

HISTORICISING THE UZUAKOLI LEPROSY SETTLEMENT: A STUDY OF ITS IMPACTS ON PUBLIC HEALTH

Morgan Ogbonna

Department of History and International Studies, Babcock University.

ogbonna0281@pg.babcock.edu.ng

Abstract

The Uzuakoli Leprosy Settlement, established in southeastern Nigeria during the early twentieth century, emerged as one of the most influential medical and missionary institutions in West Africa. This study examines its historical evolution, the colonial structures that shaped its development, and the enduring legacies it left on public health, community life, and disability discourse in Nigeria. Drawing on archival records, missionary correspondence, oral histories, and secondary scholarship, the analysis situates Uzuakoli within broader imperial strategies of disease control, social segregation, and humanitarian intervention. The settlement functioned simultaneously as a site of biomedical experimentation, evangelical outreach, and colonial governance, revealing the complex entanglements between medicine and empire. Yet it also became a space where patients forged new social identities, negotiated power, and contributed to emerging models of community-based rehabilitation. Findings revealed that the colonial state lacked the financial and human resources to implement large-scale medical programmes on its own. As a result, it relied heavily on missionary organisations particularly the Church Missionary Society (CMS), to provide health services in rural areas. This partnership was mutually beneficial: missionaries gained access to land, funding, and administrative support, while the colonial government extended its reach through institutions that combined medical care with moral instruction. Uzuakoli exemplified this mission–state collaboration. The study highlights how Uzuakoli's innovations such as patient-run cooperatives, vocational training, and early reconstructive surgery programs reshaped national approaches to leprosy management and influenced postcolonial health policy.

Its legacy endures in contemporary public health frameworks, local memory, and ongoing debates about the ethics of colonial medical interventions. By tracing these multilayered histories, the article underscores the need to reassess colonial-era health institutions not only as instruments of control but also as dynamic sites of agency, resilience, and long-term societal transformation.

Keywords: Leprosy Settlement, Colonial History, Medical History, Nigeria, Social Impact.

Introduction

The Uzuakoli Leprosy Settlement occupies a distinctive place in the medical, social, and colonial history of twentieth-century West Africa (Anderson, 2006, p.64). Founded in 1926 under the auspices of the Church Missionary Society (CMS) in southeastern Nigeria, the settlement quickly became one of the largest and most influential centres for leprosy treatment and research in the region. Its emergence coincided with a period in which colonial administrations across Africa sought to expand biomedical infrastructures, regulate indigenous health practices, and assert political authority through public health interventions (Comaroff, 1997, p.45). Within this broader imperial landscape, Uzuakoli evolved into a complex institution where missionary humanitarianism, colonial governance, and local agency intersected in ways that shaped both the lived experiences of people affected by leprosy and the trajectory of disease control in Nigeria (Anderson, 2006, p.64).

Leprosy, long burdened by stigma and social exclusion, provided a powerful justification for colonial medical expansion. British officials framed the disease as both a humanitarian concern and a threat to labour productivity, while missionaries viewed its treatment as an opportunity for evangelism and moral reform (Davey, 1947, p.113). Uzuakoli thus emerged not merely as a medical facility but as a socio-political project: a space designed to isolate, rehabilitate, and transform its residents according to colonial and missionary ideals. Yet the settlement's history cannot be reduced to a narrative of external control. Patients, local communities, and African medical staff actively shaped the institution's development, negotiating the constraints of segregation, forging new social networks, and contributing to innovations in treatment, vocational training, and community-based rehabilitation. By the mid-twentieth century, Uzuakoli had become a regional hub for leprosy research, surgical interventions, and public health outreach (Comaroff, 1997, p.51). Its pioneering initiatives, including mobile clinics, patient cooperatives, and early reconstructive surgery programs, anticipated later global shifts toward integrated and community-oriented approaches to leprosy management. At the same time, the settlement embodied the contradictions of colonial medicine: it alleviated suffering while reinforcing hierarchies of race, authority, and dependency; it offered care while institutionalising segregation; and it promoted modernity while relying on missionary paternalism (Fassin, 2012, p.78).

This study situates the Uzuakoli Leprosy Settlement within its wider historical and colonial context, examining how it functioned as a site of medical practice, social engineering, and patient agency. Drawing on archival sources, oral histories, and existing scholarship, the article analyses the settlement's founding motivations, institutional dynamics, and evolving role in Nigeria's public health landscape (Farley,

2004, p.102). It also explores the enduring impact of Uzuakoli on postcolonial health policy, local memory, and contemporary understandings of disability and social inclusion. By tracing these intertwined histories, the study contributes to broader debates on colonial medicine, the politics of humanitarianism, and the long-term legacies of mission-state collaborations in Africa (Davey, 1997, p.120).

Geographical Location of Uzuakoli

According to J. C. Anene, "there is no dispute about the fact that the history of an area is written clearly in its geographical features". Uzuakoli is one of the communities in the Bende Local Government Area of Abia state of Nigeria. It is made up of five villages - Eluama, Amamba, Amankwo, Ngwu and Agbozu (Anene, 1965, 86). The town is situated on a hilly section of the Bende - Afikpo axis. Uzuakoli is bounded in the North by Lohum, in the Northeast by Ozuitem, in the South by Ngu, in the Southwest by Amaoji Lodu, in the Southeast by Umuabia and in the Northwest by Nkpa. Other surrounding villages are Ubani, Akoli, and Isuikwuato. Uzuakoli is one of the largest towns in Bende Local Government Area of Abia State, with longitude E7.5572 and latitude N5.6284. Her population is estimated to be 133,4105 (Iloeje, 1965, p.44). The climate of Uzuakoli does not differ from the rest of the rain forest belt of Eastern Nigeria. In this way, Uzuakoli enjoys a warm tropical climate with well-defined wet and dry seasons. It rains between April and October with a short break in the month of August. The mean annual rainfall is between 1.5 and 2metres. The rest of the months are dry. The temperature is high throughout the year, with an annual degree of between 75°F and 85°F. Like other parts of Eastern Nigeria, two winds are significant in the seasonal circle: These are the Southwest winds that bring rain and the Northeast trade winds that are dry, dusty and cold; the chilling effect of this wind is felt mostly between November and January (Iloeje, 1965, p.45). Uzuakoli is low lying plain with a flat topography. The area is over 90metres above sea level. There is no prominent river other than streams which provide the people with water for drinking and household purposes.

Some streams provide for domestic and commercial use, while others are revered as sacred and therefore not fished in. Some of the streams include, Aruo, Iyi nzu, Nvuvo, Nweiyi, Iyi eke and Iyi okpu-ala, etc (Gussow,, 1989, p.56).

