I. INTRODUCTION

1. A joint report

The IACL accepted the joint recommendation of the Reporters that we produce a single General Report on the topic of Internationalisation of Legal Education (‘IOLE’). We considered this appropriate given the nature of the topic, which is not one of substantive law. Despite the distinction made by Max Weber a century ago between two main systems of legal education (the English apprenticeship system and the German university model) there is today little empirical evidence to suggest that there is a remaining chasm. Any remaining differences appear to be ones more of degree and of conventional perception.

In terms of the internationalization of legal education, there appears to be little to be gained from drawing distinctions or making comparisons along common law/civil law lines. Although in some ways there remains somewhat greater integration between the countries of the British Commonwealth as far as admission is concerned, in many ways the common law and civil law approaches, with their mix of university degrees and periods of apprenticeship are no longer really very different, and have not been so for quite a while. That is not to say that there is sufficient knowledge or understanding between the systems; failures of understanding even occur within countries, such as in Canada between the common law, and the civil law of Quebec. In some countries the ‘other system’ elicits little interest, as for instance the National Reporter for Spain mentions, or attracts generalised criticism.

2. Why address the topic of IOLE now?

Why is the topic of internationalization of legal education on the agenda now? Why is it a relevant subject for examination today? Does the topic generate the same level of interest everywhere in the world? Is enthusiasm for IOLE mainly driven by the academic sector, by government, by multinational corporations? Is the interest closely linked with the globalization of the practice of law? Or is globalisation of law itself something of a myth, or a reality reserved for only a very small percentage of practising lawyers around the world?

It is problematical to generate firm answers to these questions. But what we can report without a doubt is that there is widespread interest in IOLE, and numerous disparate initiatives around the world. Nonetheless,
some National Reporters state that the topic is simply not on the agenda at all (as was reported in relation to India, for instance, and to some degree Spain).

There are of course some terminological issues concerning the use of the terms ‘international’, ‘transnational’ and ‘global’, and their ‘-isation’ equivalents. Professor Chesterman (10 (2009) German Law Journal, 877) makes a useful distinction between “internationalisation” (a small number of lawyers involved in mediating dispute between jurisdictions; students within this paradigm/period rarely move and the vast majority study in the jurisdiction in which they live); transnationalization (a word coined by Philip Jessup in the 1950s and signifying increasing mobility of capital and people, collaborations and exchange programs in legal education and the rise of foreign students admitted into law programs) and “globalisation” (a global elite in a worldwide market for talent; law schools need to educate lawyers to be “residents” rather than “tourists” in new jurisdictions, with more dual or double-degree programs across national jurisdictions, and the creation of self-proclaimed “global law schools”). In relation to ‘globalisation’ the NR for Luxembourg (Prof Ancel) makes the point that ‘[…] la globalisation peut être perçue sur deux plans qu’on peut, en paraphrasant Gény, désigner comme celui du “donné” et celui du “construit”. By the ‘globalisation du donné’; he means the growth of international relations that results in the proliferation of international contracts, of corporate groups, the development of family relations between persons on different nationalities, etc.. This results in lawyers needing to deal more often with foreign legal systems. The ‘globalisation du construit’ then, refers to a growing internationalisation of the law itself, not only by the development of international legal instruments largely rooted in domestic legal systems, but also ‘[…] a travers une circulation accrue des idées et des concepts juridiques, entraînant une sorte de transnationalisation des droits nationaux eux-mêmes’.

In this report, on the one hand we have used the terms ‘international’ and ‘transnational’ interchangeably, and on the other hand we have referred to ‘global’ and ‘globalisation’ as distinct concepts. The latter terms are less neutral and give rise to more debate, which we do attempt to address, based on NR’s comments, at various points below. ‘Globalisation’ in terms of legal practice tends to refer to the emergence of the so-called “global lawyer”, an ill-defined term which suggests cosmopolitan individuals familiar with different legal cultures, multilingual, at ease in the world of global trade and finance, and not concerned with national borders. However, does the ‘global lawyer’ represent nothing more than a mythical future, or a legal practice elite which in some form has in fact existed for a long time in the higher spheres of international banking and finance, M&A’s, multinational corporate groups and international taxation, to name a few? Globalisation is sometimes also seen as cover for the overbearing influence of a single national system.

There is also a question whether notwithstanding the reality of socio/economic globalisation and its substantive impact on the law, the essential elements of legal practice, ie the giving of legal advice and the representation of clients in courts, always remain national (the Scottish NR refers to the global lawyer as an ‘enlightened national lawyer’). All legal questions with a foreign or international element, except for the few being dealt with by supranational courts, remain anchored in the legal system of the relevant locus. Some agree with Posner where he said:1 “Legal thinking does not cross national boundaries.” (see the debate referred to by the Swiss NR concerning Switzerland and globalization: “a bit of an American-style of isolationism prevails also in Switzerland”). If so, is IOLE just a marginal and transitory faze, the latest fad in legal education which will peter out to be replaced by the ‘next best thing’?

We think not: technology, travel, multinational business, the adoption of a few linguae francae, the creation of free trade areas, instant access to law and information from around the world are all here to stay. The world has become more integrated, and the legal academic is actively responding to such a state of affairs – albeit at a relatively low pace it would seem. On the positive side of things, more and more students have an international dimension in their legal education, and they are imbued with the values of openness, cosmopolitanism, curiosity and engagement that come with it.


National Reporters have submitted reports in relation to the 38 jurisdictions listed in Annex 1. This General Report does not attempt to incorporate all data from the National Reports, but to provide an overview and identify some common themes that emerge from the Reports. We have also selected some examples of various programs, admission rules, practice structures etc. to illustrate elements of the General Report. The National Reports frequently contained numerous useful references to sources, which are collected in Annex 2. We thank the National Reporters for their work and the useful material they have provided, and on which this General Report is almost exclusively based.

In many respects the contents of this General Report will not surprise those interested in the Internationalisation of Legal Education (IOLE). However, the Report provides a basis for further discussions at the Congress and for future development. One of our main conclusions is that many and varied IOLE initiatives are underway in the countries reported upon, but in a largely uncoordinated and very diverse manner.

As indicated above, only very few National Reporters assert that IOLE elicits no interest or initiatives in the academic sphere in their country. We are of course conscious of the fact that National Reporters would tend to have an interest in, and enthusiasm for the subject. We therefore try to maintain a healthy level of scepticism with regard to the phenomenon of IOLE. We also note that we did not ask National Reporters to provide systematic raw data about IOLE, but more general impressions and illustrations. Some few Reporters interviewed others within their jurisdiction, in India for instance and also in Ireland. We sought input about the nature of the domestic debate, the level of initiatives, divergences of opinion etc. to give us a richer picture of where IOLE stands in the various jurisdictions.

Generally speaking the NR’s did not advance any major structural reforms or advances. Most proposals tended to reflect ideas already established in some jurisdictions, or some increase in the intensity with which the goal of internationalisation of legal education should be pursued. The National Reports tended to confirm observable patterns rather than reveal unsuspected (future) plans and developments. There is nonetheless a considerable level of incidental flexibility, innovation and experimentation within the IOLE space. A theme that in our view emerges clearly from the National Reports is that legal education more generally is trending towards greater diversification depending on intended career paths and interests – and that the international aspect of life in the law is one of the diverse options that must be available in today’s world. Nonetheless we also see a communis opinio that all law graduates today should have at least a decent foundation knowledge of the world of the law beyond their own jurisdiction. Nonetheless we do conclude that it is incumbent upon law faculties to ensure that the greatest possible number of students can
participate in internationalisation. Practical, and to the extent possible also financial constraints should be systematically addressed in a cooperative and supportive fashion amongst institutions.

II. INTERNATIONALISATION IN THE LEGAL ACADEMY AND IN THE PROFESSION

1. Internationalisation in the legal academy

The National Reporters from most jurisdictions describe a high degree of internationalisation of the legal academy itself in their country. In a normative sense, National Reporters almost universally agree that there ought to be a high degree of internationalisation, and give various reasons for this, which are addressed later in the report.

A significant indicator of this is the high proportion of legal academics that have degrees from a jurisdiction other than where they live and work, although perhaps less so in civilian jurisdictions than in the common law world. The proportion is reported to be low in Czechia (10%), and relatively low in Germany (10-30%), and Portugal (20%). In Tunisia more academics had foreign degrees in the past than now, as well as Estonia (39%). The proportion is high in Cameroun (which has both common and civil law traditions); Canada; Italy much more than some years ago; Greece due to the history and the structure of Greek legal tradition, with a strong German connection; and in Japan because the law is ‘imported’ from the West, so many law professors have studied at least one foreign jurisdiction. The proportion is said to be high in most common law jurisdictions, with the exception of the USA; for instance, 2/3rds in NZ where, paradoxically the interest in IOLE is said to be low, and comparative law not well developed. The reasons for high levels of foreign qualifications are varied, from the fact that some countries are former colonies (like Cameroun or Tunisia, where there has been a decline in foreign degrees since independence) or they are members of a closely integrated cultural sphere (Canada with the USA; Ireland with UK and USA; the special links between Israel and the USA; Australia/NZ and the UK). It may be the case that foreign degrees are more common in common law countries than in civilian jurisdictions. It appears that in the civil law tradition, when people study abroad they study in a civil law country or in the US, whose LLM offerings have had a great impact and generate significant financial resources for faculties. However, in the common law tradition, individuals when they study abroad tend to choose a common law country and only rarely a civil law jurisdiction. In part this appears due to the relatively low number of LLM’s offered in civilian universities partly because of the language issue.

