Ghana Alternative Medicine Journal (GAMJ)
Abbreviated Key Title: Gha alt Med Jrnl
ISSN 2756-7176 (Print) Open Access
Journal homepage: https://saspublishers.com/journal/gamj/home

OPEN ACCESS



The Nyarkotey Principle of African Naturopathy: Qualified Intellectual Autonomy, Shared Scientific Methodology and Implications for Healthcare Research and Policy

Prof. Raphael Nyarkotey Obu, Esq[1]*

[1]PhD Candidate in Health Law, Policy and Development, Africa Research University, Zambia

DOI: https://doi.org/10.36347/gamj.2026.v07i01.001 | **Received:** 27.09.2026 | **Accepted:** 19.11.2026 | **Published:** 24.11.2026

***Corresponding author:** Prof. Raphael Nyarkotey Obu, Esq
PhD Candidate in Health Law, Policy and Development, Africa Research University, Zambia

Abstract **Original Research Article**

The emerging concept of African Naturopathy invites scrutiny of whether a regionally grounded framework can contribute to global naturopathic scholarship without asserting a separate standard of scientific truth. This commentary articulates and critically appraises the revised Nyarkotey Principle of African Naturopathy, understood as a proposal for qualified intellectual autonomy in four interrelated domains: ontology (conceptions of persons, health, illness and environment), epistemology (sources and critical appraisal of knowledge), axiology (values governing care) and praxeology (the translation of concepts into accountable action). Methodology is expressly excluded from the claim of autonomy: intervention effectiveness, safety and causation remain subject to shared methods of inquiry, including transparent clinical research, systematic review and critical evaluation. The principle is situated within a proposed four-school heuristic spanning European Nature Cure, North American Codified Naturopathy, Indian Naturopathy and Yoga, and a prospective African school. It does not establish a recognised professional category or confer authority to practise. The article identifies testable research priorities, educational and legal implications, and the risks of essentialising diverse African traditions. Its central argument is that intellectual pluralism and scientific accountability are not competing goals; the proposed framework should be judged by conceptual clarity, empirical contributions, patient protection and open scholarly criticism.

Keywords: Nyarkotey Principle; African Naturopathy; qualified intellectual autonomy; indigenous knowledge; health policy.

Copyright © 2024 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution **4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0)** which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.

INTRODUCTION: Intellectual identity without scientific exceptionalism

The place of African knowledge in contemporary naturopathic scholarship raises a question that is at once philosophical, clinical and regulatory: can African Naturopathy be conceptualised as a distinctive intellectual framework while remaining accountable to scientific methods and internationally shared patient-safety obligations? I propose that it can, provided distinctiveness is not mistaken for exemption. The Nyarkotey Principle of African Naturopathy is offered as a contestable theoretical proposition, not an already validated clinical model or an internationally ratified professional doctrine.

The World Naturopathic Federation describes a profession with common philosophical principles and internationally varied modalities, educational arrangements and regulatory contexts [1,2]. A regionally grounded conceptual contribution need not deny those shared roots. Yet the label "African" cannot itself establish a new scientific domain. A meaningful contribution requires conceptual clarity, empirical work, ethical safeguards and transparent debate. The revised Nyarkotey Principle therefore distinguishes four domains in which an African-centred framework may have qualified intellectual autonomy—ontology, epistemology, axiology and praxeology from methodology, where health researchers must share standards for testing claims.

What the principle claims and what it does not

The principle concerns the organisation of questions and the interpretation of health, knowledge, values and practice. It does not assert that African communities are homogeneous, that precolonial healing systems were identical to modern naturopathy, or that tradition itself proves clinical benefit. Nor does it create a statutory title, a protected scope of practice, a licensing pathway or a new regulator. These require legal authority and independent policy appraisal.

"Qualified autonomy" means room for distinct conceptual and contextual contributions in four domains without isolation from other disciplines or immunity from challenge. The term "autonomy" must be read critically: African sources of knowledge overlap with global clinical, social and scientific traditions; disagreements within Africa are as real as differences between regions. This is therefore an agenda for interdisciplinary investigation rather than a declaration of intellectual sovereignty over every African healing practice.

1. Ontology: persons, health, illness and environment

Ontology asks what kinds of entities, relationships and conditions a healthcare theory recognises as significant. The proposed African-centred ontology directs attention to personhood, family and community relationships, food systems, local ecologies and social circumstances alongside biological pathology. It invites scholarship on how specific African communities describe wellbeing, causation and healing, and how these descriptions may affect consultations and care-seeking.

