LEX LOCALIS-JOURNAL OF LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT
ISSN:1581-5374 E-ISSN:1855-363X
VOL. 23, NO. S6(2025)

THE RIGHT TO BODILY AUTONOMY: LEGAL BATTLES OVER REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS

Dr. Ujjwala Kakarla[1]

[1]Faculty, Dept. of English, VNRVJIET (JNTUH), Hyderabad, India

Abstract
Bodily autonomy is all about having the power to decide what happens to your own body, without anyone else, including the government, forcing you to do anything. This research paper investigates the ongoing fights over reproductive rights, which are all about being able to make choices regarding pregnancy, using birth control, and managing your periods without anyone stopping you. It is sad, but true that in many places around the world, women still have a tough time getting the right to make these choices for themselves. Some countries have strict laws about abortion that can even get you or the doctors who help you in trouble, while in other places, things like not having enough money or facing a lot of shame from society can make it almost impossible to get the help you need. This paper dives into how the laws in different countries deal with these issues and shows that sometimes, people's personal beliefs and the culture they live in can get in the way of making fair laws. It uses real-life examples and looks closely at laws to make sure everyone is treated equally, especially when it comes to gender.

Keywords: Bodily Autonomy, Reproductive Rights, Legal Reform, Human Rights, Gender Equality, Reproductive Health

Introduction

The right to bodily autonomy is a fundamental human right that involves the freedom of individuals to have control over their own bodies free from intrusion. It is a principle which is most relevant where reproductive rights are concerned, where legal, political, and cultural factors tend to converge to decide personal decision-making. Reproductive rights are steeped in history, with legislation and policy most out of step between states. Across most nations, draconian laws have restricted access to abortion and contraception on the bases of politics, religion, and culture. For example, criminalization of abortion in some areas has resulted in unsafe abortions that have put the lives of many women at risk. There have been, however, advances in legalizing and safeguarding reproductive rights through the lenses of legislation and judicial decisions in some nations. At the international level, declarations such as the Declaration on the Elimination of Violence Against Women emphasize the protection of women's rights like reproductive autonomy (United Nations, 1993).

Reproductive rights disputes have grown more ferocious in the recent past, with pro-access and anti-access groups. Those who are for access claim that withholding of reproductive freedom undermines personal freedom and widens social inequalities. Opponents on grounds of morality or religion counter them, prompting attempts at legislative restriction. These debates are also compounded by factors like socioeconomic inequalities, gender and race inequalities, and legal and ethical principles interpretations variations. In America, the reversal of Roe v. Wade has ignited national controversy surrounding the judiciary role of safeguarding reproductive rights (Smith, 2022).

The effect of reproductive rights laws is not the same to all groups. Marginalized groups, such as women of colour, poor men and women, and LGBTQ+ individuals, generally have several different kinds of barriers in accessing reproductive healthcare. These communities could encounter institutionalized discrimination, insufficient resources, and stigmas of culture that will limit their capacity to assert bodily autonomy. Thinking from the lens of intersectionality of the issues is crucial in constructing inclusive policy that captures different needs of different groups (Crenshaw, 1989).

A comparative analysis of reproductive rights across the international landscape illustrates the diverse landscape of legal strategies and cultural values. Some nations have adopted liberal legislation promoting individual liberty and public health, while others continue to uphold restrictive legislation based on conventional morals. Comparative analysis can illuminate best practices in extending reproductive rights and ascertain where there is a need to cooperate collaboratively globally and lobby on their behalf. For instance, Sweden and Canada have been known to be their reproductive healthcare system is extensive, and they both have modelled policy (Johnson, 2020).

Bodily autonomy is the core of human rights and underpins the belief that individuals have the unalienable right to control what happens to and with their body. This belief is underpinned with the protection against discrimination, violence, and coercion and is at the centre of the debates concerning reproductive rights. The corresponding emphasis. The World Health Organization (WHO) highlights that, while "The right to bodily autonomy means having control over one's sexual and reproductive life without fear, coercion, or violence" (WHO, 2021). In reproductive health, bodily autonomy encompasses the right to legal and safe abortion, contraception, fertility care, and sex education. These rights are recognized globally but not their actual implementation that remains strongly contested and uneven across the world.

