

26-Jun-
2025

CTQ NEWSLETTER

Monthly bulletin of Ctq GmbH

Issue # 06

Julia Sack

Ctq Sustainability Challenge 2025

Ctq Sustainability Challenge 2025, be Sustainability Contributor with us

We in Ctq GmbH announced CTQ SUSTAINABILITY CHALLENGE 2025 in June and welcome all applicants to participate in Ctq Challenge:

- apply for the challenge under ctq@consultingtestingqualitaet.com

till 12-Jul-2025

- provide details and evidence of your company sustainability project this year (*service fees apply)

- receive Sustainability Award 2025

Become a Sustainability Contributor with Ctq!

Let the challenge begin. We will announce the results of CTQ Challenge in the beginning of August-25.

Ctq GmbH at Lubricant Expo exhibition

We in Ctq are pleased to announce our participation in Lubricant Expo exhibition taken place in Messe Düsseldorf Hall on September, 16-18 2025. We in Ctq GmbH are delighted to be attending this event and would love to see you there. Looking forward meeting you on Lubricant Expo in Düsseldorf in September!



Ctq GmbH attends Lubricant Expo in September 2025

EcoVadis Platinum for Ctq customer

We in Ctq Ctq GmbH are glad to announce that one of our clients has recently received Ecovadis Platinum medal in EcoVadis sustainability certification. We were pleased to support them during the work together on that and are proud on this outstanding achievement!



Congratulations to Ctq customer obtained EcoVadis Platinum Medal in May-25



Ctq Sustainability Challenge 2025

Ctq webinars for quarters 3 and 4 in 2025

Here is Ctq webinars plan for next half of 2025

We in Ctq are glad to present you our webinars session for Q3 and Q4 this year.

Please feel free to join the sessions, invitations and links are in social networks under sections Events in Ctq GmbH profile.

Date	Topic
25.07.2025	Product compliance: sync with conformity requirements
29.08.2025	Green Marketing: successful maintenance of topic Sustainability
26.09.2025	How to: how to be prepared to my next certification?
31.10.2025	How to: how to implement compliance system in organization acc. ISO 37301?
28.11.2025	Sustainability management in organization - compact and compatible
19.12.2025	GHGs today: how to's and next's

Ctq webinars in 2025

Ctq audit sessions

We continue to perform the audits in online format on regulations requirements and ISO norms. Next month, on July, 18th please contact us to pass through an remote audit for ISO 37301: 2021 Compliance Management Systems And on Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive/ CSRD audit on August, 22. Please complete prerequisites and contact us for registration on remote audit session!

Sustainability context

We in Ctq initiate this section in our newsletter titled Sustainability context.

Here we'll provide you with brief overview on publications, books and sources to sustainability and ESG topics.

Please have a seat and be our guest. Are you ready? Then let's go.

Top-5 books and publications for June:

- Circular economy, Ralf T. Kreutzer
- Change Management: managing successfully the change initiatives, Rixa Regina Kroehl
- Toolbox Objectives and Key Results: transparent and agile implementation of strategy with OKR, Daniela Kudernatsch
- Organization Consultant/ Betriebsberater journal, 23-2025
- Desinfect '2025 journal, Nr. 12-2025, Toothless data protection? What is currently ailing GDPR enforcement in Germany - by Falk Steiner

Happy and sustainable reading in June! And stay in context.

Your Ctq GmbH Team

Quote of the month:

There is no delight in owning anything unshared

Seneca

All very natural!

Interview summary with

Pr. Dr. Christian Ammer, Georg August University Göttingen,



Dr. Ole Lueg, Heinrich Heine University, Hight Court, Düsseldorf,



PD Dr. Jan Michel, Heinrich Heine University Düsseldorf,



Pr. Dr. Heiner Fangerau, Heinrich Heine University Düsseldorf



Moderator of discussion: Dr. Maria Sojka



Noted by Julia Sack

Gather round before summer vacations begin, hello and welcome to our section 'Hero of the month' where we usually meet and greet fabulous and outstanding 'heads' to ask them on important topics of environment, sustainability, governance and actuals.

Who is our Hero of the Month in June?

This month we had even five of them and a chance to know more about naturalness and definition of that during the session moderated by Dr. Maria Sojka and her guests in round table discussion format.

Dr. Sojka has a science degree in Philosophy from Ruhr University Bochum, is currently Research Associate in HHU and explained the topic: All very natural!

