majority of those who will practise in the UK, as well as many lawyers who practise in other countries. The vocational programs may also attract more international entrants and have room to grow in influence.

All of this, however, is unlikely to be a domain in which the institutions that currently provide the leverages for change in UK legal education enjoy free reign. The global market for higher education, the international demand for corporate legal services and the worldwide concern for universal human rights will ultimately be the arbiters of what constitutes UK legal education in the coming century.

Perspectives on the internationalisation of legal education
A G Padilla
51 *J Legal Educ* 3, 2001, pp 350–354

Institutional efforts towards the internationalisation of legal education are still significantly influenced by assumptions that date back to the 1960s regarding the characteristics of the various legal educational systems. Twenty-seven years ago John H. Merryman outlined the then prevailing views on the main traits of the two leading systems of legal education in the West: the North American and the Continental.

First, an almost monopolistic control of the state over legal education on the Continent versus a very strong private sector influence in the North American tradition. Second, a contrast between the emphasis placed on access and democratisation in the Continental counterpart. Third, the focus on strict legal doctrine prevailing in Continental education, as opposed to the emphasis on 'policy' matters observed in North American institutions of legal education. Fourth, the basically professional character of North American legal education, as compared to the broader legal culture objectives pursued in the Continental tradition. Fifth, the curricular flexibility prevailing in the North American tradition, as opposed to the rigidity constraining academic programs on the Continent.

Developments that occurred in the last decades of the twentieth century prompt a re-examination of the traditional understandings. Such a re-examination might lead us to a clearer view of the true challenges that we face when seeking to enhance co-operation between institutions operating within the two systems. For one thing, higher education in the Continental tradition (and legal education is not an exception) has not been immune to the new emphasis on the capabilities of the private sector. Countries belonging to that tradition now have major private institutions which, albeit still young, have become ever more dynamic. Second, in the latter part of the century just concluded, the Continental university, in those instances where it was over-committed to access rather than quality, was already seeking to find a better balance. On the opposite side, during the second half of the twentieth century, the supply of legal education in the United States expanded notably as new schools began operations and others grew in size. Third, the teaching profile in both traditions, if it ever was as different as described, seems to have grown closer as the twentieth century drew to its end. Whether because of increasing familiarity between the schools of the two traditions or because of independent developments in the overall standards of quality, today the parameters for judging what constitutes good law classroom experience are similar in the two cultures.

Any barriers encountered today are fundamentally different, albeit not necessarily easier to overcome, and they are not always in the past. First, the level of resources of the institutions of the different communities may be quite disparate. Efforts at internationalisation are expensive. They demand investments that may not yield fruit immediately. Second, indirect resources to support cooperation are likewise not comparable in the two traditions. In terms of internationalisation initiatives, the funds allocated for education, which are channelled through students, may be especially significant. Third, the forces favouring the internationalisation of legal education sometimes clash with forces seeking to protect national interests that may also play a valid role in the life of some institutions. Fourth, the differences in the organisational structures of law schools and departments of the different traditions also tend to impede interrelations.

REVIEW ARTICLE

Legal education and training in Hong Kong: preliminary review
P Redmond & C Roper
Steering Committee on Legal Education & Training in Hong Kong, 2001
445pp

This report is an important assessment of the current status of the legal education and training provision in Hong Kong. It identifies a number of significant shortcomings in the present provision and proposes a model for a reformed system recommended for adoption. It was commissioned by a Steering Committee, which appointed two consultants to conduct the research and prepare a report: Professor Paul Redmond, then the Dean of the Faculty of Law at the University of New South Wales, Australia and Christopher Roper, formerly Director of the Centre for Legal Education and now Director of the College of Law Alliance, Australia.

Any review of all the facets of the system of legal education in any jurisdiction is necessarily a major undertaking. All such reviews, especially this one, due to the quality of the research and writing, are relevant to other common law countries. Whatever divergent paths these countries have trod, they still share a common inheritance.

