

Conversations with leadership:



President Jimmy Carter meets with his commission for the appointment of blacks to the federal judiciary in the 5th Circuit at the White House in June 1977. From left: Georgia state Sen. Horace Tate, Joe Reid; Coretta Scott King, staff aide Margaret McKenna, President Carter; and Attorney General Griffin Bell. (Photo/Harvey Georges, AP)

Suffolk hires a lawyer to lead

Margaret McKenna assumed her role as president of Suffolk University this past summer. Dicta sat down with her a week before classes started, after a couple of months on the job, to pick her brain about her past, her plans for the University, and her plans for Suffolk Law School.

□□□□

Dicta: What drew you to civil rights law? In what kind of cases were you involved?

President McKenna: I grew up in a working-class, immigrant community. My parents were public school teachers who were involved in social justice issues. I watched them. I always thought-as my parents did-that people deserved a fair break and did

not always get one. I witnessed discrimination, so I grew up with a sense of “that’s just not right.” I went to law school to become a civil rights lawyer.

I didn’t go to law school and then decide to practice as a civil rights attorney. I was a Title 7 Employment Discrimination lawyer through the Justice Department’s Honors Program in Washington, D.C., the Civil Rights Division. The range of cases I worked on involved police and fire departments in Dallas, Fort Worth, Miami Dade County, and the entire city of Memphis — the issue involving Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and the sanitation workers. I sued the departments for race discrimination.

Continued on page 4

A futuristic dean shares his insights

The Suffolk University Law School community need not worry about whether or not we will be prepared to maneuver in, or keep up with, the changing legal market. The school’s newest dean, a former professor of the law school, is nationally recognized for his insight into the future of legal education and law practice.

And if the furniture in his office is any indication of his tendency to keep up the latest trends — he’s definitely at the cutting edge: Dean Andrew Perlman’s office furniture is in line with the latest trend — collaborative spaces that is believed to be attractive to millennials. Even the American Bar Association has relied on Dean Perlman’s insight concerning future trends: Dean Perlman helped amend the Model Rules of Professional Conduct so that they account for changes in technology and increased globalization.

Here at the Law School, Dean Perlman is perhaps best known for being the founding director of SULS’ Institute on Law Practice Technology and Innovation, and



Suffolk Law Dean Andrew Perlman using a Google Glass while teaching in 2013. (Michael J. Clarke/Boston Business Journal)

the Legal Technology and Innovation Concentration. Dean Perlman’s many accomplishments are enumerated upon in various places on Suffolk University’s website, and in many other pages on the World Wide Web, so Dicta sat down with SULS’ newest Dean a week before classes started to get information that is not so apparent through other publications.

Continued on page 5

INSIDE:

► How to have a successful social life at law school. **Page 6**

► SBA welcomes Secular Legal Society. **Page 3**

► Boston 2024: What went wrong anyway? **Page 7**

► Toxic torts cases & Hollywood films: David vs. Goliath. **Page 2**

Dicta

Editor-In-Chief
Shakesha Coleman

Managing Editor
Rebecca De Chellis

Art Director
Gamze Yalcin

Staff Writer
Elizabeth Mollie Heintelman

Contributors
Prof. Michael Rustad
Ramon Derek Brett Livingston



@SULS_Dicta

Dicta is the official student newspaper of the Suffolk Law School community, existing solely to help foster a sense of community through communication. The goal of Dicta is to educate, inform, enlighten, and entertain the student body through outstanding reporting and editorials on news, events, trends, sports, arts, food, and popular culture.

The opinions and views expressed in Dicta are not necessarily those of the Dicta staff and are not the opinions of Suffolk University Law School or the student body. Suffolk Law School students control and conduct all facets of this paper. Dicta does not discriminate against any persons and complies with the university policies concerning equality.

Dicta encourages students, alumni, faculty, and administrators to submit letters to the editor and articles for publication. Submissions should include the author's name, class and/or position at the university or in the community. Dicta reserves the right to edit and publish all submissions. Anonymous submissions will not be published.

Printed by Sun Chronicle Media,
34 South Main St., Attleboro, Mass.

Toxic torts cases a Hollywood staple

BY PROF. MICHAEL L. RUSTAD

For 25 years, I have defended America's common law of torts against constant attacks and calls for "tort reform." I have testified before Congress twice, and been a co-counsel for amicus parties litigating before the U.S. Supreme Court. My work on punitive damages has been cited by both the majority and dissent in punitive damages cases before the U.S. Supreme Court and dozens of appeals courts.

My defense of American tort law is based on its function as a flexible, free-market based and cost-effective alternative to a more rigid and costly European-style regulation system, social insurance scheme, or some combination of the two — the most widely employed alternatives to protect the public and redress organizational harms. I am skeptical that any bureaucratic construct could function as quickly and effectively as trial attorneys driven by the profit motive (the "private attorney general") to alert and protect the public.

