



ETHICS & MEDICS

A COMMENTARY OF THE NATIONAL CATHOLIC BIOETHICS CENTER ON
HEALTH CARE AND THE LIFE SCIENCES

FEBRUARY 2024 † VOLUME 49, NUMBER 2

Also in this issue: "On the Importance of an Informed Christian Conscience," by Carolyn Humphreys

CONFRONTING THREE CONTEMPORARY CATEGORIES OF FALSE "HEALTH CARE"

Gerard T. Mundy

A child of New York City could live conceivably his entire life believing that the ubiquitous, flying-abled insects that infest many buildings of the city and that dash along the sidewalks at night, are but water bugs. The truth—that these creatures are a species of *cockroaches*—is too much of a truth to handle for many, hence the persistent vitality down through the generations of the euphemistic *water bug* moniker. If one tries to correct another who complains of a "water bug" infestation, and call these hideous creatures the cockroaches that they are, one should be prepared for admonishment. For, of course, how dare one suggest that another's home or apartment is infested with cockroaches?

Water bug is an example of a formidable euphemism. Not only does this term not transmit truth, but it cleverly moves the receiver farther away from intuitive promptings toward discovery of the truth. Indeed, the term *water bug* deflects from the intuitive disgust at the sight of these considerably large insects. With the euphemism firmly in mind as linguistic "evidence" to the contrary, however, one is able to counter, however feeble, that intuitive movement toward knowledge of these large cockroaches as a member of the species American cockroach. These insects that measure several inches long "are," simply, harmless water insects, explains the euphemism, and how can simple insects that live in the universally-known element of life-giving water be so bad?

Language and Transmittal of Truth

The substance of language is of great importance to the proper transmittal of truth, defined as "what is" by Aristotle.¹ In philosophy, language transmits metaphysical claims of being, and in everyday conveyance, language transmits claims of truth and, if one has grasp of them, of proper first principles. Not all men, however, utilize language with a view toward transmitting truth. The unscrupulous, the ideologue, the rhetorician, the deceiver, and the authoritarian all attempt command of language not in service to the transmission of truth, but in pursuit of their own manufactured ends. In a similar vein, some who are afraid to accept or acknowledge the truth commonly attempt concealment of reality by way of employing euphemisms. Those who are deceived by euphemisms and deception-through-language terminology must acknowledge that language falsehoods do affect them, for they are pernicious for persons' very understanding of both the *what* and the *is*.

One may look at three contemporary deceptive uses of language with regard to claims about practices that some allege are "health care" procedures. None of the three categories to be discussed in this

essay—abortion, physician-assisted suicide and euthanasia, and gender ideology-related mutilation procedures—are health care. Rather, these practices are anti-health care procedures, for they do not seek the end of health, understood rightly. The language employed by these false health care categories' ideologies draw one away from the truth.

The Anti-Health Care of Abortion

Abortion, the intended murder of a living child, is not "reproductive health care," contra the false, euphemistic terminology that has gained traction within abortionist ideology in recent years. Even a cursory, surface analysis demonstrates the falsity of the term. For, the reproductive system necessarily *involves reproduction*, while abortion is an action that *kills* the product of reproduction. This terminology is a contemporary example of a perniciously deceptive euphemistic employ insofar as the very opposite of the reality is termed the reality. The reality, of course, is that not only is abortion the killing of an innocent human being, but this action is anti-reproductive "health care," the exact opposite of what abortionist ideology claims.

Obfuscation of "what is" with regard to the action of abortion is linguistically evident among abortionist ideology and the media-political-social-educational establishment that are aligned with it. By way of employing imprecise terms and slogans, such as *choice*, *women's justice*, and *reproductive health*, abortionist ideology has invented baseless terminology to disguise the actions for which it is advocating. If abortion ideology were confident in its first principles, there would be no need for deceptive euphemisms. There would be no need for false attempts to label abortion as "reproductive health care," and there would be no reticence in simply calling abortion what it is: the intentional, pre-meditated killing of the innocent developing baby in the womb.

The intentional ending of life based on the passionate desires and choices of others does not fit in the purview of health care, hence totalitarian ideology has had to create euphemisms to reach its end of reclassification in falsity. Contra abortionist ideology's euphemistic term *reproductive health*, no health care professional ever intentionally kills an innocent human being in the womb as a result of the momentary passionate "choice" of others. Such an act, rather, is a perverse training that specializes in the exhaustion of life in the womb—not a medical health care specialty. Furthermore, even if one were to disagree about the positive legality and argue that direct abortion should be positively legal in the classical liberal state, even then, the practice would still not constitute health care.

The language employed by abortionist ideology very commonly aims to obfuscate the personhood of the child in the womb. The reason for this obfuscation is because recognition of personhood in the womb makes it more difficult to convince others that it is just to kill a human being according to the tastes and desires of another. For if the baby in the womb is a person, then one must confront the argument of the rightness or wrongness of killing a person. This fact is why understanding of Thomistic-Aristotelian thought with regard