CRIMINOLOGICAL ENCOUNTERS

Vol 7(1) 2025
ISSN 2506-7583
DOI 10.26395/CE.2025.1.11

Who is a Victim of What? Societal Reactions to Harms Caused and Experienced by Children in War as Teaching Materials for Critical Victimology

Ian Marder
Maynooth University, School of Law and Criminology
ian.marder@mu.ie

Keywords: Critical victimology, social construction, ideal victim, pedagogy, teaching and learning

Abstract: Critical methodologies in criminological education involve the comprehensive deconstruction of the labels of 'victim' and 'offender'. This approach seeks to encourage students to reflect on their biases and assumptions, and on the role of power in constructing social narratives. This article explores how its author attempts to utilise societal reactions to harms committed *to and by* children in wartime to support deep reflection in critical victimological education. It starts by describing how a victimology module, optional in the final year of an inter-departmental undergraduate criminology programme in Ireland, problematises the false dichotomy of 'victim and offender'. It then discusses how the course uses social and institutional reactions to the harms committed and experienced by Grace Akallo and Dominic Ongwen (as child soldiers in Uganda) and Shamima Begum (as a child who travelled to join ISIS in Syria) to illustrate the socially constructed processes by which labels of 'victim' and 'offender' are claimed and allocated. These cases exemplify how we can integrate examples relating to war into criminology syllabi to embed opportunities for reflection and critical, internationalist thinking. Given that relatively few academic criminologists in Europe publish their teaching practices and materials, the article contributes to the pedagogical literature in critical criminology and victimology, as well as to the literature on the criminology of war.

Introduction

As an applied and interdisciplinary social science, criminology represents an opportunity to provide students with a broad social scientific education. Numerous core concepts from disciplines like sociology, philosophy, politics and law, among others, can be illustrated using 'our' examples – examples of crime, social harm, violence and injustice – to help our students reflect deeply on their assumptions and biases, and engage critically with the world (Howes, 2017). Despite clear potential for criminological programmes to contribute to public pedagogies (Hamilton, 2013) – what Tidmarsh (2023, 179) terms the 'transformative potential' of teaching and learning in criminology – European criminologists in particular seldom publish and share their pedagogical approaches (the chapters in Palmer, 2020, and Young & Strudwick, 2022, being among the notable recent exceptions).

Authorship in the *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, the main pedagogical outlet for our discipline, illustrates this gap. The journal publishes four issues per year, with 103 full articles in the twelve issues spanning 2022, 2023 and 2024. Of the 275 authors, only 25 of them listed a European affiliation, with over 90% of the remaining 250 authors listing a North American affiliation. Of the 25 authors listing a European affiliation, eight were on an article by this author in 2022, of whom six were students hired as research assistants to redesign the module to which the current article pertains. If we focus on 2023 and 2024, just four authors from 190 across 72 articles listed a European affiliation. While European academics publish pedagogical work elsewhere (including in the edited collections cited earlier), this type of article is a rare occurrence in most international, peer-reviewed criminology journals. There is scope for academics in European universities and for criminology journals to share descriptions and analyses of teaching and learning – not least, as an act of resistance to universities' competitive nature and claims to own our teaching materials (Gadd & Weedon, 2017; Brown, 2021).

This article contributes to this special issue on 'the criminology of war' by discussing how I seek to use the social and institutional reactions to individual children who *both committed and were victims of* some of the most serious harms in wartime to demonstrate the essential concept of social constructivism. I begin by considering the value of discussing social constructivism in victimological education, given the role of power in helping explain how 'victim status' is claimed and allocated. The section then introduces the use of wartime examples, situating the people I discuss in lectures in the context of the module's aims, structure and teaching approach.

I then explain how I use the social and institutional reactions to children involved in conflicts in Uganda (Grace Akallo and Dominic Ongwen) and Syria (Shamima Begum) in an attempt to uncover the relationship between whether one is blamed for harms they committed, and whether we grant or withhold the status of 'victim' in relation to the harms they experienced. Although this approach has not been directly evaluated, the next section outlines why it is important to share teaching materials when their impact has not been assessed empirically, and draws on the aforementioned research to which this module was subjected (Marder et al., 2022). I conclude by inviting critical social educators to consider whether wartime examples would help them foreground and address complexities, while unpacking students' assumptions and 'gut reactions' to politicised issues, in pedagogical settings.

