Review of Contemporary Philosophy
ISSN: 1841-5261, e-ISSN: 2471-089X
Vol 24 (1), 2025
pp. 109 - 117

Transhumanism and the Utopia of Immortality: A Reality or an Illusion?

Chahra Zed Amirat[1], Noura Bouhanach[2]

[1]PhD Student, Research Laboratory in Historical and Philosophical Studies, Faculty of Human and Social Sciences, University of Abdelhamid Mehri–Constantine02, (Algeria).
E-mail: djadou41@gmail.com
[2]Professor, Faculty of Human and Social Sciences, University of Abdelhamid Mehri–Constantine02, (Algeria). E-mail : ethics02@yahoo.com

Abstract:

Transhumanism, as both a scientific and philosophical movement, aspires to realize a long-standing human ambition: the achievement of immortality or, at the very least, an extended human lifespan marked by perfect health, amortality; that is, a radical extension of human life free from disease and deficiencies. Advocates of this movement promote the use of biotechnologies and advanced technologies to enhance human physical and cognitive capacities. They argue that certain aspects of the human condition, such as disability, pain, aging, and death, are undesirable. Moreover, they consider immortality a fundamental right for both individuals and society in an era where technology and humanity are increasingly intertwined. This article aims to examine whether human immortality is a feasible reality or merely an illusion driven by economic profit motives. To explore this paradox, we employ an analytical approach, as it is the most suitable method for presenting our perspective. Our findings ultimately affirm the impossibility of achieving the illusion of immortality, as it remains an unrealistic mirage that threatens to dismantle the essence of human existence and could turn life into an unbearable ordeal.

Keywords: Transhumanism, Enhancement, Improvement, Extended Life, Aging

Received: 16 January 2025 **Revised:** 25 February 2025 **Accepted**: 23 March 2025

Introduction

Proponents of the transhumanist movement regard the human body as a machine requiring constant maintenance to remain in optimal condition. They argue that the desire for immortality stems from an innate human obsession with self-preservation and the pursuit of an ideal state of being. However, many philosophers and scientists oppose this movement, viewing it as a utopian vision that prioritizes economic interests over genuine human well-being at different stages of life. Critics also fault transhumanism for its lack of attention to ethical considerations, which are fundamental to human existence.

The aim of this article is to clearly delineate a series of responses that accurately articulate what proponents of transhumanism, particularly those from the "technoprogressive" school of thought, assert or reject. By clarifying what transhumanists do not claim, we hope to dispel several misconceptions. Many scholars have made sweeping and often exaggerated assertions about transhumanist advocates, frequently portraying them as a monolithic group.

To address the research problem of this study, we adopt an analytical approach, which we consider the most suitable method for examining transhumanism's engagement with the utopian ideal of immortality and for deconstructing the fundamental concepts that underpin this vision.

We will come to understand that most contemporary thinkers and activists in the field of transhumanism are not adherents of absolutism**,** nor do they claim to have discovered the key to universal peace and happiness.

We will then shift our focus to what technoprogressives are actually advocating, with particular emphasis on the concept of "extended life"; the notion that humanity may one day significantly prolong its healthy lifespan to achieve "immortality", a state free from aging and disease. As Testart and Rousseaux (2015, p. 207) note, *"The key distinction between technoprogressives and transhumanists lies in their stance toward nature: while the former, for the most part, refrain from idealizing it, the latter envision nothing short of modifying it."*

In this section, we will explore various factors and considerations that suggest it may be in our interest to pursue this objective.

1- Transhumanism and the Pursuit of Perfection

Critics often claim that transhumanists seek to create a "perfect human." However, unless these critics deliberately aim to misrepresent transhumanism by invoking the specter of the Nazi Übermensch, they have simply misunderstood the movement's intentions. In defining its core values, the French Transhumanist Association asserts:

"Transhumanism is frequently misrepresented and misunderstood. Many assume that transhumanists wish to create an idealized form of a 'perfect superhuman' with a standardized appearance and a perpetual smile. However, we are not in pursuit of an illusory 'perfection'; on the contrary, we believe that humans can become 'more enhanced'."