Its contribution is not that biomedical mechanisms change geographically. Rather, a model of whole-person care may be refined by recognising the patient's social and ecological context. The ontology must also accommodate diversity, changing cultural practices, urbanisation and patients who reject traditional explanations. Clinical diagnosis cannot be displaced by an untested cultural account of illness.

2. Epistemology: whose knowledge is heard, and how claims are corrected

Epistemology addresses what can count as a starting point for inquiry, how claims become credible and how errors are recognised. African indigenous knowledge, practitioner experience, patient testimony, historical records and community observations can identify research questions and potential interventions. They do not, by themselves, establish therapeutic efficacy or safety. Descriptive knowledge of use is different from evidence that an intervention produces a specified clinical outcome.

A rigorous epistemology must connect respectful documentation with authentication of botanical materials, toxicology, pharmacology, appropriate clinical comparisons, reproducibility, data quality and negative-result reporting. It must also account for knowledge-holders' consent, ownership interests and equitable benefit sharing. The intellectual opening envisaged by the principle lies in enlarging the sources of hypotheses while maintaining rigorous standards for evaluating the resulting claims.

3. Axiology: dignity, fairness and the ethics of care

Axiology concerns the values by which knowledge and clinical choices are judged. The proposed framework foregrounds dignity, cultural respect, informed consent, patient autonomy, intergenerational responsibility, ecological stewardship, non-exploitation and health equity. It asks whether local communities participate in setting research priorities and whether the benefits of research reach those who contributed knowledge.

Cultural respect cannot justify unsafe treatment, coercion, misleading advertising or delay in necessary medical referral. Conversely, safety regulation must avoid treating all indigenous knowledge as inherently inferior. Ethical validity requires both cultural sensitivity and effective patient protection. A practical ethical framework should define informed-consent procedures, adverse-event reporting, conflict-of-interest disclosure, transparent referral obligations and fair treatment of community knowledge contributors.

4. Praxeology: translating theory into accountable practice

Praxeology concerns action: what professionals are trained to do, how decisions are made, and how care is monitored. An African-grounded curriculum might examine local diets and food systems, responsible use of medicinal plants, preventive counselling, community health education, environmental risk, intercultural communication and interdisciplinary referrals. Such contextualisation is meaningful only when accompanied by clear competencies, supervised clinical experience and assessment.

This domain offers an opportunity to develop context-responsive clinical case studies and educational tools, but it cannot confer a new scope of practice by conceptual argument. Institutions must specify qualifications, clinical boundaries, escalation thresholds and referral pathways in accordance with applicable law. Where evidence is insufficient, practice should be restricted or studied rather than incorporated as proven care.

5. METHODOLOGY: shared standards rather than a separate African science

The critical revision to the original formulation is explicit: methodology is not autonomous. Randomisation, suitable comparators, sampling discipline, validated outcome measurement, systematic review, qualitative rigour, statistical reasoning,

transparent reporting and reproducibility are not the property of one region or profession. They are common means of reducing error in health research.

Different questions properly require different designs. Ethnographic work may investigate meaning and transmission; laboratory analysis may assess composition and contamination; observational studies may explore use and associations; appropriately designed trials may test defined clinical claims. The design should follow the question, and the strength of a conclusion should follow the evidence. Respect for African knowledge is strengthened, not weakened, when interventions are tested to the same standard expected elsewhere. International reporting frameworks such as PRISMA, CONSORT, STROBE, CARE and COREQ offer tools for transparency, without guaranteeing quality merely by their use.

The four-school proposal: a heuristic, not an established taxonomy

The Nyarkotey Principle may inform a proposed four-school account of naturopathic development: (i) European Nature Cure; (ii) North American Codified Naturopathy; (iii) Indian Naturopathy and Yoga; and (iv) a proposed African School of Naturopathy. These names are an analytical framework advanced by the author, not a classification endorsed by the World Naturopathic Federation or a settled history of the profession.

The first three categories identify important historical and regional currents, although each contains internal variation and cross-cultural influence. The fourth is prospective: it describes a research and educational programme that could systematically investigate African philosophical resources, indigenous knowledge, health priorities and accountable clinical applications. The proposed school should earn recognition through rigorous scholarship, demonstrated educational quality, public engagement and patient-safety performance, not through nomenclature alone.

