

# An Act Without Power<sup>\*</sup>: A Critical Analysis of a Japanese Act on Preventing Elder Abuse<sup>†</sup>

TAKAHASHI Shuichi

## Table of Contents

### Introduction

- I . Overview of the APEA
    - A. Duty to Report: What, When, and for Whom?
    - B. Authorities and the Measures the Administration Should Have and Take upon Receipt of a Report
  - II . Problems with the Duty to Report Under the APEA
    - A. Lack of Sanctions
    - B. Lack of Immunity
  - III. Problems with the Distinction Predicated upon Urgency Under the APEA
    - A. Presumptive Consequences of the Distinction
    - B. Difficulties of Japanese Administrations
    - C. Disincentives to Recognise the Urgency of Reported Cases
- Some Concluding Remarks

---

<sup>\*</sup>This title is named after the famous book on Japanese Law, JOHN OWEN HALEY, *AUTHORITY WITHOUT POWER—LAW AND THE JAPANESE PARADOX* (1991).

<sup>†</sup> This essay is based on a presentation I made at the Tokyo-Cambridge Seminar on Law and Humanities, which was held at Cambridge University on August 29, 2017. I thank the Seminar participants and Ryan Scoville for their helpful comments. I am particularly grateful to Norio Higuchi, Yasunori Kasai, Emi Matsumoto and Masayuki Tamaruya for their continuous support. Any errors in the manuscript are mine.

Question: What would you do if you found out that an elderly person might have been abused?

## Introduction

Japan's aging society is one of the country's most urgent problems. The proportion of the elderly-person demographic has already exceeded 25%,<sup>1</sup> indicating that for every four Japanese individuals, more than one is over 65 years old. This figure is projected to reach 33.3% in 2036, which means that one in three Japanese persons will be over 65.<sup>2</sup>

However, an aging society is a universal phenomenon<sup>3</sup> and is not solely prevalent among the Japanese. It is not an exaggeration that it is one of the world's most challenging issues, which leads to a common concern as to how the law should respond to such matters, and we lawyers should start taking such a problem more seriously now.

This essay will discuss one of the gravest problems faced by the aging population—elder abuse—which has garnered much public attention in Japan. Shocking news of elder abuse in nursing care facilities often hits newspaper headlines.<sup>4</sup> In fact, statistics have shown an annual increase in the number of elder abuse cases. Fiscal year 2016 saw 16,836 confirmed cases, 2.8% more than the previous year and another record high.<sup>5</sup> In the same period, 452 cases of abuse in nursing homes were reported, a 10.8% increase

---

1 The precise ratio was 27.3% in 2016. Cabinet Office, White Paper on Aging Society 2017, at 2.

2 *Id.* at 3.

3 *Id.* at 10–12.

4 *E.g.*, Abuse at nursing care facilities, Japan Times, Feb. 19, 2016, <https://www.japantimes.co.jp/opinion/2016/02/19/editorials/abuse-nursing-care-facilities/#.WzLpGxZcWEc> (last visited June 27, 2018).

5 Nursing care abuse targeting seniors climbs 11% to new record, Japan Times, Mar. 10, 2018, <https://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2018/03/10/world/crime-legal-world/abuse-elderly-nursing-facility-staffers-rises-10-8/#.WzLqDRZcWEc> (last visited June 27, 2018).

from the previous year and the completion of a decade-long climb.<sup>6</sup>

In light of these situations, to prevent elder abuse, the “Act on the Prevention of Elder Abuse, Support for Caregivers of Elderly Persons and Other Related Matters (hereinafter APEA, or the Act)” was enacted in 2005.<sup>7</sup> Despite being a huge step towards preventing elder abuse in Japan, this statute has many flaws. In particular, like many Japanese statutes, the Act does not have effective mechanisms to accomplish what it intends to provide. In this essay, I will focus on the duty to report and the APEA’s prescribed administrative measures, arguing that the Act fails to provide necessary incentives on both fronts.

The essay proceeds as follows. First, I will provide an overview of the APEA, whose key concept appears to be case urgency. Second, I will discuss the flaws of the duty to report; while the Act imposes a duty to report on every person who encounters elder abuse, it does not prescribe any sanctions for breach of that duty or provide reporters with immunity. Third, I will discuss the problem of distinction with respect to the administrative measures a municipality should take in accordance with the urgency of a reported case. Such distinction may discourage Japanese administrations from immediately responding to these cases, due to lack of resources—not only material but also human, including legal experts.