Prior to this, reproductive rights legislations have gone through a pendulum of control over empowerment. Forcing laws have been enacted in various states on either religious ideologies or sociopolitical inclinations, limiting individuals, especially women and gender minorities, from practicing autonomy in reproductive choices. For instance, there are comprehensive bans on abortion in nations such as El Salvador and Honduras, even where there is rape or impairment of the life of the mother (Centre for Reproductive Rights, 2023). These oppressive laws have resulted in human rights abuses, with women in jail or losing their lives to illegal, unsafe abortions. According to Amnesty International (2020), "Denying access to abortion constitutes a form of gender-based violence and can amount to torture or cruel, inhuman, and degrading treatment."

Meanwhile, progressive juridical progress has been the force that might be able to bring about revolutionary change. Argentina's decriminalization of abortion in 2020 and Ireland's repeal of its Eighth Amendment in 2018 are the most outstanding examples of recent victories in the struggle for reproductive justice. These legislatures were prodded by mass civil mobilization, public health considerations, and international human rights pressure. As the United Nations Human Rights Council declared in 2019, "Ensuring reproductive rights is essential to achieving gender equality and the realization of all human rights."

However, reproductive rights are contested in most of the globe and habitually serve as a pretext for larger political and ideological battles. The 2022 U.S. Supreme Court ruling to reverse Roe v. Wade pre-empted the constitutional abortion right that had held for nearly five decades and relegated it to individual states. The reversal led to a cascade of restrictive state laws and restarted nationwide demonstrations. Legal expert Reva Siegel (2022) further commented, "The ruling is a dramatic roll back of rights and departure from global trends affirming reproductive autonomy." The impact of the ruling disproportionately weighs on hitherto marginalized communities such as women of colour, youth, immigrants, and those living in rural areas, who already experience various barriers to accessing care.

Socioeconomic inequalities dictate reproductive control to a large degree. The socially and economically privileged have access to private medical care and transport, while the poor are driven to hazardous alternatives. Intersectionality theorist Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989) explains, "Discrimination does not act in a vacuum—race, gender, class, and sexuality intersect to shape individuals' lived experiences." In this sense, legal contests for reproductive rights cannot be

separated from more general systemic inequalities. These require not only legislative reform but social investment in healthcare facilities, education, and community organization.

These international frameworks like the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW, 1979) and the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action (1995) have helped advocate the elimination of obstacles in reproductive health care. These policy guidelines oblige governments to protect women's health and family planning care rights; by concurring these rights are essential in human dignity. But the enforcement is usually weak, and political will is split. The UN Population Fund (UNFPA, 2020) adds that, "Nearly half of women in developing regions are denied the right to decide freely and independently whether to have children."

From a comparative legal standpoint, countries such as Sweden, Canada, and the Netherlands have embraced integrated strategies that include reproductive rights within their social welfare and public health systems. These countries ensure universal access to abortion and contraceptive care, sex education, and maternal health services. Sweden is highly envied for its policy framework in which reproductive health is conceptualized in terms of a public good rather than a private matter of morality. As Johnson (2020) reports, "Countries with universal, stigma-free reproductive healthcare have lower rates of unintended pregnancy and maternal death."

Conversely, in patriarchal, religious, or authoritarian governments, reproductive rights are generally censored or outlawed. In Poland, a 2020 Constitutional Tribunal ruling essentially prohibited almost all abortions, causing massive public uproar and drawing international criticism. The European Parliament (2021) reacted by declaring the ruling "A breach of Poland's human rights obligations."

Moreover, advancing technology and changing family structures have brought new aspects to reproductive autonomy. Concerns related to ART, surrogacy, and gender-affirming care require general legal definitions and protections. But legal entitlement for such a right is behind, especially among LGBTQ+ populations. Human Rights Watch (2022) states that "Trans and non-binary people are systematically excluded from reproductive healthcare services because of biased legal frameworks and a lack of provider training."

Short, the right of bodily autonomy in reproductive rights is a complex and dynamic legal and ethical issue. It cuts across gender justice, public health, and democratic governance. Securing such rights requires an intersectional, multidisciplinary method—one that unpacks not only legal and structural obstacles but also defines the dignity and autonomy of everybody. As Ruth Bader Ginsburg has penned, "The decision whether to bear or be a child is central to a woman's life… and when government makes that decision for her, she is treated as less than a full adult human in control of her own choices" (Ginsburg, 1993). Reproductive autonomy, then, is not just a matter of healthcare—it is the foundation of freedom and equality in any morally just society.