In other words, transhumanists do not advocate for a homogenized humanity, which would result in a loss of diversity and richness. Such an all-encompassing vision would, in any case, contradict the fundamental principles upheld by the vast majority of transhumanists. For them, personal and bodily autonomy is non-negotiable. What they hope to achieve is a healthy diversity, a principle that is, undeniably, intrinsic to the very logic of life.

As one expert puts it: *"If the ultimate goal of transhumanism is the 'death of death,' it necessarily requires preliminary steps: first, mastering the aging process, and then achieving control over rejuvenation."* (Terence, 2016, p. 18).

Similarly, another common criticism of transhumanism is that its proponents are solely concerned with performance enhancement, seeking to maximize the potential of each individual. This interpretation is often linked to the French term *augmentation humaine*, which has been misleadingly translated as a relentless pursuit of *more*. However, the term *augmentation* represents only one possible approach to human self-modification. In fact, *augmentation humaine* is a reductive and biased translation of the original English term *human enhancement*. A more precise rendering of *enhancement* might be élévation or rehaussement.

In reality, enhancement sometimes requires reduction rather than addition. For instance, one might consider mitigating our primitive inclination for ownership and accumulation, which makes us vulnerable to the demands of consumerist society. Such an adjustment could foster a healthier relationship with material possessions, resources, and one another.

It is no coincidence that a significant number of critics focus on the notion of *augmentation*. This semantic choice, deliberate in some cases (such as with Jean-Michel Besnier) and unintentional in others, inevitably leads to an implicit rejection of transhumanism—often on the basis of an alleged obsession with quantitative improvement rather than qualitative transformation.

The second part of this article examines a set of theories commonly grouped under the term "longevitism." It is important to clarify from the outset that the vast majority of transhumanist pioneers do not aspire to absolute immortality. Instead, their ambition aligns more closely with what Edgar Morin described in 1953 as "amortality"—that is, an extended lifespan free from disease and physical decline.

The distinction between concepts cannot be overstated. While we may encounter expressions such as "biological immortality," and despite the fact that some prominent transhumanist thinkers today, such as

Ray Kurzweil, freely and perhaps excessively use the term "immortality," it is crucial to question what they actually mean by it.

At its core, immortality implies absolute exemption from death in all its forms: an immortal being cannot die, even if it chooses to. This attribute is traditionally associated with divinity, a transcendent and metaphysical quality often ascribed to the human soul. Consequently, when critics mock transhumanism for its seemingly unattainable aspirations, their skepticism appears justified—especially if transhumanists were indeed pursuing a quasi-religious ideal of eternal life.

However, this misrepresents the actual stance of most transhumanists. With the exception of a small minority of spiritually inclined transhumanists (such as members of Christian Transhumanist and Mormon Transhumanist associations), the term "immortality" is generally used within the movement to denote the theoretical possibility of a life free from aging and disease. This concept still allows for accidents, homicide, and suicide, meaning that "amortality", a term coined by Edgar Morin, is far more appropriate. The goal is to achieve an indefinitely extended lifespan, but not one that is eternal in the absolute sense.

From a statistical standpoint, eliminating aging and disease could theoretically extend the human lifespan to approximately a thousand years. While this might seem extraordinarily long from our current perspective, it is fundamentally different from true immortality.

Critics, however, argue that the transhumanist pursuit of enhancement, perfection, and immortality, interpreted as an absolute, monolithic vision, would inevitably lead to another kind of absolutism: the creation of a posthuman species with little remaining of human nature. They fear that this trajectory would result in the loss of our humanity—not merely in a biological sense, but in an ethical one.

However, AFT-Technoprog asserts that "transhumanism is a form of humanism." How can this be the case? The term "posthuman," as coined by English-speaking scholars at the end of the twentieth century—among them the Swedish philosopher Nick Bostrom—was never intended to refer to a stage of anthropic technological evolution that is more complex than what we know today. Despite its clear linguistic interpretation, "posthuman" does not necessarily mean "after human." It simply suggests that, based on current standards, we might struggle to recognize such beings as human, as they would have undergone a significant evolutionary transformation as we envision it. However, this transformation would occur gradually, and these beings themselves would almost certainly still recognize and refer to themselves as "human."