Social Constructivism, Critical Victimology and War

The call for papers for this special issue states that 'a discipline which adopts categories that criminalise "the other", uses stereotypes, and describes individuals and groups in terms of insiders and outsiders […] is intrinsically uncritical' (De Backer et al., 2023, 6). This article proceeds from related assumptions: 1) these stereotypes are sufficiently socially harmful and prevalent that it is incumbent on social scientists to address and undermine them through undergraduate teaching; 2) criminology, despite its flaws, is a discipline in which academics can intentionally undertake this task (Howes, 2017); 3) we can build critical criminological thinking into a wide range of subdisciplines beyond critical criminology modules (Sweeney, 2022); and, finally, 4) it is important to use examples from beyond our domestic contexts to globalise and Southernise our curricula and, in turn, students' perspectives (Sohoni & Petrovic, 2010; Stockdale et al., 2022).

Few categories stigmatise more than that of the 'criminal'. Criminology provides educators with the tools to help students question their biases and assumptions in this regard. We ask students to reflect on the

power imbalances that manifest in the (political) choice of what the law criminalises – and against whom (selective) enforcement occurs. This raises broader social questions. Who does our society revere and hate? Whose actions can be forgiven; whose cannot? How do wealth, politics, supremacist narratives and hegemony inform our attitudes to these issues? What is the relationship between the types of harm done, the identities of the people who cause and experience those harms, and the level of outrage, sympathy and attention (Christie, 1986; Duggan, 2018; Gracia, 2018)?

A central mission in criminological education is to undermine the assumption that wherever one lands on these questions is the only and natural way of thinking. By definition, of course, we can show that this is incorrect, as what is considered a 'crime' changes across time and place. I teach a third-year optional module in victimology, and my argument herein is that victimology is another site in which we can demonstrate that much of what we take for granted is socially constructed. I further assert that there is likely value in taking students away from local contexts by using diverse examples from around the world, including from international conflicts, when trying to help them reflect.

Briefly, the victimology module in question has existed since 2019/2020. Although its design and delivery changed in that time (Marder et al., 2022), its structure has remained broadly the same: its first half is a theoretical deconstruction of the 'victim' label, while its second half is an empirical-legal assessment of victims' needs, interests, rights and interactions with criminal justice processes and actors. It typically has around 100 students who study criminology alongside a second major or minor – often, but not exclusively, a cognate discipline like law, psychology or sociology.

Nils Christie's work on the ideal victim (1986) is a core text in introducing the ways in which the label of victim is socially constructed. Christie showed that our propensity to afford someone the label of victim depends not on the amount of harm they suffered, but on whether the social, political and economic context of the incident and the people involved are likely to generate sympathy from society. 'Society's responses to different types of victims', Christie (1986, 17) reasons, 'show that victims must have power and visibility to gain legitimacy as victims'. The victim label also provides a degree of power and has a cachet that makes it highly contested. As McGarry and Walklate (2015, 7) contended, our willingness to believe someone is a victim further depends on our understanding of structure and agency: 'suffering, power relations and choice are central to how we understand who is, and who is not, given the label victim and, as a consequence, who acquires or does not acquire victim status'. Questions including whether a person was (perceived to be) carrying out a respectable project when they were victimised and whether they are partly 'to blame' for what happened, mean that the status of 'victim' is not allocated equitably or objectively, but aligns with prevailing structural inequalities and reflects unconscious biases among privileged groups. On the island of Ireland, such an argument can also be situated in political history: during and following the Northern Irish conflict, Lynch and Joyce (2018, 183) argue, 'competing narratives of victimhood emerged and they served to inform intergroup relations', with assertions of collective victimhood retaining an important function for those who seek either to justify or to transform aspects of the conflict today. While lecturers must account for their local political and class climates when selecting examples to use in teaching, many countries are home to conflict-related historical figures and events that could help them to illustrate how people can hold diametrically opposing views on who is and is not 'really' a victim.

Indeed, nowhere is the contested nature of victimhood greater than in wars. In any conflict, one's views as to which side can rightly claim the label of victim depends on many factors, including one's identity and politics, one's exposure to information, when one considers a given conflict to have 'begun', and whom one considers the aggressor. This acute polarisation, alongside typically explicit claims of victimhood from parties on either side, means that war represents a useful context in which to consider the allocation of the victim label. For Van Wijk (2013), victims of international crimes are less likely to gain victim status unless the conflict itself has certain attributes. These include that the conflict must be unique, short and not too complex, and its timing must be 'right' (i.e., not competing for limited media and public attention with 'too many' other conflicts). Accordingly, one's willingness to recognise a person or a group as a victim/victims depends on more than the volume and nature of the harm they experience: it is socially and politically constructed. At the individual level, this is more complicated for those who have both experienced and committed harm. While the overlap between victimisation and offending has been investigated empirically (Jennings et al., 2010; Berg & Mulford, 2020; Berg & Schreck, 2022), I introduce this phenomenon in victimology primarily to help students reflect on the social construction of the victim

label, although this might also improve understanding of the prevalence and distribution of different types of victimisation.

