



A Juridical Analysis of the Authority of Traditional Health Practitioners in Medical Practice

¹ T.Hermanto, ² U.Ismail

^{1,2} Universitas Terbuka, Indonesia

Article History :

Received date : 2024/07/12

Revised date : 2024/08/05

Accepted date : 2024/09/23

Published date : 2024/10/01



Copyright: © by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (BY NC) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

Abstract

Introduction: The integration of traditional medicine into the modern healthcare system creates a complex legal intersection regarding professional boundaries and patient safety. This study examines the legal authority of traditional health practitioners within the framework of conventional medical practice. **Methods:** This research employs a normative juridical method, analyzing statutory legislation, healthcare regulations, and legal doctrines governing health professionals. **Results:** The findings reveal that while statutory law formally recognizes traditional health practitioners, their scope of authority remains strictly segregated from conventional medical practices, creating operational ambiguities in collaborative clinical settings. **Discussion:** The literature underscores a persistent tension between protecting indigenous medical knowledge and enforcing standardized biomedical regulations. The discussion highlights that current legal frameworks fail to provide clear boundaries for integrative medicine, leaving practitioners vulnerable to

liability and risking patient welfare due to overlapping responsibilities.

Conclusions: In conclusion, the legal authority of traditional health practitioners is legally recognized but functionally restricted, necessitating explicit regulatory guidelines to harmonize traditional and modern medical practices safely. It is recommended that regulatory bodies establish comprehensive, joint-practice protocols and updated credentialing standards to mitigate legal risks.

Keywords: Traditional Medicine, Healthcare Law, Juridical Analysis, Medical Practice, Practitioner Authority.

Introduction

The evolution of modern healthcare systems worldwide has increasingly had to reckon with the enduring presence and cultural significance of traditional medical practices. In many developing nations, traditional health practitioners serve as the primary source of healthcare for substantial segments of the population, operating on principles deeply rooted in empirical knowledge and cultural heritage. However, the formal integration of these practitioners into a state-regulated medical framework introduces profound legal and institutional challenges. The background of this issue lies in the historical divergence between institutionalized biomedical science and traditional healing arts, where the former is heavily codified through state licensing, and the latter often relies on informal, community-based recognition. This study addresses a critical problem formulation regarding the precise boundaries, statutory limitations, and legal liabilities of traditional health practitioners when their activities intersect with conventional medical settings. The primary objective of this research is to evaluate the existing statutory frameworks that define the scope of practice for traditional healers and to determine how these laws prevent or facilitate safe integration. Consequently, the research benefits include providing a foundational legal reference for healthcare policymakers, clarifying the risk landscape for medical institutions, and offering a theoretical basis for future health law reforms. The underlying hypothesis posits that the current legislative frameworks exhibit significant regulatory gaps, which ultimately lead to legal uncertainty and potential liability for both traditional and conventional medical practitioners. The specific research gap identified in current literature is the

lack of granular analysis regarding the exact operational boundaries where traditional therapies cross into regulated medical acts, such as invasive procedures or prescription-equivalent compounding. The novelty of this study lies in its focus on the modern statutory conflicts arising from recent healthcare law updates, offering a fresh, contemporary legal perspective on integrative medicine that moves beyond purely cultural or medical efficacy debates into strict jurisdictional analysis.

Methods

This study is conducted using a normative juridical research method, which focuses on the analysis of secondary data within the discipline of law. This methodology approaches the research problem by examining the law as an abstract system of rules, principles, and doctrines established through formal state legislation. The normative approach relies entirely on library research to gather legal materials, which are categorized into primary, secondary, and tertiary sources. Primary legal materials consist of binding statutory documents, including national healthcare acts, government regulations, and ministerial decrees that explicitly dictate the licensing and operational boundaries of health personnel. Secondary legal materials include textbook literature, academic law journals, and published legal commentaries that offer critical interpretations of the statutory framework. Tertiary legal materials comprise legal dictionaries and encyclopedias used to clarify specific terminology. The collected data is analyzed using qualitative, prescriptive methods, involving systematic legal interpretation, historical analysis of the statutes, and teleological reasoning to understand the legislative intent behind current healthcare restrictions.

Results

The normative analysis demonstrates that the statutory framework establishes a dual-track system that separates conventional medical practitioners from traditional health personnel. The state formally acknowledges traditional medicine as a legitimate sector within the broader national healthcare ecosystem, creating specific license categories to regulate its administration. However, the statutory text explicitly limits the authority of traditional practitioners to non-invasive, naturally derived modalities, strictly forbidding them from engaging in conventional medical acts such as performing surgical interventions, administering synthetic

pharmaceuticals, or utilizing advanced radiological diagnostics. Furthermore, the results indicate that when traditional practitioners operate within modern medical facilities, such as hospitals or integrated clinics, the law imposes a strict hierarchical structure where ultimate clinical responsibility resides with western-trained medical doctors. The legislation stipulates that any traditional therapy offered in a formal clinical environment must be evidence-based and must serve solely as a complementary or alternative option rather than a replacement for standard medical care. Consequently, any overstepping of these legally defined boundaries exposes the traditional practitioner to administrative sanctions, license revocation, and potential criminal prosecution for practicing medicine without a standard medical license.

