

THE PLACE OF PEACE EDUCATION AS A PANACEA FOR GLOBAL SECURITY

Dr Akano, Benedict Ubawuiké

Department of Physics, F.C.E. KONTAGORA

ABSTRACT: *This paper explains the meaning of the following concepts: Peace, Violence and War, Global Security and Peace Education. It states that education despite being an instrument per excellence for achieving positive national and global goals, have been used by some nations to perpetuate hate instead of using it to instil a culture of peace. Peace education is therefore the only type of education required in creating a culture of peace in the minds of youths and as such should be used to achieve global security. The paper also suggested five ways global security could be achieved through peace education which are; raising global citizens, building a culture of peace, creating economic development and eradicating poverty, acquiring conflict resolution skills, and raising friends of the earth and environmental peace builders. The paper concludes by with some implications of the understanding of peace, violence and war, which include the need to ensure justice, welfare and access to education for all as necessary actions to ensure peace and global security.*

KEYWORDS; Peace, Violence, Global Security, Peace Education

INTRODUCTION

The search for world peace remains a major concern for all and sundry as the threats to global peace and security, such as wars, ethnic and religious conflicts, food shortage, epidemics and terrorism have continued to occupy the top place in the headlines of the national and international dailies. Although there may be a unified voice calling for peace, it is however very clear that the general populace do not possess a commonality of understanding of what global peace and security is and how it can be realised. Any meaningful effort to pursue peace and global security according to Kester(2008), should stem from an education that builds in people the universal values and behaviours on which a culture of peace is established, including the development of non-violent conflict resolution skills and a commitment to galvanize efforts towards securing world peace. With regards to the above , the paper explains these key concepts whose understanding are germane to the theme of this paper. These concepts are as follows:

- (i) Peace,
- (ii) Peace and Violence,
- (iii) Global Security and,
- (iv) Peace Education.

I. PEACE

The Merriam-Webster online dictionary and a number of other dictionaries have defined peace as the absence of war or conflicts. The take away from this, could suggest that peace is the

direct opposite of war and by extension, that war is the absence of peace, and hence, conjures the idea that both are the two sides of the same coin. However, given this definition, one could further ask the question, what is war? For the sake of this logical rigmarole, many criticise this definition as being inadequate for the understanding of the nature of peace, since one would have to define war in order to understand what peace is. Peace in religious traditions as noted by Macquarrie (1973) is conceived affirmatively as a state of wholeness, perfection and harmony, rather than negatively as the absence of war. To this school of thought, threat to peace does not just come from those who stir up conflict but from those who acquiesce in the existing status quo.

Also, Ibeanu (2012) notes that peace is sociological seen as a state of social harmony in which there is no social conflicts and people are able to meet their needs and expectations, and politically, as a state of orderliness that is achieved through the organ of state, such as the army or the police. There are varying definitions of peace one is bound to find in a cursory literature search on the topic and this is so because the contributors present definitions from their own perspectives of the concept. It is in view of this that Galtung (2003) notes that the word peace is illusive and lacks an agreeable definition. According to him, it is utopian and unreal, and conjures to us images of harmony and bliss, which is in conflict with the chaotic and non-harmonious existence humans experience in real life.

Peace concept clarification however, received a boost when the Norwegian peace researcher, Johan Galtung introduced two dimensions of peace; Positive and Negative peace into the peace research literature. According to Galtung (1964) Positive peace is defined as the integration of human society, and later as the absence of structural violence. Structural violence is defined to include those social conditions, policies and structures, which directly or indirectly cause human suffering, harm or even death. These includes; extreme poverty, starvation, avoidable diseases, injustice, oppression, and discrimination, etc, and all of which serve as social road blocks to the supply of basic needs of people in a society (Hicks, 1987). Negative peace, on the other hand is defined as the absence of direct or open violence, such as war, terrorism and conflict. Galtung (1985) explained the two dimensions by considering an analogy from the health sciences, where a healthy body can negatively be described as the absence of disease or positively as a body that is able to resist sickness. So while one is curative, the other is preventive. Negative peace is therefore said to be curative, while positive peace is preventive, and it is a significant truism that prevention is better than cure.