A further indicator is that many Reporters stress the need to publish in another jurisdiction or in another language. In some jurisdictions (eg Israel) it is essential to publish in foreign journals to advance an academic career, whereas in others it is of little consequence (United States, India, France). As a general trend one can say that publishing abroad is becoming more important. Most often that means publishing in English language journals (Belgium). Nonetheless there are also countries (such as India, the United States, Sweden) where this is not the case, and most legal academics do not have a ‘foreign’ degree. These tend to be the larger jurisdictions, in particular where English is the home language. We assume that if research is conducted and published in other jurisdictions, this will be reflected in the approach to teaching and
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2 Note: in Italy, the jury that gives access to the equivalent of “tenure” is composed of five professors of whom one is a foreigner.
education the publishing academics take. Research and publications are often reported to require a foreign or comparative element, or to be incomplete without references to other jurisdictions, or aspects of the global legal order.

Some law schools are reported to have foreign permanent professors (eg in Italy in Trento; some “tenured” chairs in foreign law in Germany in French law, Anglo-American law, Asian law; in Luxemburg all professors of the relatively new law faculty have foreign degrees; in Singapore, after the initial appointment of a Chinese professor to teach Chinese law, other professors have been appointed to teach the law of their home jurisdictions), who teach in the international law field or about their own law of origin. Many faculties also have permanent foreign adjuncts or ‘Visiting Professors’ who attend for regular teaching duties every year or every semester (eg Trento has 26 foreign visiting professors; Visiting Professors at Gothenburg and Stockholm in Sweden, at Sciences Po in France). Courses are commonly offered in collaboration with foreign colleagues (eg, joint seminars in Germany; frequent visitors in Israel; visiting professors collaborate with locals in Sweden; etc.).

Most Reporters also stress that not just they but also their colleagues regard internationalisation of their teaching and their research as a very important priority. It is very common to read that Reporters and their domestic colleagues endeavour to build comparative elements into their undergraduate core courses. Generally the National Reports mention that there is considerable openness to foreign laws, international debates and legal institutions, etc. amongst the legal academy. Naturally the National Reporters are as individuals positively disposed towards internationalisation themselves, which might to a degree influence their perception in this regard. But they report many objective developments, such as the perceived importance of research periods at foreign institutions, attendance at multi-jurisdictional conferences, maintaining networks of contacts and collegial relations with colleagues overseas, familiarity with the foreign literature, faculty determinations to incorporate comparative elements in courses etc. Only in some of the very large jurisdictions does the establishment and maintenance of foreign networks appear to play but a minor role (the US, India).

Thus with some exceptions the legal academy can be said to be almost universally international in its outlook, networks and connections. If legal academics are not international in practice, they aspire to be so but are constrained by practical factors such as language and resources for travel. However, we shall see below that although the rhetorical level of interest in IOLE is high, the practical implementation, in particular at the core undergraduate teaching level is in reality relatively low. Mostly only Public International Law is compulsory for undergraduates, and in rare cases comparative law or an introduction to other legal systems. However, in the EU countries, European Law is almost universally required – although in important respects it forms part of the domestic legal order of those jurisdictions.

2. Internationalisation in the profession

By contrast in the practising profession internationalisation appears to be less of a priority, and its acceptance as a priority more controversial. Many professionals stress the overwhelming importance of solid knowledge of domestic law. At the starkest level, the contrast is between academia which sees IOLE as a source of insight and perspective on the law, and the profession which sees it as superfluous in teaching and
preparing students for mostly domestic practice. Even the large City firms often recruit domestic students to practice law at a national level only. The question is to what extent it should remain thus…

Only at the ‘top end’ of the profession, for the large global/city law firms is knowledge of foreign languages and laws, and knowledge of the international legal system reported as significant. For example, the National Reporter for Brazil stresses that the large majority of international work is done by the top tier UK and US firms in the major cities, whereas local practitioners tend to handle all domestic matters. There thus remains a large part of the profession who see international aspects as secondary, although a requirement that law graduates be open-minded and receptive concerning foreign and international law is commonly reported. Depending on the jurisdiction concerned, practising lawyers will also expect graduates to have some knowledge of specific supra-or transnational subjects, such as European Law, or International Human Rights law (as in Mexico), or the law of particular foreign jurisdiction (as in Luxembourg).

The big law firms (US and GB) seem to play a major role in advocating for the relevance of IOLE (as remarked upon by the National Reporters of Germany, the Netherlands, Ireland). Generally these practitioners’ advocacy in favour of internationalisation is more practically driven (see Japan, Portugal: because they have constantly increasing relationships and connections with international clients; China: African law because of investment interests in that continent) than inspired by some idealised conception of modern the global lawyer. However, there are exceptions: in New Zealand the major law firms are focused on local law (they use off-shored agents for foreign work).

In truth it is probably the case that large law firms are not really interested in the internationalisation of the curriculum of a particular University, but require associates with a foreign diploma (see Spain). Hence it is most often by way of a foreign LLM that graduates become “global lawyers” for the big firms (see Germany), but this is not always so: see eg the more universal approach in the core degree in the Netherlands, where in some universities the undergraduate degree has a significant international component. Thus study in a foreign country is a pathway to membership of the “legal elite” (the way to access to big law firms) or “to rise to the good positions” (Israel).

If the legal academy with only a few exceptions sees the building and maintenance of international relations, cooperation, exchange and interaction as a vital component of professional life, in the legal profession there appears, according to Reporters, to be a distinct division between the top-end firms that are part of international networks of law offices, collegial relations, meetings etc., and the smaller firms that tend to focus on domestic clients and work and are less interested in ongoing maintenance of international networks. Those firms see IOLE as much less significance and simply want well-trained lawyers; they see the debate about IOLE as big-firm driven. These firms focus on domestic practice and also work more in areas that are traditionally not international: criminal law, family law, estates, real property etc. In Spain, for instance, the vast majority of practitioners are reported to work in their own or in small national law firms: more national; in Ireland a divide with local practice and individual clients less interested in the debate is reported also; and in Switzerland a divide between lawyers operating in small cities and the countryside and lawyers operating in a city environment. There is arguably a more general rift between practitioners between those practicing in big law firms (or national government or big companies: see Netherlands) and the others who are more interesting in domestic law (Canada, Spain, Netherlands, Ireland, Tunisia, especially the notaries). Some Reporters say that practitioners are mainly not interested in comparative law (Italy). This tends to reinforce the need for variety in study options for law students, so that they can choose to focus more on international or domestic law, depending on the career path they envisage.
Despite the interest in IOLE at the big firm end of the profession, and taking into account the more domestic small firm category, there appears to be a serious dissonance between the legal academy and the legal profession in terms of the significance attached to IOLE. The profession as a whole is perhaps primarily interested in a wider debate about legal education, of which IOLE is an element, but where other aspects attract more urgent attention. Law firms tend to seek more practical training, skills training, efficient practice-ready lawyers direct out of university. Thus, although legal academics tend to prioritise the international in their work, practising professionals tend to have other priorities in terms of their expectations of the legal academy: better skills training, higher order research and writing skills, better doctrinal understanding, ethics and ethical values, social skills etc.

There are also pressures on legal practice around the world that have brought debate about legal education in their wake (but with some differences in intensity; see Spain). Three main factors appear to be at work to increase competitive pressures on legal practice: internationalization (outsourcing and new competitors like China or India); new technologies; and deregulation (see the LSA in England and Wales in 2007 and its effects; see Greece). In this very specific and immediate context, it’s not certain that the debate about internationalization of legal education is a priority in the practice of law. There is no longer a single and unique labour market for lawyers (diversity: see Netherlands Report).

Many Reporters mention scepticism about the notion of a ‘global lawyer’. They point out that there may be lawyers with a dual practice at times; but none offer advice on the law of multiple jurisdictions. For that, in all but the rarest case, they make use of the services of domestic lawyers within the jurisdiction concerned. The same is of course the case in relation to court appearance and litigation. Only in the most closely related jurisdictions do lawyers from other countries make court appearances: for instance in England and Hong Kong.

3. What subjects are international?

Despite the patchy interest in internationalisation in the profession, Reporters commonly refer to a long list of subject-matters that are considered quite international in nature, and a much shorter list of subjects that are considered not or less international. From that perspective, the importance of the international in legal practice seems quite high.

Even in relation to the list of more domestic topics, in more recent times international elements are creeping in. In some jurisdictions, because of the large transient (immigrants/emigrants) elements of the population, subjects that are traditionally seen as largely domestic are also said to require knowledge of non-domestic law. For the profession that means that practising lawyers in that field need at least some basic understanding of the different approaches to the law in other jurisdictions. A good example of the latter is family or matrimonial law: traditionally considered national but in countries such as Turkey, Germany, […] often found to have an international dimension because many citizens are resident outside their homeland. Migration also means that individuals have assets in many countries (see Greece) and emigration of the youth from certain countries also brings with it cross-border issues (see Ireland). In Switzerland, 23% of the people living in the country are foreigners; this influences the practice of lawyers who have to know foreign

3 See Suskind: The End of Lawyers? Rethinking the nature of legal services (OUP 2008).
family laws and cultures. In countries such as Portugal both emigration and immigration have also had an ‘internationalising’ effect, as have aggressive internationally focussed corporate headquartering, accounting and fiscal policies such as in Ireland. Even criminal law is considered more international today by most Reporters because of the international reach of organised crime, cooperation between police forces and judicial officers, and because of the development of a unique international criminal law.

