disease
- To become familiar with the major cultural approaches to the study of health
- To become familiar with standard epidemiological concepts and terminology

The term "leper" refers to someone with leprosy (Hansen's disease) or, more generally, to someone who is an outcast, excluded from participation in social life for fear of contamination. Ronald Barrett, a medical anthropologist, describes working with patients with leprosy in India: although their disease is curable (it is caused by the bacterium *Mycobacterium leprae*) and not particularly contagious, "the social stigma of leprosy furthers its physical stigma, which returns to reinforce individual and collective models of discrimination" (Barrett 2005, 225). In other words, the social consequences of the disease far exceed its biological capacity to harm, especially in the age of antibiotics. Barrett's work with leprosy patients in India reveals how health and disease have meanings that are cultural and biological, and in this chapter we provide some conceptual anthropological and epidemiological tools for understanding health and disease.

Definitions of Health

The first task in this survey of medical anthropology is to understand what the concepts of health and disease refer to. Defining health is a tricky business because health has many dimensions. In a famous pronouncement from the Alma Ata conference in 1978, the World Health Organization (WHO), the international organization based in Geneva, Switzerland, that oversees health problems and interventions around the world, defined health as a state of complete social, psychological, and physical

well-being. A lofty goal of a exactly is this what may cor well-being in stantial amo but interpre pressed beh of the powe seen at sea l many bloo same readi oxygen pr in what co for a mar woman r may be c are speci Me terms, and sic

Disea

Disca

script such, cultu tutes cate ogy san

no fro

at a

(

i

well-being. Although this definition is useful to the WHO, which has the laudable (and lofty) goal of achieving health for all of the world's citizens, it begs the question of what exactly is this state, and is it something that would be universally recognized? That is, what may constitute this sense of well-being in one society may differ significantly from what may constitute this sense of well-being in another. With respect to physical well-being, for example, having a substantial amount of body fat might be seen as a sign of excellent health in one population but interpreted as "overweight" and requiring medical intervention in another. Depressed behavior may be seen as a cause of hospitalization in one culture but evidence of the power of witchcraft in another. Or, a hemoglobin reading of 17 mg/dl might be seen at sea level as evidence of polycythemia, a condition in which an individual has too many blood cells, resulting in thick blood, whereas at 15,000 feet above sea level the same reading would be evidence of a beneficial adaptation to hypoxia, the relatively low oxygen pressure that characterizes high-altitude environments. There is also variation in what constitutes "healthiness" within populations. A body weight considered healthy for a man may be considered overweight for a woman; pregnancy in a 25-year-old woman may be seen as entirely routine, whereas pregnancy in a 45-year-old woman may be considered "risky." Hence the concept and appropriate measure(s) of well-being are specific to, and meaningful within, a set of local conditions.

Medical anthropologists find it useful to make a distinction among three terms, which are often used interchangeably in popular language: disease, illness, and sickness.

Disease

Disease refers to a physiological alteration that impairs function in some way. Descriptions of disease processes largely derive from Western biomedical science. As such, disease is a more or less "objective" measure of health that can be used cross-culturally. However, as the earlier hemoglobin example demonstrates, what constitutes "disease" in one environment may in fact enhance function in another. These categories are thus a useful starting point because they describe alterations in biology and physiological function, but it is important to be careful about ascribing the same meaning to them across populations and environments.

Here we list some common disease states and their causes. Most of these are by no means unique to humans, and several may co-occur simultaneously or derive from interactions among causes.

✓ 1. *Injury*. All organisms are vulnerable to injury or damage to some part of the anatomy as a function of random accidents, living in a dangerous environment (on a cliff, in a neighborhood where crime is common), behavior that increases the risk (driving recklessly, competing with others for mates), or some combination thereof (having a job in a factory working with heavy machinery).

✓ 2. *Infection*. Infectious disease derives from microorganisms that spread from one individual to another and cause some sort of challenge to the body's function. Infectious diseases can be viruses, bacteria, protozoa, or multicellular (such as worms) and vary from those that cause relatively little harm (such as rhinoviruses that cause the common cold) to those that cause permanent disability (such as the Zika virus) or that are potentially fatal (such as malaria or anthrax).

3. **Malnutrition.** These are physiological disorders that stem from the lack or surfeit of nutrients, including vitamins, minerals, carbohydrates, protein, and fat. A lack of food in general contributes to protein-energy malnutrition, and fat-soluble nutrient deficiencies can contribute to specific disorders (e.g., scurvy from vitamin C deficiency). In contrast, long-term overconsumption can contribute to chronic diseases such as diabetes, cardiovascular disease, and some forms of cancer.

4. **Genetic.** In the process of sexual reproduction, **mutations** may occur in the formation of egg or sperm. These mutations can ultimately create alterations in fetal development or contribute to some form of compromised function after birth. Any given genetic disorder occurs relatively rarely at the rate of mutation (often estimated at about 1 in 10,000 genes), but may become more common when passed down in reproductively isolated and inbred populations or when the disorder confers some other biological benefit, as in the case of sickle-cell hemoglobin, which seems to protect against deadly forms of malaria.

5. **Chronic.** Some forms of chronic disease stem from genetic factors, but most result from lifelong behaviors. Included in this category is cardiovascular disease, which is related to long-term dietary and activity patterns, cancers such as those related to smoking or exposure to toxic compounds, and type II diabetes, which is in many cases related to long-term overconsumption, lack of activity, or both. Importantly, these forms of disease are by and large absent from wild-living organisms, although they do manifest in domesticated pets or zoo animals as a function of diet and activity modifications. They are also relatively absent from human populations engaged in subsistence agriculture or hunting and gathering. Other disease states can be chronic, such as allergies (immune responses to benign foreign substances) or autoimmune disorders (immune responses to one's own body tissues).

6. **Psychological or behavioral.** These forms of disease are also relatively absent from wild organisms, but they have come to be common among humans in industrialized societies. Depression, anxiety, and attention deficit disorder, among others, are increasingly diagnosed in countries such as the United States. These complex disorders are caused by many factors, both biological and social, that are incompletely understood. They increasingly are treated with medications that alter the balance of neurotransmitters such as serotonin in the brain.

As is evident from this list, an individual's behavior in relation to his or her environment is critical to understanding variation in disease risk. Different social environments, patterns of behaviors, and ecological conditions all give rise to variation in the risk of any of these disorders across human populations.

Illness

Illness is used to describe the subjective experience of symptoms and suffering, and it motivates changes in behavior to alleviate the discomfort (such as altering the diet, resting, or seeking professional help). Arthur Kleinman, a medical anthropologist (see Figure 2.1), distinguishes **illness** from disease in the following way:

Illness complaints are what patients and their families bring to the practitioner. Indeed, locally shared illness idioms create a common ground for patient and practitioners to understand each other in their initial encounter.

Figure 2
Arthur Kleinman
Photo courtesy of

For
rie
re
The st
ways
cultu
expe
the a
fit m
or c
pla
cei
no
co




Figure 2.1

Arthur Kleinman.

Photo courtesy of Arthur Kleinman.

For the practitioner, too, has been socialized into a particular collective experience of illness. Disease, however, is what the practitioner creates in the recasting of illness in terms of theories of disorder. (Kleinman 1988, 5)

The subjective experience of suffering is informed by cultural contexts that provide ways of thinking about and understanding what we are feeling. That is, there are culturally specific and culturally appropriate ways of being ill and expressing that experience. In a successful therapeutic encounter, there is a close match between the articulation of illness and the diagnosis of disease. However, in many cases, the fit may not be so clear. The clinician may fail to find objective evidence of disease or declare a diagnosis that reflects an incomplete resolution of the patient's complaints. In other words, a patient may present his or her "illness problem" and receive the diagnosis that "nothing is wrong." Conversely, a person feeling well (i.e., not exhibiting illness behavior) might, through a chance clinical encounter, discover that he or she has a serious disease, such as a symptomless early-stage cancer.

Anthropologist in Action: Arthur Kleinman

The medical anthropologist Arthur Kleinman holds an M.D. and a master's degree in anthropology. He is a professor of psychiatry, as well as a professor of medical anthropology, at Harvard University and has made fundamental contributions to the field of medical anthropology, while maintaining a psychiatric practice until recently.

(continued)

(continued)

Dr. Kleinman has worked in the United States and has carried out extensive research in Taiwan and China. He has been active as a consultant for WHO, working on global mental health issues as well as issues related to infectious diseases, such as SARS and AIDS.

