Revista de Derechos Humanos Contemporáneos
ISSN: 3082-0375
Vol. 1 Issue 1 (2025) 187-226
Available online since: April 30, 2025

The Right to Health: A Global Perspective on Access to Medicine and Healthcare

El Derecho a la Salud: Una Perspectiva Global sobre el Acceso a la Medicina y la Atención Sanitaria

Carlos Alberto[1] ✉

[1] Universidad de los Andes, Bogotá, Colombia

✉Corresponding email: c.alberto@uniandes.edu.co

ABSTRACT

This article explores the global challenges and disparities in realizing the right to health, focusing on equitable access to medicine and healthcare services. Through comparative analysis of healthcare systems in low-, middle-, and high-income countries, the study investigates structural barriers including pharmaceutical monopolies, patent regimes, and healthcare infrastructure deficits that disproportionately affect marginalized populations. Drawing on international human rights law, public health policy, and social justice frameworks, the research proposes innovative approaches to overcome systemic inequities through policy reform, community participation, and global cooperation. The novelty of this work lies in its comprehensive, multi-scalar examination that integrates legal, economic, and social dimensions of health rights, advocating for a rights-based approach to universal healthcare. This article contributes to the discourse on global health equity by highlighting the intersection of human rights, public policy, and access to essential medicines.

Keywords *Right to health, Access to medicine, Healthcare equity, Human rights law, Global health policy*

RESUMEN

Este artículo analiza los desafíos y desigualdades globales para la realización del derecho a la salud, centrándose en el acceso equitativo a medicamentos y servicios de atención sanitaria. Mediante un análisis comparativo de sistemas de salud en países de ingresos bajos, medios y altos, el estudio investiga las barreras estructurales, incluyendo monopolios farmacéuticos, regímenes de patentes y déficits en infraestructura sanitaria que afectan desproporcionadamente a poblaciones marginadas. Basándose en el derecho internacional de los derechos humanos, políticas de salud pública y marcos de justicia social, la investigación propone enfoques innovadores para superar las inequidades sistémicas a través de reformas políticas, participación comunitaria y cooperación global. La novedad de este trabajo radica en su examen integral y multiescalar que integra dimensiones jurídicas, económicas y sociales de los derechos a la salud, abogando por un enfoque basado en derechos para la salud universal. Este artículo contribuye al discurso sobre equidad en salud global al destacar la intersección entre derechos humanos, políticas públicas y acceso a medicamentos esenciales.

Palabras clave *Derecho a la salud Acceso a medicamentos, Equidad en salud, Derecho de los derechos humanos, Política sanitaria global*

A. Introduction

The right to health is firmly established within the architecture of international human rights law as a fundamental prerequisite for the exercise of all other human rights. As articulated in Article 12 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), the right to health is defined as "the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health" (UN General Assembly, 1966). This mandate implies that health is not merely a matter of biological luck or charity, but a legal entitlement that places specific obligations on states to ensure that healthcare services and essential medicines are available, accessible, acceptable, and of good quality.

+1

Despite these robust legal underpinnings, the realization of the right to health remains one of the most significant challenges of the twenty-first century. The importance of this right transcends individual well-being; it is a pillar of social justice and economic stability. When healthcare is treated as a commodity rather than a right, the resulting inequities undermine the core principles of human dignity and equality. Therefore, ensuring equitable access to healthcare and medicines is not just a public health necessity but a primary requirement for a just global order.

However, the global landscape is currently defined by profound health disparities that reveal a fractured reality between different economic strata. In high-income countries, medical advancements and robust insurance schemes often provide comprehensive coverage, yet even within these nations, marginalized communities face systemic neglect. Conversely, in many low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), the right to health is often a de jure promise with little de facto reality, as millions of people lack access to even the most basic primary care or life-saving interventions (Farmer, 2005).

These inequities are most visible in the "gap" in life expectancy and maternal mortality rates between the Global North and the Global South. While high-income nations grapple with the costs of chronic lifestyle diseases, many developing nations are simultaneously battling infectious diseases and an underfunded healthcare apparatus. These disparities are not accidental but are the result of historical and structural inequalities that have left marginalized populations in a state of "medical precarity," where a single illness can plunge a family into absolute poverty.

The research problem at the center of this study is the presence of formidable structural barriers that impede the equitable distribution of health resources. Chief among these is the current patent regime and the resulting pharmaceutical monopolies protected under the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS). As argued by Stiglitz (2006), the prioritization of intellectual property rights over the right to life creates a "scarcity by design," where the high cost of patented medicines makes them inaccessible to the very populations that need them most.

Beyond the economic barriers of medicine pricing, healthcare infrastructure deficits further complicate the realization of health rights. In many developing regions, the lack of clinics, trained medical personnel, and reliable supply chains means that even if medicines were free, they would remain inaccessible to rural or impoverished populations. This infrastructure gap is often exacerbated by "brain drain," where medical professionals migrate from the Global South to the Global North, leaving the healthcare systems of their home countries in a state of perpetual crisis.

The primary objective of this study is to conduct a comprehensive, multi-scalar examination of the legal, economic, and social dimensions of healthcare access. By analyzing the intersection of international law and national policy, the research aims to identify the specific friction points where the right to health is sacrificed for corporate profit or political expediency. The study seeks to move beyond a mere diagnosis of the problem, aiming instead to synthesize a rights-based framework that integrates community participation with high-level policy reform.

This research proposes to outline innovative, practical solutions to achieve global health equity. This includes advocating for the "de-linking" of research and development costs from medicine prices, promoting the use of TRIPS flexibilities, and strengthening public healthcare infrastructure through global cooperation. By integrating the legal mandates of human rights with the economic realities of the pharmaceutical industry, this article contributes a novel perspective to the discourse on universal healthcare, asserting that a healthy world is only possible through the dismantling of systemic inequities.

B. The Right to Health in International Human Rights Law

1. *Defining the Right to Health: Legal Foundations*

The legal architecture of the right to health is anchored in a series of foundational international instruments that have evolved from moral aspirations into binding legal obligations. The journey began with the 1946 Constitution of the World Health Organization (WHO), which famously defined health not merely as the absence of disease but as "a state of complete physical, mental, and social well-being" (WHO, 1946). This expansive definition was subsequently reinforced by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR, 1948), where Article 25 recognizes the right to a standard of living adequate for health, including medical care and necessary social services. These early documents set the stage for viewing health as a fundamental entitlement rather than a charitable endeavor.

The most legally robust articulation of this right is found in Article 12 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (ICESCR, 1966). This article mandates that States Parties recognize "the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health" (UN General Assembly, 1966). Unlike civil and political rights, which often require states to refrain from action, the right to health requires proactive state intervention. However, the covenant also introduces the concept of "progressive realization," acknowledging that resource constraints may limit the speed at which a state can achieve these standards.

To clarify the normative content of Article 12, the Committee on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (CESCR) issued General Comment No. 14 (2000). This document is critical because it deconstructs the right to health into four essential elements: Availability, Accessibility, Acceptability, and Quality (the AAAQ framework). Availability requires a sufficient quantity of functioning public health and healthcare facilities; Accessibility demands that facilities are physically and economically reachable for everyone without discrimination; Acceptability ensures that services are culturally appropriate and respectful of medical ethics; and Quality dictates that services must be scientifically and medically appropriate.

Beyond the ICESCR, the right to health is further specified in treaties protecting vulnerable groups. The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW, 1979) and the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC, 1989) emphasize the need for reproductive health services and the reduction of infant mortality, respectively. These instruments argue that the right to health is not a monolith but must be tailored to the specific biological and social vulnerabilities of different populations (Gostin, 2014). Consequently, international law creates a "thick" legal framework that encompasses both general standards and specialized protections.

Scholarship on these legal foundations, such as the work of Tobin (2012), emphasizes that the "highest attainable standard" is a flexible metric. It suggests that while the biological ceiling of health is fixed, the social and political ceiling is determined by a state's available resources and the global state of medical knowledge. Therefore, the definition of the right to health is inherently dynamic, expanding as medical technology advances and contracting when global crises like pandemics or economic shifts disrupt the capacity of the state to provide care.

In addition, defining the right to health in international law serves to transition health from a private concern to a public obligation. By codifying health rights, international instruments provide a benchmark against which state performance can be measured and held accountable. This legal basis is essential for the "human rights-based approach" to health, which prioritizes the needs of the most marginalized and ensures that health policies are transparent, participatory, and legally grounded (London, 2008).

2. *Health as a Human Right: The Social Determinants*

The conceptualization of health as a human right extends far beyond the walls of the hospital or the pharmacy; it encompasses the "underlying determinants of health" that create the conditions for a life of dignity. As noted in General Comment No. 14, the right to health is an inclusive right that depends on access to clean water, adequate sanitation, nutritious food, safe housing, and healthy working conditions (CESCR, 2000). This holistic view recognizes that medical care is often a reactive response to social failures. If a population lacks clean water, no amount of medical intervention can permanently solve the resulting burden of waterborne diseases.

The importance of these social determinants is highlighted by Marmot (2005), who argues that the social gradient of health—the fact that poorer people have worse health outcomes—is a violation of human rights. From a rights-based perspective, the state's failure to provide basic sanitation or a living wage is functionally equivalent to the denial of medical treatment. Thus, the right to health serves as an "umbrella right" that necessitates the fulfillment of other economic and social rights. Education, for instance, is a critical health determinant, as health literacy empowers individuals to navigate healthcare systems and make informed choices about their well-being.

Environmental factors also play an increasingly dominant role in the realization of health rights. Exposure to pollution, toxic waste, and the impacts of climate change are now recognized as significant barriers to the "highest attainable standard" of health. Scholars like Sultana (2022) have pointed out that environmental degradation often follows the lines of existing social inequalities, where marginalized communities are forced to live in "sacrifice zones" with high levels of industrial runoff. In this context, the right to health is inextricably linked to the right to a clean and sustainable environment.