A third frequent criticism of transhumanism as an intellectual movement is the idea that it seeks to impose a particular vision or social project, if not a political one. Those who hold this belief argue that the narrative of technological progress serves to override any political critique of the prevailing neoliberal system. Others worry that eliminating human vulnerability would undermine the principle of universal human dignity, thereby paving the way for a form of indifference that enables all kinds of dictatorships to flourish.

Nevertheless, since its inception, most of the declarations issued by the transhumanist movement emphasize its commitment to global free will and its neutrality concerning any specific political stance. The reality is that transhumanist pioneers would find it difficult to fit into a single political category, simply because their political perspectives take every conceivable form. It could be said that "there are as many transhumanist movements as there are individuals who embrace transhumanism." Alternatively, as sociologist James Hughes, a participant in the transhumanist movement, argues, transhumanist thought constitutes a transversal dimension that permeates the traditional social and political space. The diagram below schematically illustrates this idea.

In general, transhumanists are not concerned with serving as a means to any particular end. Instead, they encourage approaching matters with a curious mind. The challenges they present—regarding the boundaries between the living and the non-living, human and machine, human and animal, man and woman, or even therapeutic medicine and enhancement—threaten to undermine many of our certainties. However, they do not claim that the theoretical solutions they propose should be imposed on everyone in the name of a universal happiness that they cannot achieve on their own.

All they seek to do is present their case and engage in discussion. Moreover, regardless of the future technologies they envision, all transhumanist advocates are strongly opposed to any form of arbitrary implementation.

The transhumanist movement emerged in the West, within mature and deeply rooted democracies, and in political matters, transhumanists tend to support the idea of the social contract. In this model, citizens enjoy a high degree of freedom while agreeing to abide by a set of laws voted on by their representatives and collectively accepted as legitimate: "the worst form of government, except for all the others."

Transhumanists are also frequently accused of dictating what the future should be. Some of the most prominent pioneers of this movement have even been labeled as "prophets of technology" who claim predictive abilities. It is true that some figures within the movement, most notably Ray Kurzweil in the United States and Laurent Alexandre in France, have, in one way or another, contributed to this perception. However, it is important to contextualize their words and motivations. In the case of these two examples, Kurzweil and Alexandre are media figures who have attracted public attention by being reliably provocative. To this end, they have coined or adopted a whole series of catchy yet reductive slogans: "the death of death"; "the first person to live to 1,000 years has already been born"; "artificial intelligence will equal human intelligence by 2030"; "we will upload our minds to computers by 2045," and so on. These tactics have contributed as much to distorting transhumanist ideas as they have to popularizing them. For many commentators today, the term "transhumanism" immediately evokes the notion of a "slippery slope" or "danger."

Nevertheless, despite this exaggerated media discourse, transhumanists are not in the business of making promises of any kind. At best, they provide some grounds for hope. Rather than indulging in self-reinforcing fantasies promoted by one party or another; fantasies eagerly consumed by the media, transhumanists, particularly those with a techno-progressive orientation, call for an examination of the real issues raised by their ideas. In the second part of this article, we aim to present a specific example.

Another false claim frequently attributed to the transhumanist movement is that it seeks to establish a new human hierarchy. Setting aside for the moment the issue of individual freedom mentioned earlier, there is another core principle in transhumanist thought that the vast majority of its advocates refuse to compromise on: the principle of equal dignity and equal treatment under the law for all living beings recognized as "persons," with all corresponding rights and obligations. Just as modern democracies do not make legal distinctions between an individual who can afford to travel by private jet and another who must walk, or between someone who has never attended school and another with multiple university degrees, transhumanists, ranging from radical libertarians to technological progressives, see no reason why fundamental equality should be undermined by the acquisition or lack of abilities that expand the current boundaries of our human biological state.

At this point, it is worth noting that such equality is not always an unquestioned reality, even in democratic societies, nor is it universally accepted in every country. It is a political achievement rather than a universal principle. This is not a definitive test, like the Native Americans' mastery of the wheel, which led the Catholic Church and Spanish authorities, following the Valladolid controversy of 1551, to conclude that, unlike Africans, they could not be enslaved. Rather, it is a matter of religious, ethical, and/or political context. Similarly, it falls upon those who believe in democracy, whether transhumanists or otherwise, to fight for equal dignity and legal treatment for all, regardless of the diverse human forms and experiences that may emerge in the future.