Areas of law commonly listed as being inherently international or cross-jurisdictional in nature are first and foremost concerned with: international trade and finance; human rights; sale of goods; arbitration; capital markets; company law; economic law; intellectual property; taxation; environmental law; banking and finance; company and commercial law; mergers and acquisitions; IT law; maritime law; law of the sea; telecoms; investment transactions law; transport law; energy law. The commercial law and business law are more internationalized than the other branches of law (Canada and many countries) through the big law firms (Spain). Public law is more national than private law. M&A and corporate law are said to need “global” lawyers (Spain) and more generally economic law (Germany, Greece, Tunisia: foreign investments, international arbitration. Maritime law (Greece) is stressed as very international).

Areas reported as least international, apart from the obvious real property law (land law), are administrative law; civil and criminal procedure; trusts; civil liability (torts); family law; labour law; agrarian law; electoral law; accident compensation law; indigenous law. Others that might be added although not specifically mentioned by Reporters are product liability laws; labelling and consumer information laws; etc.

In some areas of law, internationalisation has come about because of recent developments, such as the initiation and growth of an international human rights jurisprudence in Europe (Estonia, Germany, Ireland; the European ECHR and the Inter-American Human Rights Court) and also in South American (the Inter-American Human Rights Court). In other areas the underlying reality is almost inevitably international, such as aviation; international transport and sale of goods; arbitration; mergers and acquisitions; etc.

The list of areas of law that have a strongly international aspect is thus quite long and seemingly expanding according to most Reporters. As international interactions grow in a more integrated global economy, corporations become more mobile, and various new FTA’s further enable foreign investment, migration and trade, the areas that have an international component, or require some knowledge or sensitivity to foreign laws will only increase, according to most Reporters. FTA’s are a particularly significant factor, as they are growing in number, tend to be more prescriptive in detail than traditional treaties, and provide for enforcement mechanisms and international dispute resolution mechanisms.

III. The practicalities of internationalisation of legal education (IOLE)

1. The core curriculum, electives and postgraduate studies

National Reporters thus for the most part stress the importance of the international to the academic sector and academic pursuits. Comparative and transnational work is very important to academic life. At the same time, IOLE seems significant to some parts of the profession at least, and the list of subject matters that are said to be international or have an international component is long and expanding.
In that light the core question is how these elements are being translated into practical IOLE initiatives in many jurisdictions. Generally speaking, as will be addressed below, in legal education we find a divide between the core compulsory undergraduate (or JD) curriculum, usually relevant or essential for admission, and electives and post-graduate (in the sense of LLM’s) degrees. The international content of the former is light, whereas internationalisation is far more progressed in the elective part of the law degree, and in further or advanced studies not required for admission.

In the core curriculum (compulsories) the most commonly reported international aspect is the general inclusion in core courses of references to the law in some other jurisdictions, and to some international instruments. These comparative and international elements are inserted on a case by case and voluntary basis by each lecturer (see among others Switzerland); there is considerable freedom of design. Further, in most countries there is also a compulsory introduction to international law, or a public international law subject. First degree law students can usually also choose electives from a long list of subjects that are international or comparative in nature. Thus the focus of undergraduate core degree elements is in truth still overwhelmingly on teaching the domestic law of the jurisdiction concerned.

For further degrees the situation is different because there international and comparative topics and degrees abound.

2. Is IOLE a priority concern in legal education?

As indicated above, most legal academics are reported to see IOLE as a very significant priority. The difficulty faced in many jurisdictions, according to National Reporters, is that there are other, often more pressing priorities. In particular, in many countries there are structural issues: the rapid expansion of the tertiary sector with constrained resources (Turkey), the financial crisis besetting graduates and law faculties (the United States), or the fact that other topics demand priority attention (the civil law/common law internal divide in Canada; indigenous law and legal issues; focus on passing professional exams; increasing skills and practical training aspects of the curriculum etc.). The South African Reporter notes that there is a much more pressing need to improve the quality of legal training in general in that country, within the constraints of limited resources. The New Zealand Reporter states that there is no interest in IOLE in that country, as there are other more imperative needs, such as dealing with the particularities of indigenous (Maori) law and finding an accommodation between it and the common law system. The Hong Kong NR reports that much attention is devoted to the interaction between the common law and the Chinese Basic Law.

It is thus common that academics want to internationalise their teaching, degrees and curricula more, but have to defer such changes and developments because of more pressing concerns, and because the necessary resources are allocated elsewhere. Academics want to do more but are constrained, but they are also unsure what the attitude of the profession is to increased IOLE.

In quite a few jurisdictions there is pressure to prioritise IOLE from quarters outside the legal academy: primarily from governments in the context of internationalisation of the higher education sector as a whole (reported as a government priority in many countries); internationalisation of the legal services sector for the purpose of encouraging international business as a whole (as in Singapore); or increased support for the international investment, fiscal and trade goals of the government (such as in Ireland; in China to facilitate
Chinese investment in other countries). Some governments simply want to open up the country to greater international exposure and interaction (as in Sweden). In some countries IOLE is part of an international education strategy (e.g., in Ireland, mainly to attract students to study and pay fees). In some countries there appears to be more of a general consensus about the necessity of the internationalization of legal education (Germany, Netherlands,) whereas in others the topic is more hotly debated (see Greece).

In other jurisdictions pressure to internationalise comes from the legal profession, in particular where there is a significant international trade and business sector; in other words, where there are global law firms that service large multinational clients, or where the country due to its size and position is deeply enmeshed in international networks (such as in Singapore, Hong Kong, Luxembourg). Such firms sometimes directly demand lawyers with extensive international training, knowledge and exposure, or offer the conditions that motivate students to seek out such courses and training.

A leading impetus for internationalisation is of course the formation and expansion of the European Economic Community and the European Union. Although naturally regionally focused, the reverberations of the European efforts at integration of disparate jurisdictions on the substantive, procedural and educational levels have been considerable. The European Union is a laboratory for internationalisation, harmonisation and collaboration.

The debate about research and teaching in European law emerged in the European Council (1968, 1971, 1974 and 1976) (NR for Italy (Sacco)). The idea was to build a “European lawyer”, and hence to develop courses in comparative that would assist towards achieving this goal; but this has arguably not been a real success among European countries (in Spain, for example, the subject is not even offered). The “Bologna Declaration”, although standardising educational pathways (which were often very distinct: see e.g., Germany: from the Legal State Exam to the bachelor and master degrees), did not directly generate “internationalization” of local degrees (Netherlands; Portugal).

Probably the most practically important step has been the introduction of the “Erasmus program” (e.g., emphasised in the Portugal report, but generally recognised). Many students take the opportunity to study across Europe, sometimes across the common law/civil law divide. Faculties have adapted by offering law subjects in English, which inevitably results in comparative components and approaches. Students are immersed in foreign culture, including that of the law. The credit portability system means that there time at other universities advances their own degrees, although it is reported that in some countries practical constraints still militate against taking the Erasmus option.

3. Responsibility for globalising law graduates: universities or law firms?

These demands and pressures to prioritise the international in legal education then beg the question: who is responsible for the internationalisation of legal training? Who produces the ‘global lawyers’? In particular, is this a matter for the academic sector, the faculties, or for the firms. Here there is divided opinion, but the preponderance of Reporters note that the task of law faculties is still seen as primarily to produce graduates well versed in the principles, rules and techniques of domestic law. Nonetheless there is also a strong feeling that in this globally integrated world it is simply no longer enough to do this; in any case, so many areas of domestic’ law have an international element. A good domestic lawyer thus requires knowledge of aspects of
law that are not contained within the strict jurisdictional boundaries of national law. A further point is that at least the choice of expanding their international knowledge must be available to those students with an interest in international practice and the ambition to improve their access to such a career during their education.

A number of Reporters avert to the importance of the internal programs in big law firms for training tailor-made global lawyers (German, Greece). Perhaps there is a developing split or shift in responsibilities between basic education (more local) and continuing education (global law, but within the big law firms)?

In many countries practising lawyers still take responsibility for a significant component of the legal education of young graduates, because they require relatively long periods of ‘stage’, internship, pupilage or clerkship. This is a relatively neglected area of legal education, because little is reported about the learning process during these periods, or about what is required from employers, or how and what international elements are addressed. In some jurisdictions clerkships etc. have been largely, but not wholly replaced by structured practice-oriented courses. Neither these courses nor, as far as has been reported, traineeships include any overt or compulsory international elements. They tend to be focussed on the minutiae and practicalities of domestic legal practice and the courts.

Significant is also that many law graduates will in fact be employed in government departments and in corporations, as some Reporters stress. They signal the increased diversity in the career paths of law graduates, some of which will entail greater exposure to international legal issues and practice. Some therefore will require international training to a higher degree than others.

In that light what seems to have developed in many countries is an ad hoc system that is more or less responsive to the individual choices and envisaged career paths of law students: a combination of core degree aspects with an additional spectrum of elective choices to specialise in the later stages of the degree and during further studies. The Hong-Kong Reporter stresses this point when mentioning that International Law courses are offered as electives. As a result, few students take Public International Law, for they now there are few opportunities of practicing it someday, while WTO law or international arbitration are far more popular. This result is interesting when compared to countries were the only compulsory course offered is Public International Law (India), precisely the less susceptible of being of practical use later.

It thus makes sense, it seems, that law firms in the international sphere, take responsibility, at least in part, for training recruits in international aspects of legal practice. Given the variety of jobs and career paths now open to law graduates, most jurisdictions offer individual students choices at some point of their training rather than compelling to follow a standard educational path. International subjects and comparative studies are on offer in more and more jurisdictions as one of the available streams of specialisation, according to the National Reporters. But of course universities can only do so much: given the multiplicity of jurisdictions and legal areas that will be encountered in big firm practice, university education is by necessity at once selective and very general. The rest is up to the firms depending on their needs and practice mix.

