

Angelica Martin¹, Sophya Yumakulov¹ Natalie Ball¹ and Gregor Wolbring²

¹Bachelor of Health Sciences, Faculty of Medicine; ²Community Health Sciences; Community Rehabilitation and Disability Studies, Faculty of Medicine, University of Calgary

ammartin@ucalgary.ca; gwolbrin@ucalgary.ca

Purpose of Study

- To analyze discourse around therapeutic enhancements of injured soldiers and veterans, highlighting:
 - a) historical and contemporary view of impaired veterans in the Americas.
 - b) science and technology enhancement landscape,
 - c) views on veterans obtaining therapeutic enhancements.
 - d) views of veterans on therapeutic enhancements.

Introduction

- Human enhancement is an area of increasing visibility, although different facets of human enhancement enjoy different levels of visibility (1).
- Many groups are missing in the human enhancement debate, such as rehabilitation professionals and the broad group of disabled people as well as the general public (2).
- A lot has also been written about the development and use of and push for human performance enhancement products for soldiers and its impact (3-14) and part of a recent human enhancement study for the European Commission (2) covers this topic.
- Many of the debates surrounding performance enhancement have centred on the able-bodied being perceived as healthy people, from athletes to soldiers (2).
- Therapeutic body devices developed to mimic species-typical body structures and expected body functioning, as a side effect, increasingly allow the wearer to outperform the species-typical body in various functions.
- This project covered therapeutic enhancements used for injured soldiers and veterans highlighting.

Table 1: Themes around public perception NYT 1851-2011

Themes	NYT 1851-1950 impaired veterans n=80		NYT 1950-2011 impaired veterans n=196		
	# of Hits	% of Hits	# of Hits	# of Doc. Mentioning Theme	% Doc. (Total: 196 Doc.)
Positive					
Independence/Help themselves	18	22.5	8	4	2.04
Need to contribute to society	13	16.3	1	1	0.51
We owe them	15	18.8	15	12	6.12
Not their fault	1	1.3	1	1	0.51
Disability does not hinder ability	0	0.0	3	2	1.02
Should get special treatment	14	17.5	47	31	15.8
Positive impacts of disability	1	1.3	2	1	0.51
"Human Touch" is needed	4	5.0	2	2	1.02
"Reconstruction of disabled"	6	7.5	0	0	0
Heroics	3	3.8	15	10	5.1
Job Creation			30	21	10.7
Alternate Employment			13	10	5.1
Tribute			94	48	24.5
Gratitude			35	17	8.67
Reintegration			4	3	1.53

Compensation			213	91	46.4
Accessibility			41	14	7.14
Health Care Improvements			2	2	1.02
Psycho-Social Support			15	12	6.12
Negative					
Burden on society	1	1.3	8	6	3.06
Negative in aging	4	5.0	23	12	6.12
Job limits by disability	0	0.0	7	6	3.06
Helplessness	0	0.0	3	3	1.53
Need to prove themselves	0	0.0	0	0	0
Restrict Employment Opportunities			19	18	9.18
Understanding of Veteran Needed			14	11	5.61
Poor Health Care Access			14	9	4.59

Table 2 Public Perception of therapeutic enhancement of injured veterans and sold or s

Pro Enhancement Arguments	Con Enhancement Arguments
Keep up with or beat competition increase efficiency	The value of enhancements hasn't been proven enhancements can cause physical harm or adverse side effects causes more harm than benefit;
increase safety/survival of soldiers or citizens	enhancements could drive further conflict; enhancements could create more or new forms of discrimination;
improve strength improve senses;	could have negative impact on the economy/resources;
improving speed;	The value of enhancements hasn't been proven could cause psychological harm
improving cognitive skill or intelligence;	
improve mood could benefit society; can get vets to return to service; should be used so that vets have a better environment when they return home	

References
 Snyder Sam 2011. How America Can Be Loved by Everyone. Sam Snyder blog <http://samsnyder.com/2011/05/13/how-america-can-be-loved-by-everyone/>. Accessed 30 July 2011.
 Altmiere J.C. 2011. Altmiere Amendment Adopted--Will Improve Veteran's Access to Quality Prosthetics. Congressman Jason Altmiere webpage http://altmiere.house.gov/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=763:altmiere-amendment-adopted-will-improve-veterans-access-to-quality-prosthetics&catid=21. Accessed 30 July 2011.
 Youssouf M. 2005. Training Enhancement Substances: A Veteran's Perspective. IDEA <http://www.ideaft.com/fitness-library/training-enhancement-substances-veterans-perspective>. Accessed 30 July 2011.