Following the first four of 24 lectures in which the module is introduced, the 'ideal victim' concept is discussed and victimisation is quantified in 'crime' and social harm contexts, the module shifts to a four-lecture miniseries entitled, 'Who is a victim of what?' In each, we discuss case studies illustrating each person's victimisation and offending to help students reflect on the construction of victimhood and the basis by which they allocate or withhold victim status. Societal (both social and institutional) reactions to the people we discuss are an integral aspect of each case study. The slides from these lectures have been published open access on Zenodo (Marder, 2024). They can be viewed alongside a reading of this paper and/or freely used or adapted by others.

The first lecture starts with the idea of child soldiers, exploring the harm that they cause and experience, and how societies responded to specific individuals. Next, we discuss how radicalised children have been considered both victims of grooming and terrorists. It is these two topics that this article discusses. Later lectures study the victim-offender overlap in more 'domestic' crime settings, including serious or organised youth violence, violence against people who trespass on property and women who kill abusive partners, before moving on to discuss how the concept of 'victim blaming' has been applied in different settings. These materials are discussed using Socratic methods, which involve an interactive series of questions and discussions. We consider what it means to be a victim, before I describe and show videos about relevant individuals, seeking a show of hands as to whether the person in question is 'primarily a victim or an offender'. I then invite students to explain these 'gut reactions', to discuss them in pairs and plenary, and to reflect on their reasoning (Corey, 2018; Ho et al., 2023), before moving on to the next example. This approach to delivering materials seeks to begin with the victim-offender binary, as embedded in criminal justice and widely-held cultural beliefs, and demonstrate its limited utility in defining people – even when those people have killed. By the end of the series it is hoped that students will remember to reflect critically when confronted by an assertion that a person who both experienced and caused harm cannot be entitled to victim status. The first of two assessments, worth 50% of the module, attends to this segment of the course. I ask students to submit a 1500-word essay on victims of the powerful whom society ignores, on why it is important to think critically about how we use the label of 'victim', or to propose a study that explores how society treats and perceives victims of crime in Ireland.

The Harm Caused and Experienced by Child Soldiers in Uganda

I start the lecture about child soldiers with the maxim – as attributed to Johann Wolfgang von Goethe – that 'there is no crime of which I cannot conceive myself guilty'. This discussion focuses on the premise that any person may be capable of any action – no matter how harmful – under the right circumstances. We then define and quantify child soldier recruitment, citing the Paris Principles and Guidelines on Children Associated with Armed Forces or Armed Groups (UNICEF, 2007) and various international non-governmental and governmental organisations which work to advocate against the recruitment and participation of children in conflict.

In 2001, the Rome Statute established the International Criminal Court, outlining offences that it could prosecute and providing details on investigation, prosecution and trial processes, *inter alia*. This defines 'war crimes' as including 'conscripting or enlisting children under the age of fifteen years into the national armed forces or using them to participate actively in hostilities' within Article 8(2)(b)(xxvi) (International Criminal Court, 2024).

While no students ever dispute that recruiting child soldiers constitutes a very serious crime, the situation becomes more complicated when it comes to the question of whether and how, if at all, children who are recruited as child soldiers should be held criminally accountable for their actions. A quote from a now-dissolved NGO, Child Soldiers International (2019), introduces this debate:

> *Should children be prosecuted for war crimes? This is a very difficult question to answer in simple terms. International human rights and child protection experts generally recognise that children used for military purposes are first and foremost victims of abuses of their human rights and that states must prioritise the prosecution of those who unlawfully recruit and use them. [We believe] children should never be prosecuted solely for their association with armed forces or groups.*

> *However, when children are accused of committing crimes considered to be the most serious under international law, and where children have reached an age of criminal responsibility, then excluding them from criminal responsibility may deny justice to their victims and may also not be in the child's own best interests.*

I introduce two persons – both former child soldiers, but with quite different trajectories – to examine this further. First, we consider Grace Akallo, who was abducted in Uganda as a teenager and used as a child solider in Sudan, before escaping seven months later. In this period, Akallo both experienced and committed extreme violence.

My students watch a short UNICEF film in which Akallo describes these experiences and the extensive activism she has undertaken since then (UNICEF, 2013). Akallo explains the shifting nature of the duress she was under throughout her captivity: 'When they gave me a gun, at first it was very difficult, but it came with survival for the fittest because you had to shoot that gun to be able to get food. You had to go to fight to the frontline in order to be able to eat'. The video leaves little question that Akallo killed civilians not out of choice, but out of necessity. It thus frames Akallo as *entirely* not culpable; as a child whose kidnappers had a metaphorical gun to her head even when they physically did not, and who effectively pulled 'her' trigger themselves.

