

# John Broome

## *What is your life worth?*

What is your life worth to you?

‘Everything,’ you might say, since if you lose your life you lose everything. On the other hand, Epicurus’s answer appears to have been ‘nothing’:

Become accustomed to the belief that death is nothing to us. For all good and evil consists in sensation, but death is deprivation of sensation . . . . So death, the most terrifying of ills, is nothing to us, since so long as we exist death is not with us; but when death comes, then we do not exist. It does not then concern either the living or the dead, since for the former it is not, and the latter are no more.<sup>1</sup>

Epicurus seems to be saying that death does you no harm. If that is so, continuing to live does you no good.

When I asked what your life is worth to you, I meant, more precisely: how good is it for you to continue living?

---

*John Broome is White’s Professor of Moral Philosophy at the University of Oxford and a Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. His books include “Weighing Goods: Equality, Uncertainty and Time” (1991), “Ethics Out of Economics” (1999), and “Weighing Lives” (2004). He holds a Leverhulme Major Research Fellowship.*

---

© 2008 by the American Academy of Arts & Sciences

Conversely, what harm would be done to you by not continuing to live? What would you lose by dying? I disagree with both of the extreme answers ‘everything’ and ‘nothing.’ My answer takes a middle course. I shall come to it after first rejecting the extremes. On the face of it, ‘nothing’ is the less plausible of the two, but it has the most interesting arguments in its favor. I shall start with that one.

Most of us find the answer ‘nothing’ implausible because we take it for granted that dying is terrible. It may even be an imposition on Epicurus to read him as answering ‘nothing.’ He may not mean to say that death does us no harm – I shall come to that. But he does supply materials that can be used to construct a case for that view. I shall make this case as persuasive as I can, but in the end I shall argue that it fails.

The goodness of life has two components: quality and quantity. You might think that the quantity of life does not matter at all, but only its quality. Indeed,

<sup>1</sup> Epicurus, “Letter to Menoeceus,” in Whitney Oates, ed., *The Stoic and Epicurean Philosophers: The Complete Extant Writings of Epicurus, Epictetus, Lucretius, Marcus Aurelius* (New York: Random House, 1940), 30–31.

this is exactly what most of us do think about the goodness of life in another context. One way of adding to the quantity of life in the world is by having more babies; that way, more life is lived in total. But most of us do not favor increasing quantity this way. We are concerned for the quality of life of the people who live, but we are not concerned to increase the number of people who live. When the Chinese government instituted its one-child policy, its aim was to improve the quality of life of the Chinese. Another consequence of the policy is that there are fewer Chinese than there would have been without it, but the government did not think of this reduction in quantity as a bad thing, to be set against the gain in quality. Most of us would have agreed.

Moreover, this attitude we commonly have toward the number of people can be supported by an argument. Suppose a couple are thinking of having a child, but eventually decide not to. As a result, there is less life in the world than there would have been. Is this reduction in quantity a bad thing? Well, who is harmed by it? No one. No one is harmed by not being brought into existence. It is not as though there is some child who suffers the misfortune of not existing; there is simply no child, so no one is harmed. Consequently, we might plausibly think, no harm is done. We might conclude it cannot be a bad thing to reduce the quantity of life in this way.

This argument needs to be slightly qualified. Perhaps some people will be worse off as a result of the child's non-existence. Perhaps, say, the child would have grown up to make a great contribution to civilization. But if we set aside indirect effects of this sort, the argument has some force.

Bringing more people into the world is one way of increasing the quantity of

life. Extending the lives of people who are already in the world is another. Epicurus shows us that a similar argument can be used in this context too. We can ask a parallel question about the quantity of a single person's life. Previously we asked who is harmed by not being created; now let us ask at what time a person is harmed by dying. Suppose you might have lived longer, but you actually die now. Is that a bad thing for you? Well, when are you harmed by your early death? At no time. As Epicurus says, you are not harmed at any time before your death, since so long as you exist "death is not with [you]." And you are not harmed at any time after your death, since at no time after your death do you exist. Since there is no time when you are harmed, we might conclude you are not harmed at all.