Nutrition and food security are perhaps the most immediate determinants of health. Malnutrition, whether in the form of undernutrition in LMICs or the "toxic" food environments of high-income countries, directly impacts immune function and long-term health outcomes. A rights-based approach to health requires states to regulate food markets to ensure that healthy options are economically accessible. Pogge (2008) argues that the global economic order often exacerbates these disparities, as trade policies may prioritize the export of cash crops over the local production of diverse, nutritious foods needed for community health.

Furthermore, the social determinants of health include the "political determinants," such as the presence of peace and the absence of systemic discrimination. Conflict remains one of the greatest destroyers of health infrastructure and a primary driver of mental health crises and infectious outbreaks. International law, therefore, views the right to health as part of an indivisible web of rights; it cannot be fulfilled in a vacuum of violence or political instability. The right to health demands that states address the "causes of the causes," moving from clinical treatment to structural reform (Farmer, 2005).

At this point, viewing health as an inclusive human right shifts the focus of public health from individual behavior to social responsibility. It mandates that governments look at urban planning, agricultural policy, and labor laws through a "health in all policies" lens. This perspective is essential for achieving health equity, as it acknowledges that the most significant health improvements often come from improvements in the social fabric rather than from medical technology alone (Ruggie, 2011).

3. *Obligations of States: Protect, Respect, and Fulfill*

Under international human rights law, states bear a tripartite set of obligations regarding the right to health: the duties to respect, protect, and fulfill. The obligation to *respect* requires states to refrain from interfering directly or indirectly with the enjoyment of the right to health. This includes avoiding the marketing of unsafe drugs, prohibiting discriminatory practices in the health sector, and ensuring that state-sanctioned activities do not pollute the environment or limit access to traditional medicines (CESCR, 2000). It is essentially a "negative" obligation to do no harm.

The obligation to *protect* requires states to take measures that prevent third parties—such as multinational corporations, private insurance companies, or pharmaceutical giants—from interfering with health rights. This is particularly relevant in the era of privatized healthcare, where states must regulate private providers to ensure they meet the AAAQ standards. For example, states must ensure that private pharmaceutical companies do not engage in predatory pricing that makes essential medicines inaccessible to the poor. The duty to protect underscores that the state remains the ultimate guarantor of health rights, even when services are delivered by private entities (Gostin, 2014).

The obligation to *fulfill* is a proactive "positive" duty, requiring states to adopt appropriate legislative, administrative, budgetary, and judicial measures to achieve the full realization of the right to health. This includes the provision of basic healthcare services, the implementation of immunization programs, and the training of medical professionals. Within this obligation, states must prioritize the "core obligations," which are non-derogable minimum standards that must be met regardless of a state's wealth. These include access to essential medicines, maternal and child healthcare, and prevention of epidemics (Backman et al., 2008).

Access to essential medicines is a cornerstone of the duty to fulfill. According to the World Health Organization, essential medicines are those that satisfy the priority healthcare needs of the population. States are obligated to ensure these medicines are available and affordable. However, this often brings states into conflict with global intellectual property regimes. Scholars like Stiglitz (2006) argue that states have a human rights obligation to utilize the "flexibilities" in trade agreements—such as compulsory licensing—to ensure that patent laws do not prevent the domestic production of life-saving generics.

The duty to fulfill also extends to the creation of robust health infrastructure. This means investing in primary care clinics, referral hospitals, and medical laboratories, especially in underserved rural areas. It also involves the "human resources for health" (HRH) crisis; states are obligated to create working conditions that retain medical staff and prevent the "brain drain" to wealthier nations. Farmer (2005) emphasizes that without the "staff, stuff, space, and systems," the right to health remains a "parchment right"—a promise that exists on paper but has no material weight.

States have an obligation of "international assistance and cooperation." Since many LMICs lack the resources to meet even the core obligations of the right to health, wealthier nations are obligated under the ICESCR to provide financial and technical support. This international dimension of the right to health suggests that health is a global public good. The failure of wealthy nations to support global vaccine equity during the COVID-19 pandemic, for example, is seen by many legal scholars as a violation of this extraterritorial obligation to cooperate (Sultana, 2022).

4. *Challenges in Implementation: The Global-Local Gap*

The most daunting aspect of the right to health is the persistent "implementation gap" between high-minded international legal frameworks and the grim reality of healthcare on the ground. In many low- and middle-income countries, the right to health is undermined by a lack of financial resources, systemic corruption, and political instability. While the ICESCR allows for "progressive realization," many states have seen their health indicators regress due to structural adjustment programs imposed by international financial institutions, which often mandate cuts to public health spending (Pogge, 2008).

Pharmaceutical monopolies and the global patent regime represent one of the most significant structural barriers to implementation. Even when a state has the political will to provide medicines, the high cost of patented drugs for diseases like HIV/AIDS, Hepatitis C, and cancer can consume a disproportionate share of the national health budget. The TRIPS Agreement often acts as a straitjacket for LMICs, prioritizing the profit motives of private firms over the right to life. Despite the Doha Declaration affirming that TRIPS should not prevent states from protecting public health, the threat of trade sanctions or legal challenges from corporations creates a "regulatory chill" (Moon, 2009).

Infrastructure deficits remain a physical barrier to implementation. In many parts of Sub-Saharan Africa and Southeast Asia, the nearest clinic may be several hours away by foot, and once reached, it may lack basic supplies like bandages, electricity, or refrigerated storage for vaccines. This "infrastructure poverty" makes the legal promise of accessibility impossible to fulfill. Furthermore, the global shortage of healthcare workers is most acute in the regions with the highest disease burden. The migration of doctors and nurses to high-income countries constitutes a massive transfer of human capital that hollows out the health systems of the Global South (Gostin, 2014).

Systemic discrimination and social exclusion also play a role in the implementation gap. Marginalized groups, including Indigenous peoples, refugees, and LGBTQ+ individuals, often face stigma and secondary victimization within healthcare settings. Even if the law prohibits discrimination, the "cultural acceptability" of services is often ignored, leading these groups to avoid seeking care. Marmot (2005) argues that addressing these social exclusions is as important as building clinics, yet these qualitative aspects of the right to health are often the hardest to monitor and enforce.

Corruption and "leakage" in the health sector further drain the limited resources available for health rights. Funds intended for medicines or hospital equipment are frequently diverted, and "informal payments" (bribes) are often required for patients to receive ostensibly free care. This violates the principle of "economic accessibility" and erodes public trust in the state. From a rights-based perspective, the state’s failure to implement effective anti-corruption measures in the health sector is a failure to fulfill its obligation to use the "maximum available resources" for health (Backman et al., 2008).

The challenge of implementation reveals that the right to health is a deeply political issue. It requires more than legal signatures; it requires a fundamental reordering of national and global priorities. As Farmer (2005) notes, the implementation gap is essentially an "aspiration gap." Bridging it requires not only increased funding but a shift in global governance that places health rights above intellectual property and national borders. Without this shift, the right to health will remain a privilege of the few rather than a right for all.

C. Global Disparities in Healthcare Systems

1. *Comparative Healthcare Systems: An Overview of Inequity*

The global healthcare landscape is defined by a stark divergence in delivery models and outcomes that correlates directly with national wealth and political ideology. In high-income countries (HICs), healthcare is often characterized by advanced technological integration and specialized care, while low-income countries (LICs) are forced to focus on basic survival and primary prevention. This disparity is best illustrated by the global health expenditure gap: while the world spends an average of approximately $1,100 per person on health annually, HICs spend over $5,000, whereas LICs often struggle to reach $40 per capita. These financial imbalances result in a "10/90 gap," where less than 10% of global health research funding is directed toward diseases that account for 90% of the global burden of disease (WHO, 2021).

This economic stratification is more than a budgetary issue; it is an expression of what Paul Farmer (2005) describes as "structural violence." Farmer argues that the lack of access to medicine in the Global South is not a result of biological inevitable or cultural choices, but of historical and economic structures that prioritize capital over life. From a legal perspective, this violates the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), which mandates that states use the "maximum available resources" to achieve the highest attainable standard of health. When global systems allow $5,000 in care for one citizen and $40 for another, the principle of "substantive equality" enshrined in international human rights law is effectively nullified.

Access to essential medicines reflects this same divide, creating a tiered global citizenship. In high-income nations, access to the latest oncology drugs or biologics is often a matter of insurance coverage; in low-income regions, access to basic antibiotics or insulin is a matter of life or death. Health outcomes follow this economic gradient with brutal precision. For instance, the maternal mortality ratio in LICs remains as high as 415 per 100,000 live births, compared to just 12 per 100,000 in HICs (World Bank, 2023). This suggests that the healthcare system a person is born into is the single greatest predictor of their life expectancy, a reality that Thomas Pogge (2008) identifies as a failure of the global institutional order.

Furthermore, the delivery of care is often governed by different ontological approaches. In HICs, the "biomedical model" predominates, focusing on individual pathology and high-cost intervention. In LICs, out of necessity, "community-based" models often prevail. However, scholars like Amartya Sen (1999) argue that healthcare should be viewed through the "Capabilities Approach"—as a fundamental tool that enables individuals to lead a life they value. When a system fails to provide even basic vaccines, it is not just failing a medical test; it is curtailing the human capability to function and participate in society, which Sen views as a form of "unfreedom."

The role of international organizations also differs across these systems. In LICs, the World Health Organization (WHO) and NGOs like Doctors Without Borders often act as "surrogate states," providing the services that the national government cannot afford. In HICs, the relationship is more regulatory and standardized. This creates a "dual sovereignty" in many developing nations where healthcare policy is dictated by external donors rather than local democratic processes. This can lead to "vertical" health programs (targeting one specific disease like malaria) that neglect the "horizontal" strengthening of the overall health system.