Galtung (1964) positive–negative peace theory expands the conception of peace beyond the narrow definition of peace as the absence of war and conflicts, to include those coercive structures which ensure integration in a society. Hence, to move a nation towards the path of peace, one must ensure the absence of not only direct and open violence, such as war and terrorism, but all forms of social structures, which inflict psychological torture on people. Grewal (2003) further explains that the two types of peace are to be seen as two separate dimensions, where one is possible without the other. Hence, peace can exist independent of war as Ibeanu (2012) cites the case of Israel and Palestine establishing peaceful use of water resources while war raged between the two countries. On the other hand, a family, community, an institution or a nation may be far from being peaceful, even when it is not experiencing any war at all. This paper therefore argues that our society cannot be said to be peaceful when poverty, intimidation, injustice, inequality of opportunity and fear are the order of the day as it is currently being experienced in many countries today, especially in the third world countries.

II. PEACE AND VIOLENCE

The broad changes in the theory of peace and violence in the recent past do among other things show the nexus between the two concepts and that adequate understanding of violence is required in order to clarify and understand peace. Violence is defined by the free online dictionary as any behaviour in which physical force is exerted for the purpose of causing damage or injury. However, we know that violence is not only limited to violent events carried out by actors, but extends to millions all over the world who are harmed and killed because of the deprivation of basic needs due to the harsh economic, cultural, religious and political structures in their various countries. It is in this line that Galtung (1990) provides a broader definition of violence when he described three types of violence: **Direct violence**, involving the use of physical force for intentional cause of harm on self, others or a group, **Structural violence**, which is seen as social conditions and policies that cause suffering, harm or death, and **Cultural violence**, such as cultural practices that justify stigmatization, humiliation and injustice.

Direct violence expresses the intentional use of force to cause harm and the violent perpetrators or actors are accountable for their actions but the notion of structural violence does not require us to see the harm in operation, or the actors behind it. For instance, the gun man in Louisiana, America, who sprayed bullets on school children, received a worldwide condemnation, while the children who suffer malnutrition or malaria in Sub Saharan Africa and die needlessly are often glossed over as one of those things. Scheper-Hughes (2004) captures this scenario when she remarked that: “Structural violence erases the history and consciousness of the social origins of poverty, sickness, hunger, premature death, so that they are simply taken for granted and naturalized so that no one is held accountable except, perhaps the poor themselves”p14

This notion of Structural violence is however useful in throwing light on the social determinants of violence in the society as Galtung (1969) notes that violence is “present when human beings are influenced so that their actual somatic and mental realizations are below their potential realization”. The above roots violence to the structure of society and in finding causes of violence and conditions for peace, we must be willing to look at the bigger picture revealed by structure of the society.

III. GLOBAL SECURITY

The word security has become a household word due to the increasing security threats and challenges which now characterize the world at large. There is hardly a day that passes in which issues that border on security is not in the headline of either the newspaper or the cable global news. In the language of today’s social media, security can therefore be said to be both trending and controversial. Trending, for notoriety and controversial in the sense that it cannot be pinned down to a universally agreed definition, due to the fact that contributors present its meaning based on their varying ideological leanings.

To the ordinary man, security can be viewed as the state in which life and property are safe and protected from harm. Traditionally, it is the duty of the state to protect the life and property of citizens who voluntarily pledge their loyalty to it. This traditional view of security as the organ of the state has given rise to a security concept known as **national security**. Kennam (1948) defines national security as continued ability of the country to pursue the development of its internal life without serious interference from foreign powers. For the state to carry out this role it relies on the security agents such as the armed forces and the police. However, in recent

times this conception of security is now considered an obsolete idea, in view of the globalisation that has made arbitrary borders meaningless (Intriligator, 2011). Events culminating from the end of the World War II and the Cold War also contributed in bringing a shift in the view of security from its traditional state/ military centred conception to a much broader view that now place premium on individuals rather the state in explaining security.

This shift from the state to the individuals and military to non-military has given rise to another security concept called **human security**. Human security now comprises “elements of national security, food security, human rights and national development as the barometer in explaining security. The United Nations Development Programme’s 1994 Human development Report used this as an alternative concept to the traditional concept of national security. Its choice over national security is predicated on the belief that the best way to tackle security at all levels is to ensure the freedom of people from pervasive threats to their human rights and safety, and this include safety from violent threats, such like organised conflicts, terrorism and violent crimes, and non-violent threats like natural disaster, environmental degradation and infectious diseases etc (Nwanegbo & Odigbo, 2013).

