

A PHILOSOPHICAL APPRAISAL OF THE BIOLOGICAL LIMITS OF MALE LONGEVITY AND THE EFFECTS OF EXISTENTIAL RESPONSIBILITIES ON THE LIFESPAN OF MEN

Stephen A. Oguji, PhD
 Department of Philosophy,
 Imo State University, Owerri
 Email: ogujisteve@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Women consistently outlive men across cultures and historical periods, a phenomenon often explained in biomedical or evolutionary terms. This paper argues that such explanations, while necessary, are insufficient. Drawing on existential philosophy, ethics of care, and phenomenological accounts of embodiment, the paper proposes that longevity should be understood not merely as a biological outcome but as an existential achievement shaped by values, self-understanding, and habitual forms of life. The paper contends that women's longevity advantage is sustained not only by biological factors but by socially cultivated existential orientations toward care, relationality, vulnerability, and temporal responsibility. Conversely, dominant masculine ideals—emphasizing risk-taking, invulnerability, emotional suppression, and instrumentalization of the body—function as life-shortening moral frameworks. The paper then develops a normative account of how men might compensate for biological disadvantage through existential and behavioral reorientation: reconceiving strength as sustainability, embracing vulnerability as a condition of care, and understanding longevity as an ethical responsibility to one's future self. Rather than moralizing health or denying structural constraints, the paper reframes men's longevity as a philosophical problem of how life is lived and valued. In doing so, it offers a novel existential-ethical framework for understanding lifespan disparities and for rethinking masculine ideals in light of human finitude.

Keywords: Men's longevity, Existential responsibility, Human finitude, Lifespan disparity

INTRODUCTION

This paper emerges from a series of deeply personal and unsettling experiences. Between January 2022 and December 2025, my extended family, Oguji Ugbala of Okuzzu 1 in Onicha Local Government Area, Ebonyi State recorded the burial of several male members—fathers, sons, brothers, and uncles—while only one female member was laid to rest within the same period. Confronted by this striking disparity, I began to reflect systematically on patterns of mortality within the family. As of January 2026, the number of widows significantly exceeds that of widowers, a demographic imbalance that called for deeper inquiry. Extending this investigation to other families within Ebonyi State and neighboring regions, I discovered similar trends. A further informal consultation on January 26, 2026, with a mortuary attendant at a government hospital in Owerri revealed that, of 76 recorded bodies deposited between January 1 and 26, 51 were male and 25 female. These observations prompt a philosophical interrogation of the biological vulnerabilities and existential responsibilities that shape men's longevity.

In line with these experiences mentioned above, statistics across nearly all cultures, countries, and historical periods, show that women on average live longer than men—a robust empirical fact documented by demographic, biological, and evolutionary research. (United Nations, 2019, Goodkind & Kowal, 2016, Austad, 2006). This “longevity gap” persists globally: women typically, according to (Zarulli et al 840) outlive men by several years in life expectancy statistics, and even under extreme mortality conditions such as famines or epidemics, females exhibit lower mortality rates than males within the same populations.

Scientific explanations for this generally point to two pro-female interacting biological factors: genetic redundancy conferred by two X chromosomes and the cardioprotective effects of estrogen—as well as behavioral and social differences, including men’s greater engagement in risk-taking behaviors, higher rates of substance use, and lower utilization of preventive healthcare. (Geneva: WHO, 2023). Evolutionary analyses further indicate that this pattern extends across many mammalian species, reflecting long-standing dynamics of sexual selection and parental investment. (Max Plank, 2024)

But the essence and objective of this paper is that beyond these empirical findings, the longevity gap invites philosophical reflection on agency, meaning, and responsibility in relation to why women generally live longer than men. The reflection becomes richer from an Aristotelian perspective where longevity is not merely a biological outcome but is connected to *eudaimonia*—human flourishing achieved through rational activity in accordance with virtue. Aristotle argues that the good life consists not in isolated pleasures or honors but in a sustained pattern of virtuous action over a complete life: “Happiness is an activity of soul in accordance with virtue.” (Aristotle, 1999, p.18) Because flourishing unfolds temporally, habits of moderation, care for the body, and practical wisdom (*phronēsis*) are integral to living well. Persistent patterns of self-neglect or excessive risk-taking thus appear ethically deficient insofar as they undermine the conditions for a complete and flourishing life.

