

Bioethik in der Diskussion

Bioethics in discussion

Sigrid Müller, Piotr Jan Morciniec (Hg.)

# Interdisziplinäre Nachhaltigkeit

# Interdisciplinary Sustainability

## Bioethik in der Diskussion

Im Auftrag der Association of Bioethicists in Central Europe  
herausgegeben von Sigrid Müller und Piotr Jan Morciniec

### Scientific Advisory Board:

Prof. Dr. Urh Grošelj, Ljubljana University Medical Centre, Ljubljana, Slovenia;  
Prof. PhD Ștefan Iloaie, Fakultät für Orthodoxe Theologie, Babeș-Bolyai Uni-  
versität Cluj, Rumänien; Prof. Dr. Ivan Koprek, Fakultät für Philosophie und  
Religionswissenschaften, Universität Zagreb, Kroatien; Prof. Dr. Martin Lintner,  
Philosophisch-Theologische Hochschule Brixen, Italien; Prof. Dr. Marian Ma-  
chinek, Katholische Fakultät, Universität Ermland-Masuren in Olsztyn, Polen;  
Prof. Dr. István Tiringier, Ph.D., Institut für Verhaltenswissenschaften, Universität  
Pécs, Ungarn; Dr. Slavomír Dluhoš, Vorstandsmitglied BCE, Fachbereich Theo-  
logische Ethik, Katholisch-Theologische Fakultät, Universität Wien, Österreich

### Peer Review:

Prof. Dr. Katrin Bederna (Pädagogische Hochschule Ludwigsburg)  
Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Bergem (Universität Siegen)  
Prof. Dr. Bartosz Fortuński (Wirtschaftsuniversität Opole)  
Prof. Dr. Roman Globokar (Universität Ljubljana)  
Prof. Dr. Gusztáv Kovács (Bischöfliche Theologische Hochschule Pécs)  
Prof. Dr. Michael Rosenberger (Katholische Universität Linz)  
Prof. Dr. Ulrike Sirsch (Universität Wien)

German Proofreading: Claudia Bernal Díaz, Bakk.  
DTP: Jerzy Bosowski

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek  
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen  
Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über  
<http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

Copyright © 2023 facultas Universitätsverlag,  
Facultas Verlags- und Buchhandels AG, Wien, Austria  
Alle Rechte, insbesondere das Recht der Vervielfältigung und der Verbreitung  
sowie der Übersetzung, sind vorbehalten.  
Permalink (Open Access: Zugang ab November 2024):  
<http://phaidra.univie.ac.at/o:1916305>  
Druck: facultas Verlags- und Buchhandels AG  
Printed in Austria  
ISBN 978-3-7089-2427-4  
DOI: 10.24989/BCE.nachhaltig

Bioethik in der Diskussion 5 (2023)  
*Interdisciplinary Sustainability*  
S. 5–6  
DOI: 10.24989/BCE.nachhaltig.10

## Content / Inhalt

Sigrid Müller, Willi Haas & Piotr Morciniec <b>Nachhaltigkeit und Nachhaltigkeitspraxis – eine interdisziplinäre Herausforderung</b> . . . . .	7
Sustainability and Sustainability Practice – An Interdisciplinary Challenge	
Markus Vogt <b>Nachhaltigkeit definieren. Die sieben häufigsten Irrtümer</b> . . . . .	27
Defining Sustainability. The Seven Most Common Misconceptions	
Dominik Opatrný <b>Steward, Gardener, or Shepherd? Metaphors describing the human-nature relationship</b> . . . . .	43
Elena Ignovska <b>Sustainability and Reproduction: A Human Rights Based Approach</b> . . . . .	63
Nachhaltigkeit und Fortpflanzung	
Ana Frichand <b>The Role of Psychology in Providing a Sustainable Development for Future Generations</b> . . . . .	87
Die Rolle der Psychologie bei der Schaffung einer nachhaltigen Entwicklung für künftige Generationen	

Ivica Kelam	
<b>Philosophical Reflections on the Sustainability of Carbon Offset</b>	
Die Nachhaltigkeit von Kohlenstoff-Kompensation. Philosophische Überlegungen	107
Irena Labak & Irella Bogut	
<b>Educational understanding of sustainable development</b>	131
Das Verständnis nachhaltiger Entwicklung in der Pädagogik	131
Ulrich Brand	
<b>Wie versteht die Politikwissenschaft das Postulat der Nachhaltigkeit?</b>	151
How does political science understand the postulate of sustainability?	
Autorinnen und Autoren / Authors	171

Bioethik in der Diskussion 5 (2023)

*Interdisciplinary Sustainability*

S. 7–25

DOI: 10.24989/BCE.nachhaltig.1

## Nachhaltigkeit und Nachhaltigkeitspraxis – eine interdisziplinäre Herausforderung

### Sustainability and Sustainability Practice – An Interdisciplinary Challenge

SIGRID MÜLLER (WIEN), WILLI HAAS (WIEN) &

PIOTR MORCINIEC (OPOLE)

#### Abstract (Deutsch)

Nachhaltigkeit ist ein vielseitig verwendbarer Begriff. Die Breite des Begriffs kann dazu führen, dass der Begriff für spezifische Zwecke instrumentalisiert wird und an Aussagekraft verliert. Dennoch besitzt „Nachhaltigkeit“ eine wichtige „Kompassfunktion“ für modernes Leben. Der Beitrag geht daher einigen Aspekten des Nachhaltigkeitsbegriffes nach. So zeigt er zunächst die Ähnlichkeiten mit dem Begriff des moralisch Guten auf, speziell seine zeitliche und die universale Dimension. Danach behandelt er das Spezifische des Nachhaltigkeitsbegriffs im Kontext der Prinzipien der Sozialethik (Personprinzip, Solidarität, Subsidiarität) und im Vergleich zum Brückenprinzip der „Retinität“. Als fundamentales Prinzip bedarf Nachhaltigkeit der Konkretion im Handeln. Dennoch ist die Umsetzung des theoretisch Erkannten oft schwierig, weil sich eingeübte soziale Praxen aus mehreren Gründen nicht leicht verändern lassen. Deshalb ist es eine Aufgabe der wissenschaftlichen Disziplinen, die sich für Nachhaltigkeit einsetzen wollen, eigene blinde Flecken aufzudecken. Zusätzlich wirkt sich die Aufsplitterung der Disziplinen und fachlichen Zuständigkeiten bei der konkreten Gestaltung von Rahmenbedingungen für nachhaltiges Leben bremsend auf Innovation aus und erschwert die Einübung und Gestaltung nachhaltiger Lebensmodelle in der Gesellschaft, was an zwei Beispielen erläutert wird. Darum ist über