Akallo's story is chronicled in a documentary, *Grace, Milly, Lucy… Child Soldiers* (George, 2014), following a book which Akallo previously co-authored (McDonnell & Akallo, 2007). A review of the documentary, noting that it primarily represents a memoir of three girls' post-captivity lives, adds that Akallo's life 'has taken her far away from the site of her childhood horrors to the rarefied halls of the United Nations and liberal colleges in Massachusetts' (George, 2014, 268). The video we watch illustrates this, with photographs of Akallo next to celebrities and officials, holding anti-child soldier and anti-poverty reports. I ask students a simplistic question – 'is Grace a criminal, a victim, or both'? – to begin a discussion about how to reconcile her actions with her experiences, and to consider the implications for the labels we apply. Students are generally reluctant to use labels other than that of 'victim' to describe her, aligning with the status that the video implies her circumstances warrant.

The next example shown is that of Dominic Ongwen. Abducted at the age of nine by the same organisation as Akallo, the Lord's Resistance Army in Uganda, Ongwen likewise committed atrocities as a child. Yet, rather than escaping and living a 'redeemed' life, Ongwen suffered a different fate: he remained with the group, committing atrocities and recruiting child soldiers as an adult, before being prosecuted and, in 2021, convicted of these offences at the International Criminal Court.

Does Ongwen's victimisation, like Akallo, afford him a status of 'victim'? If so, to what extent does this complicate his status as a 'war criminal' (Holá & Bouwknegt, 2019; McQueen, 2019)? The slides present quotes to signal the arguments in this regard. Ongwen's defence lawyer (International Criminal Court, 2018, 6-19) maintains during his trial that his victimisation as a child rendered him not culpable for even his later actions:

> *Children abducted by the [Lord's Resistance Army], the accused inclusive, and used in the war in northern Uganda grew up in one of the most brutal environments never before known to humanity, with little room for moral development that would enable him to later take independent decisions. […] We shall show that Dominic Ongwen's presumed culpability is a sham. […] Once a victim, always a victim. One cannot be a victim and, still under the grips of the same system that victimised him, become a perpetrator.*

Unlike Akallo, Ongwen did not escape. Instead, he continued committing atrocities well into his adult years. The core issue for his defence team was that children cannot be expected to replicate Akallo's successful flight to avoid prosecution later. As quoted in Bogani (2017), the defence argued:

> *Allowing [this case] to proceed would be akin to endorsing an approach which imposes an additional requirement not found in customary international law; namely, that once a child soldier turns 15 years old, he or she has the obligation to release him or herself or escape – even where this would put his or her life at stake – or face the possibility of prosecution.*

Again, we examine the interactions between his victimisation and offending, and the implications for his status. The International Criminal Court had to resolve a legal question: whether his victimisation meant he was not liable for the acts he committed. But Ongwen's case raises sociological questions about human behaviour, and philosophical and moral questions relating to responsibility. What does it mean to be responsible for our actions? How relevant are our childhood experiences and prior and ongoing victimisation? What are we trying to achieve by holding people legally or morally responsible for their actions? And how might social and legal processes account for the complexities of real life? These are questions that wartime examples raise, but are as relevant to 'street' and corporate harms as they are to conflict-related harms. Previous empirical research by Barton et al. (2010) and Howes (2017) suggests that the complexities and questions of power which these examples raise could help students question assumptions and develop more nuanced thinking. Although for most students the longevity and seriousness of Ongwen's actions overrides his victimisation, juxtaposing his story with that of Akallo appears to enable them to interrogate how offending and victimisation interact, and to discuss thoughtfully the effects on a person's later stigmatisation and legal and moral condition.

Grooming and Radicalisation in Britain and Syria

The following lecture starts with a recap of key questions around responsibility, structure and agency, before moving straight into the story of Shamima Begum. Begum achieved notoriety, at least in the United Kingdom, in 2015 when she travelled from London to Syria with two friends, also young girls in their mid-teens. Seemingly concluding that their experience of online grooming meant they were better labelled as victims than as offenders, the Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police stated at a parliamentary committee that 'if they return home, there are no terrorism issues here'. This was taken to imply that they would not be treated the same as people who had travelled to Syria to fight (Barrett & Evans, 2015), given their role as fighters' 'brides' (Jaffer, 2015). Although Begum seemingly does not fight herself, her recruitment by, and association with, this armed group from a young age puts her in 'child solider' territory: the Paris Principles include children recruited for sexual purposes among those who should be socially reintegrated when freed. Yet, as we shall soon see, it still resulted in a stigma whereby, for many, she became irreversibly associated with ISIS and shared responsibility for the atrocities they committed.

