Scholedge International Journal of *Multidisciplinary & Allied Studies*
ISSN 2394-336X Vol. 12, Issue 01 (2025)
DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.19085/sijmas120101

Sustainable Development and the Role of Humanities in Addressing Global Challenges

Jose Miguel Villanueva Torres
University of the Philippines Open University (UPOU), Philippines

ABSTRACT

Sustainable development, as defined by the World Commission on Environment and Development (1987), asks humanity to meet its present needs without undermining the ability of future generations to meet theirs. For decades, the conversation about how to accomplish this has been dominated by economics, technology, and the natural sciences. But the problems the world faces today, from climate change to deepening inequality to eroding democratic institutions, are not purely technical. They are moral, cultural, and political. This paper argues that the humanities, including philosophy, history, literature, and the social sciences, have a serious and underappreciated role in how societies address these challenges. Drawing on the work of Amartya Sen, Martha Nussbaum, Jeffrey Sachs, and others, and engaging with frameworks like the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals, the paper makes the case that humanistic scholarship sharpens how societies reason about justice, educate their citizens, and design policies capable of dealing with real human complexity. Without this, even technically sound solutions risk failing the people they are meant to serve. The paper also examines obstacles that limit the integration of humanities scholarship into sustainability policy, and argues for genuine interdisciplinary collaboration as the most productive path forward.

Keywords: Sustainable development, humanities, human development, climate justice, education for sustainability, ethics, global governance

INTRODUCTION

The phrase "sustainable development" carries a great deal of weight. Since the Brundtland Commission placed it at the center of global policy discourse in 1987, it has been cited in thousands of reports, written into national legislation, and shaped international agreements from Kyoto to Paris to the United Nations 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Yet for all that attention, fundamental disagreements remain about what sustainability actually demands, who bears the burden of adjustment, and how present societies should weigh their own interests against those of people not yet born.

These are not questions that economists or engineers can answer alone. They are, at their core, philosophical and ethical. And yet the disciplines best equipped to wrestle with them, philosophy, history, literary studies, anthropology, and the arts, have largely been kept at the margins of sustainability policymaking. The assumption, often unspoken, is that the real work of sustainability happens in laboratories, financial models, and engineering offices. The humanities are sometimes acknowledged as providing context, but rarely treated as producing the kind of knowledge that shapes decisions.

This paper pushes back against that assumption. The humanities are not a luxury addition to sustainability scholarship. They are necessary for it. When climate negotiations stall over questions of historical responsibility, that is a moral and historical argument, not a technical one. When poor communities bear the heaviest burden of environmental degradation despite contributing the least to it,

the analysis required to understand and respond to that reality draws on philosophy, political theory, and social history. When educators try to prepare young people to think critically about a world under pressure, the tools of the humanities are what make that possible.

The paper begins by tracing how sustainable development thinking has evolved since the 1970s, noting how the conversation gradually expanded beyond economic growth to include human well-being, rights, and justice. It then turns to specific arguments for why the humanities matter in three areas: ethical reasoning about climate and environmental justice, the formation of democratic citizens capable of engaging with complex global problems, and the role of cultural knowledge in understanding why technically sound solutions sometimes fail in practice. The paper draws on work by Sen (1999), Nussbaum (2010, 2011), Sachs (2015), and others, and it engages with the United Nations' own framing of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) as a space where humanistic reasoning already appears, even when it is not explicitly labeled as such.

A note on scope: this paper focuses primarily on the English-language scholarly literature and on frameworks operating at a global or transnational level. It acknowledges that sustainable development looks different depending on where you are standing, and that indigenous knowledge systems, local traditions, and non-Western philosophical frameworks have a great deal to contribute to this conversation. That is itself an argument for the humanities. The limits of any single tradition of thought become most visible when placed alongside others.

THE EVOLUTION OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT THINKING

The modern concept of sustainable development is usually traced to the 1987 report of the United Nations World Commission on Environment and Development, commonly known as the Brundtland Report. It defined sustainable development as "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987, p. 43). That definition, short and elegant as it is, opened up as many questions as it settled. What counts as a need? Who decides which generation's needs take priority when they conflict? How do societies weigh environmental preservation against the aspirations of people living in poverty?

