Economics, Law, and Institutions in Asia Pacific

Masayuki Murayama

The Japanese Legal Profession in Transition

Springer

Economics, Law, and Institutions in Asia Pacific

The Asia Pacific region is expected to steadily enhance its economic and political presence in the world during the twenty-first century. At the same time, many serious economic and political issues remain unresolved in the region. To further academic enquiry and enhance readers' understanding about this vibrant region, the present series, Economics, Law, and Institutions in Asia Pacific, aims to present cutting-edge research on the Asia Pacific region and its relationship with the rest of the world. For countries in this region to achieve robust economic growth, it is of foremost importance that they improve the quality of their markets, as history shows that healthy economic growth cannot be achieved without high-quality markets. High-quality markets can be established and maintained only under a well-designed set of rules and laws, without which competition will not flourish. Based on these principles, this series places a special focus on economic, business, legal, and institutional issues geared towards the healthy development of Asia Pacific markets. The series considers book proposals for scientific research, either theoretical or empirical, that is related to the theme of improving market quality and has policy implications for the Asia Pacific region. The types of books that will be considered for publication include research monographs as well as relevant proceedings. The series show-cases work by Asia-Pacific based researchers but also encourages the work of social scientists not limited to the Asia Pacific region. Each proposal and final manuscript is subject to evaluation by the editorial board and experts in the field.

All books and chapters in the Economics, Law and Institutions in Asia Pacific book series are indexed in Scopus.

Masayuki Murayama
Editor

The Japanese Legal Profession in Transition

Springer

Editor
Masayuki Murayama
Organization for the Strategic
Coordination of Research
and Intellectual Properties, Institute
of Law and Social Sciences
Meiji University
Tokyo, Japan

ISSN 2199-8620 ISSN 2199-8639 (electronic)
Economics, Law, and Institutions in Asia Pacific
ISBN 978-981-97-2691-2 ISBN 978-981-97-2692-9 (eBook)
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-97-2692-9

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd.
The registered company address is: 152 Beach Road, #21-01/04 Gateway East, Singapore 189721, Singapore

Preface

This book is about the Japanese legal profession, its changes and its present situation. The Justice System Reform (JSR) from 2001 to 2004 was a very broad ambitious reform of the Japanese legal system to change the 'shape of the country'. It introduced lay assessors to sit with professional judges in criminal trials and made the rights of the accused more substantial by extending public defense to suspects. The JSR also tried significantly to improve access to justice by establishing the Japan Legal Support Center. The cornerstone of the JSR, however, is the large increase of legal professionals, particularly private attorneys. The JSR Council envisioned "to transform the spirit of the law and the rule of law into the 'flesh and blood' of Japan". Activities of a large number of lawyers would provide 'blood' to circulate in 'the flesh'. Without sufficient flow of 'blood', 'the flesh' would not be kept alive. Our research reported in this book is a present diagnosis of the 'blood' and its flow.

The significance of the JSR would not be well understood unless its vision is put in a wider historical perspective. In the process of modernization, the Japanese court system had developed a judicial infrastructure which produced 'small justice'. It was a product in which all the concerned found shared interests, though the meanings of shared interests were different among the concerned. As the judicial infrastructure was deeply rooted in the social, economic and political interests of the concerned, it would not be easy to change, in either a profound or even superficial way. However, we consider that the JSR has had certain significant impact on the Japanese legal system. What we need to do at this stage is to understand to what extent the JSR has achieved its vision and to recognize the conditions under which the JSR succeeded or failed. Focusing on the legal profession, we try to do this in this book.

Though the vision of the JSR seemed to be far-reaching 20 years ago, most of its plans have been implemented if not entirely as envisioned. One significant setback arose in its plan to sharply increase the number of lawyers in comparatively short time, in combination with the introduction of new post-graduate law schools styled on US models into Japanese law faculties with their pre-existing civil law mindset. The resulting challenge met resistance among professors, leaving doubt about just

how much remained of that old way of thinking, including the substance and procedures of the Japanese bar examination. Notwithstanding, this new law school system has itself survived, despite significant elements of the old training system for legal professionals having been revived in the process. Additionally, as this book shows, the JSR has irreversibly changed the world of legal professionals, particularly attorneys, even if not as much as envisioned by the JSR Council, and lays the groundwork for still further change.

This book resulted from our collaboration for 7 years. I organized our research project in 2017 with five researchers, Shozo Ota, Isamu Sugino, Takayuki Ii, Kyoko Ishida, and Daisuke Mori, four of whom contributed to the book. Daniel H. Foote joined us from the second year and brought his rich knowledge of both the U.S. and Japanese systems to our discussion. Dan also read a part of the manuscript and gave us valuable comments as native researcher. We are grateful for his additional assistance. In the final year of the project, Hiroyuki Kabashima joined us and we benefited from his point of view as a legal practitioner.