This type of argument, rooted in the humanist tradition and the aspirations of those seeking to "enhance humanity," is often countered by the claim that it ignores the power dynamics at play in the real world. In other words, techno-progressives are seen as "optimistic theorists" who, at best, fail to recognize that their social project will inevitably lead to discrimination, and at worst, are complicit in the deliberate depoliticization of the movement by its true architects: American tech giants, governments (particularly Russian and Chinese), major pharmaceutical corporations, and others.

It is easy to falsely claim that transhumanist advocates ignore the political context or attempt to distract us from it. However, the reality is that, over the past four decades, politics has not been at the forefront of their concerns. But why should we assign ideological significance to this observation? The truth is far simpler and more mundane: transhumanists tend to focus excessively (and sometimes exclusively) on technological solutions because this is the domain in which they can contribute most meaningfully to the debate. This is where their original and distinctive contribution lies.

Moreover, to ensure that their unique message stands out amid the background noise of the media, they are compelled to emphasize the technical aspects of their proposals. To be fair, scientific or even utopian perspectives can be found in transhumanist thought and literature, particularly in the works of some of the movement's North American founders. Therefore, it is understandable that some may feel that politics has been overlooked. The same can be said about the apparent lack of interest in culture or the environment within the transhumanist movement. In fact, several commentators have made this point, albeit at the risk of falling into the same interpretative trap.

However, those who have closely followed transhumanist movements will know that, since the early 2000s, politics has become a prominent topic among its members, who have gravitated in different ideological directions—some leaning towards liberalism, others towards interventionism. In recent years, they have even formed political parties and put forward some of the more unconventional candidates.

A final and, for me, the most important point regarding politics is that it is futile, if not absurd, to condemn transhumanism on the grounds that it will exacerbate our current social problems: productivity, capitalism, consumerism, climate and biodiversity crises, inequality, privacy threats, and so forth. In truth, claiming that this movement will inevitably worsen the situation is a form of escapism; a way of telling ourselves that fundamental social and political conditions are beyond our control. However, this common socio-political accusation does not inherently discredit transhumanism itself.

If we believe that social, economic, and political action can bring about change, then the potential consequences of the movement's development are numerous and varied. Ultimately, it may provide tools for social progress and help us overcome the crises we currently face. *"What troubles our societies today is not the evolution of interpersonal relationships, but rather the relationships we are gradually establishing with machines. A society based on transhumanist conceptions prepares us for the dissolution of cultural and social boundaries"* (Jousset-Couturier, 2016, p. 167).

2. Transhumanism and the Objective of Surpassing the Human Condition

In light of the recurring claims frequently put forth by French-speaking critics, I find it necessary once again to dismantle the misconceptions surrounding the transhumanist vision of the future. However, in an effort to contribute meaningfully to this discussion, I also seek to establish a more constructive framework. In line with the themes of this book, let us consider the transcendent ambition of radically extending the human lifespan.

How Can a Radically Extended Lifespan Be Achieved?

This article serves as an overview and is not intended to provide a detailed discussion of the technologies that transhumanists believe could enable the indefinite extension of a healthy human lifespan. For this purpose, I refer the reader to the theories and writings of Aubrey de Grey and Miroslav Radman, as well as, in French, the perspective of Didier Coeurnelle on these questions.

For over a decade, an increasing number of specialized researchers and laboratories worldwide have been conceptualizing and addressing age-related diseases in a unified and comprehensive manner. This body of work has demonstrated that, alongside lifestyle, dietary, and environmental factors, domains in which continuous improvement is essential, with due consideration for their socio-economic dimensions, other areas warrant further exploration. These include novel medical solutions, cellular, molecular, genetic, and epigenetic engineering, microbiota manipulation, human-machine hybridization, and nanotechnology.

The fundamental objective is to counteract the primary causes of aging as currently understood: molecular oxidation, cellular stress and inflammation, errors in DNA repair, telomere shortening, genetic factors, protein misfolding issues, imbalances in nutrient sensing, cellular senescence, and stem cell depletion. The quality of research in this field is improving globally. However, scientists continue to face numerous complex obstacles, all stemming from a common root cause: the difficulty of shifting entrenched mentalities.