You may say there is indeed a time when death harms you: the time when you die. You could be making either of two points. The first is that the process of dying is often terrible. This does mean your death harms you in one way, but not in a way that is relevant to the question I am asking. The question is: what is the benefit to you of continuing to live? Conversely, what harm would be done to you by not continuing to live? The terribleness of the process of dying is not a part of the answer to this question. Cutting your life short does not necessarily harm you in this way, because your dying may be terrible whether it occurs at the end of a long life or a short one. So we can set aside this aspect of the badness of death.

The second point you might be making is this: if death harms you, we know automatically that the harm occurs at the time of your death, since it is your death that does the harm. But we must distinguish the time when a harm is caused from the time when it is suffered.

If I drop a banana peel on the road, and you later slip on it and hurt yourself, your harm is caused when I drop the peel, but it is not suffered until you fall. Epicurus asks when the harm of death is suffered, not when it is caused. The answer is that it is not suffered at any time. If there were any harm, it would be caused at the time you die, but that is another matter. We can set aside this point too.

Once those two points are set aside, we should agree that there is no time when death harms you. We learn this truth from Epicurus. Epicurus apparently draws the further conclusion that, because there is no time when death harms you, it does not harm you at all. To arrive at that conclusion he needs to make the further assumption that you cannot be harmed unless you are harmed at some time. Is that a good assumption?

Once again, Epicurus supplies us with material that at first seems to support it. He says that “all good and evil consists in sensation”: the only sort of good that can come to us is a good sensation, and the only sort of bad is a bad sensation. This is a version of what is nowadays called ‘hedonism.’ It is contentious, and one way of responding to Epicurus is to deny it. But denying hedonism is also contentious, and I do not need to do it. Instead, I shall show that, even if we grant Epicurus’s hedonism, it does not truly support the claim that you cannot be harmed unless you are harmed at some time.

Let us assume, then, like Epicurus, that all good and evil consists in sensation. Since all sensations occur at particular times, we can conclude that all goods and evils occur at particular times. The goodness or badness of your life is made up of good and bad things, all of which

occur at particular times in your life. But the notions of *benefit* and *harm* are different from the notions of *good* and *bad*, and just because all goods and bads occur at particular times, it does not follow that all benefits and harms do.

*Benefit* and *harm* are comparative notions. If something benefits you, it makes your life better than it would have been, and if something harms you, it makes your life worse than it would have been. To determine whether some event benefits or harms you, we have to compare the goodness of your life as it is, given the event, with the goodness it would otherwise have had. The comparison is between your whole life as it is and your whole life as it would have been. We do not have to make the comparison time by time, comparing each particular time in one life with the same time in the other. So even if the goodness of your life is made up of good and bad things that all occur at particular times, there is no need for the comparison between lives to be made up of benefits and harms that can all be attached to particular times.

Take an analogy. Suppose the text of a book is cut before it is published. The last chapter is excised, but all the earlier chapters are left intact. Then six thousand words (say) are cut from the book, yet no words are cut from any page in the book. This is so even though every word in the book appears on a particular page. Moreover, had the book been published in the longer, uncut version, every word in the longer book would have appeared on a particular page. The number of words cut from the book is determined by comparing the whole book as it is, with the whole book as it would have been had it not been cut. It is not determined by comparing any particular page with that page as it would have been.

*What is your life worth?*

Similarly, shortening your life may harm you even though there is no time when it harms you. To determine whether it harms you, we compare the goodness of the shorter life you have, taken as a whole, with the goodness of the longer life you would have had, taken as a whole. If we believe Epicurus's hedonism, the goodness of the shorter life is made up of the good and bad sensations that occur within it. The goodness of the longer life includes all those sensations, and also all the good and bad sensations you would have had in later life had you not died. If your life is going well, these extra sensations would have been predominantly good ones. So the longer life would have been better than the shorter one. You are therefore harmed by the shortening of your life. But there is no time when you suffer this harm, just as, when the book is cut, no page in the book loses any words.

Epicurus's hedonism actually implies that death normally harms you. Epicurus thinks it implies the opposite, but he is mistaken. He is right that there is no time when death harms you, but it does not follow that death does not harm you. It may harm you, even though it harms you at no time.