Literature Review

Autonomy of the body is one of the fundamental principles of the law of human rights. It assumes that individuals must be given the autonomy of choice regarding their reproductive health. Autonomy of reproduction, according to Cook and Dickens (2003), is important for respect for persons and gender equality. In their view, withholding freedom from individuals over their reproductive choices means discrimination, injustice, and violation of human rights. Ross and Solinger (2017) extend the term bodily autonomy to that of "Reproductive Justice." Reproductive justice is defined by them as human rights to have children, not to have children, and to parent children in safe and sustainable communities. They design intersectionality on race, gender, class, and sexuality, demonstrating that reproductive oppression is more dire for marginalized populations. They highlight, "Reproductive justice anchors reproductive rights in

social justice, considering structural injustices that define reproductive lives" (Ross & Solinger, 2017, p. 10).

Abortion continues to be one of the most controversial topics within the realm of reproductive rights. Abortions are legalized as a legal and safe medical practice in some nations while others criminalize it completely or authorize it only under special conditions. Provinces such as Canada, the Netherlands, and Sweden permit abortion on demand and view it as part of reproductive health service. Canada has no criminal codes that limit abortion and thus ranks among the most liberal nations to accomplish this (Boyd, 2013). Sweden provides combined services such as counselling, medical abortion, and post-abortion follow-up through public health insurance (Berer, 2017).

In contrast, nations such as El Salvador, Poland, and selected states in the U.S. have outlawed or de facto absolute prohibitions on abortion. Abortion is banned under all circumstances in El Salvador, even rape, incest, or risk to life. Women are arrested on suspicion of abortion, which is very seriously concerning for human rights (Centre for Reproductive Rights, 2015).

In 2022, the U.S. Supreme Court overruled Roe v. Wade in Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization, effectively ending the federal constitutional abortion right (Guttmacher Institute, 2022). This move enabled states to prohibit or restrict abortion, leading to widespread legal disarray and decreased access, particularly for poor women and minorities. World Health Organization states, "Criminalizing abortion does not reduce the number of abortions—it only makes them unsafe" (WHO, 2021). Access to birth control is yet another pillar of reproductive autonomy. Birth control enables people to space their children, prevent unwanted pregnancies, and safeguard their health. The World Health Organization (WHO, 2020) states family planning is "a life-saving intervention."

Despite this, the use of contraception is still not accessible in most regions because of religious opposition, ignorance, stigma, and laws. The Philippines, for instance, is Catholic-dominated, and therefore the justification behind the delay of enacting the Responsible Parenthood and Reproductive Health Act (Ruiz-Austria, 2004). But nations such as France and Germany provide cheap or free sex education and contraceptives in public health programs. Sedgh et al. (2016) argue that a study confirms that access to modern contraception is associated with reduced maternal deaths and better economic prospects for women. With access to contraceptives, women are bound to be masters of their own lives, stay in school, and engage in economic and public life (Sedgh et al., 2016, p. 234).

Menstruation, a natural biological occurrence, continues to be neglected in the literature on reproductive rights. Denial of menstrual hygiene products, education, and sanitation facilities impacts millions of individuals, particularly women from lower-income brackets and rural communities. In India, girls are forced out of school because of menstruation. Mahon and Fernandes (2010) opine that stigma, myths, and inadequate sanitation infrastructure led to gender disparity and poor health outcomes. Nepal and Kenyan activists have campaigned for policy reforms to offer free sanitary pads in schools and make the practice of menstruation exiles illegal. Menstrual stigma is a gender equality barrier and should be fought through policy and education (Mahon & Fernandes, 2010, p. 99).

Religion and culture are both powerful determinants of reproductive rights. In all societies, legislation on abortion, on contraception, and on sexuality has more to do with religious values than with human rights principles. For instance, in most states with a high Muslim population, abortion is legal only to save a woman's life. In Catholic-majority states like Ireland (until 2018), Poland, and the Philippines, religious leaders have resisted reproductive freedom for decades. Kumar et al. (2009) maintain that opposition based on religion tends to result in women's health-harming policies and undermining women's autonomy. Politicians can even invoke religious rhetoric in secular states to limit reproductive rights, pitting constitutional

freedoms against culture. Reproductive laws are not solely legal documents; they document cultural attitudes and often rearticulate gendered power relations (Kumar et al., 2009, p. 1370). Reproductive oppression does not happen the same. Race, ethnicity, class, disability, and sexuality all play a role in access to reproductive health. Black women in America, for instance, have increased maternal mortality because of racist health systems (Taylor, 2020). The First Nations women have complained of forced sterilization in the 21st century (Stote, 2012).