Four years later, Begum made the headlines in the UK again when, from a refugee camp in Syria, she appealed to return home via interviews in the Times and, later, on ITV News. This caused extensive political debate as to whether her previous 'grooming' absolved her of responsibility for the atrocities that ISIS committed in the intervening period – especially as she initially stated that she did not regret joining them in the first place (Loyd, 2019; Segalov, 2019). Statements that Begum makes in her ITV News (2019) interview are indicative of the challenges she would later face in winning over a sceptical British public (emphasis added):

> *I don't see why [the Home Secretary] would see me as a threat. I'm a nineteen year-old girl with a newborn baby. I don't have any weapons. I don't want to hurt anyone – even if I did have weapons or anything. He has no proof that I'm a threat,* ***other than I was in ISIS, but that's it.***

Subsequently, far from welcoming her home, recognising her childhood victimisation, and affording her access to the support that such a status would legally entail, the Home Secretary stripped her of British citizenship. As of December 2024, Begum remains in Syria as her case to have her citizenship restored makes its way through the courts, her forthcoming appeal to the European Court of Human Rights the next step (Syal, 2024). With reference to Daly's (2014, 378) remark that 'victim status is not fixed, but socially constructed, mobilized and malleable', a discussion follows about whether or not Begum *was* a victim of child grooming and, if so, whether this has implications for the sympathy and, indeed, the rights she should be afforded *now*. By this stage, my students generally express a level of ambivalence and uncertainty commensurate with the complexity of these people's stories, and that indicates the approach has helped undermine the labels of 'victim' and 'offender'.

The Importance of Sharing Teaching Materials and Approaches

There are two main benefits to criminologists sharing our teaching materials. First, outlining approaches in detail and sharing materials creates Open Educational Resources for others to retain, reuse, revise, remix and redistribute (Wiley & Hilton, 2018). Arguably, making teaching materials open access is as

important as open research: this contributes to information availability, which Stagg and Partridge (2019, 477) contend is 'a necessary condition for human flourishing'. In other words, equity dictates that those of us with the time and resources to create teaching materials should make them freely available (Trotter & Hodgkinson-Williams, 2020). Victimology (Bostaph et al., 2014) and critical criminology (Sweeney, 2022) are often absent from undergraduate programmes, making it especially important to draw attention to, and share our teaching materials from, these topics.

Second, sharing materials might help academics reflect on the topics raised and ideate new or different approaches. Even if no criminologists use the cases or slides published herein, the article may still encourage readers to consider whether wartime examples can aid their teaching of different concepts. Perhaps not all countries, universities, disciplines and modules suffer from the overuse of domestic examples to illustrate how societies operate: an aspect of what Sohoni and Petrovic (2010, 288) describe as 'methodological nationalism' in social sciences. Yet, it is important to supplement calls to decolonise our curricula (Sercombe et al., 2022; Agoznino, 2023) with opportunities to reflect on the types of materials that can help us achieve this (Moosavi, 2010). For Moore (2024), addressing criminology's 'colonial problem' requires us to diversify materials at the programme level and situate knowledge in colonial histories, for which wartime examples are perfect. Sharing materials freely and discussing approaches in journals can support a teaching discourse that helps us avoid reusing the materials with which we were taught, and builds 'communities of practice' that 'engage in a process of collective learning' on changing criminological education (Wenger, 2015, 1). As a lecturer, I remain grateful to criminologists whose writings include examples which illustrate how to communicate key concepts. Christie's poetic narratives on the 'little old ladies' who are 'ideal victims' (Christie, 1986), and on a person urinating in public whose actions seem more or less 'criminal' depending on whether or not you know them (Christie, 2004), are integral to how I explain that people's statuses, identities and relationships determine the labels we give them, as much or more than their actions do.

The arguments made in this article would be strengthened if the underlying hypotheses they contained (e.g., that using wartime examples builds critical thinking) had been empirically verified. As noted, previous studies by Howes (2017) and Barton et al. (2010) investigated the impact of critical criminological instruction on student learning. Barton et al. (2010, 39) found that students 'value and engage with critical scholarship', prompting them to 'question the power of dominant ideologies and oppressive power structures [and] challenge their own prejudices and the prejudices of others'. For Howes (2017, 904), many students made either 'subtle shifts' or 'some inroads' into 'deeper levels of nuance'; others 'were deeply engaged in learning and critical thinking'. It is credible to hypothesise, therefore, that the approaches outlined here could contribute to learning in similar ways.