## I . Overview of the APEA

The APEA is said to have been enacted to prevent elder abuse.<sup>8</sup>

---

6 *Id.*

7 Law No. 124 of November 9, 2005. With respect to the English translation of this Act, I relied on the site of “Japanese Law Translation” administered by the Ministry of Justice, Japan. <http://www.japaneselawtranslation.go.jp> (last visited April 16, 2019).

8 Bryan A. Liang & Fusako Seki, *Protecting the Elderly: Policy Lessons from an Analysis of the United States and Japan*, 18(2) YOKOHAMA KOKUSAI KEIZAI HOGAKU 1 (2009).

To accomplish its objectives, the Act addresses three main topics.

One is the definition of “elder abuse”. The statute classifies elder abuse into five types: (1) assault, (2) neglect, (3) emotional abuse, (4) sexual abuse, and (5) economic abuse.<sup>9</sup>

The second topic is the framework of administrations for responding to cases of elder abuse. The Act provides that national and local governments; welfare service organisations; medical, welfare, and legal professionals; and general citizens should cooperate to prevent elder abuse.<sup>10</sup> The Act also assigns responsibilities to local municipalities to provide daily assistance for elderly persons and caregivers.<sup>11</sup>

The third topic is the duty to report, as well as the necessary authorities and measures that must be taken by the administration upon receiving a report. In the following sections, I will discuss this topic and its related problems in detail.<sup>12</sup>

#### A. Duty to Report: What, When, and for Whom?

With respect to persons who discover abuse, the APEA prescribes a duty to report. Although the best way to mitigate elder abuse is prevention, it is impossible to forestall every case. When abuse has unfortunately occurred, the necessary interventions should be put into effect as soon as possible. Before intervening, however, one would be prudent to examine the case thoroughly.

It has been pointed out that we cannot expect to receive complaints from an abused elderly person.<sup>13</sup> In some cases, due to dementia or other forms of vulnerability, they are unable to

---

9 Art. 2(4) & (5) of APEA.

10 *Id.* art. 3.

11 *Id.* art. 6.

12 APEA distinguishes elder abuse “by a care facility staff member, etc.” from elder abuse “by a caregiver”. (*Id.* art. 2(3)). Caregiver means “a person who actually takes care of an elderly person, and who does not fall under the category of a care facility staff member, etc.” (*Id.* art. 2(2)). In Japan, caregivers are often the family members of the elderly person. I mainly describe the cases of elder abuse by caregivers in this essay.

13 NORIO HIGUCHI, WHAT ARE THE PROBLEMS OF THE JAPANESE LAWS IN THE HYPER AGING SOCIETY 192 (2015).

communicate to anyone the facts surrounding their abuse or to recognise that they are indeed being abused. Moreover, in other cases, they show reluctance in reporting their abuse. If they report, the caregivers carrying out the abuse—often family members—could be arrested. The victims do not want their family members to be taken away, which often means losing their sole caregiver.

The APEA prescribes the duty of all individuals who encounter suspected cases of abuse to report them to municipalities. Such an obligation entails various responsibilities in accordance with the urgency of the discovered case. On the one hand, Article 7(1) of the APEA provides that “in cases where any person has discovered an elderly person who is likely to have been subjected to elder abuse by a caregiver, and if such elderly person’s life or health has been materially threatened, such person shall promptly report this to the relevant municipality”. On the other hand, Article 7(2) states that “in addition to the case set forth in [Article 7(1)], in cases where any person has discovered an elderly person who is likely to have been subjected any elder abuse by a caregiver, such person shall *endeavour* to promptly report this to the relevant municipality (emphasis added)”. These two provisions mean that, although the duty to report is mandatory in urgent cases, it is no longer so when the case does not pose an imminent danger, even if abuse has already been inflicted on the elderly individual.

#### **B. Authorities and the Measures the Administration Should Have and Take upon Receipt of Report**

The APEA also confers on municipalities several kinds of powers to deal with reported cases. Upon receipt of a report, a municipality should promptly confirm the safety of the elderly person and the facts of the case, as well as consult with the relevant welfare institutions on how to respond to the abuse.<sup>14</sup> Following this confirmation and consultation process, the municipality possesses either of two different authorities depending on the urgency of the

---

14 Art. 9(1) of APEA.

case.