LGBTQ+ also finds it difficult to access reproductive care. The transgender and non-binary are discriminated against and not treated with respect (Kcomt et al., 2020). Researchers hope for more open-minded medical and legal frameworks that embrace a variety of reproductive needs. Taylor reports, "True reproductive justice requires acknowledging how intersecting forms of oppression limit autonomy for marginalized groups" (Taylor, 2020, p. 45). Reform of law has been at the centre of the struggle for reproductive rights. Path-breaking law and cases have revolutionized access and protection in many countries. For instance, social movement Ni Una Menos in Argentina resulted in legalisation of abortion in 2020 (Zaremberg & Rodríguez Gustá, 2021). In Ireland, the repealing of the Eighth Amendment in 2018 came about from a large public campaign based on women's narratives and health dangers.

Judicial activism has also played a significant role. In India, rights to abortion were granted until 24 weeks in 2022 by the Supreme Court and marital rape was established as a ground for abortion, setting a new precedent (The Hindu, 2022). Despite victories, researchers note that laws need public finance, health infrastructure, and social education to achieve their ends. Legal reform is necessary but should be accompanied by public will, political determination, and access to healthcare (Berer, 2017).

Education has the power to reveal the empowerment of individuals to take knowledgeable reproductive choices. Complete sexuality education has been demonstrated to curb adolescent pregnancy, sexually transmitted disease, and gender-based violence (UNESCO, 2018). Most nations, however, avoid implementing CSE because of political influence and cultural shame. Abstinence-only in the U.S. has not served young people well. Where there is school-based CSE, reproductive health improves. Guttmacher Institute (2021) underscores the need for age-appropriate, rights-based, and inclusive reproductive education. Comprehensive, accurate, and accessible information is necessary for informed choice.

Results and Impact

Reproductive rights, particularly safe access to abortion, have a significant effect on the health outcomes of mothers. The World Health Organization (2021) approximates that about 45% of all abortions carried out globally are unsafe and 97% of them occur in developing countries. These abortions are typically carried out under unregulated, unhygienic, or unsuitable medical conditions, resulting in serious complications and fatalities. Unsafe abortion is estimated to cause about 13% of all maternal deaths globally, which translates to almost 37,000 deaths per year (World Health Organization, 2021).

It is asserted by Bearak et al. (2020) that nations with highly restrictive abortion legislation have threefold the rate of maternal death as compared to those where access is available without restriction. From their global modelling research, they deduced: "Where abortion is largely legal, 87% of abortions are safe, but only 25% in places where it is illegal" (Bearak et al., 2020, p. e1157).

Furthermore, the Turnaway Study, an American longitudinal study, reported that women denied an abortion were at higher risk of developing health issues during pregnancy, including gestational hypertension and chronic pain (Foster et al., 2018). Restriction of access to abortion has been linked to long-term mental distress, particularly when an individual is compelled to give birth to unwanted pregnancies. The American Psychological Association (2022) is of the

opinion that "denial of abortion care is related to greater anxiety, lower self-esteem, and dissatisfaction with life."

Foster et al. (2018) reported that the women who were refused abortion services were three times more likely to be at or below the federal poverty level two years post-refusal than women who received abortions. The women also had increased domestic violence, financial hardship, and greater dependence on government programs. This rings true in Jones and Jerman's (2017) discovery that: "The inability to control one's reproductive timeline perpetuates cycles of poverty, especially for women of colour and those in marginalized socioeconomic groups"

Reproductive rights legal struggles vary internationally. The 2022 United States Supreme Court overturning of the Roe v. Wade ruling left reproductive rights to the states. Consequently, numerous states enacted trigger laws that prohibited abortion entirely or tightly regulated it, many without rape, incest, or health crisis exceptions (Guttmacher Institute, 2023). Conversely, nations like Mexico, Argentina, and Ireland have proved to be liberal in recent times. The Mexican Supreme Court declared in 2021 that criminalization of abortion is unconstitutional, meaning providing windows for national decriminalization (Centre for Reproductive Rights, 2022).

