Retreat of Welfare Model for Treatment of Juvenile Delinquents in Japan : Discussion about Issues of Lowering ofthe Application Age of Juvenile Law

Retreat of Welfare Model for Treatment of Juvenile Delinquents in Japan

——Discussion about Issues of Lowering of the Application Age of Juvenile Law——

Minoru Yokoyama

This is a revised version of the paper presented at Crime and Justice in Asia and the Global South : An International Conference Co-hosted by the Crime and Justice Research Centre, QUT, and the Asian Criminological Society in Cairns in Australia on 10-13 July, 2017.

[Abstract]

In 1948 the current Juvenile Law was enacted, by which the application age of the law was raised from under 18 years old to under 20. Since then juvenile delinquents under 20 years old have been protectively and educationally treated under the welfare and rehabilitation model. We witness the drastic decrease in juvenile delinquency after 2003, to which the excellent treatment in juvenile justice under the welfare, participatory and rehabilitation model has contributed.

In June in 2015 the Public Officers Election Law was revised to lower the voting age from 20 years old to 18. Since then the lowering of the application age of the Juvenile Law has been advocated more actively for the reason that young people of 18 and 19 years old should take responsibility for their offense as adults. As this reasoning is apparently persuadable,

many people are in favor of lowering of the application age of the Juvenile Law. However, if this lowering were realized on the grounds of the public opinion, it would be an example of populism because people do not know the outstanding achievement of the protective educative measures in juvenile justice, which many scholars and practitioners in juvenile justice know all over the world through the author's articles on Japanese juvenile justice.

In this paper the author will analyze how much damages would cause in the treatment of juvenile delinquents under the welfare model if the lowering of the application age were realized. As the treatment of offenders aged 18 and 19 functions well in the current juvenile justice system, the application age of the Juvenile Law should not be lowered.

Key Words : juvenile delinquents, Juvenile Law, application age

1. Introduction of Western Juvenile Justice

After the Meiji Restoration in 1867 modernization started in Japan. Some Japanese scholars began to introduce the idea on the protective educative treatment in a reformatory school in western countries into Japan. Under the influence of this idea a female priest in a sector of Shinto, Japanese indigenous religion, founded a reformatory school for the first time in 1881. Following her, priests of conventional religions such as Shinto and Buddhism established a reformatory school. Kosuke Tomeoka, a Christian, also founded a reformatory school called "Family School". In his Family School the protective educative treatment for juvenile delinquents and juveniles having some problem was carried out at several small-sized dormitories managed by a teacher and his wife (Yokoyama, 2015 : 182).

In 1907 the current Penal Code was promulgated after the example of German Penal Code. The minimum age of culpability was raised from 12 to 14. Next year the Reformatory Law of 1900 was amended to give the protective educative treatment in a reformatory school to the former inmates in a reformatory prison. Since then, reformatory schools with small-sized dormitories managed by a teacher and his wife developed.

In 1907 Shigeto Hozumi delivered a lecture on the juvenile court in the United States after he returned from the study abroad in some advanced western countries. By his lecture people recognized the necessity of introducing the Juvenile Law to Japan. After the hot discussion the Juvenile Law and the Correctional School Law passed at the Diet in 1922.(1)

The Juvenile Law of 1922 was applied to juveniles under 18 years of age who commit an offense of a criminal law and who are prone to commit some offense. At the beginning in 1923 the Juvenile Law and the Correctional School Law were enforced. However, owing to budgetary restraints the national government could establish only two juvenile tribunals, that is, one in Tokyo and another in Osaka.(2) In correspondence with these two tribunals Tama Juvenile Training School and Naniwa Juvenile Training School were established.(3) In these schools juvenile delinquents lived in a small-sized dormitory managed by a teacher and his wife like the Family School. They were offered the protective educative training programs.

---

(1) Shigejiro Ogawa who had contributed to drafting the Reformatory Law opposed the draft of these two laws. He insisted that offenders under the age of 14 should not be adjudicated under the Juvenile Law, and that a correctional school similar to a juvenile prison should not be instituted instead of the wellfunctioning reformatory school.

(2) After 1934 five juvenile tribunals was founded to strive toward application of the Juvenile Law all over the country.

(3) To erase the image of a juvenile prison, the name of "a juvenile training school" was used instead of the name of "a correctional school".

In 1933 the Juvenile Educative Protective Law was enacted in place of the Reformatory Law to coordinate with the system under the Juvenile Law. Under this law the reformatory school was renamed the educative protective school.

After the occurrence of a military crash on July 7, 1937, Japanese army began to invade into the north part of China. Under the military regime in Japan the Spartan education was adopted to make children become a subject loyal to the Showa Emperor as a god of Shinto. Juveniles committed such a deviant behavior as truancy from working at a factory in the munition industry, were regarded as unpatriotic, whose spirit should be straighten out by Spartan education. Then, many protection corporations for juveniles began to offer a short-term program for Spartan training to juvenile delinquents. The delinquents in a facility managed by the corporation were compelled to join the military exercise and to work at a farmland and at a factory. In 1943 the correctional schools, that is, the juvenile training schools also started the short-term Spartan training formally.

In this situation the raising of the application age of the Juvenile Law was proposed in 1940. The 9th Meeting of Chiefs of Juvenile Tribunal, Chiefs of Probation Office and Chiefs of Correctional School was held at a meeting room of Judicial Ministry on May 16. For three days the chiefs discussed some items directed by the Judicial Minister. After the discussion they pointed out four problems about the juvenile delinquency. 1) We see some working youths not to recognize the present urgent situation of waging a war. 2) Many youths who are separated from custody in their family work at a factory without appropriate guidance. Therefore, some of them become licentious because factory owners spoil them to fill the shortage of labor power. 3) As they earn a lot of money in high wages, they get into a wasteful habit. 4) Then, they pursue immoral pleasure.

On May 18 the chiefs submitted a report to the minister, in which they offered proposals on six items to him. As one of them they proposed the raising of application age of the Juvenile Law from under 18 years old to under 20 (Japanese Correctional Association : 471).

On May 19, 1941, the tenth Meeting of Chiefs of Juvenile Tribunal, Chiefs of Probation Office and Chiefs of Correctional School was held at the Residence House for Judicial Minister. On May 21 the chiefs submitted a report to the Judicial Minister. In the report they proposed the revision of the Juvenile Law. To expend the scope for protection under the Juvenile Law, they proposed revision of Article 1 to raise the application age from "under 18 years old" to "under 20" (Japanese Correctional Association : 478). However, the Juvenile Law was not revised, because the war situation became worse.

