Compare and analyse in 200-300 words the different laws for abortion between India and any other country. You can use this site for reference.

I chose the Abortion Laws of Great Britain, enacted in 1967, for comparison with the Indian MTP law. Indian law, due to its colonial heritage, has always taken immense inspiration of framing legislations from Great Britain. This law is no different. The fixation at 24 weeks, required approval from 2 medical practitioners, the trope of 'avoiding harm and injury to women's lives', accounting 'forseeable environments' all point to how the current abortion laws are quite similar.

The most striking and common feature, however, is that both Abortion Laws are not informed by a rights perspective, but are framed to give precedence to the medical practitioner. The law's context in Great Britain, in contrast to India, was to 'protect women from illegal abortions'. This meant making a law that gave more powers to institutional healthcare bodies to undertake abortions. The law allows doctors to not only exercise their 'good faith' but also exercise their 'conscientious objections' to performing abortions. The doctor decides whether the woman is finally entitled to an abortion, and can choose not to participate unless the treatment is necessary to save the woman's life. Foreseeable Environment, i.e, Socio-Economic contexts may be relevant factors but are not mandatorily to be accounted for when deliberating on Abortions.

Interestingly, British law has no mention of Abortions in situations of Rape, Sexual Assault, Incest or even Contraceptive Failure! There is also no mention of Gender Specific/Selective Procedures. The law, further, allows for abortions if continuing pregnancy would cause injury to her existing children. Therefore, the doctor is the final deciding authority/judge on any contexts of the woman's life and her decisions. Britain's regressive laws can also be seen in the light of unwillingness among policy makers to offer any amendments or any iterations, unlike in India (though highly lacking!) to match the contexts of the 21st century.