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*Abstract*. I argue that physicians can save women from life-threatening pregnancies by performing a craniotomy, placentectomy, or salpingotomy without intending death or harm. To support this conclusion, I defend the relevance thesis about intentions (a person intends X only if X explains the action). I then criticize the identity thesis (if a person intends X and knows X is Y then the person intends Y) and three mistakenly strict moral principles: (1) one may not intend something that is a serious harm for an innocent person, (2) one may not intend to terminate pregnancy before viability, which would prohibit, and (3) one may not act on a person’s body in a harmful way in order to benefit another person. (1) would prohibit procuring organs from living donors, (2) would prohibit treating hepatic pregnancies and other ectopic pregnancies, and (3) would prohibit procuring organs from living donors and performing many prenatal surgeries.

When Elizabeth Anscombe criticizes pacifism, she writes, “Principles that are mistakenly high and strict are a trap; they may easily lead in the end directly or indirectly to the justification of monstrous things.”[[1]](#footnote-1) Anscombe’s point is that people might think, “War is wrong, but we must do something to fight the Nazis, so we may as well go all in and bomb German cities.” Of course, Anscombe does not propose weakening sound principles to make them more palatable to people tempted by consequentialist arguments. She argues that pacifist principles are false and that a correct understanding of intentions shows that people can rule out murder without ruling out all acts of war. As pacifists can end up persuading people to accept war without limits, opponents of abortion can end up persuading people to accept abortion with few or no limits. Suppose that opponents of abortion consider the case from St. Joseph’s Hospital in Phoenix and have an intuition that the procedure was wrong.[[2]](#footnote-2) To support their intuition about this case, they propose a principle so strict that it prohibits treatments for ectopic pregnancies. (I discuss examples of such principles below.) Voters and lawmakers who consider the principle might think, “Abortion might be wrong, but we can’t let women die from ectopic pregnancies, so I’ll vote to leave decisions about abortion up to women and their doctors.” Similarly, a physician might think, “If I agree with opponents of abortion, then I would have to allow patients to die, so I’ll follow my conscience and perform an abortion whenever it’s the lesser of two evils.”

I do not claim that opponents of abortion should propose false principles to reduce the number of abortions, but I argue that a correct understanding of intentions shows that physicians can rule out intending to kill or harm a human embryo or fetus without ruling out procedures that would save women in cases of life-threatening pregnancies, including the controversial craniotomy, placentectomy, and salpingotomy cases.[[3]](#footnote-3) In these cases, the threat to the woman comes from the child’s growing outside the uterus or being stuck in the birth canal, not from the child’s being alive or unharmed, so physicians can separate the child from the woman without intending to kill or harm the child.[[4]](#footnote-4)

The relevance thesis

 Many defenders of the placentectomy, salpingotomy, and craniotomy defend a strict definition of intended effects. One way to state the strict definition is to say that a person intends an effect if and only if it is part of a true and complete answer to the question, “What are all the changes that I need to bring about in order to achieve my goal?”[[5]](#footnote-5) Different versions of the strict definition use different terms (e.g., plans, proposals, effects, states of affairs, upshots, etc.), but I will not defend any particular version here.[[6]](#footnote-6) Instead, I defend what I have identified as the essential characteristic of the different versions: a person intends X only if X explains the person’s action.[[7]](#footnote-7) I refer to this principle as the relevance thesis.

One way to clarify whether something satisfies the relevance thesis is to ask, “If everything stayed the same except that the effect did not occur, would I still achieve my goal?” A “yes” answer is evidence that the effect is not relevant to the agent and therefore is not intended. Suppose that a woman takes mifepristone to end her pregnancy and knows that mifepristone will end her pregnancy by causing her child’s death, not by expelling the child from her body. In this case, the child’s survival would impede the woman from achieving her goal, because she still would have a child living inside her, so her child’s death is relevant to her. By contrast, when physicians perform the craniotomy, placentectomy, or salpingotomy, the child’s survival would not impede the physicians from saving the woman, which is evidence that the child’s death is irrelevant to them.[[8]](#footnote-8)

Someone could dismiss the conclusion that a physician can crush a living person’s skull without intending death as counterintuitive. My introspection could be unreliable, but I do not find that I have intuitions about what a person intends, as I do not have intuitions about which large odd numbers are prime. Perhaps others can intuit that physicians in a specific case intend death or that 7,039 is prime, but I cannot. I can, however, make inferences about what a person intends by thinking about what is likely to explain the action. I suspect that intuitions about intentions are really moral intuitions, because most counterexamples to the strict definition of intended effects are cases in which critics believe that a person does something wrong even though the strict definition entails that the person does not intend death or harm.[[9]](#footnote-9)