2. Raising of the Application Age of new Juvenile Law

After the war in 1945 Japan was democratized under the guidance of officials affiliated with the General Headquarters of the Allied Powers (GHQ) in which the United States took the initiative. To democratize Japan, many laws began to be reviewed. In spring, 1946, the Judicial Ministry began to prepare for revision of the Juvenile Law, the Correctional School Law and the Law of Enterprise for Legal Protection (Judicial Correctional Association : 693). In August the Judicial Ministry carried out a survey to judges, public prosecutors and practitioners working in a juvenile tribunal and a correctional school about the revision of these three laws. In consideration of results of the survey the Judicial Ministry judged that there were only a few articles which seemed to contradict new Constitutional Law although there are several articles which should be revised to

cope with the drastic increase in juvenile delinquency in the chaotic social situation after the war. In September, 1946, the Judicial Ministry decided the partial revision of the Juvenile Law.

Many Diet members were concerned about the drastic increase in juvenile delinquency. Then, on October 22, 1946, a proposal on the revision of the Juvenile Law was adopted in the House of Representatives. The content of the proposal was that the government should present a draft of the revised Juvenile Law as early as possible to treat youth between 18 and 22 years old as semi-juveniles to provide with the special protective measures without stigmatizing them as a criminal.

In December, 1946, the Judicial Ministry made out a draft of the Outline of Revision of the Juvenile Law, the Correctional School Law and the Law of Enterprise for Legal Protection, which was submitted to the Committee for Deliberation on Revision of the Law of Enterprise for Legal Protection. After members deliberated three times, they approved a partial revision of the Juvenile Law including the raising of the application age to under 20 years old. Receiving the report from the committee, in the early January, 1946, the ministry completed a draft of revised Juvenile Law[(4)], and submitted it to Bardet Louis, an official in charge of matters on correction in GHQ. In the later January he gave opinions about the revision of the Juvenile Law in which he proposed the establishment of a juvenile court in the place of a juvenile tribune. After exchanging opinions many times with him, the ministry succeeded in completing a draft of the Juvenile Law, which the Cabinet approved at a meeting on June 14, 1948. The Cabinet submitted the draft to the Diet on June 16, 1948.

On June 19, 1948, the first meeting of the Legal Committee was held,

---

(4) Article 2 of this revised law defined "a juvenile" as a person under 20 years old.

at which Tosuke Sato, a chief of the Agency of Legal Administration, explained the reasons of main revisions of the Juvenile Law (Japanese Correctional Association : 726–727). Concerning the reason why the application age is raised to under 20 years old, he explained the following.

> Recently we witness conspicuous increase and worsening in crimes committed by youths under 20 years old. Those youths are immature in their mind and body. They are easily influenced by the external conditions such as environment. Their crimes are not based on deep criminality. Therefore, there are more cases desirable to correct them under the protective measures than cases appropriate to imposition of criminal punishment. Then, the government decides to raise the age of "a juvenile" to under 20 years old.

As this reason was supported by the Diet members, "a juvenile" was defined as "a person under 20 years old" in the Juvenile Law enacted on July 15, 1948.[(5)] At that time people supported it, because they sympathized with many juveniles, especially orphans committed a crime under the miserable environment in a chaotic situation soon after the war (Yokoyama, 2015 : 188).

In December, 1947, the Child Welfare Law of which the application age is under 18 years old was enacted. The purpose of this law is to rear children soundly, which the Juvenile Law shares. Therefore, the author regards the Juvenile Law as a special law of both a criminal law and a welfare law.

---

(5) The Juvenile Law is applied to a juvenile delinquent who does not reach 20th birthday at the time of a final decision about a disposal at the family court.

3. Movement by Public Prosecutors for Lowering of Application Age of Juvenile Law

The current Juvenile Law prescribes three categories of juvenile delinquents, that is, a juvenile offender between 19 and 14 years old, a law-braking child under 14 years old[(6)] and a pre-offense juvenile who is prone to commit an offense in the future. In addition, the police guide a juvenile conducting such a deviant behavior as loitering at midnight and smoking as a pre-delinquent in order to give him/her warning for the purpose of the prevention of his/her future delinquency.

Under the new Juvenile Law all cases of a juvenile offender are referred from the police directly or via the public prosecutor to the family court.[(7)] The public prosecutors lost their power to screen any juvenile case, and were not qualified to appear at the family court.[(8)] At the adjudication the judge(s) presides with wide discretionary power, as the adversary system is not adopted.[(9)]

---

(6) The age of criminal liability prescribed by Article 41 of Penal Code is 14 years old. Therefore, a person under 14 years old who has violated some article of a criminal law is called "a law-breaking child" in the place of "a juvenile offender".

(7) By the revised Juvenile Law in 1949 an organization for the first referral of a case of a law-breaking child was changed from the family court to the child consultation center.

(8) By the revised Juvenile Law of 2000 the public prosecutor is admitted to appear at the family court by the permission of a judge in a case concerning a juvenile serious offender. At the court the prosecutor is expected to check the recognition about what an offense has committed. However, at the adjudication he/she is prohibited from expressing his/her opinion about the disposal for a juvenile offender, althogh he/she can state about it in a report to a judge in advance.

(9) By the revised Juvenile Law of 2000 three judges can hear at the adjudication if necessary in a complicated case.

In the Ministry of Justice public prosecutors have monopolized important positions.[10] They wanted to restore strong discretion power to screen cases of a juvenile delinquent, which they had held under the old Juvenile Law. Although the new Juvenile Law was enforced on January 1, 1949, public prosecutors affiliated with the Ministry of Justice made out a draft of the revised Juvenile Law in February, 1951. In this draft there was an article that public prosecutors screen all cases of a juvenile offense committed by juveniles aged 18 and 19 (Sawanobori : 247). However, it was not summited to the Diet in the opposite of GHQ.

The Ministry of Justice continued to prepare for the revision of the Juvenile Law. On May 23, 1966, the ministry published the Explanation about Concept of Revision of Juvenile Law, by which the lowering of the application age of the Juvenile Law and the restoration of the discretion power by public prosecutors to screen cases were proposed. They advocated that the application age of the Juvenile Law is lowered to under 18 years old, and that a new category of "a youth" is established for an offender between 18 and 22 years old who is treated in principle under the Code of Criminal Procedure. Supreme Court and the Japan Federation of Bar Associations published the opposite opinion in October and in December, 1966, respectively.[11] Many scholars in criminal laws and practitioners in the

---

(10) For example, the position of a direstor-general of Correction Bureau was occupied by a public prosecutor for a long period after the World War II. The author wrote an essay to advocate that a correction officer should occupy a position of a direstor-general of the Correction Bureau. This essay was published in Asahi Newspaper on April 28, 2002. Although Koya Matsuo, an adviser of the Ministry of Justice, supported my advocacy, it was not until January, 2013, that a correction officer became a director-general of Correction Bureau for the first time. By the way, a public prosecutor has continued occupying a position of a director-general of Rehabilitation Bureau.

(11) At that time judges evaluated the Juvenile Law highly. Therefore, the Supreme Court expressed the opposite opinion. Since 1966 we have not seen the expression of

juvenile justice expressed the objection. However, the Ministry of Justice continued to prepare for the revision of the Juvenile Law without serious consideration of the opposite opinion.