A case in point is the challenging trajectory of the TAME (Targeting Aging with Metformin) study. Over several years, multiple studies on the use of metformin; a low-cost drug widely prescribed for type 2 diabetes, suggested an association between its use and an increase in life expectancy by several years. An American research team, led by Dr. Nir Barzilai, submitted a research proposal to investigate the efficacy of this drug in "healthy" individuals. The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) was not persuaded by their initial approach, forcing the researchers to reformulate their study objective as an investigation into treatments for age-related degenerative diseases. In late 2015, the project received FDA approval; the first of its kind for such a study. Nevertheless, the TAME group struggled to secure sufficient funding to initiate their research until September 2019. No public or institutional investors were willing to associate themselves with this potentially groundbreaking project. Instead, anonymous donors, some of whom were recruited through fundraising campaigns, ultimately provided the financial support necessary to launch the study. The results, however, will take five to seven years to materialize.

Why Would a Low-Cost Treatment Capable of Extending Healthy Life by Three to Six Years Face Such Resistance?

Transhumanist thinkers argue that aging has long been regarded as a natural and inevitable process. Consequently, societies have developed a form of traditional wisdom, reflected in rituals, religion, and even language; that encourages acceptance of both aging and death. Any attempt to challenge this process, even through cosmetic interventions, for instance, is often perceived as an act of hubris. Until recently, such perspectives were not without justification. According to this logic, efforts to surpass aging (setting aside, for now, those who aspire to overcome death itself) are seen as little more than expressions of vanity and self-indulgence, doomed to failure and social disapproval. These attitudes align with what psychologists refer to as "terror management theory," whereby individuals learn to become comfortable with the inescapable aspects of human existence.

As a result, the first step proposed by the transhumanist movement toward achieving immortality is the decision to treat aging as a disease. "Eliminating aging is now within our reach, starting with the next generation... Aging will no longer be considered a natural phenomenon to which we must submit but rather a type of disease that we must eventually cure. Some scientists advocate for a global initiative to overcome all age-related diseases within the next twenty-five years by addressing aging as the root cause of these diseases" (Ferry, 2025, p. 73).

Only after this will sufficient resources be allocated to research effective methods for controlling the aging process. Only then will the expected outcomes of such research be taken into account by public authorities and made available as quickly as possible to as many people as possible. "Transhumanist advocates have begun to push their logic to its ultimate conclusion from an 'enhancement' perspective, considering aging and death, if not diseases per se, at least as epidemics comparable to diseases, given the immense suffering they cause. Indeed, their impact may be even more terrifying than that of some illnesses affecting the human body. Consequently, if modern technologies allow it, medicine, in their view, must strive to eliminate them to the greatest extent possible" (Ferry, 2016, p. 10).

In France, only a few stakeholders have dared to conceive of this intellectual leap. There is one project, called ExtenSanté, which has received support from prominent figures in French aging research. However, it remains in its infancy. Public awareness of the issues involved and the opportunities this shift could open has not yet been reached.

Beyond the technical, financial, and ethical conditions required to pursue life span extension beyond what we currently choose, several social conditions must also be considered. As mentioned in the first part of this article, the transhumanist movement does not seek to impose anything on anyone. It exists and will

continue to exist within the framework of the law, just as each individual has accepted being part of the social contract. Thus, "transhumanist advocates align with animal rights defenders in condemning human discrimination against other species. According to them, 'the biological form of the human species should not be sacrosanct. This form is neither immutable nor the sole possessor of dignity and respect. Transhumanists favor the concept of the 'person,' which is defined by the presence of certain qualities: consciousness, sensitivity, the ability to think, and the capacity for choice" (Rey, 2020, p. 99).

This implies, above all, that the extension of healthy life expectancy (excluding the still hypothetical prospect of rejuvenation) must be entirely voluntary: a personal choice made as freely as possible. Just as individuals are not usually required to take medication or consult a doctor, the decision to begin anti-aging treatment should rest solely with the individual. There should be no stigma associated with opting out, just as attempted suicide is not stigmatized in a democracy. The social and legal perception of an extended lifespan should be adjusted to facilitate the voluntary termination of one's life if desired.