I speak of 'Epicurus's argument,' but Epicurus may not mean to argue that death does not harm you. He says "death is nothing to us," but he may mean simply that you should not mind dying. He may think that dying can harm you, but that even so you should not mind it.

How could that be so? If dying will harm you, surely you should mind it. Not necessarily. It depends on what you care about. Dying will harm *you*, but maybe you should not care about what happens to *you*. You are a person, with a life that extends from when you come into existence to when you go out of ex-

istence. Caring about what happens to you involves caring about the whole of that life. But why should you care about that? For instance, what if you cared about just what happens to you in the present, rather than in your entire life? What you care about may change from time to time. Why should you not, at each particular time, care about just what happens to you at that particular time?

This needs to be put carefully. You probably care about what happens to other people besides yourself, but you probably care in a different way about what happens to you yourself. Call this sort of care 'self-care.' The suggestion is that you should attach your self-care, not to what happens to the person you are, with the whole of your life, but just to what happens to you in the present.

This is what Wittgenstein means when he uses the expression "living in the present." He points out: "For life in the present there is no death. Death is not an event in life."<sup>2</sup> So long as you care only about what happens to you in the present, rather than about yourself as a whole, you will never encounter death among the things you care about. Your death does not occur during your life, so for you it is never in the present. Possibly Epicurus is making a similar point.

I am not concerned here with the correct interpretation of Epicurus. I am interested in how good it is for you to continue living. This is a question about the good of *you*, the person you are, who has a whole life. It is not about what you should care about at any particular time. Does dying – ceasing to live – harm *you*? I asked whether we could find in Epicurus's remarks any reason for thinking it does not. His remarks provide the mate-

2 Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Notebooks, 1914 – 1916* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1961), 75.

rials for an argument, but in the end the argument fails. This does not mean that dying actually does harm you. It only means we have no reason so far to think it does not.

Now I come to the opposite answer, 'everything,' to the question 'What is your life worth to you?' The idea behind it is that when you die, you will have nothing, so by dying you lose everything.

It can be quickly disposed of. It is not true that by dying you lose everything. That conclusion is supposed to follow from the premise that, when you die, you will have nothing. But although this premise is true, it is true only in a peculiar way. Consequently, it does not support the conclusion that you lose everything when you die.

The premise that you will have nothing when you die is true because you will not exist after your death, not because you will exist but have nothing. In the same peculiar way, it is true that Pegasus has no wings, since Pegasus does not exist. In the same way too, it is true that Nelson now has no left arm; it is true because, being dead, Nelson now does not exist.

Think some more about Nelson's arms. Before attacking Santa Cruz de Tenerife, Nelson had a right arm. Afterward he did not. We can conclude that he lost his right arm in the attack. Before his death at the Battle of Trafalgar, he had a left arm. Afterward he did not. But we cannot conclude that he lost his left arm at Trafalgar. He did not lose it there; it remained attached to his body. What happened at Trafalgar instead is that Nelson ceased to exist. It therefore became true in the peculiar way that he afterward had no left arm. But, although his left arm lost its owner, its owner did not lose his left arm.

To say you lose something at a particular time normally implies that you exist both before and after the time. Since you do not exist both before and after your death, it is not true that you lose everything by dying. 'Everything' is not the right answer to the question of what your life is worth to you.

However, we can ask what you lose by dying in a way that does not imply you exist both before and after your death. We do not have to answer the question by comparing what you have after your death with what you had before it. We can instead compare what you have, given that you die at a particular time, with what you would have had if you had not died then. When we think this way, 'what you have' does not refer to what you have at a particular time, but to what you have in your whole life together. Understood this way, what you lose by dying is not everything. You lose just a part of the longer life you would have led, had you not died when you did. Death ends your life; it does not take it away.

The answer 'everything' encourages the idea that your life is infinitely valuable to you. But no one's life has infinite value. How could it? Our human lives are finite in length, and during them we can experience and achieve only a finite number of things. What you lose by dying is the finite difference between a longer life and a shorter one.