For the purpose of this article, however, we do not have the data to examine this empirically. A previous study (Marder et al., 2022) piloted restorative practices and design innovation as methods of involving students in this module's design. With 32% of registered students in LW380 Victimology in 2019/2020 (n=25), a series of restorative circles, followed by a design workshop, identified twenty student-proposed changes to the module, which I committed to implement before teaching it again. For our current purpose, it is notable that students provided suggestions regarding the type (e.g., add more podcasts to the reading lists) and design (e.g., fewer slides, less text) of teaching materials, but had no suggestions regarding the topics selected. This seemingly implies that participating students were not opposed to the materials and, indeed, most recommended maintaining and expanding the dialogic approach and the use of videos in class. I do not have the ethical approval to detail feedback from students in recent years, but it is notable that the written feedback from the past two years does not include any comment on the topics selected or their impact on learning. With these caveats, the article demonstrates how wartime examples can, at least, provide opportunities for students to think critically and reflect deeply on their assumptions.

Conclusion

It is highly likely that the vast majority of students who study victimology will never work in a specialist victim support role. Yet, there is a growing recognition that many professions interact with victims of crime in the course of their work (e.g., Browne-James et al., 2021; Nascimento et al., 2023). It is crucial to equip students to reflect on their biases, reserve judgment, and avoid stereotyping and labelling in circumstances where they might be able to support someone who needs their help.

More than this, it is a core role of universities generally, and of social scientific education in particular, to enhance students' capacity to analyse critically the information – including labels and statuses that the powerful assign the powerless – to which they are exposed. The purpose of drawing attention to Akallo's 'offending' and Ongwen's 'victimisation', for example, is not to lower sympathy for the former and increase it for the latter. Rather, it is to demonstrate that critical analysis extends beyond the level of sympathy one feels as a 'gut reaction', to assessing what informs our recognition or dismissal of another's victimisation. As Drake and Henley (2014, 141) argue:

> *Differentiating between 'victims' and 'offenders' elides consideration of more meaningful support for victims, worsens opportunities for the reintegration of ex-prisoners and constructs a false dichotomy between citizens who do not fall into mutually-exclusive categories.*

Societal reactions to acutely harmful human behaviours in war can be presented, assessed and deconstructed to enable crucial sociological, political, legal and philosophical questions to be raised. The end result, if this succeeds, should be more conscientious citizens who are equipped to think critically about these complexities when confronted with them later: when engaging with media and in social contexts (Howes, 2017), as well as electoral and professional settings (Tidmarsh, 2023). Criminologists who wish to demonstrate the responsibility of states and corporations for the most acute harms can do little better than to use wartime examples in modules that are not necessarily about international, state or corporate crime – as De Backer et al. (2023, 6) contend, the 'critical criminologist can ask who benefits from an armed conflict'. Such cases would permit us to include educational content on the responsibility of arms industries and the (post-)colonial context in which modern conflict occurs, as well as to put the social treatment of our contemporary 'folks devils' into perspective. I invite criminologists globally to spurn parochialism and consider using examples from around the world, including from conflict settings, to illustrate important concepts in our teaching.

Bibliography

Barrett, D. & Evans, M. (2015). *Three 'Jihadi brides' from London who travelled to Syria will not face terrorism charges if they return*. The Telegraph. https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/11461693/Sisters-of-the-missing-jihadi-brides-to-face-radicalisation-tests.html

Barton, A., Corteen, K., Davies, J. & Hobson, A. (2010). Reading the word and reading the world: The impact of a critical pedagogical approach to the teaching of criminology in higher education. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 21*(1), 24-41.

Berg, M. & Mulford, C. (2020). Reappraising and redirecting research on the victim-offender overlap. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse, 21*(1), 16-30.

Berg, M. & Schreck, C. (2022). The meaning of the victim-offender overlap for criminological theory and crime prevention policy. *Annual Review of Criminology*, 5, 277-297.

Bogani, F. (2017). *The trial of Dominic Ongwen: When is a child solider not a child soldier?* NATO Association of Canada. https://natoassociation.ca/the-trial-of-dominic-ongwen-when-is-a-child-soldier-not-a-child/

Bostaph, L., Brady, P. & Giacomazzi, A. (2014). Criminal justice education: Are we missing one-third of the crime triangle? *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 25*(4), 468-485.

Brown, A. (2021). *Who owns online lecture recordings?* Higher Education Policy Institute. https://www.hepi.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Who-owns-online-lecture-recordings.pdf

Browne-James, L., Litam, S. & McRae, L. (2021). Child sex trafficking: Strategies for identification, counselling and advocacy. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, 43, 113-125.

Child Soldiers International. (2019). *Should child soldiers be prosecuted for war crimes?* Child Soldiers International (website defunct at time of writing – last accessed 09/2019). https://ww16.child-soldiers.org/faqs/should-children-be-prosecuted-for-war-crimes?

Christie, N. (1986). The ideal victim. In: E. Fattah (Ed.), *From Crime Policy to Victim Policy* (pp. 17-30). Palgrave Macmillan.