Whether in food production, medicine, advertising or environmental policy, the concept of naturalness is used often. What is natural about naturalness, and is unnatural really so bad?? On these and other questions it was discussed during the session.

We took the notes and provide the summary noted. What comes from this, please read here and after.

JS: Dear all, today we have this discussion within the topic All very natural! and about the mature of naturalness.

MS: Hello. I'm glad to welcome everyone here.

I was thinking about medicine earlier. We already talked about it earlier. We now understand that conventional medicine is unnatural, for example, and that there is natural healing.

Is that really conventional medicine? So, is there a conflict there, or is there a conflict there? Because there are also minor consequences for new German injuries that are inconspicuous.

CA: Nature and traditional medicine have prevailed. A key point in this question of conventional medicine and naturopathy, for example, is that medicine has a negotiating imperative, inherent in the very act of medicine, to do something that goes against what is commonly considered the natural course of events.

Unless, of course, you do nothing. This also exists in medicine; it is called aggressive waiting. But this aggressive waiting is usually something that patients do not want.

That is why they do not go to the doctor. So it is inherent in the origins of medicine that something happens that is contrary to doing nothing, to respectfully maintaining the status quo. And in this respect, I will stop now, but it is really still exciting.

In active medicine, there was the so-called sex res non naturalis, as options for medical action. In other words, actions that can be taken that are not natural. Everything that a doctor can do as an action in nature.

And what is that about? It's about waiting, sleeping, eating, drinking. In other words, things that humans can influence. And even these are things that, in other medical concepts, have already slipped from the realm of technical action into the realm of nature.



Dr. Maria Sojka moderating the discussion on topic All very natural!



Near the House of University, Düsseldorf, Germany

In short, these controversial terms have not gone very far because they simply have conceptual weaknesses. Because medicine per se must assume that it is doing something that is against nature. Even natural aptitude does that.

With urine, with water, with air, with steel. We have now moved away from the idea that all of nature is natural, which I believe is also a



All very natural!



Heinrich Heine University Düsseldorf, Germany

controversial term that we use for medical practice. Of course, when something positive happens, it is natural.

Perhaps we shouldn't do that. Is it because you introduced the Russian terms earlier? So, the first question I would have is how relevant this is to case law.

MS: At the same time, you brought up the topic of change penalties. You often talk about what a change penalty is. Has there been any response to this? I'm curious to know.

JM: Classification, public awareness and the rule of law are, of course, fascinating topics. But when we look at values, systems and jurisprudence, they are not so concrete. What is naturalness? And what kind of awareness is this? It's difficult.

We need a definition in order to find a specific course of action. There may be problems. Middle law follows up on what a natural concept is.

We can, of course, look at it in that sense. But that is not the understanding of naturalness. We can view naturalness as something opposed to unnaturalness.

That sounds trivial. I took a look at it and defined it. Naturalness is a matter of course, something determined by nature, something given by nature.

That is very relevant. Naturalness can be viewed from two perspectives in a legal context. First, something that exists independently of humans.

Something that cannot be influenced, such as especially true of the sciences that have already been mentioned, contributing to the dynamic

when I let something go in my ego, that is a law of nature. We can also view naturalness from the perspective that we as a society allow ourselves certain conventions. What is customary? What is natural? The particularly relevant legal approach to naturalness is the collective, social awareness of what should be or is natural, which is also incorporated into legislation.

We elect certain parties, and they enter the Bundestag and make laws. We can have a conservative understanding of naturalness, or a more liberal understanding. And very importantly, our collective understanding of naturalness also includes incredibly important constitutional interpretations.

OL: That is actually the main point of legal expert opinion. Fundamental rights, basic laws and needs are now at a point that is very far removed from the idea of our basic laws and fundamental laws. This means that we now have a collective understanding of family. That is very exciting. If we look at the situation at that time, our Basic Law no longer meets the current challenges of our time. That is why the Federal Constitutional Court says that we need a change in our understanding of the constitution. It is a constitution that is changing with the times.

CA: And that social naturalness doesn't come into it. Could you quote that again in white form in the community? It's particularly good in this area of nature conservation. Yes, that would bring me straight back to the medical point.

Excuse me. A bit of sheep philosophy in both groups. But we're doing well because we've been quite diverse in medicine so far, in that we have the freedom to choose what is natural and what is unnatural. And whether we should tackle anything at all as a government. In the sense of what we do ethically and what we will do in the future. This plays a major role in obstetrics.