In his early work, Dr. Kleinman developed the concept of the explanatory model—what individuals construct to interpret and “make sense” of their experience of maladies, describing them in what Kleinman called “illness narratives” (Kleinman 1988). These illness narratives and explanatory models stem not only from an individual’s cultural context but also from his or her own life history, family and community, and belief systems. In an article outlining the relevance of these models for clinical practice, Kleinman, Eisenberg, and Good (1978) suggest asking: (1) What do you think has caused your problem? (2) Why do you think it started when it did? (3) What do you think your sickness does to you? How does it work? (4) How severe is your sickness? Will it have a short or long course? (5) What kind of treatment do you think you should receive? (6) What are the most important results you hope to receive from this treatment? (7) What do you fear most about your sickness? What are the chief problems your sickness has caused for you?

In this work and throughout his career, Kleinman has been concerned with improving the doctor–patient relationship to best alleviate not only the physiological symptoms of disease but also the multiple social dimensions of patient suffering. As a psychiatrist, he has seen how the “routine” health crises that people inevitably face (for themselves or loved ones) often precipitate a medical diagnosis (depression or anxiety), yet he argues that the moral issues that suffering brings to the fore should not be medicalized or turned into “disease” (see Q&A with Arthur Kleinman, *The Boston Globe*, July 23, 2006).

In recent years, Kleinman has turned to the consideration of how caregiving must be fully integrated into medical education, such that the diagnostic/technological aspects of medicine are not cleaved from the humanistic and moral aspects of patient care. As he writes,

I do believe that what doctors need to be helped to master is the art of acknowledging and affirming the patient as a suffering human being; imagining alternative contexts and practices for responding to calamity; and conversing with and supporting patients in desperate situations where the emphasis is on what really matters to the patient and his or her intimates. . . . The implementation of useful programmes will require parallel attention to the structural and cultural barriers that undermine caregiving in practice settings so as to encourage the experience of caregiving as core to the professional and personal life of the doctor. This will also mean that students and practitioners acquire those interpretive skills of critical self-reflection that enable them to understand and respond to all those barriers that cause doctors to fail at the art of healing. (Kleinman 2008, 23)

In a new book, he and co-author Iain Wilkinson extend this charge to the social sciences (Wilkinson and Kleinman 2016).

Because
fort, the disea
Kleinman no
which calci
family's frus
undiagnosed
(Kleinman 1
reduces the
ease may or
ones. illnes
indicates, a
be addresse
dividual, hi

Sicknes

Sickness i
with disea
a famous
is that the
1979). Th
hold task
on the sic
group. L
Doctor's
work or
compen
Given t
Among
assigne
from a

Al
ligation
additic
cially
ness a
which
“shun
by me
[Can
aborr
with

In so
auth
auth

Because illness reflects a set of individually experienced symptoms of discomfort, the disease diagnosis may not fully—or even partially—resolve these feelings. As Kleinman noted, “When chest pain is reduced to chronic coronary artery disease for which calcium blockers and nitroglycerine are prescribed, while the patient’s fear, the family’s frustration, the job conflict, the sexual impotence, and the financial crisis go undiagnosed and unaddressed, it [the disease diagnosis and treatment] is unsuccessful” (Kleinman 1988, 6). Hence, a focus on disease is often considered reductionist; that is, it reduces the illness experience to a physiological locus. Treatment of an identifiable disease may or may not resolve the experience of illness, either for patients or for their loved ones. Illness is closely tied to the sense of well-being, as the WHO definition of health indicates, and there are psychological, social, and physical aspects of illness that should be addressed. Illness is thus a more holistic concept than disease because it links the individual, his or her lived experience, cultural orientation, and social environment.

Sickness

Sickness is another term that is used in relation to health. Sometimes it is equated with disease, illness, or both, but it has a sociological meaning as well. Talcott Parsons, a famous medical sociologist, coined the phrase the “**sick role**.” What Parsons meant is that there is a socially recognized set of expectations for “sick” individuals (Parsons 1979). These expectations may include being exempt from occupational work, household tasks, or the other obligations expected of “well” individuals. To be able to take on the sick role, one must have an illness that is recognized as legitimate by the social group. Legitimacy may require documentation by a health expert, such as a clinician. Doctor’s notes are often required in industrialized societies to exempt a person from work or to allow him or her to receive what is called in the United States “worker’s compensation,” financial compensation for wages missed while the worker is sick. Given the benefits that can derive from assuming the sick role, it can be abused. Among students, it is not uncommon for sickness to be used as an excuse for missing assigned work or an examination; from the professor’s perspective, documentation from a clinician is often required to legitimize the excuse.

Although in these contexts adopting the sick role provides some relief from obligations, the sick role may also be associated with stigma, which in turn triggers additional suffering. Afflicted individuals may be avoided or even ostracized, especially when the symptoms are visible, as in the case of leprosy. In her 1978 book *Illness as Metaphor*, Susan Sontag (who died of cancer in 2004) discussed the ways in which cancer is perceived as mysterious and generates fear, such that patients may be “shunned by relatives and friends and are the object of practices of decontamination by members of their household, as if cancer, like TB, were an infectious disease. . . . [Cancer] is felt to be obscene—in the original meaning of that word: ill-omened, abominable, repugnant to the senses” (Sontag 1978, 6, 9). In this case, individuals with cancer may not wish to take on the sick role for fear of being stigmatized.

In the sick role, the distinction between illness and disease becomes relevant. In societies such as the United States where biomedically trained clinicians have authority in health matters, clinical evidence of a disease often must be present to authenticate a patient’s claim to the sick role. If no such evidence is found, the sick

role may not be legitimated, even if the person continues to complain of not feeling well. In most, if not all societies, healers may need to "vet" a person's health status if he or she is to continue in a sick role, exempt from normal responsibilities.

These are useful terminological distinctions to make, but they do not provide an answer to the question of what defines health. Disease, illness, and sickness are all related to the WHO's definition of "social, psychological, and physical well-being." They are each an important aspect of health and point to the fact that health cannot simply be defined as the *absence of disease, illness, or sickness*. However, many people may not have a sense of complete well-being, yet they would not classify themselves as ill or seek the sick role or the services of a healer. For example, a person who is chronically sleep deprived because of the demands of work or an overactive social life may not have a particularly strong sense of well-being but is unlikely to seek medical attention to treat a condition derived from having a particular lifestyle. Under these conditions, a person is able to carry out his or her normal functions, albeit with the sense that all is not as well as it could be. So, perhaps health is related to one's ability to carry out normal functions to one's satisfaction. Only when the routines of "normal" life are disrupted by an increasing or acute sense of "dis-ease" does a person recognize that he or she is suffering from ill health.

In the WHO definition of health, "social well-being" is specifically included. What does this mean? In one society it may mean being inextricably embedded in a complex network of kin relations; in others it may mean autonomy or self-reliance. For the patients with Hansen's disease in India, social well-being was severely eroded through discrimination and permanent untouchable status, even after being cured of the disease. They both continued in the sick role and expressed illness symptoms, even going so far as to further disfigure themselves as the physical confirmation of their internal suffering (Barrett 2005). Another example comes from the work of Naomi Adelson with the Cree described in Chapter 1. Adelson notes that "Of course, the ideals that comprise 'being alive well' (*miyupimaatisiun*) cannot always be met, and one may then not 'be alive well.' This does not always necessarily imply a pathological condition of the individual, however, so much as it might of society" (Adelson 1998, 11). The Cree recognize that being alive well is not merely about the absence of an individual pathology; it involves the integrity of a whole society and way of life.

If you are used to thinking about health as having an exclusively bodily locus, it may seem odd to consider social well-being an aspect of health. Indeed, for biocultural analysis, the body is often the focus of investigation. Yet as anthropologists understand and as other social and medical scientists are becoming increasingly aware, social networks seem to have a great deal of relevance to health. People with well-developed sources of social support often get sick less, recover faster, or live longer than those with less support. A recent meta-analysis of 148 studies encompassing more than 300,000 participants showed that having strong social support networks of various kinds resulted in a significant increase in the likelihood of survival (Holt-Lunstad, Smith, and Layton 2010). As Figure 2.2 shows, overall there was a 50 percent increase in odds of survival among individuals with stronger social relationships. Multidimensional assessments of social integration that included supportive social interactions and perceptions of social support (i.e., "functional" social support) as well as integration in social networks ("structural" social support) resulted in a 91 percent increase in the

Social Relatic

Social Re

Social Relations

Smc

Smoking Cess
smokingAlcohol Co
ExcessivFlu Vaccine:
in adul

Card

Drug Tr
contr

Figure 2.
Comparis
Zero indic
Credit: Ho
Meta-anal

odds of
on surv
body m
adult a




Figure 2.2

Comparison of odds of decreased mortality across several conditions associated with mortality. Zero indicates no effect.