Furthermore, from existentialist perspective, it will be shown that longevity is a matter of lived commitment rather than natural fate. For Jean-Paul Sartre, (2007, p.22) human existence is characterized by radical freedom: “existence precedes essence.” Life is not a datum passively received but a project actively constituted through choice. From this standpoint, lifespan is shaped not only by biological constraints but by how individuals assume—or evade—responsibility for their ways of being. Socially valorized ideals of masculinity that prize danger, invulnerability, or self-sacrificial overwork may function as existential scripts that men repeatedly enact, often at the cost of their long-term well-being. This means that shorter life span of men versus the women reflects not merely biological disadvantage but patterns of meaning and commitment embedded in cultural narratives.

Similarly, Hans Jonas in his *The Imperative of Responsibility: In Search of an Ethics for the Technological Age* (1984) extends this analysis by situating individual life within a broader moral horizon that includes the future of humanity itself. Jonas argues that modern technological power imposes a new imperative: “Act so that the effects of your action are compatible with the permanence of genuine human life” (p.11). Although his concern is primarily intergenerational, the framework also illuminates individual conduct. To live responsibly is to orient one’s actions toward the preservation and continuity of life—one’s own and others’. Chronic risk-taking, disregard for health, and indifference to future consequences thus appear ethically problematic not

only for their social costs but for their failure to honor life as something entrusted rather than merely expended.

It is against these perspectives that the paper will be arguing that the question “Why do men die earlier?” is not merely empirical but normative. It is argued that lifespan emerges as an ethical expression of how lives are valued, organized, and sustained over time. While biological factors partially explain women’s persistent longevity advantage, existential attitudes and socially patterned behaviors play a decisive role. Longevity is not simply given by nature; it is mediated by how individuals relate to risk, care, vulnerability, and meaning. Although men may face certain biological disadvantages, these are neither deterministic nor insurmountable. In principle, they can be counterbalanced by cultivating alternative ways of being—ways that emphasize self-care, relational responsibility, and long-term orientation. From Aristotle’s flourishing life, through existential freedom, to Jonas’s responsibility for future life, longevity appears less as a brute fact and more as a moral achievement unfolding across time.

Methodologically, the argument adopts an interdisciplinary approach. Biology provides insight into sex-based physiological differences; sociology illuminates how gender norms and social structures pattern behavior; philosophy supplies the interpretive and prescriptive framework. Philosophy, in particular, allows us to move from description to evaluation, asking not only why longevity differences exist, but what they mean and how they ought to be addressed.

THE EMPIRICAL BACKGROUND: THE LONGEVITY GAP

Studies show that women’s longer life expectancy compared to men is one of the most consistent findings in demographic research across continents, political systems, and levels of development, suggesting a near-universal female survival advantage (Steven N. Austad, 2006; Anna Barford et al., 2006). Cross-national demographic analyses further confirm that women outlive men in both high-income and developing societies, although the size of the gap varies over time and place (Dana A. Glei & Shiro Horiuchi, 2007). Research examining behavioral and lifestyle factors suggests that biological, social, and environmental influences jointly contribute to this persistent difference (Marc Luy et al., 2015). Global demographic data compiled by the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2022) and the World Health Organization (2019) consistently document the female advantage in life expectancy worldwide, reinforcing the conclusion that the pattern is both stable and widespread rather than historically or culturally isolated.

Historical demography confirms this persistence. Even in premodern societies marked by high infant mortality and infectious disease, female survival advantages emerge once maternal mortality risks are accounted for (Samuel H. Preston, 1976; Robert D. Retherford, 1975). In modern societies, where obstetric dangers have been substantially reduced, the female advantage not only remains but often widens (Shiro Horiuchi, 1997; Marc Luy et al., 2015). Such continuity indicates that the longevity gap is not simply a byproduct of contemporary medical systems but reflects deeper interactions between biological vulnerability and social organization (Steven N. Austad, 2006).

At the same time, significant variation exists in the size of the gap across time and place (Dana A. Glei & Samuel H. Preston, 2010). These fluctuations become intelligible when viewed through

Georges Canguilhem's distinction between the normal and the pathological. For Canguilhem (1991), the normal is not a statistical average but a normative capacity of an organism to establish viable relations with its environment. From this perspective, male excess mortality does not merely signal deviation from a biological norm; it reflects socially produced environments in which certain ways of living systematically exceed bodily tolerance. Risk-taking, overwork, and delayed care are rendered "normal" modes of masculine existence, even when they are physiologically pathological (Courtenay W. H., 2000).