I began to conduct research on the legal profession in the late 1980s. The topic was criminal defense work in the context of general legal practice. Since then, I have maintained my interest in the legal profession. I particularly benefited from joining the International Sociological Association Research Committee on Sociology of Law (ISA-RCSL), Working Group for Comparative Studies of Legal Professions. I first attended the RCSL annual meeting, organized by Vincenzo Ferrari, in Bologna, Italy, in 1988. I was a regular participant of the Working Group meeting from 1996 and learned a lot from lively discussions in intimate settings.

Since I began to work on the legal profession, I benefitted from reading many books and papers on legal professionals, only a part of which we could cite in this book. Many people also helped me to conduct research in Japan, the U.S., the U.K. and France. I thank Richard Abel, Benoit Bastard, Anne Boigeol, Antoine Garapon, Herbert Kritzer, Mavis Maclean, Heinrich Menkhaus, Kahei Rokumoto, Harry Scheiber, and Jean Van Houtte. My special thanks go to Susan Reid who read a substantial part of the book and gave us invaluable native comments.

Our research was made possible by funding from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science Grant-in-Aid Scientific Research (A) (17H00964), Minji Hunso Shori Kenkyu Kikin (The Foundation for Research in Civil Dispute Resolution), Japan Law Foundation, and Shiho Kyokai. We are grateful for their generous support. Finally, and most of all, we are deeply grateful to all the questionnaire respondents and interviewees for sharing their experiences with us.

I am grateful to Juno Kawakami who provided editing assistance from the inception of this project. I am also grateful to Michael House for his native editing.

I thank Yoshie for making all projects of our life possible.

Tokyo, Japan
November 2023

Masayuki Murayama

Introduction

In Japan, as in other parts of the world, it is necessary to pass the bar examination to become a judge, prosecutor, or attorney at law (*bengoshi*; hereinafter also "lawyer").[1] An increase in the number of bar examination passers in Japan, implemented in 2006 as a part of the Justice System Reform (JSR), resulted in a large increase in the number of lawyers, and their world has been changing as a result of this increase and other developments. For decades, the annual number of bar examination passers had remained around 500, though it was increased a little in the 1990s. As a result, the lawyer population was small. As of 1990 there were only 13,800 lawyers in Japan. Even after the modest increases in the 1990's, the number remained at 17,126 in 2000. The Justice System Reform Council (JSRC), which was established in 1999 and issued its final report in 2001, recommended to increase the annual number of bar exam passers to 3000 by 2010 and to bring the size of the lawyer population to 50,000. Due to the resistance of the Japan Federation of Bar Associations (JFBA) and its constituent bar associations, this recommendation was not fully realized. Yet, following the introduction of a new system of law schools in 2004 and a new bar exam system in 2006, the annual number of passers increased to more than 2000 in 2007. In the face of strong resistance by the bar, the number of passers subsequently declined, but it has remained at about the 1500 level. This has resulted in the increase of the lawyer population from 23,119 in 2007 to 44,101 in 2022, a 91% increase over those 15 years.

This was not the first time in Japan that the lawyer population increased and lawyers objected to it. The profession of lawyers was born in the process of importing the French legal system soon after the Meiji Restoration in 1867. The Meiji government tried to transplant the French law and French judicial system into Japan, and created two professions, advocate (*daigen-nin*), for representation in court, and scrivener (*daisho-nin*), for preparing documents for submission to the court. Initially, no formal qualification was required to become an advocate, but this

[1] While judges and prosecutors are also included under the heading of "legal professionals" in Japan, only attorneys are members of bar associations.

changed in 1876 when advocates were required to pass a qualifying examination. From this point, the professional project of advocates[2] began.

Although only advocates were allowed in principle to represent a party in court, there were exceptions. When an advocate was not available and a party could not attend, a party's close family member could represent a party, and when a close family member was not available, a proxy with a seal of recognition of a head of ward or district[3] could represent a party (Hashimoto, 2005, p. 191). People without a license to practice as advocate took advantage of this exception and represented parties in many cases.[4] The Code of Civil Procedure (Act No.29 of 1890) also recognized a wide range of exceptions. At the District Court, when a lawyer[5] was not available, a litigant's family member or employee could represent a litigant and, when none of these existed, anyone that had the capacity to sue or be sued could represent a litigant. At the Summary Court, even when a lawyer was available, a litigant's family member or employee could represent a litigant. In 1893, the Attorneys Act was passed, changing the official name of advocates (*daigen-nin*) to lawyers (*bengoshi*), but it did not prohibit representation in court by people without license. Non-lawyers' representation in court seemed to continue until around 1900 (Hayshi, 2009, p. 641).[6]

