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Abstract: Since the beginning of 2016 the United Nations has embarked on a ground-breaking implementation of sustainable development goals (SDGs). The next 15 years will show whether educational theorists, academic criminologists and students have taken on board relevant crime prevention and criminal justice recommendations, a few of which have been addressed in this article. Its aim is to familiarize the reader with these recommendations and the implications they have for teaching Criminology, including pursuing related recommendations in a pro-social, action-oriented and rational manner. The article calls for globally innovative programming of teaching Criminology with a view to contributing to the implementation of the SDGs, to be accounted for at the Fourteenth United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice (Japan, 2020).
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Tell me and I'll forget; show me and I may remember; involve me and I'll understand.1 Something has to be done to make professors as interested in teaching as they are in their own scholarly advancements.2

Sławomir Redo
Academic Council on the United Nations System (Liaison Office, Vienna, Austria)
F. United Nations Senior Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Expert and staff of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (ret.)

Streszczenie: W 2016 roku Organizacja Narodów Zjednoczonych/ONZ rozpoczęła wdrażanie celów zrównoważonego rozwoju. Kolejnych 15 lat pokaże, czy teoretycy edukacji, kryminolodzy akademicy i studenci uznaли rekomendacje Organizacji dotyczące zapobiegania przestępczości i wymiaru sprawiedliwości w sprawach

1Chinese proverb.
Introduction

Every now and then Criminology faces new approaches to its field heralded by titles like “New Horizons in Criminology” [10], “The New Criminology” [50], “New Directions in the Rehabilitation of Criminal Offenders” [29], “The New Criminal Justice” [27] in which its authors present fundamental, in their opinion, crime prevention and criminal justice research and education issues. The United Nations sustainable development goals (UN SDGs) agenda 2016-2030 [6], which sets an entirely new paradigm for that research and education, is another case in point [45, vol. II, part VII]. The Thirteenth United Nations Congresses on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice made in 2015 the first inroads into that agenda [7], and at the forthcoming Fourteenth Congress (Japan, 2020) Member States and other participants will make an interim report on the implementation of the relevant parts of the UN SDGs.

In this way, this article brings into it the philosophical ethical and moral underpinnings of the UN SDGs. Their moral entrepreneurship may conflict with scientific objectivity. Consequently, it may appear that teaching the United Nations criminology with its own “right” and “wrong” general ethical and logical rules may conflict with academics’ and students’ own moral principles and logic.2

However, this may not necessarily be the case, if and when we are able to convey a UN criminological idea across different legal cultures, to facilitate common ways of thinking. Especially, if the methods of teaching Criminology account for that conflict and bring about a UN open-minded action-oriented positive approach to educating students, so when they grad-

---


2“Ethics” and “morality” are sometimes used interchangeably, but in this article they respectively refer to corporate and individual behaviour.
uate from university, they likewise can start applying their knowledge and pro-social logical skills in local and global way. Then this human capital may turn into social capital for the common good. It becomes “glocal” - i.e. has the rationale that accounts for own and others’ interests worldwide.

**United Nations ethics in the context of sustainable development goals**

The UN Charter is in essence a social contract. By its form and norms it implies global ethical values and obligations to meet them [42]. While many think that they “are not going to be handed down from on high” [12, p. xv] because practically it is impossible to provide a command system in the international sphere similar to the one in the domestic life [26, p. 102], the ensuing soft law embodied in the form of UN SDGs has its universal imperatives overriding this scepticism.

Accordingly, the UN SDGs which implement the Charter call on humanity to live in harmony with nature [6, PP 7 & SDG 12.8] because “there are natural universal laws, defined in the philosophy of law, that are determined by nature, and are therefore universal” [4]. The UN SDGs found through this imperative a way between domestic command-administrative and market-oriented systems to set and implement new standards ensuing from these universal laws. “Universality embodies a new global partnership for sustainable development in the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations” that requires a change of “old mind-sets, behaviours and destructive patterns” [3, paras. 48 & 159].