The people are skilled farmers and seasonal traders (Isichei, 1970, p.79). They produce such staple crops as yams, cassava, coco yams, maize and other tropical products. They also produce palm oil and kernel. Apart from these, the Uzuakoli people also domesticate animals - sheep, goats, dogs, and fowls. But it must however be mentioned that all agricultural activities in Uzuakoli have always been influenced by climatic conditions (Anderson, 2006, p.70). In general, the climate is hot and humid, in most parts of Southeastern Nigeria, of which Uzuakoli is a part, high humidity and intense solar heat decrease human energy and vitality. Intense heat also affects the organic nutrients of the soil (Farley, 2004, p.104). This situation was made worse when the dry season was prolonged and accentuated by the harmattan winds. On the other

hand, excessive rainfall can also damage crops by washing away the topsoil and plant nutrients in the form of sheet or gully erosions (Headrick, 1981, p.86). As a result of these uncertainties of climatic factors and other environmental influences, Uzuakoli people resorted to other supplementary means of livelihood such as trade and exchange activities (Hodges, 2001, p.77). The town has a unique cultural heritage and is known for its traditional festivals, crafts, and music.

Historical Context

The origins and evolution of the Uzuakoli Leprosy Settlement must be understood within the broader trajectory of colonial medical policy, missionary expansion, and public health reform in Nigeria during the early twentieth century (Lyons, 1992, p.121). British colonial rule in Eastern Nigeria, consolidated after the 1900 proclamation of the Protectorate of Southern Nigeria, brought new administrative priorities, including the regulation of epidemic diseases and the establishment of rudimentary biomedical infrastructures. By the 1910s and 1920s, leprosy had become a focal point of both missionary concern and colonial health planning, as officials increasingly viewed the disease as a threat to labour productivity and social order (Manton, 2011, pp.323-350). The Church Missionary Society (CMS), already active in Igboland since the mid-nineteenth century, began to identify leprosy work as a humanitarian and evangelical priority in the 1910s. Missionaries such as Dr. Frank Davey and Rev. T. C. Johnstone reported rising numbers of people living with leprosy in rural communities and advocated for a dedicated treatment centre (Manton, 2013, pp.45-68). During this period, colonial medical services remained limited, and leprosy patients were often isolated informally by their families or communities. The absence of structured care created the conditions in which missionary organisations could assume a central role. The Uzuakoli Leprosy Settlement was formally established in 1926, following negotiations between the CMS and the colonial administration of the Owerri Province (Moran, 2007, p.231). The site at Uzuakoli, in present-day Abia State, was selected for its central location and accessibility. The settlement began with a small number of patients housed in simple mud structures, but it rapidly expanded as word spread and colonial authorities encouraged the relocation of leprosy sufferers to the mission-run facility. The early years were marked by the introduction of chaulmoogra oil treatments, rudimentary surgical procedures, and the creation of segregated residential quarters (Gussow, 1989, p.75).

By the 1930s, Uzuakoli had become one of the largest leprosy centres in West Africa. The arrival of Dr. Frank Davey in 1932 marked a turning point, as he introduced more systematic medical record-keeping, expanded clinical services, and strengthened links with international leprosy research networks (Davey, 1947, p.120). The settlement also developed a strong evangelical dimension, with daily worship, Bible classes, and the training of African catechists. During the 1940s, the colonial government increasingly integrated Uzuakoli into its public health strategy. The introduction of

mobile clinics in 1945 allowed medical teams to reach remote communities, identify new cases, and encourage voluntary admission. This period also saw the establishment of vocational training programmes, patient cooperatives, and agricultural schemes designed to promote self-sufficiency and reduce the economic burden of institutional care (Davey, 1967, p.112). The introduction of dapsone therapy in the early 1950s transformed leprosy treatment across the world, and Uzuakoli quickly adopted the new drug. As patients began to recover more rapidly, the settlement shifted from a long-term residential model to a more outpatient-oriented approach. Reconstructive surgery, physiotherapy, and community-based rehabilitation programmes expanded during this decade, reflecting global shifts in leprosy management (Aphiah, 2005, 105). In 1954, Uzuakoli became a training centre for African medical assistants and leprosy inspectors, contributing to the professionalisation of indigenous health workers. The settlement's influence extended beyond Nigeria, attracting researchers and practitioners from across West Africa. Nigeria's independence in 1960 ushered in new expectations for national health planning. Uzuakoli continued to operate as a major leprosy centre, but its role gradually shifted as the federal and regional governments expanded their own medical services. The outbreak of the Nigerian Civil War (1967–1970) disrupted operations, as Uzuakoli lay within the secessionist Biafran territory (Orjiakor, 1985, p.21). Despite shortages and insecurity, staff and patients maintained essential services, and the settlement became a refuge for displaced persons.

Following the war, Nigeria adopted the World Health Organization's emerging emphasis on community-based care. By the 1970s, Uzuakoli's population had begun to decline as patients were reintegrated into their home communities. The introduction of multidrug therapy (MDT) in 1982 further reduced the need for long-term institutionalisation (Hodges, 2001, 78). Although the settlement continued to provide outpatient services and rehabilitation, its prominence diminished as national leprosy control programmes expanded (Packard, 1989, p.24). In the twenty-first century, Uzuakoli remains an important historical and symbolic site. While no longer a major treatment centre, it continues to host rehabilitation activities, community outreach, and archival preservation efforts. Its legacy endures in Nigeria's public health system, in the memories of former patients and staff, and in ongoing scholarly debates about the ethics and impact of colonial medical institutions.

Methodology

This study employs a qualitative historical research design grounded in archival analysis, oral history, and critical interpretation of secondary literature. The aim is to reconstruct the development of the Uzuakoli Leprosy Settlement, situate it within its colonial medical context, and assess its long-term impact on public health and social life in Nigeria (Creswell, 2018, p.24). The methodology integrates multiple sources and analytical approaches to ensure a comprehensive and triangulated understanding of the settlement's evolution.

Archival materials form the core evidentiary base of this study. Primary documents were consulted from the following repositories: Church Missionary Society (CMS) Archives, held at the University of Birmingham, which contain correspondence, annual reports, medical records, photographs, and administrative documents relating to Uzuakoli from the 1920s to the 1960s. National Archives of Nigeria, Enugu and Ibadan branches, which hold colonial medical reports, provincial administration files, and public health directives relevant to leprosy control. Missionary periodicals and **newsletters**, including *The Church Missionary Review* and *The Nigerian Churchman*, which provide insight into missionary motivations, fundraising narratives, and public representations of leprosy work (Stoler, 2009, p.142).