What do you gain by continuing to live? Conversely, what do you lose by dying? The answer is the difference between the value of your life if you continue to live, and the value of your shorter life if you die. The right answer to the question lies between the extremes of 'everything' and 'nothing,' or between 'infinity' and 'zero.' It is 'something.'

But 'something' is not good enough; we need to know how much. Excluding

*What is your life worth?*

the two extremes puts us into the domain of quantities. A person's life has some value. What? Furthermore, once we abandon the extremes, we should expect different lives to have different values. Presumably the value of a life depends in some way on its length and its quality. How?

We need a quantitative answer to the question of what a life is worth because important decisions hang on it. Decisions are constantly being made that affect the lengths of people's lives. Some are on a small, individual scale; others on the scale of the whole world. On a small scale, all of us regularly make decisions that shorten or lengthen our lives. Statistically, each doughnut you eat shortens your life. Is it worth it? That is something you probably do not want to think about, and you are probably wise not to. But in other circumstances, you will want to make the calculation. If you have a terminal illness, you will need to decide at what point to give up treatment aimed at extending your life, and accept only palliative care. You may think carefully about that. Your decision may depend on your judgment of the value of extending your life – for instance, on whether you have a book to finish or a child to look after.

You will be weighing the quantity of your life against its quality. You may need to do this explicitly for yourself only in rare and tragic circumstances. But when the decision is for other people, you will need to be more careful. You can be cavalier about your own doughnuts, but not about other people's lives. Governments in particular make decisions that affect the lengths of many people's lives, and they should think carefully about the value of those lives.

Governments often have to weigh some people's lives against others, and weigh the quality of lives against the

quantity of lives. Take the provision of health care. Some treatments (such as hip replacements) improve the quality of people's lives without extending them; some (such as heart replacements) extend lives. When a government sets priorities among different sorts of treatment, it must weigh the quality of life against the quantity of life. It needs to set values on people's lives.

On a much larger scale, we must decide what to do about global warming, which threatens to kill huge numbers of people. It will kill them in natural disasters, in heat waves, and by extending the range of tropical diseases; and it will kill them in marginal areas of the world by making them poorer – poverty is a killer. By reducing our emissions of greenhouse gases, we can reduce the number of people who will be killed. But to do that we shall have to sacrifice some of the quality of our lives. What sacrifices should we make? What reduction in the quality of our lives in the present is worthwhile for the sake of extending the quantity of people's lives in the future? Again, we need to set a value on people's lives, and weigh quality against quantity.

The value of lives is not the only thing at issue in these decisions. When some people's lives are weighed against others, fairness also has a central place. To make this clear, I shall give an example in two parts. First, suppose a doctor can save a patient's life, and can do so using either of two treatments. One will leave the patient in good health. The other will equally well save her life, but leave her blind. Obviously, the doctor should choose the first of these treatments. That is because it will probably do more good than the second. Life with sight is generally better than life without. This is a truth we should not shrink from; nothing else explains why the doctor should

choose the first treatment rather than the second. Since there is only one patient in this first part of the example, fairness is not a consideration. The goodness of the result is the only thing that matters.

Now the second part. Suppose a doctor has two patients who each have a fatal sickness. She has enough resources to save only one of them; the other will die. One of the patients is in good health apart from her present sickness, but the other is blind. Which should the doctor save? This time the answer is not obvious. More good will probably be done by saving the sighted patient – we have already recognized that life with sight is generally better than life without. But just because more good will probably be done, it does not follow that this is the right thing for the doctor to do. It would be dreadfully unfair to the blind patient to let her die just because of her blindness. Fairness is another consideration that is just as important as doing the most good. The doctor needs to find a way of being fair. Choosing between the patients by some random lottery might be a way to do it.

So goodness is not the only consideration, but it is a central one. Therefore, to make vital decisions properly, we have to consider the value of people's lives. We need a proper account of the value of life, and we need to go through the process of intellectual debate that will eventually bring a good account into the public domain. The spur is that, until lives are valued well, they will be valued badly. Because the value of people's lives affects many decisions, governments already make their own valuations, and they generally do so badly.

