

AgingBiotech.info Summary of Objections to Anti-Aging & Counterarguments (see AgingBiotech.info/objections for the latest version & links to more detailed treatments)

objection	counterargument 1: <i>This problem is unlikely, or unlikely to be caused primarily by less aging, or not really a problem.</i>	counterargument 2: <i>Not really a problem since changes will minimize the problem, or for other reasons.</i>	counterargument 3: <i>Even if this problem occurs, withholding life-saving anti-aging therapies would be morally worse than the alternative(s).</i>
overpopulation	Overpopulation unlikely to be caused by less/no aging: Population growth is primarily determined by birth rates, not death rates. Birth rates are falling, so global population projected to stop growing (@~11B). Peak population primarily determined by how fast birth rates fall from well above 2 & birth rates drop as health improves so healthspan increases could even help. Only a small reduction in birth rate compensates for reduced age-related deaths.	Global supply of land/food/water/etc. more than sufficient: Even if population grows, world population density is vastly lower than it could comfortably be. Global food supply is increasing faster than population & hunger expected to be eradicated worldwide by 2030. Population growth rate will be slow enough to allow for needed adaptations.	Existing people have at least as much moral right to life: Even if overpopulation were a problem, it's morally repugnant for existing people to have less right to life than hypothetical, unconceived people.
only for the rich	Anti-aging therapies not likely to be expensive (for long): Technologies, including medical technologies, and drugs get cheaper after introduction so won't stay expensive long. Many anti-aging therapies may be as cheap as existing medical treatments, just with different targets. Recent high therapy costs are due to treatments targeted at small patient groups, but development costs for aging therapies can be divided by everyone past middle age.	Governments will subsidize treatments: The aged currently cost governments huge amounts for medical costs & pensions. Even expensive anti-aging therapies would be cheaper for governments to subsidize directly than current standard of care that mostly keeps the old unhealthy.	Rich people should not be tortured & killed: Even if aging therapies were expensive for a long time, disallowing access by those that could benefit & afford the costs would be immoral.
long-lived dictators	Condemning billions of others & waiting decades is the worst overthrow plan: In ranking ways to overthrow a dictatorship, evaluation criteria should include how many others get hurt (collateral damage) & how quickly positive change happens. Globally withholding aging therapies kills billions of innocents & takes the ruler's remaining lifetime, and even then a positive result is far from assured as replacement dictators are common (eg, Venezuela). Almost any other plan is better.	Number of autocracies & % of people living in them both decreasing: Worldwide the trend is for fewer dictators and a smaller fraction of global population living under them, and not due to any decrease in natural lifespans of the dictators. Thus, this is already a decreasing problem.	Many tyrants have or will get cancer and/or heart disease: Should the world stop pursuing cures & treatments for these to "take out" the fraction of dictators who will succumb to them?
boredom	Boredom so bad that suffering age-related decline & dying are preferred is unlikely: Bored people don't typically commit suicide to escape boredom & suffering from age-related health decline cannot be understated. Retirees get bored, but anti-aging would allow good health for people to continue work (enabling more career building or changing careers), sports, dating, & other entertainment undiminished. Thus, aging therapies might reduce boredom.	More entertainment over time: There are more entertainment options than ever & more created all the time. Games, music, video & written content are created faster than anyone can consume a tiny % of. Travel possibilities expand over time as travel becomes faster/easier & previously inaccessible places reachable.	Killing the not bored to prevent others' boredom is wrong: Boredom in one person is not a valid moral reason to force disability or death on anyone else. Continued living will be a choice---anyone too bored to go on can choose to stop living (eg, by discontinuing treatments to delay/reverse aging).
slower progress	Human progress is not driven by urgency from impending death: Many economic pressures drive individual incentives that in turn drive overall societal progress irrespective of lifespan: food & survival, competition at work & for mates, security, property, knowledge, entertainment, admiration. Few think that the doubling (tripling) of lifespans in the past century(ies) has slowed rate of progress.	Wasting what one has a lot of is a sign of being better off: To the extent to which progress is slowed because people waste more time as a result of having more, this is best seen as a sign of good times. One wastes what one has in abundance and having enough time to waste some is better than having too little.	
longer decrepitude	Anti-aging's goal is less/no decrepitude & suffering, not more: The existing healthcare (aka sick-care) system allows aging to cause widespread physiological decline, only treating individual diseases after clinical manifestation (mid-late stage of the full process), and has caused longer end-of-life periods of frailty & decrepitude. Anti-aging's goal & so far its scientific reality is to reverse or prevent the initial stages of this decline to prevent decrepitude.		
unsustainable pensions/healthcare costs	Those too old to be productive or healthy are a burden, but longer health is not: Longer life without late-life improvements in productivity & health would cost more in pensions & healthcare, but less/no aging would make the currently projected unsustainability of western pension & healthcare costs less problematic & may be the best way to avoid/minimize the projected demographic disaster (eg, bankruptcy of US Social Security). Increasing healthspans would improve economies by improving the dependency ratio due to the shrinking fraction of life that is dependent.		
unnatural	Natural does not mean better: Plenty natural is bad & much unnatural good, including modern healthcare (see appeal to nature fallacy). Anti-aging natural-ness is no more a problem than plumbing, vaccines, antibiotics, surgery...	Long lives or negligible aging are natural: Some species live for 500 years, others appear not to age (no increasing risk of death w/ age), so evolution has created natural examples.	
missing aging's good aspects	Avoiding the health decline of biological aging does not preclude the benefits of living longer: Living longer can bring benefits such as experience, knowledge, wisdom, & accomplishment, but these are not inherently tied to nor dependent on the poor health, suffering, disability, & death caused by age-related diseases. In fact, these benefits increase faster when young or middle aged. Untreated biological aging slows the accumulation of these benefits & eventually in many people reverses the process by robbing them of knowledge, wisdom, & skills.		
low job turnover (gerontocracy)	Lower job turnover due to longer periods of health & productivity is good not bad: To the extent that less aging allows people to stay in jobs longer than they otherwise would due to maintaining youth, and thus to not step aside for the more recently born, this is a net benefit to society. If chronologically younger competitors are more qualified, they should get a given job. If not, it is better for society for the job to be more competently done by the less recently born person.	New job types & some turnover will insure jobs for new generations: Even if less aging results in less job turnover, turnover will happen as some decide to sabbatical or change careers and others are outcompeted despite their experience. Also, new job categories are created all the time, possibly at an accelerating rate.	Forcing suffering & death is the worst policy solution: Even if too-low job turnover were a true problem, imposing decades of avoidable suffering & death would be immoral relative to simply mandating job turnover through regulation.
the future will be worse	Most hard data suggests the world is improving, not getting worse: By most objective measures the world has been on a clear, positive trajectory, eg: lower global poverty & hunger, more recreation time, less violence & killing, improving education & health, faster travel & communication, increasing engineering & computational capabilities.		Everyone should be able to make their own choice: Forcing the choice of not living longer on some due other's negative assessments is immoral. Those who expect a better / good enough for them future should be allowed to embrace it.