National Reporters sometimes also drew attention to where the benefits lie: if international firms gain considerable benefits from the ability of their graduates who have the value added IOLE component, and are able to trumpet their international attributes to clients, then should they contribute more to their training? Although graduates can be internationally trained in the law firm environment, there is still value in a systematic, academically sound and certified training course.
IV. The debate about internationalisation and globalisation

1. Consensus about internationalisation, questions about globalization

There is little argument, as several National Reporters point out, that state borders have declined in significance. Conversely, it is well recognised that the national state has long been joined by many other sources of law. Internationalisation is simply a fact. But what does “internationalization” really mean otherwise than as an observed phenomenon? As we indicated at the outset of this General Report, sometimes the term is used interchangeably with “globalization”, but clearly there is a difference between “globalization” and “internationalization”. The latter refers to “nations”, “globalization” does not. Internationalisation tends to be a more neutral, less loaded term than ‘globalisation’. It is not clear whether “globalization” is an economic concept, to do with the growth of international trade and global corporations, or can we speak of a broader sense of globalization with some cultural and political aspects?

As we said at the outset, there is a consensus in favour of the internationalization of legal education, except maybe in India, where the interest in the issue appears very modest. When the term ‘globalisation’ is injected into the debate, we seem to be dealing with something more instrumental. The Japanese reform of its education system reflects to a certain extent instrumental “globalisation” in legal education: to take part in the internationalization of transactions (note: the reform is a great subject of controversy among Japanese colleagues). In reality it may be that the term ‘globalisation’ is used to address what is in essence a domestic problem: the shortage of lawyers versed in international trade and business matters.

Not everybody is convinced that a “global lawyer” will emerge (see Ireland): to a certain extent a divide between the “network” logic, based on the idea that law is jurisdiction specific, and the “global” logic based on the opposite idea that the same lawyer can work in different jurisdictions; in this respect, the students need to learn how to work with different environments (Ireland). Globalisation is often seen as rather a process of projecting solutions, attitudes and thoughts from abroad, not always with sufficiently sensitive consideration, rather than a genuine supranational cooperative effort between nations.

Few Reporters speak of diverging “schools of thought” about IOLE; in fact most dismiss the whole notion of their being divergent schools of thought on the topic. But they do report that there are those who are in favor of internationalization and those who are against it (see for instance Portugal; Tunisia: some criticism because there a debate about new form of colonialism; France: some concern about the marginalisation of civilian approaches). The National Report for Uruguay is a case in point: the Reporter strongly supports internationalisation and believes that Uruguay is in need of radical change due to its domestic focus of education and practice. He states that there is a 50/50 view for and against IOLE, and that in his view rejecting the idea of the ‘global lawyer’ is clinging to a more insular and nationalist way of facing and resolving the legal issues ahead.

IOLE is inextricably linked to the debate about globalisation; in particular, the facts that many considered commentators are somewhat ambivalent about it. The National Reporters in many jurisdictions stress that on the one hand, globalisation is seen as a phenomenon that can be objectively observed and cannot be reversed. In terms of the law, this means greater external influence on the shape and development of
national legal systems (the Chinese Reporter stresses the perceived need to adapt traditional Chinese laws to modern needs in that country, for instance), and the development of a body of supranational law. The resulting risk identified in a number of Reports is that the cultural specificity, heritage and sensitivity of domestic law are diminished, and that the theoretical integrity of domestic legal systems is subverted by the insertion of foreign elements and principles.

The concern is perhaps most often expressed in terms of the civil/common law debate, in particular focussing on the overweening influence of the common law. The civilians tend to worry more about the common law and its impact, whereas common lawyers tend to have less interest in the civil law countries’ legal traditions and solutions (see eg in Canada where the common lawyers are said to have no interest in the law of Quebec). Civilians tend to emphasise systemic integrity more than common lawyers, and therefore tend to be more concerned about the disruptive influence of foreign law and foreign lawyers, in particular from common law countries whose systems are perceived to be very different. Civilians tend to be uneasy about the focus of common lawyers on process, argumentation and lawyering skills, rather than on ‘legal science’. As the Dutch Reporter points out, however, knowledge of the social domains where national and international/regional norms meet is very important: transport, energy, telecoms, competition, finance and investment etc. This broader contextual knowledge results in a less bookish, ‘scientific’ or academic way of thinking, arguably a more radical departure from tradition for civilian than common law jurisdictions.

Here some of the debate does fix on the so-called common law/civil law divide, in particular the pressure exerted on the civilian traditions by a shifting balance in global trade and power. Illustrative is the response of the Association Henri Capitant des Amis de la Culture Juridique Française to the World Bank’s Doing Business Reports of 2004, which reflected the sentiment that the Reports were intended to promote the common law over the civil law (see Les droits de tradition civiliste en question, Société de législation comparée (Paris, 2006)). The common law’s influence, perhaps predominance, has come about through the predominance of the United States in international matters, and the expansion of English as the lingua franca of the law. To put it simply, quite a number of National Reporters express a resulting concern that globalisation is a different word for Americanisation, and that the latter is not necessarily desirable or a positive development for a particular jurisdiction. Sometimes globalisation is contrasted with nationalism. There are in many jurisdictions specific reasons to resist globalisation, of a practical or symbolic kind, which are averted to in the National Reports.

2. Post-colonial dominance?

An interconnected concern is that globalisation is post-colonialism in disguised form – ie the imposition of legal regimes and solutions that are essentially foreign but whose supposed advantages over domestic and sometimes customary law are loudly trumpeted by their protagonists. It is said that sometimes the real advantages of this process of adopting foreign legal solutions accrue to foreign companies, investors and interests rather than to local citizens. The debate about the dominating influence of foreign jurisdictions is not only concerned with post-colonialism (as it is in Tunisia, for instance: to be closer to French law or not?): it also arises between such countries as Estonia and Germany, the former wanting to carve out its own path not too close to the German law; Canada and the United States; Scotland and England; and Australia and New Zealand? But the debate is very nuanced: in some countries external influences or historical
connections are seen as beneficial: in Singapore for instance, or Hong Kong which consciously maintains a strong common law tradition.

The difficulty then becomes how to deal with the phenomenon of globalisation in a manner that is sensitive to local traditions, culture, legal regimes and development; while recognising that shared solutions may be to everybody’s advantage. It is clear that those shared solutions will be particularly advantageous in areas of international trade, commerce and finance. They are less controversial in these areas. But in other areas these concerns translate into a desire to push back against the global influences. The question also arises as to who benefits and on whose terms harmonisation or approximation of legal systems occurs? (see eg the Finland report)

At the level of education, it is here that IOLE is inextricably linked with questions of high policy, cultural dominance, post-colonialism, historical justice and injustice, and peace and prosperity. It is apparent, and this is a matter actively pursued in some jurisdictions like the Netherlands, that there is a close connection between IOLE and cross-disciplinary research and student engagement. In other words, IOLE opens up a world of broader questions for students, which legal academics by themselves do not necessarily have the skills to address. But that they are addressed is important, because in teaching law all commentators and reporters agree that we are not simply producing technicians (as strikingly emphasised in the Argentinean Report, for instance).

In the same sphere a debate is reported about law and legal reforms across boundaries, and the adoption or introduction of foreign ‘solutions’. The difficulty with the latter is often that they are ill-adapted to the broader legal structure, but also to the broader characteristics of community, history and culture. There is regularly expressed cultural concern that western ideas, practices and institutions dominate in the internationalisation of legal education. Again broad questions arise that are challenging and interesting teaching material, but where lawyers might have to draw on the skills of specialists from other disciplines to ensure rigorous debates.

Globalization as Americanization of the law seems on the whole not to be a dominant issue (except for the Indian reporter; and in a different way Israel where much attention is paid to the American system, American scholarship and the US legal education)... The progression of the English language seems to be more significant in practical ways (see Germany where the proceedings some special divisions of courts are set up in English; see also Japan). There is also the phenomenon of a shift in the civil law tradition to the common law (see Tunisia: some faculties want to focus their attention on their relations with France, as the former colony; and some others want to deepen their knowledge in the Anglo-American traditions). To a certain extent, for some civil law countries internationalization means “commonlawization”; by contrast it is rare if not unknown for any common law country to move towards the civil law.

3. **Internal multiplicity of legal systems**

A further aspect of the debate about IOLE and globalisation that emerges from the Reports, is that in fact the openness (open-mindedness, a ‘cosmopolitan attitude’ etc.) towards different legal systems, cultures and norms is often required internally, within the borders of a particular nation state. It is not just necessarily an issue transcending borders: the open and inquisitive attitude sought to be engendered in students does not
necessarily entail internationalisation. Many nations are characterised by an internal multiplicity of the legal system.

For instance, in Canada civil law and common law coexist; in Malaysia the common law and Islamic law; in New Zealand customary law and common law; in Cameroon elements of civil law and common law; in Hong Kong the common law and the Chinese Basic Law must coexist; etc. Therefore many students come across different legal systems within the remit of their domestic studies, although sometimes unevenly: more in Quebec than in the common law parts of Canada, for instance. In some jurisdictions law students are also expected to master more than one language. In many jurisdictions the sources of domestic law also routinely include foreign decisions and statutes. In an increasing number of jurisdictions international instruments are recognised sources of domestic law. In other jurisdictions, historically extraneous sources of law are significant: Roman law in Scotland for instance, and Roman/Dutch law in South Africa. Legal systems often have a mixed history of common law and civil law elements. Thus students are exposed to these sources and often contrasting ways of reflecting upon and organising the law as a routine component of their studies. This opens their minds and they are accustomed to law as an open system with many and varied influences. To put it differently, the study of national law is in many jurisdictions inherently comparative in nature. It engenders the kind of openness that is one of the main goals of IOLE. To a minor extent this can also still be said about the study of law in countries such as NZ, Hong Kong and Australia, where comparison with English law is still a significant instrument of domestic subjects.