As the Attorneys Act had no provision concerning legal practice outside of litigation, people without license continued to work outside of litigation side by side with lawyers even after non-licensees were driven out of litigation. These people were more easily accessible for local people and helped them to solve disputes. They also provided legal services, including legal consultation, and played the role of an intermediary to bring clients to lawyers. As the Attorneys Act allowed lawyers to establish branch offices, lawyers often left management of branch offices to those people without license. Therefore, lawyers and people without license did not always have conflicting interests and the widespread legal practice without license indicates that lawyers could not provide enough legal services to satisfy legal needs among local people (Hashimoto, 2005, pp. 36–40; Misaka, 2011).

---

[2] Larson argued that an occupation tried to become a profession by achieving its market monopoly and upgrading its social status, which she called a 'professional project' (Larson, 1977, p.104). The professional project of the legal profession seeks to establish control over production of legal service and the number of people permitted to provide legal services (Abel, 1988, pp.186–187).

[3] In terms of administrative jurisdiction, a prefecture consisted of districts and a district consisted of wards.

[4] It is not known how many of such people represented litigants, but recent studies revealed that people without a license worked for litigation in areas studied, such as Shizuoka, Kyoto and Shiga (Hashimoto, 2005, pp. 193–195; Misaka, 2017, pp. 317–335).

[5] The Code of Civil Procedure includes the term "*bengoshi*" (lawyer), indicating that the word was in common usage prior to its enactment, despite the job title not yet having been officially changed from advocate to lawyer.

[6] Representation in court by people without license began as proxy's representation. Hayashi considers that this practice of representation by people without license ceased after the Rules of Proxy (Dajokan Ordinance No.215 of 1873) was abolished in 1898.

The bar examination for advocates and later for lawyers was conducted separately from the examination for judges and public prosecutors. Over the 17 years from 1876 to 1892, 2084 persons passed the advocates exam, an average of 123 advocates per year.[7] The bar exam for lawyers was more competitive, as the pass rate was very small, 5% from 1897 to 1908. The total number of bar exam passers was only 1801, an average of just 65 persons per year over 27 years from 1894 to 1921. The examination for judges and prosecutors and the examination for lawyers were combined in 1923. In 1922, the year before they were combined, 1104 persons had passed the bar examination.[8] Thereafter, from 1923, the annual number of passers of the combined judicial and bar examination remained in the 200 to 400 person range,[9] and this led to a steady increase in the lawyer population.[10] It is apparent that the Ministry of Justice which controlled the entry of persons into the legal profession felt that increasing demand would justify the increase of lawyers, noticing that a large number of people without the professional license in fact provided legal services outside of litigation.[11] The growth of the Japanese economy, particularly after the First World War, and new settlement procedures such as conciliation increased demand for legal work outside of litigation (Hayashi, 2009, p. 642). The Ministry of Justice and some lawyers considered the possibility of establishing a new profession like solicitor, but outcries among lawyers against people without license prevailed.[12] The Attorneys Act (Act No.53 of 1933), which was amended in 1933, expanded the scope of lawyer's work from legal services concerning litigation

[7] Calculated from the table in Appendix G, Spaulding, 1967, p. 346.

[8] As we just saw, the bar examination was very competitive. It seemed that the new combined examination for judges, prosecutors and private attorneys was expected to be more difficult than the bar examination and, in 1922, just before the introduction of the combined examination, an unusually large number of applicants passed the bar examination. Hashimoto considered that the Ministry of Justice intentionally increased the number of bar exam passers to satisfy increasing legal needs during the period from 1913 to 1922.

[9] Each year 100 or so among the passers were appointed to be judges or prosecutors and the rest became private attorneys (Spaulding, 1967, pp. 347–348). Even though the new combined examination had started, a special bar examination was conducted, from 1923 to 1941, for people who had applied for the bar examination before 1923 in order to "rescue the applicants to the bar examination for lawyers" (Ohno, 1970, p. 92). This special examination might have been believed to be the cause for the increase in the number of lawyers. But the statistics show that the combined examination passers were more responsible for the increase (Spaulding, 1967, pp. 347–348).

[10] A lawyer complained that the lawyer population increased from 3300 in 1921 to 5900 in 1926, which he called about a 90 percent increase (in fact 79 percent) even though these were years of economic depression (Tasaka, 1929, p. 5). Members of the bar also demanded that the annual number of passers of the combined examination should be reduced and that more judges should be appointed so as to increase the number of litigation cases (Tasaka, 1929, p. 5; 1930, pp. -2–3).