The ministry made out the Outline of Revision of Juvenile Law, which was submitted to the Legal System Council on June 18, 1970. In this Outline they proposed the establishment of the category of "a youth offender aged 18 and 19" in addition to "a juvenile delinquent under 18 years old". The public prosecutors have the discretion power to screen the cases.(12) In case of a youth offender they decide whether a youth offender is prosecuted to the family court or not. In a case of a youth offender the Code of Criminal Procedure is applied, although a family court judge can decide the protective measures instead of criminal punishment. In a case of a juvenile delinquent under 18 years old the public prosecutor can decide whether they send it to the family court as a case disposed of under the Juvenile Law or not.

The Legal System Council continued to deliberate about the revision of the Juvenile Law for seven years. However, they could not reach the consensus because many people, especially those affiliated with the left wing supported the opposite opinion advocated by scholars in criminal laws and lawyers. At last on June 29, 1977, the Legal System Council presented the Interim Report to the Minister of Justice. In this report they proposed that juvenile offenders aged 18 and 19 should be treated by the procedure different from those of under 18 years old. However, the concrete procedure for those aged 18 and 19 was not described.

In 1983 we witness the highest rate of juvenile Penal Code offenders

---

the opposite opinion against the revision of the Juvenile Law by the Supreme Court.

(12) In a trifle case the police have the power to dispose of under the summery procedure without referring it to the public prosecutor.

since 1945. This highest rate was brought by the net-widening of the police to minor offenses (Yokoyama, 1989). Although public prosecutors and the conservative politicians maintained the opinion to lower the application age of the Juvenile Law in order to adopt the tough policy against juvenile offenders, the lowering was not realized.

In the United States the crime control model became prevalent instead of the welfare model in the juvenile justice based on the doctrine of "parens patriae". In the trend of criminalization in many advanced countries Japanese welfare, participatory and rehabilitation model were highly evaluated among scholars in comparative study of juvenile justice all over the world.(13)

4. Trend to Criminalization in 1990s

In the 1990s, some lawyers participated actively as an attendant in cases in which a juvenile was referred to the family court in a false charge. Under the Juvenile Law there was no appropriate system to find facts on criminal behavior because of the absence of an adversarial confrontation between a defendant and a prosecutor. In addition, there was no provision for formal declaration of the non-guilty sentence for juveniles found to be a false charge in the adjudication. Therefore, lawyers began to consider a revision of the Juvenile Law to guarantee juveniles' rights to due process sufficiently. However, as they respected the welfare model, they did not advocate the introduction of the whole criminal procedures in the adjudication at a family court. In November, 1996, Japan Federation of Bar Asso-

(13) In 1997 John Winterdyk edited a book entitled *Juvenile Justice System – International Perspectives*, in which the author's article on Juvenile Justice and Juvenile Crime : An Overview of Japan was printed (Yokoyama, 1997). As he evaluated Japanese welfare, participatory and rehabilitation model highly, he put the article in the first chapter.

ciations, Supreme Court and Criminal Affairs Bureau of the Ministry of Justice started a meeting to exchange opinions on juvenile adjudication in order to introduce the procedure with due process for finding facts exactly on criminal behavior.[14]

In 1997 a 14-years-old boy in Kobe killed two children and injured three. The mass media gave this incident considerable coverage as the killings were quite horrific in nature. Starting from this case, the mass media continued to report about several other murder cases committed by boys between 15 and 17 years of age. The media coverage attracted a significant degree of public attention leading to a call for the harsher punishment of juvenile offenders.

Another factor impacting a change of tough policies was the increasing concern for the crime victims. The support system for the crime victims was poor, and it was not until the late 1990s that the movement for victim support began to appear before the footlights of the public square. Some crime victims, especially bereaved families who had a child killed began to insist that their rights were being neglected, while offenders' rights − above all, juvenile offenders' rights − were respected too much. As a result of this increased media coverage, the public became increasingly critical of the Juvenile Law for being too lenient with juvenile offenders. Therefore, the ruling Liberal Democratic Party began to advocate the revision of the Juvenile Law, calling for tough measures against juvenile offenders, especially those aged 18 and 19. Under pressure from the LDP, the Legal System Council hurriedly discussed a draft of the revised Juvenile Law for 6 months, and submitted it to the Minister of Justice in January in 1999.

However, this draft did not pass at the Diet owing to the political tur-

(14) It was continued until a meeting held in July, 1998.

moil. Then, the LDP took an initiative to revise the Juvenile Law toward adoption of the tough policy against juvenile offenders. The committee members of three ruling parties deliberated about the lowering of the application age of the Juvenile Law. They concluded that the lowering of the application age should be discussed in the consideration of the raising of the voting age. Then, members of three ruling parties submitted a new draft of the revised Juvenile Law to the Diet without an article to raise the application age. It was enacted at the end of November in 2000.

By the revised law the partial criminalization was introduced, although the application age was not lowered to under 18 years old. The revision of the Juvenile Law shifted the statute's focus toward greater accountability. The minimum age of a juvenile offender, who can be referred back to the public prosecutor for a criminal charge, was lowered from 16 to 14. In cases involving juveniles over the age of 16 who have committed a homicide or a malicious offense resulting in death, the family court judge(s) is obliged in principle to refer the case back to the public prosecutor for criminal indictment. In addition, the revised law includes provisions to improve the procedures for finding the facts exactly on a juvenile delinquency. In a complicated case three judges can adjudicate. The maximum term of the custody in the Juvenile Detention & Classification Center was prolonged from 4 weeks to 8. The family court judge(s) can permit the public prosecutor to appear at the court in the case of a heinous offense such as murder or robbery. In such a case a legal counselor has to appear at the court as an attendant for the juvenile offender. Furthermore, the public prosecutor can appeal to a higher court if he/she has a claim against the recognition of facts on juvenile delinquency by the family court judge(s). However, the fundamental framework of the welfare model under the Juvenile Law was maintained.

As there was severe criticism against the partial criminalization, the revised Juvenile Law of 2000 prescribed that the revised items should be reviewed during 5 years after its enforcement. Then, Supreme Court published data on the practice relating to each revised item six times until the end of March in 2006 (Yokoyama 2009). In addition, the All Japan Labor Union of Workers at Court carried out a research on the same practice on nine occasions. The Japanese Federation of Bar Associations conducted surveys and interviews with member lawyers on their impressions about handling juvenile cases under the new legislation. The results of the analysis revealed that most of the respondents wanted to return to the previous system that were reflective of the welfare model. However, despite the views and efforts of many academics, lawyers, and probation officers, the general public did not support a return to the welfare model but called for greater accountability of juvenile offenders – a shift toward a crime control model.

