



Who Judges?

The delivery of justice is a core function of the modern state. The recent introduction of jury/lay judge systems for criminal trials in Japan, South Korea, Spain, and perhaps soon Taiwan represents a potentially major reform of this core function, shifting decision-making authority from professional judges to ordinary citizens. But the four countries chose to empower their citizens to markedly different degrees. Why? *Who Judges?* is the first book to offer a systematic account of why different countries design their new jury/lay judge systems in very different ways. Drawing on detailed theoretical analysis, original case studies, and content analysis of fifty years of Japanese parliamentary debates, the book reveals that the relative power of “new left”-oriented political parties explains the different magnitudes of reform in the four countries. Rieko Kage’s vital new study opens up an exciting new area of research for comparative politics and socio-legal studies.

RIEKO KAGE is Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Tokyo. She is the author of *Civic Engagement in Postwar Japan: The Revival of a Defeated Society* (Cambridge, 2011), which received the Jury’s Prize from the Japan Nonprofit Organizations Research Association and an Honorable Mention for Outstanding Book in Nonprofit and Voluntary Action Research from the Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action. She received her LL.B. and LL.M. in law from Kyoto University, Japan and her Ph.D. in government from Harvard University, Massachusetts.

Who Judges?

Designing Jury Systems in Japan,
East Asia, and Europe

RIEKO KAGE
University of Tokyo



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge University Press
 978-1-107-19469-4 — Who Judges?
 Rieko Kage
 Frontmatter
[More Information](#)

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom
 One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA
 477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia
 4843/24, 2nd Floor, Ansari Road, Daryaganj, Delhi – 110002, India
 79 Anson Road, #06-04/06, Singapore 079906

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107194694

DOI: 10.1017/9781108163606

© Rieko Kage 2017

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2017

Printed in the United Kingdom by Clays, St Ives plc

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Kage, Rieko, 1973– author.

Title: Who judges? : designing jury systems in Japan, East Asia, and Europe / Rieko Kage.

Description: Cambridge [UK] ; New York : Cambridge University Press, 2017. | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2017035936 | ISBN 9781107194694 (hardback)

Subjects: LCSH: Jury—Japan | Jury selection—Japan. | Justice, Administration of—Japan. | Jury. | Justice, Administration of.

Classification: LCC KNX1585 .K34 2017 | DDC 347/.0752—dc23 LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2017035936>

ISBN 978-1-107-19469-4 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Contents

<i>List of Figures</i>	<i>page</i> vii
<i>List of Tables</i>	ix
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xi
1 Introduction	1
2 Theoretical Framework: Participation and Partisan Politics	39
3 The Distribution of Cases	59
4 The History of the Lay Judge System Debate in Japan up to 1996	78
5 Bringing the Lay Judge System Back In, 1997–2004	100
6 Setting the Agenda: New Left-Oriented Parties and Deliberations in the Japanese Parliament	122
7 Proposals for Lay Participation in the Republic of China (Taiwan)	138
8 Introducing Jury Systems in South Korea and Spain	154
9 The Impact of New Lay Judge Systems	173
10 Conclusions	210
<i>References</i>	221
<i>Index</i>	253

Figures

3.1 Mean scores on new left issues, expert surveys, Japan 2000–5	page 61
3.2 GAL–TAN index, Japan, 2000–5	63
3.3 GAL–TAN index, Spain, 1993–6	65
3.4 GAL–TAN index, South Korea, 2000–8	68
4.1 Number of statements referring to “jury,” per 1,000 meetings attended, by party, Japanese House of Representatives, 1947–96	89
4.2 Number of statements referring to “jury” in parliamentary debates, Japanese House of Representatives, 1947–96	90
4.3 Number of statements referring to “jury,” per 1,000 meetings attended, by party, Japanese House of Representatives, 1947–96, by decade	91
4.4 Number of statements referring to “jury” in parliamentary debates, per 1,000 meetings attended, by party, Japanese House of Councillors, 1947–96	94
4.5 Number of statements referring to “jury” in parliamentary debates, per 1,000 meetings attended, House of Councillors, 1947–96	95
4.6 Number of statements referring to “jury” in parliamentary debates, per 1,000 meetings attended, by party, House of Councillors, 1947–96	96
9.1 Percentage of acquittals among criminal cases charged, district court level, 1979–2014	182
9.2 Percentage of acquittals among murder and burglary leading to death or injury cases charged, district court level, 1979–2014	184
9.3 Percentage of acquittals, crimes not subject to lay judge trial, district court level, 1979–2014	186

