

The Demographic Squeeze: Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights at the Intersection of the Climate Crisis and Ageing Societies

Malith Madurandika Deegodage

Faculty of Medicine, University of Peradeniya, Sri Lanka.

Commentary

Abstract

The global community is currently navigating a volatile poly crisis defined by two colliding macro-trends: the accelerating climate crisis and unprecedented population aging across the Global North and East Asia. While environmental degradation induces physical health risks and pervasive generational eco-anxiety that suppresses childbearing motivations, population aging triggers acute macroeconomic alarmism regarding shrinking labour forces, collapsing tax bases, and unsustainable dependency ratios. This commentary demonstrates that these dual forces exert a structural "demographic squeeze" on sexual and reproductive health and rights. To keep their economies growing, governments manipulate reproductive health policies using pro-natalist rhetoric, financial birth incentives, and restricted access to care. This state-centric approach co-opts bodily autonomy, treats individuals as demographic capital, and places a compounding "double burden" of unpaid care work disproportionately on women amidst climate-disrupted health infrastructures. To navigate these intersecting crises ethically, this paper advocates for a paradigm shift from manipulative demographic engineering toward a rights-based framework of demographic resilience rooted in reproductive justice. Achieving demographic resilience requires decoupling economic output from perpetual population growth via technological automation, dignified migration management, and publicly funded care economies. Furthermore, ethically closing the structural fertility gap through non-transferable paternal leave, affordable housing, and universal assisted reproduction: combined with aggressive climate mitigation, environmental toxicity regulation, and climate-proofed digital health networks: ensures that bodily autonomy and reproductive freedom remain the non-negotiable bedrock of democratic, healthy societies.

Key Words: reproductive justice, climate change, ageing populations, bodily autonomy pro-natalism

Introduction

For decades, the field of Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights (SRHR) has fought for the fundamental principle of bodily autonomy. The international community has established that reproductive choices must be free from coercion, discrimination, and violence. However, as we progress through the mid-21st century, we are witnessing an unprecedented collision between two macro-trends: the accelerating climate crisis [1] and the rapid aging of the global population.

This collision creates what can be termed the “demographic squeeze.” On one side of this squeeze, the climate crisis exacerbates resource scarcity, health infrastructure failure [2, 3], and “eco-anxiety” a profound, rational apprehension among younger generations regarding the viability of bringing children into an ecologically unstable world [4, 5]. On the opposite side, ageing populations create concerns within state systems regarding shrinking labour forces, collapsing tax bases, and unsustainable dependency ratios [6, 7].

The intersection of these forces is where SRHR is currently being contested and re-engineered. Governments facing perceived “demographic decline” are increasingly utilizing SRHR policy not as a tool for public health or human rights, but as a macroeconomic lever.

Pillars of Contemporary Instability

The Climate Crisis

The climate crisis is no longer merely an environmental issue; it has evolved into a structural determinant of SRHR [1]. Extreme weather events, prolonged heat waves, and shifting disease vectors directly

compromise maternal and foetal safety [2]. For instance, climate-induced natural disasters disrupt access to essential reproductive health services, sever contraceptive supply chains, and destroy clinics in vulnerable regions [3].

Beyond these direct physical threats, the climate crisis exerts a severe, insidious psychological toll. The manifestation of this environmental degradation is a pervasive, generational phenomenon known as “eco-anxiety” [4]. Emerging empirical data indicates that climate anxiety significantly predicts diminished childbearing motivations, shaping long-term reproductive intentions and leading many young adults to desire fewer children or forgo parenthood entirely [4,5].

When young people view the climate outlook with existential dread, their reproductive choices represent a rational response to global instability [1]. Yet, this decision is frequently pathologised by policymakers and media commentators as “selfish” or “short-sighted.” This framing intentionally ignores the reality that choosing not to reproduce under such conditions is often an expression of deep ethical responsibility and care for future generations who would inherit an inhospitable planet.

The Aging Paradox

Simultaneously, a parallel demographic shift is unfolding. Low fertility rates are directly linked to rapid population ageing and demographic decline across the Global North and East Asia [6]. While rising life expectancy is a triumph of modern medicine and public health, our dominant economic models remain structurally rigid, relying entirely on a continuously expanding youth labour force to support a shrinking, retired cohort.

Consequently, population ageing carries major consequences for labour supply, shifting dependency ratios, and long-term economic growth [6, 7]. Rather than evolving economic models to accommodate an ageing society: such as reforming pension systems or redefining productivity: many states are engaging in acute “demographic alarmism.” This political framing positions low birth rates as an existential national security threat and an economic catastrophe, shifting the blame from rigid financial institutions onto individual reproductive behaviours.

The Pro-Natalist Turn in SRHR Policy

The synthesis of these two pillars: climate anxiety suppressing birth rates and population ageing triggering economic panic: has catalysed a global resurgence of aggressive pro-natalist rhetoric and policy. We are witnessing a distinct trend where SRHR is being highly instrumentalised. Rather than treating reproductive healthcare as an end in itself, states are treating the reproductive body as a factory for future taxpayers [11, 12].