[11] Lawyers estimated that there were 20,000 persons working without license in Tokyo and 50,000 nationwide (Tasaka, 1930, p. 47).

[12] Complaints of insufficient income or even impoverishment and blaming non-lawyers and the excessive number of lawyers appeared in journals (Tasaka, 1929, pp. 11–16), though some lawyers argued that the large number of non-lawyers working without license indicated that the lawyer population was not large enough (Masumoto, 1930, pp. 90–96).

to legal services in general. It prohibited lawyers from having more than one office. Additionally, in 1933, legislation entitled the Act to Supervise Dealing with Legal Practice (Act No.54 of 1933) excluded people without license from all law- related work.[13] In this way, Japanese lawyers achieved their professional project for the control of their "product", legal services (Abel 1988, p. 186). This also marked the establishment of "the small justice system"[14] which continued to exist throughout the twentieth century in Japan.

A substantially revised Attorneys Act (Act No.205 of 1949) was enacted pursuant to a proposal by Diet members with GHQ[15] support, in 1949. Article 72 of the Act prohibits non-attorneys from providing legal services. Lawyers who had vivid memories of the pre-war situation of "excessive lawyer population"(Tasaka 1929, 11) opposed increasing the number of lawyers, and any significant reform was not possible without the agreement of the so-called "three branches" of the legal profession: The Supreme Court (SC), for judges; the Ministry of Justice (MOJ), for prosecutors; and the JFBA, for lawyers. Thus, the Japanese bar succeeded in controlling

[13] As law-related work increased after WWI, lawyers who were members of the Imperial Diet worked to establish new occupations for law-related work by legislation: Judicial scrivener in 1919, patent lawyer in 1921 and public accountant in 1927. Each of these occupations could do only a narrowly defined area of work, while lawyers could do all areas of the work. Thus, lawyers were ranked at the top of the law-related professions (Hayashi, 2009, pp. 643–646).

[14] Sato Koji who would later become Chair of the JSRC characterized the traditional Japanese Justice system as 'small justice' which had remained from the pre-war period under the Meiji Constitution (Iimuro et al., 1999, p. 44). "Small justice" meant, above all, the small role of the court system in governing society. The Meiji state was a development-focused administrative state. Under the Meiji Constitution, constitutional rights could be and were circumscribed by statutes. The law was used as the instrument of governance to develop industry and keep public order. The state tried to constrain claims based on legal rights and to limit the scope of litigation by setting up conciliation procedures in civil justice conducted at the courts. The whole court system was a branch of the Ministry of Justice and the judicial power was represented by the Ministry of Justice, a Ministry of the Executive Power (Mitani, 2001, p. 48). As the prosecutors' political influence increased after 1905, judicial independence began to include prosecutors. The Penal Code (Act No.45 of 1907) gave wide discretion to indictment, sentencing and implementation of sentence, helping the judiciary to be politicized (Mitani, 2001, pp. 61–62). For the part of the court system that mostly dealt with 'ordinary people', reduction of the cost of legal services was sought. For instance, in 1913, the government expanded the subject matter jurisdiction of Summary Court and drastically reduced the number of the Summary Courts by abolishing more than 130 Summary Courts (about 40 percent of them) nationwide. This made access to the court more difficult for local people and intensified their dependence upon people without license (Hashimoto, 2005, pp. 244–245). 'Small justice' is the product of the confluence of interests among the three branches of the legal profession (judges, prosecutors, and attorneys), whose interests happened to overlap. The state wanted to minimize the cost of the courts and the lawyers wanted to control legal services and the number of lawyers who provided legal services. Official conciliation procedures and the Penal Code continued to exist after the second World War. On the development of conciliation in Japan, see Murayama, 2000, and on discretion in criminal justice in Japan, see, Murayama, 1992. The structure of criminal justice process in 1920 resembled that in 1985 with a wide exercise of discretion and a very high conviction rate (Murayama, 1998, pp. 30–35)

[15] General Headquarters of the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers. The occupation of Japan by the Allied Powers continued until 1952.

the market by excluding non-lawyers and also by suppressing the number of bar examination passers.