We have repeatedly emphasized our desire to see public authorities intervene in funding aging-related research. In fact, the transhumanist movement; particularly its techno-progressive faction, looks beyond this. To ensure a fair response to global demand, it is clear that, over time, two interrelated conditions must be met. First, the medical profession must be prepared to accommodate patient demand for effective anti-aging treatments. Second, social security programs should cover these treatments. Financially, this could be achieved by reallocating funds currently dedicated to combating age-related diseases toward preventing aging itself.

Finally, we add another condition: freedom from the pressures of technological innovation, market forces, and consumerist society. For centuries, in most societies, a youthful appearance has been considered desirable. However, in recent years, it has been transformed into a social and economic imperative. This is the "cult of youth," whose darker counterpart is discrimination against older individuals or those who are aging. The message is that such individuals should do the right thing and disappear—at least symbolically. Unfortunately, the transhumanist movement has no magic solution to counter this propaganda, which is broadcast daily on every platform by the advertising industry.

In fact, the early techno-progressivists would be the first to point out that once effective treatments for aging decline become available, the billions of dollars currently invested in cosmetic solutions, which are tantamount to paying for band-aids on a wooden leg, should be redirected toward combating aging itself. Naturally, industry players would be reluctant to loosen their grip on a captive market and may even intensify the pressure of the "cult of youth." How can we keep up with prevailing standards of success if we allow ourselves to age in a world where youth has become dominant?

This issue highlights another argument put forth by techno-progressivists: the transition towards a development model akin to that advocated by transhumanists (a transition already underway) must be accompanied by a change in our prevailing socio-economic model. Otherwise, we are setting ourselves up for an unbearable conflict.

3. Why Does the Transhumanist Movement Advocate for Radical Life Extension?

Despite the real risks of opening Pandora’s box, the transhumanist movement and its pioneers continue to place their hopes in the idea of extending human life for a prolonged period, while maintaining a state of health free from disease. The objective is to anticipate risks and prevent negative outcomes. They are also eager to recognize and promote the potential benefits.

There is not enough space for an in-depth discussion of "longevity arguments," nor even a broad summary of the possible implications, as they affect our entire socio-economic fabric. Instead, I will present several scenarios, each undoubtedly fraught with risks, yet each also brimming with promise.

One of the greatest challenges in this evolution has been evident for several years. As life expectancy and lifespan continue to increase, the intergenerational solidarity mechanism established after World War II has come under enormous strain. Year after year, successive governments have sought to patch the gaps in the

pension system. How will this system cope if individuals frequently live to 110, 120, or beyond? Transhumanist advocates call for early consideration of the gradual consequences that may unfold and for envisioning entirely new social models that we will ultimately have to adopt. The reality is that, despite the risk of complete disorder, the movement hopes that our pension systems will become obsolete.

The same applies to other institutions, such as inheritance and even education. Indeed, the entire set of social structures governing the intergenerational transfer of assets (economic resources) and knowledge needs to be reimagined. Power structures will also experience strain, as the transfer of authority in today's world is closely tied to generational succession.

It is therefore reasonable to foresee the fading of the concept of inheritance, the establishment of lifelong education as a right, and the imposition of restrictions on electoral eligibility. Once again, the potential consequences are countless.

One concern is that a slower rate of generational renewal could impact the vitality of our societies. Here, it is important to note that this intuitive concern has largely been refuted by historical evidence. In the 19th and 20th centuries, life expectancy tripled in Europe, North America, and Japan. At the same time, the proportion of the French population under the age of 20 declined from 50 percent to 25 percent, and it is expected to reach 20 percent before long. Nevertheless, these two centuries witnessed an outpouring of innovation and creativity in the arts, sciences, industries, and technology. The reality is that longer lifespans, among other factors, stimulate society rather than hinder it. This may be what we are currently witnessing in countries such as China and India, not necessarily in the arts, and certainly not in politics, but undeniably in science and technology, where the number of researchers and research laboratories continues to rise.