Biological explanations account for part of the pattern. Hormonal and genetic factors afford women certain immunological and cardiovascular advantages, while men are more susceptible to specific metabolic and inflammatory conditions (Steven N. Austad, 2006; Marianne J. Legato, 2008). Yet biology alone cannot explain why male mortality is disproportionately driven by accidents, violence, substance abuse, and preventable chronic disease (World Health Organization, 2019). These causes are not biologically necessary; they are socially patterned (Courtenay W. H., 2000). Here the empirical record becomes philosophically provocative: the longevity gap tracks not only bodily difference but differential normalization of exposure to harm.

Ian Hacking's work on statistics and "making up people" helps clarify this dynamic. Once populations are classified, measured, and compared, new kinds of persons come into being—individuals who understand themselves through statistical categories (Hacking, 1986, 1990). Life expectancy figures do not merely describe reality; they shape self-understanding and expectation. Men come to inhabit identities implicitly oriented toward shorter lives, while risk becomes naturalized as part of a masculine statistical profile. In this sense, mortality statistics participate in looping effects: classifications influence behavior, which in turn reinforces the classifications (Hacking, 1995).

Women's comparatively longer lives, by contrast, are associated with socially encouraged practices of attentiveness, relationality, and bodily monitoring (Courtenay W. H., 2000). These practices are not inherently emancipatory; they often accompany unequal caregiving burdens and moral expectations (Joan C. Tronto, 1993). Yet they function normatively to sustain life. Georges Canguilhem's framework helps explain why such practices count as life-preserving: they expand the organism's capacity to adapt rather than pushing it beyond its limits (Canguilhem, 1991). Longevity thus reflects differential norms of self-relation rather than fixed biological destiny.

It is against this background that a purely biomedical account proves insufficient precisely because the longevity gap is historically plastic. If biology were decisive, the magnitude of the gap would remain relatively constant. Instead, it expands and contracts with changes in labor regimes, warfare, substance use, and public health infrastructure (Dana A. Gleit & Samuel H. Preston, 2010; World Health Organization, 2019). Biology sets conditions of possibility, but norms determine trajectories.

This limitation becomes especially evident in adolescence and early adulthood, when men's mortality disadvantage emerges most sharply despite peak biological robustness. Elevated rates of death from violence, accidents, and suicide at these stages indicate that lifespan is not merely given at birth but actively "lived into" through culturally sanctioned behaviors (Courtenay, 2000; World Health Organization, 2019).

Michel Foucault's early work on biopolitics provides a framework for understanding this phenomenon. Modern power, Foucault argues, increasingly takes life itself as its object, governing

populations through norms of health, productivity, and risk (Foucault, 1978). Longevity statistics are central to this regime: they enable populations to be compared, optimized, and managed. Yet biopolitical rationality does not distribute life evenly. Certain forms of life—disciplined, risk-averse, health-oriented—are tacitly fostered, while others are rendered expendable.

Philosophical Relevance of the Data

The longevity gap therefore occupies the intersection of nature, normativity, and power. It raises questions about agency without collapsing into moral blame: to what extent are individuals responsible for life-shortening practices that are socially rewarded? It reframes self-care as an ethical and political issue rather than a private lifestyle choice. And it exposes how norms governing strength, sacrifice, and productivity can become literally lethal. Seen through Canguilhem, Hacking, and Foucault, longevity is neither a brute biological fact nor a neutral statistic. It is a site where norms become embodied, identities are formed, and power decides which ways of living are sustainable. The empirical background thus sets the stage for a deeper philosophical inquiry: not only why women live longer than men, but how societies normalize forms of life that differentially sustain—or erode—human flourishing over time.

BIOLOGICAL FACTORS IN WOMEN’S LONGEVITY ADVANTAGE

Biology plays a genuine and nontrivial role in explaining why women, on average, live longer than men (Steven N. Austad, 2006). A philosophically adequate account, however, must acknowledge biological influences without allowing them to harden into determinism. As both classical and contemporary philosophy emphasize, biological factors establish conditions and tendencies rather than fixed outcomes; they shape probabilities, not destinies. Aristotle provides an early framework for this non-deterministic understanding of nature. In his biological and ethical works, *phusis* denotes an internal principle of development that operates “for the most part” (*hōs epi to polu*), not with necessity (Aristotle, trans. 1984). Natural traits incline organisms toward certain ends but remain vulnerable to contingency, habituation, and practical reason (Aristotle, trans. 2000). Applied to longevity, this view implies that biological sex differences structure risks without dictating lifespans. Nature supplies potentials, not verdicts.