**Thinking about poverty and crime prevention**

Regarding the first aim of this article, the root of this change comes from the philosophers, linguists, educators and sociologists whose contributions eventually went into to the field of intercultural education. They were the first ones who sensitized us to culturally-dependent modes of thinking and highlighted them for comparisons [37, 41].

Socrates (469 BCE – 399 BCE) and Aristotle (384 BCE – 322 BCE) were the first Western philosophers who embarked on this task. Aristotle’s logic is a Western social science canon with which this article deals first. According to him, “Poverty is the parent of revolution and crime” [9, Bk II 1265]. In terms of logical deduction (general-specific-generic), as per the example taken from the anonymous student’s paper [16], this reads:

(A): A poor person needs food;

(B): An unfed person may commit a crime;

(C): Therefore if a person is poor and cannot afford food, such a person may have to steal food.

This syllogistic thinking compels to teach in such a way, so as to document the nexus between poverty and crime, as if there was a causal link between it (C), the crime prognosis (B), and person’s individual condition (A). The conclusion (C) suggests that there is the ultimate knowledge not only of the aetiology of crime (A), but also of its forecasting in an individual and generic way (B).

Be it as it may, the above example of deduction shows that syllogism is a viable method of criminological teaching, insofar as the aetiology of crime and its control are concerned, at least in Western criminology. However, it is not a viable method of criminological teaching of its prevention. In comparison with criminogenesis and crime control, this primary approach to countering crime is less universally established and interculturally successful. For teaching action-oriented crime prevention precepts the inductive Socratic method (specific-general-generic) is more plausible. By all means not
exclusively applicable to the task at hand, this method orchestrates thinking as follows:

(A): This particular poor person stole food;

(B): Is feeding the poor a universal imperative?

(C): Is stealing food preventable in such cases?

This students' self-reflective method of inferential and sceptical inquiry invites a specific moral case (A), with a pre-validated self-evident generic ethical answer (B) that frames (A) and the ensuing answer (C) which, in turn, implicitly upgrades (A) to an exemplification of a generic ethical case.

Unlike Aristotle's analytically-minded deductive logic which is entirely value-free, this educationally pre-conceptualized pro-social action method implies a single value-bound thinking what is right or wrong, especially when one or the other contrasts with the student's opinion. Originally, Socrates contested the in-group sense of justice [37]. Nowadays his method is motivated by the universal sense of justice, globally declared by certain standards and norms that may not be familiar to students, but should bind them morally, in line with one ethos of conduct.

More conduct options emerge in the Oriental philosophy. A functional equivalent of Aristotle's argument is credited to Mencius (372 BCE – 289 BCE), a leading scholar of Confucianism – a canon in China, a part of formal criminological education [54]. Mencius writes that "the good ruler should war not against other countries but against the common enemy – poverty, for it is out of poverty and ignorance that crime and disorder come" (Mencius Bk III, I, 3 after [17, p. 830]). In Aristotle's inductive terms this reads:

(A) A good ruler feeds poor in his country and educates people;

(B) Poverty is a common enemy;

(C) Poverty breeds crime and disorder anywhere;

(D) Therefore every good ruler’s common enemy is poverty and ignorance, not other countries.

This argument is also plausible in pro-social action Socratic terms:

(A): The good ruler fed the poor;

(B): Isn’t it everyone's common obligation to feed and educate the poor who bring crime and disorder, rather than to go to war with other countries in order to be able to feed the poor?;

(C): Is crime, disorder and war preventable by good rulers who feed the poor and educate them?

However, more often than not, a Confucian view on right or wrong neither makes nor addresses such contrasting distinctions. Confucianism, known for the lack of logical rigour in the manner the syllogistic thinking commands, is aphoristic, tautological, muddled and highly contextualised [13]. It either entirely avoids or defers these distinctions into the future ("The Doctrine of the Mean"[11]) and stresses attitudinal change rather than values. Hence is not a binary "right or wrong" logic to which Western-style educated people are privy.

