International Journal of Social Sciences, Language and Linguistics (2051-686X)

Philosophical Interrogation of Medicine and The African Perspective

Eruka, C. Raphael[1], **Akpuogwu, Michael Obidimma**[2]
[1]*Department of Philosophy, Madonna University Nigeria, Okija Campus*
[2]*Department of Philosophy, Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Anambra State*

Doi https://doi.org/10.55640/ijssll-05-12-14

ABSTRACT

Medical practice is not immune to epistemological dogmatism, particularly in its assumptions about normality, pathology, and therapeutic intervention. These challenges are magnified in contexts where medicine intersects with complex socio-cultural realities. In Africa, the coexistence of Western biomedicine and African traditional medicine creates additional conceptual, ethical, and practical tensions that demand philosophical scrutiny. This study aims to critically examine foundational concepts in medicine especially health, disease, illness, and sickness, in order to clarify contested boundaries between normality and abnormality. It further seeks to interrogate diagnostic practices, therapeutic expansion, and professional conduct from a philosophical perspective, with particular emphasis on African socio-cultural and existential contexts. The study employs an analytic–critical philosophical method. Conceptual analysis is applied to key debates in the philosophy of medicine, medical ethics, psychiatry, and medical sociology. Comparative reflection is used to situate Western biomedical practice alongside African traditional medicine, highlighting points of convergence, divergence, and ethical concern. The analysis shows that many medical controversies arise from conceptual ambiguity, scientific dogmatism, and the uncritical medicalization of non-pathological human conditions. In the African context, these problems are exacerbated by political interference, economic pressures, infrastructural deficits, and insufficient integration of psychosocial and cultural dimensions of care. Reductionist biomedical models are shown to be inadequate for addressing lived experiences of illness. Philosophical interrogation is essential for promoting ethical, humane, and context-sensitive medical practice. In Africa, a genuinely health-promoting medical model must integrate biomedical science, traditional medicine, and the humanities in order to safeguard human dignity and sustain holistic well-being.

Keywords: Health-Illness Continuum, Self-Alienation, Differential Diagnosis, Therapeutics, Constructionism.

INTRODUCTION

Philosophy of medicine is centrally concerned with critically examining the assumptions, concepts, and practices that guide medical knowledge and intervention. Its task is not to undermine medicine but to interrogate claims of normality, pathology, and therapeutic necessity that often become normalized within professional practice without sufficient reflection. Such interrogation is particularly necessary where medical practice risks extending beyond its legitimate domain into areas better understood as social, cultural, or existential aspects of human life. One persistent concern is the tendency toward medicalization the expansion of medical authority into conditions that fall within the ordinary range of human variation and experience. Within the health–illness continuum, transient discomforts, psychosocial distress, and culturally mediated conditions are increasingly subjected to diagnostic labeling and pharmaceutical intervention. This trend raises ethical questions about autonomy, self-understanding, and the potential for self-alienation induced by unnecessary medical treatment.

Medicine does not function in isolation but operates at the intersection of multiple disciplines, including biology, psychology, sociology, economics, politics, and culture. While biological science provides explanatory accounts of life processes, medicine is oriented toward healing concrete human subjects whose experiences cannot be reduced to organic mechanisms alone (Gifford, 2011). Consequently, philosophical reflection is required to clarify the goals, limits, and values that should govern medical practice.

The African context intensifies these concerns. Medical practice in Africa reflects a dual inheritance: Western biomedicine, which has become institutionally dominant, and African traditional medicine, which remains resilient and widely practiced. Each system is grounded in distinct epistemological and ontological assumptions about health, disease, and the human person. Philosophy of medicine in Africa must therefore critically engage both traditions interrogating Western medicine as it operates within African

socio-cultural realities, while also evaluating traditional medical practices in light of contemporary ethical and scientific standards.

This study adopts an analytic–critical philosophical approach to examine foundational medical concepts, diagnostic controversies, and professional practices. By situating these issues within African existential and socio-cultural contexts, the paper aims to contribute to a more humane, reflective, and context-sensitive understanding of medical practice.

Conceptual and Diagnostic Questions in Medicine

Medicine's close association with the biological sciences has long generated questions about its distinctive identity. While biology seeks to explain life processes through empirical investigation, medicine is oriented toward healing and caring for human beings situated within complex social and experiential contexts (Gifford, 2011). This difference underlies the enduring distinction between medicine as a science and medicine as an art.