In response to the public opinion caused by peoples' sympathy with the movement of crime victims the Juvenile Law was revised in 2007, in 2008 and in 2014 in order to guarantee the victim's rights in the procedure for a juvenile case more strongly and in order to adopt the harsher policy against juvenile delinquents. However, fortunately, the proposal of lowering of the maximum age for the application of the Juvenile Law from under 20 years old to under 18 was not included in any draft of revised Juvenile Law. During period from 2000 to 2014 the mass media did not report about the necessity of the lowering of the application age of the Juvenile Law as a trigger of a heinous offense committed by a juvenile aged 18 and 19.[15]

(15) In case a juvenile aged 18 and 19 commits most heinous crime, he/she can be sentenced to death at a criminal court.

5. Discussion about Voting Age

The Election Law on Members of House of Representatives was revised on December 17, 1945, by which females were given the suffrage. Following it, the current Public Officers Election Law was enacted on April 15, 1950. At that time they did not have an idea of lowering of the voting age from 20 years old to 18, although Japanese Communist Party had insisted the lowering before the World War II.

The Democratic Party of Japan founded as the largest opposition party in 1998 organized the Next Cabinet. On June 23, 2000, the Next Cabinet published a document that rights as adults should be given to persons aged 18 and 19, while they should take responsibility as adults. Then, the party proposed the lowering of adult age and the voting age from 20 to 18. The purpose of this proposal was to facilitate youths' participation in politics. One of reasons of the proposal was that the age of 18 was the age eligible for economic independency. They were already treated like adults in such an item as marriage, working at midnight and acquisition of driver's license. In most countries persons of 18 years old and over were treated as adults. At that time the surging Democratic Party expected more youths to vote for its member at the election.

The Democratic Party advocated that the application age of Juvenile Law should be lowered to under 18 years old in case that the adult age was lowered to 18 years old. They insisted that offenders aged 18 and 19 should be imposed a criminal punishment as adults at a criminal court. They seemed to insist so in the consideration of the upsurge of the public opinion favorable to crime victims, because they did not mention about the lowering of application age of other laws such as the Law of Prohibiting

Minors from Smoking and the Law of Prohibiting Minors from Drinking Liquor. The Democratic Party expressed the opinion that they did not advocate the lowering of the application age of Juvenile Law for the purpose of criminalization, which many members of the ruling Liberal Democratic Party insisted. However, if the lowering of the application age of Juvenile Law were realized, it would cause the heaviest criminalization in the field of juvenile justice after the enforcement of the Juvenile Law in 1949. Democratic Party explained that they proposed the lowering of the application age of Juvenile Law after reviewing the practice under the current Juvenile Law. However, without reviewing it exactly the party proposed it only by logic of balancing the age for rights as adults and the age for taking responsibility as adults. Therefore, the party continued proposing the lowering of the application age of Juvenile Law even after realization of the partial criminalization by the revised Juvenile Law enacted on November 28 in 2000.

6. Deliberation about Law of National Referendum for Revision of Constitutional Law

In May, 1997, Diet members except for those affiliated with Japanese Communist Party and Social Democratic Party organized the Union to Facilitate the Establishment of the Research Committee of Constitutional Law. In September, 2005, the Special Research Committee of Constitutional Law was founded at the House of Representatives to discuss the joint proposal of a draft of the Law of National Referendum for Revision of Constitutional Law. However, they failed to make out a draft for joint proposal. Then, two drafts, that is, one of the ruling parties and another of Democratic Party, were made out. After the finish of negotiation the former

draft in which a part of the latter draft was taken passed at the Diet on May 14, 2007. In the process of compromise the ruling parties accepted the proposal of the Democratic Party about the application age. Then, the new law prescribes that all persons of 18 years old and over with Japanese nationality have a suffrage for the National Referendum for Revision of Constitutional Law. The No. 3 Supplemental Provision of this law prescribes that before the enforcement of the law the state should discuss the revision of the application age of other laws such as Civil Code and the Public Officers Election Law, and that it should take the legal measures for youths aged 18 and 19 to participate in the national election.

After the enactment of the National Referendum for Revision of Constitutional Law, Democratic Party activated the discussion. On July 22, 2008, the party published the Summary of Items on the Lowering of Adult Age. In this summery they advocated that the maximum age of juveniles sent to a juvenile training school should be lowered to under 18 years old. After the publishing of this summery the author began to write articles for the campaign against the lowering of the application age of the Juvenile Law (Yokoyama, 2008 and Yokoyama, 2010).

The Democratic Party took the political power by the victory at the election of the House of Representatives held on August 30, 2009. However, the party failed to make out a draft of the revised Juvenile Law to lower the application age before it lost the political power in January, 2012.

The Diet members to make out a draft of the Law of National Referendum for Revision of Constitutional Law founded a project team to lower the voting age to 18 years old within two years of its enforcement. The project team made out a draft of the revised Public Officers Election Law to lower the voting age which was submitted to the Diet in November, 2014. This draft was discarded because of the dissolution of the House of

Representatives. In March, 2015, the Diet members affiliated with six parties and one Diet member submitted a draft containing the same content to the Diet. This draft passed unanimously on June 4, 2015, at the House of Representatives and on June 17, 2015, at the House of Councilors.

7. Revised Public Officers Election Law of 2015

The revised Public Officers Election Law had several supplemental provisions. No. 5 Supplemental Provision and No. 11 one suggested the lowering of the application age of the Juvenile Law. Then, from the end of May, 2015, the author activated a campaign against the lowering of the application age of the Juvenile Law.(16)

The Diet members for contributing to revision of the Public Officers Election Law mentioned three reasons why the voting age should be lowered to 18 years old. 1) According to the research by National Diet Library the suffrage is given to a person of 18 years old and over in 176 among 191 countries. 2) The voting age prescribed by the Public Officers Election Law should be equal to that prescribed by the Law of National Referendum for Revision of Constitutional Law. 3) If the voting age were lowered, youths aged 18 and 19 could be expected to participate in politics, which will strengthen the base of democracy. However, many youths aged 18 and 19 were bewildered with being given a suffrage, because it was not realized by their demand.(17) Therefore, teachers in senior high

(16) As Japan Federation of Bar Associations knew the contents of the revised law, it published the Opinion about Lowering of Adult Age on February 20, 2015, and submitted it to Minister of Justice on February 26, 2015. Most scholars in juvenile law including the author did not know it, because the mass media did not report about the opinion published by Japan Federation of Bar Associations.

(17) According to results of opinion survey to persons aged 18 and 19 conducted in No-

schools are expected to carry out the legal education, as majority of youths of 18 years old are indifferent to politics.[18]

Scholars in the Juvenile Law, lawyers and practitioners working in juvenile justice were concerned about two supplemental provisions of the revised Public Officers Election Law. No. 11 Supplemental Provision prescribes that the state should discuss the lowering of the application age of other laws such as Civil Code and the Juvenile Law, and that it should take necessary legal measures to lower the application age of other laws equal to that prescribed by the revised Public Officers Election Law. Conventionally, the revision of Juvenile Law was deliberated carefully at the Legal System Council. It was a serious problem that the direction of the revision of the Juvenile Law was prescribed by a supplemental provision of a law without any deliberation at the Legal System Council. It must be undue process for legislation of an important law.