Nonetheless the next Confucian criminological example with an extended metaphor concerning offender's rehabilitation - the environmental ethics metaphor that may look "sketchy", "folksy", "literary" [49, p.371] - falls into the Socratic method of "specific-generic-generic" inquiry. Intersected by the three Western logic premises it reads:

"(A): Man’s nature is like water whirling round in a corner;

(B): Man’s nature is indifferent to good and evil, just as the water is indifferent to the east and west,
(B1): Water will indeed flow indifferently to the east and west, but will it flow indifferently up and down?

(B2): The tendency of man’s nature to good is like the tendency of water to flow downwards,

(B3): Now by striking water and causing to leap up, you may make it to go over your forehead, and by damming and leading it, you can force it up a hill,

(B4): But are such movements according to the nature of water?

(C): It is the force applied which causes them. When men are made to do what is not good, their nature is dealt with in this way” (Mencius Bk VI A 2 after [48, p. 249]).

The limited space here prevents from the further interpretation, in Western logic, terms of much longer and more elaborate Confucian arguments, for example, on the role of sustainable development (SD) in crime prevention (Mencius, Bk I 7). In short, Mencius gives there a panorama of logical relations between nature, person and good governance, in line with the overall Confucian maxim “Cultivate yourself, put your family in order, run the local government well, and bring peace to the entire country” that communicates the importance of in-group cohesiveness for that legal culture and governance as a process facilitating SD.

One way or another, the pro-social Socratic method applied to such criminological issues enlivens their critical consideration and constructive follow up for any legal culture confronted by globalization issues, including crime and its prevention [41]. Empirical evidence shows that educational returns for Chinese law faculty students exposed to it are favourable [44]. The first motto of this article thus retains its sense across legal cultures.

In general, following the opinion of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization that the SD education is the best hope for an alternate approach with a moral and ethical foundation that shapes character and strength of mind [18], SD educators believe that, SDs are:

*a concept that can integrate across professions and disciplines to provide solutions to our many deep-seated problems…It differs from traditional approaches to environmental education in that it focuses on complex social issues, such as, the links between environmental quality, human equality, human rights, peace and their underpinning politics…Education, in this context, incorporates current daily happenings in an interdisciplinary and intercultural setting, requiring citizens to have skills in critical enquiry and systemic thinking to explore the complexity and implications of sustainable development…[T]his new educational approach also requires a new pedagogy, which sees learners develop skills and competencies for partnership, participation and action* [25, p. 138].

Obviously, the Socratic method is not particularly pedagogically innovative (after all it was first used by Plato, 424/423 – 348/347 BCE, in his Meno). But in the Western Hemisphere only in the 1970s this humanistic way of educating has started to gain ground in the United States. Through student-centred pedagogy, they were taught to examine their own preconceptions (beliefs) about social problems, use imagination, to be responsible and to think independently [24, p. 215].

Likewise, the Socratic method it is not a breakthrough that can and will change the teaching of Criminology entirely. Realizing however the dominance of the passive method of teaching (through instruction) over the method that involves a student who searches for information and in his/her “soul” finds what may be and con-
structive (even if civilly disobedient), and comes up with genuinely own answer in certain circumstances - all this may be more effective than merely instruction what to do about Sustainable Development, global warming and crime prevention, for example.

**Climate change and criminological education**

Coming therefore to the second objective of this article, the SD concept may also be the reference to address now the question of the correlates of poverty-related criminal conduct – the "second best" approach, if agreed that the causes of crime are intractable. This assertion contrasts with the claim of the tractability of the causes of global warming. According to climatologists who reviewed over 4,000 papers discussing the correlates of global warming, over 97% of them endorsed "human-caused" global warming [15].