Credit: Holt-Lunstad J, Smith TB, Layton JB (2010) Social Relationships and Mortality Risk: A Meta-analytic Review. *PLoS Med* 7(7): e1000316. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1000316

odds of survival. Figure 2.2 illustrates that the magnitude of the effect of social support on survival is potentially greater than that of well-known risk factors such as smoking, body mass index, or physical activity, among others. The results were consistent across adult ages, gender, initial health status, follow-up period, and cause of death.

Health, Ethics, and Cultural Relativism

The WHO's definition of health as a state of complete social, psychological, and physical well-being raises some ethical questions for medical anthropologists. One of the hallmarks of anthropology is the concept of "cultural relativism"—the idea that the

(continued)

(continued)

elements of each culture must be understood on their own terms, without evaluations based on norms derived from other cultures. However, if a particular practice (such as female genital cutting or maternal detachment from their infants, as discussed in Chapter 6) is physically deleterious or painful, yet enhances a person's social or psychological well-being, is this practice "healthy?" If it is accepted that a universal component of well-being is freedom from physical pain and suffering, but also that well-being encompasses social and mental attributes, what is an appropriate medical anthropological interpretation or action? There is no clear resolution to this issue, and medical anthropologists take a variety of stances. Some use their research as a way of helping to understand these paradoxes; others attempt to find ways of eradicating the physical suffering while preserving the cultural meanings or integrity of a practice; others seek to effect cultural change, regardless of what social benefits such physical suffering is associated with; still others use their writing to bring these complexities to a broader audience, including policy makers.

Furthermore, one important anthropological contribution is to bring to light the ways in which health is not evenly distributed across cultures and to clarify the ways in which local culture is implicated in improving or worsening health and the ways in which larger political and economic forces contribute to health differentials. As Paul Farmer (1999) has argued, it should not be assumed that poor health in one population is just an intrinsic part of that culture, such that there is little to be done about it without "disrupting" cultural integrity. Instead, medical anthropological analyses should elucidate the various local, historical, and more global factors that contribute to variation in health across cultures. As Farmer notes, what people with poor health tend to have in common around the world is poverty; despite different cultural attributes, the common denominator to low life expectancy or high infant mortality, for example, is being at the low end of the economic hierarchy (this is covered in more detail in Chapter 10). Moreover, just because biomedicine is derived from Western culture (suggesting that its introduction might undermine local ethnomedical traditions) does not mean that it cannot be extremely effective in treating many diseases, and such resources should be made universally accessible.

The Locus of Health: The Body and Society

In a seminal paper in *Medical Anthropology Quarterly*, Nancy Scheper-Hughes and Margaret Lock (1987) argued that there are three bodies to be considered in the analysis of health and disease: the individual body, the social body, and the body politic. The *individual body* ("self") has been privileged in Western biomedical praxis as the sole locus of disease. A separation of the mind and body, the legacy of Rene Descartes's attempt to separate the "intangible mind" from the material body, has

resulted in the latter particular ailment. phenomena to be may be viewed as

Whether socialized as valid cause and Lock describe social world of the disease; individual social world. to harm individual (ence); in contrast proved health f Wilkinson and which social are society and the

Considering individual health to "embody" the fair to say that and its links to there is in biomedicine conditions condition as a in which medicine when there is

Pregnancy life cycle, are the twentieth-century clinicians and sion, which or her life a cal disease as the box conditions to best "treat" diseases of treatments medical to reduce its

Biological

There is a cal perspective cause or

resulted in the latter being privileged over the mind in the search for the cause of a particular ailment. The extent to which people recognize social or even psychological phenomena to be aspects of health is highly variable across cultures. That is, health may be viewed as an exclusively somatic state rather than a characteristic of society.

Whether social or other forms of external forces (e.g., supernatural) are recognized as valid causes of illness or disease is also highly variable. Scheper-Hughes and Lock described the *social body* as the seam between the physical body and the social world of the individual. The ills of society may be inscribed on the body via disease; individual wellness in turn may be, at least in part, reflective of a harmonious social world. A society rife with social divisions, inequality, or conflict is likely to harm individual health (e.g., via stress, increased exposure to infection, or violence); in contrast, well-integrated or egalitarian societies should generate improved health for their members (see Chapter 10, R. G. Wilkinson 1996; R. G. Wilkinson and Pickett 2009; Marmot 2015). The *body politic* refers to the ways in which social and political forces exert control over the bodies of individuals in a society and thereby constrain opportunities for optimal health for all.

Considering health in relation to all three "bodies" makes clear the ways that individual health is connected to larger social conditions and how individuals come to "embody" the conditions of their social worlds. In the context of biomedicine, it is fair to say that health has come to be exclusively the concern of medical practitioners and its links to larger social phenomena are not made explicit (Farmer 1999). Indeed, there is in biomedicine, as well as in other medical traditions, a tendency to medicalize conditions that have clear social roots. **Medicalization** refers to the defining of a condition as a disease, or in need of medical surveillance. It often occurs in situations in which medicine and medical practitioners have social and cultural authority or when there is resistance to seeing health as closely tied to social conditions.

Pregnancy and childbirth, which can certainly be considered intrinsic to the life cycle, are good examples of life cycle processes that have been medicalized over the twentieth century. It is widely held that pregnancy should be monitored by clinicians and that birth should occur in hospitals (see Chapter 6). Similarly, depression, which in many cases is clearly related to an individual's satisfaction with his or her life and social network, has come to be considered predominantly a biological disease and is treated accordingly with pharmaceuticals (see Chapter 11, as well as the box about Arthur Kleinman). How social forces increase the risk of such conditions is often subsumed in such discussions, and the focus turns toward how to best "treat" these diseases. Thus, ills of the social body come to be treated as diseases of the individual body. This may result in inappropriate or ineffective treatments that sidestep the underlying cause; in other words, the focus is on biomedical treatment rather than social policies that might prevent the condition, reduce its frequency, or ameliorate suffering from it.

Biological/Medical Normalcy

There is an important distinction to be made between a biocultural and a biomedical perspective on disease. Both take the body as their focus and assume that a cause or locus of disease can be found there. But this is a *starting point* for

biocultural analysis rather than an *endpoint*, as it is in biomedicine. A useful distinction to make here is between the **proximate** and **ultimate** causes of disease. Proximate literally means nearby, and in this case it refers to the immediate cause of some physiological disruption. It could be a bacterial infection that is the proximate cause of a high fever, lassitude resulting from too little thyroid hormone, or difficulty breathing caused by unimpeded growth of cancer cells in the lungs. This is where biomedical analysis often stops.

In contrast, biocultural analysis takes off from here to investigate the more distant or "ultimate" causes of the disease. It asks *why*—why this individual, in this population, living under a set of household, community, regional, national, or global conditions, each of which has been shaped by historical and evolutionary forces. What factors put the individual at risk for the bacterial infection? Was it the lack of attention to hygiene in a nursing home, and why was the person there to begin with? Was the individual exposed to asbestos in the course of his job as a demolition worker, and how did he end up with that job anyway? Ultimate factors can also be locally defined and include supernatural forces that are believed to cause disease, such as witchcraft, sorcery, or some other form of divine intervention.

Biocultural analyses (and medical anthropological analyses in general) try to get at these more "distant" or ultimate causes of a malady. They cast a critical eye on standards of health derived from biomedicine, which have most often been developed in a Western context. The example described earlier of hemoglobin levels in sea-level and high-altitude populations is illustrative of this. Another example is that standards for growth (achieved weight and especially height for age) routinely used in cross-population analysis often derive from the well-known U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) growth charts. When used in this way, frequently it appears that the population being compared with the CDC standards is "failing" to achieve the same age-specific body size. Figure 2.3 compares the CDC charts for growth in weight among boys against the WHO standards published in 2007. In general, the WHO standards are lower than the CDC standards, especially from ages 6 months to 32 months. The WHO standards are based on healthy children from diverse populations and call into question the CDC standards as the global norm for "optimal" growth (de Onis et al. 2007). That is, contemporary children in the United States may in fact be overnourished and able to grow at rates that are historically unprecedented. Hence, the wisdom of using these standards as an ideal is being questioned, especially because U.S. children are now manifesting increasing rates of what used to be considered adult-onset diseases such as diabetes. This topic is taken up in more detail in Chapter 4.