Table 3* If you acquired an injury which led to the removal of your legs and you had the choice between ... what would you choose

a) artificial legs that behave like a 'normal' leg therefore do not outperform 'normal' legs;	28.1%	n=43
b) artificial legs that that are better than the 'normal' legs	35.3%	n=54
and c) no artificial legs but something like a wheelchair.	1.3%	n=2
Don't Know	35.3%	n=54

References

- Coenen C, Schuijff M, Smits W, Klaassen P, Hennen L, Rader M, Wolbring G. Human Enhancement Study. European Parliament; 2009. Report No. (IP/A/STDA/FWC/2005-28/SC35_41_6_45) PE 417_483.
- Masters C. 2008. Bodies of Technology: Cyborg Soldiers and Militarized Masculinity. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association, Town & Country Resort and Convention Center, San Diego, California, USA http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/110/0/2/18/p10286_index.html. Accessed 30 July 2011.
- Ierra 2007. Brain Chips for Future Soldiers. Techpin.com <http://www.techpin.com/brain-chips-for-future-soldiers/>. Accessed 30 July 2011.
- Statcbrain.com. 2008. Brain Machine Interface: BMI (Cyborg Soldiers). Statcbrain.com <http://www.statcbrain.com/archive/brain-machine-interface-bmi-cyborg-soldiers/>. Accessed 30 July 2011.
- Weinberger S. 2008. Could Soldiers Be Prosecuted for Thought Crime? Wired Magazine Blog. The Danger Room <http://blogs.wired.com/defense/2008/04/could-soldiers-be-prosecuted-for-thought-crime/>. Accessed 30 July 2011.
- South African Times. 2000. Cyborg soldiers learn hi-tech killing. South African Times http://www.iol.co.za/index.php?set_id=1&click_id=31&art_id=qw965881260728251. Accessed 30 July 2011.
- english.chosum.com. 2007. Cyborg Soldiers to Be Kitted Out by 2020. english.chosum.com <http://english.chosum.com/w21data/html/news/200705/200705230023.html>. Accessed 30 July 2011.
- Shachtman N. 2008. DARPA Wants Soldiers to Touch: From 300 Feet Away. Wired Magazine Blog. The Danger Room <http://blogs.wired.com/defense/2008/04/darpa-wants-soldiers-to-touch/>. Accessed 30 July 2011.
- Henry A. 2006. Nanotechnology Makes Way for Cyborg Soldiers. Boston Underground <http://www.bostonunderground.info/articles.php?id=70&issue=47>. Accessed 30 July 2011.
- Thomas A. 2007. Pentagon to implant microchips in soldiers' brains. PressESC <http://pressesc.com/news/8035072007/pentagon-implant-microchips-soldiers-brains>. Accessed 30 July 2011.
- Tom Spears. New drug may help soldiers stay awake Doctors unsure of long-term effect. The Ottawa Citizen 2003.
- Weinberger S. 2007. Pentagon to Merge Next-Gen Binoculars With Soldiers' Brains. Wired Magazine <http://www.wired.com/wired/magazine/news/2007/05/binoculars>. Accessed 30 July 2011.
- Aftermath News. 2006. Should We Make Cyborg Soldiers? Aftermath News <http://aftermathnews.wordpress.com/2006/09/29/should-we-make-cyborg-soldiers/>. Accessed 30 July 2011.
- Cyberpunk 2006. Soldiers as Cyborgs. Cyberpunkreview.com <http://www.cyberpunkreview.com/news-as-cyborgs/>. Accessed 30 July 2011.
- The Advisory Panel on Online Public Opinion Survey Quality. 2011. Standards and Guidelines for Sampling, Public Works and Government Services Canada <http://www.tpsgc-pwsc.gc.ca/rop-por/rapports-reports/comitee/panelonline/page-03-eng.html>. Accessed 30 July 2011.
- New York Times. The Civitas reception. New York Times 1895 May 2:8.
- Nord DP. 1988. A Republican Literature: A Study of Magazine Reading and Readers in Late Eighteenth-Century New York. *American Quarterly* 40(1):42-64.
- New York Times Magazine. On the Means of Preserving Public Liberty. New York Times Magazine 1790:125.
- "Canadian Veterans" photo retrieved November 2, from: <http://www.torontojunitransplantclub.org/TLTC-images/WWI-Salute-01.jpg>

Methodology

- The NYT is by meaning of others(16) and its self perception(17;18) important in informing the 'average' person on important issues.
- Thematic analysis of NYT articles (Table 1) covering perception of injured veterans. using (a) the ProQuest search engine (provided by the University of Calgary) for articles from 1851 to 2006 and (b) the archive search engine on the New York Times website for articles from 2006 to 2011 (August 16, 2011).
- Online delivered exploratory, non-probability survey using the Survey Monkey platform;
- 46 simple yes or no questions, a likert scale, opinion self-rating scales, as well as open-ended questions was generated
- Results of question 46 is presented here (Table 3)
- Target group: Members of 'Veterans' Voice forum'
- As this is a non-probability sample, no tests of significance were performed (15).
- Searching Google with the term combinations veteran and enhancement the following reasons for supporting or rejecting enhancements were found (table 2)

Results

- There are positive and negative views of injured veterans (Table 1)
- There are pro and con arguments for giving therapeutic enhancements to injured veterans (Table 2)
- Non injured veterans if asked to choose from different therapeutic options for a hypothetical loss of limbs preferred therapeutic enhancements (artificial legs) that enable beyond the normal abilities over artificial legs that lead to normative abilities over non leg related solutions such as wheelchairs (Table 3) .

Acknowledgements

- The work was in part supported by a European 7th Framework Grant and SSHRC grant that GW is a part of. We would like to thank Ruud Ter Meulen and Christopher Coenen from the European grant and all the students of GW, also known as the "Wolb Pack".