Medical science is primarily concerned with theoretical development and explanatory models, whereas medical practice applies these models to promote health in concrete individuals. Philosophy of medicine is therefore less focused on advancing biomedical theory than on evaluating the appropriateness, limits, and ethical implications of medical practice. These concerns become particularly salient in cases where diagnosis extends beyond organic pathology into contested domains of normal human variation.

Central to this debate are the concepts of health, disease, illness, and sickness. Disease refers to objectively identifiable physiological or pathological processes; illness denotes the subjective experience of discomfort or suffering; and sickness describes the social recognition of a health condition and its associated role expectations (Hofmann, 2017). Failure to distinguish these dimensions often results in diagnostic confusion and therapeutic overreach.

Several controversial cases illustrate this problem. For instance, treating short stature resulting from normal biological variation as a medical disorder requiring hormonal intervention raises questions about cultural norms and the limits of medical authority (Boorse, 2011). Similarly, the medicalization of menopause or aging processes reflects a tendency to redefine natural life stages as pathological conditions warranting pharmaceutical correction.

Debates surrounding pediatric deafness further expose tensions between biological abnormality and cultural valuation. While some advocates regard deafness as a normal variant requiring cultural accommodation rather than medical intervention, most societies continue to classify it as a functional abnormality, particularly where treatment can restore communicative capacity (Boorse, 2011). The controversy reveals the role of value judgments in determining what counts as pathology.

Alcoholism and depression raise similar conceptual challenges. Alcoholism may be interpreted as a social or behavioral problem rather than a disease, except where clear organic pathology emerges. Likewise, reactive grief following loss is a normal human response that does not necessarily warrant psychiatric diagnosis or pharmacological treatment (Boorse, 2011; Fulford, 2002). These examples underscore the need for philosophical clarity in distinguishing medical conditions from existential or social experiences.

Overall, diagnostic practices are inevitably shaped by theoretical assumptions and cultural values. Philosophy of medicine provides the conceptual tools necessary to clarify these assumptions, prevent unwarranted medicalization, and preserve the ethical integrity of medical practice.

Scientific Dogmatism and Theoretical Divergence

Medical practice often operates under an implicit assumption of scientific certainty. Yet clinical experience consistently reveals that medical knowledge is provisional, probabilistic, and subject to revision. The tendency toward scientific dogmatism becomes problematic when diagnostic conclusions and therapeutic decisions are presented as definitive rather than as informed judgments based on incomplete evidence (Maier & Shibles, 2011).

Insider critiques of medical education suggest that professional training has historically emphasized memorization and hierarchical obedience over critical reasoning and reflective judgment (Maier & Shibles, 2011). Such orientation fosters compliance rather than intellectual openness and discourages questioning of established protocols. Philosophy of medicine counters this tendency by cultivating logical analysis, epistemic humility, and openness to revision.

Clinical practice further exposes the limits of certainty. Physicians with different specializations may arrive at divergent diagnoses when presented with the same clinical features, reflecting differences in theoretical orientation, methodological emphasis, and interpretive frameworks. For this reason, diagnosis ought to remain open to reevaluation rather than treated as a fixed or final determination (Maier & Shibles, 2011).

The influence of theoretical perspectives also shapes medical judgment. Social constructionist approaches, for example, emphasize the cultural dimensions of disease but risk minimizing the objective reality of pathological conditions. While social meanings undeniably shape illness experience, reducing disease to a social construct can trivialize suffering and undermine effective public health interventions (Bunge, 2013). Philosophy of medicine is required to mediate between explanatory theories and clinical realities.

Psychiatry illustrates these tensions with particular clarity. Critics have argued that mental illness lacks the objective status of somatic disease and reflects value-laden judgments about deviance or social nonconformity (Szasz, 1960, 1987). Nonetheless, contemporary psychiatric philosophy recognizes that genuine mental disorders can arise when adaptive mechanisms fail under stress, producing identifiable patterns of dysfunction (Fulford, 2002). Psychiatry thus

occupies a complex space between biological explanation and human meaning.

Scientific dogmatism ultimately undermines medicine's ethical mandate. A reflective, philosophically informed practice acknowledges uncertainty, resists theoretical absolutism, and remains responsive to the lived experiences of patients. Such openness is essential for sustaining professional integrity and humane care.