No. 5 Supplement Provision prescribes that the judge(s) is obliged to give a decision according to Paragraph 1 of Article 20 of Juvenile Law, that is, a decision of the referral back to the public prosecutor for criminal indictment, in case that a youth aged 18 and 19 commits some kinds of a serious offense of Public Office Election Law. However, youths aged 18 and 19 have no possibility of committing such offenses, because only a responsible person for election campaign can commit these offenses.[19] The

---

vember, 2015, by Japan Broadcasting Corporation 11.6% and 36.8% answered "Very much" and "A little" respectively to a question whether he/she is bewildered with exerting a voting right.

(18) At the election of members of the House of Councilors held on July 10, 2016, about 2,400,000 youths aged 18 and 19 were newly given the right to voting. In spring in 2016 many programs on how to exert the right to voting were offered to students of third grade of a senior high school.

(19) One of the applied offenses is Article 247 of Public Officers Election Law, by which

author has doubt that seriousness of such offenses of Public Officers Election Law deserves to send back in principle to the public prosecutor for criminal indictment like in case of a murder and a malicious offense causing death.[20] No. 5 Supplement Provision was introduced not by seeing the reality, but by the logic that youths aged 18 and 19 should take responsible for committing some serious offense of Public Officers Election Law like an adult as they are given a suffrage. It must be the laying of a foundation to lower the application age of the Juvenile Law in the future. By the way, the revised Public Officers Election Law stipulates that No. 5 Supplement Provision is temporarily enforced for some period. The author has doubt about how long the temporary enforcement of this supplement provision will continue. Will it continue even after the lowering of the application age of Juvenile Law is not realized?

8. Movement toward Lowering of Application Age of Juvenile Law

In the ruling Liberal Democratic Party the Special Mission Committee on Adult Age held the first meeting on April 4, 2015. After the enactment of the revised Public Officers Election Law in June, members of the Special Mission Committee activated discussion about the lowering of application

---

an accounting officer is prohibited from paying more money for election campaign than one appointed by the law. A youth aged 18 and 19 has almost no possibility of working as such a responsible person for the campaign.

(20) Paragraph 2 of Article 20 of the revised Juvenile Law of 2000 prescribes that in case of juvenile offenders over 15 years old who have committed a heinous offense such as a murder and a malicious offense causing death the family court judge(s) decides in principle the referral back to the public prosecutor for criminal indictment. This revision was realized after the hot discussion with many opponents.

age of other laws, especially the Juvenile Law. On August 4, 2015, the statement signed by 114 scholars in criminal laws was published to oppose the lowering of the application age of the Juvenile Law. Japan Federation of Bar Associations and all local bar associations expressed the opposition by the end of September. However, the mass media did not report about the opposite opinion as the big news. Many people sympathizing with crime victims supported the imposition of a criminal punishment on youths aged 18 and 19 as an adult.(21) Therefore, members of the Special Mission Committee of LDP neglected the opposite opinion. On the other hand, Japan Medical Association decided the statement on opposition to the lowering of the application age of both the Law of Prohibiting Minors from Smoking and the Law of Prohibiting Minors from Drinking Liquor, and submitted it to the Special Mission Committee. On September 10 the committee held the last meeting, at which they decided a report to the president of LDP. In the report both opinion of lowering the application age and that of maintaining it were written in a case of these two laws. However, members of the committee decided the lowering of application age of the Juvenile Law with a condition that the protective measures should exceptionally be given to youth offenders aged 18 and 19, if necessary. They demanded the Ministry of Justice to discuss the criminal legal system for youths.

In response of the demand the Ministry of Justice established the Study Meeting on Criminal Legal System for Youths. The meeting was held ten times from November 2, 2015, to July 29, 2016. The author presented the opposite opinion against the lowering of the application age of

(21) 88% of those who responded to the public opinion poll conducted in August and September in 2015 by the Yomiuri Newspaper were affirmative to lower the application age of the Juvenile Law to under 18 years old.

the Juvenile Law at the second meeting on November 28, 2015.[22] The Ministry of Justice asked people to write comments about the criminal legal system for youths by the end of December. The ministry received an opinion from 664 persons, among which 337 were lawyers or officers working at lawyers' office. Among 664 respondents, 634 persons or 95.5% expressed the opposition to the lowering of the application age of the Juvenile Law, while only 9 persons supported the lowering. Public prosecutors affiliated with the Ministry of Justice, who took the initiative in the meeting, neglected these opposite opinions. However, they could not acquire concrete ideas on criminal legal system for youths from invited scholars and practitioners in juvenile justice until the last meeting held on July 29, 2016. Then, although they received an advice from three scholars working as an adviser, they failed to describe the criminal legal system for youths with the exceptional application of protective measures in detail. In addition, they could not neglect opinion about the maintenance of the application age of the Juvenile Law in Correction Bureau headed by Satoshi Tomiyama, a director-general coming from a correction officer. In December, 2016, the Report on Summary of Discussion at the Study Meeting on Criminal Legal System for Youths was published, in which opinions both on the maintenance of the application age of the Juvenile Law and that on the lowering were written with reasons.

---

(22) The author distributed documents about the campaign against the lowering of application age of the Juvenile Law to some statesmen. A former Minister of Justice appreciated my documents, although he had agreed with a report decided by the Special Mission Committee in LDP. As he introduced the author to a high-ranking official of the Ministry of Justice, the author had an opportunity to state the opposite opinion at the second study meeting (http://www.moj.go.jp/keiji1/keiji12_00123.html). By the way, an official of the ministry informed the author in advance that the study meeting aims not to listen to the opposite opinion, but to discuss the criminal legal system for youths on the premise of lowering of the application age of the Juvenile Law.

Receiving the report, on February 9, 2017, the Minister of Justice asked at the general meeting of the Legal System Council to discuss the issue on the application age of the Juvenile Law in addition to another issue on the straightening of criminal laws to improve the treatment of criminals. At the meeting they approved the establishment of the Division on Juvenile Law and Criminal Laws. Most of mass media expressed the careful discussion without premising on the lowering the application age of the Juvenile Law.

The Minister of Justice appointed 19 persons as a member of this division and 18 as an assistant.[23] The first meeting of the division was held on March 16, 2017. At four meetings until June 29, 2017, members of the division received lectures by professional officers working at the juvenile justice to understand the practice. Then, at the later part of the fourth meeting on June 29, 2017, they began to exchange opinions about first issue on the lowering of the application age of the Juvenile Law to under 18 years old. However, they did not have enough time to exchange opinions.