From the financial incentivisation of births to targeted restrictions on reproductive healthcare, governments are attempting to artificially force fertility rates upward [8, 9]. In this environment, bodily autonomy is treated as a secondary luxury that can be compromised to meet the state’s fiscal requirements. The individual right to choose is being subverted by an economic mandate to reproduce.

The Co-optation of the Reproductive Body

The fundamental danger of the demographic squeeze is the re-instrumentalisation of the reproductive body by state actors.

Historically, SRHR movements have fought to remove state intervention from reproductive choices, establishing that individuals have the absolute right to decide if, when, and how to reproduce. However, history demonstrates that restrictions on reproductive rights have frequently been used as coercive tools of state population policy [9].

When a government frames reproductive choices as a “civic duty” or an economic necessity, it undermines a rights-based approach to health. This nationalist rhetoric often masks profound failures in domestic social policy. Instead of addressing the structural barriers that make raising children genuinely difficult, such as hyper-inflation, the high cost of living, widening gender pay gaps, and a lack of affordable housing: states frequently pivot to restricting abortion, limiting access to emergency contraception, or dismantling comprehensive sex education. They attempt to increase the birth rate through coercion and systemic deprivation rather than by building a supportive, liveable society.

This approach is inherently unsustainable and unethical. It treats women and gender-diverse individuals as demographic capital rather than autonomous human agents. Furthermore, forcing childbearing into a world defined by intensifying climate volatility does not solve macro-economic problems; instead, it exacerbates systemic stress on families, leads to poorer maternal and child health outcomes, and deepens public distrust in governing institutions.

The “Double Burden” of Care

The intersection of climate change and aging societies creates an acute, compounding burden that falls disproportionately on

women. Globally, women already provide the vast majority of unpaid care and domestic work [10]. The demographic squeeze severely complicates this unequal division of labour. As populations age, the demand for eldercare increases exponentially; simultaneously, as the climate crisis intensifies, extreme weather events damage healthcare infrastructure, disrupt essential public services, and increase localized health risks [2, 3].

When climate disasters disrupt community infrastructure, the resulting care gaps are almost exclusively absorbed by women within the household. A society that encourages or forces higher birth rates without investing heavily in robust, state-supported care infrastructure traps women in a catastrophic cycle of “double duty.” Women are expected to replenish the future workforce through higher fertility while simultaneously sustaining the vulnerable elderly population through intense, unpaid caregiving: all without receiving enhanced economic, social, or climate protections.

Any critical discussion of SRHR in this era must advocate for a reorganization of the care economy. The international community must firmly reject the patriarchal assumption that the private family unit can endlessly absorb the systemic shocks of an ageing society and a changing climate.

Toward Reproductive Justice

To navigate the Demographic Squeeze without compromising fundamental human rights, the SRHR and international policy communities must abandon outdated paradigms and adopt a multi-faceted approach centred on Reproductive Justice. Reproductive Justice defines reproductive

freedom as the human right to have children, the right not to have children, and the right to parent and raise children in safe, healthy, sustainable environments [5]. Moving away from demographic engineering requires a transition toward demographic resilience: a framework that respects bodily autonomy while proactively building the structural conditions necessary for human communities to thrive.

Policymakers must completely abandon the coercive goal of “fertility maximization.” Instead, public policy should prioritize the quality of life, well-being, and rights of existing and future populations. If an ageing population poses genuine economic challenges, the ethical solution is not to force births, but to adapt our economic frameworks:

- **Technological Innovation:** Utilizing automation, artificial intelligence, and advanced technological changes can maintain or enhance economic productivity, effectively offsetting natural declines in labour supply without requiring an ever-expanding population [7].

Ethical Migration Management: Facilitating safe, legal, and dignified migration is the fastest mechanism to balance demographic deficits [6]. Wealthy, ageing nations must avoid predatory “brain drain” practices: such as poaching essential healthcare workers from developing nations in a manner that collapses those nations’ local health systems. Migrants must be embraced as full rights-holders with clear pathways to citizenship, rather than treated as disposable, temporary labour to fix a demographic math problem. In many ageing societies, individuals actually desire to have more children

than they end up having. However, their fertility intentions are blocked by acute structural barriers, prolonged economic uncertainty, and bleak perceptions of future stability [8]. Closing this “fertility gap” ethically means fulfilling existing human desires rather than coercing or manipulating new ones:

- **Eliminating Economic Coercion:** Massive public investment in universal, high-quality childcare and affordable, stable housing dramatically reduces the structural barriers to family planning and has been shown to increase fertility intentions in developed countries [8]. This ensures that the choice to have a child does not sentence a family to structural poverty.
- **Dismantling the “Motherhood Penalty”:** Implementing non-transferable, paid parental leave mandates for fathers balances the professional playing field, prevents women from being penalized in the labour market, and shifts domestic cultures toward true gender equality in household labour [10].
- **Universal Assisted Reproduction:** Making Assisted Reproductive Technology (ART) and IVF fully accessible through public healthcare systems ensures that the right to parent is a universal health right, rather than a luxury reserved exclusively for the wealthy.