A question raised by this example is: *what is biologically normal?* This is a crucial issue because "normal" tends to be equated with healthy. It is important to develop a better sense of (1) the range of what might be considered normal (as in the norm—the most common form of a characteristic), either across populations or across history, and (2) what evidence exists supporting a relationship between a trait and an increased or decreased risk of disease across populations and environments (G. C. Williams 2000). The concept of **biological normalcy** can also be applied to conditions for which there is no known cause or cure within a given society, which are thus labeled normal. For example, the dowager's hump, now known to be




Figure 2.3
The CDC and WHO growth standards represent deviations from the mean for age, but especially so for children under 5 years of age. Source: de Onis, Mericq, and the CDC 2000 growth chart Society for Nutrition.

caused by osteoporosis, women in Western societies have considered this a direct-to-consumer risk and in need of intervention.

Thus, although height, weight, and other particular measures of health will be assessed across populations or

The issue of biological normalcy across human populations is a unique set of challenges to understand the members of a race and health differences can be




Figure 2.3

The CDC and WHO growth standards for weight for age for boys. Units are z scores, which represent deviations from the population mean. Note that the CDC standards are higher at almost every age, but especially so from ages 6 months to 32 months.

Source: de Onis, Mercedes, et al. 2007. "Comparison of the WHO child growth standards and the CDC 2000 growth charts." *J. Nutr* 137:144-148. Reprinted with permission from American Society for Nutrition.

caused by osteoporosis of the spine, long described a normal aspect of aging among women in Western societies. Barbara Mintzes (2002) notes the pernicious effects of direct-to-consumer drug advertising as a way to encourage individuals who might have considered themselves relatively healthy (i.e., normal) to see themselves as at risk and in need of pharmaceutical treatment.

Thus, although in this book descriptive characteristics of bodily states (e.g., height, weight, parasite load, blood pressure) are used, the meaning of their particular measures will be subject to investigation, with no prior expectation that they will be associated with the same risks or derive from the same causes across populations or that they are considered problematic within any given society.

The issue of biological normalcy is especially relevant to our understanding of human biological variation. There are some well-known biological differences across human populations, and historically these were understood as aspects of race. Races were seen as different "types" of humans, with each type having some unique set of biological characteristics that differentiated it from others. We now understand that these differences are in degrees of frequency rather than simply all members of one population having a trait that is not found in another (the topic of race and health is considered in detail in Chapter 10). Some of these genetic differences can be understood as the outcome of variation in the diseases faced by

populations and therefore they have health significance. Thus, to understand the sources of this biological variation among human populations, it is necessary to outline an evolutionary perspective on health. Biocultural analyses often make extensive use of evolutionary perspectives in efforts to understand how culture—especially as it affects interactions with the natural environment—has long-term consequences for the body, in the form of biological changes.

Evolutionary Perspectives on Health

To start, evolutionary theory is a set of well-supported hypotheses that explains how biological systems came about, how they change over time, and how they are maintained. Evolutionary theory is the overarching paradigm for all of the life sciences—those branches of science that are concerned with living organisms. The core principles of evolutionary theory are straightforward and have clear relevance to health. These principles derive from the pathbreaking work of Charles Darwin (1809–1882) in the nineteenth century. Darwin, along with the less-celebrated Alfred Russell Wallace, provided a process—**natural selection**—that could explain how organisms came to have their traits and how these traits were closely related to the environment in which the organisms lived. Simply put, within populations individuals vary in their characteristics, and many of these variations are heritable (capable of being passed on to offspring via DNA). Because resources such as food, space, mates, protection from predation or climate, and so on are usually limited, there is often competition among individuals for those resources. Individuals with characteristics that give them some advantage in that struggle will get more resources, which in turn will provide those individuals an advantage in survival, reproduction, or both. For example, individuals who have some trait that allows them to better resist infection or metabolize energy more efficiently have an advantage in environments characterized by infectious disease or food shortages. Ultimately, they likely will have more offspring than those without these favorable traits. Over time, such favorable traits should spread in the population, and the characteristics of that population, as evident in the frequency of those traits, will have changed, as illustrated in Figure 2.4. This is **evolution**: changes in the characteristics of a population over time. Natural selection is a mechanism by which such changes can occur.

The traits that confer some survival or reproductive advantage are referred to as **adaptations**. Importantly, an adaptation is specific to an environmental context; what provides an advantage in a tropical forest may not be at all adaptive in an Arctic environment. Predators, food resources, and infectious diseases are problems that all organisms must solve, but the particularities of those problems and their adaptive responses vary by environment. Adaptive responses can occur throughout the body—natural selection may favor more acute vision, blood cells that do not allow infection by a parasitic disease, darker or lighter skin, larger or smaller intestines, or a bowl-shape pelvis for upright walking versus a flat pelvis that serves quadrupedalism well. Bodies can thus be thought of as bundles of adaptations. Keep in mind that although natural selection is often seen as “the strongest survive,” the adaptation of interest may have nothing to do with strength per se and the “competition” may be invisible to us.

Need a source of variation?
RANDOM GENETIC

Individuals vary; variation is **HERITABLE**.

Environments in which there are threats to survival and reproduction as resources are referred to as **SELECTIVE FORCES**.

Those whose traits are better suited to the environment (more resources or available mates, more offspring) are referred to as **FITNESS**. Survival of the fittest.

Traits that are heritable and that confer a reproductive advantage are referred to as **ADAPTATION**. Adaptation is the process by which traits that confer a reproductive advantage become more common in a population.

Figure 2.4
Evolution of the

Adaptations are traits that are heritable and that confer a reproductive advantage. Fitness is the ability of an organism to survive and reproduce in its environment. Natural selection is the process by which traits that confer a reproductive advantage become more common in a population over time. Evolution is the change in the characteristics of a population over time.




Figure 2.4

Evolution through natural selection and the concept of adaptation.

Adaptations are measured by the **fitness** of the individuals who possess these traits. Fitness is defined as reproductive success (how many offspring or grand-offspring, etc., you have). To have fitness, you must survive to reproductive maturity or make some contribution to the reproductive fitness of close biological relatives (this is known as *inclusive fitness*). Because the strict measure of fitness is often difficult to assess, especially in humans with their long generation times, health indexes are often used as proxies for fitness—that is, for the assessment of adaptations. By definition, these are linked—either directly or indirectly—to survival and reproduction (Little 1989). Frequently used indexes include standard biological measures—hemoglobin status, infectious disease status or parasite load, child height and weight, blood pressure, reproductive outcomes such as miscarriage, or birth weight. All of these signal something about health that has significance for survival chances and overall reproductive success. Ideally, these measures can be linked together in a prospective study—that is, by assessing individual health characteristics and following an individual over longer periods of time to assess his or her fertility and survival (or age at death). Prospective studies are difficult to do because they require monitoring of individuals over long periods of time, so more often than not health measures are used as proxies for adaptation if they are known to affect survival or reproduction.

Selective forces are environmental factors that ultimately challenge survival and reproduction, but more immediately endanger health and well-being. They are sometimes referred to as **stressors**. Exposure to pathogens, lack of food or specific

nutrients in the diet, or overexposure to heat or cold, among many others, all serve as selective forces, and individuals with characteristics that help them cope with these stressors have higher fitness and better health than others. Those characteristics then get passed on with greater frequency to the next generation of the population. Natural selection acting in different environments on different existing organisms contributes not only to variation between species but also to variation observed between populations within a species that inhabits a broad geographic range, such as humans. Hence, an evolutionary perspective is relevant to investigations of health, especially those that consider population differences in health.

Natural selection is a slow process, producing a gradual change in the frequencies of adaptive traits over generations. When environmental changes are relatively rapid, however, natural selection must play "catch-up." Genetic adaptations evolved in response to the previous environmental conditions; when environments change quickly relative to generation time, there will be a period during which there is a mismatch between the population's genetic characteristics and the environment. This time is likely to be characterized by higher rates of morbidity and mortality.

