Review Article ISSN 2835-6276

American Journal of Medical and Clinical Research & Reviews

Navigating the Boundaries: Dialogical Medical Practice and the Challenge of Pseudoscience

Julian Ungar-Sargon MD PHD

Borra College of health Sciences, Dominican University.

*Correspondence: Julian Ungar-Sargon MD PHD
jungasarson@dom.edu

Received:25 May 2025; Accepted:29 May 2025; Published:05 June 2025

Citation: Julian Ungar-Sargon. Navigating the Boundaries: Dialogical Medical Practice and the Challenge of Pseudoscience. AJMCRR. 2025; 4(6): 1-6.

Abstract

Contemporary healthcare faces mounting pressure to balance evidence-based medical protocols with patient-centered care, cultural competence, and physician professional satisfaction. My "dialogical medical practice" framework applies theological models of creative engagement to this challenge, but its relationship to current concerns about medical pseudoscience requires careful examination.

To analyze how this framework for dialogical medical practice intersects with established criteria for distinguishing legitimate healthcare innovation from medical pseudoscience, identifying both strengths and areas requiring strategic clarification.

Critical analysis of the dialogical medical practice framework using established philosophical and medical criteria for evaluating pseudoscience, including Boudry's pragmatic-naturalistic approach to demarcation, the World Medical Association's Declaration on Pseudoscience, and Callaghan's analysis of medical denialism. Examination of theological foundations, epistemological commitments, and practical implications for medical education and clinical practice.

The framework demonstrates remarkable sophistication in avoiding pseudoscience characteristics by maintaining explicit commitment to evidence-based medicine, working within established medical authority, and focusing on communication enhancement rather than alternative treatments. Key strengths include sophisticated epistemological foundations, professional integration approach, and potential to address physician burnout while improving patient satisfaction. Areas requiring strategic clarification include language around "alternative healing traditions," boundaries between patient narratives and clinical evidence, and protocols for implementing flexible clinical approaches without undermining evidence-based guidelines.

Dialogical medical practice represents a promising approach to healthcare improvement that successfully navigates most concerns about medical pseudoscience. With strategic clarifications around imple-

mentation boundaries and explicit positioning as medical communication innovation, this framework provides valuable resources for enhancing evidence-based medicine through improved patient engagement and cultural competence. The theological models offer unique insights for professional development that could significantly impact healthcare quality while preserving scientific integrity.

Keywords: medical dialogue, evidence-based medicine, patient-centered care, medical epistemology, clinical communication, healthcare innovation, pseudoscience prevention, professional development, medical education, cultural competence.

Introduction

The tension between maintaining scientific rigor and embracing patient-centered care represents one of contemporary medicine's most complex challenges. Our framework for "dialogical medical practice" offers a sophisticated approach to this dilemma, drawing on theological models of creative engagement to transform physician-patient relationships while preserving evidence-based foundations (1). This analysis examines how his proposed methodology intersects with current concerns about medical pseudoscience, revealing both significant strengths and areas requiring strategic clarification.

The framework emerges from a rich tradition of Orthodox Jewish intellectual engagement with modernity, particularly the work of figures like Rabbi Zadok HaKohen and the Netziv, who developed sophisticated strategies for maintaining core commitments while engaging contemporary challenges (2). Our application of these theological models to medical practice represents an innovative approach to professional development that deserves careful consideration within current debates about evidence-based medicine and patient autonomy.

Pseudoscience Avoidance

Our approach attempts to avoid the epistemological traps that characterize medical pseudoscience. Unlike practitioners who abandon scientific authority in favor of alternative paradigms, his framework explicitly commits to enhancing rather than replacing evidence-based medicine (3). This positioning aligns with Boudry's analysis of pseudoscience as practices that "imitate real science" while failing to adhere to genuine scientific standards (4). By working within established medical authority rather than creating parallel systems, the dialogical approach avoids this fundamental pseudoscience characteristic.