- Moloney F. J., *Sacra Pagina. The Gospel of John*, Collegeville 2005.
- Murray R., *The Cosmic Covenant. Biblical Themes of Justice, Peace and the Integrity of Creation*, London 1992.
- Musolff A., *Metaphors. Sources for Intercultural Misunderstanding?*, "International Journal of Language and Culture", 2014, 1, 1, 42–59.
- Nam M., *Prophetic Dialogue. East-Asian Theology and the Changing Voice of Mission. What can the Church of England learn from East-Asian theology in terms of Contextualizing the Gospel? A dissertation submitted to Trinity College/Bristol Baptist College, Bristol 2020a.*
- Nam M., *East-Asian theology as a corrective to a Western view of creation care* (2020b), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MMmRqfkYg4w> (17.02.2023).
- Nam M., 'Stewardship' or Yin-Yang? *East-Asian Theology and a Biblical Environmental Ethic* (2022), <https://blog.arocha.org/en/stewardship-or-yin-yang-east-asian-theology-and-a-biblical-environmental-ethic/> (17.02.2023).
- Northcott M.S., *The Environment and Christian Ethics*, Cambridge 1996.
- Palmer C., *Stewardship. A Case Study in Environmental Ethics*, in: Ball, I. (ed.), *The Earth Beneath. A Critical Guide to Green Theology*, London 1992.
- Raymond M., *Ecosystem Services and Beyond*, "BioScience", 2013, 63, 7, 536–546.
- Schaab G.L., *Beyond dominion and stewardship*, in Burdon, P., *Exploring Wild Law. The Philosophy of Earth Jurisprudence*, Kent Town 2011.
- Rosenberger, M., *Christian Ethics of Creation. On the Path of Ecological Conversion*, Baden-Baden 2022.
- Schüngel-Straumann H., *On the Creation of Man and Woman in Genesis 1–3: The History and Reception of the Texts Reconsidered*, in Brenner-Idan, A., *Feminist Companion to Genesis*, Sheffield 1993, 53–76.
- Shore-Goss R., *God is Green. An Eco-Spirituality of Incarnate Compassion*, Eugene 2016.
- White L., *The Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis*, "Science", 1967, 155, 3767, 1203–1207.
- Zámečník J., *From Steward to Sibling*, "Communio viatorum," 2020, 62, 2, 148–183.

Bioethik in der Diskussion 5 (2023)

*Interdisciplinary Sustainability*

S. 63–86

DOI: 10.24989/BCE.nachhaltig.4

## Sustainability and Reproduction: A Human Rights Based Approach

## Nachhaltigkeit und Fortpflanzung

ELENA IGNOVSKA, SKOPJE

### Abstract (Deutsch)

Der Beitrag nähert sich der Nachhaltigkeit aus einer Menschenrechtsperspektive. Sie nimmt eine anthropozentrische Sichtweise auf Umweltfragen ein und argumentiert, dass Mensch und Umwelt miteinander verbunden und daher voneinander abhängig sind. Der Beitrag des EGMR (Europäische Menschenrechtskonvention) hat sich als revolutionär erwiesen, da er den Geltungsbereich bestimmter in der EMRK verankerter Rechte auf den Bereich des Umweltschutzes ausgeweitet hat. Andererseits könnten auch nationale Gerichte den Menschenrechtsansatz auf nationaler Ebene anwenden, bevor er überhaupt den EGMR erreicht.

Familienrechtliche Fragen bewegen sich im Grenzbereich zwischen privatem und öffentlichem Recht. Nachhaltigkeit, Umwelt und Familien überschneiden sich im Thema der Reproduktion. Nachhaltige Entwicklung ist anfällig, weil die meisten Menschen, Familien und Regierungen sich mehr um ihre eigene Zukunftsfähigkeit kümmern als um die ganze Welt. Der Beitrag verwendet denselben Menschenrechtsansatz, um die Frage zu beantworten, wie die Diskrepanzen bei der Fortpflanzung (Überbevölkerung und Fertilitätsraten unterhalb des Reproduktionsniveaus) in verschiedenen Regionen gelöst werden können, die die planetarische Nachhaltigkeit auf unterschiedliche Weise bedrohen.

**Abstract (English)**

The paper approaches sustainability from a human rights perspective. It takes anthropocentric lenses towards environmental issues, arguing that humans and the environment are interconnected and therefore interdependent. The ECtHR's contribution has proven revolutionary by broadening the scope of certain rights stipulated in the ECHR to the area of environmental protection. On the other hand, even national courts could apply the human rights approach on national level before it even reaches the ECtHR.

Family law issues are at the borderline between private and public law. In the intersection of sustainability, environment and families there is the intersection of reproduction. Sustainable development is vulnerable because most people, families, and governments care more about their own sustainability than about the whole world. The paper uses the same human rights approach to answer how to solve reproductive discrepancies (overpopulation and below-replacement fertility rates) in different regions that threaten planetary sustainability in different ways.

**Keywords (Deutsch)**

Nachhaltigkeit; Reproduktion; Familie; Menschenrechtsansatz;

**Keywords (English)**

Sustainability; reproduction; family; human rights approach;

**1. Human Rights Approach towards Sustainable Future**

Sustainability in the international agenda is a recent phenomenon.<sup>1</sup> The "Brundtland Report" is probably the most cited document regarding the definition of sustainable development as a "type of development that meets

<sup>1</sup> This text follows a lecture on the topic for purposes of a winter school "Sustainability as a Challenge: An Interdisciplinary Approach" at the Catholic Theological Faculty, University of Vienna in the framework of CEEPUS – Bioethics network supported by OeAD, 28 November – 3 December, 2022.

the needs of the present without compromising the ability of the future generations to meet their own" (Report of the World Commission 1987). The Millennium Development Goals (MDG's) from 2000 had an ambitious plan that unfortunately was not met by its 2015 deadline (United Nations 2000). Accordingly, a new set of international efforts and therefore hope for planetary sustainability was planned with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in 2015 with an aim to be accomplished by its 2030 deadline (United Nations 2015). The main differences between MDG's and SDG's (apart of the number of goals, targets and indicators) are: 1) the orientation – while MDG's were oriented primarily towards developing countries, particularly the poorest, SDG's were oriented towards the entire world (rich and poor) and 2) the focus (scope) – while MDG's focused on social inequalities, SDG's expanded the scope into economic growth, social inclusion and environmental protection. The MDGs largely ignored the three pillars of what we see today as crucial for a holistic view on sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. This holistic (or integrated) approach is essential for balanced sustainable development. The opposite would mean that favoring one at the cost of the other pillars is non-sustainable trade-off (for instance, if one favors solely economic growth like China in the 70's and 80's, one might end up with air pollution and environmental degradation that may eventually lead to sacrifice of the environmental pillar for the sake of the economic pillar) (Swiss Learning Exchange). However, the SDG's are still nationally-owned and country-led, wherein each country is given the freedom to establish a national framework in achieving the SDGs (Fernandez-Taranco 2017).