Finally, the digitization of health records and the rise of telemedicine have introduced a new layer of disparity: the "digital health divide." While HICs are leveraging AI for diagnostic accuracy, many LICs lack the basic telecommunications infrastructure or stable electricity required to maintain a digital registry. This technological gap threatens to further insulate HICs from the health realities of the Global South, creating a "data-rich" North and a "data-blind" South. This lack of data in the South often means that global health priorities are set without a full understanding of the actual disease burden in the poorest regions.

These disparities highlight that the "right to health" is far from universal in practice. The global system operates as a "stratified biomedical hierarchy," where the quality of care is a function of a nation's position in the global economy. To address this, scholars like Gostin (2014) propose a Framework Convention on Global Health, which would go beyond current treaties to establish binding financial commitments from HICs to support health systems in the South. Without such a structural overhaul, the comparative analysis of these systems will continue to be a study in "avoidable suffering."

2. *Low-Income Countries: Survival Amid Scarcity*

Healthcare delivery in low-income countries (LICs) is frequently a struggle against absolute scarcity and "infrastructure poverty." The most pressing challenge is the infrastructure deficit; many rural areas lack clinics with consistent electricity or refrigerated "cold chains" necessary for vaccine storage. In these regions, "access" is often defined by physical distance, with millions of people living more than 10 kilometers from the nearest health outpost. This geographic barrier is compounded by a catastrophic shortage of trained medical personnel, often exacerbated by the "brain drain" of doctors to wealthier nations.

According to WHO standards, a minimum of 4.45 health workers per 1,000 people is needed to achieve universal health coverage; however, many LICs operate with fewer than 0.5 per 1,000 (WHO, 2022). This shortage creates what Achille Mbembe (2003) might term "necropolitics" in a medical context—the state (or lack thereof) essentially decides who is "disposable" by virtue of where healthcare is *not* located. When a village lacks a midwife, the high maternal mortality rate is not just a statistic; it is a manifestation of a system that has failed to protect life at its most vulnerable point.

Financial constraints further hollow out these systems. Because public health budgets are often less than 5% of GDP, the burden of payment shifts to the individual. In LICs, out-of-pocket (OOP) spending can account for over 50% of total health expenditure. For a population living on less than $2.15 a day, a single medical emergency—such as a complicated birth or a case of malaria—can lead to "catastrophic health expenditure." This violates the principle of Financial Risk Protection, which is a core pillar of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG 3).

The legal context in LICs often includes "Rights to Health" enshrined in their constitutions (e.g., South Africa or Kenya), yet these are frequently "unfunded mandates." The gap between the constitutional promise and the material reality creates a "crisis of legitimacy" for the state. Pogge (2008) argues that the global trade rules, specifically TRIPS, act as a secondary barrier; even if an LIC has the clinical capacity, it often cannot afford the patented medicines required for treatable conditions like Hepatitis C or HIV/AIDS without significant international subsidies.

Furthermore, LIC health systems are often "donor-dependent," which can lead to a lack of sustainability. When a global health fund targets a specific epidemic but leaves the underlying primary care structure in ruins, the system remains fragile. Scholars like Sultana (2022) refer to this as a form of "climate and health coloniality," where the North dictates the terms of survival in the South. This paternalism often ignores local Indigenous medical knowledge, which could offer more sustainable and culturally appropriate health interventions in areas where Western pharmaceuticals are unavailable.

Corruption also acts as a "silent killer" in LIC health systems. When funds intended for essential medicines are diverted or "informal payments" (bribes) are required to see a doctor, the poorest are effectively barred from the system. Transparency International (2020) notes that the health sector is one of the most prone to graft in developing nations. From a human rights perspective, this is a direct violation of the duty to "fulfill," as the state is failing to ensure that available resources are actually reaching the intended recipients.

Lastly, the impact of political instability cannot be overstated. In countries like the DRC or Yemen, the health system is often the first casualty of war. The deliberate destruction of hospitals and the flight of medical professionals turn treatable injuries into death sentences. In these contexts, "scarcity" is a weaponized political tool. The international community's failure to protect health workers in conflict zones represents a total collapse of the Geneva Conventions and the human rights framework, leaving the right to health in a state of absolute suspension.

3. *Middle-Income Countries: The Burden of the "Double Transition"*

Middle-income countries (MICs) face a complex "double burden" of disease that tests the limits of their burgeoning health systems. They are currently navigating an epidemiological transition where they must simultaneously battle "diseases of poverty" (infectious diseases like TB) and "diseases of affluence" (non-communicable diseases like diabetes and heart disease). While MICs often have more developed urban hospital networks, they suffer from a severe uneven distribution of resources. For example, in countries like India or Brazil, state-of-the-art private hospitals in metropolitan hubs exist alongside underfunded public clinics in the periphery.

This geographic and economic divide creates what Marmot (2005) calls the "social gradient in health." In MICs, your social class doesn't just determine your lifestyle; it determines whether you receive an MRI or a generic herbal remedy. The legal framework in many MICs (such as Brazil's *Sistema Único de Saúde*) promises universal care, but "judicialization of health" has become common. This is where citizens sue the state to receive high-cost medicines that the public system cannot afford, a phenomenon that often benefits the middle class who have access to lawyers, further entrenching inequality.

Rising healthcare costs in MICs are driven by the increasing need for expensive chronic care and the importation of high-cost medical technologies. As these nations attempt to implement Universal Health Coverage (UHC), they often face "the squeezed middle": a large informal labor sector that is too wealthy for subsidies but too poor for private insurance. This group often falls through the cracks, experiencing "medical bankruptcy" despite living in a "middle-income" economy. This illustrates the failure of market-based healthcare to provide a safety net for those in the informal economy.

Furthermore, MICs are often the "test beds" for global pharmaceutical companies. While this can bring investment, it also raises ethical questions regarding clinical trials and access to the resulting drugs. Sassen (2014) argues that these nations are sites of "expulsion," where the poor are pushed out of the "modern" healthcare system and into a shadow system of low-quality, unregulated private clinics. This "commodification of care" turns health into a luxury good rather than a human right, a direct contradiction of the ICESCR's principles.

Political dynamics in MICs often prioritize "prestige projects"—like high-tech specialized hospitals in the capital—over the "boring" but vital work of primary rural healthcare. This "urban bias" in health policy leaves millions of rural inhabitants without basic services. Sen (1999) emphasizes that health policy must be participatory; yet, in many MICs, the "medical-industrial complex" has more influence over health budgets than the communities they are meant to serve. This leads to a misallocation of resources that favors high-cost cures over low-cost prevention.

The rise of the "private-public partnership" (PPP) model in MICs is also a point of scholarly contention. While PPPs can bridge the infrastructure gap, they often lead to "mission creep," where the private partner's need for profit undermines the public partner's duty to provide universal care. Scholars like Ruggie (2011) have noted that without strict human rights oversight, these partnerships can become "extractive," draining public funds to guarantee private returns. This complicates the state's role as the "guarantor" of health rights, as it becomes entangled in commercial contracts.

MICs are on the front lines of the "lifestyle disease" epidemic, often fueled by the entry of multinational food corporations. The "Right to Health" in these nations must therefore expand to include the "Right to a Healthy Environment," including food regulation. The state’s failure to regulate high-sugar or ultra-processed foods, which drive the diabetes crisis, is seen by health rights advocates as a failure of the duty to "protect" the population from harmful commercial interests. This shift requires a multisectoral approach to health that most MIC bureaucracies are currently ill-equipped to handle.

4. *High-Income Countries: Privatization and Marginalization*

Despite their wealth, high-income countries (HICs) are not immune to profound health inequities, though these are often hidden behind high average health indicators. The primary challenge in these nations is the marginalization of specific populations and the "structural racism" embedded in health delivery. In the United States, for example, mortality rates for Black women in childbirth are nearly 3 times higher than for white women, even when controlling for income and education. This is what Farmer (2005) would call a "pathology of power"—where social hierarchies are literally written into the bodies of the oppressed.

Legal analysis of HIC systems reveals a tension between the "Right to Healthcare" and "Market Sovereignty." In the US, the lack of a universal healthcare mandate (despite the Affordable Care Act) leaves millions underinsured. In contrast, European systems like the UK's NHS are facing "privatization by stealth," where services are increasingly outsourced to private firms. Scholars like Sassen (2014) argue that this represents the "hollowing out" of the social contract. When the state treats health as an "individual responsibility" rather than a "collective good," it violates the spirit of the UDHR.

Privatization in HICs also impacts the "Acceptability" and "Quality" of care for the poor. As "unprofitable" hospitals in rural or low-income urban areas are closed, "healthcare deserts" are created. This forces marginalized populations to rely on overburdened emergency rooms for primary care, which is both less effective and more expensive. This "spatial injustice" in health access is a direct result of prioritizing "shareholder value" over "patient outcomes," a hallmark of the neoliberal era that Harvey (2005) describes as "neoliberalism as a class project."

Furthermore, undocumented migrants in HICs face a state of "legal invisibility" that bars them from the health system. In many nations, doctors are legally required to report undocumented patients, creating a "chilling effect" that prevents them from seeking care for communicable diseases. This is not only a human rights violation but a public health disaster. The "exclusion of the stranger" from the health system illustrates the limits of nationalized health rights in a globalized world, where "citizenship" becomes a prerequisite for "life-saving care."

HIC systems also struggle with the "medicalization of social problems." Issues like homelessness, addiction, and poverty are often treated as medical pathologies rather than social failures. This shift allows the state to avoid addressing the "social determinants of health" (Marmot, 2005) by simply prescribing medications. The opioid crisis in the HICs is a prime example of how corporate profit (Purdue Pharma) combined with the medicalization of pain can lead to a mass-scale human rights violation, where the duty to "protect" was abandoned for the duty to "promote" pharmaceuticals.