Objections to the relevance thesis and the strict definition of intended effects

Steven Jensen argues that, according to the strict definition, the rules against adultery and theft have few applications because most adulterers do not intend to commit adultery and most thieves do not intend to steal.[[10]](#footnote-10) This argument depends on the premise that a person commits a kind of action only if the person intends to perform that kind of action.[[11]](#footnote-11) As a counterexample to this premise, note that a person can commit a felony without caring that the action is a felony, or even knowing that the action is a felony as opposed to a misdemeanor. For example, someone who robs a bank merely as a means of getting rich commits no less of a felony than someone who robs a bank as a means of being convicted of a felony and receiving free meals in prison. As intending to commit a felony is not an element of a felony, intending to commit adultery or theft is not a necessary condition of adultery or theft. Knowingly having sexual relations with someone other than one’s spouse suffices for adultery, so a married person who has sexual relations with a stranger merely as a means of satisfying sexual desires with no regard to marital status commits no less an act of adultery than a married person who has sexual relations with a stranger as a means of commiting adultery and getting revenge on a cheating spouse. Similarly, knowingly depriving other people of their property suffices for theft. Other examples of wrong actions that a person can commit without intending to perform that type of action include kidnapping, littering, loitering, promise-breaking, and trespassing. These actions, like adultery and theft, are not defined by what the agent intends, so a strict definition of what people intend does not entail that rules against these actions have few applications.

For another challenge to the strict definition, consider a case proposed by Alexander Pruss:

An eccentric, literalistic but always truthful magnate tells Sam he will donate to famine relief, saving a hundred lives, if and only if Sam follows his directions to the iota. Sam is to purchase a gun, sneak at night into a zoo owned by the magnate, and kill the first mammal he sees. Unfortunately the first mammal Sam sees is the zookeeper, and he shoots her. When Sam is charged with murder, he argues that he did not intend to kill the human there, but only to kill the mammal. After all, it was irrelevant to rationally explaining his action that the mammal was human—the only relevant fact was that it was the first mammal he saw, and it just happened to be human.[[12]](#footnote-12)

Sam is guilty of murder, because intending to kill someone because of the victim’s humanity is not an element of murder as intending to harm someone because of the victim’s race is an element of a hate crime. A mobster who kills a potential witness might not care whether the victim is human or extraterrestrial, but I see no reason to deny that the mobster is as guilty of murder as a misanthrope who intends to kill a human being as a means of reducing the human population. Not every unjust killing is an example of intending to kill a human being.

Assuming that Sam acts unjustly and is guilty of murder, does he intend to kill a human being? The answer depends on unstated details about the case.[[13]](#footnote-13) Suppose that Sam recognizes the zookeeper as human, judges that killing a human would count as killing a mammal, and decides for that reason to kill her. In this version of the case, Sam intends to kill a human being as a means of killing a mammal. Suppose, however, that Sam sees an animal in the dark and judges that it is too large to be a bird or reptile and must be a mammal—perhaps a gorilla, perhaps a human, or perhaps a bear standing on two legs, but definitely a mammal. He then decides to kill the animal, aims at it, only then recognizes it as human, and pulls the trigger. In this version of the case, the victim’s being human does not explain Sam’s action. According to the relevance thesis, therefore, Sam does not intend to kill a human being in this version of the case.

Anyone who finds this conclusion about Sam’s intention to be counterintuitive should consider the possibility that what seems like an intuition about Sam’s intention is really an intuition about Sam’s guilt. (Pruss presents Sam’s argument about his intention as a defense against a murder charge.) The relevance thesis does not excuse his action or lessen Sam’s guilt, because neither the wrongness of his action nor his guilt depends on whether he intends to kill a human being or to kill a mammal known to be human. One can believe both that intentions are relevant for evaluating actions and that intentions often are not the most important consideration for evaluating actions. In some pregnancy cases, whether a physician intends death or harm might be decisive for evaluating the action, but one should not assume that the most relevant consideration in some cases is the most relevant consideration in all cases.