The African Perspective on Medical Practice

Medical practice in Africa is shaped by dynamic interactions between biological science, cultural values, and communal social structures. Medicine is not merely a technical enterprise but a lived social practice embedded within African cosmology, where health is understood in relational rather than strictly individualistic terms. Consequently, diagnosis and therapy often extend beyond the patient to involve family, healer, and community.

African medical practice reflects a dual inheritance: Western biomedicine and African traditional medicine. While Western medicine dominates institutional healthcare, traditional medicine remains resilient and influential, particularly in rural settings. Traditional African medicine adopts a holistic orientation in which physical, psychological, social, and spiritual dimensions of health are integrated rather than compartmentalized. Diagnosis, treatment, and recovery are understood as communal processes, even though such collectivism may at times conflict with contemporary norms of individual autonomy (Akpuogwu, 2025b).

Cultural systems significantly influence perceptions of normality and abnormality. Unlike some Western contexts that promote disability cultures, African societies generally do not normalize conditions such as pediatric deafness where therapeutic intervention is available. Treatable impairments are commonly viewed as legitimate candidates for medical or therapeutic correction, reflecting a pragmatic orientation toward functional restoration rather than cultural redefinition.

Psychiatric conditions in Africa are particularly complex due to overlapping organic, psychosocial, economic, and political stressors. The distinction between genuine psychiatric disorders and socially induced distress is often blurred by poverty, unemployment, conflict, and systemic instability. In such contexts, mental health statistics may reflect adaptive responses to structurally oppressive environments rather than intrinsic psychopathology.

African medical practice is further compromised by political interference and economic pressures. The politicization of healthcare has resulted in inadequate infrastructure, insufficient funding, and erosion of professional standards. Unfulfilled political promises and weak institutional support contribute to misdiagnosis, overburdened facilities, medical tourism, and unethical practices driven by economic survival rather than patient welfare (Akpuogwu, 2025a).

Despite these challenges, African medicine remains oriented toward addressing genuine health needs rather than commodifying pseudo-medical conditions. A philosophically informed African medical practice must therefore integrate biomedical competence with ethical reflection, cultural sensitivity, and social responsibility to promote authentic and sustainable health outcomes.

Disease, Illness, and Sickness: An Integrated Analysis

The conceptual distinction between disease, illness, and sickness remains central to philosophical reflection on medical practice. These terms refer to analytically distinct but experientially overlapping dimensions of health. Disease denotes objectively identifiable physiological, biochemical, genetic, or psychological dysfunctions that are subject to clinical observation, measurement, and intervention. Illness refers to the subjective experience of discomfort, suffering, or incapacity, while sickness captures the social recognition of a health condition and the roles, expectations, and entitlements associated with it (Hofmann, 2017).

Although these distinctions are conceptually useful, they rarely present themselves separately in lived experience. The individual who suffers from disease simultaneously undergoes subjective distress and social disruption. Consequently, treating these dimensions in isolation risks fragmenting care and undermining genuine health restoration. Philosophy of medicine highlights this gap between conceptual clarity and clinical phenomenology.

Illness, as a subjective state, often involves a perceived loss of agency. The term "patient" itself implies passivity and dependence, signaling a disruption of normal functioning and self-concept (Fulford, 2002). While some aspects of illness can be externally assessed through symptoms or behavioral cues, internal experiences such as pain, anxiety, or despair resist objective quantification and must be interpreted through communication and empathy.

Sickness, by contrast, is socially constituted. It is defined by conventions, expectations, institutional policies, and cultural norms that determine who qualifies as sick and what social exemptions or obligations follow (Hofmann, 2017). Legal and economic systems reinforce this dimension, particularly in contexts where sickness legitimizes absence from work or access to healthcare resources. Importantly, sickness is typically understood as a transient deviation from normal functioning, distinguishing it from deviant behavior such as malingering (Fulford, 2002).

In the African context, these distinctions are rarely operationalized in isolation. Traditional African medicine adopts an integrated understanding of disease, illness, and sickness, treating them as interrelated aspects of a single human condition. Therapeutic intervention is therefore multipronged, addressing organic dysfunction alongside psychological reassurance and social reintegration. Failure to adopt such a holistic approach may result in prolonged suffering, incomplete recovery, or relapse.