The "digital divide" within HICs also creates new inequities. As healthcare moves toward app-based scheduling and "telehealth," the elderly and those without high-speed internet are left behind. While AI and "precision medicine" offer the promise of personalized cures, these are currently only available to the ultra-wealthy. This creates a "biological class system," where the rich can afford to "bio-hack" their way to longevity while the poor are stuck with an increasingly dilapidated public system. This is a far cry from the ICESCR's goal of the "highest attainable standard" for *everyone*.

HICs are the primary drivers of the "Global Health Hegemony." They set the research agendas, own the patents, and control the international health organizations. This "epistemic power" means that HIC health concerns (like rare cancers) receive far more funding than LIC concerns (like neglected tropical diseases). Scholars like Santos (2014) refer to this as "epistemicide"—the silencing of the health needs and knowledge systems of the Global South. A truly universal right to health would require HICs to relinquish some of this control and move toward a more democratic global health governance.

5. Structural Barriers: Systemic Inequality and Instability

Beyond the clinical setting, systemic barriers such as poverty and political instability act as social determinants that undermine health rights in a way that medicine alone cannot fix. Poverty is the "ultimate barrier"; it dictates a person's nutrition, housing quality, and exposure to environmental toxins. Even in nations with "free" healthcare, the indirect costs of care—such as lost wages, transportation, and childcare—effectively bar the poorest citizens from seeking treatment. This results in "late-stage diagnosis" for diseases that could have been easily managed, a cycle that Marmot (2005) links to the "biology of poverty."

Political instability and conflict represent a total collapse of the right to health, turning "healthcare" into a "war crime." War leads to the deliberate targeting of health infrastructure (as seen in Syria and Gaza), the flight of medical professionals, and the disruption of pharmaceutical supply lines. In conflict zones, deaths from preventable diseases often far outnumber deaths from direct violence. This is what Mbembe (2003) describes as "death worlds"—spaces where the infrastructure of life is systematically dismantled to destroy the "will to live" of a population.

The role of Multinational Corporations (MNCs) as structural barriers is also significant. Through lobbying and trade agreements, MNCs can prevent states from enacting public health laws (like tobacco control or soda taxes). This is known as "corporate capture" of public policy. From a legal standpoint, this violates the state's duty to "protect" its citizens from third-party harm. Ruggie (2011) points out that while states have duties, corporations have "responsibilities," but the lack of binding international law for corporate human rights abuses makes this a weak protection.

Systemic corruption within health ministries further erodes the "Financial Accessibility" of care. When funds intended for medicines are diverted or "informal payments" are required for care, the poor are pushed out. Transparency International (2020) notes that corruption kills as surely as any virus. From a rights-based perspective, corruption is a "misuse of the maximum available resources," a direct violation of the ICESCR. It turns a "public service" into a "private racket," destroying the trust necessary for a functional health system.

Furthermore, environmental racism acts as a structural barrier. Indigenous and marginalized communities are disproportionately located near toxic sites, leading to "environmental pathologies" that the health system is often ill-equipped to handle. Scholars like Sultana (2022) argue that "climate change" is the ultimate structural barrier to health, as it increases the range of infectious diseases and destroys the food systems that communities rely on. The "Right to Health" must therefore be seen as inseparable from "Climate Justice."

The "legal barrier" of patents and TRIPS continues to be a point of global contention. Even when a state has the capacity to produce a life-saving generic drug, international trade law often prevents them from doing so to protect "intellectual property." This prioritization of "property rights" over "life rights" is a central critique of the current neoliberal order. Stiglitz (2006) argues that this is not just an economic issue but a moral one; the current patent system is a "tax on the sick" that transfers wealth from the poor South to the rich North.

Therefore, structural barriers ensure that for the world's most marginalized, the right to health remains an unfulfilled promise. These barriers are not "natural" or "unavoidable"; they are the result of specific political and economic choices. Addressing them requires moving beyond "medical missions" and toward "structural reform"—including land reform, wealth redistribution, and the decolonization of international trade law. As Paul Farmer (2005) famously said, "the idea that some lives matter less is the root of all that is wrong with the world."

D. Pharmaceutical Monopolies, Patent Regimes, and the Crisis of Accessibility

1. Pharmaceutical Monopolies: The Legal Construction of Medical Capital

Pharmaceutical monopolies are not merely market phenomena; they are legally constructed entities sustained through stringent international patent protections. The primary global instrument facilitating this is Article 27(1) of the TRIPS Agreement, which mandates that "*patents shall be available for any inventions, whether products or processes, in all fields of technology, provided that they are new, involve an inventive step and are capable of industrial application.*" This provision removed the sovereign discretion previously held by developing nations to exclude essential medicines from patentability, effectively standardizing a commercial approach to life-saving technology.

The analytical significance of this provision lies in its universal application across all WTO member states, creating a global floor for intellectual property rights that favors capital-heavy pharmaceutical firms. A critical issue arises when the "inventive step" criterion is loosely interpreted to facilitate "evergreening"—a strategy where corporations secure secondary patents for minor, non-therapeutic modifications of existing drugs, such as changes in dosage or delivery mechanisms. This extends monopoly control far beyond the standard 20-year limit, preventing the timely entry of generic competitors who could drive prices down.

Juridically, this practice creates a direct conflict with Article 12 of the ICESCR, which guarantees the right to the highest attainable standard of health. When drug prices are dictated by monopoly-driven "market value" rather than the cost of production or the patient's ability to pay, states fail in their negative duty to *respect* and positive duty to *protect* the right to health. The legal architecture thus prioritizes the protection of intangible assets over the material survival of vulnerable populations, transforming a human necessity into a luxury commodity.

Furthermore, the concentration of medical capital through these monopolies allows corporations to exercise disproportionate influence over national health policies. By controlling the supply and price of essential drugs, "Big Pharma" can effectively lobby against price controls or mandatory insurance inclusions, arguing that such measures stifle innovation. This creates a "chilling effect" on domestic legislation in middle-income countries, where governments fear that challenging patent rights will lead to the withdrawal of life-saving products from their markets.

The social cost of this legal construction is measured in "preventable mortality." As argued by Paul Farmer (2005), these monopolies are a form of structural violence, where the law is used to exclude the poor from the benefits of modern science. The systemic exclusion is not an accidental byproduct but a calculated feature of a regime that values intellectual property as a supreme right. Consequently, the legal construction of medical capital actively produces health inequities by ensuring that the most effective treatments remain financially out of reach for the majority of the global population.

The lack of transparency in R&D costs further complicates the monopoly debate. Corporations often justify high prices by citing the "billions" spent on development, yet much of this research is often subsidized by public grants or academic institutions. The TRIPS framework, however, does not require corporations to disclose these subsidies. This information asymmetry allows monopolies to capture public investments for private gain, a phenomenon that undermines the "social contract" of patent law—where exclusive rights are supposed to be a fair exchange for the public disclosure and eventual democratization of knowledge.

2. *Patent Regimes and Global Health Inequity: A Structural Analysis*

The rigidity of the global patent regime serves as a primary driver of disparities in health outcomes between the Global North and South. This is specifically codified in Article 33 of the TRIPS Agreement, which stipulates that "*the term of protection available shall not end before the expiration of a period of twenty years counted from the filing date.*" From a descriptive-analytical standpoint, this 20-year duration often functions as a "death sentence" for patients in developing nations who cannot wait two decades for affordable generic versions of essential treatments for cancer, diabetes, or infectious diseases.

Thomas Pogge (2008) posits that this framework creates a profound structural injustice. Because the patent system only provides incentives for research into diseases that affect wealthy populations—who can afford the resulting high-priced drugs—diseases that disproportionately affect the poor are neglected. This "10/90 gap" (where only 10% of research funding goes toward 90% of the world's health problems) is a direct consequence of a patent regime that links the direction of innovation to the purchasing power of the consumer rather than the burden of the disease.

In the hierarchy of international law, the protection of commercial assets under Article 33 frequently supersedes the spirit of Article 25 of the UDHR, which asserts the right to medical care as part of a standard of living adequate for health. This creates a legal paradigm where commercial security is favored over biological survival. The structural nature of this inequity means that even well-intentioned global health initiatives often struggle to overcome the fundamental barrier of high-cost, patented inputs, leading to a perpetual cycle of dependency on Northern donors.

Moreover, the enforcement of these regimes is backed by powerful trade sanctions. Developing nations that attempt to challenge the 20-year monopoly often find themselves on "Special 301" watchlists, facing economic retaliation. This pressure ensures that even when domestic laws might permit more flexible interpretations of patent rights, the global trade environment forces compliance. The structural analysis reveals that health inequity is not just about a lack of medicine, but about a global legal order that penalizes states for prioritizing the lives of their citizens over the profits of foreign firms.

The "colonization of knowledge" is a further consequence of this regime. As Sultana (2022) notes, Western patent laws often do not recognize traditional or communal knowledge, allowing Northern firms to "discover" and patent plant-based remedies used for generations in the South—a practice known as biopiracy. This not only extracts wealth from the Global South but also prevents indigenous populations from using their own traditional treatments if they conflict with a newly granted Western patent.

The structural analysis of patent regimes demonstrates that universal healthcare cannot be achieved within the current TRIPS framework without radical reform. The 20-year monopoly creates a "bottleneck" in global health delivery, ensuring that the latest medical advancements remain a privilege of the rich. Until the international community acknowledges that the right to health is a *jus cogens* norm—a higher law that should override trade agreements—the patent regime will continue to serve as a barrier to global health equity, reinforcing a world of "haves" and "have-nots" in the face of disease.

3. *Case Studies: The Human Cost and the Conflict of Rights*

The destructive impact of these legal regimes is most poignantly evidenced by the HIV/AIDS crisis in Sub-Saharan Africa. Pharmaceutical corporations invoked their exclusive rights under

Article 28(1) of TRIPS, which grants a patent owner the power "*to prevent third parties... from the acts of: making, using, offering for sale, selling, or importing*" the patented product. In the late 1990s, while millions were dying of AIDS in Africa, pharmaceutical giants used this provision to block the importation of generic ARVs from India, maintaining prices at $10,000 per patient annually, despite a production cost of less than $300.