Genetic and hormonal differences illustrate this probabilistic structure. Women’s possession of two X chromosomes affords a degree of genetic redundancy that can mitigate the expression of deleterious mutations, while men’s single X chromosome increases vulnerability to certain inherited disorders (Austad, 2006). Hormonal profiles further contribute to differential risk: estrogen exerts protective effects on cardiovascular health and immune response, whereas testosterone is associated with higher inflammatory load and cardiovascular stress (Marianne J. Legato, 2008). Yet these effects operate statistically. Not all women benefit equally from hormonal protection, nor are all men biologically disadvantaged to the same extent. Moreover, many hormonal advantages decline after menopause, even as women’s longevity advantage often persists, indicating that biology initiates but does not sustain the gap (Austad, 2006).

Simone de Beauvoir’s critique of biological determinism sharpens this point. “Biology is not destiny,” she famously argues, insisting that physiological facts acquire meaning only within social and existential contexts (Beauvoir, 2011). Sexed bodies do not prescribe life trajectories; they are interpreted, managed, and lived through historically variable norms and practices. Applied to

longevity, this insight cautions against reading biological differences as explanations of unequal outcomes rather than as elements within broader structures of agency and valuation.

Contemporary philosophers of science reinforce this non-deterministic stance through accounts of probabilistic causation. Causes in complex biological systems, as Nancy Cartwright argues, do not necessitate outcomes but raise or lower their likelihood under specific conditions (Cartwright, 1989). Biological factors thus function as dispositional contributors whose effects depend on environmental, behavioral, and institutional contexts. Framed in this way, biology explains why the longevity gap is possible, but not why it takes particular forms in lived human lives. It establishes a baseline of vulnerability and resilience against which agency, habit, and social organization operate. To treat biology as fate is to obscure precisely the space in which ethical and political transformation remains possible.

EXISTENTIAL AND BEHAVIORAL DIMENSIONS OF LONGEVITY

Attitudes toward Vulnerability and Care

One of the most consistently observed gender differences relevant to longevity concerns attitudes toward vulnerability. Women, across many cultural contexts, enjoy greater social permission to acknowledge weakness, seek assistance, and attend to bodily and emotional needs without jeopardizing their moral standing. This permission has concrete consequences: earlier medical intervention, stronger support networks, and a sustained orientation toward maintenance rather than crisis response.

Care ethics offers a powerful framework for interpreting this pattern. Carol Gilligan argues that moral maturity does not consist in abstraction from dependency but in responsiveness to it (Gilligan, 1982). Against moral theories that valorize autonomy as separation, Gilligan emphasizes that attentiveness, responsibility, and care for particular others constitute a legitimate moral voice. Nel Noddings develops this insight into a relational moral ontology, arguing that ethical life originates not in rules or principles but in the lived experience of being-with and caring-for others (Noddings, 1984). From this perspective, vulnerability is not a moral deficit but a precondition of ethical relation. Women's greater willingness—or social permission—to acknowledge vulnerability may therefore support practices of care that indirectly sustain life. Men's systematic discouragement from such acknowledgment transforms vulnerability into silent risk. When care is feminized and dependence stigmatized, attentiveness to bodily signals is delayed until pathology becomes unavoidable. Philosophy here clarifies that care is not the opposite of agency but one of its most mature expressions: the capacity to sustain oneself and others across time.

Relational Orientation and Embodied Subjectivity

Differences in relational orientation further illuminate the longevity gap. Women tend, on average, to cultivate denser social networks, engage in sustained emotional labor, and maintain relationships across the life course. These patterns are often unequally imposed and ethically ambivalent, yet they also generate protective effects for physical and mental health.

Maurice Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology of embodied subjectivity challenges the image of the self as an isolated interior consciousness. The subject, he argues, is always already situated, bodily, and interwoven with others and the world (Merleau-Ponty, 1962). Existence is not something one

has but something one lives through embodied engagement. Social disconnection thus registers not merely as psychological loss but as an impoverishment of embodied being. Longevity data appear to support this ontological claim: lives sustained through ongoing relational embodiment are more resilient than those organized around self-sufficiency. Men's relative social isolation—especially in later life—has measurable consequences. Narrower friendship networks, reduced emotional disclosure, and reliance on a single partner for intimacy increase vulnerability to depression, stress-related illness, and premature death. The philosophical cost of construing autonomy as independence becomes biologically legible.