Now I am referring to a discussion of natural birth or non-natural birth. That is the caesarean section. What is very interesting here is that natural birth is always viewed very positively.

And many reasons are given as to why it is good for mother and child. But when you pull back the curtain and take a closer look, gynaecologists say – although no one says it outright, it is articulated – that caesarean sections cause far fewer birth complications. And that is also exciting; the measurement scale is what is interesting.

And there is this great theory that a certain score, called the Apgar score, was developed by a midwife, Virginia Apgar, and this score is given to the child when it is born, depending on how healthy it is, based on criteria such as skin colour, for example. Children who are born naturally are bluer, which is not as good as children who are born by caesarean section. And children born by caesarean section have a higher score. So if you are a gynecologist and want a good Apgar score, then a caesarean section is better.

If you consider other consequences for the mother, then natural birth is better. So, there is this discussion. In reproductive medicine as a whole, the concept of naturalness has actually I would add that legal policy in society, and we are already at this point, even if it is the type of

armament, the reasons of naturalness, there is lost its appeal.

Reproductive autonomy has come to the fore. Natural birth is a source of excitement for so-called deaf babies, etc. But this also seems to be almost a normal recession in the paradigm in which current medicine operates.

It is a science-oriented medicine that assumes that the entire human nature can be explained by means of physics and chemistry, but also treated by means of physics and chemistry. So that I can dissolve naturalness precisely in this understanding of nature. This means that this separation does not exist in this science-oriented complex.

It is introduced here by complementary medicine, which deliberately constructs itself as the antithesis of natural naturalness. And also everything that has to do with the natural object throughout the year. Okay, then one more word.

Even what is considered naturopathy today is not the image of old naturopathy. Naturopathy in the narrow sense is only light, air and water. And there is the point that it is no problem at all to supply light, air and water artificially.

In other words, with lamps and blowers. This means that genuine naturopathy itself has already blurred the boundary between too much nature and technology, which we have resolved much better in the opposite concept than culture. Well, then I'll go even further.

What can reality imitate? The contrast between nature, technology, nature, culture. And the question I have to ask myself again, even though I come from scientific theory, is that there is no real answer, but what we heard in the discussion is that in various scientific fields, it was somewhat reserved how reality was to be applied in that context. Is that something that is also produced from the outside? Somehow, science also needs this discussion in context, or has science itself produced something? That's a good question.

I think we need the result. That's a good question. In what direction has science been approached? If I refer to what has already been said, there is something called reparative natural law in jurisprudence.

It's the same in the natural sciences. We need the narrative. It is always based on the scientific knowledge of the time.

The natural sciences, as they are called in Germany, is a term that also exists in Germany, as does the concept of nature. It depends on how far you go. Some people would include medicine as scientific, some as scientifically sound.

It is similar in science. Also in geology, how far you take it, where this concept of nature comes from. I believe that science is also always in dialogue with how the matter can be implemented with a broader society today.

To pick up on that, not only, as in the natural sciences, is it a destructive concept to describe nature as it is, but also a normative component. Certain things are considered good in a situation, others are considered not so good. It's hard to say.

I don't think there is a good answer I can give as to whether the concept of nature comes from

that was just mentioned. If you look at the medieval understanding of nature, for example, and today's understanding of nature, we know much more today, we have much more to discover, the sciences have made their way, and I find that exciting.

MS: How can we gain a better understanding of nature?

JM: Yes, that's a question I found very important, namely this question, because that's where normative thinking comes into play. So we attach great importance to leaving out, for example, contemporary decisions that have to be made when describing what we see in our perception. We can describe quite well how forests are changing, but it's a bit difficult because you can also see that the concept of naturalness is changing, undergoing an evolution, so to speak, from basic physics, but we don't have to go into that.

So there is an evolution there, but nevertheless I think it is important to say when we need to use the natural sciences to describe things quantitatively, in numbers, and when we need to start saying how we actually evaluate this and what follows from it. And I find that important, especially as a scientist, because I don't want to be the one who decides on social norms in advance, but rather that the matter must be negotiated in a democracy. For example, the question of whether we manage forests or not, and to what extent, and what expectations we actually have of forests.