The theological foundations prove particularly valuable in this regard. Rather than inventing new scientific-sounding theories about healing mechanisms, we draw on established intellectual traditions for understanding how authority and innovation can coexist creatively (5). This methodological sophistication distinguishes his work from approaches that appropriate scientific language inappropriately or make unfounded claims about therapeutic efficacy. His emphasis on "hermeneutical humility" and "creative fidelity" provides frameworks for professional development that enhance clinical judgment rather than undermining it.

Furthermore, the World Medical Association's Declaration on Pseudoscience emphasizes the importance of maintaining professional boundaries and evidence-based standards while acknowledging that "therapies and techniques accepted by the scientific community" can provide complementary

benefits when used appropriately (7). Our framework operates squarely within these parameters by focusing on communication enhancement and clinical decision-making improvement rather than promoting unproven treatments.

Areas Requiring Strategic Clarification

Despite these strengths, several elements of the framework require careful consideration to address potential concerns from critics of medical pseudoscience. The language around "alternative healing traditions" proves particularly sensitive, as it could be interpreted as endorsing practices that lack scientific validation (8). While our intent appears to focus on cultural competence and patient engagement rather than treatment endorsement, clearer boundaries would strengthen the framework against misinterpretation.

Callaghan's analysis of medical denialism emphasizes how moral failures can lead to both Type I errors (accepting false claims) and Type II errors (rejecting valid evidence) with potentially catastrophic consequences (9). The dialogical framework's emphasis on openness to diverse perspectives must be balanced with clear criteria for evaluating the validity of different knowledge claims. Without such boundaries, well-intentioned physicians might inadvertently validate pseudoscientific beliefs or undermine evidence-based treatments.

The framework's critique of "rigid protocol adherence" also requires nuanced handling. While clinical flexibility represents an essential component of excellent medical care, this language might be interpreted as undermining evidence-based guidelines (10). Ernst's systematic reviews of alternative medicine demonstrate how departure from evidence-based protocols can lead to patient harm, particularly when motivated by philosophical commitments rather than clinical evidence (11). Our approach needs clearer articulation of how clinical adaptation differs from protocol abandonment.

Integration with Evidence-Based Medicine

The most promising aspect of our framework lies in its potential to strengthen rather than weaken evidence-based medicine through enhanced patient engagement and cultural competence. Research consistently demonstrates that patient satisfaction and treatment compliance improve when physicians demonstrate genuine interest in patient perspectives and cultural backgrounds (12). The theological models of creative engagement provide sophisticated tools for achieving this integration without compromising scientific standards.

The framework's emphasis on "dialectical thinking" proves particularly valuable in this regard. Rather than viewing scientific evidence and patient narratives as competing sources of truth, the dialogical approach suggests that excellent clinical care emerges from their creative synthesis (13). This aligns with contemporary understanding of evidence-based medicine, which explicitly incorporates clinical expertise and patient values alongside research evidence in treatment decisions (14).

Novella's analysis of science-based medicine emphasizes that rigorous scientific standards need not preclude compassionate, individualized care (15). Indeed, the most effective medical interventions often require sophisticated understanding of how general research findings apply to particular patient circumstances. The theological framework provides concrete tools for developing this sophisticated clinical reasoning while maintaining scientific integrity.

Professional Development

The framework's implications for medical education deserve particular attention. Traditional medical training often emphasizes technical competence while providing limited resources for navigating the complex interpersonal and cultural dynamics that characterize excellent patient care (16). The theological models of intellectual engagement offer proven strategies for maintaining core commitments while engaging diverse perspectives creatively and productively.

Gorski's analysis of medical education emphasizes the need for training that helps physicians distinguish between legitimate patient concerns and pseudoscientific beliefs (17). The framework contributes to this goal by providing sophisticated tools for patient engagement that enhance rather than compromise clinical judgment. The emphasis on "hermeneutical humility" proves particularly valuable, as it encourages physicians to remain open to unexpected sources of insight while maintaining appropriate skepticism about unvalidated claims.