This integrated model underscores a critical implication for contemporary medical practice: effective care must recognize

that restoring an organ does not necessarily restore the person. A philosophically informed medical methodology must therefore attend equally to biological repair, subjective healing, and social reintegration in order to achieve authentic and sustainable health outcomes.

Preventable Diseases and the Case of Malaria in Africa

Malaria stands as one of the clearest examples of a largely preventable disease that continues to impose severe human and economic costs in sub-Saharan Africa. Despite decades of well-established knowledge about effective prevention and treatment, the region still accounts for approximately 90 percent of global malaria cases and deaths, with children under five and pregnant women remaining the most vulnerable populations (World Health Organization [WHO], 2023; United Nations Children's Fund [UNICEF], 2021).

The persistence of malaria is not primarily due to a lack of medical solutions, but rather to structural and systemic barriers. Insecticide-treated bed nets, indoor residual spraying, rapid diagnostic testing, and artemisinin-based combination therapies have all demonstrated high effectiveness in reducing morbidity and mortality (WHO, 2022). However, access to these interventions remains uneven, particularly in rural and impoverished areas characterized by weak health systems and political instability (Bhatt et al., 2015).

Malaria also illustrates the deep interconnection between health and socioeconomic conditions. Inadequate housing, limited sanitation infrastructure, and restricted access to healthcare create environments where malaria transmission thrives. At the same time, malaria reinforces poverty by reducing labor productivity, increasing school absenteeism, and placing sustained pressure on already strained public health budgets (Sachs & Malaney, 2002). This creates a self-perpetuating cycle in which disease and poverty reinforce one another.

Global factors further complicate malaria control efforts. Climate change, through rising temperatures and shifting rainfall patterns, is expanding the geographic range of malaria-transmitting mosquitoes and increasing transmission intensity in some regions (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [IPCC], 2022). Additionally, growing resistance to both insecticides and antimalarial drugs threatens the long-term effectiveness of existing control strategies (WHO, 2023).

Nevertheless, evidence shows that sustained, targeted investments can produce substantial gains. Countries that have paired international support with strong national commitment and community-based implementation have achieved significant reductions in malaria-related mortality (Bhatt et al., 2015). The continued burden of malaria in Africa is therefore less a medical failure than a failure of prioritization, equitable resource allocation, and long-term commitment to preventive public health.

This case underscores a broader conclusion: preventable diseases continue to claim lives not because solutions are unavailable, but because they are not consistently delivered where they are needed most.

Philosophical Interrogation of Medicine and the African Perspective

The case of malaria in Africa invites a deeper philosophical interrogation of medicine itself, specifically, how medical knowledge is produced, applied, and ethically justified across different sociocultural contexts. While biomedical science has achieved significant successes, its dominant structures often present medicine as a universally applicable and value-neutral enterprise. From an African perspective, this assumption requires critical scrutiny, as it can obscure the social, historical, and moral dimensions that fundamentally shape health and disease (Pellegrino, 2002; Engel, 1977).

Modern Western biomedicine largely operates within a universalist paradigm, conceptualizing disease primarily as a biological malfunction amenable to standardized technical solutions. Although this model has undeniable strengths, it risks reductionism by prioritizing biological explanation over social meaning and lived experience (Kleinman, 1988). In many African contexts, health outcomes are deeply intertwined with poverty, communal structures, environmental conditions, and historical inequities. Consequently, interventions that neglect these dimensions may be scientifically sound yet socially ineffective or ethically incomplete. The continued prevalence of preventable diseases such as malaria exposes the limitations of a purely biomedical approach when structural injustice remains unaddressed (Farmer, 2004).

From a philosophical standpoint, medicine is not merely a technical or scientific practice but a moral and social institution embedded within systems of value and power. Decisions concerning which diseases are prioritized, how resources are distributed, and which populations receive adequate care are inherently ethical decisions rather than neutral outcomes of scientific reasoning (Pellegrino & Thomasma, 1993). Seen in this light, the persistence of malaria is not only a failure of implementation but also a reflection of global moral inequality. Preventable suffering persists where there is insufficient political will to confront injustice, revealing a gap between medical capability and ethical commitment (Daniels, 2008).