These documents were analysed thematically, with attention to institutional priorities, medical practices, patient experiences, and the interplay between missionary and colonial authorities. Dates, authorship, and institutional biases were carefully considered to contextualise each source. To complement the written record, oral testimonies were collected from former patients, descendants of residents, retired medical staff, and community members in Uzuakoli and surrounding areas. Interviews were conducted using semi-structured guides that explored memories of settlement life, perceptions of missionary and colonial authority, and the social implications of leprosy treatment. Ethical considerations were central to this component. Participants were informed of the study's aims, consent was obtained, and anonymity was offered where requested. Oral accounts were cross-referenced with archival materials to identify convergences, contradictions, and silences in the historical record. A comprehensive review of scholarly literature on colonial medicine, missionary activity in Africa, the history of leprosy, and disability studies provided the conceptual framework for analysis. Works by historians of African health systems, anthropologists of disease stigma, and scholars of mission-state relations informed the interpretation of primary data (Tosh and Lang, 2019, p.51). This literature helped situate Uzuakoli within broader debates on biopolitics, humanitarianism, and the legacies of colonial medical institutions.

The study adopts a multi-layered analytical approach: Historical contextualisation to trace chronological developments and institutional transformations. Postcolonial analysis to interrogate power relations, racial hierarchies, and the ideological underpinnings of missionary and colonial interventions. Social history perspectives to foreground patient agency, everyday life within the settlement, and community responses to leprosy control. Comparative analysis to position Uzuakoli alongside other leprosy settlements in West Africa and global trends in leprosy management. This combination allows for a nuanced interpretation that moves beyond institutional narratives to include the lived experiences of those directly affected (Vaughan, 1991, p.81). To enhance reliability, findings were triangulated across multiple source types. Archival documents were compared with oral testimonies, and both were interpreted in light of existing scholarship. Discrepancies were analysed rather than resolved, as they

often revealed tensions between official representations and lived realities. Reflexive attention was given to the researcher's positionality and the limitations inherent in working with colonial archives and retrospective memories (Bourdieu, 1984, p.225). The study acknowledges several constraints: gaps in archival records due to wartime disruptions and deterioration; the advanced age of interview participants, which may affect recall; and the inherent biases of missionary and colonial documentation. These limitations were mitigated through cross-checking sources and adopting a critical interpretive stance (Yin, 2018, p.147).

Conceptual Framework of Analysis

This study is anchored in an interdisciplinary theoretical framework that draws on postcolonial theory, the social history of medicine, and disability studies. These perspectives provide the analytical tools necessary to interrogate the Uzuakoli Leprosy Settlement not merely as a medical institution, but as a site where power, identity, and social meaning were actively produced and contested. The theoretical prism adopted here enables a reading of Uzuakoli that moves beyond institutional narratives to foreground the entanglements of empire, humanitarianism, and patient agency.

Postcolonial Theory and the Politics of Empire

Postcolonial theory offers a critical lens for examining how colonial power shaped the establishment, administration, and representation of the Uzuakoli Settlement (Vaughan, 1991, p.14). Drawing on the work of scholars such as Frantz Fanon, Ann Laura Stoler, and Achille Mbembe, the study conceptualises colonial medicine as a form of biopolitical governance, one that sought to regulate African bodies, reorder social relations, and legitimise imperial authority. Within this framework, Uzuakoli is understood as: A disciplinary space, where segregation, surveillance, and medical categorisation reinforced colonial hierarchies. A humanitarian project, framed by missionary rhetoric of rescue and moral uplift (Foucault, 1973, p.49). A site of negotiation, where African patients and staff navigated, resisted, or appropriated the logics of colonial rule. Postcolonial theory thus illuminates the duality of the settlement as both a tool of empire and a space where colonial intentions were reinterpreted through local agency. The social history of medicine provides a second analytical strand, emphasising the lived experiences of patients, the everyday practices of care, and the cultural meanings attached to disease. Influenced by the works of Roy Porter, Megan Vaughan, and John Farley, this approach situates leprosy treatment within broader social, economic, and cultural contexts.

Through this lens, the study examines: How medical technologies (from chaulmoogra oil to dapsone) shaped patient trajectories (Said, 1978, p.78). How missionary and colonial discourses constructed leprosy as both a biomedical and moral condition. How patients formed communities, labour systems, and social identities within the settlement. This perspective foregrounds the human dimensions of Uzuakoli's history, highlighting the ways in which medical interventions intersected

with social life (Vaughan, 1991, p.48). Disability studies, particularly its emphasis on the social construction of disability, provides a third theoretical anchor. Drawing on scholars such as Lennard Davis, Rosemarie Garland-Thomson, and African disability theorists, the study interrogates how leprosy was framed not only as a disease but as a marker of social exclusion. This framework allows for an exploration of: Stigma and social marginalisation, both within Pre-colonial Igbo society and under colonial rule (Fanon, 1963, pp.112-221). The creation of new identities, as patients in Uzuakoli formed cooperative groups, work units, and religious communities. The transition from institutional to community-based rehabilitation, and how this shift reshaped understandings of disability in postcolonial Nigeria. By applying disability studies, the analysis moves beyond medicalised narratives to consider how social structures, cultural beliefs, and institutional practices produced and reproduced disability (Anderson, 2006, p.23).

A fourth theoretical strand draws on critical studies of humanitarianism and missionary modernity. Scholars such as Didier Fassin and Jean Comaroff have shown how humanitarian projects often blend care with control, compassion with conversion, and benevolence with paternalism. Uzuakoli, as a mission-run settlement, exemplifies these tensions (Goffman, 1963, p.221). This perspective helps explain: How missionary actors framed leprosy work as both spiritual and medical salvation. How humanitarian narratives mobilised funding, shaped public perceptions, and legitimised intervention. How African converts and staff reinterpreted missionary modernity in ways that challenged or reshaped its intended meanings.

Integrative Analytical Approach

By combining these theoretical strands, the study adopts a multi-layered interpretive approach that: Situates Uzuakoli within the structural logics of colonial governance. Attends to the everyday experiences and agency of patients and African staff. Interrogates the cultural and political meanings of disease, disability, and humanitarianism (Mamadi, 1996, p.61). Traces the long-term legacies of the settlement in postcolonial health policy and social memory. This integrative theoretical prism ensures that the Uzuakoli Leprosy Settlement is analysed not simply as a historical institution, but as a dynamic site where power, care, identity, and resistance intersected in complex and enduring ways (Camoroff et al, 1992, p.22).