In truth very few countries have a monolithic domestic law. We already pointed out that the law of Scotland absorbed Roman law to a very important extent, for instance. In the EU, through the development of EU Law, many countries have learned to speak another legal language than their own. A telling example is the European Court of Justice: a mix of civil law and common law. The application of the European Convention of Human Rights arguably introduces a civil law way of thinking into the English law tradition. On the other hand the Swedish National Report notes that because the Court is making the law, this arguably introduces a common law element in civil law thinking. The European Law is a kind of “regional globalisation of law” with uniform effects (to a certain extent: all the EU countries are from the “western tradition”). But in some jurisdictions the very idea of law itself is seen as a foreign import – the Japanese report mentions this, and the importance therefore of studying that law, mostly in Germany. Taiwan provides a further interesting example. The Taiwanese reporter stresses that even in domestic litigation reference may be needed to sources of law from influential jurisdictions, referring primarily to Germany and Japan, from where Taiwanese law was imported. The Reporter also mentions that study of a foreign law, primarily German or Japanese, was strongly encouraged, as was the study of these languages besides English. However, the Reporter also notes the increasing influence of American Law, even over these traditional German/Japanese influences. In many ex-colonies as well the law is in essence foreign, having partially or completely displaced existing law, now often referred to as ‘customary law’. This is a significant issue in many countries such as Canada, New Zealand, Australia, the US and South American jurisdictions.

4. Who drives and who benefits from the internationalisation of legal education?

As mentioned above, many legal academics inherently value internationalisation in their work (all our National Reporters are of course supporters of comparative law). A substantial driver of IOLE is thus the
inherent priorities and attitudes of the legal academy. However, also significant are other factors that many National Reports mention, and most important amongst these is perhaps the drive of many universities to ‘internationalise’. Some newer universities adopt a vigorous international approach so as to carve out a niche in a competitive market for higher education (e.g. Maynooth; UCD Sutherland in Ireland; Örebro in Sweden). Other existing universities choose to profile themselves as ‘international’ across the board – international means ‘quality’ here, or reflects a longstanding strategic choice, or geographic position (such as Luxemburg; Maastricht and Tilburg in Holland have a long tradition now). International connections, courses and programs are seen to bring prestige to institutions, as well as adding value to education.

Government policy in relation to higher education is often the underlying driver, as for instance in China, where internationalisation is a national objective and the Chinese government introduced a grants program for Law Schools to adopt IOLE. In countries such as Sweden there has been an express government policy to encourage or compel universites to internationalise their programs and academic networks. Funding is sometimes made especially available for it. Research support from governments is sometimes made dependent upon the international nature of research: internationalisation is set as a criterion for funding or approvals in Germany, for instance (the Research Fund); and in the Czech Republic. Governments voice an economic argument in favour of internationalisation, for instance within the European Union where economic integration is articulated by the National Reporters for Spain and Estonia.

Deliberate profiling of internationalisation tends to apply to the metropolitan, larger and more prestigious universities partly because these universities also command the resources required to internationalise their programs. Usually such programs come at a considerable cost because they are more resource intensive and concern smaller numbers of students. Internationalisation is therefore a greater priority at the ‘high end’ of the market than in smaller, regional institutions, except for those who make it their main point of distinction. Internationalisation is used as a means to attract the most capable and best financed students. And it is those more prestigious universities that tend to supply graduates to the large international law firms.

From a university management perspective, law faculties are expected to participate in internationalisation, and given the inherent interest in such developments amongst legal academics, they need little convincing. However, there are structural difficulties that are unique to law and some other professional degrees: there is no a universal science of law. Language constraints are also a difficulty. Thus internationalisation is in some ways more problematical for law than for other university disciplines.

Also driving internationalisation of legal education are government policies and the departments and institutions that implement them. Here there is a wide spectrum going from total political indifference (such as reported in India, Spain, the United States), to active government policy to increase the international content of legal degrees, and the opportunities to study international and foreign law. Interesting examples of the latter are provided by Singapore and Taiwan. Other examples are the Irish Government Action Plan for Jobs 2013, and the policy of the Malaysian government to see that country develop as a legal services hub for the region.

Internationalisation of legal education is seen in many countries as essential to developing countries’ international trading capacity, but in other cases the tendency is less the result of deliberate policy than of the factual situation: the South African reporter mentions that that country has become a legal hub for the African region because of relatively short court delays and a perception of incorruptibility. Of course Africa also presents an interesting example of how increased regional cooperation has resulted in IOLE and IOLP: the SADC and the African Union play an important part.
A third driver is the corporate world and the generally large and the often closely enmeshed multinational law offices that service them. Although amongst the practising profession there is a divergence of opinion about the degree of IOLE that should occur in law schools, there is a consensus that some amount of international, comparative and foreign law should be incorporated in academic law studies. In some countries the profession is actively engaged with IOLE in the universities, but this is not the norm. Alternatively one can say that IOLE is driven by student interest in career opportunities in the mostly large and international law firms that service multinational business and finance. However, irrespective of these subtleties there is one clear fact: the global law firm sector of the profession has grown substantially over the years, and hence the demand for graduates with more global experience and knowledge.

A driver also mentioned by a number of National Reporters, is the personnel requirements of government: foreign affairs and associated departments and agencies require lawyers with some international legal training, exposure and openness. Governments need to engage more frequently with other states and with supra-national organisations on many fronts, and lawyers are required with the capacity to undertake these tasks effectively. Lawyers are often critical intermediaries in these international connections.

It should be noted that apart from the Universities and faculties themselves, and the occasional government department, there is on the whole very little institutional engagement with internationalisation. That is in particular the case with the judges/courts, and professional bodies, although there are interesting exceptions: for instance Australia (Bentley and Co). There is no special institution that examines the need for internationalization of legal education, even where reform of legal education has been examined (Canada, Spain even if they have recently reformed their programs, Estonia, India, Ireland, Italy).

V. What forms does IOLE take?

1. Philosophical vs instrumental support for internationalisation

To some degree the practical manifestations of IOLE are determined by the attitudes taken to it; one important distinction in this regard is between a more instrumental and a more philosophical approach to IOLE. Many Reports identify two principal but distinct advantages of IOLE. First, they recognise that the study of foreign law or comparative law is a useful source of reflection and deeper understanding of domestic laws, legal institutions and practices. IOLE provides a useful perspective on domestic legal approaches and suggests possible critiques and reforms. Contrasting with other jurisdictions is a useful tool for critical reflection upon one’s own, and for considering reform options. As the Mexican Reporter states, IOLE can enable legal criticism not just legal indoctrination.

A second approach we call ‘instrumental’: it holds that IOLE is important because it provides graduates with a better competitive profile when they enter the profession. In these high-pressure days this is seen as very important. Graduates who have studied abroad, been exposed to foreign professors, have undertaken comparative analysis, and perhaps know a foreign language stand a better chance in a competitive labour market. They will be more attractive to certain branches of the legal profession. This approach to IOLE is less concerned with producing inherently more reflective, knowledgeable, mature law graduates than with producing good, employable workers. In some respects this is a more ‘sellable’ advantage when IOLE
resources are sought, as it is easier to justify the expenditure of resources on students where this can be translated into tangible career benefits. A concomitant issue is the oversupply of law graduates in many jurisdictions, such as France for instance. Students seeking a competitive advantage and more distinctive CV will seek out further specialist subjects, and law faculties with large numbers of students will have greater scope to offer all kinds of electives. Argument concerning better lawyers and better people are more difficult to substantiate and pin down.

National Reporters frequently refer to these debates about the role of law schools: to give a competitive advantage to their graduates or to develop well-rounded legally trained citizens? The two goals are of course not mutually exclusive, but which goal is prioritised will impact upon the pervasiveness and style of IOLE adopted in any given institution. The first priority makes a universal argument that applies to all law students, whereas the more instrumental approach tends to focus on providing effective choice to those students who are interested in an international career.

2. Generally: a great range and diversity of initiatives.

Whatever the reason or motivation, there is little doubt judging by the National Reports that from the legal academy’s perspective in most countries IOLE has grown considerably in recent decades, and that this growth is clearly set to continue. However, IOLE does not tend to be organised, coordinated or particularly well-directed, neither at the national nor at the international level.

Most striking from the various Reports is the great diversity of initiatives, schemes and approaches, and the absence of high level coordination or standardisation. There are also multiple but diverse and uncoordinated networks, consortia, frameworks etc. Some interconnections and collaborations exist between institutions and countries, but they are piecemeal (eg in Hong Kong the Committee in charge of legal education invited two Australians to conduct a review, an interesting example of cross-fertilisation.)

a. Exchange programs

Most Reporters refer to widespread and active participation in international networks concerning academic work: workshops, conferences, research periods abroad, foreign scholars visiting, submitting and publishing in foreign journals etc. Faculty members mostly aspire to and maintain active networks with colleagues from other jurisdictions. In some cases these networks develop along traditional connecting lines, for instance between Quebec and France; between Japan and Germany; and between England and some of its former colonial jurisdictions (NZ, Australia). Where the networks do not exist, either because of funding issues, language problems or traditional isolation, Reporters nonetheless refer to the existing desire and ambition of legal academics to join in.

Networks have developed within the civil law jurisdictions as well as in the common law world. Importantly, collaborative relationships across the civil law/common law divide have expanded in recent times and continue to be pursued by many academics. Reporters emphasise a desire to network with countries outside
their traditional sphere, and report on successful initiatives in research and teaching in this regard. Scholarly connections often underpin developments in educational programs.