African philosophical traditions offer alternative conceptual notions that challenge the assumptions underlying dominant biomedical models. Many African worldviews emphasize communitarianism and relational conceptions of personhood, often expressed through the notion that personhood is constituted through social relationships rather than individual autonomy alone (Mbiti, 1969; Gyekye, 1997). Within this perspective, health is understood as a collective and relational condition tied to social cohesion, environmental balance, and moral order. Illness may therefore signify not only physiological dysfunction but also broader social or structural disruption. Such perspectives highlight the inadequacy of health interventions that focus exclusively on individual bodies while neglecting community contexts and social determinants (Wiredu, 2004).

The historical legacy of colonialism further complicates the practice of medicine in Africa. Colonial medical systems frequently served administrative and economic interests rather than the well-being of colonized populations, reinforcing patterns of exclusion and neglect (Vaughan, 1991). Indigenous medical knowledge was often dismissed as irrational or inferior, leading to enduring hierarchies of knowledge production. These hierarchies persist in contemporary global health through forms of epistemic injustice, where local perspectives are marginalized in policy-making and research agendas (Fricker, 2007; Abimbola, 2019). A philosophical interrogation of medicine must therefore address not only material deprivation but also the power relations that determine whose knowledge is recognized as legitimate.

These considerations carry important implications for global health ethics. An ethically defensible approach to healthcare in Africa requires more than the dissemination of biomedical technologies; it demands epistemic humility, cultural responsiveness, and genuine engagement with local communities (Benatar, 2013). Integrating biomedical science with African philosophical insights does not undermine scientific rigor but strengthens it by situating health interventions within their social and moral contexts. Such pluralism is essential for addressing diseases whose persistence is rooted as much in injustice as in biology.

In sum, a philosophical interrogation of medicine from an African perspective reveals that health cannot be separated from questions of justice, history, and collective well-being. The continued burden of preventable diseases such as malaria represents not merely a technical failure but a philosophical and ethical challenge, one that calls for a more inclusive, context-sensitive, and morally grounded understanding of what it truly means to heal.

Toward an Ethically Grounded and Context-Responsive Medical Practice

Building on the philosophical critique advanced previously, this section turns toward synthesis and normative direction. If the persistence of preventable diseases in Africa reflects not only technical gaps but also ethical and epistemic failures, then meaningful progress requires a reorientation of medical practice itself. Section 8 therefore outlines the ethical principles and practical commitments necessary for a medical paradigm that is both scientifically effective and socially just.

At the core of such a paradigm is the recognition that health interventions must be context-responsive rather than universally imposed. Global health strategies often rely on standardized models designed for scalability and efficiency, yet these models can overlook local social structures, cultural meanings, and historical experiences that shape health behavior and trust in medical systems (Kleinman, 1988; Abimbola, 2019). Ethical medical practice in Africa must therefore prioritize community engagement and participatory decision-making, ensuring that affected populations are not passive recipients of care but active contributors to its design and implementation (Benatar, 2013).

An ethically grounded approach also demands a stronger commitment to health justice. From a moral perspective, the unequal distribution of preventable disease burdens violates basic principles of fairness and human dignity. The continued concentration of malaria and other preventable illnesses in low-income African settings reflects global inequities in resource allocation, political influence, and research priorities (Daniels, 2008; Farmer, 2004). Addressing these disparities requires not only increased funding but also structural reform that strengthens local health systems, invests in prevention, and ensures sustainable access to essential medicines and technologies (World Health Organization [WHO], 2023).

Furthermore, epistemic pluralism must be recognized as a core ethical requirement rather than an optional supplement. Integrating indigenous knowledge systems and local healing practices with biomedical approaches can enhance cultural legitimacy and improve health outcomes, provided such integration is pursued critically and respectfully (Gyekye, 1997; Wiredu, 2004). This does not imply abandoning scientific standards, but rather expanding the epistemic framework within which health and illness are understood. In doing so, medicine becomes more responsive to the lived realities of African communities and less entangled in colonial hierarchies of knowledge (Fricker, 2007; Vaughan, 1991).

Finally, an ethically responsive medical practice must be future-oriented. Climate change, urbanization, and demographic shifts are reshaping disease patterns across Africa, amplifying vulnerabilities while testing already fragile health infrastructures (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [IPCC], 2022). Ethical responsibility therefore extends beyond immediate intervention to long-term planning, resilience building, and intergenerational justice. Preventive medicine, environmental stewardship, and social policy must be treated as inseparable components of public health strategy (WHO, 2023).