First, the APEA provides for on-site inspection. Article 11 of the Act confers on the mayor of the municipality the authority to instruct “officials engaged in business affairs related to welfare services for elderly persons to enter into such elder person’s domicile or residence and carry out a necessary investigation or questioning”. The Act adds, however, a caveat to that provision: “in cases where a mayor of a municipality finds that elder abuse by a caregiver may have posed a material threat to the life or the health of an elderly person”. Thus, the Act allows the authority to do coercive investigation only when it finds that elder abuse may have posed a material threat to life or health of the elder person.<sup>15</sup>

Second, the APEA requires the municipality to provide temporary shelter by promptly housing the abused elderly person in a facility such as a short-term admission facility.<sup>16</sup> A prerequisite for taking this measure is also that the life or health of the person “is likely to have been materially endangered due to elder abuse by his/her caregiver”.

A number of other related duties and powers are conferred on administrations to ensure the implementation of the above-mentioned measures. A municipality has a constant duty to secure the accommodations necessary for temporary sheltering.<sup>17</sup> Also, in cases where the abused person has been housed in a care facility, the mayor of the municipality or the head of the facility may restrict visitation rights of the caregiver who inflicted the abuse as a prudent way to prevent further abuse and protect the elderly individual.<sup>18</sup>

---

15 In other words, if we take the provision of the Act at its face value, the municipality is unable to investigate when the caregiver rejects the inspection even though elder abuse is strongly suspected unless the life or health of the elderly person is likely to have been materially endangered.

16 *Id.* art. 9(2).

17 *Id.* art. 10.

18 *Id.* art. 13.

## II. Problems with the Duty to Report Under the APEA

While the APEA imposes a duty to report, the Act has no mechanisms to encourage reporting.<sup>19</sup> In preventing elderly abuse, the premise that we should keep in mind above all else is that a false negative is more serious than a false positive. A false negative in this context means that, although abuse has indeed occurred, it is falsely unreported. A false positive means that, although no abuse really took place, it is falsely reported. Overlooking abuse would cause irreparable damage to the abused person, especially in cases where life or health is seriously endangered. Thus, it is necessary to provide a framework in which false negatives are more frequently avoided.

Once we accept this premise, we find that the APEA lacks at least two essential features concerning the duty to report.<sup>20</sup> One is that the Act does not provide any sanctions when a mandated reporter fails to discharge their duty. Another is that the Act does not prescribe indemnity for a reporter if the reported case eventually turns out to be false.

### A. Lack of Sanctions

APEA has no adequate sanction mechanisms for cases where a mandated reporter fails to report an abuse that he/she has encountered. Despite the Act's imposition of the duty to report on all persons who discover elder abuse, it does not provide any punishments if they do not fulfil that duty. A person who is negligent in reporting the abuse of an elderly person whose life is thereby endangered would not be liable for such a failure under the Act. This is applicable even to doctors, (public health) nurses, lawyers, and other caregivers in their professional capacities, even

---

<sup>19</sup> This part places heavy reliance on HIGUCHI, *supra* note13, at 199–202.

<sup>20</sup> Moreover, as implied above, the duty to report provided under APEA is merely a duty to “endeavor” when the case is not one of imminent danger, even if abuse has actually been inflicted.

though the Act itself recognises how easy it is for such individuals to detect abuse.<sup>21</sup>

Some form of sanction (whether criminal or administrative) should be enforced on these professionals whenever they fail (at least negligently) to fulfil their duty without justification. Not only are they in a better position to expose abuse in their everyday operations, but also they have the professional skills to tell whether a case constitutes abuse, which is not always easy for laypersons. Therefore, to achieve the aim of the reporting system under the Act, at least those in professional positions and capacities should be liable in case of failure to report. The APEA lacks any such mechanisms.

#### **B. Lack of Immunity**

The APEA's other deficiency is that it does not confer any immunity on a reporter if the case he/she has reported turns out to be false. To be sure, the APEA does not specifically refer to any potential liabilities for the reporter. It includes, however, the possibility of lawsuits (specifically defamation lawsuits) under its general tort provisions, which means that a reporter could be sued for defamation by the person whom he/she falsely reported as the abuser.