The identity thesis

 One alternative to the relevance thesis is the identity thesis: if a person intends X and knows that X is Y then the person intends Y.[[14]](#footnote-14) According to the identity thesis, my parents intended to give me the name of a Soviet dictator when they gave me the middle name Joseph, and I intend to play catch with my second cousin’s first cousin once-removed whenever I play catch with my son. I disagree, because the identities are unlikely to explain the actions. Consider two statements in which brackets represent what a person intends:[[15]](#footnote-15)

(1) *I intend [to play catch with my son, who is my second cousin’s first cousin once-removed].*

(2) *I intend [to play catch with my son], who is my second cousin’s first cousin once-removed*.

(1) would be true if I sought to satisfy my second cousin’s request to point out his first cousin once-removed by playing catch with him, but (2) is true if my son’s relation to my second cousin is irrelevant to me. Brackets also clarify what my parents intended when they chose my middle name:[[16]](#footnote-16)

(1) *They intend [to give him a name that is his father’s and grandfather’s middle name and that is the first name of a Soviet dictator]*.

(2) *They intend [to give him a name that is his father’s and grandfather’s middle name], and that is the first name of a Soviet dictator.*

According to the identity thesis, (1) is correct, assuming that my parents knew about the identity of my middle name and Stalin’s first name. According to the relevance thesis, (2) is correct, assuming (as I do) that Stalin’s name was irrelevant to my parents.

I suspect that the identity thesis seems plausible only because it fits people’s moral intuitions about the craniotomy and other cases, but someone could propose a similar hypothesis about the relevance thesis. I am happy to conclude that physicians can perform a life-saving procedure instead of letting the woman die in the craniotomy and placentectomy cases and a less invasive salpingotomy instead of a salpingectomy. The relevance thesis seems like an axiom of action theory to me, so I will not attempt to derive it from a more basic principle.

One problem with the identity thesis is that its proponents have not explained why it applies only to known identities. Suppose that I buy something with a $100 bill (an event less common than I would prefer). I take it as uncontroversial that I intend to give someone a picture of the first Postmaster General only if I know that the bill depicts the first Postmaster General, but why? One answer is that this identity cannot explain my action if I am unaware of the identity, but this answer is an application of the relevance thesis. A proponent of the identity thesis could answer that we intend things only insofar as they are known because everything comes to the will through the intellect.[[17]](#footnote-17) I agree, but this answer is a restatement of the principle that people intend only what they know. I do not defend the relevance thesis in terms of faculty psychology, but one advantage of the relevance thesis is that it explains why nothing comes to the will except through the intellect: if a person is completely unaware of X then X is not relevant to the person and therefore does not explain the person’s action.

 Another problem with the identity thesis is that it entails that some people simultaneously intend to cause an effect and to prevent the same effect. For example, suppose a man has a severe speech impediment and testifies on behalf of his father. The man squeezes a stress ball to reduce his stuttering despite knowing that he will stutter every syllable (e.g., to reduce the time it takes to say the “f” in “father” from five seconds to as short a time as possible).[[18]](#footnote-18) According to the identity thesis, he intends to stutter (by testifying) and to avoid stuttering as much as he can (by squeezing the stress ball). I see no reason to agree that the man intends to stutter as he struggles to avoid stuttering. Similarly, suppose that a carpenter is on a team of contractors building a shed and finds that his wife has painted all his nails pink to celebrate their daughter’s birthday. He fears that other contractors will laugh at him for using pink nails, so he sands each nail to remove pink paint before he pounds it, but he cannot remove all the paint from every nail.[[19]](#footnote-19) According to the identity thesis, he intends to pound pink nails (by pounding the only available nails) and to avoid pounding pink nails insofar as possible (by sanding the nails). I see no reason to agree that the carpenter intends to pound pink nails as he furiously sands each nail to make it *less* pink. Unlike the identity thesis, the relevance thesis does not entail that the man intends to stutter or that the carpenter intends to pound pink nails, because the stuttering does not explain why he testifies, and the pinkness does not explain why the carpenter pounds nails.

Further, the identity thesis entails that events outside a person can change the person’s intention without any other change in the person. Consider Anscombe’s example about a man who pumps poisoned water into a cistern that supplies drinking water to a house. In one version of the example, the man says truthfully, “I didn’t care tuppence one way or the other for the fact that someone had poisoned the water, I just wanted to earn my pay by doing my usual job.” Anscombe concludes that the man does not intentionally pump poisoned water.[[20]](#footnote-20) Now suppose that another person adds a filter to the line that removes the poison from the water and that the person switches the filter on and off as the man pumps. According to the identity thesis, whether the man intends to pump poisoned water changes as the other person flips the switch.