On the account of globalization, the concept of security has further changed to include yet another term, known as **global security**. The emergence of threats and global problems which are mainly cross border, such as organised crime, terrorism, refugee flow, immigration, climatic change, pandemics etc has given rise to the feeling that the nations in isolation cannot face these challenges alone and that collective efforts are needed to provide security on the international level. Most of these threats have anthropogenic, natural and technological origins. The Wikipedia (2015) therefore defines global security as the coordinated measures taken by nations and international organizations, especially, the United Nations and affiliated NGOs to ensure mutual survival and safety.

IV. PEACE EDUCATION

Education stands out as one of the rational activities of man that greatly distinguishes him from other animals. It has also been diversely defined by different educators, but I will limit myself to a few. For example, Nduka (1982) defines education as the process of cultural transmission and renewal, while, Farrant (1980) sees it as the total process of human learning through which knowledge is imparted, faculties are trained and skills are developed. Similarly, Okafor (1984) defines it as a process of acculturation through which the individual is helped to attain the development of his potentialities and their maximum activation when necessary, according to right reason and to achieve thereby his perfect self-fulfilment. These definitions of education do agree that it is not accidental or casual event, but presupposes conscious, deliberate and well planned action that is methodological applied to the individual, so as to develop his total being, which includes the head, the heart and the hand. It also highlights the role of the society (the family and the state) in this process, which is implied since the learner is helped to acquire education. Education therefore, can be either formal or informal. Lastly, education is expected to achieve a purpose and not be an absolute end on itself. Okafor (1984) remarks, that education must serve as a means to other ends. Particularly, it must be a means to live and to function in a society. Hence, education is required to have a functional value, much larger than earning a living but achieving self-fulfilment.

Self-fulfilment cannot on its own be attained if man is left as an island to himself; Each human person therefore needs other human beings for his self-fulfilment, and peace is fostered when

we acquire deep understanding about the value and worth of the human life. It is with regard to this understanding that the United Nations was established in 1945 after World War II in order to save up coming generations from the scourge of nuclear war, reaffirm faith in the dignity and worth of the human person and in gender equality, and to promote social progress and better standards of living.

Peace education was directed to the pursuit of the above goals of the United Nations. For instance, the article 26 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights stipulates that peace education is to be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedom; to promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations; racial or religious groups and to also further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace. (United Nation General Assembly, 1948). Similarly, the 1990 Jomtein declaration on the right of the child to education states that basic learning needs not only comprise of literacy and numeracy but also the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values needed to live and work in dignity and to participate in development. Peace education is therefore seen as the vision of education of the United Nations and her other agencies such as the UNICEF and the UNESCO. No wonder, the United Nations General Secretary, Banki, Moon dedicated the international day of Peace, 2013 to peace education. This must have been done in order to show the importance of peace education in ensuring peace all over the world.

The teaching method advocated for the teaching of peace education is the andragogy style. The traditional teaching method which is teacher centred has been found to be both un-democratic and pedagogically skewed. (Olaoye, 2001) and hence, do not match the production of intended social outcomes of instruction. Peace education being rooted on democratic principles is learner centred and favours the use instruction strategies such as cooperation, team work, and respect for diversity, dialogue and active participation. Stan (1997) & Olaoye (2001) advocate that education for democracy should be based on the instructional style of andragogy, rather than pedagogy. This is because pedagogical instructional procedure among other things assumes the child learner to know little or nothing about the subject matter or in the words of John lock, Tabula Rasa, and the teacher is seen as the seat of wisdom, whose work it is to download pieces of information into passive learners. This method of teaching has been labelled as “fill them up method” by Akano (1997).

The Andragogy teaching style is linked to Malcolm Shepherd Knowles (1913-1997) and is explained to mean a learner centred way of teaching adults. According to Kearsley (2010) andragogy involves four basic principles which are applied to adult learning. These are:

1. Adults are to be involved in the planning and evaluation of lessons,
2. Experience provides a bases for learning of activities and so should be encouraged,
3. Adults are more interested in learning subjects that have immediate relevance and impact personal to their life and Learning is problem centred rather than content centred.