In the European Union, there is no legal definition of the concept of sustainability. It is however introduced in the EU system by art. 3 of the TEU (Maastricht Treaty):

The Union shall establish an internal market. It shall work for the sustainable development of Europe based on balanced economic growth and price stability, a highly competitive social market economy, aiming at full employment and social progress, and a high level of protection and improvement of the quality of the environment. It shall promote scientific and technological advance. It shall combat social exclusion and discrimination, and shall promote social justice and protection, equality between

women and men, solidarity between generations and protection of the rights of the child [...]

The term sustainability is further mentioned in art. 21.2 TEU:

The Union shall define and pursue common policies and actions, and shall work for a high degree of cooperation in all fields of international relations, in order to: [...] (d) [...] foster the sustainable economic, social and environmental development of developing countries, with the primary aim of eradicating poverty; (f) help develop international measures to preserve and improve the quality of the environment and the sustainable management of global natural resources, in order to ensure sustainable development [...]

In the later TFEU (Lisbon Treaty), sustainability is incorporated in art. 11:

Environmental protection requirements must be integrated into the definition and implementation of the Union's policies and activities, in particular with a view to promoting sustainable development,

art. 114(3), (5) and art. 191:

Union policy on the environment shall contribute to pursuit of the following objectives: preserving, protecting and improving the quality of the environment, protecting human health, prudent and rational utilization of natural resources, promoting measures at international level to deal with regional or worldwide environmental problems, and in particular combating climate change. 2. Union policy on the environment shall aim at a high level of protection taking into account the diversity of situations in the various regions of the Union. It shall be based on the precautionary principle and on the principles that preventive action should be taken, that environmental damage should as a priority be rectified at source and that the polluter should pay [...],

but also in art. 193 and art. 194 (1).

Prior to 1970 individual countries had sovereignty over their natural resources. The UN Stockholm Declaration from 1972 is the first international document that restricts national sovereignty when it comes to global environmental issues stating in its Principle 21:

States have the sovereign right to exploit their own resources pursuant to their own environmental policies, and the responsibility to ensure that activities within their jurisdiction or control do not cause damage to the environment of other States or of areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction.

Since it soon became clear that we share the environment on the same planet with the previous, current and future generations (Report of the World Commission 1987), this doctrine of absolute sovereignty over the environment has changed over time and led states to cooperate to protect the environment for both mutual and self-interest. From this, the international environmental law has emerged (Nanda & Pring 2013). Nowadays, International environmental principals are: 1. Preventive action, 2. Precaution, 3. Polluter Pays, 4. Duty to Cooperate, 5. International Equity and 6. Duty to Cooperate (Nanda & Pring 2013, 19–68).

International Human Rights Documents that recognize environmental issues are: the UN Charter (art. 55); the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (art. 3, 25 and 27); the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (art. 25); the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (art. 24(2)). Binding Conventions (for the countries that ratified them) are already existent in the domain of Biodiversity, Chemical and Hazardous Waste, International Water Conventions, Climate and Atmosphere (such as UN Convention on Climate Change, Kyoto Protocol, Paris Agreement) etc. Non-binding documents are more of plans, goals etc. (such as SDG's).

The World Health Organization defines environment as all the physical, chemical and biological factors external to the human host. As such, it can be observed from the human's point of view, i.e. eventual harm to human being from environmental degradation – anthropocentric nature, or from its own point of view, i.e. the intrinsic value of all living organisms

and the environment – eco-centric nature (Council of Europe – HELP Course 2021). The human rights approach to environmental issues analyzes eventual harm done to humans (anthropocentric nature) due to environmental degradation, global warming and climate change. As such, it is not enough to protect the environment per se, but is a good start to initiate public responsibility in front of national or regional courts for purposes of protecting human rights endangered by environmental threat. The relation is mutual – the environment is precondition for enjoyment of human rights, while human rights are used as a tool for protection of healthy environment. The first recognition of close relationship between human rights and environment (yet, not binding) was in the UN Stockholm Declaration in which Principle 1 stipulates:

Man has the fundamental right to freedom, equality and adequate conditions of life, in an environment of a quality that permits a life of dignity and well-being, and he bears a solemn responsibility to protect and improve the environment for present and future generations.

The human rights approach enables gradual development of a new and emerging right – to a clean, healthy and safe environment that is still not recognized as such in the international human rights arena (Council of Europe – HELP Course, Module 1 2021). Eventual recognition of such explicit right will facilitate both national and international environmental protection instead of the current dependency of invoking other rights for individual or collective environmental litigations and adequately, restoration. In an absence of such explicit right, the human rights based approach to environmental issues uses other available rights to prove the same and allows individuals to challenge national governments in cases of environmental damage and lack of preventive measures to concerning environmental risks. These rights could be categorized as substantive rights (such as the right to life, right to private and family life, right to peaceful enjoyment of property); participatory rights (such as the freedom of expression, freedom of assembly and association)<sup>2</sup> and

<sup>2</sup> Procedural rights are grounded in many various international law instruments, the most prominent being the Convention on Access to Information,

procedural rights (such as the right to a fair trial or the right to an effective legal remedy and execution of court decisions).