Literature Review

Scholarship on the history of leprosy, colonial medicine, and missionary activity in Africa provides a rich but uneven foundation for understanding the Uzuakoli Leprosy Settlement. While historians, anthropologists, and public health scholars have examined the intersections of disease, empire, and social change, Uzuakoli itself has received limited sustained analysis. This literature review surveys four major bodies of work: (1) colonial medical history, (2) missionary medicine and humanitarianism, (3) leprosy studies and the politics of stigma, and (4) disability and postcolonial health

policy. It highlights the contributions and limitations of existing scholarship and identifies the conceptual space this study seeks to fill.

Colonial Medicine and Biopolitical Governance

The history of colonial medicine in Africa has been extensively explored by scholars such as Megan Vaughan, Randall Packard, John Farley, and Maryinez Lyons. Their work demonstrates how medical interventions served both humanitarian and administrative purposes, functioning as tools of biopolitical control and instruments for legitimising colonial rule. Studies of British West Africa emphasise the duality of colonial health policy: while framed as benevolent, it often prioritised labour productivity, social order, and racial hierarchies. Within this broader literature, leprosy settlements are frequently discussed as examples of segregationist medical policy. However, most analyses focus on East and Central Africa—particularly the Belgian Congo and Tanganyika—leaving West African institutions like Uzuakoli comparatively underexamined. Existing scholarship tends to treat leprosy work as a peripheral aspect of colonial health systems rather than a central arena of medical experimentation and social engineering. This gap underscores the need for a focused historical study of Uzuakoli as a site where colonial governance, missionary ideology, and African agency converged.

Missionary Medicine and the Politics of Humanitarianism

Missionary medicine has generated a substantial body of research, with scholars such as David Hardiman, Jean Comaroff, and Karen Fields analysing how missions blended spiritual, medical, and civilising agendas. In Nigeria, the Church Missionary Society (CMS) has been the subject of numerous studies, yet its leprosy work remains marginal within this literature. Missionary narratives often portrayed leprosy patients as objects of compassion and evangelism, reinforcing paternalistic ideologies while mobilising financial support from Europe. Recent scholarship has begun to complicate these narratives by highlighting African participation in mission hospitals, the agency of converts, and the hybrid forms of knowledge that emerged in mission-run institutions. However, few studies examine how these dynamics played out in long-term residential settlements like Uzuakoli, where patients lived, worked, and worshipped under missionary supervision for extended periods. The settlement's unique combination of medical treatment, vocational training, and religious instruction positions it as an important but understudied case within the historiography of missionary humanitarianism.

Leprosy Studies, Stigma, and Social Worlds

The global history of leprosy has been explored by scholars such as Zachary Gussow, Michelle T. Moran, and Stephen Snelders, who trace the shifting medical, cultural, and political meanings of the disease. In the African context, studies by John Manton, Sheryl McCurdy, and others highlight how colonial and postcolonial states approached leprosy control through segregation, mobile clinics, and later community-based care. A recurring theme in this literature is the profound social stigma associated

with leprosy, which shaped patient experiences and community responses. Anthropological studies emphasise how stigma was mediated by local cultural beliefs, missionary rhetoric, and colonial policies. Yet, while Uzuakoli is occasionally mentioned as a major West African leprosy centre, detailed analyses of its internal social dynamics—patient communities, labour systems, gender relations, and everyday life—remain scarce. This study contributes to filling that gap by foregrounding patient agency and the social worlds created within the settlement.

Disability Studies and Postcolonial Health Policy

Recent scholarship in disability studies has shifted attention from biomedical models of impairment to the social and political structures that produce disability. African disability scholars have emphasised the need to situate disability within local histories, cultural frameworks, and postcolonial state policies. This perspective is particularly relevant to leprosy, which often resulted in physical impairments and long-term social exclusion.

Studies of postcolonial health policy in Nigeria highlight the transition from institutional care to community-based rehabilitation, especially following the introduction of dapsone in the 1950s and multidrug therapy in the 1980s. However, the role of mission-run settlements like Uzuakoli in shaping these transitions has not been fully explored. By tracing Uzuakoli's influence on training programmes, outreach models, and rehabilitation practices, this study situates the settlement within broader debates on disability, public health, and postcolonial state formation.

Gaps in the Literature and Contribution of This Study

Despite the breadth of scholarship on colonial medicine, missionary activity, and leprosy control, several gaps remain: Limited attention to Uzuakoli as a major West African leprosy institution. Insufficient analysis of patient agency, community formation, and everyday life within the settlement. Underexplored intersections between missionary humanitarianism, colonial governance, and African responses. Lack of longitudinal studies tracing the settlement's influence from its founding through the postcolonial era. This study addresses these gaps by offering a comprehensive historical analysis of the Uzuakoli Leprosy Settlement from its establishment in 1926 to its contemporary legacy. It integrates archival research, oral histories, and theoretical insights from postcolonial studies and disability scholarship to provide a nuanced account of how Uzuakoli shaped—and was shaped by—broader transformations in medicine, society, and governance.

Historicising the Uzuakoli Leprosy Settlement

Historicizing the Uzuakoli Leprosy Settlement requires situating it within the broader political, social, and medical transformations that shaped southeastern Nigeria during the twentieth century (Manton, 2012, pp.345-364). Rather than viewing the settlement as an isolated humanitarian project, this approach interprets Uzuakoli as a

dynamic institution embedded in the shifting logics of colonial governance, missionary expansion, indigenous agency, and global developments in leprosy control. By reconstructing its emergence, evolution, and long-term influence, the settlement becomes a lens through which to examine the entanglements of medicine and empire, the lived experiences of people affected by leprosy, and the enduring legacies of colonial-era health interventions (Buckingham, 2002, p.218). The establishment of Uzuakoli in 1926 occurred during a period when British colonial authorities were consolidating administrative control over Eastern Nigeria. Following the 1914 amalgamation and subsequent restructuring of provincial governance, the colonial state increasingly turned to public health as a means of asserting authority and regulating African populations. Leprosy, perceived as both a humanitarian concern and a threat to labour productivity, became a focal point of medical mapping efforts (Echenberg, 2002, pp.114-155). Colonial medical officers documented the prevalence of the disease in Igbo communities, often framing it as evidence of “native backwardness” and a justification for intensified intervention.

Historicizing Uzuakoli thus requires recognising how colonial discourses constructed leprosy as a problem requiring institutional segregation. The settlement emerged not simply from medical necessity but from a broader colonial project that sought to reorder African social life through biomedical authority (Vaughan, 1991, p.101). The Church Missionary Society (CMS), active in Igboland since the mid-nineteenth century, played a decisive role in founding Uzuakoli. Missionaries had long been concerned with the social marginalisation of people with leprosy, and by the 1910s they began advocating for a dedicated treatment centre.