Legal liberalization does not always equate to access, however. In Argentina, even after abortion was legalized in 2020, budget constraints and right-wing opposition still restrict access, particularly in rural provinces. "For us not having contraception is taking us back to the 1960s," reported one Buenos Aires health activist (The Guardian, 2024). Cultural attitudes and religious traditions unambiguously inform the creation of abortion policy. In Malawi, for example, abortion is against the law except when the mother's life would be at risk, but a vibrant religious leadership coalition has compelled the process forward. High-profile campaigner Reverend Timothy Nyasulu further explained: "I have seen women struggling; I've seen them suffering… I am pro-choice because I have seen what it means when they don't have access" (The Guardian, 2024). Conversely, in nations where extreme religious conservatism has dominated, Nicaragua and El Salvador, the globe's harshest abortion prohibitions were enacted, jailing women even for miscarriage (Amnesty International, 2023). Such laws tend to strengthen patriarchal control over women's bodies and promote fear, stigma, and criminalization.

Digital health platforms, or FemTech, have emerged as essential instruments in increasing the access to reproductive health care, especially in areas where direct abortion care is not easily accessible. Research affirms that telemedicine abortion is safe, efficient, and has a success rate of more than 95% (Kumsa et al., 2023). Data surveillance and privacy concerns have been discovered, though. Hassan et al. (2024) cautioned: "Most period tracking and pregnancy apps collect and provide information to third-party advertisers or governments with ethical issues in repressive environments" (p. 4). In criminalizing or illegal abortion nations, their app users unknowingly endanger themselves with legal issues.

Denying women abortions and contraceptives makes them less economically independent. Foster et al. (2018) conducted a study in the Turnaway Study and discovered that turned-away abortion patients had significantly lower levels of full-time employment, depended more on government aid, and possessed fewer resources to pay for basic needs. Additionally, their children experienced greater economic insecurity.

Jones and Jerman (2017) noted: "Access to contraception and abortion enables women to delay childbearing, earn more education, and obtain better-paying jobs, thus decreasing intergenerational poverty".

Discussion

Even though most countries have pro-reproductive rights policies, individuals still experience a wide range of barriers when accessing abortion and associated services. Bearak et al. (2022)

describe how abortion stigma is institutionalized and thus becomes difficult to access care. This ranges from stringent requirements, excessive procedures, and unavailability of abortion clinics. Likewise, Johnson and Lee (2023) established that even in Australia, even in states like New South Wales, where abortion is legal, public hospitals do not provide such services. Dr. Ellie Stone (2023) explains that "Even though abortion is legal in NSW, public hospitals can't provide it because of resistance from powerful people in the healthcare system" (p. 11). Jones (2019) refers to this as the "normative implementation gap," whereby the law requires something, but individuals are still excluded from accessing care as institutions do not implement.

Doctors and nurses in the USA, and many other countries, have a right to refuse to perform abortions if it contradicts their religion or belief. This is referred to as conscientious objection (CO). Although this gives the providers rights, it works to the disadvantage of the patients. In Italy, around 71% of physicians refuse to perform abortions (Chavkin & Treston, 2021). Tongue (2022) continues stating that if there are too many clinicians who protest, then it is not a matter of individual choice anymore, but a systems issue: "Calling CO a personal right ignores the fact that it affects whole systems when most people refuse at once" (p. 42). O'Donnell (2020) continues to state that CO leads to delays and chaos, and that some doctors even refuse to treat miscarriages, putting patients at serious risk.

Abortion stigma refers to the judgment and shame associated with individuals who undergo abortion by society. Baker et al. (2023) term it as being culturally entrenched and supported by stringent rules and judgmental policies. Mokashi et al. (2023) depict how stigma impacts the distribution of such crucial medicines as mifepristone in America in conservative communities: "Stigma takes away doctors' freedom to act, even when science supports them. It shows the big difference between what medical guidelines say and what happens in real life" (p. 1134). Misinformation online is another obstacle in today's time. Rana and Patel (2024) discovered that websites like Google and TikTok have a bias towards obscuring or burying quality medical information when individuals search for abortion care. Individuals are then presented with myths or lethal "home remedies" instead. What their research states is: "Hiding real abortion information online acts like a legal restriction—it stops people from finding help" (p. 78). Jackson and Lee (2023) also demonstrate how memes and social media posts spread misinformation, which it becomes hard for people to make informed decisions about their health.