Tort law is a private law subject with a public vision. Tort remedies have become increasingly controversial since Ronald Reagan employed a story about a man telephoning from a booth near a highway who was seriously injured by an uninsured drunk driver. The man sued the phone company, arguing the booth was too close to a busy intersection and that the door of the booth had been defective. Corporate officials strongly supported Reagan's presidential campaign partly because they feared that "Robin Hood juries" would assess unjustified awards out of sympathy to the plight of injured plaintiffs.

In recent decades, trial lawyers have been satirized in popular culture. The general public is amused, angered and perplexed by punitive damages verdicts, such as in the McDonald's "hot coffee" case. While the hot coffee litigation is known by nearly every student, few know the injuries were severe and McDonald's own records demonstrated more than 700 prior complaints arising from super-heated coffee.

I use a variety of legal paradigms to help students understand the McDonald's coffee case as a problem from both plaintiff and defense perspectives. Its concrete fact pattern provides students an excellent opportunity to apply and flip a variety of creative legal arguments. I ask students, for example, how they would use law and economics concepts if they were representing McDonald's Corp., which sold billions of cups of coffee and registered only 700 complaints. Does efficiency dictate lowering the tem-

perature to redress only 700 consumer injuries out of billions of cups of coffee?

Most law school classes have several students with prior training in neoclassical economics who are able to make complex efficiency-based arguments as to whether McDonald's should or should not be subject to liability and, if so, the amount of money necessary to deter future misbehavior. A social justice approach, in contrast, employs very different logic and comes to conclusions more favorable to the plaintiff.

Hollywood filmmakers have countered the popular view of tort law by portraying the David vs. Goliath mismatch faced by brave individuals suing for public safety. My first brush with a famous case made into a film was the plutonium contamination case in *Silkwood v. Kerr-McGee Corp.*, 464 U.S. 238 (1984), which became the subject of an Academy Award winning movie.

I was a year out of law school clerking for Judge William E. Doyle of the 10th Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals. This tort action had been filed by Karen Silkwood's estate against an Oklahoma nuclear facility to recover for plutonium contamination. An Oklahoma jury awarded the plaintiff \$505,000 in compensatory damages and \$10 million in punitive damages. The 10th Circuit reversed the award, arguing that it was preempted by federal nuclear regulations. The U.S. Supreme Court reversed and remanded, holding that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), and therefore Oklahoma, could consider a tort lawsuit arising out of the plant's lack of safety. The Oklahoma jury imposed punitive damages stemming from plutonium escaping Kerr-McGee's fuel processing plant in Cimarron.

The director of the Health Physics Program at Oak Ridge National Labs testified that Kerr-McGee's safety program was "very weak and inadequate." Kerr-McGee's inventory system was so lax that 18,186 grams of plutonium could not be located — enough to place the entire country in jeopardy. (One half-gram of plutonium is enough to give 35 million people a lifetime lung burden.) When I was clerking for Judge Doyle in the summer of 1985, I wrote the dissenting view, opposing the 10th Circuit's decision that the state action was preempted by Oklahoma's worker's compensation act.

I also had a slight role in the actual case that became the basis of the film, *A Civil Action*, starring John Travolta as Jan Schlichtman, the plaintiff's attorney that litigated the toxic torts case of *Anderson v. W.R. Grace*, 628 F. Supp. 1219 (D. Mass.

1986). The book and film portray the David vs. Goliath nature of a toxic tort lawsuit: the powerful corporate defense firms against understaffed and poorly financed plaintiffs' attorneys.

Eight families alleged that two Fortune 500 corporations contaminated the local water supply with toxic industrial solvents. These Massachusetts families hired a young attorney who brought civil suits against W.R. Grace and Beatrice Foods for recovery of damages associated with wrongful death from cancers. The companies retained the services of two leading Boston law firms. I was on the defense side as an associate in one of those powerful firms. The jury found W.R. Grace liable for environmental pollution, while the case against Beatrice Foods was held in favor of the defendant. The action against W.R. Grace was eventually disposed of through a settlement for approximately \$8 million.

The account of this now famous case portrays the personal tragedies behind this legal conflict. On the human side we heard of children who died slow deaths from leukemia and the eventual bankruptcy of the plaintiffs' attorneys who helped the families "construct" the legal dispute. On the legal side, we heard of the inside life of a courtroom, the large corporate law firms, and the financially-struggling, small firm taking on two legal giants. This film offers a broad, contextualized view of law and legal practice, illustrating that lawsuits and legal claims do not simply emerge out of thin air; but, rather, a contextualized social process and history to all legal claims.