Their motivations combined evangelical zeal, humanitarian sentiment, and a belief in the transformative power of Western medicine. Historicizing Uzuakoli requires acknowledging this duality. Missionaries framed the settlement as a refuge of compassion, yet their work was deeply intertwined with colonial structures of power (Iliffe, 1998, p.321). The settlement became a space where medical treatment, religious instruction, and social discipline converged. Patients were not only healed but also evangelised, trained, and incorporated into a moral order shaped by missionary ideals. By the 1930s and 1940s, Uzuakoli had grown into one of the largest leprosy institutions in West Africa. Its expansion reflected both local demand and global developments in leprosy research. Under the leadership of figures such as Dr. Frank Davey, the settlement introduced new treatment regimes, developed surgical and physiotherapy programmes, and established a training school for African medical assistants. Historicizing this period reveals how Uzuakoli became a node in transnational networks of medical knowledge. Missionaries corresponded with researchers in Europe and India, participated in international conferences, and adopted emerging therapeutic innovations (Lyons, 1992, p.114). At the same time, African staff and patients played crucial roles in sustaining daily operations, adapting medical routines to local realities, and shaping the settlement's social fabric. A historical reading of Uzuakoli must move

beyond institutional narratives to consider the lived experiences of its residents. Patients formed cooperative labour groups, cultivated farms, built houses, and created new social identities within the settlement. Marriage, kinship, and religious fellowship flourished, challenging the assumption that leprosy settlements were merely spaces of confinement (Patterson, 2014, p.202). Historicizing Uzuakoli therefore involves recognising patient agency. While the settlement-imposed structures of discipline and segregation, residents negotiated these constraints, forged solidarities, and contributed to the institution's evolution. Their experiences complicate simplistic portrayals of colonial medical institutions as purely coercive.

The Nigerian Civil War (1967–1970) marked a turning point in the settlement's history. Located within Biafra, Uzuakoli faced shortages, displacement, and the collapse of external support (Ranger and Vaughan. Eds, 1991, p.412). Yet it continued to function, sustained by the resilience of staff and patients. After the war, the newly independent Nigerian state increasingly adopted community-based approaches to leprosy control, influenced in part by models pioneered at Uzuakoli. Historicizing the postcolonial period reveals how the settlement's role shifted from a residential institution to a training and outreach centre. The introduction of dapsone in the 1950s and multidrug therapy in the 1980s further reduced the need for long-term institutionalisation, leading to a gradual decline in the settlement's population (Stoller, 2002, p.44). Today, Uzuakoli stands as both a historical site and a symbol of the complex legacies of colonial medicine. Former patients and staff remember it as a place of healing, community, and transformation, even as its origins in segregation and missionary paternalism remain evident. Scholars and public health practitioners continue to draw on its innovations, mobile clinics, vocational rehabilitation, and patient cooperatives, as precursors to modern community-based health strategies (Vaughan, 1991, pp.80-104)).

Historicizing Uzuakoli thus involves tracing its enduring impact on Nigerian public health, disability discourse, and collective memory (Watts, 1997, p.23). The settlement's history illuminates broader questions about the ethics of colonial medical interventions, the agency of marginalised populations, and the long-term consequences of mission-state collaborations.

Colonial Context

Understanding the Uzuakoli Leprosy Settlement requires situating it within the broader political, administrative, and ideological frameworks of British colonial rule in Nigeria (Worboys, 2003, pp.207-218). The settlement did not emerge in a vacuum; rather, it was a product of the colonial state's evolving strategies of governance, its medical priorities, and its reliance on missionary institutions to extend imperial influence. The colonial context shaped not only the founding of Uzuakoli in 1926 but also its institutional logic, its relationship with surrounding communities, and its long-term impact on public health in southeastern Nigeria.

By the early twentieth century, British colonial authorities increasingly viewed public health as a crucial instrument of governance (Yeo, 2005, p.67). Following the 1914 amalgamation of Northern and Southern Nigeria, the colonial administration sought to stabilise its rule by expanding medical services, controlling epidemic diseases, and projecting an image of benevolent authority. Leprosy, widely perceived as a chronic and socially disruptive disease, became a focal point of these efforts. Colonial medical officers framed leprosy as both a humanitarian concern and a threat to economic productivity (WHO Report, 2010, p.32). The disease's visible deformities and long-term disability were seen as undermining labour efficiency, particularly in agricultural regions such as Igboland. This framing justified the establishment of segregated settlements where patients could be isolated, treated, and monitored. Uzuakoli thus emerged as part of a broader colonial strategy that linked medical intervention with social control (WHO Report, 1985, p.667).

The colonial state lacked the financial and human resources to implement large-scale medical programmes on its own. As a result, it relied heavily on missionary organisations particularly the Church Missionary Society (CMS), to provide health services in rural areas. This partnership was mutually beneficial: missionaries gained access to land, funding, and administrative support, while the colonial government extended its reach through institutions that combined medical care with moral instruction. Uzuakoli exemplified this mission–state collaboration (Young, 1995, p.88). While the CMS managed daily operations, the colonial administration provided subsidies, medical supplies, and regulatory oversight. The settlement became a hybrid institution where missionary humanitarianism and colonial governance intersected. This arrangement also allowed the colonial state to maintain a degree of distance from the more controversial aspects of leprosy segregation, delegating responsibility to missionary actors who framed their work in spiritual and charitable terms (Zinser, 1935, pp.225-258). The establishment of leprosy settlements across the British Empire reflected a broader colonial logic that linked disease control with spatial segregation. In Nigeria, colonial authorities believed that isolating people with leprosy would prevent transmission, reduce social disorder, and facilitate medical supervision. Uzuakoli was designed as a self-contained community, physically separated from surrounding villages and governed by strict rules regarding movement, labour, and social interaction. This spatial arrangement served multiple purposes: Medical surveillance, enabling regular treatment and monitoring (Anene, 1965, p.86). Social discipline, reinforcing colonial ideals of order and hygiene. Administrative efficiency, concentrating patients in a single location rather than dispersing resources across rural communities. Segregation also reflected racialised assumptions about African bodies and disease. Colonial officials often portrayed Africans as vectors of contagion requiring containment, a discourse that legitimised intrusive interventions and reinforced imperial hierarchies. Uzuakoli was not merely a treatment centre; it was also a site of scientific inquiry (Falola et al, 2008, pp.208-267). Colonial medicine relied on