In conclusion, the African experience with preventable diseases exposes fundamental limitations in prevailing models of medicine and global health. A reimagined medical practice, one grounded in ethical responsibility, contextual awareness, and epistemic humility offers a path toward more equitable and effective health outcomes. By aligning scientific capability with moral commitment, medicine can move closer to fulfilling its foundational purpose: the promotion of human flourishing for all, rather than for the privileged few.

CONCLUSION

Medicine in Africa has come a long way; both in the traditional and Western modes of practice. Issues have developed consequent on the long practice culture. Such issues require analysis in the medical context for the sake of clarification and objective repositioning of practice to counter the undesirable. Issues arising from medical practice are circumstantial in the sense that some are consequent on societal-progression socially, culturally, technologically, economically and

epistemologically. Because they are largely not always foreseen, there is no final solution or resolution to the problems. The transcending of the problems of practice in the not so distant past may mean the call for perceptive awakening to the possible issue of new developments in medical practice stemming from alterations in the way society does things or the way the profession of medicine innovates or chooses to view certain presenting health problems. Thus the questions examined yesterday may have been fairly addressed today in the spirit of objectivity and non-prejudiced disposition with heightened awareness to the possibility of the emerging of fresh issues tomorrow in need of philosophical interrogation going forward.

This research surveyed a range of relevant questions and tried to appraise medical practice correspondingly. The foci were both Western and African medicine. It is hoped that the socio-medical analysis has created the climate of a new consciousness of the medical activities in need of streamlining for a practice pedigree amenable to enduring health attainment of the population. The discourse is expectedly ongoing as contributory measure to sound medical practice.

Policy Implications and Recommendations

The analysis presented in this article carries important implications for health policy at national, regional, and global levels. If preventable diseases in Africa persist due to structural injustice, epistemic exclusion, and ethical neglect rather than medical incapacity alone, then policy responses must move beyond short-term, technocratic solutions. Effective and just health policy must integrate biomedical expertise with ethical reflection, contextual knowledge, and long-term institutional commitment. The following recommendations outline key policy directions informed by the arguments developed throughout this article.

1. Prioritize Prevention as a Core Policy Objective
Health policies should explicitly prioritize preventive care, such as vector control, vaccination, sanitation, and public health education, over predominantly curative approaches. Prevention is both cost-effective and ethically defensible, particularly in contexts where preventable diseases disproportionately affect vulnerable populations.

2. Strengthen Local Health Systems
Sustainable disease control requires long-term investment in national and community-level health systems, including infrastructure, workforce training, supply chains, and data systems. Policies should favor system strengthening over fragmented, disease-specific interventions.

3. Embed Ethical Frameworks in Health Policy Design
Health policies should be guided by explicit ethical principles such as equity, justice, solidarity, and respect for human dignity. Ethical review mechanisms should be integrated into public health planning, not limited to clinical research alone.

4. Promote Community Participation and Co-Production
Governments and global health actors should institutionalize mechanisms for meaningful community engagement in health policy formulation and implementation. Policies developed with community participation are more likely to be culturally legitimate, trusted, and effective.

5. Address Social Determinants of Health
Health policy must be coordinated with policies in housing, education, labor, and environmental management. Addressing poverty, inadequate housing, and environmental risk is essential for reducing the burden of preventable diseases such as malaria.

6. Support Epistemic Pluralism in Health Systems
Policy structures should recognize and responsibly integrate indigenous knowledge systems and traditional healing practices alongside biomedical approaches. This requires regulatory oversight, dialogue, and research investment to ensure safety while respecting cultural legitimacy.

7. Reform Global Health Governance Structures
International health institutions and donor agencies should rebalance decision-making power by strengthening leadership and agenda-setting capacity within African institutions. Equitable partnerships should replace top-down models of aid and intervention.

8. Invest in Climate-Resilient Health Strategies
Health policies must anticipate the effects of climate change on disease patterns. This includes investing in climate-resilient infrastructure, early warning systems, and adaptive vector-control strategies.

9. Ensure Equitable Access to Essential Medicines and Technologies
Policies should address structural barriers to access, including pricing, intellectual property constraints, and supply chain vulnerabilities. Regional manufacturing and procurement strategies can improve affordability and security of access.

10. Commit to Long-Term Accountability and Evaluation
Governments and global health actors should adopt transparent monitoring and evaluation principles that assess not only health outcomes but also equity, community trust, and ethical impact. Long-term accountability is essential for sustained progress.