Governments usually take their method from economics, which has a ready-made way of attaching a value to any-

thing. Economists value things on the basis of the preferences of individuals, which are revealed by their willingness to pay. They calculate a value for human life from people's willingness to pay to extend their lives, or from their willingness to pay to reduce risks to life. This method avoids the need to have any proper account of the value of life. That is left to the people. People make their own judgments about the value of their lives, and express them through their willingness to pay. The economist is spared the bother.

Values for willingness to pay are in practice gleaned from such data as the premium that workers must be paid to induce them to take on dangerous jobs, or from questionnaires that ask people what they would be willing to pay to make their lives safer. The values that emerge vary widely, and are in some cases incoherent. In one study, people's willingness to pay for a large reduction in risk was no more than their willingness to pay for a small reduction.<sup>3</sup> This is not surprising. It is wishful thinking to imagine that people's willingness to pay in these circumstances derives from any coherent view about the value of their lives. It is a difficult task to assign a value to your life. In practice, when you take on a dangerous job, or answer a questionnaire, you are not likely to have made a proper judgment about the value of your life. Your willingness to pay will probably be haphazard; it is not likely to reveal a real judgment.

Valuing lives by willingness to pay is in practice not done even to the standards of good economics. Willingness to pay is measured in terms of money. There is

3 M. W. Jones-Lee, G. Loomes, and P. R. Phillips, "Valuing the Prevention of Non-Fatal Road Injuries: Contingent Valuation vs. Standard Gambles," *Oxford Economic Papers* 47 (1995): 676 – 695.

*What is  
your life  
worth?*

no harm in that: we need to compare the value of lives with the value of other things, and we need some common unit of value. Money is as good as any. But we have to recognize that money does not have the same value to one person as to another. Money is worth less to the rich than to the poor, who require it to satisfy their urgent needs. It is worth less to someone who is nearer death than it is to someone who is not so near; if you are expecting to die soon, you will not have many uses for your money. So if an old person is willing to spend more on extending her life than a young person is, that may not be because her life is more valuable. It may be because money is less valuable to her. If an American is willing to pay fifteen times more to extend her life than a Bangladeshi is, that does not mean her life is fifteen times more valuable.

This is an elementary point, but it is ignored within the practice of valuing human life. The Office of Management and Budget instructs federal agencies to set a higher value on a year of a senior citizen's life than on a year of a young person's life. Its explanation is that old people are likely to have accumulated savings to spend on their health.<sup>4</sup> Its thinking must be that, since an old person has saved up more money, she is likely to be willing to pay more to extend her life, and this shows that a year of her life is more valuable. But actually it simply shows she has more money. One report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change seriously suggested valuing Americans at fifteen times the value of Bangladeshis.<sup>5</sup> So long as willingness

4 Office of Management and Budget, "Circular A-4: Regulatory Analysis," September 17, 2004, sec. E.

5 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, *Climate Change 1995*, vol. 3, *Economic and Social*

to pay is used in this foolish manner, it would be better not to use it at all.

When economists do better cost-benefit analysis than this, they have methods of correcting for money's different values to rich and poor people.<sup>6</sup> But they have as yet no way to correct for its different values to those near death and to those who are further away. In order to make that correction, they would first need a proper account of the value of life.

A different branch of economics has already developed an account of its own. Health economists regularly value people's lives in terms of quality-adjusted life years (QALYs), and their work strongly influences practical decision making in health care. They take the view that the value of a life is given by its length in years, adjusted by a factor that is supposed to measure its quality. There are many difficulties in implementing this theory in detail, but it is sensible in broad terms.

I am not saying it is correct. My purpose is not to defend any particular theory of the value of a life. The benefit of extending life, and conversely the harm done by shortening it, is the difference in value between a longer life and a shorter life. This is the first step toward a theory. It tells us that what we need is a theory of the value of a whole life.

But I shall not go further than that. My purpose is only to argue that we need a theory. Many people are disturbed by the idea of fixing a concrete value on human life. But we need to do it.

---

*Dimensions of Climate Change* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 195–198.

6 See Jean Dreze and Nicholas Stern, "The Theory of Cost-Benefit Analysis," in Alan J. Auerbach and Martin Feldstein, eds., *Handbook of Public Economics*, vol. 2 (Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1987), 909–989.