

I'm going to present an argument by analogy in defense of abortion. If you're not a fan of thought experiments involving far-fetched scenarios, you may want to keep scrolling.

Suppose people-seeds float around in the air at any location where sporting activities are happening (gyms, parks, football stadiums, etc.). A people-seed is a seed that, once inhaled, gets implanted in your body and becomes a human organism that will develop over the course of nine months until it gets ejected. Before that time, there's no way to remove it from your body without resulting in its death. The chance of a people-seed getting implanted is roughly the same as the chance of getting pregnant, and the risk to your body is roughly the same.

So here's the argument:

(S1) It's morally permissible to remove a developing people-seed from your body.

(S2) If so, then it's morally permissible to get an abortion.

(S3) So, it's morally permissible to get an abortion.

I expect most people to share the judgment S1. If you don't, then consider yourself safe from this argument.

The main objection I expect to get to S2 is that the natural purpose of sex is pregnancy, but that natural purpose of sports activities is not getting implanted with people-seeds.

However, I think this is just a fallacious appeal to nature. Just because things *are* a certain way, or nature developed in a certain way, doesn't entail that things *ought to be* that way, or that it has any moral relevance.

References

Judith Jarvis Thomson – "A Defense of Abortion"