Depending on the answer, different paths are taken, but I don't think it can be science that says it has to be a sense of concern, or it has to be organ donation, it has to be a parliament, we don't want that. These are all things that science can say, if it goes down that path, then it's likely, if it goes down that path, then it's likely, but in my understanding, that should somehow be normative. Then we quickly come to the school of thought, and then there are various things that are right and various things that are wrong, and that can't be good. I would fundamentally agree that we live in times when we see climate change and other things, so we are facing the Grand Challenges, as they are sometimes called, the SDGs, the Sustainable Development Goals, the UN's sense of sustainability, we have certain goals, that is normatively built in, and we as scientists are instructed to work in this direction.

That makes you classic for natural scientists, for ideology and so on. How do you respond to that? We also have newer, let's say, natural science research campaigns, environmental scientists for example, who still work together with sociologists, scientists and others. How would you assess that? Well, I would say that they are of course also called upon, but they should be practical. What do you mean, if we go down this path, then let this and that speak for this path, let this and that speak for that path? We can certainly express an opinion about what we think is better, but there are many decisions to be made.

OL: I think it must be held accountable in a democracy, in society, in the city council, in parliament, in the state parliament, in the Bundestag. Because I believe that if scientists get involved, they are the ones who exist. In case of doubt, it may even be true that they have a good solution, but then we quickly end up on a path where many people, including myself and others, are involved.

definitely a right that precedes the definition of the legal politician. Especially in parenthood, because we have a pre-racist legal naturalisation policy, the care and upbringing of the child is the natural right of the parents. This advice seems quite clear, but with full doubt and the politics of the day.

We are parents in Germany. That is a natural right. I believe that self-determination is also enshrined in the Basic Law, especially when it comes to same-sex recognition.

This is a topic that has been on the agenda repeatedly in recent times. There were concrete proposals on how to strengthen legal policy itself. Unfortunately, it must be said that we have not established a tradition of German children's rights.

And above all, because legal policy is fundamentally masculine. I believe we still understood the oath as a theological concept of naturalness. This is always the different-sex union of man and woman.

We had this explicitly anchored in legal policy. This was taken up again in 2013. This also included an application to same-sex personalities from events.

In 2024, the Federal Constitutional Court opened up even further. At least to theological parents. Another, far-reaching scope for definition is the Legislative Act.

The fact that we have to take this turn towards society is guaranteed by society. At the Constitutional Court, we have a relatively large number of options for action, which also need to be redefined by the economy. But if the relevant political decision-makers in society and the world have a certain understanding of naturalness, this will not be possible to implement.

We are from a military hospital run by the Greens. We need political consultations and shit to be implemented. I don't know if I would go along with you, but that would be a different debate, that we hand all this over to society, because I believe you need the expertise and studies to assess it.

CA: The question that came up in all the exemptions is, do we even want this? Is what we want even natural? For example, I have to make sure that people roll over in the grass. Should we do that or not? Earlier, we had the question that, as humans, we haven't done anything for the 21st century.

Isn't that a difficult concept? I completely agree with you that we first need to define what that actually is. Otherwise, everyone has a different understanding of whether we want to go back there or not. I believe that many people are a little afraid of the increasingly strong characterisation and the attitude of sticking to what you have, that you only move further away, rather than the basic fear that was already there, but I have my doubts as to whether everyone would be willing to give up various things in order to get closer to it again.

HF: The question that came up in all the exemptions is, do we even want this? Is what we want even natural? For example, I have to make sure that people roll over in the grass. Should we do that or not? Earlier, we had the question concerned, apart from what the legislator does. For example, in the treatment of the common cold broad-spectrum antibiotics, so that their

cold disappears really quickly, it is usually the sciences themselves. But I do believe that they contribute a great deal to it, and that is

that, as humans, we haven't done anything for the 21st century.

MS: Isn't that a difficult concept? I completely agree with you that we first need to define what that actually is. Otherwise, everyone has a different understanding of whether we want to go back there or not.

CA: I believe that many people are a little afraid of the increasingly strong characterisation and the attitude of sticking to what you have, that you only move further away, rather than the basic fear that was already there, but I have my doubts as to whether everyone would be willing to give up various things in order to get closer to it again.

When things get serious, when people have to make sacrifices, then their willingness quickly disappears. Flying somewhere – I read that after Corona, Christmas flights to Christmas parties exploded – as an ecologist, I ask myself, are we all still sane? So, anyone who hasn't understood that their own contribution is important may not have understood what it's all about. What I mean is, there may be a desire for naturalness, but I think that when things get serious, a lot of people are quite happy when things aren't so natural.