9.4	Number and percentage of death sentences among all cases charged, district court level, 1979–2014	187
9.5	Percentage of death sentences, murder and burglary leading to death or injury, 1979–2014	188
9.6	Percentage of life sentences among all cases charged, 1979–2014, district court level	190
9.7	Percentage of fifteen- to thirty-year sentences among individuals found guilty who were sentenced to jail or prison terms, district court level, 1979–2014	191
9.8	Percentage of defendants found guilty and sentenced to fifteen- to thirty-year sentences among those sentenced to jail or prison terms, crimes subject to lay judge trial, district court level, 1979–2014	192
9.9	Percentage of those sentenced to more than ten years among those sentenced to jail or prison terms, injury leading to death, district court level, 1979–2014	194
9.10	Percentage of suspended sentences with probation among suspended sentences, murder, burglary leading to death or injury, and injury leading to death cases, district court level, 1979–2014	195
9.11	Probations as percentage of suspended sentences, crimes not subject to lay judge trials, district court level, 1979–2014	197
9.12	Percentage of cases for which charges were filed, murder, burglary leading to death or injury, and injury leading to death, 1979–2014	198
9.13	Percentage of cases for which charges were filed, 1979–2014, crimes not subject to lay judge trial	200
9.14	Request for warrants for detention denied, 1979–2014	201
9.15	Percentage of detainees released before final judgment, 1979–2014	202

Tables

1.1 Distribution of jury/lay judge systems among OECD countries (as of 2015) and Taiwan	<i>page 9</i>
1.2 Configuration of lay judge systems in Spain, Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan	17
1.3 Levels of public confidence in the courts/justice system	28
2.1 Expected transfer of powers from professional judges to jury/lay judges	40
3.1 Measures of GAL–TAN, Comparative Manifesto Project	62
3.2 Positions of South Korean parties on new left issues	67
3.3 Positions of Taiwanese parties on new left issues	71
3.4 Strength of new left-oriented parties within party system at the time of enactment of lay judge systems, Spain, Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan	73
3A.1 2000 Survey	75
3A.2 2003 Survey	76
3A.3 2005 Survey	76
3B.1 Standard errors for the means of parties’ positions on new left issues as shown in Table 3.1	77
3C.1 Positions of Japanese parties on new left issues, DALP dataset	77
4.1 Number of statements referring to “jury,” per 1,000 meetings attended, by party, Japanese House of Representatives, 1947–96	92
4.2 Number of statements referring to “jury,” per 1,000 meetings attended, by party, 1947–96, Japanese House of Councillors	97
6.1 Number of references to “pure” jury, “mixed” jury, participation, by party, Committee on Judicial Affairs, House of Representatives	127

6.2	Number of references to “pure” jury, “mixed” jury, participation, by party, per 10,000 characters, Committee on Judicial Affairs, House of Representatives	128
6.3	Questions relating to introduction of a jury/lay judge system, as a percentage of all questions posed, by party, Committee on Judicial Affairs, House of Representatives	130
6.4	Number of references to “pure” jury, “mixed” jury, participation, by party, Committee on Judicial Affairs, House of Councillors	131
6.5	Number of references to “pure” jury, “mixed” jury, participation, by party, per 10,000 characters, Committee on Judicial Affairs, House of Councillors	132
6.6	Questions relating to introduction of a jury/lay judge system, as a percentage of all questions posed, by party, Committee on Judicial Affairs, House of Councillors	133
6.7	Combined number of references to “pure” jury, “mixed” jury, participation, by party, Committees on Judicial Affairs, House of Representatives and Councillors	134
6.8	Combined number of references to “pure” jury, “mixed” jury, participation, by party, per 10,000 characters, Committees on Judicial Affairs, House of Representatives and Councillors	135
6.9	Combined number of questions relating to introduction of a jury/lay judge system, as a percentage of all questions posed, by party, Committees on Judicial Affairs, House of Representatives and Councillors	136