This case created a tragic paradox where life-saving medicine existed scientifically but remained non-existent economically for those in need. The conflict reached a peak in 1998 when 39 pharmaceutical companies sued the South African government for attempting to implement a law allowing for the importation of cheaper generic drugs. The global outcry over this lawsuit eventually forced the companies to drop the case, but it highlighted the lengths to which corporations would go to protect the "sanctity" of Article 28, even at the cost of millions of lives.

A similar pattern of "property over people" emerged during the COVID-19 pandemic. Despite Article 12(2)(c) of the ICESCR, which obligates states to take steps for the control of epidemic diseases, wealthy nations initially blocked a "TRIPS Waiver" proposed by India and South Africa. This waiver would have temporarily suspended patent protections to allow for the decentralized production of vaccines in the Global South. The delay resulted in "vaccine apartheid," where high-income countries reached high vaccination rates while health workers in low-income countries remained unprotected.

The COVID-19 case also highlighted the issue of "Trade Secrets." Unlike patents, which are eventually disclosed, trade secrets (protected under Article 39 of TRIPS) cover the specific "know-how" of manufacturing. Corporations refused to share these recipes even when offered compensation, ensuring that they remained the sole producers. This underscores that the current legal order treats pandemic response not as a collective humanitarian effort, but as a proprietary business opportunity, where the "sanctity of the contract" outweighs the "sanctity of life."

These case studies confirm that the international legal order remains predominantly state-centric and market-oriented rather than human-centric. When a public health crisis occurs, the default setting of global governance is to protect the interests of the innovators (predominantly in the North) rather than the lives of the afflicted (predominantly in the South). This hierarchy of rights ensures that marginalized populations are always the last to receive care, and only then through the "charity" of the North rather than as a matter of legal right.

In both the HIV and COVID-19 examples, the only effective solutions came from challenging the patent regime through civil society activism and South-South cooperation. These case studies prove that the "right to health" is not granted by international trade bodies; it is fought for in the courts and on the streets. They serve as a grim reminder that without a fundamental shift in how the law treats medical technology, every future global health crisis will likely follow the same path of artificial scarcity and avoidable death.

4. *TRIPS Flexibilities: The "Paper Tiger" of Legal Justice*

While the TRIPS framework is undeniably stringent, it contains "emergency exits" reinforced by the 2001 Doha Declaration. Article 31 of the TRIPS Agreement governs "Compulsory Licensing," which allows a government to authorize the production of a patented drug without the holder's consent. The declaration affirmed that the agreement "*does not and should not prevent members from taking measures to protect public health*," providing a theoretical legal basis for states to prioritize their citizens' lives over corporate patents.

However, Article 31 remains a "paper tiger" for many developing nations. The procedural requirements are onerous; the state must typically first attempt to negotiate a voluntary license on "reasonable commercial terms" for a "reasonable period." While these requirements can be waived in a "national emergency," many countries fear that doing so will trigger litigation or trade retaliation. The lack of a clear, internationally accepted definition of what constitutes an "emergency" leaves low-income countries vulnerable to bullying by wealthier nations and their pharmaceutical lobbies.

Furthermore, Article 6 of TRIPS facilitates "Parallel Importation," enabling a nation to import patented drugs from territories where they are sold at lower prices (exhaustion of rights). While this is a vital tool for lowering costs, its efficacy is frequently neutralized by "TRIPS-plus" provisions in bilateral Free Trade Agreements (FTAs). These FTAs often force developing nations to adopt "data exclusivity" rules, which prevent generic manufacturers from using existing clinical trial data to prove their product's safety, effectively blocking generic entry even if a patent has expired or a compulsory license is issued.

The "Paper Tiger" status is also reinforced by a lack of technical capacity. Manufacturing modern biologics or mRNA vaccines requires more than just a legal license; it requires a sophisticated industrial base and specialized personnel. The TRIPS Agreement does not mandate the transfer of this "know-how." Consequently, even if a country like Bangladesh or Kenya issues a compulsory license, they may find themselves unable to actually produce the drug, leaving them still dependent on the very corporations they are trying to bypass.

Analytical evidence suggests that the "flexibilities" were designed more to appease critics than to provide a genuine path to health equity. Since the Doha Declaration, only a handful of countries have successfully utilized compulsory licensing for non-HIV drugs, largely due to the "regulatory chill" created by the global trade environment. States are essentially forced to choose between their trade relationships and their citizens' health, a choice that the current international legal architecture makes unnecessarily difficult.

In addition, to transform TRIPS flexibilities from a paper tiger into an effective tool, the international community must move toward a "Human Rights-First" interpretation of trade law. This would involve a "safe harbor" provision, where any measure taken by a state to provide essential medicines is automatically presumed to be TRIPS-compliant. Until the "pro-patent" bias of the WTO is balanced by a "pro-health" mandate, the right to health will continue to be a secondary concern in the world of international trade, and the flexibilities will remain a hollow promise for those most in need.

E. Barriers in Healthcare Infrastructure and Delivery

1. *Structural Deficiencies: The Infrastructure Gap*

The realization of the right to health is fundamentally predicated on the availability of a functional physical infrastructure, yet low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) suffer from a profound "infrastructure deficit." Under Article 12 of the ICESCR, states are obligated to ensure the "availability" of health facilities; however, in many LICs, the primary healthcare network is characterized by dilapidated buildings, lack of reliable electricity, and absence of clean water. This structural fragility means that even if life-saving medicines are provided through global initiatives, the lack of "cold chain" refrigeration or sterile environments renders them ineffective.

Beyond physical buildings, the deficiency extends to the "supply chain of survival." Many LMICs operate under a state of chronic shortage for basic medical supplies, from diagnostic reagents to surgical sutures. This scarcity is often a result of inadequate public health spending, which frequently falls below the $86 per capita recommended by the WHO for a basic package of health services. Consequently, the healthcare system becomes a site of "triage by necessity," where the lack of a basic oxygen canister or a functioning X-ray machine determines who survives and who does not.

Analytically, this deficit is not merely a lack of resources but a failure of "Horizontal Health Systems." For decades, global donors prioritized "Vertical Programs" (targeting specific diseases like Polio or HIV) while neglecting the foundational infrastructure. This has created a "siloed" system where a clinic might have high-tech HIV diagnostics but lack the basic infrastructure to treat a common infection or a birth complication. This imbalance violates the principle of "Integrated Care" and leaves the system vulnerable to total collapse during surges, such as the COVID-19 pandemic.

Furthermore, the geographic distribution of these facilities is profoundly inequitable. Most high-level hospitals are concentrated in urban centers, leaving rural populations to rely on overburdened and under-equipped health posts. This "Urban-Rural Divide" creates a secondary barrier of distance and transportation costs, which Amartya Sen (1999) identifies as a major constraint on human "capability." For a rural laborer, a five-hour journey to a clinic represents not just a medical challenge, but a catastrophic loss of wages.

The lack of digital infrastructure further isolates LMIC health systems from the global medical community. While high-income countries (HICs) utilize electronic health records (EHR) and AI-driven diagnostics, many LMICs still rely on paper-based systems that are prone to loss and error. This "Digital Health Divide" prevents effective disease surveillance and ensures that the Global South remains "data-poor." Without accurate data, health ministries cannot efficiently allocate their limited resources, perpetuating the cycle of systemic inefficiency.

These deficiencies are often compounded by "Climate Vulnerability." Health facilities in LMICs are frequently the first to be destroyed by extreme weather events. The lack of "Climate-Resilient" infrastructure—such as solar-powered clinics or flood-proof hospitals—means that the right to health is constantly under threat from environmental shifts. To fulfill the "Highest Attainable Standard," international law must move toward a mandate for "Resilient Infrastructure" that can withstand both biological and environmental shocks.

2. *The Health Workforce Crisis: A Global Brain Drain*

The most critical component of healthcare delivery is the human element, yet the world faces a catastrophic shortage of healthcare professionals, particularly in the Global South. According to the WHO (2022), there is a projected shortage of 10 million health workers by 2030, with the burden falling almost entirely on LMICs. This violates the "Availability" requirement of the AAAQ framework, as a clinic without a trained nurse or doctor is effectively a hollow structure. In many developing nations, the ratio of physicians to the population is as low as 1 per 10,000, compared to over 30 per 10,000 in HICs.

This shortage is driven by a systemic "Global Brain Drain," where medical professionals trained at the expense of developing nations migrate to HICs in search of better wages and working conditions. Analytically, this represents a "Reverse Subsidy," where the poorest nations end up subsidizing the healthcare systems of the wealthiest. While individuals have a right to migrate, the collective impact on the source country's healthcare system is devastating. International law, through the WHO Global Code of Practice on the International Recruitment of Health Personnel, attempts to regulate this, but it remains a voluntary and largely toothless instrument.

The impact is most acute in rural and remote areas, where "Medical Deserts" are the norm. Healthcare professionals often resist rural postings due to a lack of professional support, poor living conditions, and the absence of medical equipment. This creates a "Dual System" within countries: a relatively well-staffed private sector for the urban elite and a skeletal public sector for the rural poor. This internal "maldistribution" is a violation of the principle of "Non-Discrimination" in the provision of healthcare.

The workforce crisis also leads to "Task-Shifting," where lower-level health workers are forced to perform tasks they are not fully trained for, such as nurses performing surgeries or community health workers diagnosing complex illnesses. While task-shifting can be a pragmatic temporary solution, it raises significant concerns regarding the "Quality" of care. Without proper supervision and a pathway for professional development, these workers face high rates of burnout and moral distress, leading to a further exodus from the profession.