One would easily presume that people are generally inclined to avoid such troublesome situations even in the presence of the possibility of abuse. Individuals with no professional skills may find it difficult to categorically say whether the case before them constitutes abuse, and this may give them the incentive to overlook vague cases when faced with the possibility of liability. Moreover, under the current APEA regime, reporters have only a "moral duty" to report because they face no possibility of sanctions even when they ignore abuse on purpose. And the Act's omission of an

---

21 Article 5 of APEA says that "persons who have business relationships involving welfare services for elderly persons, such as care facility staff members, etc., medical doctors, public health nurses and attorneys-at-law, shall be aware that their positions allow them to easily discover elder abuse, and shall endeavor to do so at the early stages".

immunity clause is likely to discourage people from reporting close cases.

Therefore, we cannot deny the possibility that many people will not dare to report. Granting immunity to reporters would not necessarily promote reporting, but it would mitigate some of the disincentives that such a responsibility might entail.

### III. Problems with the Distinction Predicated upon Urgency Under the APEA

The second problem with the APEA is that it prioritises reported cases according to urgency. Such a feature is meaningless for (potential) reporters because, regardless of urgency, the APEA does not penalise them in case they fail to report a case, as discussed above. Thus, an urgency-based distinction carries significance only for the municipality that receives the report.<sup>22</sup> Only when a case is urgent will the municipality have the authority to implement such measures as forcible investigation or temporary sheltering of the abused elderly person.

#### A. Presumptive Consequences of the Distinction

The urgency-based framework is problematic in part because it creates adverse incentives for municipalities. To fulfill its duties under the Act, an administration should ensure that an abused elder is accommodated in its facilities and commit officials to carry out any necessary measures, including by following (complicated) administrative procedures. An administration should also prepare for the possibility that litigation will arise to challenge measures undertaken pursuant to the Act. Some of these steps, such as investigation and even temporary sheltering, are expensive and require not only a lot of material resources but also human resources, including legal experts to assist with implementation.

Japanese municipalities, however, often do not have the resources

---

<sup>22</sup> Art. 9(2) & 11(1) of APEA.

to follow through. In this context, administrators might try to grapple with resource limitations by unjustifiably deeming even urgent cases as non-urgent, and thus as requiring less by way of administrative response. This suggests that the APEA framework could disincentivise administrations from recognising the urgency of reported cases.

## B. Difficulties of Japanese Administrations

I will now illustrate the difficulties faced by Japanese administration in carrying out APEA measures using a case that ended in litigation.<sup>23</sup> The development of this case suggests that administrations indeed have insufficient (material and human) resources to cope with elder abuse cases, and that there is a tendency to avoid recognising the urgency of cases to which they should respond.

### 1. Summary of the Facts of the Case

A care facility staff member discovered that an elderly person had many bodily injuries when the staff took care of her. The staff asked her who had injured her, and she replied that it was her daughter, who was her primary caregiver. The care facility reported this case to the municipality.

Following receipt of the report, the municipality's public health nurse tried to promptly follow the steps provided by the Act to protect the elderly individual. The nurse took the elderly person to the hospital and the police station to examine the severity of the abuse, but initially received only tepid responses from both the facility and the hospital, both of which were reluctant to declare that this was indeed a case of abuse and to take the necessary steps to shelter the elderly person without notifying her family.<sup>24</sup> Nevertheless, the nurse of the municipality persisted in her efforts to protect the elder and finally succeeded in persuading authorities to take additional measures. The municipality decided to

---

23 Tokyo Chiho Saibansho [Tokyo Dist. Ct.] January 16, 2015, Hei 25 (wa) no. 9392, 2271 HANREI JIHO [HANJI] 28.

accommodate her in another facility which served as a temporary shelter.

Afterwards, when the daughter arrived at the initial facility to take the elderly person home, she found out that the elder person had been moved to the shelter. The family then notified the police and protested, citing an “abduction by the administration”.

Following this protest, the daughter and the municipality discussed the elder’s subsequent treatment. The daughter initially denied any abuse but vaguely admitted that she had done some wrongdoing to her elderly family member at times. Nevertheless, the daughter demanded many things from the municipality. For example, she demanded that the municipality visit her home to see the elderly person’s living conditions. Although the municipality had already had the elderly person examined by a doctor and given prescribed medication, she insisted that the municipality provide her with other supplements and place her under a rehabilitation program. Moreover, she required the municipality to report to her in detail the treatment the elderly person was undergoing. The municipality accepted all of these demands.