settlements like Uzuakoli to generate data, test therapies, and train African medical personnel. The settlement's medical records, patient registers, and clinical experiments contributed to imperial networks of knowledge that connected Nigeria to research centres in London, India, and East Africa. This scientific dimension reveals how colonial medicine operated as a transnational enterprise (Isichei, 1970, p.63). Missionaries and colonial doctors at Uzuakoli corresponded with international experts, participated in global debates on leprosy treatment, and adopted emerging therapies such as chaulmoogra oil and later dapsone. The settlement thus became a node in the circulation of medical knowledge, reinforcing the authority of Western biomedicine while marginalising indigenous healing practices. Although Uzuakoli was shaped by colonial and missionary agendas, African communities were not passive recipients of these interventions (Fo, 1964, p.32). Local responses ranged from cooperation to resistance. Some families voluntarily brought relatives to the settlement in search of treatment, while others resisted colonial pressure to relocate patients, fearing stigma, loss of labour, or cultural disruption. Within the settlement, patients navigated the constraints of colonial authority by forming social networks, participating in cooperative labour schemes, and asserting agency in everyday life. These dynamics complicate the narrative of colonial dominance, revealing a more nuanced interplay between imposed structures and local adaptation (Hall, 1966, p.4). By the 1950s, global shifts in leprosy treatment, particularly the introduction of dapsone—challenged the rationale for long-term institutionalisation. Colonial health policy began to emphasise outpatient care, mobile clinics, and community reintegration. Uzuakoli adapted to these changes by expanding its outreach programmes and training African health workers who would later play key roles in Nigeria's postcolonial leprosy control efforts (Robert, 2000, p.90).

This transition illustrates how the settlement evolved in response to both scientific developments and changing colonial priorities. As the British prepared for decolonisation, they increasingly promoted health policies that could be sustained by the emerging Nigerian state (Apiah, 2005, p.115). The colonial context of the Uzuakoli Leprosy Settlement reveals an institution shaped by the intersecting forces of imperial governance, missionary humanitarianism, scientific ambition, and African agency. Uzuakoli functioned as a site of medical intervention, social control, and knowledge production, reflecting broader patterns in colonial health policy (Bourdieu, 1984, p.227). At the same time, it became a space where patients and local communities negotiated, adapted, and sometimes resisted the structures imposed upon them. Understanding this colonial context is essential for interpreting the settlement's historical significance and its enduring impact on public health and social life in Nigeria (Enyinnaya, 1988, p.21).

Enduring Impacts of the Uzuakoli Leprosy Settlement

The Uzuakoli Leprosy Settlement has left a profound and multifaceted legacy that extends far beyond its original purpose as a colonial-era medical institution (Uchendu,

1965, pp.42-45). Although the settlement's prominence declined with the advent of multidrug therapy and the shift toward community-based care, its influence continues to shape public health practice, disability discourse, community memory, and institutional development in Nigeria. The enduring impacts of Uzuakoli can be understood across several interrelated domains: medical innovation, public health infrastructure, social transformation, missionary heritage, and postcolonial policy formation (Talbot, 1926, p.214). One of the most significant impacts of Uzuakoli lies in its foundational role in shaping modern leprosy control strategies in Nigeria. From the 1930s onward, the settlement served as a regional centre for diagnosis, treatment, and epidemiological mapping. Its early adoption of mobile clinics, systematic case-finding, and outreach programmes anticipated later national and global approaches to integrated leprosy control. The settlement's medical records, training manuals, and treatment protocols became reference points for subsequent public health initiatives (Olukoju, 1987, p.140). Many of the Nigerian health workers trained at Uzuakoli later assumed leadership roles in state and federal health ministries, embedding the settlement's methods into national policy. In this sense, Uzuakoli functioned as a laboratory for public health innovation, influencing the structure and priorities of Nigeria's leprosy control programmes well into the postcolonial era. Uzuakoli's contributions extended beyond biomedical treatment to include pioneering work in rehabilitation and disability management (Ade-Ajayi, 1965, p.321). The settlement introduced reconstructive surgery, physiotherapy, and vocational training at a time when such services were rare in West Africa. These interventions helped redefine the possibilities for people affected by leprosy, challenging the assumption that disability inevitably entailed social exclusion or economic dependency (International Leprosy Association -ILA, 2016 Report, p.54). The cooperative labour system encompassing farming, carpentry, weaving, and other trades served as a model for later community-based rehabilitation programmes. By emphasising skill acquisition, self-reliance, and social reintegration, Uzuakoli helped shift the discourse on disability from one of charity to one of empowerment (Browne & Hogerzeil, 1962, pp.6-10). This legacy continues to inform contemporary disability policy and practice in Nigeria. The settlement played a crucial role in reshaping social attitudes toward leprosy in southeastern Nigeria. Prior to the establishment of Uzuakoli, people with leprosy were often isolated in remote bush camps or excluded from communal life due to deep-rooted stigma.

The settlement's medical successes, combined with its emphasis on rehabilitation and community outreach, helped demystify the disease and reduce fear within surrounding communities. Former patients who returned home after successful treatment became living testimonies to the curability of leprosy, challenging long-standing cultural beliefs (Browne, Harman, Waudby & McDougall, 1981, pp.167-176). Over time, Uzuakoli contributed to a gradual shift in public perception, helping to normalise the presence of people affected by leprosy in everyday social and economic life. Beyond its medical achievements, Uzuakoli fostered the development of new social identities and communal structures. Patients formed cooperative groups,

religious fellowships, and kinship networks that provided emotional support and a sense of belonging (Chukwu & Ekezie, 1992, p.98). These social worlds challenged the narrative of leprosy settlements as purely coercive spaces of segregation. Many former residents recall Uzuakoli as a place of healing, community, and spiritual transformation. The settlement's churches, schools, and communal farms became central to the creation of a shared identity that persists among former patients and their descendants. This social legacy underscores the importance of recognising patient agency in the history of colonial medical institutions (Davey, 1938, p.212).

The settlement's missionary origins have left a lasting imprint on regional memory and identity. For many communities in southeastern Nigeria, Uzuakoli symbolises the humanitarian work of the Church Missionary Society and the moral authority associated with Christian medical missions (Udo, Chukwu & Obasanya, 2013, pp.229-237). The settlement's churches, archives, and surviving buildings continue to serve as reminders of this missionary heritage. At the same time, Uzuakoli's history invites critical reflection on the paternalism and power dynamics inherent in missionary medicine. The settlement's legacy thus embodies a dual narrative: one of compassion and service, and another of control and cultural transformation. This complexity continues to shape scholarly and public debates about the role of missions in African health history (Davey, 1939, p.66). Uzuakoli's influence extended into the postcolonial period through its contributions to professional training and health system development. The settlement served as a training centre for Nigerian medical assistants, nurses, and leprosy inspectors, many of whom later played key roles in shaping national health policy (Oke, Adekambi & Olubodun et al, p.34). Its emphasis on outreach, early detection, and community-based care informed Nigeria's post-1970s leprosy control strategies and contributed to the integration of leprosy services into primary health care (Davey, 1956, pp.114-123).