And your experience is also based on a certain point in time; we simply don't know what will be natural in the future. And what we do know is that the forests that would naturally be here, especially the Paupe, which we are nominating, will be severely affected by climate change. This means that we will find our ancestral land to be something other than natural, something alternative to what we use as natural today.

And how you will feel about it when you don't know the whole story will be exciting. You sometimes see in advertising that if you buy the products, a tree will be planted. Is that true? A tree is actually planted because we can find carbon.

But in that respect, we don't all know that this is the problem. Our forests provide about 10-15% of CO₂. That means we would need seven times as much forest as we have to provide what we can offer in the air gases.

And we would need two and a half times the entire area of Germany. Then everyone would be living unnecessarily, we would be feeding on air and light, and we would need two and a half times as much land as we have to compensate for what we need. That means a few trees here and there are all well and good, but they won't save us.

We have to reduce emissions and then we will clean up the forests. That applies to forests. In the scenario where you would go east, it's true, then you would bind what is now additional in the air, and we could do that again here.

And you would also have to clear areas where people live who make their living from agriculture. That is also one of the serious options. That's why it's often a bit of a double-edged sword.

There is actually a certain amount of excitement about it, but unfortunately there isn't any. Um, we were just working on it a bit. Exactly, on

whether we really want to go back to the countryside. For the times we have today and just let it go as a discrepancy in the debate between what we want, i.e. which direction do we want to go in here? And we're looking to see if we can understand naturalness a little better.

We are currently considering the question of where the purchasing factor comes into play in public elections, once again in a financial context. Is there a push to move away from this, or do we need to revisit it? There is a similar development in medicine as there is in law; the medicine we practise is very, very young in terms of its history. So, since the middle of the 19th century, we have been doing what we call science-based medicine. In other words, medicine that attempts to form an understanding based on physics and chemistry in the 19th and 20th centuries. It took some time for medicine to catch up with something like Heisenberg's work. It is still relatively new.

Before this type of medicine became established, what does established mean, medicine was a marketplace business. It's like when you're sick, the first thing you do is not go to the doctor. First you treat yourself, then you ask mum or dad, then you ask your girlfriend, then your neighbour, and then at some point you go to a doctor.

The famous society I mentioned earlier in Germany then decided at some point, sometime in the 1880s, to create a legal framework, the Care Act was passed, the Continuity Ordinance, etc. A certain form of medicine, namely science-based medicine, was given priority. This also includes the famous

This makes it unnecessary to deal with nature or the competitive needs of natural science, because they believe in the power of natural science. Nevertheless, in real practice, where patients come, the wishes and needs of patients must be taken seriously. I think all of us have heard or said the phrase, 'I don't think much of medication'.

Why do people say that? They say it because they think it is simply much more natural and natural in the sense of light to supply the body with something from outside, which in this case is a medicine from nature. Once the headache is there, you might make the first exception because the product is so old that it is almost natural. I want to ask something ironic.

What I mean is that every doctor deals with naturalness and nature on a daily basis in their practice, and sometimes it takes on an important scientific and medical component, for example in the treatment of a cold. When patients want antibiotics, preferably broad-spectrum antibiotics, so that their cold disappears really quickly and doesn't get worse, it's usually the doctor who says, let's not do that, it might be a virus, let's try fever-reducing medication first.

And sometimes it takes on an important scientific and medical component again. For such a criminalization that is not screaming missed. There would no longer be such a return to the supposed naturalness.

Whereby this is actually a self-commitment in naturalness, whereas we actually have to carry out the obstruction. I actually find it quite difficult when the Federal Constitutional Court backs down and suddenly makes a lettuce offer to the border again, as the undercutting is

doctor who says, let's try fever-reducing medication first, which works well, because, and here we are back to forestry again, the problem has arisen that the diversity of antibiotics in the tiny game with the natural development of bacterial resistance has created a completely new man-made bacterial world, and in order to regain it, you don't have to use all the means at your disposal right away.

And this concept of nature is omnipresent, but there is no need to debate it at the moment because, at the moment, this medicine is still the one that has established itself on the market. If, at some point, society says, we are going to create a system of coexistence, we are going to abolish health insurance or open it up to all other healers, then this debate will have to start again. That could be the case if medicine as a group bites back.