Instead, I may be more concerned with the "loss of childhood." Understanding the significance of children's physical presence in society, how they influence adults and, consequently, our values, is challenging. We are witnessing a shift from an era in which children were omnipresent yet largely unnoticed to one where they constitute a minority commanding substantial attention. Our tendency to prioritize children to the extent that they become "little tyrants," alongside the arguments presented by longevity advocates, should prompt us to reflect on how the concept of childhood is gradually being detached from the actual physical presence of children. Children, of course, serve as the ultimate reservoir of childhood values like innocence, spontaneity, curiosity, vulnerability, and solidarity. However, their declining presence does not necessarily imply that these values are being lost or are in decline.

While we may attempt to find solutions to anticipated risks, the prospect of significantly longer and healthier lives is overwhelmingly positive.

First, it offers hope for the preservation of human life itself. This objective underpins all our rights and freedoms, as the sanctity of life is upheld across all cultures, religions, and philosophical traditions. From this perspective, longevity advocates are merely continuing humanity's long-standing pursuit. The fact that we may surpass the currently recognized limit of 122 years does not alter this fundamental aspiration.

Second, increased life expectancy has historically been a positive outcome of economic development, particularly the emancipation of women. As women attain greater equality, fertility rates tend to decline, significantly facilitated by modern family planning policies. Should we lament the population aging that results from this progress? Certainly not. Lower fertility rates are essential for addressing overpopulation, and prolonged life expectancy should be celebrated, especially in developing nations.

Finally, it is worth noting that transhumanist thought encompasses multiple perspectives, including, for instance, the connections between healthy aging and reductions in aggression, impulsive overconsumption, and even the possibility of a more favorable "happiness curve." It is conceivable that the benefits of overcoming death, freedom from disease and aging, are limited only by our imagination. Consequently, the only truly recognizable project in living organisms, as in all physical systems, is the pursuit of equilibrium, namely, death. Everything else such as regulation, growth, evolution, learning, and even sustained reproduction is not an inherent project but rather random disturbances that, fortunately, serve to hinder this inevitable outcome. *(Besnier, 2009, p. 120).*

Conclusion

The notion of overcoming mortality invites us to conceive of humanity as an ongoing project. From this perspective, we no longer define ourselves solely by our physical form or material structure, just as we are not strictly determined by our age. This project is rooted in an evolutionary vision that has shaped human history through a selective process aimed at preserving and extending the lifespan of the fittest and most adaptable individuals. This idea is echoed by Hoquet, who states:

"Transhumanism signifies this transition from purely biological evolution to an evolution directed or managed by humans—that is, an artificial one. It represents the promise that humanity will be able to replace blind natural selection with conscious design, thereby taking control of its own destiny." (Hoquet, 2021, p. 139).

Ultimately, humans are bearers of values that are continuously defined and redefined by society. Thus, the ideas advocated by longevity proponents and transhumanist thinkers encourage a vision of humanity that is in constant renewal, even perpetually evolving. Rather than striving for a form of absolute perfection; a rigid ideal that could ultimately constrain us and lead to a fatal stagnation, transhumanism argues that significantly extended healthy lifespans would enable individuals to achieve greater personal growth and contribute more actively to the extraordinary human experience. However, this perspective does not fall into the illusion of seeking eternal immortality, which contradicts the very essence of existence. Indeed, the relentless pursuit of such an ideal could ultimately threaten the very foundations of human life itself.

References:

1. Besnier, J. (2009). *Demain les posthumains* [Tomorrow's Posthumans]. Hachette Littératures.
2. Ferry, L. (2016). *La révolution transhumaniste* [The Transhumanist Revolution]. Plon.
3. Ferry, L. (2025). *IA : Grand remplacement ou complémentarité ?* [AI: Great Replacement or Complementarity?]. L'Observatoire.
4. Hoquet, T. (2021). *Les Presque Humains* [The Almost Humans]. Seuil.
5. Jousset-Couturier, B. (2016). *Le Transhumanisme* [Transhumanism]. Eyrolles.
6. Rey, O. (2020). *Leurre et malheur du transhumanisme* [The Deception and Misfortune of Transhumanism]. Desclée de Brouwer.
7. Terence, M. (2016). *Le transhumanisme est un intégrisme* [Transhumanism is a Fundamentalism]. Cerf.
8. Testart, J., & Rousseaux, A. (2018). *Au péril de l'humain - Les promesses suicidaires des transhumanistes* [At the Risk of Humanity : The Suicidal Promises of Transhumanists]. Seuil.