That claim sensitizes to the shifting approach to criminogenesis. In particular, it shifts the attention to possible new correlates of poverty-related criminal conduct ("destructive patterns" [3, para. 159]). However, the supporting criminological evidence at hand is, at best, thin. The most authoritative to date climatological analysis by the UN-mandated Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (UNIPCC) on the causes and effects of global warming reports that neither there is respective statistical criminological evidence ("environmental crime causes global warming") nor that sufficient systematic evidence points to violent conflicts as an effect of global warming, let alone that global warming has criminogenic consequences as far as impoverishment is concerned. Only speculatively, the UNIPCC expresses its concern over various welfare implications that result from the migration forced by global warming, hence about the later consequences [40]. In short, the UNIPPC's global vision hardly lends itself to conventional academic framework and recommendations in Criminology (even the newest involving cybercrime). It follows that, so far, the UNIPCC must have taken rather a cursory look at the various statistical criminological findings, the many of which interplay with its concerns [19, 40]. Nonetheless, like with the often emphasized by the UN "intrinsic" but "inextricable" links between security and development such findings on the links between climate change, impoverishment and crime may continue to be inconclusive given the complexity of criminogenic factors at play. Therefore this section may not so be relevant in the sense of a corroborated (especially by the force of logical syllogism) substantive climatological nexus between impoverishment and crime, or - more accurately - criminogenic consequences of economic inequality and social inequity prompted by climate change, but paradigmatic.

In this way, and pending further criminological research, this section seeks to expand "Green Criminology" - originally, the study of harms and crimes against the environment broadly conceived, including the study of environmental law [21]. However, it does not yield to any other ideology - other than that of the United Nations.

Accordingly, in terms of research and education this section argues that the afore mentioned study should involve:

Intergenerational Learning (IL) - the process pursued by environmentalists "in which individuals of all generations acquire skills, knowledge, attitudes, and values through participation in purposeful, mutually beneficial activities. This is accomplished by tapping into the individual participants" knowledge, skills and wisdom acquired in their own "life worlds". [20, pp. 76 and 31].

"green-cultural criminology" – the exploration of the cultural meaning and significance of terms such as "environment" and "environmental crime";

"gender mainstreaming" (alias "ecofeminism"), however not as an ideological brand of materialism to which the

---

1 Particularly three "Climate change" reports: 1995, 2007 and 2014 are important in the context of the topic of this article. See further [40].

6 E.g. see the foreword to [1], p. viii, and para. 30.
latter term is credited [33, p. 4] but as the overarching UN policy of equality between men and women.

The above elements are ingrained in the United Nations environmental protection policy. They also were among the cornerstones of the United Nations Secretary-General’s incipient SDGs vision on the “Road to Dignity” in which he called to:

“ensure zero tolerance of violence against or exploitation of women and girls. Women and girls must have equal access to financial services and the right to own land and other assets. All children and adolescents have the right to education and must have a safe environment in which to learn. Human development also means respect for human rights…Today, more than ever, the realities of 1.8 billion young people and adolescents represent a dynamic, informed and globally connected engine for change. Integrating their needs, rights to choice and their voices in the new agenda will be a key factor for success. It is essential that young people receive relevant skills and quality education and lifelong learning, from early childhood development to post-primary schooling, including life skills and vocational education and training, as well as science, sports and culture. Teachers must be given the means to deliver learning and knowledge in response to a safe global workplace, driven by technology”. [3, paras. 69 and 71].

In 2015, this very embracing vision eventually made into the UN SDGs [6] which cannot be achieved without one another, even though Goal 1 on poverty eradication is the most important. Regarding education, among other goals, one general and one specific goal is relevant the topic of this article. A general goal 13.3 reads: “Improve education, awareness-raising and human and institutional capacity on climate change mitigation [emphasis added], adaptation, impact reduction and early warning”). Goal 4.7 is quite specific:

“By 2030, ensure that all learners acquire the knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development, including, among others, through education for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship and appreciation of cultural diversity and of culture’s contribution to sustainable development”.

Realizing special relevance of the latter goal to the topic of this article, in countries where the access to education and legitimate sustainable livelihoods is tenuous (hence their youth are vulnerable to illegal profit-making “life chance” offers), one may now continue with other SD goals. Among them is how to teach about countering organized crime deforestation (illegal tropical timber logging and trafficking) to “protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably managed forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss” (goal 15).