These concerns were not entirely new. The 1972 *Limits to Growth* report, produced by the Club of Rome, had already raised serious questions about the physical limits of indefinite economic expansion (Meadows et al., 1972). What the Brundtland Report added was an equity dimension to the environmental argument. Sustainability was not only about preserving nature; it was also about ensuring that development reached people who had been left out of it. This was a significant conceptual move, one that opened the door to the social sciences and, eventually, to the humanities.

The Sustainable Development Goals, adopted by the United Nations in 2015, pushed this further. The 2030 Agenda is explicit that sustainable development rests on three interconnected pillars: economic growth, social inclusion, and environmental protection (United Nations, 2015). Goal 4 commits to quality education for all; Goal 10 to reduced inequalities; Goal 16 to peace, justice, and strong institutions. None of these can be achieved through technical means alone. They require sustained moral and political reasoning about what societies owe each other.

Sen's work on human development had already been building this case for years before the SDGs arrived. In *Development as Freedom* (1999), Sen argued that development should be understood not as growth in GDP but as the expansion of people's real freedoms, a framework he had begun developing in earlier work (Sen, 1985). He called these substantive freedoms "capabilities." A person who cannot read, who has no access to political participation, or who lives in chronic fear is not developed in any meaningful

sense, no matter what their country's aggregate income figures say. This reframing moved the measure of development from economic indicators to human experience, which is precisely the territory that the humanities have spent centuries mapping.

Nussbaum's capabilities approach, developed in dialogue with Sen, made this connection more explicit still. In *Creating Capabilities* (2011), Nussbaum argued for a threshold of human capabilities that any just society must secure for its members. The list includes not just material necessities but the ability to live with concern for other species, to play, to participate in political life, and to have one's emotional life shaped by meaningful relationships and experiences. This is not the language of macroeconomics. It is the language of ethics and the humanities, applied to questions of global justice.

Sachs (2015) extended this frame to the SDGs themselves. In *The Age of Sustainable Development*, he argued that sustainable development is ultimately a question of civilizational values. The choice between a world of ecological collapse and one of shared prosperity is not primarily a question of whether the technology exists to make the transition. For the most part, it does. The deeper question is whether societies can generate the political will and the moral imagination to use it well. That kind of moral imagination is what the humanities cultivate.

WHAT THE HUMANITIES BRING TO THE TABLE

The humanities encompass a wide set of disciplines: philosophy, history, literature, linguistics, the arts, religious studies, and much of cultural anthropology and political theory. What they share is a concern with meaning, interpretation, and judgment. Where the natural sciences ask what is true, and the social sciences ask what is measurable, the humanities ask what matters and why. That may seem like an odd question to bring to a conversation about climate change or biodiversity loss. But it is exactly the right question.

ETHICS AND HISTORICAL REASONING

Take the problem of climate justice. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) confirmed in its Sixth Assessment Report what scientists had been saying for decades: human activity has warmed the planet at an unprecedented rate, with destructive effects already underway and worse ones projected (IPCC, 2021). The science is not the main obstacle to action. The obstacle is a set of disagreements about who bears responsibility for historical emissions, who should pay for adaptation, and how to distribute the costs of transition fairly across nations at vastly different stages of development.

These are moral and political arguments. A historian can trace how industrialization in Europe and North America built the material wealth those countries now possess, and show that it also built up the carbon debt that the whole world now carries (Steffen et al., 2015). A philosopher can ask whether it is just for a country in sub-Saharan Africa, which has contributed almost nothing to cumulative global emissions, to face the worst effects of climate change without adequate support from those who have contributed the most. A political theorist like Held (1995) can ask what international institutions would need to look like to handle disputes of this kind with any legitimacy.

These disciplines do not just add texture to the policy debate. They are prerequisites for having it honestly. Without them, the conversation defaults to which parties have the most economic power, and that rarely produces just outcomes. Rockström et al. (2009) introduced the concept of planetary boundaries, physical limits within which humanity must operate if it wants to avoid catastrophic system changes. Understanding why societies repeatedly push past those limits, and what it would take to change course, requires more than natural science. It draws in history, politics, psychology, and ethics.

Literature and the arts contribute something else: the capacity to make abstract suffering visible and real. Stories about communities displaced by rising seas, or farmers whose livelihoods collapse after repeated droughts, are not simply illustrations of data. They create the kind of empathetic understanding that moves people to act. Nussbaum (2010) argued in *Not for Profit* that cultivating narrative imagination is essential to democratic life. Citizens who cannot imagine the experience of people different from themselves are poorly equipped to reason about shared problems. That capacity is trained by reading fiction, by engaging with art, by studying history.