At the fifth meeting on July 27 they exchanged opinions on criminal laws and criminal procedure laws to improve the treatment for criminals including juvenile offenders. After the exchange of opinions a chairman, a scholar in laws of criminal procedure, proposed to discuss the straightening of criminal laws and criminal procedure laws in three subcommittees by shelving discussion the issue about whether the application age of the Juvenile Law should be lowered or not. A lawyer working as an assistant who is one of four representatives of Japan Federation of Bar Associations opposed this proposal. However, the proposal was approved, as no member

(23) Anyone among 117 scholars in criminal laws who expressed the opposition to the lowering of the application age of the Juvenile Law in August, 2015, was not appointed as a member of the division.

of the Division on Juvenile Law and Criminal Laws opposed. The author is afraid that public prosecutors affiliated with the Criminal Affairs Bureau of the Ministry of Justice take the initiative in discussion about topics in three subcommittees on the premise of the lowering of the application age of the Juvenile Law to under 18 years old. If so, undemocratic discussion would be carried out in three subcommittees.

9. Bad Influences in Juvenile Justice by the Lowering of Application Age of Juvenile Law.

1) Guidance at School

Legal System Council concluded the lowering of adult age to 18 year old by the revision of Civil Code. The draft of the revised Civil Code will pass at the Diet in the near future. If the adult age and the application age of Juvenile Law were lowered, teachers at a senior high school would confront with difficulty in guidance for students of third grade who reach 18th birthday because these students might refuse from receiving their guidance as an adult (Yokoyama, 2017 : 105). As the students are liberated from parental supervision, teachers could not consult with their parents to cope with their delinquency.

Under Article 61 of the Juvenile Law the mass media is prohibited from writing of a name and features of a juvenile delinquent. If the application age of the law were lowered, a name and features of a delinquent student having reached 18th birthday would be informed by the mass media, with which the high school would have difficulty with coping.

At schools the activities to prevent juvenile delinquency are carried

out in the liaison with the police. Many senior high schools join the School-Police Report System to exchange information about a student who is guided or arrested by the police, and that about a student who causes some problems at the school. In addition, there is the School Supporter System, under which a retired police officer is dispatched to a school by the request of its principal in order to prevent students from committing delinquency. If the application age were lowered to under 18 years old, the School-Police Report System and the School Supporter System would not be applied to a delinquent student having reached to 18th birthday.

2) Delinquency Preventive Activities by Police

Article 2 of the Rule of Juvenile Police Activities prescribes that "a juvenile" is a person under 20 years old defined by Paragraph 1 of Article 2 of Juvenile Law. Therefore, if the application age of the Juvenile Law were lowered, youths aged 18 and 19 would not be treated under the Rule of Juvenile Police Activities. The police would lose the power to give guidance to youths aged 18 and 19 as a pre-delinquent, to offer an aid to them as a juvenile crime victim and a juvenile necessary for protection, and to give counselling to them under this rule. The police screen a juvenile with high possibility of committing a future offense among a lot of pre-delinquents. He/she is referred to the family court as a pre-offense juvenile. If the application age of the Juvenile Law were lowered, youths aged 18 and 19 would not be given the protective measures as a pre-offense juvenile.

Under Paragraph 2 of Article 8 of the Rule of Juvenile Police Activities the police are authorized to give the continuing guidance with juvenile' consent and his/her protector' consent after guidance on site. The

support activities as the continuing guidance have been activated since 2010. However, if youths aged 18 and 19 were excluded, the support activities by the police would wane (Yokoyama, 2017b : 196).

3) Investigation by Police

In Chapter 11 of the Rule of Criminal Investigation there are several special provisions for a juvenile case. Article 203 in this chapter prescribes that the police must have a spirit to rear a juvenile offender soundly when they investigate him/her. Under Article 204 an interrogator is obliged to be careful about their words and behavior with kindliness and understanding not to hurt juvenile's sentiment. Article 208 prescribes that police officers should confine a juvenile suspect as few as possible and that they should be especially careful about time and way on how to arrest a juvenile suspect and take him/her to a police station. If the application age of the Juvenile Law were lowered, these special provisions would not be applied to youths aged 18 and 19. As they become more immature than previously, they might be more frequently induced to a false confession by a harsh interrogation.

4) Referral from Police

Under the Juvenile Law all cases of a juvenile offender is referred directly or via the public prosecutor to the family court. The police do not have power to screen the cases. If the application age of the Juvenile Law were lowered, many youths aged 18 and 19 having committed a trivial offense would be released as an adult at the summary procedure at a police station. They would lose an opportunity to be offered the protective educative measures under the Juvenile Law.[24]

5) Practice by Public Prosecutor

Since the revision of the Juvenile Law in 2000 heinous cases of a juvenile over 15 years old have been more frequently referred back to the public prosecutor for criminal indictment. In addition, by this revised law the public prosecutor is admitted by the family court judge(s) to appear the court for adjudication. Therefore, they seem not to demand the restoration of their power to screen juvenile cases as we saw soon after the World War II. However, public prosecutors occupying important positions of the Ministry of Justice have endeavored to realize the demand by the Special Mission Committee on Adult Age of LDP. They think about introduction of exceptional protective measures for some youth offenders aged 18 and 19 in case that the application age of the Juvenile Law is lowered.

If the application age were lowered, all cases of offenders aged 18 and 19 would be treated in principle as an adult under the Code of Criminal Procedure. If so, the public prosecutor would restore the power to screen cases aged 18 and 19. If the public prosecutor screens cases of those youth offenders at the standard for adult offenders, many those offenders would be released without being prosecuted in the formal criminal procedure to the criminal court.[25]

(24) The police officers, especially those in charge of guidance activities give the waring and the guidance to a juvenile delinquent at the time of referral to the public prosecutor or the family court. Such guidance and warning could not be given to youths aged 18 and 19 if the application age of the Juvenile Law were lowered.

(25) In 2015 all persons of disposing of at the public prosecutors' office amounted to 1,191,556, among which 80,160 were referred to the family court. Among 1,111,396 excluding 80,160 persons referred to the family court, 92,930 or 8.4% were prosecuted in the formal criminal procedure, 278,529 or 25.1% were prosecuted for a summery order, 670,686 or 60.3% were released by prosecution grace of the prosecutor, and

If the public prosecutor were given the power to decide to offer the exceptional protective measures to youth offenders aged 18 and 19, by what standard would they exert this discretionary power? As they are specialists in criminal laws, they can screen cases according to the degree of seriousness of an offense. However, could they screen cases for exceptional protective measures adequately in consideration of necessity of offering the protective measures? If not, could the public prosecutors' offices employ many case workers for this screening? It would be difficult in the bad financial situation of the national government.(26)

6) Practice at Criminal Court

Most cases of a trivial offense were treated at the summary criminal court. In these cases, especially cases of a traffic offense offenders are imposed only a fine. Currently, many juveniles aged 18 and 19, are put under protective measures such as the probation and the treatment in a juvenile training school under the Juvenile Law. For example, those who have committed a traffic offense are offered a special program to learn traffic laws and the adequate attitude when they drive an automobile. If the application age of the Juvenile Law were lowered, youths aged 18 and 19 would lose an opportunity to receive these programs. The programs for tentative probationers and probationers in case of a traffic offense would wane, because the age for ac-

---

69,251 or 6.2% were released by non-prosecution. If the application age of Juvenile Law were lowered, more than 92% of suspects aged 18 and 19 were diverted from the criminal justice without receiving the sentence in the formal criminal procedure. By the way about 60% among all adult cases were released after the imposition of a fine in the summary procedure.

