

# Drug experiments on third-world populations essay examples

[Business](#), [Company](#)



There are several issues facing the pharmaceutical industry, and as always, there are several controversies. Various companies have begun seeking areas to conduct experiments involving drugs, particularly in third world countries. The fact that these tests are conducted on unsuspecting and in most cases desperate and vulnerable people is extremely wrong and should be illegal. Sharing in the knowledge that people in third world countries experience poor medical care, and high levels of drug deficiencies, upcoming pharmaceutical companies prey on this need and desperation to supply untested drugs, and observe the effects at a distance. This process could go two ways, one, the drug could be effective and advantageous to the people. On the other hand, the drug could cause debilitating effects such as mutations and death in some instances. In a world where right is vital, it is difficult to judge pharmaceutical companies harshly. Initially, the companies would test on animals, but animals have rights, as well. It does not make sense to transfer the testing process to humans in third world countries, especially the unsuspecting ones. In such a case, drug testing is essential before distribution. The companies should seek voluntary testing agents instead of preying on unsuspecting and desperate people. As such, these companies should offer adequate remuneration and compensation if anything should happen accidentally.

Conducting clinical trials on humans and unsuspecting ones, nonetheless, is a controversial issue. Some of the controversies associated with drug testing include ethical and moral issues. Ethical issues usually arise when researchers opt to conduct the tests in another country. The research may be a way of assisting people with poor health care, or addressing a problem

associated with lackluster health care. Often, the ethics of designing, participating in the research, as well as follow up on the testees has brought up issues. Testing on host countries imposes ethically unsuitable burdens on poor countries, and the people that participate in the research. Testing third world groups with placebos when there is an efficient means of treatment means that the control group is considered of lesser value compared to control groups that are usually in developed nations (Shah 1).

Kant theory states that every manner of action that includes but not limited to murder, robbery, and cheating are an offense. Kant notes that some of the actions done are in the best interest of the people; however, Kant opposes performing such actions even if these actions provide happiness than the alternative. Kant suggests that people question themselves regarding the act that they perform, whether the actor can rationally affect all other actors involved. If the answer produces a negative effect, then the actor must not perform that action. The actors must also question if their actions will diminish or limit the value of other human beings that might participate in the said action. If the answer is a negative, then the actor has permission to perform that action. Kant believed that asking oneself regarding these questions is relevant in making a morally acceptable decision. Utilitarian theory, on the other hand, states that an actor must perform everything possible in a bid to save the lives of other people. This is true, even if there will be several casualties involved. In short, this calls for sacrificing the lives of a few people for the greater good (Anscombe 1).

The two theories present valid points to the testing of drugs and conducting clinical trials; however, they create contradicting arguments to the same. For

instance, most ethical people would subscribe to Kant's theory, especially human rights activists. If performing clinical trials harm other people, then it seems logical and moral to cancel the trials until researchers reach an alternative to testing the drug. This seems like the most moral decision, as performing otherwise would be putting the lives of others in danger, for the exchange of others. This is murder or manslaughter in some legal aspects, which is punishable by law. However, some situations call for drastic actions, even if testing will cause death of a few people, for the greater good and the survival of others. However, there should be a system that determines when and why it is suitable to perform the trials (Anscombe 1).

This is easy by developing a code of ethics associated with drug trials, which states that all pharmaceutical companies must subscribe. Part of the codes must state that these companies cannot perform drug trials without notifying parties involved. Otherwise, the board or authoritative body in charge should act swiftly and accordingly against such companies. If parties consent to taking part in the trials, then the companies should proceed. The companies should also conduct adequate research and provide antidotes and monetary compensation to victims if anything should go wrong.

The Canadian government should not be in a position to establish a rule that force all people to participate in a compulsory drug trial. There is no reason why people should participate in a trial, especially if does not affect them directly. As such, the board should set up parameters to allow people to come forward whenever a trail is about to take place. Some people are passionate enough to participate in the trial without necessarily receiving

compensation of any kind. In any case, compensation serves as a great motivator for subjects to participate.

## **Works cited**

Anscombe Elizabeth. Kantian ethics. Web. 28 June 2013.

Available at:

Shah Sonia. The constant gardener: what the movie missed. 2005. Web. 28 June 2013.

Available at:

< [http://www. thenation. com/article/constant-gardener-what-movie-missed#axzz2XTszBoQD](http://www.thenation.com/article/constant-gardener-what-movie-missed#axzz2XTszBoQD)>