However, probably the most influential development in IOLE in recent years has been the expansion of opportunities for students to study abroad for part of their degree. Credit is mostly awarded towards the domestic degree requirements. There are extensive networks of exchange agreements between universities in place around the world (see the example of the University of Montevideo wherein the faculty runs a United States law program consisting of 8 subjects that is mandatory for all law students at the university and has also signed student exchange agreements with 24 universities around the world in order to facilitate internationalisation of its students), and in Europe the Erasmus program is the great enabler. EU-based relationships also lie at the source of many dual degrees or even common degrees between three institutions with diplomas in three languages (France, England, Germany: Humboldt King’s and Paris 2, or Lille 2, Kent and Saarbrucken, for instance).

The impetus the Erasmus program has provided for European law faculties is enormous. For instance in Germany: 22% of any cohort of students spend a semester abroad. Many now provide either whole programs or a number of subjects in English, to accommodate incoming Erasmus students. Many of these subjects are naturally concerned with comparative or transnational topics of law. The subjects taught mostly in English not only provide more students with the opportunity of studying abroad, they also provide more options to academics to teach in overseas institutions. Thus in terms of elective subjects, and in terms of elective PG subjects, there is definitely a strong trend towards more international offerings. The traditional suite of electives has either been absorbed or greatly expanded by comparative; supranational; international or global law subjects.

The “Bologna Process” has also played a role in the reforms of the curriculums, enabling credit recognition for subjects taken under an exchange program. The “LMD” system (for “licence” or bachelor 3 years, “master” 2 years after the “licence”, “doctorate” 3 years after the master degree) is very important to improve the internationalization of legal education (in favour of the improvement of exchanges, even outside Europe, see Tunisia).

It is important to note that these are structural, centralised and unified reforms, and that they have had very great impact.

But as well as Erasmus in Europe, the growth of the network of exchange agreements worldwide has generated enormous opportunities for study in foreign institutions, and the impetus to provide visiting students with accessible and worthwhile educational opportunities. Some universities now have a great number of student exchanges (for instance, in Italy especially in Trento; in Greece; in Japan where since the reforms of 2004 low numbers have slightly increased, eg. Keio receives around 10 foreign students per year; in NZ: frequent but for a limited number of students; and Portugal: a lot and growing in number). However, no exchange of students exists in India. In Ireland, the Law Society has promoted lawyer exchanges allowing its trainee solicitors and solicitors to gain some experience abroad (in Germany, Spain and Belgium), but normally these initiatives are only found at the level of legal education and not practical legal training. There are exceptions: it is common for big law firms, for instance, to send some of their best associates to offices located in another country for a period of time (one or two years) in order to practice in a different context. In France, the Paris Bar School (EFB) encourages students to spend one semester abroad, and has recently concluded agreements with universities in different parts of the world to that effect (mainly India, China and Brazil).
Critical to the success of credit swaps and exchange programs is language compatibility. For most jurisdictions this means offering courses in a foreign language: Torino in English and Spanish, for instance, as well as Sciences Po in Paris, France. The reality is that most often the chosen language is English, as working knowledge of English as a second language is perhaps most widespread (which also encourages many students to travel to common law English-speaking jurisdictions for further studies). This partly explains why there are very few in Spain and in Japan, but there are reasons (such as the post-colonial situation: law comes from the West). More and more courses are given in English in the Bachelors or other first degree, as for instance in some of the bachelor programs in the Netherlands (Tilburg, Groningen and Maastricht). Although more undergraduate electives are offered in English, overwhelmingly such courses are found at the Masters level. For instance, a lot of courses are given in English in Germany, the Netherlands or Switzerland at Masters level; in the International Hellenic University of Thessaloniki, the teaching is exclusively provided in English; in English in Estonia; in English in Portugal; in English in the Netherlands (Masters degrees related to European law, international law, human rights and comparative law); and in German and French in Switzerland.

In this new environment, some foreign language skill becomes critical to participate meaningfully in IOLE. This can even be important at a student’s home institutions, since the law schools more commonly have to and do combine courses taught in English and other courses taught in the local language (see eg Netherlands; courses given in French in all of the law Faculties in Tunisia (the post-colonial situation; the same in India with English) but also one master in English (Tunis II)). Nonetheless a foreign language is nowhere mandatory, except for those who want to access to a dual-degree or to participate to an “Erasmus exchange”. To speak a foreign language is “a hallmark of an adaptable and knowledge student” (see Ireland). English is mandatory in some few jurisdictions, however: eg for German students engaged in the 1st State Exam; in Greece for obtaining a law degree (Greece); and French is mandatory in Tunisia.

But very few law faculties offer foreign language instruction adapted to legal studies – only a few reporters mention Legal English courses and the like. It appears that more can be done in this critical area, to ensure participation by as many students as possible in this most critical aspect of IOLE.

A foreign language is mandatory for PhD students in some countries (eg Estonia), and quite a number allow theses to be written and defended in English (eg Sweden and Estonia) or sometimes another language such as French (eg Tunisia). In other countries the national language is mandated throughout the curriculum (eg France from bachelors to PhD level).

b. Specialist and advanced international law programs

A further significant phenomenon is the recent growth of specialist advanced programs in subject matter that is regarded as inherently or historically international or transnational in nature, such as intellectual property law masters, masters in banking and finance law, programs in international human rights law, in corporate law etc.

Many examples are advanced in the various National Reports. Related are those programs that are specifically tailored to students from around the world. Some National Reporters emphasise the importance
of a mixed body of students from different nationalities, as well as teachers with multi-jurisdictional background, for successful instruction and personal development.

Here the object is not so much to accommodate exchange students, but to offer interested students the option to specialise in an area of international or transnational law. These programs are mostly LLM’s (3rd cycle, after Bachelors and Masters completion), but in some cases the earlier stages of the law degree allow for streams or specialisations in international subjects. The China School of Law (CESL) is a good example, providing an LL.M from Hamburg University for a year spent in China studying European Law and Chinese Law. CESL also provides for longer programs and the opportunity to receive the diploma of both institutions.

c. Joint and dual degree programs

Less significant to date but reported to be on the increase, is the offering of joint or dual degrees. Some of these are developed within the confines of certain ‘consortia’; others are dual programs between two or three faculties only: for example the Essex/Nanterre/Lyon/Toulouse program; and the five foreign dual degree programs offered by Columbia University in the US.

There are some dual degrees (for instance, in Ottawa, the common law section has a dual JD-degree with the USA). Dual-degrees are known in Italy and some attempts exist in Estonia. Some dual-degrees have been in existence for a long time (Germany between Köln and Paris I since 1990; the “European Law School”; Ireland: UDC with Paris 2 and Toulouse 1), coming about because of strong EU influence. There are a number of collaborations between countries with different frameworks (see Greece). However, there are no dual degrees in countries such as India, Israel, and NZ. In Europe there are some joint or dual degrees along the lines of the “Erasmus Mundus Joint Degree” model (see Portugal). Some other examples are the NACLE and ALTLAS cooperation’s. Generally speaking, although relatively rare still, these types of structures are on the increase, but not in a systematic manner.

The Hauser Global Law School in New York University is important in this space, as is McGill university in Canada, which also offers dual civil and common law degrees, although not strictly speaking international, but for the purpose of practice in the whole of Canada (Quebec and the rest). Some institutions, although a significant minority, have even established joint undergraduate degrees, or trans-systemic degrees, such as at NUS: for instance, [...] In some rare instances, programs are offered with a view to dual admission, but then only in relation to very closely related jurisdictions: one example is the dual Scottish/English admission degree offered in Dundee since 2009.

These programs are blossoming in part because they concern those phases of legal education that are unconstrained by admission requirements and because they are driven by inherent scholarly interest and other academic motivations. By contrast, not many developments have occurred at the level of undergraduate degrees, although they are not totally unknown: see in France, for example, the dual degree between Paris 1 and King’s. Undergraduate students begin with two years in London and then come back to Paris I for two further years and they obtain a “Master 1” (and are admitted to the bar exam) and a BCL from King’s. The same exists with Köln, Complutense in Madrid and Firenze. These dual degrees are for undergraduate students, but only for small numbers. Otherwise at undergraduate level the pace of change and innovation often seems glacial, with some developments never really getting off the ground. However,
in countries where the basic law degree is a post-graduate degree (the JD most often), joint degrees (JD/LLM) are more common now.

The main and obvious reason for the lack of integration amongst programs and IOLE across jurisdictions is that legal education is heavily geared towards admission, and the admission requirements of almost all bars do not require an element of foreign, comparative or international law. Therefore these are not built into the core compulsory curriculum to any great extent. Nothing much has changed in this regard over recent years. Students tend in majority to undertake the minimum requirements for admission, leaving it until later to specialise, either in the context of practice or by way of LLM’s. Luxembourg is an interesting casse in this respect: since admission is based on a Bar examination focussing on Luxembourg law (preparatory courses for this examination are not provided by the university, but by the Bar body), the law faculty is freer to innovate and adopt more courses based on international law.

Thus overwhelmingly IOLE has occurred at the elective stage of legal education, and then mostly at PG level. More international exposure is one of the choices open to law students at that stage of their training, and tends to be driven by a desire to be active in the international sphere during their future careers. But at the core compulsory stages, the exposure to IOLE is relatively minimal and little has changed in this regard in recent decades.