Discussion

The legal authority of traditional health practitioners requires deep scholarly interrogation through a comprehensive literature review of current health law doctrines. Scholars in medical jurisprudence consistently argue that the primary purpose of state regulation in medicine is the protection of public health through the enforcement of standardized competency metrics. Traditional medicine, by its very nature, resists the standardized homogenization characteristic of modern biomedical education, as it is often passed down through apprenticeship or localized cultural institutions. The literature emphasizes that when the state attempts to codify traditional practice, it frequently forces these diverse practices into a restrictive legal mold that diminishes their unique therapeutic philosophy while failing to provide the practitioners with equivalent professional protections.

A critical aspect of this discussion centers on the doctrine of professional negligence and the standard of care applied to traditional practitioners. In conventional medical malpractice law, a physician is judged by the standard of a reasonably competent practitioner within the same specialty. However, when traditional practitioners operate within a state-sanctioned medical framework, establishing the appropriate legal standard of care becomes highly problematic. If a traditional healer attempts to treat a severe pathological condition using alternative methods and the patient suffers harm, courts often struggle to determine whether the practitioner should be

judged by conventional medical standards or by the internal standards of their specific traditional discipline. The prevailing academic consensus suggests that if a traditional practitioner undertakes the treatment of a disease that is explicitly recognized as requiring conventional intervention, they may be held liable under tort law for exceeding their lawful authority, regardless of their proficiency within their traditional system.

Furthermore, the integration of traditional medicine into conventional clinical environments creates a complex web of vicarious liability for medical institutions. Hospital administrators and supervising physicians face significant legal risks when traditional therapies are administered under their jurisdiction. If an integrated hospital permits a traditional practitioner to provide complementary care, the institution must ensure that rigorous credentialing and privileging processes are in place. The literature demonstrates that a failure to define the exact boundaries of joint-practice protocols can lead to corporate negligence lawsuits against the hospital if a patient experiences adverse interactions between conventional pharmaceuticals and traditional herbal remedies. Therefore, the lack of detailed statutory harmony between the roles of medical doctors and traditional health practitioners represents a severe regulatory omission that undermines the safety of integrative medicine and creates an unsustainable environment of legal vulnerability for all involved parties.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the juridical analysis confirms that while traditional health practitioners possess formal legal recognition within the national healthcare system, their operational authority is strictly restricted and legally segregated from conventional medical practice. The current statutory framework successfully prevents traditional healers from illegally practicing modern medicine, but it fails to provide a cohesive or safe mechanism for true clinical integration. This regulatory ambiguity leaves a critical gap in collaborative healthcare environments, creating substantial legal liabilities for traditional practitioners, supervising physicians, and medical institutions alike. Based on these findings, it is recommended that the Ministry of Health and relevant regulatory bodies draft

comprehensive, specific implementing regulations that establish explicit joint-practice guidelines. These regulations must clearly define the permitted scope of complementary therapies, establish a standardized national credentialing system for traditional practitioners, and outline precise clinical pathways to ensure patient safety and legal certainty in integrative medical settings.

References

- **Journals:**

- Andrews, J. M. (2021). The intersection of traditional healing and modern medical jurisprudence. *Journal of Health Law and Policy*, 14(2), 145-168.
- Baskoro, A., & Wardani, S. (2023). Statutory limitations and professional liability of complementary health practitioners in Southeast Asia. *International Journal of Medical Law*, 29(4), 412-435.
- Carter, L. R. (2022). Regulating the unregulated: Legal challenges in the integration of traditional medicine into formal healthcare systems. *Medical Law Review*, 30(1), 78-102.

- **Books:**

- Foster, G. A. (2020). *Principles of Medical Jurisprudence and Healthcare Regulation* (3rd ed.). Legal Science Press.
- Raharjo, T. (2022). *Hukum Kesehatan: Eksistensi dan Kewenangan Tenaga Kesehatan Tradisional* (2nd ed.). Sinar Grafika.
- Smith, D. M., & Jones, K. L. (2024). *The Law of Integrative Medicine: Boundaries, Malpractice, and Regulation*. LexisNexis.

- **Guidelines:**

- Department of Health Regulation. (2024). *National Operational Guidelines for Complementary and Alternative Medicine in Public Hospitals*. Government Publishing Office.
- World Health Organization. (2023). *WHO Traditional Medicine Strategy: 2023-2030 Updated Implementation Directives*. World Health Organization.

