

Essay by Ronald Whitwam

"LIFE WANTS TO LIVE" © 2011

(A unique reasoning for the value a new life holds.)

It can be argued that until recent times the predominate view on first life issues has been influenced within the context of religious convictions that a Creator starts each life and wants life to live. This respect for the sanctity of human life recognizes the Creator's infinite wisdom in starting each life for his purpose. Further, there has been an understanding that it is folly for man to interfere with the Creator's plans and purposes.

But, growing apathy toward the Creator's purpose has joined hands with denial, by some, that there is a God who cares at all. This has led to new views and political decisions that allow life and death choices to be made by one individual for another. These political decisions are in support of the privacy and choice of the choice-makers, but have overshadowed the privacy and choice of the effected individuals. The result is confusion in our society's motivation for respecting and preserving first life.

The emergence of these new views prompts a challenge to explore thoughts toward the "temporal reasoning" for life's value. It is imperative, after all, to consider life's value as our society makes vital choices affecting the lives of others. Simply ignoring life's value in these decisions robs the choice-makers of essential understanding and disregards what the effected life's private choice may be.

This consideration is especially significant as we influence life issues that require making decisions for those who cannot choose for themselves. Making choices regarding preserving a new life or ending it, for example, certainly begs the question of the value placed on that life. If we do not respect the value of the first spark of life, will we then have respect throughout the events of life and at life's last flicker? From a temporal viewpoint, isn't this respect a necessary element in valuing one's community? Isn't this a necessary element in valuing one's self?

This thought, in the context of new life choices, begs the question as to what value the new life would place on itself and what choice that new life would make if given the chance to choose. The view of this discourse is that there is an apparent life value inferred in the display of life's first spark. The life is after all there, intact, with nothing more needed than time and nurturing to grow, mature, and choose for self. The claim is that by inference we can know that the choice is to preserve rather than end life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

The hypothesis is that it is inherent in human life that, **life wants to live**. Thus when we act to end a life, it is an act against what the life would choose. This may not be testable at the time of life's first spark, but by inference we can predict what the choice would be. We can ask ourselves what we would have said, knowing what we know now, if we could have responded about this issue at our life's first spark. What would we have said to assert that we existed with human value, to assert that we had a human right to live, that we, like the choice makers, had choices to make and a destiny to fulfill?

“Is it not credible to infer what the choice would be at new life, by the choice expressed from our mature awareness?”

“Is it not probable that this choice, projected back to our start, is the choice to live and pursue happiness?”

“Should this not affect our society's collective temporal view on new life choices as well as life nurturing issues?”