3. IOLE at the first degree/core compulsory level

As suggested above, various constraints mean that internationalisation in the compulsory fazes or core curriculum is at a relatively low level. Most National Reporters state that there is general agreement that some minimum level of exposure to the global legal system is required, but there is considerable diversity concerning what should be offered and required of all law students. As indicated, in most countries only Public International Law is required, in some Comparative law or an Introduction to Legal Systems; but in China three undergraduate international law courses are now required. In Brazil the national curricular guidelines do not require any international content. This is not a very standardised area of the law curriculum across jurisdictions (whereas in other regards the core curricula tend to be rather similar). Many Reporters stress that academic or institutional autonomy is a core principle of the university sector, which means that faculties are not particularly amenable to centrally ordained curricular choices (the Argentina Reporter, for instance, notes that national public schools enjoy complete autonomy to determine the content of the law curriculum).

The most common international elements integrated into the core curriculum that Reporters refer to are: individual motivation /faculty policy to include some comparative elements in the teaching of domestic core subjects; the compulsory offering of Public International Law (and European law in EU countries); sometimes compulsory offering of Introduction to Legal Systems or some such subject; inclusion of introduction to some aspects of foreign and international law in generally introductory courses (‘Legal Systems’ courses); and in some relatively rare cases, the requirement that one elective course be international; or in a rare cases, that students take a semester at an exchange university overseas (at Bucerius and EBS Law School, in Germany, one semester abroad is mandatory). It is of course common, as pointed out above, that students obtain credit for courses taken at foreign law faculties (Canada).
IOLE in some instances finds expression in the introduction of mandatory courses on Comparative Law. This seems to be traditional in Italy, where one annual course in Comparative Law is required for graduation. Similarly, law faculties or universities branding themselves as more “global” or “international” have realised their claims by introducing compulsory comparative law subjects: this is the case for Maastricht Faculty of Law, or NUS (which indeed profiles itself as “Asia’s Global Law School”, and offers Comparative Legal Traditions as a compulsory course). However, in Greece, for instance, it is an optional course (at 2 out of 3 Faculties). Introduction to comparative law is mandatory in Maastricht.

In many countries reported on either no IOLE compulsory requirements are present (IOLE only figures amongst elective courses) or only a compulsory *International Public Law* subject is required to obtain a basic law degree. As far as the compulsory offering of European law is concerned, this is not really perceived as “international” law by EU countries but a part on the internal system (see German Report). EU law is naturally a priority (Greece Report), in particular in countries such as Bulgaria which joined the Union in 2007. In that country International law and Human Rights law are also compulsory subjects. Thus both Public International Law and European Union Law are generally mandatory all over Europe (see eg Spain, Estonia, Germany, Bulgaria). International law is generally not mandatory for students (Israel Report); the Uruguayan Law degree and its courses are said to be ‘purely local’; little or no emphasis is placed on the study of other jurisdictions within labour, civil, tort and contract courses, only making reference to foreign legal issues and topics when studying International Conventions, Treaties and International Organizations and the laws derived from them. There is diversity: optional courses concerning foreign legal systems (Canada, Germany) vs. mandatory courses (McGill in Canada, Italy for 9 credits on 300) or nothing (Cameroon) or in a few institutions (ICADE, Universidad de Navarra, IE Law School in Spain), collaborative courses with foreign institutions on a bilateral basis. Comparative law is seldom taught in Spain. See also Tunisia (no course) and NZ (not regularly offered). Comparative law is mainly taught as an optional course for advanced students (3rd or 4th year in Greece; Tunisia) or simply optional during the basic curriculum (see Ireland except for EU Law, Japan In only the new law schools?) but mandatory in Maastricht (Netherlands) and in different law schools in Israel or Portugal. Less comparative law courses than before are now offered in Tunisia (the decline of the French influence). No more than public international law in India. Further interesting examples are NZ: no course in Australian law (even though NZ is close to Australia); and Hong Kong, where there is no mandatory international law course, but foreign elements are built into every course.

It is thus apparent that IOLE at the core compulsory level is minimal. This reflects, to quote Professor Schmid, referred to by the Swiss NR, the attitude that “National law is a “need to have” when international law is “nice to have”.

Universities use their elective programs, foreign exchanges and their LLM’s as the main way to “globalize” theirs students. The fact that IOLE at the basic level is not compulsory to any great extent is not the consequence of priorities set by the legal academy, which mostly regards IOLE as a priority, but of those set by the profession, which does not see it as a first priority. In this context an influential factor is the autonomy the faculties enjoy to set their curriculum. Most Reporters refer to some level of supervision and control from government or various commissions and bodies representing the profession. New programs sometimes require ministerial or departmental approval. But in any case law faculties tend to follow the requirements set by the bars for admission, although some faculties are ‘ahead of the game’: for instance, at the University of Montevideo the faculty runs a United States law program consisting of 8 subjects that is mandatory for all law students at the university. Montevideo has also signed student exchange agreements with 24 universities around the world in order to facilitate internationalisation of its students.
Thus it is mostly a matter of personal choice whether individual students take international subjects amongst their electives. In many cases there is little space to exercise such choice in basic degrees, as students tend to favour broad national electives such as family law and tax law that are seen as relevant to regular domestic practice, rather than more narrow international specialisations.

Faculties are loath to make international law subjects compulsory, because the modern tendency is to limit the compulsory part of the curriculum and maximise choice. Nonetheless in many countries there is a surfeit of elective classes with international aspects on offer, and the fact that degrees tend towards more electives and fewer core compulsory can only work in favour of IOLE. Of course Luxembourg is a very interesting exception: there the basic degree is international in nature, and students wishing to specialise in domestic law can choose this option at the Masters level. This is a complete reversal of the norm.

VI. IOLE and broader issues in legal education

1. Other priorities: skills etc; optional pathways; diverse careers

We have already averred to the fact that although most legal academics consider IOLE very important, other issues often take priority, so that internationalisation gets little funding or attention. An alternative perspective is to see IOLE in the context of broader developments in legal education. In particular, the greater emphasis on legal skills; and the greater emphasis on either replacing or augmenting the *cours magistral* with more active and participative methods of instruction, and more problem-solving by students. The focus shifts from the knowledge of the sources of law to ‘thinking about law’ and accepting law as a ‘historical accident or historical contingency’. Internationalisation builds greater flexibility and a less formal(-istic) approach into law. In the McGill program, when common law and civil law teaching is integrated, it is not possible to teach ‘the rules’: a more reflective method is required.

Small group or ‘tutorial’ style teaching and mooting, ADR exercises and like techniques are becoming more common and are highly rated as teaching methodologies. For instance, it is reported that in Argentina and Greece, mooting has become a very popular component of legal education.

Many of these emanate rather more from the common law world, where several National Reports point out that the emphasis of legal education has traditionally been more on training in legal argumentation and reasoning process, rather than on disclosing the underlying structural unity of the legal system. Such methods have found their way gradually onto the radar also of teaching institutions in the civil law world. However, in the common law they emanate perhaps more naturally from the more ‘professional’ nature of law schools, as in the US (with law as a JD or post-graduate professional study option). In the common law, in particular in England, a legal education remained much longer the province exclusively of the profession.

A coincidence can be observed between the trend towards IOLE, and the trend towards more skills education and more participative learning. Mooting is often conducted at the international level, and tutorials tend to adopt a more Socratic discussion model. Tutorials and small group teaching more common in elective subjects where visiting lecturers are often employed, who use English and often are either trained or employed in the common law world.
A further development that is relatively common amongst jurisdictions, is the increased recognition that there are multiple career paths for law graduates. The lawyer who becomes a practising solicitor or barrister for life is becoming more the exception than the rule. Law faculties increasingly recognise that they should consider the variety of careers their graduates will follow when designing legal education and the curriculum. From that perspective a more international career is just one of the options open to graduates, and one of the possible paths that they may wish to follow. The essence of a good legal education is to recognise this multiplicity and provide effective choices and pathways – and an international profile is just one of those. Here the emphasis is not so much how can a bit of everything be built into everybody’s legal education, but how can we provide a solid core and then multifarious and well-imagined options.

Concomitantly there is a realisation that legal training is meeting diverse needs in society, only one of which is for more internationally trained and exposed graduates. In any case, as the Dutch Reporter says, legal education will have to diversify and ‘offer specific and targeted programs’ more systematically in the future.

2. Legal education and extra-jurisdictional admission

A very significant factor that affects our debate is admission. Most National Reports speak of the difficulties foreign graduates will encounter to gain admission in other jurisdictions. Most commonly a law graduate seeking admission in another country will be required to take a raft of subjects and sit exams. There are some more flexible approaches, but even in the European Union the dream of a European lawyer or flexible admission requirements has not been realised, notwithstanding determined and ongoing efforts, of which the steady stream of Directives is proof.

We would really advocate more and systematic work on making cross-jurisdictional admissions more flexible and more workable. Universities and the profession can work together more here: there will be much to gain by removing protectionist barriers. Singapore presents an interesting example in this regard, as it has introduced very flexible and multifarious practice arrangements (see Report at 26).

Most jurisdictions do not offer programs that assist with admission in other jurisdictions. In that sense there are no ‘global lawyers’, ie lawyers admitted in many jurisdictions. Dual admissions do exist, and ready admission to other jurisdictions occurs in some areas: between France and Quebec for instance and between Ireland, the UK and Australia/New Zealand.

Differences in systems of legal education are closely related to differences in admission standards, because admission has such large impact on what is taught. Some of the different structures reported upon are found in Annex 3 (Table). Generally we observe that admission standards vary considerably between jurisdictions. Where there are independent bar examinations for admission to the profession, the faculties have more latitude to experiment with programs and education. Where the law degree is the ‘ticket’ of entry to the profession, with only articles or Practical Legal Training additionally required, the faculties are far more constrained in their choices. That is particularly the case at the compulsory undergraduate level.