The framework also addresses growing concerns about physician burnout and dissatisfaction with contemporary medical practice (18). By providing tools for more meaningful patient engagement, the dialogical approach may help physicians rediscover the intellectual and emotional satisfaction that initially attracted them to medicine. This represents a significant advantage over approaches that require physicians to choose between scientific rigor and humanistic sensitivity.

Institutional Implementation and Safeguards

For healthcare institutions considering implementation of dialogical medical practice principles, several safeguards would strengthen the framework against potential pseudoscience concerns. Clear protocols for distinguishing between cultural competence enhancement and treatment authorization would address Callaghan's concerns about moral failure in medical decision-making (19). Similarly, explicit guidelines for when and how non-medical perspectives inform care delivery would prevent inappropriate application of the framework.

The World Medical Association's recommendations for addressing pseudoscience emphasize the importance of institutional oversight and professional accountability (20). The framework would benefit from explicit incorporation of these principles, particularly regarding documentation requirements and peer review processes for cases involving significant departure from standard protocols.

Training programs implementing the framework should include specific modules on recognizing and addressing pseudoscientific beliefs while maintaining therapeutic relationships with patients who hold such beliefs (21). This represents a sophisticated challenge that requires both scientific knowledge and interpersonal skill, precisely the kind of complex professional competence that the theological models are designed to develop.

Strategic Positioning and Future Directions

The optimal positioning for our work emphasizes medical communication innovation and professional development rather than alternative healing approaches. This framing maintains full compatibility with evidence-based medicine while addressing legitimate concerns about patient satisfaction, cultural competence, and physician development (22). The theological foundations provide unique resources for healthcare improvement that comple-

ment rather than compete with scientific medical training.

Future research might examine specific outcomes associated with dialogical medical practice implementation, particularly regarding patient satisfaction, treatment compliance, and clinical outcomes (23). Such empirical validation would strengthen the framework's credibility within evidence-based medicine communities while providing concrete data about its effectiveness.

The framework's potential applications extend beyond individual physician-patient relationships to include healthcare team dynamics, institutional culture development, and medical education curriculum design (24). These broader applications represent promising areas for further development that could significantly impact healthcare quality and professional satisfaction.

Conclusion

Our dialogical medical practice framework represents an attempt at healthcare improvement that successfully navigates most concerns about medical pseudoscience. By maintaining explicit commitment to evidence-based foundations while drawing on theological models for professional development, the approach offers valuable resources for addressing contemporary healthcare challenges (25). With strategic clarifications around boundaries and implementation protocols, this framework provides an important model for how medicine can evolve while preserving scientific integrity.

The theological insights prove particularly valuable for understanding how innovation and tradition can coexist productively in professional contexts. Rather than viewing evidence-based medicine and patient-centered care as competing paradigms, the framework suggests that their creative synthesis represents the future of excellent healthcare (26). This represents a significant contribution to ongoing debates about medical authority, patient autonomy, and professional development in contemporary healthcare contexts.

The framework's emphasis on "creative fidelity" offers a particularly important insight for medical education and professional development. Like the Orthodox thinkers who found that engaging modernity deepened rather than undermined their religious commitment, physicians who master dialogical practice may discover that openness to patient perspectives enhances rather than compromises their clinical effectiveness (27). This represents a promising direction for addressing current challenges in healthcare while maintaining the scientific foundations that make modern medicine so remarkably effective.