This mismatch is especially relevant to health among contemporary populations (Gluckman and Hanson 2006; Moalem 2007; Nesse and Williams 1994). Cultural change is rapid relative to genetic change, and the historical changes in lifeways that have occurred over the past hundreds of years have resulted in most contemporary humans living in environments that differ substantially from those in which we evolved. For some 2 million years, members of our genus *Homo* were hunter-gatherers, eating a diverse diet of wild plants and animals; living in small, mobile, kin-based groups; and engaging in energetically demanding activities. Few human groups live by subsistence hunting and gathering anymore, and most rely on the products of agriculture, which differ from wild foods. Furthermore, in industrialized or highly urbanized societies, work patterns are no longer shaped by foraging or food production, but are often sedentary in nature. Combined with urbanization, which creates large, dense accumulations of people, this creates a set of environmental or lifestyle conditions at odds with those that prevailed during much of our genetic evolution. The types of diseases that prevail among industrialized societies are likely to reflect, at least in part, this mismatch.

Adaptability

Adaptations derived from natural selection are based on heritable variation, and they are therefore accompanied by genetic changes in DNA that are passed from generation to generation. There are other forms of biological adaptation, however. One form is physiological plasticity or **adaptability**. This refers to shorter-term, non-heritable changes that occur in individuals when they are confronted with immediate challenges to their survival. The capacity for specific adaptability responses has a genetic foundation, but the engagement of that response depends entirely on environmental exposure. For example, in response to a sudden drop in temperature, an individual shivers to generate heat, and vasoconstriction (narrowing of the blood vessels) occurs to reduce heat loss. Likewise, when bacteria or a virus infects tissues in the body, the body responds by raising body temperature. To the individual, this

manifests as soon as the Note that th That is beca inefficient c

For str efficient kin nating con disease th When ind match the blood cell tirely reve tion goes

Other that occu tered du can be fi those co during of more be enga often p acteriz will se during both)

Beh

Ther impo Vari grou thei bui sho car tra Fu ne ev sp se

it

manifests as fever, but to the bacteria this is a severe obstacle to reproduction. As soon as the challenges have passed, the individual reverts to physiological baseline. Note that these short-term responses are meant to be just that—of short duration. That is because they are expensive to maintain in terms of bodily resources and are inefficient or even deleterious over the long term.

For stressors that persist over longer periods of time, the body engages more efficient kinds of adaptive responses. If cold stress continues, the body shifts to alternating constriction and dilation of the blood vessels. In the context of an infectious disease threat, other arms of the immune response are engaged (see Chapter 8). When individuals increase weight-bearing activity, bones increase in density to match the new load; when individuals travel to high altitude, they build more red blood cells to more adequately take up and deliver oxygen. These responses are entirely reversible: bone density declines with less activity, and red blood cell production goes back to baseline levels when the individual returns to sea level.

Other adaptability responses that are less reversible, but more efficient, are those that occur during the early periods of growth and development. If a stress is encountered during this period, when the body is most malleable, growth and development can be fundamentally altered in ways that increase survival and reproduction under those conditions. For example, if undernutrition is encountered chronically in utero or during early childhood, growth in height will be stunted to preserve the development of more critical physiological systems such as the brain. Other adaptive responses may be engaged that make metabolic function more efficient. These kinds of alterations are often permanent, and they can be beneficial if in fact the future environment is characterized by the same kinds of stressors, such as chronic food scarcity. However as we will see in Chapter 5, these also come with costs to individual health that may manifest during childhood or later in life. Thus, whether these are adaptive or problematic (or both) is subject to differing interpretations (Schell and Magnus 2007).

Behavioral Adaptability

There are also behavioral adaptability responses, and these are likely to be especially important for a large-brained, cognitively astute species such as *Homo sapiens*. Variation in behavioral adaptations may be evident in cultural traditions because groups have been exposed to different threats to their health over time as a result of their different historical and ecological situations. For example, differences in home-building styles may reflect differences in exposure to malaria. Researchers have shown that building houses high off the ground can reduce exposure to malaria-carrying mosquitoes that have a low flight ceiling (Charlwood et al. 2003). Healing traditions likewise reflect local health threats and may be adaptive in that context. Furthermore, unlike genes, which can only be passed from one generation to the next, behaviors can be transferred quickly across individuals or populations. However, there are barriers to the transmission of behaviors: those strongly linked to a specific cultural or religious tradition may be less likely to be transferred in the absence of migration, war, colonization, or proselytizing.

In many cases, behavioral adaptations involve modification of the environment itself. That is, instead of adapting to the environment, the environment is adapted or

changed. Although the difference between adapting to an environmental challenge or adapting the environment such that it no longer poses a challenge may be subtle for humans, the latter has been a key part of our adaptive behavioral repertoire. Most often this takes the form of buffering us from health threats. Building shelters, separating drinking water from wastewater, building houses high off the ground, or using mosquito netting are all examples of this kind of environmental modification. Using insecticides to control insect-borne diseases or fertilizer to increase crop productivity also fit into this category, as do medical systems that effectively reduce mortality from life-threatening diseases. All reflect the creative abilities of *H. sapiens* to modify the environment in ways that reduce threats to survival, health, or well-being.

There is an important caveat to these kinds of technological innovations: although they may solve a particular problem, especially in the short term, it is also possible that they disrupt some other part of the environment such that a new challenge emerges. Building dams for irrigation or hydroelectricity can increase agricultural or economic productivity, but it also changes the ecological conditions such that new disease vectors can flourish. When the Aswan Dam was built to create Lake Nasser in Egypt, the lake became home to *Bulinus* snails, which carry the helminthic infection schistosomiasis, a debilitating disease associated with blood loss and scarring of the blood vessels surrounding the liver, intestines, or bladder. When people started using the still water for a variety of activities (fishing, washing, playing), they were exposed to these helminthes, which are parasitic worms (Desowitz 1981; see also Chapter 9). Thus, environmental modifications often have unforeseen consequences for health, and they may also contribute to the problem of genetic-environment mismatch mentioned previously.

These examples illustrate another important point: all adaptations are in some way *compromises*. This means that there are both benefits and costs to changes made in response to a health challenge, regardless of whether the adaptation is genetic, developmental, a short-term physiological alteration, or a behavioral change. It is difficult to imagine what optimal adaptations would be—that is, those that come with few or no costs. Sickle-cell hemoglobin may be a genetic adaptation to malaria, but it increases the frequency of sickle-cell anemia, a life-threatening disorder of red blood cells. Fever serves to reduce bacterial infection but requires many cellular resources and may be destructive to an individual's own cells. Insecticides may kill mosquitoes initially, but over time mosquitoes evolve resistance and are able to resurge.

There are thus two dimensions of investigation in biocultural analysis: one considers local adaptive responses to health challenges (genetic, physiological adaptability, or behavioral adaptability), which we have just described, and the other considers the nature of those specific challenges and how they became threats to health in that population (Wiley 1992). Many of these challenges are likely to be derived from historical circumstances that have altered the social environment in ways that result in ill health. The colonial era had a particularly deleterious effect on local health patterns when new modes of employment, including the shift away from subsistence agriculture to commodity production for export, new forms of stratified social relations, and ecological changes derived from new modes of production and transportation all fundamentally altered health conditions in colonized areas. One outcome of this was an improvement of health in many European

countries as even as the Americas, in infectious diseases between native and non-native time, and tancy among sub-Saharan shown in 7 as such, is peptancie:

Table 2.1

Central /
Ethiopia
Haiti
Sierra L
Afghan
Bangla
Palest
Pakist
India
Boliv
Philij
Chin
Cos
Tha
Bra
Cu
Tu
Ri
G
S

countries as their economies expanded and new supplies of food were available, even as the colonies experienced a perceptible decline in health conditions. In the Americas, indigenous population numbers plummeted because of exposure to new infectious diseases from Europeans, and a legacy of major health disparities between native and European-derived populations persists well into the twenty-first century. Disparities in health across the globe came to be more distinct during this time, and these persist today. These are evident in huge differences in life expectancy among countries around the world—from a low of about 50 years in some sub-Saharan countries to more than 80 in Scandinavian countries and Japan, as shown in Table 2.1. Life expectancy is the average length of life in a population and, as such, is strongly affected by levels of mortality early in life. Variation in life expectancies reflects differences in disease burdens, especially early in life, and years

Table 2.1 Life Expectancy and Income across Countries, 2014–2015

	Life Expectancy at Birth	Gross National Income, Purchasing Power Parity, Per Capita
Central African Republic	50	\$610
Ethiopia	64	\$1,500
Haiti	64	\$1,750
Sierra Leone	50	\$1,830
Afghanistan	61	\$1,980
Bangladesh	71	\$3,340
Palestinian Territory	73	\$5,080
Pakistan	66	\$5,100
India	68	\$5,760
Bolivia	67	\$6,130
Philippines	69	\$8,300
China	75	\$13,130
Costa Rica	79	\$13,900
Thailand	75	\$13,950
Brazil	75	\$15,900
Cuba	78	\$18,710
Turkey	77	\$19,040
Russia	71	\$24,710
Greece	81	\$26,130
South Korea	82	\$34,620
Japan	83	\$37,920
United Kingdom	81	\$38,370
Australia	82	\$42,880
Canada	81	\$43,400
Sweden	82	\$46,710
United States	79	\$55,860

Source: Population Reference Bureau, 2014 and 2015 World Population Data Sheets. <http://www.prb.org>

of life lost as a result of these diseases. Thus, global and local political economies which have taken shape under specific historical conditions, have been important forces producing variation in health.