Christie, N. (2004). *A Suitable Amount of Crime*. Routledge.

Corey, P. (2018). *The Socratic Method in today's university. In. L. Trepanier (Ed.), The Socratic Method Today: Student-Centred and Transformative Teaching in Political Science* (pp. 138-151). Routledge.

Daly, K. (2014). Reconceptualising sexual victimisation and justice. In I. Vanfraechem, A. Pemberton & F. Ndahinda (Eds.), *Justice for Victims: Perspectives on Rights, Transition and Reconciliation* (pp. 378-395). Routledge.

De Backer, M., Melgaço, L. & Volinz, L. (2023). War and criminology. *Criminological Encounters, 6*(1), 5-8.
Drake, D. & Henley, A. (2014). 'Victims' versus 'offenders' in British political discourse: The construction of a false dichotomy. *Howard Journal of Crime and Justice, 53*(2), 141-157.
Duggan, M. (2018). Conclusion. In: M. Duggan (Ed.), *Revisiting the 'Ideal Victim': Developments in Critical Victimology* (pp. 313-314). Policy Press.
Gadd, E. & Weedon, R. (2017). Copyright ownership of e-learning and teaching materials: policy approaches taken by UK universities. *Education and Information Technologies*, 22, 3231-3250.
George, A. (2014). Raymonde Provencher, director. *Grace, Milly, Lucy... Child Soldiers. African Studies Review, 57*(4), 267-270.
Gracia, J. (2018). Towards an inclusive victimology and a new understanding of public compassion to victims: From and beyond Christie's ideal victim. In: M. Duggan (Ed.), R*evisiting the 'Ideal Victim': Developments in Critical Victimology* (pp. 297-312). Policy Press.
Hamilton, C. (2013). Towards a pedagogy of public criminology. *Enhancing Learning in the Social Sciences, 5*(2), 20-31.
Ho, Y., Chen, B. & Li, C. (2023). Thinking more wisely: Using the Socratic Method to develop critical thinking skills amongst healthcare students. *BMC Medical Education*, 23, Article 173 (2023).
Holá, B. & Bouwknegt, T. (2019). Child soldiers in international courtrooms: Unqualified perpetrators, erratic witnesses and irreparable victims? In M. Drumbal & J. Barrett (Eds.), *Research Handbook on Child Soldiers* (pp. 350-373). Elgar.
Howes, L. (2017). Critical thinking in criminology: Critical reflections on learning and teaching. *Teaching in Higher Education, 22*(8), 891-907.
International Criminal Court. (2018). *ICC-02/04-01/15-T-179-Red-ENG WT 18-09-2018 1/101 GB T*. International Criminal Court. https://www.icc-cpi.int/sites/default/files/Transcripts/CR2018_05105.PDF
International Criminal Court. (2024). *Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (informal consolidated version)*. International Criminal Court. https://www.icc-cpi.int/sites/default/files/2024-05/Rome-Statute-eng.pdf
ITV News. (2019). *IS bride Shamima Begum insists she's not 'a threat' to the UK*. ITV News. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gau2TdG0oY4&ab_channel=ITVNews
Jaffer, N. (2015). *The secret world of ISIS brides: 'U dnt hav 2 pay 4 ANYTHING if u r wife of a martyr'*. The Guardian. https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/jun/24/isis-brides-secret-world-jihad-western-women-syria
Jennings, W., Higgins, G., Tewksbury, R., Gover, A. & Piquero, A. (2010). A longitudinal assessment of the victim-offender overlap. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25*(12), 2147-2174.
Loyd, A. (2019). *Shamima Begum: Bring me home, says Bethnal Green girl who left to join ISIS.* The Times. https://www.thetimes.com/uk/politics/article/shamima-begum-bring-me-home-says-bethnal-green-girl-who-fled-to-join-isis-hgvqw765d
Lynch, O. & Joyce, C. (2018). Functions of collective victimhood: Political violence and the case of the Troubles in Northern Ireland. *International Review of Victimology, 24*(2), 183-197.
Marder, I. (2024). Who is a victim of what? LW380 Victimology, BCL Law and Criminology, Maynooth University, four-part miniseries. Zenodo. https://zenodo.org/records/14471499
Marder, I., Vaugh, T., Kenny, C., Dempsey, S., Savage, E., Weiner, R., Duffy, K. & Hughes, G. (2022). Enabling student participation in course review and redesign: Piloting restorative practices and design thinking in an undergraduate criminology programme. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 33*(4), 526-547.
McDonnell, F. & Akallo, G. (2007). *Girl Soldier: A story of Hope for Northern Uganda's Children*. Chosen.
McGarry, R. & Walklate, S. (2015). *Victims: Trauma, Testimony and Justice*. Routledge.
McQueen, A. (2019). Falling through the gap: The culpability of child soldiers under international criminal law. *Notre Dame Law Review Online, 94*(2), 100-127.
Moore, J. (2024). "Law", "order", "justice", "crime": disrupting key concepts in criminology through the study of colonial history. In: F. Adebisi (Ed.), *Decolonisation and the Law School: Dreaming Beyond Aesthetic Changes to the Curriculum* (pp. 21-35). Routledge.
Moosavi, L. (2019). Decolonising criminology: Syed Hussein Alatas on crimes of the powerful. *Critical Criminology,* 27, 229-242.
Nascimento, C., de Oliveira, M., Vidigal, M., Inocencio, G., Vieira, W., Franco, A., Ferrerira, M. & Paranhos, L. (2023). Domestic violence against women detected and managed in a dental practice: A systematic review. *Journal of Family Violence*, 38, 149-160.
Palmer, D. (2020). *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Criminology*. Palgrave MacMillan.