It is not proposed to review in detail this report, which is quite long and very comprehensive. In addition there are some distinctive features to legal education in Hong Kong arising from its colonial heritage and its current political and economic climates, which will be of limited interest to the general reader. This commentary will therefore be confined to a brief overview of the contents. Readers who wish to access the entire report can do so on the Internet at http://www.hklawsoc.org.hk

Part A of the report deals with the general themes of the mix of knowledge and skills necessary for the formation and subsequent professional development of lawyers, together with the place of values in legal education and training. It provides an account of the sources of modern structures of legal education and training, including a comparative outline of the legal education systems in other relevant countries. It also addresses environmental changes in a range of areas, including new areas of legal services, increased lawyer specialisation, the changing structures of legal practice, student centred learning and addressing unmet legal needs. These themes are then considered in the light of the particular constitutional, economic and social circumstances in Hong Kong.

In Part B chapter 4 the authors examine the range of competencies and attributes required in Hong Kong lawyers as a group, looking first at securing a match between legal training and social need and then at the range of the need for legal services. They then construct a typology of the skills, competencies and attributes required in the profession, including general intellectual skills, those specific to the discipline of law, professionals skills and the relevant personal attributes and ethical capacities to be nurtured through the legal education process.

Chapter 5 scrutinises the widespread perception in Hong Kong about an excess in the supply of lawyers, leading to concerns about a diminution of standards and the impact of these numbers on legal practice. Another critical issue which is germane to Hong Kong is the problem with language proficiency, where students undertake their studies in English, which for most is their second language.

The goals and orientation of the academic stage are addressed in chapter 7, together with the structure of law degree programs and the methods of teaching, learning and assessment necessary to achieve the skills and knowledge formation recommended. Not surprisingly, this a critical section of the report. Chapter 8 canvases the preparation for practice which occurs during the vocational stage of the legal education process.

The remaining chapters in Part B deal with the establishment of a common standard for all persons seeking professional admission in Hong Kong, academic staff development and training, equity and access issues, legal specialisation and inculcating a commitment to lifelong learning while benchmarking a CPD scheme for the profession. In chapter 14 there is a very worthwhile discussion of the place for teaching values in both the academic and vocational stages.

In the second last chapter the authors seek to shape their recommendations into a coherent model for a legal education and training system for Hong Kong. As a result, it contains the kernel of their report and is very interesting reading. The final chapter covers their recommendations for the governance structures which should be put in place to control the process of qualification for admission to practice.

Clearly, there are many features to the legal education system in Hong Kong that are creatures of its colonial legacy and have probably been thrown into greater relief since its reversion to China five years ago. Nonetheless the essence of that heritage will be shared by most common law countries, which will make this report of considerable interest to many. The authors are to be commended on the quality of their research and their scholarship. It is a comprehensive and well considered report into an entire system of legal education, no mean feat in itself. It will be very interesting to see what use the Steering Committee which commissioned the report makes of this document and to what extent its recommendations are translated into actual decisions about the future structure of an improved legal education system in Hong Kong.

Editor

LEGAL ETHICS

Teaching values in law school: shared norms, bad lawyers and the virtues of casuistry
P R Tremblay
36 *U S F L. Rev,* 2002, pp 659–718

Lawyers encounter ethical questions and morally uncertain choice opportunities on a regular basis. Many observers believe that the legal profession is riddled with ethically troublesome practices, implying that lawyers not infrequently choose the wrong answer to their ethical questions or resolve their moral uncertainties ineptly. Notwithstanding this critical trend, the literature on moral decision-making by lawyers reflects a sustained appreciation for, and sometimes deference to, a conception of moral pluralism and 'personal values.' The assertion that the legal profession lacks a shared account of normative ethics is as widespread as the claim that the profession is experiencing a moral crisis.

There may be ways, at least pragmatic ways, to talk and teach about values and virtues with lawyers and law students. There is much to be gained by a search for common, shared norms, and for 'paradigm cases' representing agreed-upon sentiments about how moral issues ought to be resolved, as a basis for reasoned conversation about more complex