

Table of Contents

Introduction	V
--------------------	---

TOPIC I

Social Security Systems, Risk-Spreading and the Compensation of Damage in the Case of Personal Injury

A. Comparative Stimulations (<i>Helmut Koziol</i>)	3
1. Overview	3
2. Advantages and disadvantages of the European concepts	5
3. Ideas for a solution	7
B. Statements by Country Reporters	11
1. France (<i>Jean-Sébastien Borghetti</i>)	11
2. Norway (<i>Bjarte Askeland</i>)	15
3. Poland (<i>Katarzyna Ludwickska-Redo</i>)	19
4. Hungary (<i>Attila Menyhárd</i>)	26
5. England and the Commonwealth (<i>Ken Oliphant</i>)	31
6. United States of America (<i>Michael D. Green</i>)	35
7. Japan (<i>Fumihiko Nagano</i>)	38
A. Proposal of »comprehensive remedy system« in Japan	38
I. Criticism of the present tort law and other remedy systems	38
II. Structure of »comprehensive remedy system«	39
1. Sources of the fund	39
2. Payment by the fund	39
3. Abolishment of the tort law system	39
B. Discussion on this proposal	40
I. Administrative difficulties	40
II. Problem in respect of justice	40
III. Problem of deterrence	40
C. Comparison to the concept of »social liability insurance« by Koziol	41

I. Distinction between security insurance and liability insurance 41

II. Similar problem concerning deterrence effect 41

D. Remarks 42

I. Trade-off between facilitating compensation and maintaining deterrence effect 42

II. Desirable reach of liability insurance 42

C. Concluding Remarks (*Helmut Koziol*) 44

1. Replacing tort law by insurance systems 44

2. General liability insurance 47

TOPIC II

Flexibility Instead of the All-or-Nothing Rule

A. Comparative Stimulations (*Helmut Koziol*) 57

1. General remarks 57

2. Method of drafting rules 58

3. Clear delineation between legal instruments and interim forms 59

4. Absolutely protected and unprotected interests 60

5. Partial compensation 61

B. Statements by Country Reporters 66

1. France (*Jean-Sébastien Borghetti*) 66

2. Norway (*Bjarte Askeland*) 70

3. Poland (*Katarzyna Ludwichowska-Redo*) 72

4. Hungary (*Attila Menyhárd*) 82

5. England and the Commonwealth (*Ken Oliphant*) 85

6. United States of America (*Michael D. Green*) 89

7. Japan (*Fumihiro Nagano*) 92

A. Flexible system in Japanese tort law 92

I. Judgement of unlawfulness 92

II. Right to »considerable probability of survival« 92

III. Reduction of liability based on the degree of contribution 93

IV. Gradual liability of joint tortfeasors 93

B. Perspective for flexible system in Japanese legislation 94

I. Desirability of flexible system in legislation in general 94

II.	Prerequisites for using the flexible system for tort law legislation	94
1.	Selection of the areas of application	94
2.	The way of listing the relevant factors	95
C.	Concluding Remarks (<i>Helmut Koziol</i>)	96
1.	General remarks	96
2.	Method of drafting rules	96
3.	Clear delineation between legal instruments and interim forms ..	99
4.	Absolutely protected and unprotected interests	99
5.	Partial compensation	100

TOPIC III

Liability of Children as well as Persons with Reduced Abilities and the Notion of Fault

A.	Comparative Stimulations (<i>Helmut Koziol</i>)	105
1.	Liability of children	105
2.	Liability of mentally disabled persons	107
3.	Liability of children and mentally disabled persons and the notion of fault	107
B.	Statements by Country Reporters	110
1.	France (<i>Jean-Sébastien Borghetti</i>)	110
2.	Norway (<i>Bjarte Askeland</i>)	113
3.	Poland (<i>Katarzyna Ludwichowska-Redo</i>)	117
4.	Hungary (<i>Attila Menyhárd</i>)	125
5.	England and the Commonwealth (<i>Ken Oliphant</i>)	128
6.	United States of America (<i>Michael D. Green</i>)	130
7.	Japan (<i>Fumihiko Nagano</i>)	133
A.	State of Japanese law with regard to liability due to misconduct of children and mentally disabled	133
I.	Exclusion of liability	133
II.	Liability of supervisors	133
1.	Liability based on art 714	133
2.	Liability based on art 709	134
B.	Evaluation	135
I.	Tendency of Japanese law	135
II.	Necessity of the liability of supervisors	135
III.	Fault-based or strict liability?	136

C.	Maintainability of the objective standard of negligence	136
I.	Contradiction?	137
1.	Change of the meaning of capacity for liability	137
2.	Relationship between objective theory and capacity for liability	137
II.	Practical difference between the two theories	137
III.	Justification of the concept of objective fault: Liability based on social trust?	138
C.	Concluding Remarks (<i>Helmut Koziol</i>)	140
1.	Liability of children and mentally disabled persons	140
2.	The notion of fault	143