(26) The budget deficit in Japan is worst among developed countries.

quiring an drivers' ordinary license is 18 years old.

In cases of a relative serious offense a judge gives the imprisonment sentence. However, in many cases the imprisonment sentences is suspended. In 2015 the total number of persons imposed the imprisonment sentence amounted to 56,878, of which 34,688 or 61.0% were suspended its execution. If the application age of Juvenile Law were lowered, youth offenders aged 18 and 19 would have more chances than 60% to receive the suspended imprisonment sentence, because most of them do not have any criminal career. They would be released without giving any protective measures, although some would be put under probation.[27]

In Japan youths aged 18 and 19 commit violent and heinous offenses infrequently. Therefore, only a small number of offenders of these ages would be confined in a prison. Those who insist the lowering of the Juvenile Law, think that prisoners aged 18 and 19 would have an opportunity to receive the educative treatment similar to that in a current juvenile training school. However, the protective and educative programs are offered more poorly in a juvenile prison than in a juvenile training school.[28]

7) Practice at Juvenile Detention & Classification Center

If the application age of the Juvenile Law were lowered, youth offenders aged 18 and 19 would be confined in a jail without receiving a re-

(27) Among 34,688 persons receiving the suspended imprisonment sentence in 2015, 3,460 or 10.0% were put under the probation.

(28) Under the Penal Code the imprisonment with the compulsory labor and that without the compulsory labor are prescribed. As almost all of those imposed the imprison sentence are obliged to participate in the prison labor, young prisoners of under 20 years old receive the educative programs outside working hours.

search at the Detention & Classification Center. During the confinement in a jail they would lose an opportunity to receive the educative program, because they would be treated as an adult suspect with the presumption of innocence.

The total number of the newly accommodated juveniles in the Juvenile Detention & Classification Center decreased from 20,380 in 1999 to 9,132 in 2015. If the application age of the Juvenile Law were lowered, the total number of the accommodated persons in the center would decrease by 30%. The author esteems that a half of the Detention & Classification Center in depopulated prefectures would be closed, by which the center would disappear in many prefectures. The juvenile delinquent accommodated in the center located in another prefecture would suffer great damage when he/she is adjudicated at the family court in his/her prefecture. In addition, many specialists in behavioral sciences and Homukyokans (teachers in charge of legal affairs) would lose their jobs at the Detention & Classification Center. The techniques to classify the accommodated delinquents according to their quality discrimination and to treat them under the temporary educative programs would wane.

8) Practice at Family Court

Recently, judges at a family court tend to adopt the procedure similar to criminal procedure, because at the adjudication they consider the seriousness of delinquent behavior more importantly than the necessity of protection for a juvenile delinquent. If juvenile delinquents heard at the family court decreased owning to the lowering of the application age of the Juvenile Law, this tendency might be advanced as probation officers at the family court lose their ability to treat various cases as a

social worker.[29]

A judge can put a juvenile delinquent on the temporary probation before the final decision. If the application age of the Juvenile Law were lowered, the juvenile temporary probationers would decrease by a half. Many facilities to accommodate them would be closed.

9) Treatment at Juvenile Training School

The total number of juveniles sent to a juvenile training school decreased from 6,052 in 2000 to 2,743 in 2015. If the application age of the Juvenile Law were lowered, the total number of juveniles treated at a juvenile training school would decrease by 40%. About a half of juvenile training schools accommodating juveniles over 15 years old would be closed. The highly evaluated educative treatment in a juvenile training school would wane (Yokoyama, 2016).

10) Practice of Probation and Parole

The judge(s) at the family court can decide to put a juvenile delinquent on probation in addition to the temporary probation which the family court probation officer supervises. Juveniles released temporarily from a juvenile training school are put on parole. Juvenile probationers and parolees are given aid for rehabilitation by a probation & parole officer and a Hogoshi (a volunteer probation & parole officer). If the application age of the Juvenile Law were lowered, juvenile probationers would decrease by 30%. Especially, the educative programs

(29) Since 2000 more and more family court probation officers have worked as a sevant to a judge. They give up playing a role as a professional case worker to realize juvenile's best interests (Yokoyama, 2012). Their abandonment of this role also contributes to neglecting the necessity of protection for a juvenile delinquent at the adjudication.

for juvenile traffic probationers would disappear, because the minimum age of the driver's ordinary license is 18 years old.

Under Article 60 of the Juvenile Law the restriction of qualification prescribed by any law is not applied to a person having committed an offense before his/her 20th birthday. Therefore, the stigmatization against juvenile delinquents released from a juvenile training school is lighter than that against ex-prisoners who have committed an offense as an adult. If the application age of the Juvenile Law were lowered, the restriction of qualification would be not applied to offenders aged 18 and 19. They would have more difficulty in rehabilitating themselves in the community after the release from a prison, even after the release from a facility to give exceptional protective measures. It would be a retreat of the rehabilitation model in the current juvenile justice.

10. Conclusion – Future of Japanese Juvenile System

In Japan the protective educative treatment of juvenile delinquents has been excellently carried out under the welfare and rehabilitation model by the support of many volunteers in the community. Therefore, John Winterdyk evaluates Japanese juvenile justice system highly as the welfare, participatory and rehabilitation model. However, this excellent system faces the danger of collapse in the recent political climate and movement by public prosecutors affiliated with the Ministry of Justice.

On June 17, 2015, the Revised Public Office Election Law to give the suffrage to youngsters aged 18 and 19 passed at the Diet unanimously after which the public opinion are favorable for the lowering of the application age of the Juvenile Law to under 18 years old. The author began to ex-

plain the excellent practice under welfare, participatory and rehabilitation model in Japanese juvenile justice, and how greatly this excellent practice would be damaged if the application age of the Juvenile Law were lowered. Backed up by the author's explanation the Correction Bureau of the Ministry of Justice has insisted the maintenance of the application age of the Juvenile Law. Then, they succeeded in put their opinion into the Report on Summary of Discussion at the Study Meeting on Criminal Legal System for Youths published in December, 2016.

On March 16, 2017, members of the Division on Juvenile Law and Criminal Laws of the Legal System Council started to discuss the issue on the lowering of the application age of the Juvenile Law. Public prosecutors affiliated with the Criminal Affairs Bureau in the Ministry of Justice take the initiative in discussion about topics of the legal system and the treatment for criminals on the premise of the lowering of the application age of the Juvenile Law to under 18 years old. It looks like undemocratic, because they do not give time enough to discuss opinions on the maintenance of the application age of Juvenile Law.