Furthermore, the health workforce in many LMICs is aging, and there is a critical shortage of educators to train the next generation. The "Educational Infrastructure" for medicine and nursing is often underfunded, leading to a bottleneck in the production of new professionals. This lack of "Human Capital" investment means that even if a country achieves economic growth, its health system remains stagnant. The right to health therefore requires a "Right to Education" for health professionals, ensuring a sustainable pipeline of expertise.

The safety of the health workforce in conflict-ridden LMICs is a major structural barrier. Doctors and nurses are often targeted by warring factions or suffer from the collapse of the rule of law. When health workers flee a conflict zone, the health system effectively dies. The international community’s failure to enforce International Humanitarian Law regarding the protection of medical personnel is a direct contributor to the total collapse of health delivery in regions like Yemen, Syria, and parts of the Sahel.

3. *Financial Barriers: The Violence of Out-of-Pocket Expenditure*

Even where infrastructure and personnel exist, the "Price of Care" remains the most significant barrier for marginalized populations. In many LMICs, health systems are chronically underfunded, forcing the burden of payment onto the individual. Out-of-Pocket (OOP) expenditure accounts for over 40-50% of total health spending in many LICs, compared to less than 15% in most HICs. This directly violates the "Economic Accessibility" pillar of the Right to Health, which mandates that healthcare must be affordable for all, regardless of income.

Analytically, OOP expenditure acts as a "Regressive Tax" on the poor. For a family living on the poverty line, a single medical emergency can lead to "Catastrophic Health Expenditure," forcing them to sell assets, pull children out of school, or enter a cycle of intergenerational debt. This is what Paul Farmer (2005) describes as the "Biology of Poverty"—where the lack of money translates directly into the progression of disease. The legal standard of "Affordability" is essentially nullified when the cost of a life-saving procedure exceeds a household's annual income.

The "Privatization" of healthcare services in LMICs has further exacerbated this crisis. Under pressure from neoliberal economic policies, many governments have outsourced health services to private providers or introduced "User Fees" in public clinics. While proponents argue this increases efficiency, the reality is the "Expulsion" of the poor from the healthcare market (Sassen, 2014). Privatization shifts the healthcare logic from "Need" to "Demand," where those who cannot pay are treated as "non-existent" in the eyes of the provider.

Financial barriers are also "Gendered." In many patriarchal societies, women have less control over household finances, making them more vulnerable to the impact of user fees. When a family has to choose who receives care, the "investible" male members are often prioritized over females. This creates a gender-based health gap that can only be closed through the implementation of Universal Health Coverage (UHC) and the total abolition of user fees at the point of delivery.

Furthermore, the "Indirect Costs" of healthcare—such as lost wages, transportation to urban centers, and the cost of food while hospitalized—often exceed the direct medical costs. For a marginalized group, these hidden barriers are just as lethal as the hospital bill. A truly rights-based health system must address these "Non-Medical Costs" through social protection schemes. Without a "Safety Net," the right to health remains a luxury available only to those who can afford the "logistics of survival."

The lack of "Financial Transparency" and the prevalence of "Informal Payments" (bribes) in public health systems create a secondary layer of financial exclusion. In some regions, patients are forced to pay under-the-table fees just to access basic beds or medications that are supposedly free. This "Corruption Tax" disproportionately affects those with the least political power, further eroding trust in public institutions. To fulfill the Right to Health, states must move toward "Transparent Public Financing" and a "Public-First" model that treats health as a social contract rather than a market commodity.

4. *Case Study: The Crisis of Maternal and Child Health*

The failure of healthcare infrastructure and delivery is most tragically evident in the rates of maternal and child mortality in Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia. Despite global targets, maternal mortality remains a "Silent Pandemic," with nearly 287,000 women dying annually from pregnancy-related causes—95% of which occur in LMICs. Analytically, these deaths are "Pathologies of Power"; they occur because the health system fails to provide the basic "Emergency Obstetric Care" (EmOC) that has been standard in the North for over a century.

In Sub-Saharan Africa, the lack of "Surgical Capacity" and blood banks means that a common complication like a postpartum hemorrhage or an obstructed labor becomes a death sentence. Under Article 12(2)(a) of the ICESCR, states must provide for the "reduction of the stillbirth-rate and of infant mortality and for the healthy development of the child." However, without functioning operating theaters or trained midwives, this legal provision is a "Dead Letter." The absence of "Continuum of Care"—from prenatal visits to postnatal follow-up—ensures that the most vulnerable transition periods of life remain the most dangerous.

The "Three Delays Model" provides a powerful analytical framework for this crisis: (1) Delay in seeking care due to lack of education or money; (2) Delay in reaching a facility due to poor infrastructure; and (3) Delay in receiving adequate treatment due to supply shortages. In Sub-Saharan Africa, these delays are systemic. A woman might decide to seek care, only to find the nearest clinic is 20 kilometers away with no ambulance service, and upon arrival, find that the only nurse on duty has no sterile gloves or oxytocin.

Child mortality follows a similar structural pattern. Millions of children die before their fifth birthday from "Diseases of Poverty" such as pneumonia, diarrhea, and malaria—all of which are treatable with low-cost interventions. The barrier is the "Delivery Gap." When a health system lacks a "Cold Chain" for vaccines or basic oral rehydration salts, the right to life of the child is effectively abandoned. The high rate of neonatal mortality (deaths in the first 28 days) specifically highlights the failure of the "Infrastructure of Birth."

Furthermore, maternal and child health (MCH) is often used as a "Proxy Indicator" for the overall health of a nation. High mortality rates reflect a total system failure—from the lack of clean water (Determinants) to the lack of trained doctors (Workforce) and the burden of user fees (Finance). In South Asia, while some progress has been made, the "Nutrition-Health Nexus" remains a barrier; stunted children grow into women with narrow pelvics, leading to higher risks during childbirth. This intergenerational cycle of ill-health can only be broken through an "Integrated Infrastructure" approach.

The solution to the MCH crisis requires more than just clinical aid; it requires "Legal Accountability." In some nations, maternal death is now a "Reportable Event," and "Maternal Death Surveillance and Response" (MDSR) systems are being used to hold health administrators accountable for systemic failures. By treating every maternal death as a potential "Human Rights Violation," advocates can force governments to invest in the "Infrastructure of Survival." Only when a village clinic in rural Africa has the same "Right to Function" as a hospital in Europe will the promise of health equity be realized.

F. Social Justice and Equity in Health Policy

1. *Health as a Social Justice Issue: The Ethics of Survival*

Healthcare and access to medicine are not merely technical or logistical concerns; they are fundamentally matters of social justice that reflect how a society values human life. At its core, health is a "foundational capability," a concept popularized by Amartya Sen (1999) and Martha Nussbaum (2011), without which an individual cannot exercise other basic rights like political participation, education, or labor. When a child dies from a preventable disease due to poverty, it represents a moral indictment of social structures that distribute life-saving resources based on wealth rather than need. Addressing health disparities is therefore essential to achieving broader social justice because inequality in health is the most intimate and irreversible form of inequality.

The ethical framework of John Rawls (1971) and his "veil of ignorance" provides a compelling argument for health justice: if individuals did not know their social status or birthplace, they would rationally design a system that prioritizes universal health access. From a legal perspective, this is codified in Article 12 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR, 1966), which recognizes the right of everyone to the "highest attainable standard" of health. In a social justice context, this means the state has a duty to eliminate the "structural violence" described by Paul Farmer (2005), which renders certain populations more susceptible to disease and early death.

Furthermore, health disparities are often the result of historical injustices, such as colonialism and systemic exploitation. These forces have left certain groups with fewer resources to protect their health, creating a cycle where poor health leads to further economic marginalization. For example, recent data from the CDC (2022) reveals that life expectancy for Black Americans is significantly lower than for White Americans, a gap rooted in systemic factors. Addressing these gaps is a form of "reparative justice," acknowledging that current health outcomes are inextricably tied to past systemic harms.

The commodification of medicine under global neoliberalism represents a primary challenge to health justice. When life-saving pharmaceuticals are treated as private property under the TRIPS Agreement (1994) rather than common goods, the "right to profit" of corporations is prioritized over the "right to life" of the poor. Thomas Pogge (2008) argues that this creates a "global health hierarchy" where survival is a commodity. Social justice advocates demand that essential medicines be viewed as "Global Public Goods," requiring a radical restructuring of global trade laws to ensure that scientific progress benefits all of humanity.

In the context of the Global South, health justice is also a matter of decolonization. Much of the global health infrastructure is still governed by Northern institutions that often dictate health priorities for the South. Sultana (2022) notes that a social justice approach demands "Health Sovereignty," where communities control their own resources and recognize indigenous medical knowledge. True equity is only possible when the power dynamics of global health are democratized, moving away from paternalistic aid toward genuine partnership and reparations.

Health as social justice necessitates a focus on the "voiceless." Marginalized groups, including refugees and the homeless, often face the worst health outcomes while having the least influence over health policy. A justice-oriented policy must include "procedural justice," ensuring those most affected by inequities are central to decision-making. As Article 25 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights

(UDHR, 1948) implies, health is a prerequisite for dignity; a society cannot claim to be just if the biological integrity of its most vulnerable members is compromised by systemic neglect.

2. The Social Determinants of Health: Non-Medical Drivers of Mortality

The "Social Determinants of Health" (SDH) are the non-medical factors that influence health outcomes—the conditions in which people are born, grow, live, work, and age. According to the World Health Organization (WHO, 2008), these factors account for between 30% and 55% of health outcomes, often outweighing the impact of clinical care. Income and social status are perhaps the greatest predictors of health; globally, those in the lowest income quintile face infant mortality rates that are often double or triple those in the highest quintile. This demonstrates that health is a product of the "upstream" environment.

Education serves as another critical determinant, acting as what many call a "social vaccine." Marmot (2005) consistently demonstrates that higher education levels correlate with healthier children and lower maternal mortality rates. In Sub-Saharan Africa, children born to mothers with no education are statistically more likely to die before age five than those born to mothers with secondary education. This link exists because education increases health literacy and economic agency. Consequently, the right to health is inextricably linked to the Right to Education (Article 13, ICESCR, 1966).