Segalov, M. (2019). *Shamima Begum was groomed. She deserves the chance of rehabilitation*. The Guardian. https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2019/feb/14/shamima-begum-grooming-islamic-state-pregnant-uk

Sercombe, H., Stanley, C., Mundine, K. & Wolfenden, H. (2022). Decolonising the curriculum: Who is in the room? In: S. Young & K. Strudwick (Eds.), *Teaching Criminology and Criminal Justice: Challenges for Higher Education* (pp. 225-248). Palgrave MacMillan.

Sohoni, D. & Petrovic, M. (2010). Teaching a global sociology: Suggestions for globalizing the U.S. curriculum. *Teaching Sociology, 38*(4), 287-300.

Stagg, A. & Partridge, H. (2019). Facilitating open access to information: A community approach to open education and open textbooks. *Proceedings of the Association for Information Science Technology, 56*(1), 477-480.

Stockdale, K., Sweeney, R. & Dean, G. (2022). Exploring the criminology curriculum: Using the intersectionality matrix as a pedagogical tool to develop students' critical information literacy skills. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 33*(4), 567-585.

Sweeney, R. (2022). *Restorative justice in criminology? Critically examining the production, and exclusion, of restorative justice knowledge(s) within undergraduate criminology in England and Wales*. PhD Thesis, York St John University. https://ray.yorksj.ac.uk/id/eprint/8415/

Syal, R. (2024). *Shamima Begum: Supreme court refuses to hear UK citizenship appeal*. The Guardian. https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/article/2024/aug/07/shamima-begum-supreme-court-refuses-hear-citizenship-appeal

Tidmarsh, M. (2023). A pedagogy of 'public criminology' as a counter to marginality? Lessons for community sanctions and measures from the Pedagogy of the Oppressed. *Probation Journal, 70*(2), 179-198.

Trotter, H. & Hodgkinson-Williams, C. (2020). Open Educational Resources and Practices in the Global South: Degrees of social inclusion. In: M. Smith & R. Seward (Eds.), *Making Open Development Inclusive: Lessons from IDRC Research* (pp. 317-356). MIT Press.

UNICEF. (2007). *The Paris Principles: Principles and Guidelines on Children Associated with Armed Force or Armed Groups*. UNICEF.

UNICEF. (2013). *To the grave and back*. UNICEF. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=esT0y1fgjhQ&ab_channel=UNICEF

van Wijk, J. (2013). Who is the 'little old lady' of international crimes? Nils Christie's concept of the ideal victim reinterpreted. *International Review of Victimology, 19*(2), 159-179.

Wenger, E. (2015). *Communities of Practice: A brief introduction*. University of Oregon. https://scholarsbank.uoregon.edu/server/api/core/bitstreams/d1fddebc-8756-4647-9aef-80046f02df59/content

Wiley, D. & Hilton, J. (2018). Defining OER-enables pedagogy. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning, 19*(4), 134-147.

Young, S. & Strudwick, K. (2022). *Teaching Criminology and Criminal Justice: Challenges for Higher Education*. Palgrave MacMillan.

Ian Marder is an Associate Professor in Criminology at Maynooth University School of Law and Criminology in Ireland. His main areas of research and teaching are in restorative justice and restorative practices. He teaches victimology and works with victim services, including as a Director of Victim Support at Court.

How to cite this article (APA– 7th ed.):

Marder, I. (2025). Who is a victim of what? Societal reactions to harms caused and experienced by children in war as teaching materials for critical victimology. *Criminological Encounters.* 7(1). 142-152. https://doi.org/10.26395/CE.2025.1.11

© The author(s), 2025 | Licensed under Creative Commons CC BY-NC-ND 4.0.