

I'm going to present an argument by analogy in defense of abortion.

Suppose there's an evil cabal of scientists intent on creating human clones. Any time you go out at night, there's a chance of getting kidnapped by one of these scientists (where the chance is the same as getting pregnant from sex).

Once you're kidnapped, the scientist uses your DNA to create a human clone inside you that depends on your body in a way similar to pregnancy, with similar effects and risks. The development of the clone is exactly like that of an embryo.

The only way to remove it, before it gets ejected at nine months, causes its death. Suppose all the above is common knowledge.

So, here's the argument:

- (C1) It's morally permissible to remove a clone from your body.
- (C2) If so, then it's morally permissible to get an abortion.
- (C3) So, it's morally permissible to get an abortion.

I expect most to agree with C1. Even if the clone has a right to life, this is outweighed by your right to control what's inside your body.

An objection to C2 is that pregnancy from sex is a "natural" process, while the cloning ordeal is an artificial process conducted by another agent.

But the risk of ending up with a clone inside you when you go out at night is the same as the risk of pregnancy when you have sex, so the involvement of another agent seems irrelevant.

And the fact that something's "natural" is also morally irrelevant, and to assume otherwise is a fallacious appeal to nature.