Ethical issues in the future of life extension

(and their implications for the present)

Sarah Chan Institute for Science Ethics and Innovation

Some arguments that don't provide good reasons to reject life extension...

- "Radical life extension will change the face of society"
- "We'll get tired of life"
- "We'll lose our sense of personal identity"
- "There are better uses of resources than prolonging the lives of those who have already had many years"
- "The planet will become overcrowded"

... but should give us reasons to think!

"Life extension will change society"

- Argument: Living to 150 and beyond will produce social changes with unknown consequences
 - For example, it will become commonplace to know your great-grandchildren, and to have two or more working career lifespans, or to have a very long retirement
- Counter-argument: We have already seen social change as a result of increased lifespan
 - Change is not necessarily a bad thing
 - We shouldn't avoid it just because the consequences are uncertain
- What this should prompt us to think about today:
 - These changes have (in some cases) happened without much forethought or policy planning!
 - What should we be thinking about now in order to shape thoughtful policies for a life-extended future?

"We'll get tired of life"

- Argument: Extended life will eventually become burdensome
- Counter-argument: Well, we can always choose to stop living!
- What this should prompt us to think about:
 - Do we pay enough attention to issues of welfare and social care for the aged today?
 - If life is or becomes burdensome for many people in the later years of life, why is this the case?
 - Clearly we don't think this should be addressed by suggesting they stop living!
 - What else can we do about it?

"We'll lose our sense of identity"

- Argument: If you live for an extremely long time, you will eventually cease to be the same person; therefore extending life is meaningless as it does not mean 'you' yourself will continue to exist
- Counter-arguments:
 - Dependent on how we understand identity and what is important to us about existence
 - Continuity can be important even during process of gradual change
 - We already experience radical changes to our sense of self and identity during the 'normal' lifespan
- But we should also think about:
 - What are the challenges to identity and selfhood that are experienced by ageing people living through social change over several decades?
 - Are we sufficiently prepared to help them deal with this?

"There are better things to do"

- Argument: instead of spending our resources on prolonging the lives of relatively few, we should allocate our health care / research resources
 - where they will do more good
 - where the good they do will be more fairly distributed
- Counter-arguments:
 - Not a reason to reject life extension as such
 - Some of these resources aren't available for other purposes
- ▶ The reality today:
 - We already have a massive problem of justice in how we allocate health care and research resources on a global scale! What are we going to do about this?
 - Not just life extension / ageing therapy... most of medical treatments in the developed world!

"The planet will become overcrowded"

- Argument: If ageing postpones death indefinitely but people keep reproducing, the population will grow to unsustainable levels.
- Counter-arguments:
 - We could always impose limits on reproduction
 - Surely this is better than imposing limits on life?
 - Technology might find a solution
- ▶ The reality:
 - The world's population is already at a level that poses a problem for sustainability at our current rates of consumption
 - We need to worry about this today, not when ageing research is perfected!

Summary

- None of these arguments provide adequate reasons to reject anti-ageing research and life extension
- But they do highlight problems we already face today
- We should be addressing these now, not pretending that avoiding (further) life extension will make them go away!