The application of andragogy in the teaching of peace education is however based on the views of Stan (1997) and Borden Powel (1920) that children are able to bring about much better understanding about their propensities into the classroom and that they too have the capability for critical thinking, just like the adults.

2. PEACE EDUCATION AS A CATALYST FOR GLOBAL SECURITY

Global insecurity now threatens the peace and security of all and there is a general outcry for the eradication of wars, hostilities and violence in all the troubled places on the earth. In the past, the use of force through oppressive military action has been seen as the only way to control turbulent conditions of insecurity in many nations. However, in recent times, this idea is being done away with, on the account of the understanding that military control only postpones the evil day. And the corked up aggression and suppression will one day find a vent in the future. Peace education is now being recognized as a preventive alternative that can promote tolerance and a culture of peace. It is for this understanding that the former President Obasanjo in the 18th July edition of This day Newspaper cancelled President Buhari to tackle Boko Haram terrorism with education and also to know that even if the military power is to win the war against terror, the gains of the victory will be sustained only by education.

It is however been argued in this section that, despite the fact that security, stability and development are dependent on education, it is a transformative and functional education that is efficacious in eradicating violence and creating a culture of peace. Just like the wrong type of education has been used to fuel conflicts in many parts of the world. For instance, education was used to foster hatred and fuel violence in Rwanda, Sudan and Sri Lanka, etc. (Bokova, 2011). In the same way, educating for peace could also help people become agents of peace by imbibing a culture of tolerance and peace, as Nurvarro-castro and Nario- Galace (2008) opines that “peace does not come with our DNA, but must have to be taught and learned”.

Peace education as we have seen has four major change agents, which are knowledge, values, attitudes and skills and they are used as vehicles for transforming mind-sets and behaviour of people either going into or out of a conflict, by building knowledge and awareness of the ramifications and root causes of conflicts, and presenting possible alternatives for resolving them. To achieve global security, peace education could contribute in five key areas in ensuring world peace and a sustainable use of earth’s resources. These areas include;

I. Raising Global citizens.

Security challenges of today are global in nature and their solution requires global action in the ways people think and act to care for the earth and their neighbours who share it with them. To meet the challenges of today will not just take the education that equips us with numeracy and literacy, but the type that cultivates in us those humane qualities that make us respect human rights and, appreciate diversity and gender equality. Peace education through its transformative education is able to produce individuals who become peace activists and see their identity as transcending beyond their national territorial boundaries to that of the emerging global community.

Global citizen is defined by the Wikipedia (2015) as one who places his identity with the emerging global community. Through peace education, individuals achieve vision for a better world that is free of poverty, disease, injustice and discrimination and work consciously to bring about necessary changes in the global community. The hope of global security can be realised through the solidarity of individual global citizens as they speak up and act in a way to bring a healing balm to the wounds of the world. And so, confirming the words of Nelson Mandela, that “safety and security don’t just happen; they are collective consensus and public investment” (WHO, 2002).

II. Raising a culture of peace

Peace education could be used to achieve global security because it seeks to instil a peace culture in all adherents. The Seville statement on violence remarks that; War is not a fatality determined by the genes, violent brains, human nature or instincts, but is rather a social invention. Therefore, the same species that invented war is capable of inventing peace. (UNESCO, 2002)

Violence and war is therefore the product of man's culture. It is then possible to create a culture of peace by modifying our cultural beliefs and indeed our mind-sets to imbibe tolerance, justice and fair play needed for global peace. Peace education by encouraging peace in the minds of men and women thereby raises peace makers who build peace based on the universal respect for human rights, justice, tolerance and gender equality.

III. Creating economic development and poverty eradication

There exist some clear linkages between education, poverty and violence. Extreme poverty has been found to be at the root of terrorism, violence and wars, but education has always been a way to boost economic growth. A purposeful and transformative education has the capability to change people's life by equipping them with skills and a mind-set to lift their lives from poverty. When people are given opportunity to have proper education, then they have good chances to an improved standard of living. This does not only influence them personal, but the society as a whole is delivered from the pangs of human deprivation. Besides, Peace education also raises peace and human right activists who pressure their various governments for good governance and good governance enhances human and global security.