Housing and the physical environment represent the material social determinants. Overcrowded housing and poor sanitation are primary drivers of infectious diseases. General Comment No. 14 (CESCR, 2000) explicitly states that the right to health includes "underlying determinants of health, such as access to safe and potable water and adequate sanitation." Without addressing the "housing-health nexus," medical treatment remains a temporary fix for a structural problem. Spatial injustice in urban slums ensures that the poor face a "double burden" of infectious and chronic diseases.

Race and ethnicity act as structural determinants that shape access to power. In many high-income countries, systemic racism within the medical system leads to poorer quality of care for minority groups. For example, MBRRACE-UK (2021) found that Black women in the UK are four times more likely to die in childbirth than White women. This disparity is not biological but rather the result of cumulative social exclusion and "medical bias." Addressing these inequities requires a "Health in All Policies" (HiAP) approach that tackles racism as a primary public health priority.

Gender is a pervasive determinant that dictates health-seeking behavior and resource allocation. In many societies, women have less agency over reproductive health decisions or household funds for medical care. This creates a gender-based health gap that can only be closed through the implementation of Universal Health Coverage (UHC) and the elimination of discrimination, as mandated by Article 12 of the CEDAW (1979). A gender-transformative approach addresses the power imbalances that prevent women and non-binary individuals from achieving optimal health.

Therefore, employment and working conditions serve as economic determinants. Precarious employment and lack of paid sick leave disproportionately affect low-wage workers, as seen during the COVID-19 pandemic. Protecting the "Right to Safe and Healthy Working Conditions" under Article 7 of the ICESCR (1966) is as vital to public health as the distribution of vaccines. Achieving health equity requires that labor laws be viewed as health interventions, shifting the responsibility from the individual to the structural level.

3. *Equity vs. Equality in Healthcare: The Necessity of Proportionate Response*

In health policy, the distinction between "equality" and "equity" is critical. Equality implies giving everyone the same resources, whereas Equity recognizes that different populations have different starting points and needs. As Sen (1992) argues, a focus on equality of resources can ignore the vastly different "capabilities" individuals have to convert those resources into health. Equity demands "unequal treatment for unequals" to achieve a level playing field, ensuring that resources are distributed proportionately to address specific disadvantages.

Sir Michael Marmot (2005) argues that we must strive for "Equity of Outcome." This means that health policy must be intentionally "pro-poor." For example, an equitable vaccination strategy would not simply offer the vaccine on a first-come, first-served basis—which favors those with internet access and transportation—but would utilize mobile clinics to reach rural or marginalized areas. Equity requires the removal of "barriers to entry" that equality-based policies often ignore, such as language, physical disability, or cultural stigma.

The legal principle of "Substantive Equality" in international human rights law supports this equity approach. It mandates that states take "affirmative action" or "temporary special measures" to assist historically disadvantaged groups. While this may appear as "discrimination" under a strict equality framework, it is a legal requirement under the ICERD (1965) to correct systemic imbalances. In healthcare, this translates to allocating higher budget percentages to territories with higher disease burdens or provide specialized maternal care for low-income populations.

Privatization often promotes a "formal equality" that masks deep "substantive inequity." While everyone may have an "equal right" to buy insurance, the ability to pay is not equally distributed. This leads to a two-tier system where wealth dictates the quality of care. Amartya Sen (1999) argues that the market is an excellent tool for distributing luxuries but a catastrophic one for human capabilities like health. Focusing on equity means asserting that health is a "merit good" that should be de-commodified.

Equity is also essential for "vulnerable populations," such as those with disabilities. An equality-based system might provide standardized care that fails to account for specialized needs. Equity demands "Reasonable Accommodation," as mandated by the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD, 2006). Without an equity lens, these populations are effectively excluded from the health system, even if services are technically "open" to everyone.

In addition, focusing on equity is a prerequisite for "Global Health Security." As the COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated, "no one is safe until everyone is safe." An equal distribution of vaccines that ignores the higher disease burden and lower capacity in the Global South is not only inequitable but strategically flawed. Equity in this context means prioritizing the "periphery" to protect the whole. By placing the needs of the "last and the least" at the center, we move from fragmented national equality to robust global human equity.

4. *Health and Human Rights Frameworks: Making Health Justiciable*

A "Rights-Based Approach" (RBA) to healthcare transforms the patient from a passive recipient of aid into a "right-holder." This framework is grounded in the "AAAQ" standards defined by General Comment No. 14 (CESCR, 2000): Availability, Accessibility, Acceptability, and Quality. These legal benchmarks allow advocates to objectively measure health system performance and use the law to compel reform. By treating health as a binding obligation rather than a policy preference, the RBA provides a powerful tool for marginalized populations.

The "Justiciability" of the right to health is a central component of this framework. In countries like South Africa and Brazil, courts have used constitutional rights to force governments to provide life-saving treatments. For instance, in Minister of Health v. Treatment Action Campaign (2002), the South African Constitutional Court ruled that the government was legally required to provide Nevirapine to prevent mother-to-child transmission of HIV. This demonstrates that a rights-based approach provides a "legal shield" against state neglect.

The RBA also emphasizes the "Right to Information" and "Participation." Under Article 12 of the ICESCR (1966), individuals have the right to participate in decision-making processes that affect their health. This ensures that health policies are not designed in isolation by "experts" but involve the active participation of affected communities. Participation ensures that services are "Acceptable" and "Culturally Appropriate," which increases the utilization of care and respects the dignity of the patient.

Accountability is the most critical pillar of the rights-based framework. An RBA requires the establishment of independent monitoring bodies and transparent "budget tracking" to ensure resources reach intended populations. It moves the discourse from "best efforts" to "binding obligations." When a state fails to reduce maternal mortality despite having the resources, Yamin (2016) argues that an RBA treats this as a "Human Rights Violation" rather than a mere policy failure, allowing for legal and political recourse.

The RBA also addresses the "Extraterritorial Obligations" (ETOs) of states. In a globalized world, the actions of wealthy states directly impact the health of people in other nations. The Maastricht Principles on ETOs (2011) argue that the right to health creates a duty for high-income countries to ensure their international trade and patent agreements do not harm the health of populations in the Global South. This provides a legal basis for challenging pharmaceutical monopolies as cross-border human rights abuses.

Finally, a rights-based approach ensures that health policies prioritize "core obligations," such as access to essential medicines and maternal care. By framing these as fundamental rights, they are protected from austerity measures and political whims. As Lawrence Gostin (2014) argues, the human rights framework is the most powerful tool to ensure human dignity remains the primary objective of health policy. It provides the moral and legal architecture for a world where the right to health is a legally enforceable reality for every human being.

G. Proposed Solutions for Global Health Equity

1. *Comprehensive Policy Reform: Addressing Structural Barriers*

To achieve global health equity, systemic policy reform must occur at both national and international levels to dismantle the legal and economic barriers currently obstructing care. Nationally, governments must transition from regressive health financing models to progressive, tax-funded systems that insulate public health from market volatility. As Gostin (2014) argues, this requires the constitutionalization of the right to health, ensuring that health budgets are protected from austerity measures. Internationally, reform must focus on the regulation of pharmaceutical entities and the modification of trade agreements that currently prioritize intellectual property over human life, as seen in the restrictive nature of the TRIPS Agreement (1994).

Public health governance requires a "Health in All Policies" (HiAP) approach, integrating health objectives into sectors such as trade, environment, and education. This structural shift ensures that health is not treated as a siloed medical issue but as a cross-sectoral priority. National regulatory agencies in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) must also be strengthened to provide robust oversight of both public and private providers. By establishing binding transparency requirements for pharmaceutical pricing and research subsidies, policy-makers can mitigate the information asymmetry that currently allows for predatory pricing models.

2. *Universal Health Coverage (UHC): The Pillar of Inclusion*

The implementation of Universal Health Coverage (UHC) is the most effective mechanism for ensuring that individuals, regardless of socioeconomic background, can access essential services without suffering financial hardship. According to the WHO (2021), UHC is not merely about health insurance but represents a fundamental social contract where the state guarantees a comprehensive package of preventive, curative, and rehabilitative services. As Sen (1999) suggests, UHC is essential for expanding human "capabilities," allowing individuals to lead productive lives free from the constant threat of catastrophic health expenditure.

A rights-based UHC model must prioritize "Economic Accessibility" by abolishing user fees at the point of service, which historically act as a total barrier for the poor. Financing must be "pre-paid and pooled" to ensure that the healthy subsidize the sick and the wealthy subsidize the impoverished. By focusing on primary healthcare (PHC) as the foundation of UHC, states can achieve the greatest health gains per dollar spent. This approach fulfills the "Core Obligations" under General Comment No. 14 (CESCR, 2000), ensuring that maternal care, immunizations, and essential drugs are available to all.

3. *Global Cooperation and Solidarity: Beyond Charity*

Global health disparities cannot be resolved through unilateral action; they require a paradigm shift from "charitable aid" to "international solidarity." This involves the mandatory transfer of medical technology and manufacturing "know-how" from high-income countries (HICs) to regional hubs in the Global South. Sultana (2022) argues that this is a matter of decolonial justice, moving away from a model where the South is a perpetual recipient of Northern "surplus" toward a model of technological sovereignty. This includes the sharing of undisclosed information and trade secrets under Article 39 of TRIPS during health emergencies.

Increased international financing is also required to address the "maximum available resources" mandate of the ICESCR (1966). Proposals such as a global "Financial Transaction Tax" or a "Carbon-Health Levy" could provide sustainable funding for a Global Health Fund, reducing reliance on the fluctuating whims of bilateral donors. Cooperation must also extend to the sharing of medical knowledge and data, ensuring that the Global South is not merely a source of clinical trial subjects but a co-owner of the resulting scientific advancements. Solidarity requires recognizing that in a globalized world, a health threat anywhere is a threat everywhere.

