



Since the beginning of the electoral campaign in Peru, which started a few months ago more forcefully, I have been wondering which candidate is the one who deserves our vote. Honestly, I have heard everything, I have talked with many people, and there is a lot of unease and indecision in the situation. Who to vote for?

The discussions I have heard usually deal with two central issues: corruption and the economy. However, despite being central issues, I consider that there are more important issues still that are the defense of life and the family.

Why?

Let's see, society is a union of people, but it is not simply a conglomeration of them. A Spanish philosopher tells us that society is an association of people who seek the achievement of particular and common ends (1). What fines chase society? There can be no other than the same person and their well-being. That is their supreme goal and all the ends they pursue are directed to the person himself. Let's ask. Why do we want to improve transportation? Why do we want to favor the types? Why are we concerned about security as much as the fight against crime? All this is found in the well-being of the people that make up the society, their professional development, their well-being, their comfort. The purpose of being together as a Peruvian society is to seek the good of the Peruvians, the Peruvian, the human being who lives in these lands.

Politicians have a particularly important position in this society, since, from a classical definition, they must seek to serve the common good of this, and not simply seek to entrench their power. The common good is "the proportionate participation of every one of the components of the Society of the goods of the same", as well as "the series of social and juridical conditions that enable the good of every one of the citizens" (2). If the society is to seek the good of the person, some should watch particularly and from a managerial position to unify this good for all and establish the conditions for the Peruvians to reach their perfection. This means that they should provide means for everyone to participate in the goods that are necessary, both material and spiritual, both economic and other related to

deep values that are needed for society to reach its perfection and each can achieve happiness. Each society will have different needs in response to the common good. If a society suffers from a lot of crime, it will have to attend to that. If a society suffers from extreme poverty, it will have to attend to that sector. However, there are some goods that, because of their basic nature, are and will always be a matter to protect, respect and promote by the state in the name of the common good. It can be said that they are goods that one cannot renounce, as the basis of society, and the source of the greatest goods for the person. Two of them are life and family.

The Constitution of Peru clearly states: "Everyone has the right: to Life" (article 2, number 1). It is the first number of all those concerned with the rights of the person. Life is the origin of every other right, so much so that, if life is not respected, everything else -language, race, sex, economic condition, identity, freedom of conscience, religion, inviolability of domicile, and long etcetera- is without its foundation first.

In this, we are talking about the defense of life from conception. Perhaps the most transcendental question on this issue is this: whether the embryo and the fetus are or are not a human being. Because if he is a human being, he receives all the rights that concern us, starting, as I mentioned, for the right to life. Is it or is it not a human being? Scientifically, we have some arguments. From conception, the embryo is a living being that contains all the information to develop. Develop, not change to something that will be something else. Substantially, it is already a human being, and, although some aspects that are proper to man as rationality have not yet manifested, they are certainly contained in the embryo. Do we wonder if a newborn baby that does not have the capacity for self-reflection or to abstract is a human being? We do not do it in any way, because we know that this is something that will develop. How not to affirm then with all forcefulness that the embryo is a human being? On the other hand, talking about the woman having the right to decide about her body sounds contradictory, because even though the embryo and, later, the fetus is dependent on her, they are not her body. They are an independent living being with a different DNA, even with the possibility that the mother and the baby have different blood types.

Therefore, my first conclusion is that a politician, however well prepared by the studies he has done or has a proposal that will make us grow economically in the best way, if he does not respect life from conception, is ruled out because he would be attacking a foundation of society.

On the other hand, we have a family. The family is the basic cell of society. What does this mean? The whole society is configured in families. That is the basis of each person's life, where kinship and consanguinity establish an intimate relationship that gives structure and foundation to all people. In the family, the person begins his education and training, and is the area of development first of the personality, laying the foundations for all life. The family is very important in

society, and politicians, taking care of the common good, have the inalienable duty of protecting it, defending it and promoting its well-being, taking care to generate a culture through the laws that affect its realization.

So, the family brings great benefits to society. First, it is so, because it perpetuates life, being the "sanctuary of Life", because, without new people, society does not grow; and secondly, for the contribution to the formation of new citizens. This, then, applies to the natural family between a man and a woman. While there are other ways to bring children into the world, respecting human nature children comes from the union between man and woman. Aristotle mentioned that happiness is achieved by virtue, and this is achieved by respect for nature. The politicians, in aspiring that the man reaches its perfection, must ensure respect for the natural, because it is the biological and spiritual path that we have in itself, to arrive at our perfection. Can we dare to invent or reinterpret the human being? On the other hand, there are scientific studies that affirm the qualitatively different contributions that men and women give to the formation of the child. (3) The mother gives a contribution of unconditional love, which is fundamental in the first months in which the child develops the feeling of trust. The father, on the other hand, puts limits and conditions, helping in a particular way to the maturity of the child. We could continue to deepen, although this is not the intention of this text.

Therefore, and with a deep conviction, I affirm that, if a politician renounces the natural family, it is ruled out, otherwise, and with laws that promote other types of relationships, could generate a culture that will stick against it, undermining a foundation base of the Society.

As a conclusion, I would like to mention something that could baffle and seem contradictory to what was said earlier: the electoral Panorama in Peru makes the decision very complex from these two fundamentals. I don't want to mention specific candidate names, but I do say some considerations. Some candidates may defend life and/or family, but their moral life is questioned. Other candidates do not defend the life and/or the family, however, they presume of a more honorable life, they have a solid formation, and they express a sincere desire to want to help the country. Other candidates do not have a righteous moral life, do not have enough studies, and do not defend these two fundamentals. The latter is completely discarded. Others change their speeches and settle according to the circumstances, coming to defend life and/or the family. It is also important to state that it is different for a candidate to say in interviews some opinions about it, for his government plan to have clear proposals. Of course, having proposals for action gives his words much greater seriousness. As we see, the panorama is very complex! That is why the decision must be taken from a very prudent discernment which involves reading the candidates' proposals conscientiously. The foundations (life and family) are clear, and I think they are criteria that we should value more than an excellent economic proposal or studies abroad by a candidate. However, the panorama indeed demands to weigh all the factors to make the best decision. It is likely to be another year in which the lesser evil is chosen. Let us pray that

soon new politicians will be formed, who will be chosen freely and consciously for who they are. And let's also act, let's train to be able to contribute from the place of each one to the transformation of Peru.