HUMAN NEEDS BEYOND MATERIAL WANTS

Max-Neef (1991) offered a model of human needs that goes well beyond material consumption. People need affection, identity, freedom, and participation in their communities. Development programs that treat people as input-output systems, ignoring these deeper needs, consistently produce resistance, dropout, and failure. Understanding human needs in this fuller sense requires the humanities. Economics alone cannot get you there.

Table 1 below organizes some of the key humanities disciplines, their central concerns, and the specific contributions they make to sustainability scholarship and policy. The categories are not rigid; many scholars work across several of these at once.

Table 1. Humanities Disciplines and Their Contributions to Sustainable Development Scholarship

Discipline	Core Concerns	Contributions to Sustainability Scholarship and Policy
Philosophy	Ethics, justice, moral reasoning	Intergenerational equity, rights of nature, climate justice arguments
History	Causation, institutional change, long-run analysis	Origins of industrial emissions, colonial legacies in global environmental burden
Literature and the Arts	Narrative, empathy, cultural meaning	Communicating environmental risk, building public empathy for distant communities
Political Theory	Power, governance, democratic legitimacy	Global governance frameworks, accountability in SDG implementation
Anthropology	Cultural knowledge, fieldwork, social systems	Indigenous resource management, explaining why development programs fail in practice

Note. Compiled by the author as a conceptual framework. Contributions listed are illustrative, not exhaustive.

The humanities also provide a corrective to institutional overconfidence. Many well-intentioned development programs have failed because they were designed without adequate understanding of the cultural and political contexts into which they were introduced. Agricultural schemes have undermined food security by ignoring existing land management practices. Water projects have displaced communities without consent. Urban renewal programs have destroyed the social networks that held neighborhoods together. The pattern is consistent enough that it demands explanation, and Sterling (2001) pointed to an educational failure at the heart of much sustainability thinking: a tendency to treat problems as technical puzzles rather than social realities embedded in history and power.

CLIMATE JUSTICE AND ETHICAL REASONING

The conversation about climate change has been framed, for most of its public life, as a scientific and economic debate. Is the planet warming? At what rate? What is the cost of reducing emissions compared with the cost of doing nothing? These are important questions. But the debate that has actually stalled international action is a moral one, and it has been present from the beginning.

When developing nations argue that they should not be required to limit their industrial growth to solve a problem created by already-wealthy countries, they are making a moral argument. When climate advocates argue for a loss and damage mechanism that would require wealthy nations to compensate poorer ones for climate-related harm, they are invoking principles of justice. When indigenous communities fight to protect forests that have sustained their lives for generations, they are asserting a kind of rights claim that neither emissions trading schemes nor biodiversity indices fully capture.

The IPCC's Working Group II report (IPCC, 2022) acknowledged explicitly that vulnerability to climate change is distributed unevenly, tracking closely with existing social inequalities. The communities with the least historical responsibility for emissions are, in most cases, the ones facing the greatest risks. This finding calls for ethical analysis, not just more data.

The philosophical tradition has tools for this. Intergenerational justice, the question of what present generations owe to future ones, has been debated carefully by philosophers for decades, and the literature is substantial. Cosmopolitan political theory, represented by thinkers like Held (1995), asks how principles of justice can be applied across national borders when no world government exists to enforce them. Environmental ethics asks what, if anything, we owe to non-human species and to natural systems that sustain all life. These are not abstract exercises. They are the underlying structure of every serious climate negotiation. Making those frameworks explicit helps clarify what is at stake and what kinds of agreements could reasonably be considered fair.

Sen's (1999) argument that development requires the expansion of real human freedoms connects directly here. A world in which climate change systematically destroys the capabilities of the world's most vulnerable people, their ability to grow food, to live in stable communities, to participate in political life, is a world moving backward. The ethical case for aggressive climate action is not only about preserving the environment. It is about preserving the conditions for human flourishing, and that is a concern the humanities have always been prepared to articulate and defend.

EDUCATION, DEMOCRATIC CITIZENSHIP, AND SUSTAINABILITY

UNESCO's *Education for Sustainable Development Goals* report (2017) made the case that education is not just one of the seventeen SDGs but a means of achieving all the others. The reasoning is sound. An educated population is better prepared to participate in democratic governance, to hold institutions accountable, to understand complex global problems, and to make choices that reflect long-term thinking rather than immediate self-interest.