Japanese criminal laws have been influenced by German laws, in which the theoretical consistency is emphasized. Public prosecutors affiliated with the Ministry of Justice and several scholars in criminal laws supporting them insist the lowering of the application age of Juvenile Law from the viewpoint of the consistency in the whole legal system. On the other hand, other scholars in criminal laws and lawyers insist that the application age of each law can be decided differently according to its purpose. But, the latter insistence is neglected by the public prosecutors and the scholars supporting them at the Division on Juvenile Law and Criminal Laws.[30] It is

(30) We were not informed about how the Minister of Justice decided 19 members of the Division on Juvenile Law and Criminal Law of the Legal System Council. I guess

very curious for them not to insist the lowering of application of all laws including the Law of Prohibiting Minors from Smoking and the Law of Prohibiting Minors from Drinking Liquor if they emphasize the consistency in the whole legal system.

In advanced countries we have seen the tendency in juvenile justice to move from the welfare model to the crime control model. Majority of scholars and practitioners in juvenile justice all over the world are concerned about it. They appreciate practice under the current Japanese Juvenile Law. The author has sent essays on the opposite opinion against the lowering of the application age of the Juvenile Law to several influential statesmen, who had have an opinion favorable for the lowering of it. They know that many youths aged 18 and 19 having committed a minor offense would be released without any educative treatment if the application age were lowered. Then, they begin to reconsider the issue on the lowering of the application age. Why do prosecutors and scholars supporting them at the Division on Juvenile Law and Criminal Laws take the initiative in realizing the lowering of the application age of the Juvenile Law in such changing political climate? If the application age of the Juvenile Law were realized, they would be a laughingstock among not only scholars and practitioners in juvenile justice in Japan but also those supporting the welfare and rehabilitation model in the juvenile justice all over the world.(31)

---

that he decided according to an advice by a director-general of the Criminal Affairs Bureau who took the initiative in lowering the application age of the Juvenile Law, because no scholar expressing the opposite opinion against the lowering was appointed as the member.

(31) The author presented a paper at International Conference on the Education and Correction for Problematic and Delinquent Juveniles and Youth held on August 19-20, 2017, which was hosted by the School of Educational Science at LU DONG University in Yantai City, Shandong Province, China. After my presentation two guest speakers, that is, Stephan Parmentier (Belgium) and R. Thilagaraj (India) supported my oppo-

Juveniles become more and more immature as a result of being reared with too much care in a society with decreasing birthrates. In case such immature persons commit an offense, it is more desirable to give the educative measures instead of the imposition of criminal punishment in order to make them rehabilitate into a society. From this viewpoint the author insists that the introduction of the educative measures for youth offenders aged between 20 and 22 should be considered in addition to the maintenance of the current application age of the Juvenile Law.

References

Japanese Correctional Association (1984). *Modern Development of Juvenile Correction* [written in Japanese]. Japanese Correction Association, Tokyo.

Sawanobori, T (2015). *Entrance into Juvenile Law-Sixth Version* [written in Japanese]. Tokyo, Yuhikaku.

Yokoyama, M (1989). Net-widening of the juvenile justice system in Japan. *Criminal Justice Review*, 14(1) : 43-53.

Yokoyama, M (1997). Juvenile Justice : An Overview of Japan. In J. Win-

site opinion against the lowering of the application age of the Juvenile Law. By the way, supporters of my opposite opinion are Peter Grabosky (Australia), Susan Feldman (Australia), Kellens Georges (Belgium), Jim Hackler (Canada), John R. (Jack) McDonald (Canada), George Foskett (Canada), Sophie Body (France), Ahti Laitenen (Finland), Helmut Kury (Germany), Manfred Brusten (Germany), Joachim Kersten (Germany), Robert Harnischmacher (Germany), Lévay Miklós (Hungary), John Pratt (New Zealand), Anna Szafranek (Poland), Emil W. Plywaczewski (Poland), Yakov Gilinskiy (Russia), Alfonso Falero Folgoso (Spain), Branislav Simonovic (Serbia), Johan Bertilsson (Sweden), Jerzy Sarnecki (Sweden) , Katy Pickvance (UK), Martin Wright (UK), Witlod Pawlak (UK), Michael Levi (UK), Emilio Viano (USA), Robert S Agnew (USA), Steven F Messner (USA), Henry Pontell (USA), Richard Bennett (USA), S Vincentnathan (USA), Richard James Terrill (USA), Preston Elrod (USA).

terdyk (ed.), *Juvenile Justice System – International Perspectives*. Toronto : Canadian Scholars' Press, Inc. : 1–28.

Yokoyama, M (2003). Revision of the Juvenile Law Toward Partial Criminalization in Japan. In A. Manganas (ed.), *Essays in Honour of Alice Yotopoulos-Marangopoulos : Human Rights, Crime-Criminal Policy* : Volume B. Athens, Bruylant, 1545–1562.

Yokoyama, M (2008). Should the Application Age of Juvenile Law be Lowered to under !8 Years Old? – Concerning Opinion of Democratic Party [written in Japanese]. http://www2.kokugakuin.ac.jp/zyokoym/juvlawage1.html,

Yokoyama, M (2009). How has The Revised Juvenile Law Functioned since 2001 in Japan? In E. W. Plywaczewski (ed.), *Current Problems of the Penal Law and the Criminology No. 4*. Bialystok, Poland. Temida 2, 667–702.

Yokoyama, M (2010). Change in Idea of Treatment of Juvenile Delinquents – Transition of Idea on Protectionism in Relation to Maximum Application Age of Juvenile Law [written in Japanese]. In T. Sawanobori and H. Takauchi (eds.), *Idea of Juvenile Law*. Tokyo, Gendai Jinbun-sha, 115–139.

Yokoyama, M (2012). Trend of Juvenile Adjudication to Criminal Trial – Consideration by Observing a Mock Adjudication at Tokyo Family Court [written in Japanese]. In H. Umezawa (ed.) *Course of History of Study Meeting on Juvenile Law for 30 years*. Tokyo, Study Meeting on Juvenile Law 74–78.

Yokoyama, M (2015). Juvenile Justice and Juvenile Crime : An Overview of Japan, In J. Winterdyk (ed.), *Juvenile Justice – International Perspectives, Models, and Trends*. Boca Raton London New York : CRC Press : 179–208.

Yokoyama, M (2016). Change in Educative Treatment in Japanese Juvenile Training School. *Kokugakuin Journal of Law and Politics*, 53 (4) : 31–65.

Yokoyama, M (2017a). Problem of Change in Suffrage Age to 18 Years Old and the Lowering of Application Age of Juvenile Law [written in Japanese]. *Annual Report of Japan Education Law Association*. Tokyo, Yuhikaku, 46 : 98–107

Yokoyama, M (2017b). Development of Police Activities for Juveniles and Its Present Problems [written in Japanese]. *Security Science Review*. Tokyo, Tachibana Shobo, 19 : 170–199.

Winterdyk, John (1997). *Juvenile Justice System – International Perspectives*. Toronto : Canadian Scholars' Press, Inc.