The increase of the lawyer population in the twenty-first Century is, in a sense, remarkable, as it was started in the face of professional control of the legal market by lawyers, although the JFBA could not ignore the changing environment for their legal practice.[16] Yet, as was the case around 1930, the sharp increase of the lawyer population from 2007 incurred outcries against the "excessive increase in the number of lawyers". As has been the case ever since reform to the legal training system shortly after the second World War, bar exam passers must complete training at the Legal Training and Research Institute (LTRI) before working as legal professionals, but it was publicized on mass media that some graduates of the LTRI could not find jobs[17] and that lawyers began to engage in instances of malfeasance or other misdeeds because of excessive competition.[18] Local bar associations began to demand the decrease of bar exam passers[19] and, in 2011, the JFBA changed the policy from supporting the JSRC recommendation, to decreasing the number of bar exam passers, although the JFBA did not immediately specify the reduced number of bar exam passers. (JFBA, 2011a).[20]

Because of this backlash against the planned increase in bar exam passers, the number never reached the 3000 figure announced by the JSRC. Neither did it ever come back to the previous low number of 500, and the total number of lawyers has been growing steadily, if not so rapidly as planned.

[16] Under the mounting political pressures for deregulation, there was a long process toward the Justice System Reform (Murayama: 2020, pp. 751–757). There was an expression, "20 percent justice", which meant that the Japanese courts handled only 20 percent of all the legal problems that should have been dealt by the courts. The JFBA president from 1990 to 1992 criticized this small capacity of the judiciary and argued for increasing the number of bar exam passers (Iimuro et al., 1999, p. 47). He had become well known after representing consumers in a toxic powdered milk case and a fraudulent gold trade case. On the dark side of the small capacity of the judiciary, see, Milhaupt and West, 2000.

[17] Most LTRI graduates used to enter employment at law firms after completing the LTRI training. During this period, some graduates could not find employment at law firms, as we will see in Chap. 1. When the number of bar exam passers was restrained to 500, success in the bar examination almost guaranteed lifetime income. On the financial aspect of this situation, see Nakazato et al., 2006.

[18] The JFBA began to announce record high numbers of disciplinary dispositions against lawyers' misconduct. In 2007, the number of disciplinary dispositions increased to 70 cases for the first time and further increased to 98 in 2013 and 101 in 2014. A newspaper article wrote that the period of increase overlapped that of increasing number of bar exam passers, implying the causal relation between the two (Asahi, 2015).

[19] For instance, the Tokyo Bar Association sent its opinion on the Population Problem of Legal Professionals to the JFBA, arguing that the JSRC policy of increasing the number of bar exam passers to 3000 by 2010 was too hasty and that it would be appropriate to consider setting the number of passers within the range from 2100 to 2500 (Tokyo Bar Association, 2009).

[20] The following year the JFBA proposed reducing the number of bar exam passers to 1500 (JFBA, 2012a).

The increase of the lawyer population in the twenty-first century has already caused structural changes in the Japanese legal profession: stratification in terms of income and prestige and diversification of legal practice.

Business law firms handling international transactions and finance were small until the 1990s, but now five law firms, the so-called Big Five, have grown to have 500 to 600 lawyers each.[21] As of 2022, there were 11 law firms with more than 100 lawyers and the number of lawyers at those law firms comprised 9% of all the lawyers in Japan (JFBA 2022a, pp. 53–54). As this reflects, the large business law firms have become conspicuous.

The increase in the lawyer population also brought competition into legal practice not only for corporate clients but also for individual clients. In the past, Japanese lawyers did not like to take cases of clients without a personal introduction. According to a JFBA survey in 2000, the respondents had some kind of introduction or had prior consultation with the lawyer in 92% of cases (JFBA Bengoshi Gyomu Kaikaku Iinkai 2002a, p.77). But the practice of relying on personal introductions to obtain clients has been gradually changing in the case of individual clients. In the early 2000's law firms began to advertise their practice for consumer loan cases on TV, and since then law firms have begun actively to advertise on the Internet their practices handling divorce, traffic accidents, compensation for hepatitis B, and criminal defense as well as consumer loans. These advertisements clearly assume that general members of the public are consumers of the firms' legal services. The report of a JFBA survey conducted in 2010 indicated that the use of advertisements significantly increased the percentage of new clients without introduction (JFBA 2011b, p. 101).

As more people seek information on the Internet, an increasing number of lawyers have created home pages for their offices. In 2005, a lawyer who had worked at one of the Big Five law firms set up a venture business managing a portal site for potential clients to search for lawyers, Bengoshi Dot Com. The company grew rapidly, and was listed on the Tokyo Stock Exchange Mothers in 2014. It now boasts having over 20,000 lawyer members (Bengoshi Dot Com 2023). Bengoshi Dot Com not only provides information for member lawyers but also helps them create their own home pages on the Internet. Bengoshi Dot Com also created a free legal advice page, called "legal consultation for everybody", where any person can write in a legal question, to which any lawyer, as a volunteer, can give a legal answer free of charge. In this way, lawyers can make their name more visible among visitors to the website. Since Bengoshi Dot Com had to be careful not to violate the Attorneys Act, they provided their service on the website free of charge in the early years. Now they charge a membership fee for member lawyers (Motoe, Uesaka 2015, p. 1, pp. 76–77, pp. 101–105, p. 127).