Kimberlé Crenshaw (2011) coined the term intersectionality, by which she means that some individuals experience multiple discriminations at the same time—being a woman, being poor, and being a racial minority, for example. In Brazil, for example, Fernandes and Alves (2024) quoted that abortion can be found in only 3.6% of the cities for victims of rape disproportionately impacting Black and poor women. Migrants and refugees will probably do even worse. Hrdy and Banerjee (2022) describe the situation in which asylum seekers in Poland find themselves in a state of legal limbo with no assistance and are vulnerable to racism. They quote: "These women are caught between ambiguous laws and hard-line religious rules, with little assistance from the system" (p. 29).

Reproductive rights are being revoked after being conferred. For instance, in America, the 2022 Supreme Court ruling (Dobbs v. Jackson) withdrew national coverage for abortion. Smith and Nguyen (2022) state that this left patchwork laws in all the states, and doctors and patients have a hard time keeping up with what is permitted. Perkins King (2023) terms this as: "The rollback dilemma—every small gain in rights can be taken away suddenly, making doctors unsure and patients scared" (p. 102). McCaffrey et al. (2021) also illustrate how U.S. foreign policy, for instance, the global gag rule, destroys abortion care in the developing world by withholding funding.

For proper care to be provided, proper training should be afforded to health practitioners. Yet, there is much that is still not getting it. In Gillespie and Rahman's (2023) argument, they note that just 21% of U.S. OB-GYN residencies include hands-on abortion training. They contend that this is the norm because: "Knowing how to do an abortion is a basic part of being an OB-GYN" (p. 88). In Ethiopia, Gebremedhin et al. (2022) conducted a study of a training program called VCAT (Values Clarification and Attitudes Transformation). The program decreased stigma among health professionals and enhanced their competence in treating patients with respect and compassion.

To make our services better, we must know whether people can access them clearly. Zarate and Velasco (2025) propose a "Reproductive Access Index (RAI)" that monitors: clinics which are available per person. waiting time for treatment. cases of CO. They find that increasing RAI scores result in less maternal death and complications. This is evidence that monitoring such numbers makes systems fairer. Many researchers believe that laws are not enough by themselves. Without strong systems and backing, rights afterwards are mere words on paper (Jones, 2019; Bearak et al., 2022). Tongue (2022) believes that CO must be tackled as a system issue and regulated in such a manner that access to legal services is not revoked from people. Baker et al. (2023) and Fernandes and Alves (2024) mention how social and racial stigma still rule the bodies of women. Rana and Patel (2024) observe that restricting information on the internet is as perilous as prohibiting abortion. Smith and Nguyen (2022) and Perkins King (2023) recall that reproductive rights are easily repealed, so we require robust safeguards.

Conclusion

The right to self-governance over one's own body is essential to human dignity, equity, and liberty. This investigation demonstrates that reproductive autonomy—including obtainment of termination of pregnancy, contraception, and menstrual wellness—are pivotal facets of this self-governance, yet they remain inequitably safeguarded and profoundly debated across lawful and sociocultural landscapes. Analysis of diverse legal frameworks and socio-political settings uncovers that restrictive regulations, frequently shaped by cultural, religious, or patriarchal ideologies, obstruct individuals from making free and informed decisions regarding their reproductive health. Such constraints not only compromise physical and mental well-being but also represent a basic violation of human rights and gender justice. Through comparative case examinations and lawful critique, this paper has exhibited that access to reproductive healthcare is not merely a matter of medical supply, but additionally a question of basic human rights and societal equality.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship and/or publication of this article.