But what kind of education? The UNESCO report pointed toward learning that equips people to think critically about the systems they inhabit and to imagine alternatives. This is a fundamentally humanistic vision. It is not primarily about technical skills. It is about habits of mind, the kind that emerge from reading deeply, arguing carefully, and reckoning honestly with history.

Nussbaum (2010) raised an alarm worth taking seriously in this context. She observed that education systems in many countries were steadily cutting space for the humanities in favor of subjects with more immediate economic payoff. This shift, she argued in *Not for Profit*, threatens democracy itself. Citizens trained only in technical fields may be skilled workers, but they may not be equipped to question authority,

to reason across cultural difference, or to think historically about how their societies came to be the way they are. Those capacities matter for sustainability, not as soft extras but as the basis for the political engagement that collective action requires.

Giroux (2014) took this argument further in *Neoliberalism's War on Higher Education*. He argued that the defunding and marginalization of the humanities in universities reflects an ideological choice that narrows democratic participation. When institutions treat students primarily as future workers rather than future citizens, they produce people who are effective in markets but passive in politics. That passivity is a problem in a moment that demands collective action at a scale the world has rarely attempted.

The United Nations Development Programme (2016) linked human development directly to democratic participation, arguing that people must be agents in their own development, not just recipients of programs designed for them by experts. That kind of agency requires the capacity for critical thought, for historical awareness, and for moral reasoning. It requires what a genuinely humanistic education produces.

UNESCO (2015) framed education as a "global common good," emphasizing that access to quality learning is not just a private benefit but a shared resource that societies must protect and invest in collectively. This framing reflects a humanistic understanding of what education is for. It is not only skills transfer. It is the reproduction of the social and moral capacity that makes collective life possible. Without that capacity, the political conditions for sustainable development cannot hold.

CHALLENGES AND THE WAY FORWARD

None of what has been argued here means that incorporating humanities scholarship into sustainability science and policy is straightforward. Several real obstacles stand in the way.

The first is institutional. Research funding in the natural and applied sciences is substantially larger than in the humanities. The metrics used to evaluate research impact, citations, patents, commercial applications, tend to favor quantitative disciplines. Humanities scholars working on sustainability topics often find themselves speaking mainly to other humanities scholars rather than to the engineers, economists, and policymakers who have the most direct influence over outcomes.

The second obstacle is linguistic. The humanities tend to produce nuanced, context-specific arguments that resist easy summarization. Policy requires simplification. There is genuine tension between the kind of knowledge the humanities produce and the kind that fits into a policy brief. This is not a problem unique to the humanities, but it tends to be more acute there than in disciplines that can present their findings as numbers.

The third obstacle is reputational. In many political environments, the humanities are dismissed as impractical or politically biased. This perception is not always fair, but it is real, and it affects how humanistic arguments are received in public debate. Scholars in these fields have sometimes made the situation worse by writing primarily for each other in language that most people outside the academy cannot access.

These obstacles are real but not insurmountable. Griggs et al. (2013) argued for an integrated approach to the SDGs that treats the social, environmental, and economic dimensions as genuinely interdependent rather than sequential. That kind of integration already implies a role for humanistic reasoning. The *Limits to Growth* report (Meadows et al., 1972) raised questions about human values and social organization that the natural sciences could not answer on their own. Fifty years later, those questions are more pressing, not less.

The most productive path forward is probably not to argue that the humanities should replace technical disciplines in sustainability research. It is to argue for genuine interdisciplinary collaboration, the kind that brings together a climate physicist, a historian of industrialization, a political philosopher, and a community advocate in the same project, and treats all of them as having something essential to contribute. This kind of collaboration already happens in some institutions. It needs to become the norm, not the exception.

CONCLUSION

Sustainable development, as the Brundtland Commission understood it and as the 2030 Agenda has extended it, is about more than keeping CO_2 concentrations within a range that human civilization can tolerate. It is about creating conditions in which all people can live with dignity, agency, and a fair share of the world's resources. That is a moral and political project as much as it is a scientific and technological one.

