

## *The Names That Must Not be Spoken Aloud*

Most characters in the Harry Potter novels refer to him as "You-Know-Who," or "He-Who-*Must-Not-Be-Named*," rather than say his *name* aloud. A taboo is placed upon *the name*, such that Voldemort or his followers may take power from anyone who dares to speak it aloud. Such is also the case with the names of those powerful little beings living and growing in human wombs. Anyone wishing to destroy those hidden entities must take care to call them "uterine contents," or "blobs of cells," or, if need be, "fetuses," but NEVER, ever call them by the names that must not be spoken aloud: "unborn children," or, worse (shudder) "human beings." Why? Because we intuitively know that children (unborn or otherwise) have rights, are helpless and innocent, and that they should be protected, not destroyed...."blobs of cells?"..."uterine contents?" - not so much.

So hats off to Premier Wade McLaughlin and Hon. Robert Henderson for successfully navigating through the recent public announcement - that the provincial government will now offer and pay for abortions in PEI - while never once speaking "the names that must not be spoken aloud." By never drawing attention to the fact that they are making it a little easier for Island women to end the lives of their unborn children, no reporter ever thought to ask: "Mr. Premier, do you believe unborn children should be protected by your government and granted the right to keep living if an abortion isn't deemed to be medically necessary?" Nope. With the initial press conference, and in every single follow-up media interview, the announced change was only ever characterized as a move to support women's "reproductive health rights"....and who in their right mind would ever suggest that a woman should be denied her reproductive health rights?

But wait a second, explain to me again how abortion is a reproductive right? When you think about it.....it really isn't. A reproductive right is, plain and simple, the "right to reproduce" is it not? And when does that right come into play? Well, it seems pretty obvious that a woman can only exercise her "right" to reproduce by either engaging in sexual intercourse or opting for *in vitro* fertilization. A decision to abort a child at some later date has absolutely nothing to do with human reproduction. In fact, it's actually the exact opposite of human reproduction – it's human "destruction." It's nothing less than a full-on, frontal attack on human reproduction, surgically undoing and negating the very reproductive "right" which the woman previously exercised in one of the two above-mentioned ways. Isn't that completely obvious to everyone? But alas! Such are the illogical and euphemistic mental machinations employed by people unwilling to speak "the names that shall not be spoken aloud;" names that have the power to evoke images of little human beings and bring awareness of the truth about abortion into our moral consciousness – the truth that with every abortion, another vulnerable and innocent human child is destroyed.

*Kevin J. Arsenault lives in Ft. Augustus and obtained his Ph.D. in ethics from McGill University.*