
Globalization has been accompanied by increasing attention to law as a form of social and political ordering, both among and within states. This has naturally led to some pressure on legal institutions in Asia, which traditionally played a relatively peripheral role. New demands for legal ordering have led to changes in the systems of educating lawyers in Asia, which are now being asked to produce better-trained professionals in larger numbers. This timely edited volume, part of the Routledge series on Law in Asia, focuses attention on how legal education is changing in response to these pressures. Some countries have developed whole new systems of legal education, with graduate law programs and new professional requirements; others have made more modest reforms, but all have had to confront demands for change.

Like other volumes in the Routledge series, this book contains a rich overview of developments in various jurisdictions. Coverage is not as thorough as in the other volumes of the series, though it is still quite broad, with only Thailand and Malaysia omitted from among the major jurisdictions of the region. There is a heavy focus on Japan, with four of the sixteen chapters devoting a good deal of attention to it. These include perspectives on various aspects of the legal reforms, a chapter on German research on Japanese law, a view from inside a Japanese law school on teaching American law, and a view from inside a Japanese law school on teaching American law, and a diagnosis of the ills of the new Japanese law school system by Kent Anderson and Trevor Ryan. The latter is one of the gems of the volume, as it provides a comparative framework to understand the gatekeeping function of legal education. The chapter correctly points out that the Japanese reforms introducing a new system of graduate legal education drew on two incongruous models: the law school system drew on market logic and allowed many schools to open, but entry into the legal profession remained subject to a state-established quota. This fundamental contradiction is at the heart of many criticisms of the new system.

Beyond Japan, the volume covers other jurisdictions in varying levels of depth. The country chapters do not have a common structure, and vary in their focus. The Cambodia chapter, for example, is a comprehensive historical overview, while the chapter on Vietnam is more in the nature of an evaluation report from a donor-funded project and the Singapore chapter focused on establishing a particular educational institution. The Korea, Taiwan, China and Hong Kong chapters are all quite thorough and analytic, and the Indonesia chapter focuses a bit more narrowly on the long tradition of Islamic legal education. Some chapters seek to situate legal education into broader global dynamics, while others are content to stay at a descriptive or even personal level. This is probably a case where fewer chapters would have produced a tighter volume.

The expansive coverage is perhaps appropriate, however, given the genesis of the volume as a tribute to Professor Malcolm David Hamilton “Mal” Smith, a beloved teacher of Japanese law in both Australia and Japan, who passed away prematurely in 2006. Chapter Two is a personal and intellectual biography of Professor Smith, and makes it clear that he was a force for bringing people together across different contexts. For those who, like this reviewer, never met Professor Smith, the warmth of his approach shines through the tributes of his students and colleagues.