IV. Acquisition of conflict resolution skills

Conflict is a normal part of any healthy relationship. Violence and wars only result when conflicts are being mismanaged. Good conflict resolution skills could help to build the bonds of peace and fraternity. The main threat to global security is therefore not the conflicts but the dearth of corps of persons with good conflict resolution skills to manage them. Peace education therefore fills this gap by equipping learners with skills of dialogue, mediation and negotiation.

V. Raising friends of the Earth and environmental peace-builders

Peace education emphasizes sustainability and care for the earth as a factor in peaceful relationship. This is because environmental peace-building will ensure sustainable development. The Wikipedia (2015) defines sustainable development to mean the organising principle for sustaining finite resources necessary to provide for the needs of the future generation. Sustainable development was developed in Europe in the 17th century in response to the growing awareness of depletion of timber resources. Land owner were obligated as a national duty to plant trees to avoid the destructive over exploitation of natural resources. It is therefore part of global security to use our finite resources cautiously. Conflicts result when resources are scare and therefore people fight for the scare resources. In fact the fight for scarce resources has been at the root of many wars and conflicts. Again, the interdependent in the ecosystem put us at serious global risk and danger when the balance is distorted by extinction of a particular resource. Some of these threats are the global warming, climatic change, desertification and flooding. The pertinent questions we need ask ourselves are these questions: What happens to our children un- born if we finish the oil wells? What if we cut

down all the forest trees for timber and firewood? How safe will our atmosphere be? And if we do all these, would we be harming ourselves in any way?

IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSION

The available pieces of information so far presented in this paper do as a matter of fact lend themselves to a number of implications for us, our society, country and the world at large.

Firstly, from the broad view of the nature of peace, no family, college or country can be said to be peaceful if there is poverty, injustice, discrimination and imbalance in appointments, even if there is no open violence or war.

Secondly, the understanding of violence makes it that the unnecessary death of children from malnutrition and preventable diseases, and that of a car driver who dies on our bad roads due to pot holes, have not died of their own misfortune but of violence from the hands of greedy and corrupt politicians who cart away monies for the welfare of citizens and for infrastructural development.

Thirdly, violence has its roots in the structure of the society. A society deprived of education, justice, and access to opportunity, gender and tribal equality etc., merely seats on a keg of gun powder that may explode with time. This day Newspaper of 18th July 2015 reports that the former Nigerian President, Olusegun Obasanjo, said that an education survey conducted in the 6 geopolitical zones of Nigeria in 2010 showed that the Northeast zone of Nigeria where Boko Haram dominates recorded 17%, which was the lowest and according to him, people believe Boko Haram insurgency has come to be due to the poor education in that region..

Fourthly, military action alone is not sufficient to effectively overcome terror or violence. This was the position of the American Ambassador to Nigeria, Mr James Entwistle as to why American Government denied Dr Goodluck Jonathan's administration weapons to fight the Boko Haram terrorists. As contained in the October 9th, 2014 edition of the Premium Times, the ambassador admonished Nigeria that buying high tech weapons should not be the only way to resolve Boko Haram terrorism, but in addition to the welfare of soldier and of the citizens should be seen as other options.

In conclusion, Peace education has been presented as a panacea for global security. Through the knowledge from education about peace and for peace, learners come to term with the horror of wars and conflicts, their root causes and acquire attitudes, skills and values needed to instil and nurture a culture of peace that is characterized by non-violence, respect for cultural diversity, human rights, gender equality and justice, as against that of violence and war. Albert Einstein's words that "The problems we have cannot be solved at the same level of thinking that we created them" should encourage us to raise our thinking and that of our youths about peace so as to solve our current global security challenges.