In the context of poverty, opportunities for adaptation may be limited. Adaptive responses require resources of some kind, and if they are not available, the ability to adapt can be seriously compromised, leading to a downward spiral of health. Impoverished living conditions generate multiple stressors that challenge health and well-being, including crowding, unclean water or contaminated food, insufficient heating or cooling mechanisms, lack of access to health care, and increased levels of violence, among many others, such that not only are resources scarce, but also challenges to health exist on multiple fronts. Poverty is a root cause of health differentials within and between populations. Wealthier individuals have more resources and hence more adaptive options but also face fewer challenges to their health and well-being. It is tempting to consider the relatively poor health often seen among impoverished populations as evidence of "failure to adapt," but this is tantamount to blaming the victim. Instead, it is critical that the root causes of resource disparities be illuminated, because only with attention to these causes will lasting solutions to entrenched health problems of the poor be possible. As Richard Wilkinson (1996) has demonstrated, it is also the case that in populations that are highly stratified, with large resource differentials within them, not only do the poor suffer more, but also everyone's health suffers compared with populations with more egalitarian resource distributions (see Chapter 10).

Cultural Approaches in Medical Anthropology

A biocultural perspective attempts to integrate both biological and cultural factors in the holistic study of health. However, some medical anthropologists employ approaches that are specifically cultural in focus. This reflects not only a pragmatic but also a theoretical orientation: the body, its biology, and evolution are considered of secondary importance to the social and cultural factors that more immediately influence health, healing, and well-being. But how does culture influence health? Culture is a set of shared meanings (i.e., it exists at the group level), embedded in social institutions, and an implicit shaper of individual beliefs and behavior. Indeed, when individual beliefs or behavior is at odds with a set of shared meanings, health may be compromised. William Dressler has pioneered "cultural consonance" analysis and demonstrated in several contexts that individuals who do not conform to or participate in some core cultural components (i.e., their experience does not match expectations about how the world works) tend to have worse health than those who do conform or participate (Dressler 1995). Several of these cultural approaches are outlined next.

Political Economy of Health

Sometimes also called **critical medical anthropology**, this perspective examines power differentials and their impact on health (Singer and Baer 1995). This perspective traces its origins to Rudolf Virchow (1821–1902), the pioneering German

pathologist who
As demonstrated
across the globe
tend to have
than poor groups
that have re-
land, other
from the critical
risk of poor
increase the
toxic environ-
fewer health
refers to as
ied in adverse
racism, see

From
changes to
maintain
kind of sys-
tems and

Pow-
cross-cul-
tural bet-
ween dif-
ferent
systems
there are
differences
hierarchi-
cal than
to red-
uce likely
with in-
tercultural
results
hand-
some
than
child-
hood
own
care
of e-
lderly

Et-
So-
ter

pathologist who was also a crusader for social reform in the service of public health. As demonstrated previously, one of the most obvious sources of variation in health across the globe is economic status. Wealthy groups within and across countries tend to have overall better nutrition, fewer infectious diseases, and longer life spans than poor groups. This difference in wealth can be traced to historical processes that have resulted in differential access to important economic resources such as land, other forms of capital, credit, political power, and so on, which mostly stem from the capitalist world system. Individuals with fewer resources are doubly at risk of poor health: they are more likely to be exposed to hazardous conditions that increase their risk of disease (through occupational hazards, contaminated domestic environments, unclean water or food, violence, etc.) and they have access to fewer health-care resources. This is what the physician-anthropologist Paul Farmer refers to as "structural violence": how the social machinery of oppression is embodied in adverse health outcomes and needless suffering among the poor or victims of racism, sexism, or all of the above (Farmer 2004).

From this perspective, the only lasting solution to health differentials lies in changes to the social, cultural, economic, and political structures that support or maintain differential access to resources within and between populations. Any other kind of specific health intervention will address only one or at best a few of the problems and usually only temporarily, leaving underlying structures unchanged.

Power differentials can exist in many social domains. They are easily seen in cross-country comparisons. As Table 2.1 indicates, there is a clear positive correlation between life expectancy and per capita wealth. Within countries there are differences that correlate with local levels of economic or social stratification, political systems and ideologies, cultural heterogeneity, and ecology. In the United States, there are substantial differences among subpopulations with regard to health indexes, and they tend to track along with economic status (see Chapter 10). Gender differences in health are likely to be pronounced in societies with strong gender hierarchies. For biological reasons that are not well understood, women live longer than men, but this biological advantage can be undercut by social factors that serve to reduce female survival. On the one hand, across societies, females are more likely to have lower incomes, less representation in governments, and less power within a household context to make decisions about resource allocations. As a result, female health is often compromised relative to that of males. On the other hand, men may be subjected to other kinds of occupational hazards more often than women (coal mining, high-stress white-collar jobs, factory work). Likewise, children are vulnerable to such inequities because they rarely have access to their own economic resources and lack the skills to manage their own health and health care. They are subject to household decision making that may privilege the health of economically productive adults over that of children, sons over daughters, or older children over younger children.

Ethnomedical Systems

Some of the earliest work in medical anthropology was on indigenous healing systems (**ethnomedical systems**) and how they vary cross-culturally (Foster and

Anderson 1978). Although the practice of healing may appear to be strikingly different across cultures (from chanting shamans to surgeons wielding scalpels), healing traditions have elements in common: all have theories of etiology (disease causation), diagnostic criteria, therapeutic measures, formalized interactions between patients and healers, and mechanisms for training new healers (see Chapter 3; Fabrega 1997). The complexities of healing systems tend to track along with social complexity in general. In highly structured, large-scale societies (such as India or China), the practice of medicine is likely to be institutionalized, with formal mechanisms for training, authoritative medical texts, professional organizations of healers, and a complex pharmacopoeia for treatment. In smaller-scale societies, there may be no textual tradition and more informal mechanisms for training and transmission of knowledge. Thus, healing traditions and institutions are cultural products and "make sense" within their cultural context. To individuals within a culture, local healing traditions produce explanatory models of health and disease. Arthur Kleinman pioneered the concept of *explanatory models* in his research on doctor-patient clinical interactions, which revealed that physicians and patients (especially when they are from different cultural backgrounds) often have different explanatory models for the cause, appropriate treatment, and definition of an ailment (Kleinman, Eisenberg, and Good 1978; see also *Anthropologist in Action: Arthur Kleinman* box). This goes for highly complex systems such as Western biomedicine, Chinese medicine, Āyurveda (practiced in South Asia), or "folk healers" or shamanism.

One of the major distinctions among medical traditions is the extent to which the cause of a given ailment is located within or beyond the patient. In biomedicine, clinicians look for evidence of some disruption in function at the cellular level (a proximate cause), which may involve an infectious agent or replication of abnormal cells or other organic disturbances. Likewise, in Āyurveda, practitioners search for evidence of an imbalance in the body's humors (wind, bile, phlegm). Other traditions consider the possibility that religious or moral transgressions have resulted in divine punishment or that other individuals can "send" sickness out of spite or jealousy. These etiological differences in turn lead to the use of different types of therapies to restore health. In biomedicine these tend to be individual focused because interventions are focused on the body of the sick individual. In other contexts in which the cause of disease is supraindividual, social, or supernatural, appropriate interventions may include prayer, sacrifice, social reconciliation, and other types of group-level therapies, sometimes in conjunction with therapies that treat the immediate physiological cause.