As more people searched for information on lawyers on the Internet, lawyers began to advertise particular fields as their strength, virtually indicating it as a

[21] Initially there were four large firms, the so-called Big Four: Nishimura Asahi, Anderson Mori Tomotsune, Nagashima Ono Tunematsu, and Mori Hamada Matsumoto. TMI caught up them later, resulting in the current Big Five.

specialized field on their home pages.[22] It is now common that most lawyers mention particular fields of law as their frequent practice.

The public view of the role of lawyers is also changing. In the twentieth century, both lawyers and the general public viewed the role of a lawyer to be a litigator. People went to see a lawyer when they considered litigation.[23] That narrow view is gone. When people have some problem or dispute, they go to meet lawyers, not always thinking about suing others.

This book focuses on the structural changes of the Japanese legal profession and their consequences by relying on, mainly, our research data on careers of individual lawyers from 1950 to 2019.[24] We also rely on interview data with lawyers[25] as well as statistics compiled by the JFBA, SC and MOJ.

In Chap. 1, Stratification and Diversification in the Japanese legal profession, Masayuki Murayama looks at the changing landscape for private attorneys and their practice. The rapid increase of the lawyer population in the twenty-first century has had a significant impact on legal practice at law firms, and it has also allowed lawyers move to other sectors such as in-house positions and public offices. Among law firms, there appeared the Big Five firms for business clients and "mass process" law firms for individual clients. General practice has been getting more focused and traffic accidents and divorce matters have become the major sources of income for many lawyers. The budget for legal aid and public criminal defense was increased and came to represent a significant source of income for some young lawyers. Legal practice at law firms has changed from a profession largely aloof from common people to more general legal service providers. The increase in lawyer population also significantly increased the number of in-house lawyers. Along with the rise in business law firms, law departments of corporations have been expanding in the business law field. Lawyers from law firms also have begun to take leave from their firms to work at national ministries on fixed term appointments. Lawyers also have begun to work as part-time judges for civil and family cases on fixed term appointments.

The following chapters analyse select themes more intensively. Chapter 2, Number of Lawyers and Lawyer Career Mobility in Japan, looks at how professional mobility has changed. Shozo Ota analyses annual changes in individual lawyer's mobility since qualification as a legal professional, and also changes of

[22] Most lawyers do not use the term "specialized field", as the JFBA recommends against it. This is because there is no institutional guarantee on specialization.

[23] "Proposal to go out to activities out of court has been repeated since the Meiji period, yet lawyers of our country stayed in court-centered activities…. Even today, representation or defense at the court is at the center of activities in legal practice" (Kawabata, 1981, p. 14).

[24] For the survey and data, see Appendix A. The questionnaire is in Appendix B.

[25] Nineteen interviews were conducted during the period from June 2017 to August 2018. Two additional interviews were conducted in August 2023. Three interviews among the nineteen were conducted by Daniel H. Foote and Masayuki Murayama together, and one interview was conducted by Daisuke Mori. Others were conducted by Masayuki Murayama. Only the month and year are shown for each interview to avoid identification of an interviewee.

mobility for a 10-year term since qualification as a legal professional. These analyses indicate that the mobility among lawyers began to increase in the middle of the 1990s when the number of legal professionals registered at the JFBA exceeded 500 for the first time since 1974. This finding indicates that the current level of annual increase in the number of lawyers will maintain such mobility among lawyers in future.

Income is often the most important element for any occupation, and that is particularly the case with the legal profession, as high income often comes together with high social prestige. It was long believed that once having passed the bar exam, life-time good income was guaranteed. In Chap. 3, Work History Factors Affecting Lawyers' Incomes: Firm Size, Clientele, and Legal Apprenticeship Cohort, Isamu Sugino considers whether and to what extent such factors as sector of practice, clientele, office management style, law school graduation, gender, years of practice, etc. affected income, relying on multiple regression and longitudinal analyses. He finds the larger the firm size and the longer the years of service, the higher the income. But this is not the case with women lawyers. He also finds that recently qualified lawyers earn less than experienced lawyers.

Kyoko Ishida examines characteristics of women lawyers' careers in Chap. 4, Japanese Lawyers' Career Through the Lens of Gender. She finds that though income disparity between men and women lawyers has persisted, it is less in the younger generation. For women lawyers, their salaries reduced often between the first and second law firms. This was not the case for men lawyers. She does not find such a gender disparity among in-house lawyers, however. She predicts that, as work-life balance was chosen by many women for a reason for changing jobs, many women lawyers will move to in-house positions.