Integrating Climate-Resilient Health Infrastructure

Finally, SRHR must be integrated into national climate adaptation strategies. Health facilities must be “climate-proofed” through decentralization and renewable energy micro-grids to prevent

total operational failure during natural disasters. Furthermore, digital health and telehealth networks must be expanded to ensure that comprehensive reproductive care, counselling, and safe abortion access remain available even when physical infrastructure is severely compromised by climate shocks.

Conclusion

The Demographic Squeeze represents a defining structural challenge of the coming decades. It is fundamentally a test of global values: whether we choose to protect human rights and bodily autonomy, or prioritize short-term macro-economic growth indicators and rigid financial systems. The current impulse toward coercive pro-natalism is a reactionary, fear-based response to a changing world.

The task for the global SRHR community is to counter this systemic fear with a robust framework of demographic resilience. We must consistently argue that the right to bodily autonomy is entirely non-negotiable. Whether a society is young or old, wealthy or developing, stable or climate-stressed, reproductive freedom remains the bedrock of a healthy, democratic society. By shifting our global focus from manipulative demographic engineering to genuine, rights-based support structures, we can successfully navigate this squeeze without crushing the very individuals the state is meant to serve.

Ethical Approval

Ethical approval was not required for this commentary, as it does not involve primary human participants, identifiable personal data, or experimental clinical interventions.

The manuscript is based entirely on existing literature, publicly available policy data, and the author's independent analysis.

External Funding

No external funding or financial support was received for the preparation or writing of this commentary. The work was conducted independently by the author.

Conflict of Interests

The author declares no conflict of interests. There are no financial, personal, or professional relationships that could be perceived to inappropriately influence or bias the content of this work.

Data Availability Statement

This commentary did not involve the generation or analysis of new primary datasets. All information, secondary data points, and academic references used are publicly available and fully cited within the manuscript.

Statement on the Use of Artificial Intelligence

Language refinements, structural formatting, and proofreading assistance for this commentary were provided by Gemini (Google). The intellectual interpretation, core policy analysis, and structural conclusions presented are entirely the author's own.

References

1. United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction. Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 1. Whitmee S, Haines A, Beyrer C, Boltz F, Capon AG, De Souza Dias BF, et al. Safeguarding human health in the Anthropocene epoch: report of The Rockefeller Foundation–Lancet Commission on planetary health. *The Lancet* [Internet]. 2015 Jul 16;386(10007):1973–2028. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736\(15\)60901-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(15)60901-1)
2. Sorensen C, Saunik S, Sehgal M, Tewary A, Govindan M, Lemery J, et al. Climate change and women's health: Impacts and opportunities in India. *GeoHealth* [Internet]. 2018 Sep 24;2(10):283–97. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018gh000163>
3. Casey SE, Chynoweth SK, Cornier N, Gallagher MC, Wheeler EE. Progress and gaps in reproductive health services in three humanitarian settings: mixed-methods case studies. *Conflict and Health* [Internet]. 2015 Feb 2;9(S1):S3. Available from: <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4331815/>
4. Zimmermann G, Darwiche J, Messerli-Bürgy N, Van Petegem S, Mouton B, Venard G, et al. "Bringing Children in a burning World?" The role of climate anxiety and Threat Perceptions in Childbearing Motivations of Emerging Adults in Switzerland. *Emerging Adulthood* [Internet]. 2024 Jun 2;12(5):925–38. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/21676968241258270>
5. Dillarstone H, Brown LJ, Flores EC. Climate change, mental health, and reproductive decision-making: A systematic review. *PLOS Climate* [Internet]. 2023 Nov 9;2(11):e0000236. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pclm.0000236>
6. Gietel-Basten S. Demographic and social anxieties: the second demographic transition in Asia. *China Population and Development Studies* [Internet]. 2022 Sep 1;6(3):338–49. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42379-022-00121-0>
7. Babad Y& GD& G Sam. Fertility and ageing – actuarial perspectives. *ideas.repec.org* [Internet]. 2023; Available from: https://ideas.repec.org/a/cup/bracjl/v28y2023ip_6.html

8. Thévenon O. Family policies in OECD countries: A comparative analysis. *Population and Development Review* [Internet]. 2011 Mar 1;37(1):57–87. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1728-4457.2011.00390.x>
9. Berer M. Abortion law and policy around the world: In search of decriminalization [Internet]. 2017. Available from: <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5473035/>
10. Ervin J, Taouk Y, Alfonzo LF, Hewitt B, King T. Gender differences in the association between unpaid labour and mental health in employed adults: a systematic review. *The Lancet Public Health* [Internet]. 2022 Aug 31;7(9):e775–86. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36057276/>
11. Forati R, Bartz D. The Rise and Fall and Rise of Pronatalism: A Disingenuous Policy that Harms the Health of People and Society. *The Journal of Law Medicine & Ethics* [Internet]. 2025 Jan 1;53(3):435–43. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1017/jme.2025.10129>
12. Tan J. Beyond fertility figures: towards reproductive rights and choices. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications* [Internet]. 2024 Jan 16;11(1). Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-02608-2>