Several days later, despite having once found abuse, the municipality decided to end protective accommodations on the view that the threat to the elderly individual was not imminent. Before this decision, the municipality had received a call from the facility accommodating the individual, which said that they would be

---

24 As the Court in this case noted, the Act does not require the municipality to notify the family before they take such measures. The municipality should temporarily shelter the elderly person whose life or health is in danger due to the abuse, so as to ensure that further elder abuse by the caregiver (the family) is not inflicted. Thus, it is very natural that the municipality is not required to notify the family who is suspected of abuse. Rather, Article 13 of the Act provides that, “in cases where measures such as sheltering have been implemented for any elderly person who has been subjected to abuse by a caregiver, the mayor of the municipality or the head of the care facility related to such measures may, for the purpose of preventing further abuse, restrict the caregiver who inflicted abuse from visiting the elderly person”. The Court also held that providing notice of temporary sheltering could increase the risk that the caregiver takes back the abused elderly person. *See supra* note 23 at 40–41.

unable to shelter her within a few days due to lack of capacity.

After the decision to end the accommodation, the administration and the daughter began to negotiate when the elderly person would be returned home. That is when the family's lawyer stepped in. The daughter demanded to know where the elderly person was accommodated so that she could immediately bring her home. The administration initially refused, as the elderly individual had a fever at that time and could not be moved. Nevertheless, the administration finally disclosed the location of the facility because the daughter was adamant, according to the court's findings.

## 2. Judgment of the Court

The daughter then filed a lawsuit against the municipality for roughly 7.7 million yen in damages. One of the plaintiff's allegations was that the municipality was negligent in its decision regarding the urgency of the case.

The Tokyo District Court dismissed all the plaintiff's claims and held that what measures should be implemented towards the prevention of elder abuse and the protection of the elderly person should be deferred to the discretion of the officer of the municipality. The measures the municipality has taken are illegal only when those measures were extremely unreasonable and beyond or abuse of its discretion.<sup>25</sup>

Applying this standard, the court found that the municipality's decision on the urgency of the case was within the norm. Thus, it concluded that the resulting decision to provide temporary shelter did not constitute an abuse of discretion.

### C. Disincentives to Recognise the Urgency of Reported Cases

This case implies that Japanese municipalities are suffering from a lack of resources and sheds light on the powerlessness of administrators. Not only material resources but also human resources, particularly legal experts (lawyers), were all insufficient and remain so. This scarcity makes it difficult for administrations to

---

25 *Id.* at 37-38.

responsibly fulfil their responsibilities under the APEA.

In this case, the municipality was unable to accomplish the measures they had initially decided to take. The administration succumbed to the demands of family member who was suspected of abuse and obscurely admitted to wrongdoings. In fact, the municipality in this case accepted the family's demand to give the abused elderly person dietary supplements which were not prescribed by the doctor and to provide the family a thorough report on the treatment the elderly individual was undergoing. Furthermore, the administration yielded to the demand, which was done after the family's lawyer stepped in, that the municipality disclose the location where the abused elderly person was being sheltered, even though that location should have been concealed to prevent further abuse. The municipality was forced to make such unnecessary (and rather inadmissible<sup>26</sup>) compromises in their response to the complaints of the suspected abuser even though the administration had dealt with the case, as the district court found, in accordance with the Act.

These imply the conditions in which Japanese officials handle the daily affairs related to elder abuse. They are burdened with complaints from suspected abusers.<sup>27</sup> When receiving such complaints, an administration should respond to them primarily

---

26 *See id.* As mentioned above, notifying others of the fact of temporary sheltering or the location of the facility at which the abused elderly person is accommodated could increase the risk of further abuse.

27 It is often said that there are many cases in which a suspected abuser comes to the municipality office again and again to complain that the elderly person has been abducted by the municipality. (In fact, it has been reported that some municipal officials have needed legal protection against unreasonable complaints by the abusers in their daily operations. *See* Kyoko Nakamura et al., *The current state of consultation and the system of correspondence for elderly abuses in communities of A prefecture -Results from an investigation of staffer of communities in charge of elderly abuses* – 13 JOURNAL OF HEALTH SCIENCES 69, 77 (2016)). Responding to these legal complications imposes a great burden on the administration. As a result, due to heavy budget constraints, officials might have an incentive to stay away from the (potentially) complicated cases as much as possible, even though they have broad discretion as noted in the judgment above.

through its legal specialists, but officials with the duty to take measures against daily abuse should not have to deal with such legal inconveniences. Nevertheless, Japanese administrations suffer from a lack of qualified lawyers, and it is not easy for them to access independent lawyers because of severe budget constraints.<sup>28</sup> Thus, officials directly responsible for handling cases of abuse are also forced to respond to legal disputes.