Care, Continuity, and World-Building

Hannah Arendt's reflections on natality and world-building further deepen the analysis. For Arendt, human life gains meaning not through heroic self-assertion but through participation in a shared world that persists beyond individual lives (Arendt, 1958). Natality names the capacity to begin, while continuity depends on practices that preserve and renew the human world. Care—understood as sustaining bodies, relationships, and institutions—is therefore not ancillary to political or existential significance but foundational to it.

Social scripts that equate masculinity with risk, stoicism, and self-sacrifice disrupt this continuity. When danger is moralized and care devalued, life is oriented toward intensity rather than duration. Premature death then appears not as an anomaly but as the foreseeable outcome of a meaning structure that prizes endurance over preservation. The longevity gap thus exposes how existential orientations shape biological outcomes. Taken together, care ethics, embodied phenomenology, and Arendtian world-building reveal longevity as neither accidental nor purely medical. It reflects how societies distribute permission to be vulnerable, how selves are embedded in relations, and how meaning is assigned to care across time. Longevity emerges not merely as survival, but as a mode of inhabiting the world responsibly and sustainably.

THE EXISTENTIAL COSTS OF MASCULINE IDEALS

Stoicism Misunderstood

Classical Stoicism, properly understood, does not advocate emotional suppression or bodily neglect. Stoic philosophers such as Epictetus and Seneca emphasized rational attentiveness to what lies within one's control, including the disciplined care of the body and the moderation of destructive passions (Epictetus, trans. 2008; Seneca, trans. 1969). Endurance was never meant to entail blindness to suffering. The contemporary appropriation of "stoicism" within masculine culture, however, distorts this tradition into a mandate for silence, emotional opacity, and self-neglect. Pain is treated not as a signal to be interpreted but as an obstacle to be ignored. This distortion shortens life rather than ennobles it.

Friedrich Nietzsche offers a powerful critique of such misreadings. He repeatedly warns against moral ideals that glorify endurance for its own sake and convert suffering into proof of worth (Nietzsche, 1967, 2006). When strength is defined as the capacity to endure damage without complaint, life itself becomes subordinated to an abstract ideal. Nietzsche identifies this as a life-denying orientation: an ethos that "turns against life" by valuing hardness over vitality (Nietzsche, 1967). In this light, pseudo-stoic masculinity appears not as resilience but as a quiet asceticism that sacrifices flourishing to image.

The Cult of Invulnerability

Closely related is the cult of invulnerability: the belief that a worthy life is one untouched by dependence, fear, or fragility. Existential philosophy identifies this stance as a form of self-deception. For Martin Heidegger, authentic existence requires being-toward-death—the lucid acknowledgment of finitude as an ever-present condition of life (Heidegger, 1962). Mortality is not a future event to be denied but a structuring horizon that gives urgency and meaning to existence. To deny vulnerability is therefore to flee from one’s own being.

Jean-Paul Sartre deepens this critique through the concept of bad faith. Bad faith arises when individuals refuse to recognize themselves as finite, embodied agents and instead adopt rigid identities that excuse them from responsibility (Sartre, 1956). The invulnerable man who imagines himself as pure will or instrument of endurance denies his bodily contingency in order to sustain a socially admired role. This denial is not neutral. By discouraging preventive care, emotional expression, and adaptive change, it accelerates physical decline. Mortality denied becomes mortality hastened.

Nietzsche again proves instructive. He distinguishes life-affirming strength from the will to hardness that refuses to acknowledge limits. Genuine vitality, for Nietzsche, includes the capacity to interpret suffering, respond creatively to it, and reorganize life accordingly (Nietzsche, 2006). Ideals that demand blindness to fragility, by contrast, impoverish life rather than intensify it.

Instrumentalization of the Self

A final existential cost emerges when men are encouraged to treat their bodies as tools rather than as lived sites of meaning. Productivity, endurance, and output are prioritized to the point where the body is valued only for what it delivers. Phenomenology distinguishes between the lived body (*Leib*)—the medium of perception and care—and the objectified body (*Körper*), a resource to be optimized or exhausted (Heidegger, 1962). When the self is instrumentalized, exhaustion becomes moralized and rest stigmatized. Injury is reframed as honor.