In this sense, the ECtHR's contribution has proven revolutionary by broadening the scope of certain rights stipulated in the ECHR to the area of environmental protection (Cenevska 2016, 4). It is worthwhile mentioning that the right to access to courts and fair trial applies only if: the case matter is over civil right or obligation, the dispute is serious and genuine and the outcome of the proceeding is directly decisive towards applicant's rights (Council of Europe – HELP Course, Module 3 2021). It does not apply however in cases of *actio popularis* i.e. if the legal action is brought in the interest of the public order (L'Erabilere A.S.B.L. v. Belgium, ECtHR 2009). These rights were already invoked and somehow proved to be working in more than 300 cases in front of the European Court of Human Rights.<sup>3</sup> They are categorized in several groups regarding their subject matter: balanced protection, urban nuisance, pollution, environmental activism, environmental disasters and dangerous activities (Council of Europe – HELP Course, Module 3 2021). The evolutive interpretation of the ECtHR allowed that the mostly used articles from the ECHR are art. 2 and 8. The first case where the ECtHR recognized that severe environmental pollution could violate the right to respect for home, private and family life, even if it does not pose a serious health risk is the case Lopez Ostra v. Spain (Lopez Ostra v. Spain, ECtHR 1994). This case illustrates that a clean environment is a precondition to the enjoyment of human rights and that the human rights approach could be used to address environmental problems (Council of Europe – HELP Course, Module 3 2021). Apart from this top-down approach, the Urgenda case in the Netherlands, upheld the opposite showing how even national courts

---

Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (Aarhus Convention, UN ECE/CEP/43).

<sup>3</sup> For instance, some of the corner-stone decisions are: Lopez Ostra v. Spain, Hatton and Others v. the UK, Guerra v. the Italy, Fredin v. Sweden, Mamere v. France, Taskin and Others v. Turkey, Zander v. Sweden and many others.

could apply the human rights approach on national level before it even reaches the ECtHR.<sup>4</sup>

## 2. Human Rights Approach in Family Matters in Europe

Family law matters historically have been treated as out of subjective nature allowing national states based on their own morals and traditions to rule what family life encompasses. This notion made difficult to enable harmonization of family law in European context or to even discuss about European family law as such. Nevertheless, over the years, the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) has changed the level of flexibility of the margin of appreciation, interpreting the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR, Council of Europe 1950) on grounds of rational and strict scrutiny in the European context, claiming that its decisions set a European hierarchy of values, which cannot vary drastically from State to State (Marauhn & Ruppel 2008, 246–247; Brems 2008; Lester & Herne 1998). Family life has developed in a manner to respond to all kinds of modern issues, looking at the Convention as a living and evolving instrument. Family matters are present in many fields of life and do not only concern article 8 of the Convention but also other articles depending on the context in each particular case (Laffranque 2018). Even though family life is often connected with traditions and culture, for the ECtHR, it is an autonomous concept.

The individual rights in the field of family life are protected in article 8 – as a right to respect for private and family life; article 12 – as a right to marry and establish a family; article 14 – as a general principle of non-discrimination; and article 6 (1), as a fair trial and a right to access civil law courts for solving family matters (among others). When the ECtHR analyzes potential infringements of the ECHR it may call upon other human

<sup>4</sup> Urgenda Foundation v. State of Netherlands, 2015 in which 900 citizens sued and won against the Government because it has not done enough to prevent global climate change.

rights internationally binding documents. One of them, being especially important in the context of family life is the Convention on the Rights of the Child (UN 1989). Having these provisions in mind, family law and human rights intersect in the field of rights related to couples, relationships between children and their parents and other relatives and children's rights (Ignovska 2020).

The most relevant article from the ECHR for family law is article 8 showing its contradictions in two paragraphs:

Everyone has the right to respect for his private and family life, his home and his correspondence.

There shall be no interference by a public authority with the exercise of this right except such as is in accordance with the law and is necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security, public safety or the economic well-being of the country, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals, or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others.

Family law issues are at the borderline between private and public law. This is because they tackle individuals and their autonomy to make decisions about own choices regarding what kind of private and family life they want to live in. In these lines, the state should try to refrain from imposing particular lifestyle since it may infringe human rights. Therefore, there is again anthropocentric focus – on the human person<sup>5</sup> that comes from

<sup>5</sup> The relational concept of personhood is ambiguous because of several reasons. As a key element that launches all the other consequential misinterpretations is the context in which a person develops. By investigating cultural pro-attitudes, Prodanov distinguishes between individualists and collectivists, as related to Catholic, liberal and Western tradition on the one hand, and Orthodox, communitarian Eastern European tradition on the other hand. According to this author, while “the former sees the person as a bundle of rights”, the latter perception of a person is identified with a “bundle of his social identities, affiliations and roles”. From this quotation, it is understandable why the actualization of personhood in Western countries begins at the moment when one is entitled to acquire his own rights,



within and finds its own way out in the society. On the other hand, the society and the state via its policies regulate what way of living private and family life is preferable while protecting public interest or the vulnerable (like abandoned children, citizens under custody etc.) and avoiding what they consider inappropriate (for instance, creating children for “sole” purpose of satisfying the child wish of the intended parents<sup>6</sup>). Therefore, there is a thin line between the overwhelming role of the state and its justified absence. In the intersection of sustainability, environment and families there is the intersection of reproduction. Namely, reproduction has been observed in the past, is observed nowadays and probably will be observed in the future in the light of population increase – that may eventually lead to unsustainable planet, or the opposite population decline – that may eventually cause the same. In the intersection of reproduction, the margin of appreciation of the ECtHR has been challenged many times. Yet, the individual anthropocentric human rights based approach v. the collective, overall public interest are still tentative.

The text that follows will analyze some national demographic policies that consider(ed) uncontrolled reproduction their problem for sustainable future and if the human rights based approach could avoid state’s intrusion into private and family life while achieving global sustainability.

---

and in Eastern countries only when one coexists in the group, class or community and consequently becomes a recognized subject, not as a holder of rights, but primarily as a holder of obligations. Therefore, if for *Individualists*, the human essence originates from within, as an inherited and self-sufficient element for individual development, for *Communitarians*, the same human essence is a substrate of social identities, affiliations and roles. Bearing in mind this historical background of development of thought and science, could be explained why some authors hold firmly onto ontological properties, claiming individuality as a supreme value and promote observation over isolating oneself, while others always interrelate the individual with society, as a mutual mirror in which both the individual and society look upon and therefore shape themselves (Prodanov, 1996).

<sup>6</sup> This is illustrated very well in the case of *Paradiso and Campanelli v. Italy* (Ignovska 2017).

### 3. Human Rights, Reproduction and Sustainability

Over the history and nowadays there is a huge discrepancy between opinions regarding the human reproduction and its possible threat towards sustainable societies: is it the overpopulation or below population replacement fertility rates? Many authors warned that world with over 7 billion people outpaces economic growth (Nanda & Pring 2013, 632). The UN Secretary General Ban Ki Moon also warned in his message for UNEP’s 2011 Annual Report:

The global population has reached 7 billion people. In just five years, we will add another half billion people – all needing food, jobs, security and opportunity. Environmental, economic and social indicators tell us that our current model of progress is unsustainable. Ecosystems are under stress. Economies are faltering. We need to chart a course that strengthens equality and economic growth while protecting our planet.