Not only does this require skills and knowledge beyond their professional qualifications, it also further intensifies the scarcity of human resources. As a result, in responding to complaints, officials become unable to sufficiently fulfil their main duty—to deal with elderly abuse. And they could get the tendency to comply with demands even from suspected abusers and to improperly compromise with them.

Such predicaments might further encourage Japanese administrations to cite budget limitations to avoid complicated cases as much as possible, despite having broad discretion to act. The easiest action under the APEA framework is simply to dismiss the urgency of the reported case, as the resulting lack of authority makes it unnecessary to take costly protective measures.

In this way, even if suspected cases of abuse are reported, the Act could increase the likelihood that municipalities will fail to recognise urgent cases, effectively rendering the abused elderly individual alone and vulnerable. The abovementioned case reveals that such inferences are not made arbitrarily. The municipality decided to end accommodations due to scarcity of resources. They had initially recognised the urgency of the case and sheltered the abused elderly person.<sup>29</sup> They were forced to change their initial

---

28 This problem seems to be related to the fact that there are very few qualified attorneys in Japanese society. The ratio of the number of lawyers to the population is very low in comparison with Western countries.

29 According to the Act, the municipality can take coercive measures such as sheltering in cases where the life or health of the abused elderly person is likely to have been materially endangered due to abuse by his/her caregiver. Thus, the accommodation of an abused elderly person means that authorities decided it was an urgent case.

decision, however, due to lack of accommodation facilities. The case thus shows that scarce resources disempower administrations and motivate them to avoid measures that the Act clearly authorises and demands. Such process would be actualised through the way that administrations could acquire the tendency to avoid recognising the urgency of reported cases.

### Some Concluding Remarks

Unfortunately, elder abuse is likely to become more and more common all over the world, as an aging society is a universal phenomenon. The APEA is one huge step for the aging Japanese society because it cites elder abuse as one of the country's major problems and provides certain mitigating measures. In fact, the number of reported cases has been increasing annually, as mentioned above. We can never resolve any issue without an initial step.

Nevertheless, many problems remain under the Act. The APEA fails to provide for the enforcement of what it prescribes. The Act does not incorporate mechanisms to encourage reporting, but instead creates incentives that discourage administrations from implementing its provisions. Yet where elder abuse is overlooked, the victim is placed in a deeply precarious situation. For this reason, it is essential for us to reconstitute the mechanisms to promptly discover cases of abuse and deal with them as soon as possible.

To accomplish this task, we should reconsider the duty to report and its related sanctions, as well as the distinction predicated on the urgency of the case. We should also increase the number of experts, including legal professionals, to enhance the response to the abuse itself along with the legal disputes it might generate.

It is certainly not practical to focus only on reporting and other post hoc methods for dealing with abuse. Since the resources available for Japanese administrations are limited, it is imperative to restructure the system to help prevent elder abuse in the first place. It is time for countries to cooperate with each other to consider

different systems and measures to prevent elderly abuse, and to alleviate the problem quickly and efficiently.

### References

- Shuichi Takahashi, *Elder Abuse and the Laws*, in ELDER LAW (NORIO HIGUCHI & FUSAKO SEKI eds. forthcoming 2019) (in Japanese).
- NORIO HIGUCHI, WHAT ARE THE PROBLEMS OF THE JAPANESE LAWS IN THE HYPER AGING SOCIETY (2015) (in Japanese).
- Norio Higuchi, *Elder Abuse and the Responsibility of Professionals*, 8 MUSASHINO HOGAKU, 41–73 (2018) (in Japanese).
- Bryan A. Liang & Fusako Seki, *Protecting the Elderly: Policy Lessons from an Analysis of the United States and Japan*, 18(2) YOKOHAMA KOKUSAI KEIZAI HOGAKU 1–37 (2009) (in English).
- Kyoko Nakamura et al., *The current state of consultation and the system of correspondence for elderly abuses in communities of A prefecture – Results from an investigation of staffer of communities in charge of elderly abuses –* 13 JOURNAL OF HEALTH SCIENCES, 69–82 (2016) (in Japanese).

※This essay was partly supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP16H03458.