Heidegger’s analysis of authenticity clarifies what is lost in this process. When existence is absorbed entirely into roles, functions, and performance, the self becomes alienated from its own possibilities (Heidegger, 1962). Longevity suffers because the body is no longer listened to, only demanded of. Nietzsche would describe this as a symptom of nihilism: life subordinated to values that ultimately undermine it (Nietzsche, 1967). Taken together, these philosophical critiques reveal that dominant masculine ideals impose genuine existential costs. Misunderstood stoicism, invulnerability, and instrumental self-relation do not merely shape identity; they shape lifespan. What appears as strength often masks a refusal.

EXISTENTIAL AND BEHAVIORAL ATTITUDES MEN SHOULD CULTIVATE

The Normative Core: Reorienting Masculine Ideals toward Longevity

If men are to compensate for biological vulnerabilities and culturally induced risks, the task is not merely behavioral modification but existential reorientation. What is required is a transformation in how life, strength, care, and time itself are understood. Classical philosophy already provides a rich framework for such a transformation, one that treats longevity not as accident or indulgence but as a moral achievement.

Care of the Self as Care of the Soul

Socratic and Platonic ethics begin from the claim that the primary task of human life is the care of the soul (*epimeleia tēs psychēs*). In the *Apology*, Socrates rebukes his fellow citizens for attending to wealth, honor, and bodily advantage while neglecting the condition of their souls (Plato, 2002). Care of the self here is not self-indulgence but moral stewardship: an ongoing attentiveness to how one lives, what one values, and what kind of person one becomes over time. Importantly, this care presupposes finitude. One cares for the soul precisely because life is limited and easily misdirected. Applied to masculine ideals, this tradition challenges the equation of self-care with weakness. To attend to one's health, emotional life, and relational capacities is not a retreat from moral seriousness but its condition. A neglected body and an unexamined life alike undermine the possibility of sustained ethical agency. Longevity, from this perspective, is not merely biological survival but the preservation of the conditions under which self-examination and responsibility remain possible.

Stoic Rational Self-Care Properly Understood

Stoicism is often misread as a doctrine of emotional suppression or heroic indifference to suffering. In fact, classical Stoic thinkers such as Epictetus and Seneca emphasized rational self-governance and prudent care of what lies within one's control, including one's body and habits (Epictetus, trans. 2008; Seneca, trans. 1969). Epictetus insists that philosophy is not a matter of posturing but of daily exercise (*askēsis*), aimed at living in accordance with nature understood as rational order (Epictetus, trans. 2008). Seneca explicitly warns against confusing endurance with wisdom, arguing that neglect of health undermines one's capacity for moral action (Seneca, trans. 1969).

Properly understood, Stoic self-care aligns with longevity rather than opposing it. Rational discipline involves interpreting bodily signals, moderating excess, and preserving one's ability to act well over time. The popular masculine appropriation of "stoicism" as silence, emotional opacity, and self-neglect represents not fidelity but distortion. It replaces rational stewardship with denial, thereby converting what was meant as a philosophy of freedom into a practice of quiet self-harm.

Virtue as Habit and Temporal Practice

Aristotle's ethics further clarifies why longevity must be understood temporally. Virtue, for Aristotle, is not an isolated act or moment of heroism but a stable disposition (*hexis*) formed through repeated practice over time (Aristotle, trans. 2009). Moral excellence requires concern for the whole life, not merely for episodic displays of endurance. Practical wisdom (*phronēsis*) involves discerning how to act so that one's capacities are preserved and refined across changing circumstances (Aristotle, trans. 2009).

From this standpoint, masculine ideals that glorify overwork, chronic risk, or bodily disregard appear ethically incoherent. They prioritize intensity over continuity and sacrifice future agency for present recognition. Aristotle's framework instead supports an account of strength as sustainability: the capacity to remain a functioning, responsive, and responsible agent across decades. Caring for one's health, cultivating emotional regulation, and maintaining relationships are thus not ancillary virtues but central to ethical life.

Technologies of the Self and Ethical Self-Formation

Michel Foucault's later work on technologies of the self provides a modern articulation of these ancient insights. Foucault describes ethical subjectivity as something actively formed through practices by which individuals "effect operations on their own bodies and souls" in order to live in certain ways (Foucault, 1988). Such practices—self-monitoring, reflection, discipline, and care—are not expressions of narcissism but of freedom exercised within constraint.

Longevity fits squarely within this framework. To care for one's future capacity to act is to engage in an ethical relationship with oneself across time. Preventive health practices, emotional literacy, and relational investment become techniques through which men resist socially imposed scripts of self-exhaustion. In this sense, choosing longevity is not withdrawal from responsibility but an expansion of it: a commitment to remain available to others and to share projects over the long term.