PREFERENCES

Akano, B. U. (1997). A Problem Solving Approach to Integrated science teaching, *Kontagora Journal of Science and Technology*, 1 (2&3)

- Boden Powel (1920). *Aids to Scouts Masterpiece: A Herbert Jenkins Book*
- Bokova, I (2011) Education and Security- Dawn, Pakistan: Why Education matters for global Security, *An Editorial Article, UNESCO*.
- Farrant J.S. (1980). *Principles and Practice of Education*. London; Longman Group Ltd
- Fountain. S. (1999) *Peace Education in UNICEF*. New York: UNICEF.
- Retrieved from www.unicef.org/girlseducation/files/PeaceEducation.pdf 13th July 2015
- Galtung, J. (1964). An Editorial. *Journal of Peace Research*, 1(1), 1-4.
- Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, Peace, and Peace Research. *Journal of Peace Research*, 6 (3), 167-191.
- Galtung, J. (1985). Twenty-Five Years of Peace Research: Ten Challenges and Some Responses. *Journal of Research*, 22 (2), 141-158
- Galtung, J. (1990). Cultural Violence. *Journal of Peace Research*, 27(3), 291-305
- Grewal, B. S. (2003). Galtung: Positive and Negative Peace Pdf. Retrieved from, <https://docs.google.com/open?id=OB...>
- Harris. I. (2008). "History of Peace Education" in Monisha Bajaj Ed. *Encyclopaedia of Peace Education*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age
- Published retrieved from http://www.tc.edu/centrs/epe/PDF%20articles/Harish_2feb08.pdf
- Hicks, D. (1988). "Understanding the field", In David Hicks, (Ed.). *Education for Peace: Issues, Principles, and Practice and Practice in the Classroom*.
- Ibeanu, O. (2012). Conceptualizing Peace, In Shedrack G. B. (Ed.) *Introduction to Peace and conflict Studies in West Africa: A Reader*, Ibadan, Spectrum Books Limited
- Intriligator (2011). Global security and Human Security, International Network for Economics and Conflict, Retrieved from, inec.suip.org/.../global-security-and-hum...
- Kearsley, G (2010). *Andragogy (M. Knowles). The Theory into practice database*. Retrived from <http://tip.psychology.org>
- Kennam, G. F. (1948).Organising Political Welfare. Retrieved from, digitalarchive.wilsoncentre.org/.../1143
- Knowles M, S (1962) *A history of Adult Education Movement in the USA*, New York; Kriegeri
- Macquerrie, J. (1973). *The Concept of Peace*. New York: Harper Row
- Nduka O. (1982) *Western Education and the Nigerian Cultural Background*. Ibadan; University press.
- Nwanegbo, C. J. & Odigbo, J (2013). Security and National Development in Nigeria: The Threat of Boko Haram, *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3 (4)
- Nurvarro-castro, L and Nario- Galace, J. (2008). *Peace Education: A path way to a Culture of Peace*. Philippines, Centre for Peace Education
- Okafor, F.C. (1988). *The Philosophy of Education and Third World Perspective*. Enugu, star publishing Company
- Olaoye A.A (2001) Education and National rebirth for sustainable democracy, Being a lead paper presented at the National conference on Education, F.C.E., Kontagora , Niger state.
- Reardon,B. & Cabezudo,A (2002).*Learning to Abolish War*. New York: Hague Appeal for Peace.
- Scheper- Hughes, N. (2004). *Dangerous and Endangered Youth: Social Structures and Determinants of Violence*. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 1036:13-730
- Stan A. etal. (1989). *Approaches to creative teaching*. Enugu, Summer

- Educational Publishers in Olaoye A.A (2001) education and National rebirth for sustainable democracy, being a lead paper presented at the National conference on Education, FCE, Kontagora, Niger state.
- Toh, S.H. (2004). Education for International Understanding towards a Culture of Peace: a conceptual framework. In V. F. Cowagas (Ed.) *Education for International Understanding towards a Culture of Peace: Teachers Resource Book*. Seoul, South Korea: Asia –Pasific Centre of Education for International Understanding.
- United Nations (1945). Preamble of the UN Charter Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/cyberschoolbus/peace/frame2.htm>
- United Nations General Assembly (1997). International Year for a Culture of Peace, 2000. A/RES/52/15
- UNESCO (2002). Education for culture of peace. <http://www.unesco.org/education/ecp/presentation.htm>
- WHO (2002). World Report on Violence and Health
- Zionst, E. (2010). Transforming a Culture of Violence through Peace Education. Retrieved from: blog.woolman.org/.../transforming-cultur...
- Wikipedia, the free encyclopaedia (2015) Global Citizens, Retrieved from <https://en.m.wikipedia.org/.../Global...>
- Wikipedia, the free encyclopaedia (2015). Sustainable Development, Retrieved from <https://en.m.wikipedia.org/.../Sustainable>.