It has been often said that graduation from a best law school opens a way to a job at a top law firm. Daisuke Mori tests whether this prediction is a valid one in Chap. 5, The Relationship between Education Institutions and Legal Careers. He compares the periods before and after the establishment of the law school system. He finds that, regarding the number of lawyers at their first law firm, both within-school and between-school inequalities widened after the establishment of the law school system. Moreover, between-school inequalities considerably widened between the first 5 years and the second 5 years in the period after the establishment of the law school system.

In the concluding chapter, From Professionalism to Consumerism, we summarize our findings and see how the latest backlash has affected the JSR. Competition and stratification that the JSR brought about undoubtedly triggered the backlash. However, despite the negative campaigns, the public image of lawyers has improved, and people now look for lawyers as legal service providers for all. Although lawyers are deeply divided with their different occupational interests anchoring in different groups of clients, it is probable that the JFBA will still be able to influence the number of lawyers in the future.

Tokyo, Japan Masayuki Murayama

References

Abel R (1988) United States: The Contradictions of Professionalism. In Abel R, Lewis P, eds., Lawyers in Society: The Common Law World, University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London.

Asahi (Asahi Shinbun) (Asahi News) (2015) Bengoshi Chokai Saita 101ken Azukarikin Ryuyo Medatsu Sakunen (Record High 101 Lawyers Disciplined Chiefly for Misappropriation of client funds in 2014), February 21, morning ed., 37.

Bengoshi Dot Com (2023) https://www.bengo4.com/lawyer/service_plan/?utm_source=google&utm_medium=cpc&utm_campaign=brand&gad=1&gclid=Cj0KCQjwvL-oBhCxARIsAHkOiu2yoeoDsZFqd-HANNI1JZ1gepQtxzvQ305pyCQ3sbMMlx1zCig-2yMaAvU5EALw_wcB. Retrieved September 23, 2023.

Hahimoto S (2005) Zaiya "Hoso" to Chiiki Shakai (How Working "Legal Professionals" Interact with Their Communities), Horitsubunkasha, Kyoto.

Hayashi M (2009) Nihon ni okeru Hoh Senmonshoku no Kakuritsu—Shokuiki no Keisei to sono Dokusen (Establishment of the Legal Profession in Japan: Formation of Professional Work and Its Monopolization) , Suzuki H, Takatani C, Hayashi M, Yashiki J, eds., Hoh no Ryuhtsuh (Circulation of Law), Jigakusha, Tokyo, pp 639-665.

Iimuro K, Nakabo K, Yasuoka O, Sato K, Horino O, 21 Seiki no Shiho wo Kataru, Jiyu to Seigi 50(1): 42-69.

JFBA (Japan Federation of Bar Associations) (Nihon Bengoshi Rengokai) (2011a) Urgent Recommendations on Policies for the Number of Legal Professionals, March 27. https://www.nichibenren.or.jp/en/document/opinionpapers/220317.html. Retrieved September 16, 2023.

------ (2011b) Bengoshi Gyomu no Keizaiteki Kiban ni kansuru Jittai Chosa Hokokusho (Survey Report on the Economic Basis of Legal Practice), Jiyu to Seigi, 62 (6).

------ (2012a) Hohsoh Jinkoh Seisaku ni kansuru Teigen (Proposal Concerning Policy on Numbers of Legal Professionals)," March 15, 2012. https://www.nichibenren.or.jp/library/ja/opinion/report/data/2012/opinion_120315.pdf. Retrieved August 29, 2023.

------ (2022a) Bengoshi Hakusho (White Paper on Attorneys), Nihonbengoshirengokai, Tokyo

JFBA Bengoshi Gyomu Kaikaku Iinkai (JFBA Committee for Reforming Lawyers' Practice) (2002a) Nihon no Horitsu Jimusho 2000—Bengoshi Gyomu no Keizaiteki Kiban ni kansuru Jittai Chosa Hokokusho (Law Firms in Japan in 2000: Survey Report on the Economic Basis of Legal Practice), Jiyu to Seigi, 53 (13).

Kawabata, K. (1981) Shokugyo tosite mita Bengoshigyo—Bengoshi Service no Juyo to Kyokyu no Doko (Lawyering Seen as an Occupation: Changes in Need and Provision of Legal Services), Horitsu Jiho 53 (2): 13–22.