VII. Conclusion: a global lawyer for tomorrow?
We note that it emerges from the Reports that the most important drivers of IOLE are: Individual attitudes, interest and ambitions of academics; the internationalisation drive in the Higher Education sector (universities), and government policy; the demand for graduates with international experience and knowledge of other legal systems; the conviction that comparative study improves local understanding; multi-system domestic law; and historical ties to other jurisdictions or other legal families. We also note that practitioners are less inclined towards more courses related to internationalization. In order to serve their clients, they often prefer for the students to deepen their knowledge of internal law; they are more interested in wider skills in domestic law, and also in ethics and professionalism (Canada). In-house (corporate) lawyers tend to be more ‘globalised’ for obvious economic reasons. Nonetheless for many practitioners international elements in the curriculum are important because they make for a better informed more nuanced domestic lawyer...

But if our main question is, simply put, ‘do we need more people trained in international questions tomorrow?’, then the answer is an unequivocal ‘Yes’. The integration, internationalisation or globalisation of the world is expanding on different levels, not just in the commercial sphere. This even includes such traditionally ‘national’ areas of law as family law, criminal law and tax. Nonetheless there is a varying scale of required knowledge: from the domestic lawyer who has to know more and more international law (as said, even in Family law or Criminal Law etc), to the “global lawyer” (a small group even in the long run). There is then a matching varying scale of intensity of international legal education, from the minimum standards for all lawyers (even purely domestic in orientation) to the ‘global lawyers’. There is thus a correlation between legal practice (or other law study based careers) and legal education.

From this perspective it makes sense to set universal minimum standards of international exposure for all students in the UG curriculum; encourage structuring of programs so every student has a realistic opportunity to participate in international law studies (including addressing credit issues and financing issues for exchanges); and integrate second language/legal language teaching in the law faculties on a compulsory basis.

In terms of universal minimum standards we should direct our attention at two targets: one, the incorporation of compulsory introduction to foreign and transnational law and legal issues in every compulsory degree program. This will benefit all students both in terms of career progression, in terms of a domestic as well as international career, and in becoming more critically minded and well-educated lawyers. Good local lawyers have a solid understanding of international legal issues and structures.

The growth of joint and dual degrees and exchange programs will undoubtedly continue. However, the existing growth has been uncoordinated and patchy, and has delivered uneven opportunities. Depending on which institution a student is at, he or she will have opportunities to participate or not. A more structured approach might help to ensure that every student has the opportunity to take part in a multiple degree program or at least in an exchange. This will require attention to organisation aspects and to resources. Some students at very internationalised faculties will enjoy the necessary options and opportunities at their own institutions.

Generally, given the spectrum of career options, it is efficient to offer options/choices: the general educational trend is towards greater variety and distinct streams in law degrees with different career paths in mind; since exchanges are perhaps the most effective and popular IOLE element, we should be
determined to ensure that every student can access them: funding, and language training is required. Students should not be denied this opportunity for lack of resources; they should have more effective second language training as part of their undergraduate degrees. Arguably this should be a mandatory part of any law degree and need not necessarily be English: it should apply to English language countries too.

We observe that there has been considerable success where structural intervention has constructed a workable basis for exchanges. The Erasmus and Bologna reforms are the prime example, although these have a very specific goal of training future European lawyers, because of the increased integration between European jurisdictions. Nonetheless the traditional institutional autonomy of universities has also been beneficial in that it has allowed many experiments and innovations to bloom without too much central intervention. This institutional autonomy has allowed faculties to be responsive to student’s diverse career goals and ambitions. However, in some countries institutional autonomy is far more limited, as is for instance the case in India and Spain.

A key issue to allow participation is language. There should be a concerted effort to equip all law students with foreign language skills. The training should be provided within law faculties or in close collaboration with language faculties or institutions. The focus should not solely be on English: more and more students speak 3 or 4 languages, and in any case students from Anglophone jurisdictions will also benefit from knowing a foreign language which will give them unmediated access to the law of other countries, be they in Asia, Latin America or in Europe. This will allow lawyers to overcome the remaining divide between civil law and common law, and also between these two families of law and others (such as Islamic law, customary law etc.)

The focus on IOLE is thus on two things: a universal and compulsory basis with an aim to have basic knowledge; openness; and a more discerning and critical attitude to domestic law; and then specialist and voluntary offerings for those more interest. That is, fitting into the general trend towards more diversified law training for more diversified law careers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Michael Crommelin</td>
<td>University of Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Monica Pinto</td>
<td>University of Buenos Aires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Anne-Lise Sibony</td>
<td>University of Liège</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Daniela Vargas</td>
<td>College of Law, Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Tsvetana Kamenova</td>
<td>Plovdiv University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Maurice Kamga</td>
<td>Legal Officer, International Court of Justice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visiting Professor, International Relations Institute of Cameroon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Aline Grenon</td>
<td>University of Ottawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Jutras</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada (Quebec)</td>
<td>Helge Dedek</td>
<td>McGill University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Ding Xiangshun</td>
<td>Renmin University of China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>David Sehnalek</td>
<td>Masaryk University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Jaan Ginter</td>
<td>University of Tartu, Faculty of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Tuomas Tiittala</td>
<td>University of Helsinki, Faculty of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Michael Sturner</td>
<td>University of Konstanz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Ioannis Voulgaris</td>
<td>Democritus University of Thrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Lin Feng</td>
<td>City University of Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>K. B. Agrawal</td>
<td>University of Rajasthan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Marie-Luce Paris</td>
<td>UCD Sutherland School of Law, Dublin Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Newcastle Law School, University of Newcastle (AU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Dr. Daphne Barak</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Center, IDC Herzliya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Contact Person</td>
<td>Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Rodolfo Sacco</td>
<td>University of Turin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alberto Gianola</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Naoke Kanayama</td>
<td>Keio Law School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Pascal Ancel</td>
<td>University of Luxembourg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Sharifah Suhanah bte Syed Ahmad</td>
<td>University of Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Miguel Rabago Dorbecker</td>
<td>Iberoamerican University B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Tony Angelo</td>
<td>Victoria University of Wellington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Aalt Willem Heringa</td>
<td>Maastricht University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Miguel Raimundo</td>
<td>University of Lisbon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Eric Descheemaeker</td>
<td>University of Edinburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Gary Bell</td>
<td>National University of Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Ms Sloth-Neilsen</td>
<td>University of Western Cape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Soledad Atienza</td>
<td>IE University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Henrik Forschamn</td>
<td>Uppsala University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laura Carlson</td>
<td>Stockholm University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Alexander Morowa</td>
<td>University of Lucerne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tawian</td>
<td>Jeanette Shao</td>
<td>National Cheng Kung University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>Kalthoum Meziou</td>
<td>University of Tunis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Muharrem Kilic</td>
<td>Akdeniz University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>David Marrani</td>
<td>Institute of Law, Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antonios Platsas</td>
<td>University of Derby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Frank Upham</td>
<td>New York University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>Nicolas Etcheverry</td>
<td>University of Montevideo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<td>Bar Exam</td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Bachelor + Master in law (4y)</td>
<td>Bar Exam</td>
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</tr>
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<tr>
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<td>LL.B. (4y) OR any degree + JD (2-3y) OR any degree + CPE (1-2y) (PCCL) (1y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Undergraduate degree + LL.B(3y) OR LL.B(5y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LL.B (3-4y) OR Solicitor: Final Examination Solicitor:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preliminary Examination Barrister: King’s Inn Entrance Examination Barrister:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ degree of Barrister (“deviling”) at Law (1y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>LL.B. (3,5y) Apprenticeship (1y) Bar Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israël</td>
<td>“Laurea” (5y) Apprenticeship (18m) Bar Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Bachelor + Master (5y) Supplementary Courses on Luxembourg Law Bar Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Undergraduate degree Juris Doctor (2-3y) Bar Exam Apprenticeship (1y) + Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>“Licenciado en Derecho” (3-5y) Registration of the degree by the Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>LL.B(4y) OR Certificate in Legal Practice Apprenticeship (9m) Bar Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>LL.B (3y) LL.M (1-2y) Apprenticeship courses (2-3y) + Training Program (15m-4y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>LL.B (4y) Professional Legal Studies Courses (5m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>LL.B (4y) Professional Legal Apprenticeship (18m) Final Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Bachelor (3y) Bar Exam Apprenticeship (18m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>LL.B (4y) OR any degree + Law degree (2y) Diploma in Apprenticeship (21m) + Advocates:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Professional Legal Practice (1y) Competence Courses (“deviling”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Qualification Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>LL.B (4y) or JD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bar Exam (&quot;Part B&quot;: 5m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apprenticeship in law firm (6m) OR Government Legal service (3y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Undergraduate LL.B (4y) OR any degree + Graduate LL.B (3y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney: Apprenticeship (&quot;Articling&quot;) (2y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advocates: Apprenticeship (&quot;Pupilage&quot;) (1y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>&quot;Grado en Derecho&quot; (4y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate program (1y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apprenticeship(6m) Bar Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>LL.M (4,5y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apprenticeship (3y) Bar Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Bachelor of Law + Master of Law (4,5y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apprenticeship (1-2y) Bar Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>LL.B (4-5y) OR any graduate degree + Post-graduate School degree (3-4y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bar Exam Pre-Service Training Courses (1m) + Apprenticeship (5m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>Bachelor (3y) Bar Exam Professional School (1-2y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>LL.B (4y) First Bar Exam Apprenticeship (1y) Second Bar Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States (standard model)</td>
<td>Undergraduate degree (4y) + Juris Doctor (3y) OR foreign undergraduate degree (4y) + LL.M (1y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bar Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>Law degree (3-4y) Oath</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>