It is a fact that the world population is constantly growing – it more than doubled from 1968 to 2012, while it grew by 40 percent from 1987 to 2011 (Nanda & Pring 2013, 632). In November, 2022 a baby girl born in Manila was officially counted as the 8 billionth person in the world (Timesnow 2022). However, almost all of this population growth – 97 of every hundred people – has occurred in less developed countries and that puts a strain on their available and scarce resources.

On the other hand, many rich and middle-income countries are much more concerned about their low fertility and ageing. For instance, in Europe, the decreased fertility rates are not satisfactory for simple reproduction of the human kind. Since 1960s, the total fertility rate in the European Union has fallen by more than 40% and it keeps on falling. By all parameters, Europe is a low fertility region (Jozwiak & Kotowska 2008). The most recent data over the USA birth rates also show sharp decline with most women having an average of 1,3 babies and more often having them later in life – at age 35 or older (Tabachnick 2023). Even though demographers do not agree with some speculations that low birth rates *per se* are causing population therefore civilization collapse, they do

not exclude other factors that might reduce or wipe out humanity, such as: nuclear wars, pandemics, whole new religions and family preferences, the prospect of colonizing other planets or hugely extending the human lifespan (Reynolds 2022).

Inevitably, a question arises: what seems to be the reason for such discrepancy in opinions regarding the demographic sustainability? To start with, the demographic features do vary from high fertility rates, usually in low-income countries to low fertility rates, usually in high-income countries. The future prospects are that the population of the high-fertility countries will rise even more, while the population of the low-fertility countries will decline even more, widening the gap (Nanda & Pring 2013, 632). This means that fertility rates are not proportional to the income. This also widens the gap between rich and poor making the rich even richer, while poor even poorer. For instance, there is wide divergence in what it takes to sustain the lives of people around the world: it takes 9.5 hectares of the earth's space to sustain the life of the average American, compared to only about 1 hectare for the average person in India or most of Africa, and 2.7 hectares for the average person worldwide (Nanda & Pring 2013, 632). Similar figures go to other costs during human lives such as water, food, clothes, leisure etc. Accordingly, while poor are usually being more they spend less and the rich, even though being less spend more. Therefore, one could claim that overconsumption (unsustainable consumption practices in developed countries) is a bigger problem to sustainability than overpopulation (too many people for too little resources that cause poverty in under developed countries). Dovers and Butler argue the same and among other arguments refer to a study from 2009 that shows that countries with the fastest population growth also had the slowest carbon emissions, while the reverse was also true. They further state: "an American has an ecological footprint almost 9 times larger than an Indian – so while the population of India far exceeds that of the United States, in terms of environmental damage, it is the American consumption of resources that is causing the higher level of damage to the planet." (Dovers & Butler 2015).

Yet, many authors claim that something has to be done in order to stabilize population growth, achieve a balance between fertility and mortality

rates and an equilibrium between population and the earth's carrying capacity in order to sustain ecological balance (Nanda & Pring 2013, 635). Even though some initiatives to influence fertility rates do have human rights implications (especially for women's rights), they are still largely left under the supremacy of the national states and their estimations on what public interest in the national context encompasses. After all, most people, families and governments care about their own future viability than the overall. This makes the international action on population issues limited to declarations and principles, instead of binding norms.

Looking for the foundations of the right to reproduce in the outer political context as a doctrinarian set of values to be protected in the name of the *public/common good* goes back to the identification of the family with the state. According to Aristotle, the common good of the state (*πόλις*) is a synthesis of the private interests of families (*οἶκος*), making the integrity of the family a private institution essential for the common life in the state (Provencal 2001). On the other hand, an identification of this kind could be seen as an intrusion into the private and family life of the individual by the State. Very often the rationale for choosing one against another policy is mirrored by the global goals to be achieved (that may aim towards boosting or dropping the birthrate) as a public interest and not in the reflection of the particular individual liberty or right. Thus, other reasons (political, economic, religious and eugenic) which are beyond the individual, through history have dominated the private and family domain dictating when, how and in what number people should procreate. The most influential example in the 18<sup>th</sup> century was the *Malthus theory on control of population growth* due to the estimated decrease of already scarce resources, and the possibility of overpopulation that might lead to famine, disease or war (Malthus 1798).

In this wide spectrum of available governmental mechanisms to control reproduction, there are examples from coercive measures to reduce population to extreme pro-natal policies. For instance, the Indian government took drastic measures to curb population growth in the mid-1970s via vasectomies and forced sterilization for men with two or more children while giving small loans and priorities for houses (Nanda & Pring 2013, 636). China experienced the both extremes from the spectrum. While in the

1950s promoted births for purposes of socio-economic development (via Mao Tse Tung's slogan: "the more babies the more glorious are their mothers"), gradually shifted to one-child limitation policy introduced in the late 1970's because of the estimation that the land could no longer sustain its growing population. This went hand in hand with coerced abortions and sex selections – highly controversial towards appreciation of human's rights (Callahan 1995, 256). It was only in 2015 that China withdrew the one-child policy (Crli & Darvin 1985) and several years later, again compromised human rights promoting ban for non-medical abortions – with hidden purpose of increasing the population and the economic growth (Yeung & Gan 2021). Some other countries feared increased mortality and decreased birth rates and consequently promoted pro-natal policies as part of their strategy of growing nations. This was the case in France – introducing the most restrictive laws on abortion in Europe in 1920, as an attempt to recuperate for the lost lives during World War I (Yeung & Gan 2021, 225), Germany – the Nazis' rationale of increasing the population from 66 to 90 million in order to claim more territory (Callahan 1995, 255 referring to Sanger 1971)<sup>7</sup>, and Italy (as Benito Mussolini intended to grow worldwide power by growing the nation) (Callahan 1995, 256). This was also noted in more recent years under the veil of maintaining political viability or seizing political dominance in the Middle East Israel, Iran and Iraq (Callahan 1995, 256). Romania is another example for leading extreme pro-natal policy in the 1960's for purposes of increasing the population under the state decree that proclaimed: "The fetus is the property of the entire society. Anyone who avoids having children is a deserter who abandons the law of national continuity". Alongside these coercive policies, there were less coercive too, for instance, most of them, including India, China and Romania gave monetary and other rewards to individuals and families complying with their population policies while taxing

<sup>7</sup> It is also worthwhile mentioning that in this period Germany combined pro and anti-birth policies, applying sterilization laws to preclude reproduction by "inferiors" and intense propaganda to boost reproduction among "superiors" i.e. women of the desired heritage (Callahan 1995, 257).

those who did not. Even though providing health, educational or financial incentives has proven to be effective in combating some population issues, they are surrounded with some controversies, such as: do they enable the freedom of choice or the opposite – disable it – the recipient has been coerced into it through community pressure or financial desperation (Dovers & Butler 2015).