TOPIC IV

Liability for Agents and Agents' Liability

A.	Comparative Stimulations (<i>Helmut Koziol</i>)	149
B.	Statements by Country Reporters	154
1.	France (<i>Jean-Sébastien Borghetti</i>)	154
2.	Norway (<i>Bjarte Askeland</i>)	156
3.	Poland (<i>Katarzyna Ludwichowska-Redo</i>)	160
4.	Hungary (<i>Attila Menyhárd</i>)	167
5.	England and the Commonwealth (<i>Ken Oliphant</i>)	172
6.	United States of America (<i>Michael D. Green</i>)	173
7.	Japan (<i>Fumihiko Nagano</i>)	176
A.	Liability of principals for the misconduct of auxiliaries	176
I.	Grounds of liability	176
1.	State of the argument in Japan	176
2.	Some answers to criticism	176
a)	Existence of dangerousness	177
b)	Supplement by the idea of realisation of profit	177
c)	Some special characteristics of the liability of the principal as strict liability	177
II.	Range of liability	178
1.	Relationship of direction and supervision	178
2.	Requirement for »business«	178
B.	Liability of the auxiliary	179
I.	Proportion of burden in relation to the principal	179

II.	Liability of the auxiliary toward the victim	179
III.	Excursus:	
	Liability of enterprise due to its own negligence	180
C.	Concluding Remarks (<i>Helmut Koziol</i>)	182
1.	Liability for Agents	182
a)	General remarks	182
b)	Strict liability	184
c)	Fault-based liability	192
d)	Solution	193
2.	Agents' liability	194

TOPIC V

Limitations of Liability and Lawful Alternative Conduct

A.	Comparative Stimulations (<i>Helmut Koziol</i>)	199
1.	Limitations of liability	199
2.	Lawful alternative conduct	200
a)	A problem of natural causation or protective purpose of the rule?	200
b)	The notion of natural causation	201
c)	The defence of possible lawful conduct	204
B.	Statements by Country Reporters	209
1.	France (<i>Jean-Sébastien Borghetti</i>)	209
2.	Norway (<i>Bjarte Askeland</i>)	212
3.	Poland (<i>Katarzyna Ludwichowska-Redo</i>)	215
4.	Hungary (<i>Attila Menyhárd</i>)	223
5.	England and the Commonwealth (<i>Ken Oliphant</i>)	224
6.	United States of America (<i>Michael D. Green</i>)	226
7.	Japan (<i>Fumihiro Nagano</i>)	229
A.	Distinction between causation and protective purpose of the infringed rule	229
I.	Tendency of Japanese argument	229
1.	Transition of argument	229
2.	Recent tendency: Highlighting the normative element of factual causation	230
3.	Treatment of lawful alternative conduct	230
II.	Regarding the distinction made by Koziol	230

1.	Evaluation	230
a)	Meaning: Avoidability of result as the minimum requirement for liability	230
b)	Problem: Difference between lawful alternative conduct and protective purpose of the rule	231
2.	One possible solution: Three-stage distinction?	231
B.	Remarks on each group of cases	232
I.	Different characters of problems	232
1.	Difference: Unavoidability or permission to infringe the right	232
2.	Problem: Not protective purpose but necessity of protection of rights	232
II.	Cases of lack of informed consent	232
1.	Self-responsibility of the patient	232
2.	Possibility of compensation due to infringement of right to self-determination	233
III.	Cases of detention without appropriate procedure	233
1.	Purpose of the procedural regulation	233
2.	Possibility to limit compensable damage	233
IV.	Summary	234
C.	Concluding Remarks (<i>Helmut Koziol</i>)	235
1.	The notion of causation	235
2.	The problem of alternative lawful conduct	237

TOPIC VI

Compensation in Kind for Non-Pecuniary Harm, in Particular the Finding of a Violation

A.	Comparative Stimulations (<i>Helmut Koziol</i>)	243
B.	Statements by Country Reporters	245
1.	France (<i>Jean-Sébastien Borghetti</i>)	245
2.	Norway (<i>Bjarte Askeland</i>)	246
3.	Poland (<i>Katarzyna Ludwichowska-Redo</i>)	249
4.	Hungary (<i>Attila Menyhárd</i>)	252
5.	England and the Commonwealth (<i>Ken Oliphant</i>)	254
6.	United States of America (<i>Michael D. Green</i>)	255
7.	Japan (<i>Fumihiko Nagano</i>)	256
A.	Japanese discussion on restitution in kind	256

I. Purpose of art 723 256

II. Content of »appropriate measure« 256

III. Reach of art 723 257

IV. Summary 257

B. Perspective for finding of a violation as a type of restitution
in kind in Japanese law 258

I. Finding of a violation as a method of restoration
of non-pecuniary damage 258

1. Starting point 258

2. Possibility of extension 258

3. Limit of extension 259

II. Finding of a violation as a pure method of deterrence ... 260

C. Concluding Remarks (*Helmut Koziol*) 261

Index 265

List of Authors 273