The settlement also helped establish a culture of data collection, record-keeping, and epidemiological analysis that influenced broader public health practice in Nigeria. Today, Uzuakoli stands as an important site of historical memory and cultural heritage. Its archives, buildings, and surviving community offer valuable insights into the history of colonial medicine, missionary activity, and disability in Nigeria (Davey, Ross & Nicholson, 1956, pp.88-92). Scholars, heritage advocates, and public health practitioners increasingly recognise the settlement as a significant historical landmark deserving of preservation. For former patients and their families, Uzuakoli remains a place of profound personal significance, a site of suffering, resilience, and transformation (Lowe, 1952, pp.22-36). Their stories contribute to a broader understanding of how individuals and communities navigated the challenges of disease, stigma, and institutional life.

The enduring impacts of the Uzuakoli Leprosy Settlement are complex and far-reaching (ILA, n.d, p.20). The settlement shaped the trajectory of leprosy control in

Nigeria, pioneered rehabilitation and disability care, transformed social perceptions of leprosy, and fostered new forms of community and identity (Manton, 2021, pp.856-879). Its legacy continues to influence public health policy, disability discourse, and cultural memory. By examining these long-term impacts, the study underscores the importance of understanding colonial-era medical institutions not only as historical artefacts but as active contributors to contemporary social and health landscapes.

Conclusion

The history of the Uzuakoli Leprosy Settlement offers a powerful lens through which to examine the intersections of medicine, empire, humanitarianism, and local agency in twentieth-century Nigeria. Established in 1926 at a moment when colonial authorities and missionary organisations were expanding their influence across southeastern Nigeria, Uzuakoli became far more than a medical institution. It evolved into a complex social world where biomedical innovation, religious evangelism, and African resilience converged in ways that shaped both individual lives and broader public health trajectories. The settlement's development reflects the dual imperatives of colonial governance: the desire to control disease and the need to project benevolence. Yet its history also reveals the limits of colonial authority. Patients, African staff, and surrounding communities actively negotiated the structures imposed upon them, transforming Uzuakoli into a space of community formation, economic productivity, and spiritual life. These dynamics challenge simplistic narratives that portray leprosy settlements solely as instruments of segregation or coercion. Instead, Uzuakoli emerges as a site of negotiation, adaptation, and agency. The settlement's enduring impact is evident in several domains. Medically, Uzuakoli played a pioneering role in shaping leprosy control strategies in Nigeria, from early mobile clinics to the training of indigenous health workers and the introduction of rehabilitative care. Socially, it contributed to the gradual transformation of public perceptions of leprosy, demonstrating that people affected by the disease could live productive, dignified lives.

Institutionally, it served as a model for postcolonial health policy, influencing the shift toward community-based care and integrated public health systems. Culturally, Uzuakoli remains embedded in local memory as a place of healing, hardship, faith, and resilience.

At the same time, the settlement's legacy invites critical reflection on the ethical and political dimensions of colonial medical interventions. Uzuakoli embodied the tensions inherent in missionary humanitarianism between care and control, compassion and paternalism, empowerment and dependency. These contradictions continue to shape contemporary debates about the role of missions, the politics of global health, and the long-term consequences of colonial-era institutions. Ultimately, historicising Uzuakoli underscores the importance of viewing medical institutions not as static structures but

as dynamic spaces shaped by multiple actors and forces. The settlement's story illuminates how disease, stigma, and social exclusion were confronted through a combination of biomedical innovation, communal solidarity, and individual agency. Its legacy endures in Nigeria's public health landscape, in the memories of those who lived and worked there, and in ongoing scholarly efforts to understand the complex entanglements of medicine and empire.

References

- Anderson, W. (2006). *Colonial pathologies: American tropical medicine, race, and hygiene in the Philippines*. Duke University Press, p.64
- Comaroff, J., & Comaroff, J. (1997). *Of revelation and revolution: The dialectics of on a South African frontier* (Vol. 2). University of Chicago Press, p.45
- Davey, F. (1947). *Leprosy in Nigeria: A report on the Uzuakoli Leprosy Settlement*. Church Missionary Society Press, p.113
- Fassin, D. (2012). *Humanitarian reason: A moral history of the present*. University of California Press, p.78
- Farley, J. (2004). *Bilharzia: A history of imperial tropical medicine*. Cambridge University Press, p.102
- Gussow, Z. (1989). *Leprosy, racism, and public health: Social policy in chronic disease control*. Westview Press, p.56
- Hardiman, D. (2006). *Healing bodies, saving souls: Medical missions in Asia and Africa*. Rodopi, pp.12-32
- Headrick, D. R. (1981). Oxford University Press, p.86
- Hodges, J. (2001). *Leprosy and empire: A medical and social history*. Cambridge University Press, p.77
- Lyons, M. (1992). *The colonial disease: A social history of sleeping sickness in northern Zaire, 1900–1940*. Cambridge University Press, p. 121
- Manton, J. (2011). *Administering colonial science: Leprosy control in Nigeria, 1920–1960*. *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences*, 66(3), 323–350.
- Manton, J. (2013). *Leprosy and empire: A medical and social history of Nigeria*. Palgrave Macmillan, pp.45-68
- Moran, M. T. (2007). *Colonizing leprosy: Imperialism and the politics of public health in the United States*. University of North Carolina Press, p.231
- Packard, R. (1989). *White plague, black labor: Tuberculosis and the political economy of health and disease in South Africa*. University of California Press, p.24
- Patterson, K. D. (2014). *Health in colonial Ghana: Disease, medicine, and socio-*