In practice, healing traditions have come to be *pluralistic*, meaning that elements of one may be incorporated into another or that individuals in a society may seek out healers from various traditions in their quest for health. In India, Āyurvedic practitioners dispense antibiotics or give vaccinations or other injections; biomedical practitioners may recommend massage or acupuncture for pain (Leslie 1992). Thus, although people may profess a belief in one particular medical paradigm, in fact many are willing to try others, especially when a particular illness proves resistant to one therapeutic approach. This kind of permeability seems to be at odds with the idea that medical systems are embedded within one particular cultural context, but it may well be that when individuals are suffering they become more

open to alternative
cal therapies h
at treating or
ficiencies has
and desirable
only bits and
of its therapie

As group
or habitation
new explana
medical anti
cultures may
tural traditi
problems. In
ican adults
biomedicin
1990s (Tin
niques, chi
tions altho
or underst
cine sugge
culture th
may also
therapies

Alth
tradition
be viewe
cine refl
the belie
purely r
causati
malfun
rise of
duction
pervac
against

Inter
Many
their
Cliff
polo
grap
and
requ

open to alternative approaches in their search for relief. Furthermore, as biomedical therapies have become widely available around the globe and their clear success at treating or preventing some ailments such as bacterial infections or vitamin deficiencies has been demonstrated, these therapies have become widely acceptable and desirable for some types of symptoms. People may understand or subscribe to only bits and pieces of the explanatory model of biomedicine but will still make use of its therapies.

As groups encounter members of other populations or alter their subsistence or habitation patterns, their patterns of disease may likewise change. In response, new explanations of disease or therapies may be adopted. One phenomenon that medical anthropologists have frequently described is that individuals in diverse cultures may try numerous healing methods that derive from widely varying cultural traditions in their efforts to cure themselves of seemingly intractable health problems. In the United States, surveys show that more than one-third of all American adults use some form of complementary or alternative medicine in addition to biomedicine and that this number has remained relatively steady since the late 1990s (Tindle et al. 2005). Most common were herbal therapies, relaxation techniques, chiropractic care, and yoga. Individuals make use of these healing traditions although they are derived from cultures with different concepts of the body or understandings of the causes of ill health. This openness to other forms of medicine suggests that beliefs and behaviors related to health and disease are aspects of culture that are especially open to change or, at the very least, experimentation. It may also reflect a pragmatic approach, in which there is evaluation of different therapies for different ailments.

Although it may be tempting to see biomedicine as "superior" to other healing traditions, because of its widespread success at treating many ailments, it can also be viewed as an ethnomedical system of Western societies (Rhodes 1990). Biomedicine reflects the values of these societies as much as other medical systems reflect the beliefs and values of non-Western groups. For example, biomedicine focuses on purely natural causes of disease and sees the supernatural as irrelevant to disease causation. Furthermore, metaphors of the body as a machine with functional or malfunctioning parts are common. Medical anthropologists have argued that the rise of this common metaphor coincides with a transition to a factory-based production system in industrialized societies (Martin 1994). Political metaphors also pervade biomedicine, as in the immune system's capacity to "defend" the body against harmful "invaders," with which it is "at war" (E. Cohen 2009).

Interpretive Approaches to Illness and Suffering

Many anthropologists interpret medical systems, health, and disease strictly within their cultural contexts. This **interpretive approach** was strongly influenced by Clifford Geertz's notion of ethnography as "thick description." That is, the anthropologist must fully understand (through the process of long-term, in-depth ethnographic fieldwork) the role that various behaviors play within their cultural context and how the behaviors make sense within that milieu. Thus, the analysis of illness requires that these behaviors be considered in the context of the worldview of

individuals, which is itself related to historical, ecological, political, economic, and myriad other factors. It becomes possible to see illness as the embodiment of an individual's role within that culture. For example, Nichter (1981) has described illness as an "idiom of distress," a culturally sanctioned way of expressing dissatisfaction with one's position or role at a given time.

Such idioms of distress are culture specific. Similarly, a locally recognized syndrome can be considered culturally constructed. Historically, in medical anthropology these were referred to as culture-bound syndromes—clusters of symptoms that were recognized as illness in one society but not necessarily within another. Examples included *pibloktoq*, a syndrome recognized by Arctic peoples as a set of psychological symptoms that made afflicted individuals behave in ways at odds with their normal roles (see Chapter 11). Likewise, among the Hmong of Laos, including those who have migrated to the United States, a syndrome known as *tsog tsuam* (nightmare attack) attributed to the *dab tsog* (nightmare spirit) is described (see further discussion of *pibloktoq* and *tsog tsuam* in Chapter 11). This was given the biomedical label sudden unexplained nocturnal death syndrome (SUNDS) because it often results in sudden death during sleep, but no proximate cause has been uncovered by biomedical researchers. The Hmong describe this syndrome as being caused by failure to perform traditional religious obligations, and it is characterized by intense psychological stress, especially in relation to their displacement and trauma subsequent to political persecution in Laos (Adler 1995).

The WHO **International Classification of Disease** provides standardized definitions of all known human diseases. It was originally developed in 1900 by a group of representatives from the International Statistical Institute, and the WHO took over responsibility for it in 1948. The International Classification of Disease represented a concentrated effort to create a universal classification of diseases that could be applied in any cultural setting. Nonetheless, anthropologists have found that even these standardized categories are subject to interpretation because they intersect with locally defined disease categories. For example, infant diarrhea may be recognized across cultures, but its causes and appropriate treatment vary widely. Similarly, in Ladakh, India, where average birth weight is around 2,700 grams, the WHO definition of 2,500 grams for low birth weight (below which babies are seen to be at greater risk of death) is relatively meaningless because almost 50 percent of newborns fall into this category (Wiley 2004a).

The cultural construction of disease refers to how disease categories, **nosologies** (systems of disease classification), symptomatology, and treatments are subject to cultural influence. This is a major theme in culturally focused medical anthropology. This perspective links to the political economic approach by considering not only how disease is interpreted culturally but also how it is produced by social structures, cultural beliefs, values, and behaviors. For example, how do social conditions such as occupation, housing, and social stratification act to produce infant diarrhea? What historical processes produced these conditions and ultimately contributed to this outcome? How do culturally prescribed beliefs and behaviors contribute to this health outcome? In this case, disease is seen as a reflection of socially and culturally created conditions and, in turn, is interpreted within that cultural context.

An important c
As humans express
sions that individua
common in medica
as "hot" or "cold," r
Linguistic analysis
of disease etiology.
lahuaya Indians of
do of their surrou
derive from the sa
health (see also A

Linguistic in
into social relatio
toms and their c
munication, or d
interaction illur
these "illness na
perspective and
success or failur
Maynard (2006
patient interact
opening, prese
for power diffe
noses and trea
differences be
can have impo
lution of the c

Applied N

A large num
and ethnog
design or im
applied me
ple, mediati
the clinicia
economic
culture br
cians and
goes beyo
the treatm
both pati
models so
therapeu
of patien
social w

An important component of this interpretive approach is analysis of language. As humans express culture through language, the particular words and expressions that individuals use in talking about health and disease are revealing. It is common in medical traditions with Greek and Arabic roots to talk about diseases as "hot" or "cold," reflecting a conception of the body as being made up of humors. Linguistic analysis can illustrate how worldviews are manifest in the classification of disease etiology. For example, Joseph Bastien (1985) has described how the Qollahuaya Indians of Bolivia have a similar conceptualization of their bodies as they do of their surrounding mountain environment. Sickness and ecological problems derive from the same source, and both must be healed to reestablish wholeness and health (see also Adelson 2000).

Linguistic interactions between healers and patients likewise provide insights into social relationships. How do patients and healers describe the patients' symptoms and their causes differently? Is there mutual understanding and clear communication, or does each seem to be speaking a different language? How does their interaction illuminate social distinctions between patients and healers? Analyses of these "illness narratives" provide rich insight into divergence between a clinician's perspective and that of the patient, which in turn has implications for the likely success or failure of the prescribed treatment regimen. John Heritage and Douglas Maynard (2006) note that there are opportunities at every stage of the doctor-patient interaction during clinic visits (which they describe as having six stages: opening, presenting complaint, examination, diagnosis, treatment, and closing) for power differentials, lay versus biomedical misunderstandings, contesting diagnoses and treatment regimens, and so on to play out. The extent to which there are differences between patient and clinician understandings, priorities, and authority can have important effects on the success of the interaction and ultimately the resolution of the complaint.