From the European, let alone Polish perspective, alerting about the global or European consequences of deforestation or desertification may look as if it were “extra-terrestrial”. However, at a second look, these factors, reportedly, involve forced migration of people from the desertificated areas of Somalia and Eritrea into Europe and the concern about the rising risk of religiously motivated immigrant terrorism [43]. Consequently, goal 15 is “brought home” for it begs in Europe the question of integrating refugees and other migrants (first and second generation) into the mainstream of life, in which civic and other crime prevention education should be at its core in the future multicultural continent.

The limited article’s space neither allows to go into other criminological implications of the immigration process nor to quote other UNSD goals and targets and exemplify them in the analytical or pro-social action-oriented fashion. Luckily, there have already been inroads by others [50, 54], first modelled by the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, initiated at the UN General Assembly 1997 by Poland [5]. Hence there are now programmatically sufficient and substantively documented indications to follow, as far as the teaching about the countering of various other than timber logging and trafficking forms of organized crime is concerned, among the many: trafficking in drugs (“alternative development”) and people - the latter also in the context of climate change.
Firearm trafficking addresses another dimension of sustainable development, first of all in the sense of its threat to peace and security. As noted already, links can also be found between armed violence and climate change, however, doubted by the UNIPCC [40].

Teaching how to significantly reduce homicide (Goal 16.1) is researched better than the above problem. Homicide is very well addressed in criminological literature, including that of the United Nations [52], even though undervalued in the UNIPCC's account, as far as climate change and physical violence is concerned [40]. Less forthcoming and resourceful is criminological advice on anti-corruption (Goal 16.5), especially in educational terms for young people, and – in its own right – as an element of inclusive and peaceful societies for sustainable development, obtaining access to justice and building effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels [36].

Regarding anti-corruption and household property rights (i.e. the afore-mentioned imbalance in assets property rights), the need to balance out the roles between men and women permeates the entire UN SDGs agenda. Yet, the latter (i.e. the property rights) have subsided as an issue in western criminology [40, 46]. This must be because property rights and domestic violence seems to be now weakly correlated with one another, but it is still alive in the criminological literature of developing countries (Ibid.). Regarding the role of women and children education in anti-corruption, this has been entirely neglected in Criminology.

Conclusion

Concerned about the ever-expanding field of criminal policy-relevant research, Polish criminologist Leszek Lernell (1906-1981) felt that looking for new concepts and methods to counter crime will "melt down...science in the boundless search, in the jungle of sociological, economic and other problematic" [31, p. 40]. That view was grounded in the autarchic world with its Cold War era divisions, before the time of globalisation and human rights developments, and much ahead of the problem of global warming. Today, cyberspace and anything else under the sun must come within the world view, i.e. "a mental model of reality - a framework of ideas and attitudes about the world, ourselves, and life, a comprehensive system of beliefs - with answers for a wide range of questions" [53] to respond to students and others as per the UN SDGs.

No longer any autarchic view, not even Confucianism with is very broad humanistic vision of sustainable development, can reach where the United Nations wants us to travel and look into. Nor this can be done by natural sciences alone, that is without teaching how to deal with the SD problems in a civic way. Nowadays, this kind of global civic education is absent in high school curricula, as shown in the deficient Programme for International Student Assessment of the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development [38, 40]. Compensating for this absence at a higher university level through SD-bound Criminology, laudable as it is, certainly will make a bigger difference, if combined with general civic education earlier. But there still persists one more limitation that prevents from "delivering knowledge about how to deal with and live with difference and diversity" [24, p. 216]. It is our ability to see the world in its full complexity and endless diversity as, in fact, it is.

Two “optical” insights and one in-kind conclusion may help to explain this limitation. Johannes Hevelius (1611-1687), the jurist and astronomer from Danzig (now Gdańsk- the site of the Publisher of the Polish Journal of Criminology), argued that outer space can be seen with the naked eye rather than telescopic sights. In favour of the latter instrument (so to say) was Jan N. Potocki (1761-1815), Polish-French-Russian Orientalist, ethno linguist and traveller:

"Regrettably, the travellers usually see the world through the glasses brought from their own homeland and having arrived to a foreign land do not bother to adjust their glasses to the other way. Hence so many irrelevant insights" [35, p. 120].