And sometimes it takes on another important scientific and medical component. For example, in the treatment of the common cold. If patients want antibiotics, preferably broad-spectrum antibiotics, so that this cold really disappears quickly, then it is more likely to be the doctor who says, let's try antipyretics first, where it goes away well, because that brings us right back to forestry, the problem has arisen that the multiplicity of antibiotics in the interplay with the natural development of bacterial resistance has created a completely new man-made bacterial world, and in order to be able to acquire it again, you don't have to use all the remedies you have right away.

And this concept of nature is omnipresent, but there is no need for a debate at the moment, because at the moment this medicine is still the one that has prevailed on the market. If at some point society says we're going to abolish the stock system, abolish health insurance or open it up to all other healers, then this debate will have to start again. That could be the case if medicine as a group bites back.

And it's totally positivist of me to say this, but this medicine wasn't a conspiracy, it was simply from the patients' point of view that their pain and their treatments were relatively successful. We can see now, I've just seen this in one of them, because today or tomorrow I read the news that the vaccination commission in the USA has been abolished by Health Minister. That's why I say that these were social decisions, that medicine is set up the way it is, and that can also be taken away again.

And in the sense of an understanding of nature that relies on people having to deal with their environment without the support of technical, chemical aids, this certainly leads to a path to naturalness according to the state of scientific research today, it will not lead to more health in the sense of less pain and less illness. But it is a social decision, of course. And that's why you always have to deal with it.

And vaccination, I'm glad I said that, is of course precisely this loop in which the concept of nature is constantly brought up, which I didn't mention. And in the debate about vaccination, there are also ongoing discussions,

They didn't come up with a fancy name, but said quite clearly that coronavirus is like the disease from 2019. And that's how Covid came about. And then people started posting in the once have an example of. You know, you're US Health Minister, you're Kubertin, where you're now banning this and that, which is the

equivalent of censorship, are foresters who are. I think it's kind of clear in the team area that, in the end, we all want to do without it somehow not about nature, but about the different risk perceptions of illness and vaccination and the possible consequences of non-vaccination and vaccination. And the concept of nature plays a very important role here, I think that's right.

I just wanted to add that, funnily enough, there are many parallels, even in the middle of the 19th century, actually only in the natural sciences, which are developing the discipline today. And we have exactly the same development in that many of these laws are also being called into question. So, we all love them now and natural science says, well, maybe there are also comments on this, the consequence of which is to leave everything alone and do nothing. Nature does everything itself quite well. I'd like to talk about experiments in a different way. There were no similar discussions 20 or 30 years ago. Because we were much more likely to accept this way of looking at forests or people or medicine. And now this has obviously started to happen.

And then facts that are not facts are being accepted and opinions have been given a different weight than 20 or 30 years ago. And that actually seems to me to be a phenomenon that transcends disciplines, a zeitgeist that, to be honest, worries me a little. Because if it's enough to say, well, I say something, and it meets with such a positive response, because I tend not to question whether it's really true, even if there's no one left to question it. Then the past situations happen, what happens there and what happens here. So, I believe that we are actually living in a time where this question of what the change in naturalness actually means and what the implications are is actually quite exciting, but also a bit dangerous.

OL: I think it's very interesting that you're taking up the issue of naturalness, perhaps only briefly, can we even go back to something that we guess a lot naturally, because you want to miss it by saving and guessing. That's why we can get closer, because it may not have seemed so natural at the time, but of course this desire, it's not easy in such states, and that's why you're a criminal lawyer here in the abridgement of homosexuality. This was hardly done, and was implemented in a very natural way, as it created a criminal society between men who were in a position of contempt. In 1994, which is not so long ago if you think about it, and indeed frightening, this paragraph comes from the Ceasar Right, and it was kept after a discussion of homosexuality between men over the age of 21, which created a certain criminal society.

This paragraph existed in 1994, and this is well done, at least in the Constitutional Court, and in the Constitution, which we still solve today, that this criminal liability is indeed a certain criminal society. But there was only one, as the natural term, which is legal, the need for men, but not for women. This is under the principle of one-time equal rights, which has the Constitutional Court, but that was none, this is not a problem, because homosexuality is really an anxiety that urges public, and therefore we adopt a clear state regulatory law.