Practices of this kind demonstrate that the use of the State's power to control reproduction and the private domain are not outdated in the domain of achieving other political goals. There was also an attempt of such scenario to take place in the Republic of North Macedonia, manifesting in a form of constant promotion and subventions for families with more children, public governmental campaigns against abortion resulting in a change in the law on abortion (Закон за прекинување на бременоста 2013). The legitimacy for imposing particular ways of family life is usually hypocritically grounded in other (than political) values which are closer to the individual and not to the State (so that the individual can identify him/herself on a personal level). That is how the individual right to family life melts with the dominantly accepted cultural values. The process of building values through different methods (one of which is continuous propaganda) and thus particular collective culture is long and persistent. Therefore carefully nurtured cultural values are imbedded not only in society but also in individual identification and integration within society. Consequently, they cannot fade away easily, but it is a long time-consuming process for the change on both collective and private levels to occur. On the contrary, if states focus more on social and economic reforms and technological advances – towards clean energy – (that should also be affordable in the developing countries) instead of controlling reproduction, a submissive individual may not feel suffocated to exercise reproductive choices in the collective culture. Nevertheless, it remains that matters of contraception, abortion, sexual freedom, parental choice and application of reproductive technologies are dependent on enforcement of morals, these being dictated by legitimate state interests (Cohwn & Taub 1989, 426). This is especially important for the acceptance of the new reproductive technologies and the ways they are entering into the domain of family life and

parenting, while questioning morality and human dignity. Yet, there are international efforts to treat reproductive rights and freedoms as human rights in the: Universal Declaration of Human Rights; International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights; International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights; Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women; European Convention on Human Rights; Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Dignity of the Human Being with regard to the Application of Biology and Medicine etc. These international documents include: the right to life, the right not to be subjected to inhumane or degrading treatment or arbitrary and unlawful interference, the right not to be subjected to medical or scientific experimentation without consent, the right to marry and found a family, the right to privacy, the right not to be discriminated on the basis of sex, the right of access to health care, the right to information and advice on family planning, the right to freely and responsibly decide on the number and spacing of children, the right to have access to education, the means to exercise this right, the rights to freedom of opinion and expression and the right to an effective remedy for violations of fundamental rights.

There is also a large number of human rights' case law, for instance from the European Court of Human Rights supporting the notion that reproductive rights and freedoms are human rights (ECtHR Factsheet Reproductive Rights 2022). They are legal rights and freedoms related to sexuality, reproduction and reproductive health. In these terms, the challenge that the international arena is facing is to achieve balance between the population rates and sustainability without compromising individual human rights.

The International Convention on Population and Development (ICPD) held in Cairo in 1994 outlined that there is an interrelationships between population, sustained economic growth, sustainable development, and empowerment of women. The comprehensive program, emphasized several issues, including population and environment, gender equality and empowerment of women, reproductive rights and reproductive health, population and sustainable development, fertility, mortality, and population growth rates, sustained economic growth, and poverty.

Reproductive rights rest on the recognition of the basic right of all couples and individuals to decide freely and responsibly the number, spacing and timing of their children and to have the information and means to do so, and the right to attain the highest standard of sexual and reproductive health – health as a “state of complete physical, mental and social well-being [...]” (WHO 2020, 1). It therefore implies that people have the capability to reproduce and the freedom to decide if, when and how often to do so. Key elements for improving and maintaining reproductive rights and health are: comprehensive sexuality education, affordable and accessible methods of contraception and family planning, safe abortion care and counseling, quality maternal healthcare and maternal, paternal and parental leave prior and following birth. This should result with gender equality by enabling reproductive choices and equal involvement of both men and women into child rearing project and parental responsibilities that come along after having reproduced, but also equal opportunities in the labor market. Even more, it has a potential to voluntarily decrease fertility rates among poor countries (with a focus on girl's education, contraception, professional opportunities)<sup>8</sup> and increase them among rich countries (with a focus on shared parental leave and domestic responsibilities that will ease the tensions that women have with their dual roles as working mothers). This is in line with the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (art. 5)<sup>9</sup> and the EU Directive

<sup>8</sup> Dovers S., Butler C. are on the same opinion stating: “Birth rates naturally decline when populations are given access to sexual and reproductive healthcare, education for boys and girls beyond the primary level is encouraged and made available, and women are empowered to participate in social and political life. Continuing to support programs and policies in these areas should see a corresponding drop in birth rates. Similarly, as the incomes of individuals in developing countries increase, there is a corresponding decrease in birth rates. This is another incentive for richer countries to help their poorer neighbours reach their development potential.” (Dovers & Butler 2015)

<sup>9</sup> Article 5 (b) stipulates: (b) To ensure that family education includes a proper understanding of maternity as a social function and the recognition of the

2006/54/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of the Implementation of the Principle of Equal Opportunities and Equal Treatment of Men and Women in Matters of Employment and Occupation (EU Directive 2006/54/EC).

The main objectives of the ICPD Program of Action regarding the relationship between population and environment are: to ensure that population, environmental and poverty eradication factors are integrated in sustainable development policies and to reduce both unsustainable consumption and production patterns as well as negative impacts of demographic factors on the environment in order to meet the needs of current generations without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. One of the ideas behind the MDG's was to insure the right of men and women to be informed and to have access to safe, effective, affordable and acceptable methods of family planning of their choice, as well as other methods of their choice for regulation of fertility and the right of access to appropriate health-care services that will enable women to go safely through pregnancy and childbirth and provide couples with the best chance of having a healthy infant. However, the Vatican opposed the Program's reference to birth control and abortion, and several Latin American countries joined several Muslim countries in blocking consensus in the outcome document at the 1994 Conference. Subsequently, in 2000, when the UN Millennium Summit adopted by consensus the Millennium Development Goals, the key provisions of the Program of Action – reproductive right and universal access to reproductive health – were not included. Nevertheless, several goals of both MDG's (promotion of gender equality and empowerment of women, reduction of child mortality improvement of maternal health) and SDG's (good health and wellbeing, quality education, decent work and economic growth and gender equality) were in the intersection of sustainability and reproductive rights.