Larson, M. (1977) The Rise of Professionlism: A Sociological Analysis, University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London.
Masumoto, S. (1930) "Bengoshi ha hatashite kajoka? (Are There Really Too Many Lawyers?), "Hohsoh Kohron, 34 (2): 90–96.
Milhaupt C, West M (2000) The Dark Side of Private Ordering: An Institutional and Empirical Analysis of Organized Crime, The University of Chicago Law Review, 67: 41-98.
Misaka Y (2017) Kindai Nihon ni okeru "Zendan no Shiho" to sono Ninaite—1880 Nendai Shigaken Hikone Chiiki no Minji Hanketsu Genpon ni arawareta Daigennin to Dainin wo Sozai to shite ("Prior Stage for Justice" and People Who Worked There in Modern Japan: Based on Advocates and Proxies Who Appeared in Civil Judgment in the Hikone District of Shiga Prefecture in the 1880s). In Nakamura K, Kiriyama T, Yamamoto K, eds., Shakai Henkaku to Shakai Kagaku—Jidai to Taiji suru Shiso to Jissen (Social Transformation and Social Science: Thought and Practice Confronting the Times in Which We Live), Showado, Kyoto.
Mitani T (2001) Seiji Seido toshiteno Baishinsei: Kindai Nihon no Shihoken to Seiji (Jury System as a Political Institution: Judicial Power and Politics in Modern Japan), The University of Tokyo Press, Tokyo.
Motoe T, Uesaka T (2015) Bengoshi Dotto Komu: Komatteiru Hito wo Sukuu Bokutachi no Chosen (Bengoshi Dot Com: Our Challenge to Save People in Trouble), Nikkei BP, Tokyo.
Murayama M (1992) Postwar Trends in the Administration of Japanese Criminal Justice: Lenient but Intolerant or Something Else? J Japan-Netherlands Institute, 4: 221–246.
------ (1998) Nihongata Keiji Shiho Katei no Tokucho (Characteristics of Japanese Criminal Justice Proceedure). In Shibahara K, Nishida N, Inoue M (eds), Matsuo Koya Sensei Kokishukuga Ronbunshu (Festschrift for 70th Birthday of Professor Koya Matsuo), Gekan (Vol. 2), Yuhikaku, Tokyo, pp. 25–46.
------ (2010) The Origins and Development of Family Conciliation in Japan: A Political Aspect, Journal of Social Welfare & Family Law, 32 (2): 143–153.
------ (2020) Japan: Toward Stratification, Diversification and Specialization. In Abel R, Hammerslev O, Sommerlad H, Schultz U, Lawyers in 21st-Century Societies, Volume 1: National Reports, Hart Publishing, Oxford, New York, pp. 753–774.
Nakazato M, Ramseyer J, Rasmusen E (2006) The Industrial Organization of the Japanese Bar: Levels and Determinants of Attorney Incomes, Discussion Paper No. 559, Harvard Law School.
Ohno M (1970) Shokugyo Shi toshiteno Bengoshi oyobi Bengosikai no Rekishi (History of Lawyers and Bar Associations as an Occupational History). In Ohno M, ed., Gendai no Bengoshi (The Contemporary Lawyer). Vol. 2: Bengoshi no Dantai (Associations of Lawyers), Nihon Hyoronsha, Tokyo, pp. 1–116.
Spaulding, R (1967) Imperial Japan's Higher Civil Service Examinations, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Tasaka S (1929-30) Shakai Mondai to shiteno Bengosshi no Seikatu oyobi sono Taisaku (Life of Lawyers as a Social Problem and Countermeasures for Same), Hohsoh Kohron, 33 (10): 2–18; 33 (11): 2–16.
Tokyo Bar Association (2009) Hoso Jinko Mondai ni kansuru Ikensho (Opinion on the Problem of the Population of Legal Professionals). https://www.toben.or.jp/message/libra/pdf/2009_03/p54-58.pdf. Retrieved August 15, 2023.

Statutes

Bengoshi Ho (Attorneys Act) (Act No.7 of 1893; Revised, Act No.53 of 1933; Revised, Act No.205 of 1949)
Dai-nin Kisoku (Rules of Proxy) (Dajokan Ordinance No.215 of 1873)
Horitsu Jimu Toriatsukai no Torishimari ni kansuru Horitsu (Act to Supervise Dealing with Legal Practice) (Act No.54 of 1933)
Minji Sosho Ho (Code of Civil Procedure) (Act No.29 of 1890)

Contents

Contributors

Mori Daisuke Kumamoto University Faculty of Law, Kumamoto, Japan

Sugino Isamu Ochanimizu University, Tokyo, Japan

Ishida Kyoko Waseda Law School, Tokyo, Japan

Murayama Masayuki Institute of Law and Social Sciences, Organization for the Strategic Coordination of Research and Intellectual Properties, Meiji University, Tokyo, Japan

Ota Shozo Meiji University School of Law, Tokyo, Japan