

(This is the 5th video in the series starting with Video 2)

Let's consider another revision to this pro-life argument (Video 2). Here is something I saw a lot in the comments, and which I wasn't surprised to see. People said, you don't consent to just *any* outcome, but only "natural" outcomes.

So here's the revised argument:

(P1****) Pregnancy is a "natural" foreseeable outcome of sex.

(P2****) Consent to X is consent to any "natural" foreseeable outcome of X.

(C) So, consent to sex is consent to pregnancy.

The first step to evaluating this is to figure out what's meant by "natural".

If it means "normal" or "common", then I already critiqued that argument in a previous video.

If it means "not due to the intervention of any agent", then I also already critiqued that one.

If it means something like, "the outcome that is the intended purpose of the action", then I have several problems with that.

First, pregnancy is not the only purpose for sex. When I have sex, my goal isn't to make babies. I'm trying to get pleasure and hopefully, if I do it right, give my partners some pleasure.

If, on the other hand, you're talking about "nature's purpose"—or the reason it evolved—then sure, but I don't see how that's morally relevant. That seems awfully close to a fallacious appeal to nature.

If you're talking about "God's purpose"—or the reason God created it—well, then you'd have to argue that God exists and argue about God's intentions. And even if you could make those arguments, I *still* don't see how that's morally relevant.

Suppose my friend makes me a knife for the purpose of cutting, and I choose to use it as a paper weight instead. If I accidentally cut myself, we wouldn't say I consented to being cut. It was an accident.

So, I just don't think this argument works.