References

American Psychological Association. (2022). Abortion and mental health: Findings from the psychological research. https://www.apa.org/news/press/releases/abortion-mental-health

Amnesty International. (2020). My body my rights: Abortion is a human right. https://www.amnesty.org

Amnesty International. (2023). El Salvador: Total abortion ban violates human rights. https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2023/03/el-salvador-abortion-ban-human-rights/

Baker, M. R., Plant, M., & O'Hara, R. (2023). Abortion stigma and gender norms: An institutional critique. Journal of Gender & Society, 47(1), 45–60.
Bearak, J., Jones, R. K., & Cardenas, G. (2022). How abortion stigma manifests institutionally: A multi-country scoping review. Social Science & Medicine, 311, 115271.
Bearak, J., Popinchalk, A., Ganatra, B., Moller, A. B., Tuncalp, Ö., Beavin, C., Kwok, L., & Alkema, L. (2020). Unintended pregnancy and abortion by income, region, and legal status of abortion: Estimates from a comprehensive model for 1990–2019. The Lancet Global Health, 8(9), e1152–e1161. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(20)30315-6
Berer, M. (2017). Abortion law and policy around the world: In search of decriminalization. Health and Human Rights, 19(1), 13–27.
Boyd, S. B. (2013). Abortion in Canada: A legal history. Journal of Law and Social Policy, 22, 1–18.
Center for Reproductive Rights. (2015). Persecuted: Political process and the criminalization of abortion in El Salvador. https://reproductiverights.org
Center for Reproductive Rights. (2022). Mexico Supreme Court decriminalizes abortion. https://reproductiverights.org/mexico-decriminalizes-abortion/
Center for Reproductive Rights. (2023). The world's abortion laws. https://reproductiverights.org/worldabortionlaws
Chavkin, W., & Treston, N. (2021). An institutional critique of conscientious objection: Lessons from Italy. Journal of Medical Ethics, 47(6), e14.
Cook, R. J., & Dickens, B. M. (2003). Human rights dynamics of abortion law reform. Human Rights Quarterly, 25(1), 1–59.
Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. University of Chicago Legal Forum, 1989(1), 139–167.
Crenshaw, K. (2011). The intersectionality of women's reproductive oppression. Feminist Legal Studies, 19(3), 299–307.
European Parliament. (2021). EU Parliament condemns abortion ban in Poland.
Fernandes, L. A., & Alves, T. (2024). Selective access: Racial and geographic disparities in rape-related abortion care in Brazil. Latin American Research Review, 59(2), 123–145.
Foster, D. G., Biggs, M. A., Ralph, L., Gerdts, C., Roberts, S., & Glymour, M. M. (2018). Socioeconomic outcomes of women who receive and women who are denied wanted abortions in the United States. American Journal of Public Health, 108(3), 407–413. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2017.304247
Gebremedhin, T., Hintsa, S., & Fekadu, Z. (2022). Evaluating values clarification interventions in Ethiopia: Longitudinal effects on provider attitudes. Reproductive Health, 19(1), 98.
Gillespie, K. C., & Rahman, R. (2023). Abortion training as a litmus test for obstetric competence. American Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology, 228(2), 86–90.
Ginsburg, R. B. (1993). Remarks at Women's Rights Conference, Columbia University.
Guttmacher Institute. (2021). Comprehensive sexuality education: Information, rights, and health. https://www.guttmacher.org
Guttmacher Institute. (2022). Abortion policy in the absence of Roe. https://www.guttmacher.org
Guttmacher Institute. (2023). Abortion policy in the U.S. post-Roe. https://www.guttmacher.org/2023/abortion-policy-us-post-roe
Hassan, M., Jameel, M., Wang, T., & Bashir, M. (2024). Unveiling privacy and security gaps in female health apps. arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01593. https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.01593