The humanities have been making this kind of argument for a long time. Sen argued that development is about freedom. Nussbaum argued that it is about capabilities and human dignity. Historians have shown how the present distribution of wealth and environmental burden was produced by specific decisions made by identifiable actors over identifiable periods of time. Philosophers have mapped the ethical terrain of intergenerational and international justice. Educators have argued, with substantial evidence, that preparing people to live in and help govern a complex world requires more than vocational training.

These arguments are not supplementary to the work of sustainable development. They are foundational to it. The challenge for the field is to build institutions, funding structures, and collaborative practices that reflect this. Until the people designing and implementing sustainability solutions treat humanistic knowledge as genuinely necessary rather than decorative, they will continue producing technically sophisticated plans that stumble on the human terrain.

The problems the world faces are real and pressing. But so is the knowledge needed to address them well. Much of that knowledge lives in books, in classrooms, and in the minds of scholars who study not how the world works mechanically but what it means to live in it justly. That is not something the field can afford to treat as optional.

REFERENCES

Giroux, H. A. (2014). *Neoliberalism's war on higher education*. Haymarket Books.

Griggs, D., Stafford-Smith, M., Gaffney, O., Rockström, J., Öhman, M. C., Shyamsundar, P., Steffen, W., Glaser, G., Kanie, N., & Noble, I. (2013). Sustainable development goals for people and planet. *Nature*, *495*(7441), 305–307. https://doi.org/10.1038/495305a

Held, D. (1995). *Democracy and the global order: From the modern state to cosmopolitan governance*. Stanford University Press.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2021). *Climate change 2021: The physical science basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (V. Masson-Delmotte, P. Zhai, A. Pirani, S. L. Connors, C. Péan, S. Berger, N. Caud, Y. Chen, L. Goldfarb, M. I. Gomis, M. Huang, K. Leitzell, E. Lonnoy, J. B. R. Matthews, T. K. Maycock, T. Waterfield, O. Yelekçi, R. Yu, & B. Zhou, Eds.). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157896

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2022). *Climate change 2022: Impacts, adaptation and vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (H.-O. Pörtner, D. C. Roberts, M. Tignor, E. S. Poloczanska, K. Mintenbeck,

A. Alegría, M. Craig, S. Langsdorf, S. Löschke, V. Möller, A. Okem, & B. Rama, Eds.). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009325844

Max-Neef, M. A. (1991). *Human scale development: Conception, application and further reflections*. Apex Press.

Meadows, D. H., Meadows, D. L., Randers, J., & Behrens, W. W., III. (1972). *The limits to growth*. Universe Books.

Nussbaum, M. C. (2010). *Not for profit: Why democracy needs the humanities*. Princeton University Press.

Nussbaum, M. C. (2011). *Creating capabilities: The human development approach*. Harvard University Press.

Rockström, J., Steffen, W., Noone, K., Persson, Å., Chapin, F. S., III, Lambin, E. F., Lenton, T. M., Scheffer, M., Folke, C., Schellnhuber, H. J., Nykvist, B., de Wit, C. A., Hughes, T., van der Leeuw, S., Rodhe, H., Sörlin, S., Snyder, P. K., Costanza, R., Svedin, U., … Foley, J. A. (2009). A safe operating space for humanity. *Nature*, *461*(7263), 472–475. https://doi.org/10.1038/461472a

Sachs, J. D. (2015). *The age of sustainable development*. Columbia University Press.

Sen, A. (1985). *Commodities and capabilities*. North-Holland.

Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford University Press.

Steffen, W., Richardson, K., Rockström, J., Cornell, S. E., Fetzer, I., Bennett, E. M., Biggs, R., Carpenter, S. R., de Vries, W., de Wit, C. A., Folke, C., Gerten, D., Heinke, J., Mace, G. M., Persson, L. M., Ramanathan, V., Reyers, B., & Sörlin, S. (2015). Planetary boundaries: Guiding human development on a changing planet. *Science*, *347*(6223), 1259855. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1259855

Sterling, S. (2001). *Sustainable education: Re-visioning learning and change*. Schumacher Society/Green Books.

UNESCO. (2015). *Rethinking education: Towards a global common good?* UNESCO.

UNESCO. (2017). *Education for sustainable development goals: Learning objectives*. UNESCO.

United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development* (A/RES/70/1). United Nations. https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda

United Nations Development Programme. (2016). *Human development report 2016: Human development for everyone*. UNDP.

World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). *Our common future*. Oxford University Press.