Reorienting Meaning Away from Risk

Finally, a philosophical reorientation must address how meaning is assigned. Many masculine scripts locate significance in danger, sacrifice, and domination. Risk becomes proof of worth; exhaustion, a badge of honor. Yet such meaning is structurally unstable, dependent on ever-greater stakes and diminishing returns. An alternative conception of meaning, implicit in Plato, Aristotle, Stoicism, and Foucault alike, emphasizes continuity, stewardship, and presence (Aristotle, trans. 2009; Epictetus, trans. 2008; Foucault, 1988; Plato, 2002). To sustain one's life attentively, to remain capable of care, and to inhabit one's embodied existence truthfully is to honor life as something entrusted rather than expended. Longevity, on this view, is not cowardice but fidelity—to oneself, to others, and to the future. All this means that even though men cannot choose their biology, they can choose how they inhabit it. By cultivating practices of care, rational self-governance, and temporal responsibility, longevity becomes not a statistical accident but an ethical achievement shaped by philosophical insight.

A common objection holds that arguments emphasizing agency in longevity risk moralizing health and implicitly blaming men for earlier mortality. This concern is well founded. A John Rawls framework reminds us that individuals' life prospects are shaped by social structures whose fairness cannot be assumed. Health outcomes are deeply influenced by what Rawls calls the "basic structure" of society—institutions that distribute opportunities, risks, and resources independently of individual choice (Rawls, 1971). Masculine norms are typically inherited prior to reflection, and many life-shortening behaviors are socially rewarded rather than freely chosen. The present argument is therefore critical rather than accusatory: it seeks to expose how norms constrain agency, not to assign personal fault.

Bernard Williams's critique of moralized ideals further sharpens this caution. Williams warns against ethical frameworks that transform contingent goods—such as health or longevity—into moralized standards by which persons are judged (Williams, 1985). To treat early death as a moral failure would be philosophically indefensible. Accordingly, this account resists equating health outcomes with virtue.

CONCLUSION

This paper has argued that men's shorter lifespan, while partly grounded in biological vulnerability, cannot be adequately understood as a mere medical misfortune. Rather, it reflects a durable existential pattern shaped by norms of masculinity, orientations toward risk and care, and culturally sanctioned attitudes toward vulnerability. Men do not simply have shorter lives; they are often guided into ways of living that quietly abbreviate them. Longevity, in this sense, is not only distributed by nature but patterned by meaning. Recognizing this does not entail blaming individual men for their mortality. Instead, it reveals how inherited ideals of strength, endurance, and self-sacrifice can become life-shortening when left unexamined. What appears as fate is frequently the cumulative result of normalized practices that discourage care, relationality, and long-term self-regard.

The central philosophical contribution of this work is to reframe longevity as an achievement of agency rather than a passive outcome of biology or medicine. By integrating empirical findings with existential analysis, the paper shows that lifespan is partly an ethical expression of how a life is inhabited over time. Philosophy's role is not to replace biomedical explanation, but to interpret what those explanations imply about responsibility, normativity, and the good life. Longevity, so understood, becomes a site of philosophical evaluation: a measure of whether dominant ideals support sustainable existence or erode it. This reframing allows demographic data to speak to enduring philosophical concerns about selfhood, embodiment, and the temporal structure of responsibility.

In the end, learning from women's longevity does not require imitation in any narrow sense. It calls instead for a transformation of masculine ideals: from endurance to sustainability, from invulnerability to care, from risk-centered meaning to stewardship of life. Such transformation does not diminish masculinity; it renders it livable. To take one's life seriously, both literally and philosophically, is to acknowledge that life is finite, fragile, and ongoing. It is to live in a way that preserves the conditions of future agency rather than exhausting them for present recognition. In this light, longevity is not merely about living longer, but about living wisely enough that one remains answerable to one's life for as long as it lasts.