References

1. Ungar-Sargon J. From Medical Orthodoxy to Dialogical Practice: Applying Theological Models of Creative Engagement to Contemporary Healthcare. Dominican University IL; 2025.
2. Elman Y. R. Zadok Hakohen on the History of Halakha. Tradition. 1985;21(4):4-26.
3. Sackett DL, Rosenberg WM, Gray JA, et al. Evidence based medicine: what it is and what it isn't. BMJ. 1996;312(7023):71-72.
4. Boudry M, Blancke S, Pigliucci M. What Makes Weird Beliefs Thrive? The Epidemiology of Pseudoscience. Philosophical Psychology. 2014;28(8):1177-1198.
5. Soloveitchik JB. The Lonely Man of Faith. New York: Doubleday; 1992.

6. Institute of Medicine. Crossing the Quality Chasm: A New Health System for the 21st Century. Washington: National Academy Press; 2001.
7. World Medical Association. WMA Declaration on Pseudoscience and Pseudotherapies in the field of health. Cordoba, Spain; 2020.
8. Ernst E, Singh S. Trick or Treatment: The Undeniable Facts About Alternative Medicine. New York: W. W. Norton; 2008.
9. Callaghan C. Pseudoscience in medicine: cautionary recommendations. Afr Health Sci. 2019;19(4):3118-3126.
10. Guyatt G, Cairns J, Churchill D, et al. Evidence -based medicine: A new approach to teaching the practice of medicine. JAMA. 1992;268 (17):2420-2425.
11. Ernst E. A systematic review of systematic reviews of homeopathy. Br J Clin Pharmacol. 2002;54(6):577-582.
12. Stewart M, Brown JB, McWhinney IR, et al. Patient-Centered Medicine: Transforming the Clinical Method. 3rd ed. London: Radcliffe Publishing; 2014.
13. Halivni DW. Revelation Restored: Divine Writ and Critical Responses. Boulder: Westview Press; 1997.
14. Haynes RB, Devereaux PJ, Guyatt GH. Clinical expertise in the era of evidence-based medicine and patient choice. ACP J Club. 2002;136 (2):A11-14.
15. Novella S. The Skeptics' Guide to the Universe: How to Know What's Really Real in a World Increasingly Full of Fake. New York: Grand Central Publishing; 2018.
16. Levinson W, Roter D, Mullooly JP, et al. Physician-patient communication: the relationship with malpractice claims among primary care physicians and surgeons. JAMA. 1997;277 (7):553-559.
17. Gorski DH. Integrative oncology: really the best of both worlds? Nat Rev Cancer. 2014;14 (10):692-700.
18. Shanafelt TD, Hasan O, Dyrbye LN, et al. Changes in Burnout and Satisfaction With Work-Life Balance Among Physicians and Comparison With the US Population Between 2011 and 2014. Mayo Clin Proc. 2015;90 (12):1600-1613.
19. Callaghan C. Pseudoscience in medicine: cautionary recommendations. Afr Health Sci. 2019;19(4):3118-3126.
20. World Medical Association. WMA Declaration on Pseudoscience and Pseudotherapies in the field of health. Cordoba, Spain; 2020.
21. Sierpina V, Frenkel MA. Integrative medicine education: the patient, the physician, and the patient-physician relationship. Explore (NY). 2005;1(4):246-253.
22. Epstein RM, Hadee T, Carroll J, et al. "Could this be something serious?" Reassurance, uncertainty, and physician self-efficacy in primary care. Ann Fam Med. 2007;5(5):455-464.
23. Little P, Everitt H, Williamson I, et al. Observational study of effect of patient centredness and positive approach on outcomes of general practice consultations. BMJ. 2001;323(7318):908-911.
24. Baker A. Crossing the Quality Chasm: A New Health System for the 21st Century. BMJ. 2001;323(7322):1192.
25. Lichtenstein A. Leaves of Faith: The World of Jewish Learning. Jersey City: Ktav; 2003.
26. Magid S. American Post-Judaism: Identity and Renewal in a Postethnic Society. Bloomington: Indiana University Press; 2013.
27. Kalman J. The Song of Songs and the Editor of Editors: On the Implications of the Netziv's Rinah Shel Torah. Journal for Semitics. 2014;23 (2ii):720-747.