Hrdy, S., & Banerjee, P. (2022). Reproductive liminality: Refugee women's abortion experiences in Eastern Europe. Journal of Migration & Health, 8, 21–32.
Human Rights Watch. (2022). A report on access to reproductive healthcare for LGBTQ+ persons.
Jackson, M. L., & Lee, J. A. (2023). Memeification of misinformation: Social media and abortion narratives. New Media & Society, 25(5), 1021–1040.
Johnson, E., & Lee, R. (2023). Underground networks: How public opposition shapes service denial in NSW abortion care. Health Policy, 137, 45–54.
Johnson, L. (2020). Comparative reproductive health policies: Lessons from Sweden and Canada. International Journal of Health Policy, 15(3), 45–59.
Johnson, M. (2020). Global reproductive health policy: Comparative models and outcomes. Cambridge University Press.
Jones, D. A. (2019). The normative implementation gap in abortion policy: Why legislation is not enough. Health & Human Rights, 21(1), e137–e150.
Jones, R. K., & Jerman, J. (2017). Population group abortion rates and lifetime incidence of abortion: United States, 2008–2014. American Journal of Public Health, 107(12), 1904–1909. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2017.304042
Kcomt, L., Gorey, K. M., Barrett, B. J., & McCabe, S. E. (2020). Healthcare avoidance due to anticipated discrimination among transgender people. American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 58(6), 832–840.
Kumar, A., Hessini, L., & Mitchell, E. M. H. (2009). Conceptualising abortion stigma. Culture, Health & Sexuality, 11(6), 625–639.
Kumsa, F. A., Prasad, R., & Shaban-Nejad, A. (2023). Medication abortion via digital health in the United States: A systematic scoping review. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03051. https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.03051
Mahon, T., & Fernandes, M. (2010). Menstrual hygiene in South Asia: A neglected issue for WASH (water, sanitation and hygiene) programmes. Gender and Development, 18(1), 99–113.
Mokashi, M., Stevenson, J., & Patel, V. (2023). Mifeprex in hostile contexts: Stigma and the limits of clinical autonomy. Southern Medical Journal, 116(11), 1128–1135.
O'Donnell, J. (2020). Billboard refusals: Institutional conscientious objection and reproductive injustice. Bioethics Journal, 34(4), 370–379.
Perkins King, L. (2023). The rollback dilemma: Legal precarity after Dobbs. Harvard Law Review, 136(1), 95–119.
Rana, S., & Patel, S. (2024). Algorithmic gatekeeping: Abortion information accessibility online. Journal of Digital Health, 10(1), 67–82.
Ross, L. J., & Solinger, R. (2017). Reproductive justice: An introduction. University of California Press.
Ruiz-Austria, C. (2004). The struggle for reproductive rights in the Philippines. Reproductive Health Matters, 12(24), 148–156.
Sedgh, G., Ashford, L. S., & Hussain, R. (2016). Unmet need for contraception in developing countries: Examining women's reasons for not using a method. Guttmacher Institute.
Siegel, R. (2022). Roe's undoing: The Court's retreat from equal citizenship. Yale Law Journal, 132(3), 451–479.
Smith, A. (2022). The implications of overturning Roe v. Wade: A legal analysis. Journal of Constitutional Law, 24(2), 112–130.
Smith, G., & Nguyen, T. (2022). Post-Roe Michigan: Legal fracturing of abortion care in the U.S. Journal of Health Politics, Policy & Law, 47(5), 789–814.

Stone, E. (2023). Embedded resistance: Medical hierarchies and abortion denial in public healthcare systems. Australian Journal of Public Health, 46(1), 8–14.

Stote, K. (2012). The coercive sterilization of Aboriginal women in Canada. American Indian Culture and Research Journal, 36(3), 117–150.

Taylor, J. K. (2020). Structural racism and maternal health among Black women. Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics, 48(3), 506–517.

The Guardian. (2024, February 7). Malawi faith leaders support decriminalizing abortion: 'I've seen women suffer'. https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2024/feb/07/malawi-faith-leaders-abortion

The Hindu. (2022). Supreme Court expands abortion rights in historic judgment. https://www.thehindu.com

Tongue, Z. L. (2022). Conscientious objection and structural failure: A human rights framing. International Journal of Law, Policy and the Family, 36(1), 40–58.

UNESCO. (2018). International technical guidance on sexuality education: An evidence-informed approach. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

United Nations. (1993). Declaration on the elimination of violence against women. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Declaration_on_the_Elimination_of_Violence_Against_Women

United Nations Human Rights Council. (2019). Reproductive rights and gender equality report.

UNFPA. (2020). State of world population 2020.

WHO. (2020). Family planning/Contraception methods. https://www.who.int

WHO. (2021). Preventing unsafe abortion. https://www.who.int

WHO. (2021). Sexual and reproductive health and rights. https://www.who.int

Zaremberg, G., & Rodríguez Gustá, A. (2021). Legalizing abortion in Argentina: Feminist mobilization and political will. Politics & Gender, 17(2), 303–311.

Zarate, R., & Velasco, M. (2025). Introducing the Reproductive Access Index: Measuring abortion policy implementation. Lancet Reproductive Health, 2(4), 210–218.