---

common responsibility of men and women in the upbringing and development of their children, it being understood that the interest of the children is the primordial consideration in all cases.

#### 4. Conclusion

The Earth's population is estimated to grow from the present 8 billion to at least 9,7 billion by 2050 and 10,4 billion by 2100 (World Population Prospects 2022, 9). Overpopulation is associated with poverty, hunger, disease, illiteracy, especially in low-income countries that cope with scarce resources. Overpopulation is also associated with negative environmental outcomes such as: over-farming, deforestation, water pollution, eutrophication and global warming (LeBlanc 2021). As such, overpopulation is not sustainable.

On the other hand, in some developed regions, like Europe there is a low fertility rate. The problem with low fertility is that it reduces population size (if it is below two, than there is not even simple reproduction). Even more, the reduction is not at all ages but only among the young.<sup>10</sup> That means that there will be less or not enough payment in the healthcare or pension funds, less workers to keep up the economy etc.<sup>11</sup> This situation produces an age structure that creates a momentum for future population decline and must be stopped at some point if the population is to be demographically sustainable (McDonald 2001).

Therefore, population stabilization is essential to reach the goal of sustainable development. However, coercive population control measures violate human rights and dignity and are not preferable option to achieve that goal. Instead, attention needs to focus on human rights based approach that protects human lives, subsequently the environment they live in. Key strategies that could enable population stabi-

---

<sup>10</sup> In the 1960s, there were six people of working age for every retired person. Today, the ratio is three-to-one. By 2035, it will be two-to-one (World Economic Forum 2021; Eurostat)

<sup>11</sup> Some authors seem to even cherish small populations because according to them, today we can produce more with fewer working-age people and if we redistribute wealth, falling populations could be a boon. This could have an impact on the human welfare, women's empowerment and the environment (Skirbekk 2022).

lization while appreciating and uplifting human rights are: 1. Enabling equal access to education (not just primary) for all girls and boys; 2. Promotion of gender equality and women's empowerment; 3. Ensuring reproductive rights and sexual and reproductive health services, including access to family planning services; 4. Affording maternal, but also shared parental leave following birth of children; 5. Ensuring affordable childcare and 6. Addressing environmental issues associated with population changes. Appreciating reproductive rights and freedoms, but also facilitating the child rearing process has a potential to voluntarily decrease fertility rates among overpopulated developing countries and increase them among developed countries that struggle for simple reproduction.

Even though, most governments care more about their own future viability and still enjoy wide margin of appreciation in dealing with these issues under their own supremacy, it is obvious that that we share the same habitat on the planet Earth and therefore, an international cooperation is necessary at least when it comes to fulfilling the sustainable development goals. In this sense, the human rights approach is a joint international effort to promote humans' lives as well as the environment in which they live. The UN Framework Principles on Human Rights and the Environment state:

"Human beings are part of nature, and our human rights are intertwined with the environment in which we live. Environmental harm interferes with the enjoyment of human rights, and the exercise of human rights helps to protect the environment and to promote sustainable development." (Report of the United Nations Human Rights Council 2018, 7)

The environmental issues are global therefore the humans' effort to balance sustainable life should also be unite.

## Bibliography

- Aging Europe – Statistics on Working and Moving into Retirement, Eurostat (July 2020). [https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Ageing\\_Europe\\_-\\_statistics\\_on\\_working\\_and\\_moving\\_into\\_retirement](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Ageing_Europe_-_statistics_on_working_and_moving_into_retirement) (1.3.2023).
- Baby Girl Born in Manila Symbolizes 8 Billionth Person in the World, Timesnow (15.11.2022). <https://www.timesnownews.com/viral/vinice-mabansag-baby-girl-born-in-manila-symbolises-8-billionth-person-in-the-world-article-95527905> (1.3.2023).
- Bye, bye Baby? Birthrates are Declining Globally- Here is Why it Matters, Global Health, World Economic Forum (June, 2021). <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2021/06/birthrates-declining-globally-why-matters/> (1.3.2023).
- Callahan J.C., Introduction to Part III: Electing and Preventing Birth, in: Callahan J.C. (ed), *Reproduction, Ethics and Law. Feminist Perspectives*, Bloomington/Indianapolis, 1995, 251–265.
- Cenevska I., *Environmental Rights in the Dialogue between the ECJ and the ECtHR* (Geneva Jean Monnet Working Papers 12), Geneva 2016.
- Cohwn S., Taub N. (eds.), *Reproductive Laws for the 1990s, Contemporary Issues in Biomedicine, Ethics, and Society*, Humana Press, Clifton, New Jersey, 1989.
- Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, United Nations, 18.12.1979. <https://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/cedaw/text/econvention.htm> (1.3.2023).
- Convention on the Rights of the Child, United Nations, 20.11.1989. <https://www.unicef.org/child-rights-convention/convention-text> (09.08.2023).
- Crli E., Darvin D., Kane P. (eds), *China' One-Child Policy*, New York, St. Martin's Press, 1985.
- Dovers S., Butler C., *Population and Environment. A Global Challenge*, Australian Academy of Science (last updated 24.07.2015). <https://www.science.org.au/curious/earth-environment/population-environment> (1.3.2023).
- EU Directive 2006/54/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of the Implementation of the Principle of Equal Opportunities and Equal Treatment of Men and Women in Matters of Employment

- and Occupation. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1461323959640&uri=CELEX%3A32006L0054> (1.3.2023).
- Factsheet Reproductive Rights, European Court of Human Rights (December 2022). [https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/fs\\_reproductive\\_eng.pdf](https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/fs_reproductive_eng.pdf) (1.3.2023).
- Fernandez-Taranco O., Sustainable Development Goals are Country-Led and Country-Owned, United Nations Sustainable Development Goals, 22 Sept. 2017 <https://unsdg.un.org/latest/blog/sustainable-development-goals-are-country-led-and-country-owned> (9.10.2023).
- HELP Course, Environment and Human Rights, Council of Europe, 2021 [access: <http://help.elearning.ext.coe.int/>] (09.08.2023).
- Ignovska E., *Paradiso and Campanelli v. Italy: Lost in Recognition. Filiation of an Adopted Embryo born by Surrogate Woman in a Foreign Country*, Strasbourg Observers, April 4, 2017.
- Ignovska E., *The Family Law of the Republic of North Macedonia through the Prism of the European Convention on Human Rights, "Iustinianus Primus Law Review"*, Vol. 11, Special issue, 2020.
- Jozwiak J., Kotowska I.E., *Declining Birth Rates in Europe: Reasons and Remedies, "European View"*, No. 7; 2008.
- L'Erabilere A.S.B.L. v. Belgium*, ECtHR, Application No. 49230/07, judgment of 24.2.2009.
- Laffranque J., HELP Family Law, European Court of Human Rights, 14.12.2018.
- LeBlanc R., *The Environmental Impact of Overpopulation*, Liveaboutdotcom (updated 2.5.2021). <https://www.liveabout.com/how-overpopulation-impacts-the-environment-4172964> (1.3.2023).
- Lester L. Herne H. Q.C., *Universality v. Subsidiarity: A Reply*, "European Human Rights Law Journal", Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 73–81, 1998.
- Lopez Ostra v. Spain*, ECtHR, Application No. 16798/90, judgment of 9.12.1994.
- Malthus T., *An Essay on the Principle of Population*, London, 1798. <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/4239/4239-h/4239-h.htm> (1.3.2023).
- Marauhn T., Ruppel N., "Balancing Conflicting Human Rights: Konrad Hesse's Notion of "Praktische Konkordanz" and the German Federal Constitutional Court", Brems E. (ed.) *Conflicts Between Fundamental Rights*, Intersentia, 2008.