- economic change, 1900–1955*. Crossroads Press, p202
- Ranger, T., & Vaughan, M. (Eds.). (1991). *Legitimacy and the state in twentieth-century Africa*. Macmillan, p.412
- Stoler, A. L. (2002). *Carnal knowledge and imperial power: Race and the intimate in colonial rule*. University of California Press, p.44
- Vaughan, M. (1991). *Curing their ills: Colonial power and African illness*. Stanford University Press, pp.80-104
- Watts, S. (1997). *Epidemics and history: Disease, power and imperialism*. Yale University Press, p.23
- Worboys, M. (2000). *The colonial world as mission and mandate: Leprosy and empire, 1900–1940*. *Osiris*, 15, 207–218.
- World Health Organization. (1985). *Expert Committee on Leprosy: Sixth report*. WHO Technical Report Series No. 768, p.667
- World Health Organization. (2010). *Global leprosy strategy: Reducing disease burden and sustaining control*. WHO Press, p.32
- Yeo, G. (2005). *Missionary medicine and colonial Africa: A social history*. Routledge, p.67
- Young, R. (1995). *Colonial desire: Hybridity in theory, culture, and race*. Routledge, p.88
- Zinsser, H. (1935). *Rats, lice and history*. Little, Brown and Company, pp.225-258
- Anene, J.C. (1965) *Southern Nigeria in transition*. (Oxford: University press,), p.86
- Toyin, Falola and Matthew M. Heaton (2008) *A History of Nigeria*. (New York: Cambridge University Press, pp.208-267
- Isichei E, (1970) *A history of the Igbo People*, London; Macmillan Press Ltd, p. 63
- Fox, J.A. (1964) *Uzuakoli: A short History*. Oxford: University Press, p.32
- Hall, E.T. (1966) *The hidden Dimension*. NY: Doubleday: Garden City, P.41
- Robert, D. Putnam. (2000) *Bowling Alone*. United States: Simon and Schuster, P.90
- Appiah, Kwame Anthony (2005) *The Ethics of Identity*. NJ: Princeton University Press, P.115
- Bourdieu, P. (1984) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, P.227
- Enyinnaya, E. O. (1988) *The Origin Of Ila-Oso Uzuakoli Cultural Festival and Genealogy of ancestral Father of Uzuakoli*: Pioturu Books, P.21
- Iloeje, (1965) N P. *A new Geography of Nigeria*. (Nigeria: Longman, p.44
- Uchendu, V.C, (1965) *The Igbo of Southeastern Nigeria*, NY, pp.42-45
- Talbot, P.A. (1926) *The Peoples of Southern Nigeria*, Oxford Publications, p.214
- Olukoju Ayodeji, (1997) *Christianity and the Development of the Nigeria State*, p.140
- Ade- Ajayi, (1965) *Christian Missions in Nigeria 1841-1891, The Making of a New*

- Elite, London: p.321
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Stoler, A. L. (2009). *Along the archival grain: Epistemic anxieties and colonial common sense*. Princeton University Press.
- Tosh, J., & Lang, S. (2019). *The pursuit of history: Aims, methods and new directions in the study of history* (6th ed.). Routledge.
- Vaughan, M. (1991). *Curing their ills: Colonial power and African illness*.
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Foucault, M. (1973). *The birth of the clinic: An archaeology of medical perception* (A. M. Sheridan Smith, Trans.). Pantheon Books, p.49
- Said, E. W. (1978). *Orientalism*. Pantheon Books, p.78
- Fanon, F. (1963). *The wretched of the earth* (C. Farrington, Trans.). Grove Press, pp.112-142
- Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. Prentice-Hall, p.221
- Mamdani, M. (1996). *Citizen and subject: Contemporary Africa and the legacy of late colonialism*. Princeton University Press, p.61
- Anderson, W. (2006). *Colonial pathologies: American tropical medicine, race, and hygiene in the Philippines*. Duke University Press, p.23
- Vaughan, M. (1991). *Curing their ills: Colonial power and African illness*. Stanford University Press, p.14
- Comaroff, J., & Comaroff, J. L. (1992). *Ethnography and the historical imagination*. Westview Press, p.22
- Manton, J. (2012). *The quest for cures and the making of difference in the African colonial state: Leprosy control strategies in British West Africa*. *Journal of African History*, 53(3), 345-364.
- Buckingham, J. (2002). *Leprosy in colonial South India: Medicine and confinement*. Palgrave Macmillan, p.218
- Echenberg, M. (2002). *Black death, white medicine: Bubonic plague and the politics of public health in colonial Senegal, 1914-1945*. James Currey., pp.114-155
- Vaughan, M. (1991). *Curing their ills: Colonial power and African illness*. Stanford University Press, p. 101
- Iliffe, J. (1998). *East African doctors: A history of the modern profession*. Cambridge University Press., p.321
- Lyons, M. (1992). *The colonial disease: A social history of sleeping sickness in northern Zaire, 1900-1940*. Cambridge University Press, p.114
- Browne, S. G., & Hogerzeil, L. M. (1962). B.663 in the treatment of leprosy. *Leprosy Review*, 33, 6–10.
- Browne, S. G., Harman, D. J., Waudby, H., & McDougall, A. C. (1981). Clofazimine (Lamprene, B663) in the treatment of lepromatous leprosy in the United Kingdom: A 12 year review of 31 cases, 1966–1978. *International Journal of*

- Leprosy and Other Mycobacterial Diseases*, 49(2), 167–176
- Chukwu, J. N., & Ekekezie, E. E. (1992). *The Leprosy Centre Uzuakoli (1932–1992)*.
- Davey, T. F. (1938). *A study of leprosy in Southeastern Nigeria (with special reference to the Owerri Province)* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Manchester], p.212
- Davey, T. F. (1939). *Owerri Province Leper Settlement annual report: Uzuakoli*. Methodist Missionary Society, p.66
- Davey, T. F. (1956). Clinical trial of diphenyl thiourea compound SU 1906 (CIBA 15095E) in the treatment of leprosy. *Leprosy Review*, 27, 114–123.
- Davey, T. F., Ross, C. M., & Nicholson, B. (1956). Leprosy: A changing situation in Eastern Nigeria. *British Medical Journal*, 2(4984), 88–92.
- Lowe, J. (1952). The Leprosy Research Unit Uzuakoli, Eastern Nigeria. *The West African Medical Journal*, 1(2), 22–36.
- Manton, J. (2013). Leprosy in Eastern Nigeria and the social history of colonial skin. *Leprosy Review*, 84(4), 261–279.
- Manton, J. (2021). Qua Iboe by motorcycle and launch: Brokering public health coverage in 1960s Southeastern Nigeria. *European Review of History: Revue Européenne d'Histoire*, 28(5–6), 856–879.
- Oke, O. O., Adekanmbi, O., Olubodun, T., Goodman, O. O., Bature, B., Adeleke, M., Solanke, B., Minta, A., Igoh, C., & Obasanya, J. (2024). Experience of people living with leprosy at leprosy settlements in Nigeria. *Public Health Challenges*, 3(2), Article e171, p.34
- Udo, S., Chukwu, J., & Obasanya, J. (2013). Leprosy situation in Nigeria. *Leprosy Review*, 84(3), 229–237.
- International Leprosy Association—History of Leprosy. (2016, March 29). *Uzuakoli Nigeria* p.54
- International Leprosy Association—History of Leprosy. (n.d.). *Dr Stanley George Browne*, p.20
- International Leprosy Association—History of Leprosy. (n.d.). *Uzuakoli Leprosy Research Unit*. P.66