4. *Community Participation: Empowering Local Health Governance*

Community participation is the "missing link" in many health policies, yet it is vital for ensuring that services are "Acceptable" and "Culturally Appropriate." A rights-based approach, as defined by Yamin (2016), demands that affected populations—particularly marginalized groups—be central to the design, implementation, and monitoring of health interventions. This "Bottom-Up" governance ensures that health policies reflect the lived realities of the people they serve, leading to higher utilization rates and better health outcomes. Empowerment involves moving from "consulting" communities to granting them "decisional power" over local health budgets.

Local health governance, through community health committees and village health teams, can bridge the gap between formal institutions and remote populations. These community-led interventions are often more effective at addressing social determinants like sanitation and nutrition than top-down medical programs. By training community members as health advocates, states can foster a culture of "Legal Empowerment," where citizens know their rights and can hold providers accountable for neglect or discrimination. Participation is not just a policy tool; it is a fundamental human right enshrined in Article 12 of the ICESCR.

5. *Reforming the Pharmaceutical Industry: Innovation for the Public Good*

The current pharmaceutical model, driven by monopoly-based patents, systematically neglects diseases that affect the poor while over-investing in "me-too" drugs for wealthy markets. Radical reform involves "decoupling" R&D costs from medicine pricing through alternative models like Medical Prize Funds. As Stiglitz (2006) proposes, these funds would reward innovators with large cash prizes for addressing high-priority global health needs in exchange for placing the resulting patents in the public domain. This ensures that the incentive for innovation remains high while the price of the resulting medicine remains at the low cost of generic production.

Furthermore, the global community must incentivize the production and distribution of generic drugs by simplifying the "Compulsory Licensing" process under Article 31 of TRIPS. Strengthening the generic industry in the Global South creates competitive pressure that naturally lowers prices and increases supply resilience. Reforming the industry also means mandating transparency in R&D spending and clinical trial results, ensuring that public investments in science yield public benefits. By shifting the industry's focus from "Value-Based Pricing" to "Need-Based Innovation," the international community can ensure that the "Right to Life" finally takes precedence over the "Right to Profit."

H. Conclusion

1. *Summary of Key Findings*

This analysis has demonstrated that the global disparity in health outcomes is not a peripheral consequence of development but a structural feature of a systemic architecture that prioritizes commercial interests over human survival. The primary barriers identified—ranging from the legal construction of pharmaceutical monopolies under Article 27(1) of the TRIPS Agreement (1994) to the catastrophic deficits in healthcare infrastructure in the Global South—collectively maintain a "dual system" of health. In this system, medical innovation remains a proprietary luxury for wealthy populations, while marginalized groups are relegated to "medical deserts" characterized by workforce shortages and prohibitive out-of-pocket expenses. These findings underscore that the "crisis of accessibility" is inherently tied to a global legal order that treats the right to health as subordinate to the right to property.

2. Global Health Justice: Toward a Rights-Based Paradigm

The realization of global health equity necessitates a fundamental shift from a market-oriented approach to a rights-based paradigm grounded in the principles of social justice and international human rights law. Reaffirming the standards of General Comment No. 14 (CESCR, 2000)—Availability, Accessibility, Acceptability, and Quality—is essential for making health rights "justiciable" and holding states and non-state actors accountable for systemic neglect. Global health justice requires the de-commodification of essential medicines and the recognition that the "highest attainable standard of health" is a universal entitlement that transcends national borders and economic status. International cooperation must transition from paternalistic aid toward a model of "Health Sovereignty," where the Global South is empowered through technology transfer and regional manufacturing autonomy.

3. Call to Action: Prioritizing the Human Right to Survive

There is an urgent mandate for policymakers, international organizations, and civil society to collaborate in dismantling the structural violence inherent in the current global health architecture. This call to action urges the international community to prioritize the implementation of Universal Health Coverage (UHC) and the total abolition of user fees that currently "expel" the poor from life-saving care. Furthermore, WTO member states must advocate for a permanent "TRIPS-Minus" framework for essential medicines to ensure that intellectual property never again serves as a bottleneck during public health emergencies. We must move beyond rhetorical aspirations and institutionalize a Framework Convention on Global Health (FCGH) to create a legally binding accountability mechanism that places human dignity at the center of global trade and governance.

4. Future Research Directions

As the global health landscape evolves, further research is required to navigate emerging challenges and opportunities for equity. First, the role of digital health technologies and AI must be scrutinized to ensure they bridge existing access gaps rather than creating a new "digital divide" in diagnostics and surveillance. Second, the profound impact of climate change on the resilience of healthcare systems requires a new framework for "Climate-Health Reparations" to assist vulnerable nations in managing environmental health shocks. Finally, continued analysis of "TRIPS-Plus" provisions in bilateral trade agreements is necessary to protect the "policy space" of developing nations. By addressing these frontiers, future research can contribute to a more inclusive and resilient global health order that fulfills the promise of health for all.

I. References

Anaya, S. J. (2004). *Indigenous Peoples in International Law*. Oxford University Press.

Annas, G. J. (2003). *The Rights of Patients: The Authoritative ACLU Guide to the Rights of Patients*. Southern Illinois University Press.

Backman, G., et al. (2008). Health systems and the right to health: an assessment of 150 countries. *The Lancet*, 372(9655), 2047-2085.

Baker, B. K. (2004). *Fundamental Issues in the IPR and Public Health Debate*. South Centre.

CDC. (2022). *Health United States: Life Expectancy by Race and Ethnicity*.

CDC. (2023). *Maternal Mortality Rates in the United States, 2021*. Atlanta: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

CESCR. (2000). *General Comment No. 14: The Right to the Highest Attainable Standard of Health*.

Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR). (2000). *General Comment No. 14: The Right to the Highest Attainable Standard of Health*. UN Doc. E/C.12/2000/4.

Correa, C. M. (2000). *IPR, the WTO and Developing Countries*. Zed Books.

Farmer, P. (2005). *Pathologies of Power: Health, Human Rights, and the New War on the Poor*. University of California Press.

Gostin, L. O. (2014). *Global Health Law*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Ho, C. M. (2011). *Access to Medicine in the Global Economy*. Oxford University Press.

Homsy, J., et al. (2016). *Vertical vs. Horizontal Health Programs in Africa*. Journal of Global Health.

ICESCR. (1966). *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*.

Lancet Commission. (2018). *High-Quality Health Systems in the SDG Era*.

London, L. (2008). What is a human-rights based approach to health and does it matter? *Health and Human Rights*, 10(1), 65-80.

Maastricht Principles. (2011). *Maastricht Principles on Extraterritorial Obligations of States in the Area of ESC Rights*.

Marmot, M. (2005). Social determinants of health inequalities. *The Lancet*, 365(9464), 1099-1104.

Mbembe, A. (2003). Necropolitics. *Public Culture*, 15(1), 11-40.

MBRRACE-UK. (2021). *Maternal Mortality: Saving Lives, Improving Mothers' Care*.

Moon, S. (2009). Medicines as Global Public Goods: The Design of a New Strategy. *Global Health Governance*, 2(2).

Nussbaum, M. C. (2011). *Creating Capabilities: The Human Development Approach*. Harvard University Press.

Pogge, T. (2008). *World Poverty and Human Rights*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Rawls, J. (1971). A *Theory of Justice*. Harvard University Press.

Reichman, J. H. (2009). *Compulsory Licensing of Patented Pharmaceutical Inventions*. Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics.

Ruggie, J. G. (2011). *Just Business: Multinational Corporations and Human Rights*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Sassen, S. (2014). *Expulsions: Brutality and Complexity in the Global Economy*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Sell, S. K. (2003). *Private Power, Public Law*. Cambridge University Press.

Sen, A. (1999). *Development as Freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

South African Constitutional Court. (2002). *Minister of Health v. Treatment Action Campaign* (TAC).

Stiglitz, J. E. (2006). *Making Globalization Work*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Sultana, F. (2022). The unbearable heaviness of climate coloniality. *Political Geography*, 99, 102637.

t'Hoen, E. (2009). *The Private Power of Public Goods: TRIPS, Patents and Access to Essential Medicines*. KEI.

Tobin, J. (2012). *The Right to Health: A Resource in International Law*. Oxford University Press.

Transparency International. (2020). *The Global Corruption Barometer: Health Sector Analysis*. Berlin.

TRIPS. (1994). *Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights*.

UN General Assembly. (1948). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*.

UN General Assembly. (1966). *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights* (ICESCR).

UNICEF. (2023). *The State of the World's Children: For Every Child, Vaccination*.

United Nations. (1966). *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*.

WHO. (2008). *Closing the Gap in a Generation: Health Equity through Action on the Social Determinants of Health*.

WHO. (2021). *Global Health Expenditure Report: A Decade of Spending*. Geneva: World Health Organization.

WHO. (2021). *Universal Health Coverage (UHC) Global Monitoring Report*.

WHO. (2022). *Health Workforce: Global Strategy on Human Resources for Health*. Geneva.

World Bank. (2023). *World Development Indicators: Health Systems*. Washington D.C.

World Health Organization (WHO). (1946). *Constitution of the World Health Organization*.

World Health Organization. (2021). *World Health Statistics 2021: Monitoring Health for the SDGs*. WHO Press.

WTO. (1994). *Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS)*.

WTO. (2001). *Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health (Doha Declaration)*.

Yamin, A. E. (2016). *Power, Suffering, and the Struggle for Dignity*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

***

Acknowledgment

None

Funding Information

None

Conflicting Interest Statement

The authors state that there is no conflict of interest in the publication of this article.

Publishing Ethical and Originality Statement

All authors declared that this work is original and has never been published in any form and in any media, nor is it under consideration for publication in any journal, and all sources cited in this work refer to the basic standards of scientific citation.

Generative AI Statement

N/A