- McDonald P., *Low Fertility, Not Politically Sustainable*, "Population Today", Vol. 29, No. 6, 2001.
- Millennium Development Goals, United Nations, 2000.
- Nanda V.P., Pring G.R., *International Environmental Law and Policy for the 21st Century*, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2013.
- Prodanov, V., *Cultural Pro-Attitudes, Reproductive Ethics and Embryo Protection*, Evans D. (ed), *Conceiving the Embryo, Ethics, Law and Practice in Human Embryology*, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1996.
- Provencal L.V., *The Family in Aristotle, "Animus"*, Vol. 6, 2001, 3–31.
- Report of the Secretary-General, *Permanent Sovereignty over Minerals and Water Resources*, United Nations Economic and Social Council [ECOSOC], Feb. 18, 1993. <https://www.un.org/unispal/document/auto-insert-177754/> (09.08.2023).
- Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: *Our Common Future*, 1987.
- Report of the United Nations Human Rights Council Special Rapporteur on the issue of Human Rights Obligations relating to the Enjoyment of a Safe, Clean, Healthy and Sustainable Environment, 2018. <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/G18/017/42/PDF/G1801742.pdf?OpenElement> (9.10.2023).
- Reynolds M., *Elon Musk is Totally Wrong About Population Collapse*, Wired, 6.10.2022. <https://www.wired.co.uk/article/elon-musk-population-crisis> (1.3.2023).
- Skirbekk V., *Decline and Prosper! Changing Global Birth Rates and the Advantages of Fewer Children*, edited by Catherine E. Bowen, Cham, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-91611-4>.
- Stockholm Declaration – Declaration of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, 1972.
- Swiss Learning Exchange, *The Three Pillars of Sustainability*: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ijSSe66865w&t=17s> (1.3.2023).
- Tabachnick C., *U.S. Birth Rates Drop as Women Wait to Have Babies*, CBS News, 12.1.2023. [https://www.cbsnews.com/news/u-s-birth-rate-decline-national-center-for-health-statistics-report/?fbclid=IwAR3\\_nMWn1r-KT\\_mD6zan5L4OSH1mFz4hNY6c-wAt8ZSjxhzs8AI4IY8auPQ](https://www.cbsnews.com/news/u-s-birth-rate-decline-national-center-for-health-statistics-report/?fbclid=IwAR3_nMWn1r-KT_mD6zan5L4OSH1mFz4hNY6c-wAt8ZSjxhzs8AI4IY8auPQ) (1.3.2023).

- World Population Prospects. Summary of Results, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2022. [https://www.un.org/development/desa/pd/sites/www.un.org.development.desa.pd/files/wpp2022\\_summary\\_of\\_results.pdf](https://www.un.org/development/desa/pd/sites/www.un.org.development.desa.pd/files/wpp2022_summary_of_results.pdf) (1.3.2023).
- Yeung J., Gan N., China Says its Restricting Abortions to Promote Gender Equality. Experts are Skeptical, CNN, 1.10.2021. <https://edition.cnn.com/2021/10/01/china/non-medical-abortion-mic-intl-hnk/index.html> (1.3.2023).
- WHO, Constitution, in: WHO, Basic Documents, 49<sup>th</sup> edition 2020, 1–19. <https://www.who.int/about/governance/constitution> (10.08.2023).
- Закон за прекинување на бременоста, “Службен весник на Република Македонија/Law on Termination of the Pregnancy, Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia“, 87/2013, 17.06.2013.

Bioethik in der Diskussion 5 (2023)

*Interdisciplinary Sustainability*

S. 87–106

DOI: 10.24989/BCE.nachhaltig.5

## **The Role of Psychology in Providing a Sustainable Development for Future Generations**

## **Die Rolle der Psychologie bei der Schaffung einer nachhaltigen Entwicklung für künftige Generationen**

ANA FRICHAND, SKOPJE

### **Abstract (Deutsch)**

Künftige Generationen stehen im Mittelpunkt der nachhaltigen Entwicklung, wie in den meisten einschlägigen UN-Dokumenten betont wird. Mit der Aufnahme der psychischen Gesundheit in die Ziele für nachhaltige Entwicklung wird anerkannt, dass sie eine wichtige Rolle bei der Erreichung der globalen Entwicklungsziele spielt. Aufgrund der rasanten technologischen Entwicklung wachsen Kinder und Jugendliche heute in einer sich schnell verändernden, digitalen Welt auf, die ihnen viele Möglichkeiten bietet, sie aber auch mit verschiedenen Herausforderungen konfrontiert, die ihre psychische Gesundheit auf verschiedenen Ebenen beeinträchtigen. In diesem Sinne ist das Wissen der Psychologie von entscheidender Bedeutung für die Schaffung von Bedingungen für eine optimale Entwicklung und eine gute psychische Gesundheit der jüngeren Generationen. Daher müssen Fachleute einen wesentlichen Schritt zur Stärkung der Resilienzfähigkeiten, Selbstregulierung und emotionalen Reife künftiger Generationen unternehmen, um sie in die Lage zu versetzen, erfolgreich mit den Herausforderungen umzugehen, die sich aus der Erfüllung individueller Entwicklungsaufgaben, Berufs- und Lebensentscheidungen, der Anpassung an die Ausweitung der künstlichen Intelligenz, dem zunehmenden Einfluss sozialer Medien und den Herausforderungen der Cybersicherheit, der technologischen Innovation, die