From the two above insights follows one conclusion relevant to the topic of this article. The UN SDGs pro-
poses new optics to overcome what we see every day: the myopia of those in the Northern countries, i.e. Occidentalism, and of those in the South ("global South"), i.e. Orientalism - both against the background of universal innate egoism, individualism, homeland’s tribalism and nationalism. Natural as they all are (but not in excess), the UN SDGs not only aim to correct such distortions but offer a new vision for sustainable livelihood - a part of Culture of Lawfulness to come, foresaw by the Thirteenth United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice [7, 34].

Drawing on the accumulated and verified knowledge, educationists and educators should in the name of sustainable development that calls for greater inclusiveness, peace and prosperity reapply that knowledge, use new advice, findings, instruments, methods and concepts to change the otherwise "old mind-sets, behaviours and destructive patterns" [3, para. 159]. Hopefully, time will come that through cradle-to-grave education (or to use the scientific term: lifelong learning), Member States of the United Nations, women and children (as the UN Charter’s “succeeding generation”), but also academics, students and others - will seriously take on board what the UN is calling for.

People taught today about the content of the UN SDGs and what respectively they bring into their countries and life, are the link between the current and the future society. Teaching Criminology and its precepts as per the UN SDGs will make a difference for them in their universal education and the world of tomorrow. If in the 1950 issues of international criminology were quipped to be at “stratospheric levels” [47, p. 82], would today we still quip about teaching Criminology within the UN SDGs’ climate change context?

The UN SDGs will help to overcome the self-sustaining poverty of thought that disadvantages people, keeps them at bay and prevents them from legitimately materializing their life chances. Criminological education in various legal cultures should emphasize that hopeful difference for the successful implementation of the UN SDGs 2016-2030.

Not only governments and intergovernmental organizations called by the United Nations [34, p. 186], but also the non-governmental community including the International Society of Criminology, the American, Asian, and European societies of criminology (among others) should recognize and start programmatically implementing the UN slogan “Future We Want for All” [2] - the future with the 2016-2030 UN SDGs. Without them it cannot be materialized. Would we all want another future? At the Fourteenth United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice (Japan, 2020) Member States will look for the answer.

As a former UN official and now and independent academic, the author’s curiosity is really not about that interim answer of governments. It rather is about the answer of global academic community: will it seize the opportunity to go on board of a ship passing in its front with an important and heavy UN workload? This metaphorically [8] formulated and concluding question posed in this Journal (issued in a Hanzeatic sea port city- the author’s birthplace), is prompted because of the preceding the UN SDGs Millennium Development Goals/MDGs 2000-2015. Then Member States themselves missed the opportunity to come up in the MDGs’ content with the balance between freedom from want (development) with issues related to freedom from fear (human rights), or give respective sufficient attention to inequalities and inclusiveness. In sum, will in 2016-2030 the academic and the United Nations worlds go in one direction? Or, paraphrasing the second motto of this article, will Criminology professors be interested in teaching the UN SDGs?

7 This UN Secretariat’s slogan is derived from the title of the Outcome Document of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (2012), otherwise called the “Rio+20 resolution” (A/RES/66/288). The first United Nations Conference on Environment and Development was held 20 years earlier (Rio de Janeiro, 3-14 June 1992).
8 Prompted by Kran [28] who referred to Aliston’s article “Ships Passing in the Night: The Current State of the Human Rights and Development Debate seen through the Lens of the Millennium Development Goals” [8]. While the Millennium Development Goals had a great deal in common with human rights commitments neither the human rights nor development communities embraced this linkage with conviction. The two agendas resembled ships passing in the night, even though they are both headed for similar destinations.
References:


[4] A/70/268, Harmony with nature, Report of the Secretary-General, 4 August 2015;


Law and Criminology