

International Ethics

Sheila P. Davis
sheila.davis@usm.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://aquila.usm.edu/ojhe>

Recommended Citation

Davis, S. P. (2015). International Ethics. *Online Journal of Health Ethics*, 11(1). <http://dx.doi.org/10.18785/ojhe.1101.01>

This Front Matter is brought to you for free and open access by The Aquila Digital Community. It has been accepted for inclusion in Online Journal of Health Ethics by an authorized administrator of The Aquila Digital Community. For more information, please contact Joshua.Cromwell@usm.edu.

International Ethics Issues
Summer 2015

In this issue, three articles address societal/ population-based rights and responsibilities. Dr. Mukherjee from Bangalore, India highlights the ethical and moral aspects of the debate raging in certain states in India to raise the drinking of alcohol age to a minimum of 25. In like manner, Drs. Harsman Tandilittin and Christopher Luetae of the Technical University of Munich closely examine the tenants of the Corporate Social Responsibility program of Indonesia's Tobacco companies. They argue that in order for tobacco companies to be more responsible, they are duty bound to also address the negative impacts of tobacco. From Loyola University in Chicago, Hatchett, Elster, Wasson, Anderson, and Parsi examine deeply entrenched structural inequalities that impact upon all aspects of healthcare. In so doing, they provide instructional resources to ameliorate these atrocities.

With a focus on ethical issues impacting family units, Walton, Aerts, Burkhart, and Terry of Andrews University, Michigan, USA, provide an in-depth review of literature on intimate partner violence (IPV) screening and its implications for health care providers. They present current research on IPV screening prevalence, the importance of such screening, barriers to screening, methods to screen, and tools to enhance screening among the medical and physical therapy community. From Denmark, Komu and Ethelberg question the rights of governments to impede on individual freedoms of families by limiting or attempting to legislate population control and other family planning issues. Their belief is that as the public is educated, this may militate against unnecessary ethical dilemmas and conflict. Also from Denmark, Acharya and Gautam examine the implications of Direct-to-Consumer genetic testing where there is no direct communication between the consumer and a certified medical professional. Specifically questioned are both the confidentiality and accuracy of the results. Authors' purport that priority should be given to prevent any undesirable consequences to consumers. In the last article related to family ethics, Hostiuic of Carol Davila University, Bucharest, compares and contrasts the practice of giving forensic autopsy practitioners unrestricted access to human bodies in order to determine the cause of violent death compared to the highly restrictive practice granted researchers attempting to retrieve biological samples or data in research who also attempt to find a 'truth'. They intimate that each scenario has specific ethical issues that should be explored.

In the academic setting, Marx, Ward, Goshom and Sumrall of the University of Southern Mississippi, USA, once more challenge the academic community to ensure parity for those who have hearing impairment. As a follow up to a previous article, the current article provides results from a model developed and tested by authors to augment instruction of hearing impaired patients. They were able to demonstrate significant improvements in knowledge and skills related to one's ability to communicate with the hearing impaired upon use of their model. Also from the state of Mississippi, Lovelace-Ray, University of Mississippi Medical Center, share the analysis of a case study involving implementation of research in the home setting. Lovelace-Ray reminds us of

the rapid expansion of home health nursing in the last several decades and the resultant increase of nursing research conducted in the home.

Last, in what appears to be the most contentious ethical dilemma of articles in this issue, Potter explores and critiques the practice of the Iranian model of compensated kidney donation. The salient question presented is: Does the Iranian model of kidney donation compensation work or could work as an ethical global model? Before answering in the affirmative or negative, you are asked to closely examine the debate. Please share your response on our facebook page: <https://www.facebook.com/theojhe>

Thanks to all authors for sharing your scholarship with our journal. From the staff of the Online Journal of Health Ethics, we wish you a very prosperous new school year and rest of 2015. We will publish once more this year. Blessings.....

Sheila!

Sheila P. Davis, PhD, RN, FAAN, FNP-C
Editor – Online Journal of Health Ethics