REFERENCES

- Arendt, H. (1958). *The human condition*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Aristotle. (1984). *The complete works of Aristotle* (J. Barnes, Ed.). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Aristotle. (2000). *Nicomachean ethics* (R. Crisp, Trans.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Aristotle. (2009). *Nicomachean ethics* (W. D. Ross, Trans.). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press. (Original work published ca. 350 BCE)
- Austad, S. N. (2006). Why women live longer than men: Sex differences in longevity. *Gender Medicine*, 3(2), 79–92. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1550-8579\(06\)80198-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1550-8579(06)80198-1)
- Barford, A., Dorling, D., Davey Smith, G., & Shaw, M. (2006). Life expectancy: Women now on top everywhere. *BMJ*, 332(7545), 808. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.332.7545.808>
- Beauvoir, S. de. (2011). *The second sex* (C. Borde & S. Malovany-Chevallier, Trans.). New York, NY: Vintage Books. (Original work published 1949)
- Canguilhem, G. (1991). *The normal and the pathological* (C. R. Fawcett, Trans.). New York, NY: Zone Books. (Original work published 1943)
- Cartwright, N. (1989). *Nature's capacities and their measurement*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.
- Courtenay, W. H. (2000). Constructions of masculinity and their influence on men's well-being: A theory of gender and health. *Social Science & Medicine*, 50(10), 1385–1401. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536\(99\)00390-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536(99)00390-1)
- Epictetus. (2008). *Discourses and selected writings* (R. Hard, Trans.). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press. (Original work published ca. 108 CE)
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality, Volume 1: An introduction* (R. Hurley, Trans.). New York, NY: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1988). Technologies of the self. In L. H. Martin, H. Gutman, & P. H. Hutton (Eds.), *Technologies of the self: A seminar with Michel Foucault* (pp. 16–49). Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Glei, D. A., & Horiuchi, S. (2007). The narrowing sex differential in life expectancy in high-income populations: Effects of differences in the age pattern of mortality. *Population Studies*, 61(2), 141–159. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00324720701331433>
- Glei, D. A., & Preston, S. H. (2010). Causes of death contributing to the narrowing sex differential in life expectancy. *Population and Development Review*, 36(4), 801–823.
- Hacking, I. (1986). Making up people. In T. C. Heller, M. Sosna, & D. E. Wellbery (Eds.), *Reconstructing individualism* (pp. 222–236). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Hacking, I. (1990). *The taming of chance*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hacking, I. (1995). The looping effects of human kinds. In D. Sperber, D. Premack, & A. J. Premack (Eds.), *Causal cognition* (pp. 351–383). Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.
- Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and time* (J. Macquarrie & E. Robinson, Trans.). New York, NY: Harper & Row. (Original work published 1927)
- Legato, M. J. (2008). Gender-specific aspects of cardiovascular disease. *International Journal of Fertility and Women's Medicine*, 53(2), 58–63.
- Luy, M., Gast, K., Doehner, H., Doehner, W., & Vaupel, J. W. (2015). Gender differences in life expectancy: How much can be explained by differences in lifestyle? *European Journal of Epidemiology*, 30(8), 735–749. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10654-015-0033-7>

- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1962). *Phenomenology of perception* (C. Smith, Trans.). London, England: Routledge & Kegan Paul. (Original work published 1945)
- Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Nietzsche, F. (1967). *On the genealogy of morals* (W. Kaufmann & R. J. Hollingdale, Trans.). New York, NY: Vintage Books. (Original work published 1887)
- Nietzsche, F. (2006). *Thus spoke Zarathustra* (A. Del Caro, Trans.). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1883–1885)
- Planck, Max, (2024) Institute for Demographic Research, “Why Women Live Longer than Men,”
- Plato. (2002). *Five dialogues* (G. M. A. Grube, Trans.). Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing. (Original work published ca. 399 BCE)
- Preston, S. H. (1976). *Mortality patterns in national populations*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Retherford, R. D. (1975). The changing sex differential in mortality. *Population Studies*, 29(1), 77–92.
- Sartre, J.-P. (1956). *Being and nothingness* (H. E. Barnes, Trans.). New York, NY: Philosophical Library. (Original work published 1943)
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Seneca. (1969). *Letters from a Stoic* (R. Campbell, Trans.). London, England: Penguin Books. (Original work published ca. 65 CE)
- Tronto, J. C. (1993). *Moral boundaries: A political argument for an ethic of care*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. (2022). *World population prospects 2022: Summary of results*. New York, NY: United Nations.
- Williams, B. (1985). *Ethics and the limits of philosophy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- World Health Organization. (2019). *World health statistics 2019: Monitoring health for the SDGs*. Geneva, Switzerland: Author.
- Virginia Zarulli et al., “Women Live Longer than Men Even during Severe Famines and Epidemics,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 115, no. 4 (2018): E832–E840.