Applied Medical Anthropology

A large number of medical anthropologists are engaged in applying the principles and ethnographic knowledge derived from anthropological scholarship to the design or implementation of health policies and interventions and, hence, are doing applied medical anthropology. They may work in a clinical setting by, for example, mediating between a patient's understanding of his or her condition and that of the clinician. Often patients and healers are from different social, cultural, and economic contexts, leading to a mutual lack of understanding. Anthropological culture brokers can play a vital role in facilitating communication between clinicians and patients, thereby increasing the likelihood of a positive outcome. This goes beyond simple language translation to ensure compliance by the patient with the treatment regimen. Instead, medical anthropologists in clinical settings help both patient and clinician to understand each other's perspectives and explanatory models so as to facilitate communication and ultimately enhance the likelihood of therapeutic success. In such a context, the medical anthropologist works as a kind of patient advocate. Most clinics do not have medical anthropologists on staff, and social workers often play this advocacy role. It is important that whoever is filling

this role have some basic training in medical anthropology, especially in a cultural society.

Applied medical anthropologists also work in institutions where health policies are designed to target specific populations or health problems. Here they bring their ethnographic knowledge and experience to bear on the development of health policy or interventions. They try to bring a user's perspective to the table, helping to ensure that any health intervention programs are culturally appropriate, do not violate social norms, or do not require resources that are simply not available. Organizations that employ medical anthropologists include various nongovernmental organizations; the WHO; federal, state, and local public health bureaus; and in the United States, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), among many others. In such contexts, medical anthropologists also act as community advocates by ensuring that members' voices are heard in the design of health programs and policies. Applied medical anthropologists may also be hired to conduct short-term ethnographic research to assess the feasibility and likely success of a particular health-related intervention. Arthur Kleinman is a particular kind of "applied anthropologist" insofar as he brought his anthropological insights into his clinical practice (and vice versa); others will be featured throughout the book.

Epidemiology

Before delving further into medical anthropological topics, it is important to become familiar with some of the terminology used in the study of health at the population level. Many of these terms come from a discipline closely related to medical anthropology: epidemiology, which is the study of the distribution of disease in a population. Epidemiology is a key part of public health, a branch of health studies that is concerned with the health of the population (i.e., the public) as opposed to the individual (referred to as clinical health, or clinical medicine). Although epidemiology originated as the study of infectious diseases and how they spread, epidemiology is concerned with the distribution of all diseases, infectious or not. It is concerned with the factors that influence the distribution of disease and thereby affect the risk of disease. The following terms are used to describe patterns of disease in epidemiological work:

1. **Prevalence**—The total number of individuals with the disease in a particular time period.
2. **Incidence**—The number of new cases in a particular time period.
3. **Endemic**—A disease that has a long history in the population, with little change in either prevalence or incidence over time.
4. **Epidemic**—A disease that dramatically increases its incidence and prevalence in a short period of time. In the context of an infectious disease, epidemics result when an infection spreads rapidly through the population. Infectious disease epidemics often have a cycle, with rapid increases in incidence, followed by a decrease in incidence (see Figure 8.3 for an example of an influenza epidemic). The decrease results from the fact that most individuals will have been exposed (or are dead) and hence are no longer

susceptible
noninfectious
childhood

5. Pandemic

pandemic,
prevalence

Two other relevant mortality refers to period divided by the *Morbidity and Mortality* Its ominous nan- tious diseases' t' bidity" part of from those dise- those same tim- text, refers to d

Medical a- training in epi- their work can and Marcia In- graphic skills, less "rich") e- methods. The- that help bett- epidemiologi- on the socia- there is over- cause it is re- living in co- mainstream- see also Ch- population- vance to m

Conclu

Medical a- ety of per- context, ditions h- are impo- sis. Som- made th-

¹ The CD- cials com-

susceptible to contracting the infection. There can also be epidemics of noninfectious diseases. It is not uncommon to hear about epidemics of childhood obesity or hypertension in the United States.

5. **Pandemic**—An epidemic that occurs on a global scale. HIV is considered a pandemic, and diabetes is quickly becoming one because its incidence and prevalence have increased dramatically in populations throughout the world.

Two other relevant terms are **morbidity** and **mortality**. Morbidity refers to disease; mortality refers to death. The mortality rate is the number of deaths in a given time period divided by the total population size. In the United States, the CDC publishes the *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* (MMWR; <http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr>). Its ominous name aside, the MMWR lists the number of cases of notifiable infectious diseases¹ that occurred that week and for the previous year; this is the “morbidity” part of the MMWR. It also provides tables listing the number of deaths from those diseases (i.e., the mortality from those diseases) that occurred during those same time periods. **Infant mortality**, which we refer to in many places in this text, refers to death in the first year of life.

Medical anthropologists often work with epidemiologists or seek additional training in epidemiology to complement their anthropological skills. A sampling of their work can be found in *Anthropology and Public Health*, edited by Robert Hahn and Marcia Inhorn (2009). Many medical anthropologists bring to bear their ethnographic skills, which can be profitably combined with larger-scale (but necessarily less “rich”) epidemiological surveys, thereby melding qualitative and quantitative methods. Their work can also help make sense of epidemiological patterns in ways that help better design culturally appropriate interventions. Anthropologists who use epidemiological data have much in common with social epidemiologists, who focus on the social factors that influence disease risk in a given population. In that way, there is overlap between critical medical anthropology and social epidemiology because it is routinely evident that marginalized or impoverished populations or those living in countries with high income inequality have poorer health than those in the mainstream, with higher incomes, or living in more equitable societies (Krieger 2011; see also Chapter 10). Other epidemiologists focus on genetic factors that give rise to population patterning of disease (genetic epidemiologists); these are of great relevance to medical anthropologists using an evolutionary approach to health.

Conclusion

Medical anthropologists are a diverse group of anthropologists who employ a variety of perspectives in their attempts to understand health within its local cultural context, variation in health between populations, or the ways in which health conditions have changed as a function of evolutionary or historical processes. There are important differences among the approaches with respect to the level of analysis. Some are concerned with individuals—their individual life histories that have made them vulnerable to a particular disease, how their maladies are interpreted

¹ The CDC has a list of notifiable infectious diseases that must be reported to them. Local health officials compile these data and send them to the CDC on a weekly basis.

and made sense of within their cultural context, or how to improve their well-being within the realm of a clinical encounter. Others are concerned with group-level trends in health. Typically, biocultural analyses are less concerned with the determinants of individual health and more concerned with why one population or group has a higher or lower incidence or prevalence of a given disease. From this perspective, these are complementary approaches, although our emphasis in this book is on health at the population level and the relationships between disease frequency and the social, natural, and historical contexts in which it occurs.

Study Questions

1. Compare and contrast disease, illness, and sickness.
2. What are the basic causes of disease?
3. What is the "sick role"? How is it defined? How does a sick role become "legitimated"?
4. What does it mean to say that there are three bodies to be considered in the analysis of health?
5. How do the proximate and ultimate determinants of disease differ?
6. What are some of the problems encountered in trying to define biological normalcy?
7. What are stressors? What are some of the most critical stressors that influence health status?
8. What is adaptability and how is it related to adaptation? What are some examples of these responses and how are they related to health?
9. What roles do political and economic factors play in producing global patterns of variation in health?
10. What is the focus of critical medical anthropology? How does it differ from the biocultural approach or the interpretive approach?
11. How can biomedicine be viewed as the ethnomedical system of Western cultures?
12. Define these key concepts in epidemiology: prevalence, incidence, endemic, epidemic, pandemic, morbidity, and mortality.

Critical Thinking and Discussion

1. What are three conditions that currently appear to be undergoing the process of medicalization? What are the costs and benefits for society of the medicalization of these conditions?
2. Why is it impossible to understand biological adaptation without reference to the environment in which an organism lives?
3. Identify ways in which our biologies seem to be mismatched for the contemporary environment. How do these mismatches negatively influence our health?
4. Think about your own health history. Where would you locate the causes (bodily, social, evolutionary, etc.) of your most significant instances of ill health?

Chap
He

CHA

• To

• To

c

• 1

•

•

•

•

•

•

•

•

•

•

•

•

•

•

•

•

•

•

•

•

•

•

•

•

•

•

•

•