From philosophical proposal to researchable propositions

A useful principle must yield questions capable of independent appraisal. At least five programmes follow. First, comparative conceptual studies should assess whether claims of distinctiveness are historically accurate and coherent across selected African settings. Second, qualitative research with patients, educators, knowledge-holders and clinicians should examine whether the proposed domains reflect lived healthcare understandings. Third, curriculum-mapping studies should compare competencies, safety training and referral practices across educational models. Fourth, empirical research should evaluate precisely specified interventions, including quality, harms, interactions and clinically meaningful outcomes. Fifth, legal and policy research should compare regulatory options, costs, enforcement capacity, equity effects and professional accountability.

Negative findings would not automatically invalidate the value of cultural context, but they should change claims about particular interventions. Likewise, stakeholder rejection of a proposed professional category must count as evidence for revising the framework. The principle can mature only if its assumptions, terms and practical implications remain revisable.

Legal and policy implications for African health systems

The World Health Organization's Global Traditional Medicine Strategy 2025–2034 calls for stronger evidence, safety, appropriate regulation and respectful integration of traditional, complementary and integrative medicine [3]. It offers a policy context, not approval for any specific naturopathic intervention. Consequently, conceptual recognition cannot substitute for legal examination of professional titles, educational accreditation, regulatory competence, complaints systems, informed consent, medicines quality, referral obligations and professional indemnity.

My ongoing another doctoral research in Health Law, Policy and Development at Africa Research University, Zambia examines the development of legal and policy frameworks for integrating African Naturopathy into national health systems, with comparative attention to African jurisdictions. The research considers alternative regulatory designs rather than presupposing that a separate statute or authority is necessary. The responsible question is which institutional arrangements best protect patients, support evidence generation and permit legitimate educational and clinical activity within each country's legal order.

Possible objections and limits

Three objections deserve serious treatment. The first is conceptual inflation: if every regional practice receives its own school, the profession may lose definitional coherence. The response is to demand specific contributions and clear boundaries rather than automatic recognition. The second is romanticisation: invoking indigeneity can obscure heterogeneity, unsafe traditions or commercial appropriation. The response is community participation, explicit ethics and independent testing. The third is scientific relativism: qualified autonomy may be mistaken for a licence to substitute culturally preferred explanations for reproducible evidence. The revised principle explicitly rejects that interpretation.

There is also a risk of overstating "African" as a single category. A continent of diverse languages, histories and clinical systems cannot be reduced to one ontology or set of therapies. This commentary supplies a conceptual framework; it does not report original clinical data, demonstrate therapeutic effectiveness, establish

international acceptance or prove the superiority of a distinct school. Its strength will be determined by what subsequent scholarship can confirm, refine or reject.

CONCLUSION

The Nyarkotey Principle proposes a way to defend intellectual participation without demanding scientific exceptionalism. Its qualified autonomy in ontology, epistemology, axiology and praxeology allows African scholarship to formulate distinctive questions about health, knowledge, values and practice. Its insistence on shared methodology ensures that the evaluation of clinical claims remains public, rigorous and corrigible.

African Naturopathy, on this account, is neither a rejection of global naturopathy nor a licence to bypass evidence and regulation. It is an invitation to build an African-grounded, ethically responsible and internationally engaged research programme. The framework should be published, challenged, empirically examined and revised. That not terminological assertion alone is the path from a proposed principle to a credible academic contribution.

DECLARATIONS

Funding: No external funding was received for the preparation of this commentary.

Conflicts of interest: The author is the proponent of the principle discussed and serves in leadership roles in naturopathic education and professional organisations. These intellectual and professional interests are disclosed for transparency.

Ethics approval: Not applicable; this is a conceptual commentary and reports no new human-participant or animal research.

Data availability: No new dataset was generated or analysed.

REFERENCES

1. World Naturopathic Federation. About naturopathy. Available at: https://worldnaturopathicfederation.org/about-naturopathy/ (accessed 12 November 2026).
2. World Naturopathic Federation. WNF White Paper: Naturopathic Philosophies, Principles and Theories. 2017. Available at: https://worldnaturopathicfederation.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/WNF_White_Paper_June-2017.pdf
3. World Health Organization. Global Traditional Medicine Strategy 2025–2034. Geneva: WHO; 2025. Available at: https://www.who.int/teams/who-global-traditional-medicine-centre/traditional-medicine-strategy-2025-2034