Some opponents of the craniotomy argue that the physician acts wrongly by intending to crush the child’s skull, which is a serious harm.[[21]](#footnote-21) I have argued that the crushed skull in the craniotomy case is not identical to harm, because the crushed skull causes harm and no effect is identical to its cause.[[22]](#footnote-22) Whether a crushed skull harms an organism depends on whether the crushing causes death or a loss of functioning. A crushing that would harm or kill a human with a fragile skull might not harm a human with a less fragile skull (or an octopus with a flexible skull). This contingency of a crushed skull’s harmfulness is evidence that harm is the death or lost functioning caused by the crushed skull, not the crushed skull itself.

Perhaps someone could define harm so that a crushed skull is identical to a harm, not merely the cause of harm, but such an interpretation would make the prohibition of intending harm too strict. Consider a kidney transplant in which physicians procure a kidney from a living donor. Opponents of the craniotomy have not explained how to define harm in a way that includes the crushed skull when physicians perform the craniotomy that does not also include a cut abdomen and lost kidney when physicians perform the kidney transplant. (I assume that the donor’s consent does not eliminate the harm to the donor, but the donor could be a child or comatose patient who cannot consent.) Someone could argue that the donor’s cut abdomen and lost kidney are less serious harms than a crushed skull and that the harms in the transplant case are proportionate to the good of saving the recipient’s life, but the principle in question is a prohibition of intending something known to be a serious harm regardless of the benefits to others. Both the kidney transplant and the craniotomy have the benefit of saving someone’s life, so opponents of the craniotomy need to explain why the rule against intending something known to be a serious harm (not merely the cause of a serious harm) prohibits the craniotomy but not the kidney transplant.

Other mistakenly strict principles about abortion

 According to the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB): “Abortion (that is, the directly intended termination of pregnancy before viability or the directly intended destruction of a viable fetus) is never permitted.”[[23]](#footnote-23) Consider a salpingectomy to treat ectopic pregnancy. Some authors argue that a physician who performs a salpingectomy intends to remove a damaged part of the fallopian tube, not to terminate pregnancy.[[24]](#footnote-24) The problem with this analysis of the salpingectomy is that removing part of the tube without removing the embryo would not end the ectopic pregnancy. To save the woman, the physician must remove the embryo from the woman’s body. In other words, the physician must terminate the pregnancy. In case of hepatic pregnancies, physicians cannot remove the liver, so they cannot save the woman without separating the embryo from the liver. I see no relevant difference between cutting an embryo from a liver and performing a salpingotomy, but I hope that opponents of the salpingotomy would not insist that physicians leave hepatic pregnancies untreated.

 Some opponents of abortion claim that physicians may not act on the child’s body in a harmful way to benefit the mother.[[25]](#footnote-25) This principle also is mistakenly strict. I do not believe any opponent of abortion would oppose kidney transplants or prenatal surgeries, but the physician who procures a kidney from a living donor acts on the donor’s body in a harmful way to benefit the recipient, and a physician who cuts open a woman’s abdomen to perform surgery on a fetus’s malformed lung acts on the woman in a harmful way to benefit the child.[[26]](#footnote-26)

Conclusion

 I hope that opponents of abortion will not rely on intuitions to insist that physicians sometimes must allow both a woman and her child to die even though the physicians could save the woman. Instead, I hope that opponents of abortion will be persuaded to accept the relevance thesis and the strict definition of intended effects. If they are not persuaded, then I hope that they will present an alternative definition, explain why people should accept this alternative without relying on moral intuitions, clarify how someone can apply this alternative to specific cases, and address possible counterexamples. A rule that requires physicians to allow a pregnant woman to die should not depend on mere intuitions or on a philosopher’s ipse dixit about identity. No woman should die because her physician follows a mistakenly strict principle, but I do not worry that episcopal statements or scholarly arguments will convince many physicians to leave hepatic pregnancies untreated or to stop performing prenatal surgeries. I do worry, however, that many people will see a mistakenly strict principle as a reason to accept sophistical arguments about abortion, instead of a reason to define moral principles more precisely.[[27]](#footnote-27) The relevance thesis supports a conclusion that opponents of abortion should welcome: physicians can save women from life-threatening pregnancies without intending to kill or harm the child. For opponents of abortion, this conclusion has the virtue of making it easier to defend rules against abortion. I have argued that it also has the virtue of being true.[[28]](#footnote-28)
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