Taken together, these policy recommendations underscore the central claim of this article: improving health outcomes in Africa requires more than biomedical innovation. It demands ethical clarity, political will, and a commitment to justice that aligns medical practice with the lived realities of the populations it seeks to serve.

REFERENCES

1. Abimbola, S. (2019). The foreign gaze: Authorship in academic global health. BMJ Global Health, 4(5), e002068. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2019-002068
2. Akpuogwu, M. O. (2025a). Politics, healthcare delivery, and ethical challenges in contemporary African medical practice. Manuscript in preparation.
3. Akpuogwu, M. O. (2025b). Communal values and autonomy in African traditional medicine. Unpublished manuscript.
4. Benatar, S. R. (2013). Global health justice and ethics: Toward a new global social contract. American Journal of Bioethics, 13(8), 29–39. https://doi.org/10.1080/15265161.2013.813579
5. Bhatt, S., Weiss, D. J., Cameron, E., Bisanzio, D., Mappin, B., Dalrymple, U., Battle, K. E., Moyes, C. L., Henry, A., Eckhoff, P. A., Wenger, E. A., Briët, O., Penny, M. A., Smith, T. A., Bennett, A., Yukich, J., Eisele, T. P., Griffin, J. T., Fergus, C. A., … Gething, P. W. (2015). The effect of malaria control on Plasmodium falciparum in Africa between 2000 and 2015. Nature, 526(7572), 207–211. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature15535
6. Boorse, C. (2011). Concepts of health and disease. In F. Gifford (Ed.), Philosophy of medicine (pp. 13–64). Elsevier.
7. Bunge, M. (2013). Medical philosophy: Conceptual issues in medicine. World Scientific Publishing.
8. Daniels, N. (2008). Just health: Meeting health needs fairly. Cambridge University Press.
9. Engel, G. L. (1977). The need for a new medical model: A challenge for biomedicine. Science, 196(4286), 129–136. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.847460
10. Farmer, P. (2004). Pathologies of power: Health, human rights, and the new war on the poor. Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved, 15(3), 307–325. https://doi.org/10.1353/hpu.2004.0049
11. Fricker, M. (2007). Epistemic injustice: Power and the ethics of knowing. Oxford University Press.
12. Fulford, K. W. M. (2002). Values in psychiatric diagnosis: A contemporary perspective. World Psychiatry, 1(3), 143–146.
13. Gifford, F. (Ed.). (2011). Philosophy of medicine. Elsevier.
14. Gyekye, K. (1997). Tradition and modernity: Philosophical reflections on the African experience. Oxford University Press.
15. Hofmann, B. (2017). What is disease? In J. K. B. Olsen, S. Pedersen, & V. F. Hendricks (Eds.), A companion to the philosophy of medicine (pp. 7–20). Wiley-Blackwell.
16. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2022). Climate change 2022: Impacts, adaptation and vulnerability. Cambridge University Press.
17. Kleinman, A. (1988). The illness narratives: Suffering, healing, and the human condition. Basic Books.
18. Maier, R., & Shibles, W. (2011). What philosophy of medicine is. In F. Gifford (Ed.), Philosophy of medicine (pp. 3–12). Elsevier.
19. Mbiti, J. S. (1969). African religions and philosophy. Heinemann.
20. Pellegrino, E. D. (2002). The internal morality of clinical medicine: A paradigm for the ethics of the helping and healing professions. Journal of Medicine and Philosophy, 26(6), 559–579. https://doi.org/10.1076/jmep.26.6.559.2998
21. Pellegrino, E. D., & Thomasma, D. C. (1993). The virtues in medical practice. Oxford University Press.
22. Sachs, J. D., & Malaney, P. (2002). The economic and social burden of malaria. Nature, 415(6872), 680–685. https://doi.org/10.1038/415680a
23. Szasz, T. S. (1960). The myth of mental illness. American Psychologist, 15(2), 113–118. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0046535
24. Szasz, T. S. (1987). Insanity: The idea and its consequences. Syracuse University Press.
25. United Nations Children's Fund. (2021). Malaria in children. UNICEF.
26. Vaughan, M. (1991). Curing their ills: Colonial power and African illness. Stanford University Press.
27. Wiredu, K. (2004). A companion to African philosophy. Blackwell Publishing.
28. World Health Organization. (2022). World malaria report 2022. WHO.
29. World Health Organization. (2023). World malaria report 2023. WHO.