Also, our own personal rights context is sexualized, that was the Federal Constitutional Court, not all influenced, but our own legal experts say that the keyed reform bill for the oriented and content-oriented. That's too simple and too clear. We have to eliminate the

My addition to the information from the international classification of diseases, processes we have there ourselves. whole is a slip of paper. And we are trying to introduce homosexuality was discussed in 1998. Since then it is no longer a disease. First it was a criminal offense, then it was a disease and then it was classified. It's such an exciting discussion in terms of the groups I could invite. Maybe one point that strikes me so much. It's always about the image of the natural sciences, the concept, the image of the natural sciences. This is a static image that has been around since the 19th century or so.

On the other hand, it is quite clear to us that we are making progress in these areas and I fully share your view that we do not want to have the conditions that we already have in the world. However, in the development with the piece of paper, we can perhaps develop the idea that we can't just talk about the image and this abstract concept of nature with reference to scientific work and then perhaps contrast it with wishful thinking. Then it's a matter of warning. Instead, we should take a close look at what scientists do, how we arrive at such a concept. For example, in the 2003 courts, the judgment was based on biology.

CA: We have an image of biology that has changed a lot. It played a major role in the 19th century. We see many things differently and more clearly today than we did back then, but we don't really know what biologists actually do. Biologists don't just look at nature, they have to be very inventive, they have to know taxonomies, they have to invent names according to very specific rules that are imposed. This in turn has to be accepted in publication processes and must then be reflected in certain databases, in other knowledge rights editors, which in turn have to be accessible, even if internships or studies have been conducted.

It's actually so trivial how this actually works that I think it could help if we could perhaps clarify things a little bit, like today. It's not such a simple contrast that it's a scientific world. But I should have learned that you have to understand how scientific work works.

Very briefly, I would like to talk about the other figure. Very briefly, because that's what's so exciting about diseases. Most people assume that diseases are static entities, like little animals, like the animals in the zoo, like the tomato, like the other alligator. This is also the case with humans: they change with evolution, with irony, with changes in the forests, with changes in the climate, new diseases emerge and they first have to be given a name, they have to become a need. Think of the last pandemic, the coronavirus, which needed names for debts. And then the disease also needed a name. Covid world, what actually happens to people? Then there are always contested diseases. People argue about whether it's really a disease or not. And then this idea of a unique design of curious beings and created nature becomes unchangeable. Because it's just like in forestry.

MS: I wanted to illustrate and enumerate this. Okay. Didn't you already see that we were up before the whole plenary session from in between? Then let's start with you.

CA: I always have the first word. Yes, if society is not to decide what is or is not permitted as research, they must first achieve a planning approach.

And with those, that I unharvested. A question now would sometimes be to the vast plants.

Because you realize, could you with the AI, when all the garden are evaluated, plants, so resisting the environment and CO2 pollution and all these trolls, the German ballot may not become suitable at all to just try out the new climate action. So, I don't have a word for you. So, a few more things other than that, we can go for at least twelve years and, uh, until next year, right with the tragedy of the antipathy, where of course we get an offspring, uh, the troll offspring, like we want to do. So, to the first point, let's decide how I greet the mind. It would also be misunderstood if I were to say that science should decide what it should imagine.

But the question here is first of all where we make it more transparent what we imagine, why we do it, what we do why, how we do it. So, in reality, there has been a knowledge museum for a few years now that is dedicated to the idea of saying how science works. So, go ahead, what are your methods, what does your science do? Genetically modified tree chains, the fruits and seeds last 20-30 years.

You have a very long time in agriculture and see what happens. It is certainly one approach, although there is also the idea that there are tree species that are not protected. In Europe, for example, in a region that already has the climate, which we expect to be over 70 some.

And after that, the approach that needs to be realized is to let up for a short time. But it is indeed the case that we want to have very explicit research programs that already address many topics and changes, and then follow them in the development process. But of course, there are also moral, philosophical and legal issues. For us it's relative, but not in the world.

MS: Thank you very much.

HF: I think, we have the program. We now have it in the reenactment. I'm pleased, above all, that it was fun. Just the fact that it was fun to see how it all worked. We also thought about the fact that we don't have to be interactive, we have to be science-technology, technical and cultural things. The permissions that can be used, that have been used, have really used nature, made it healthy. Science has to take care of itself. That's not so easy. Thank you!

JS: Many thanks for the interesting session and great discussion on the topic.

Ladies and gentlemen, that was Dr. Sojka with invited for discussion guests.