Acknowledgments

This book has truly been a collective endeavor. Numerous scholars and friends helped me improve and refine its message every step of the way. In the early stages of this project, Yuriko Takahashi organized the edited volume project that first sparked my interest in the lay judge system. Yutaka Shinada generously offered the dataset that provided the initial inspiration for this project. Takeshi Ito, Hiroshi Okayama, Masako Suginoara, Naoki Takahashi, and in particular Yu Uchiyama offered insightful comments that helped to orient this work in the right direction. Yoshiko Herrera, Airo Hino, and Kenneth McElwain read through the entire manuscript and generously offered their time and insights at an author's conference at the University of Tokyo on a sizzling August day in 2015. The Kansai Group for Public Administration is among the best fora in Japan for presenting works-in-progress, and I thank Wataru Kitamura, Haruka Kubo, Shunsuke Kyo, Kengo Soga, and other participants of this group who selflessly devoted their time to giving me feedback on a cold, rainy day in Kobe in February 2016. Celeste Arrington and Jiyeoun Song carefully read draft chapters and offered their expertise on Korean politics. As I am a newcomer to the field of criminal law/criminal procedures, this book would not have been possible without the legal expertise and extensive feedback of Takayuki Shimaya. David Welch kindly arranged talks for me at highly productive seminars at the Japan Foundation in Toronto and the University of Waterloo. At the final stages of this book project, I benefited tremendously from participating at a seminar at the Graduate School of Law, Kobe University. I thank Professors Atsumi Kubota and Shimaya for organizing the event, as well as Takuya Hatta, Tamotsu Isomura, Shintaro Koike, Yukio Okitsu, Hiroshi Takahashi, Kazutaka Ueshima, Takashi Uto, and other participants at the event. The book has also benefited greatly from insightful comments, suggestions, and support from Eric Feldman, Darryl Flaherty, Carlo Guarnieri,

Takuya Iwata, Reid Krell, Michio Muramatsu, Shozo Ota, Jeffrey Sachs, and Chin-shou Wang. Kazuhiko Nishihara and Ryoko Yabuki at the Honmachi International Law Office kindly offered highly professional legal support. I also thank the three anonymous reviewers for this book for their careful reading of the manuscript and extremely helpful comments.

The Taiwan portion of the book would not have been possible without the incredible warmth with which many individuals there opened their doors and minds to me. In particular, I thank the Judicial Reform Foundation, which kindly facilitated numerous interviews that I had not dreamt would be possible. Jerry Cheng, Chuang Chiao-ju, and Kao Jung-chi helped me become oriented with the Taiwanese debates over introducing the jury/lay judge system. Senior officials at the Judicial Yuan kindly offered their candid views on the debate, and Professor Yu-shun Lin generously shared his insightful expertise based on his knowledge of both Taiwanese and Japanese legal systems, while Professor Wang Yeh-lih filled me in on the nuances of Taiwanese politics. Ker Chien-ming, Yu Mei-nu, Tien Chiu-chin, and Wan-Ling Chu kindly offered their insightful views on both the legislative and the NGO worlds in Taipei. I also thank Professor Wang and the Taiwanese Political Science Association for generously hosting my stay in Taipei to present an early version of this work at their annual meeting in December 2014.

The book has benefited from the work of three superb research assistants. Ronan Tse-min Fu provided research assistance for the Taiwanese case study and also served as an excellent interpreter in my interviews in Taipei. Nick Horton also conducted crucial background research for the Taiwanese case. So-hyung Lee cheerfully undertook the painstaking task of preparing the index, as well as assisting in research on the Korean case. I wish these young scholars all the best in their future endeavors.

I am fortunate to have an incredibly smart and generous group of colleagues at the Department of Advanced Social and International Studies at the University of Tokyo. I am deeply grateful for their unwavering commitment to research, which has made this book possible.

It has been a great pleasure to have the opportunity to work with the superbly efficient and dedicated Joe Ng and the whole team at Cambridge University Press. Thanks to Joe, the path to publication has moved forward much more quickly and smoothly than I had

Acknowledgments

xiii

thought possible. I am also grateful to Karen Oakes and Grace Morris at the Press.

Two individuals in particular have helped me enormously on this project and also serve as tremendous role models for my career overall. I have been very fortunate to have the opportunity to work with Frances Rosenbluth, who kindly invited me to speak about this project at Yale University in September 2015. We also spent a fun day together shopping in New Haven, picking up Frances' boys, and exchanging ideas over bottles of kombu-cha. Frances has an incredible ability to balance family and cutting-edge research and I continue to learn much from her through our collaborative projects.

The book has also benefited greatly from the sharp insights of Susan Pharr. Ever since I embarked on my Ph.D. dissertation project at Harvard fifteen years ago, Susan has continued to offer incisive yet kind suggestions, consistently encouraging me to “think big.” During the final stages of writing this book manuscript, Susan once again helped me to sharpen and broaden the scope of my argument.

I also thank a third (but really first) mentor, Hideo Otake. When I embarked on this project, little did I know that this would become a book on the new left. In true new left fashion, I will not dedicate this book to him, but I hope that he is well.

Finally, I thank my teammate-in-life and co-owner of our “struggling small business,” Jacques Hymans, for his unfailingly loyal support. This book would not have been possible without him.

This project was generously supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 15K03267.