The film, *Erin Brockovich*, depicts the true story of a young woman who helped to launch a toxic torts lawsuit that ultimately resulted in a \$333 million class-action settlement against a California utility for polluting the local water supply. Legal crusaders like the real-life Erin Brockovich protect the public by uncovering corporate conduct that threatens the community. My role is even more attenuated in this case, as I serve on the board of the Center for Justice and Democracy with Brockovich.

Tort law is increasingly an institution of social control and public policy, expanding from its traditional role of compensation and reducing the cost of accidents. Tort law, like sunlight, acts as a disinfectant by exposing hidden threats to the public welfare not detected by public authorities.

MICHAEL RUSTAD is Thomas Lambert Jr. Professor of Law & Co-Director Intellectual Property Law Concentration, Suffolk University Law School

SBA welcomes Secular Legal Society

Interview with Ramon Derek Brett Livingston, President, Secular Legal Society:

□□□□

Dicta: Has your group tried to get SBA recognition before?

SLS: We received a rejection and then it was overturned on appeal. I wanted to start an organization, so I had an inchoate idea at the end of the year of starting a secular organization and I basically rushed to get everything together for presentation. I wanted to get recognition before the start of the year for various reasons.

Dicta: If so, do you feel/believe that recognition/votes were denied because of the nature of your group's beliefs or people's perception of what a "secular" group stands for?

SLS: Looking back, I really do not know. If you saw my second presentation, it obviously had a little sarcasm and animosity in it, so people might think that I felt I was discriminated against at my first presentation. There was one presentation before us (Trust and Estates/Real Estate Group) when we went in front of the COP. Their presentation was good and afterwards, not many questions were posed by the other presidents, and they were easily approved.

After we presented, Brendan (The Co-President of the club) and I felt like a human punching bag. It just seemed like total chaos, and in addition, some of the questions were a little baffling. A lot of the presidents left before we finished answering questions, which we found out later was due to them having to attend class, not out of disrespect. At the time though,

including the totality of my experiences in life, it seemed like the same old discrimination I would get when I would tell someone that I do not believe in a deity.

But, most importantly, we have our organization right now, and we have moved past that experience. I can say that I do not harbor any ill feelings from that experience, and while it helped motivate my second presentation, I am looking forward to other things.

Dicta: What is the mission of your group?

SLS: I think the main mission in our group, just like any other group, is bring like minds together. From a legal standpoint, we believe that it is important to address secularism in our legal community. We are an underrepresented ever growing group, and we seek to create a community that empowers individuals to express their ideas without fear of prejudice. We believe that our justice system is a place for free rational thought, and we would like to encourage an open dialogue regarding legislation involving church/state separation, First Amendment rights, lack of secular involvement in the political process, and the stigma tied to those who have secular beliefs.

Dicta: What stereotypes do your group's members face?

SLS: Although we are an ever growing group, there are many stereotypes pretty much everywhere in the world minus Japan, Scandinavia, and some parts of Europe. One of the biggest stereotypes is that atheism associated with immoral behavior. I feel that because my morals come from within, I feel more genuine as a person, as

Come meet Dicta staff:

Come celebrate the first publication of Dicta, Suffolk University Law School's student-run newspaper, for the 2015-2016 academic year! A special reception will be held on Wednesday, Oct. 21, from 6 to 7:30 p.m. in the faculty dining room, 120 Tremont St. For more information contact Shake-sha Coleman at 347-709-1327, or by email at scoleman2@suffolk.edu

opposed to following guidelines in a book to base my sense of morality. I must stress that not everyone believes this, but it is a very prevalent stereotype.

Many people believe that atheists are way too open with their views, when I believe it is the opposite. Many do not come out because of fear of persecution, such as people like my mother, who is a high school teacher, tells me she tells others she is agnostic when asked by other teachers because of some backlash she received by saying she was atheist, and that being agnostic sounds more palatable.

Another stereotype is that we want to remove religion from everywhere. We believe that freedom of religion is fine as long as it is not hurting others. There was an episode this year of "What would you do?" which shows a table of atheist people angry at another table for praying in a restaurant. This is totally off base if you have seen it, as we do not care about private citizens exercising their First Amendment privileges, it is only government which we seek to remove religion. The episode is so

off base and unrealistic, it is a complete farce.

Also, just look at Congress. Being an open atheist is political suicide.

Dicta: You gave a lot of good information about your group during your presentation at the SBA meeting. Can you repeat that info. for the article? (I think you gave info. re. history of secular groups in the U.S./ Int'l arena.)

SLS: I will have to think about that one. Well, I have to say a few things to leave you with:

- ▶ People with PhD's are the most likely to be atheist.

- ▶ Harvard's 2014 incoming class had 34% identify as atheist or agnostic, with Yale at 32%.

- ▶ Four of the five safest countries in the world are also in the top five in rates of atheism.

- ▶ In 13 countries face execution with secular beliefs

- ▶ Six states have archaic laws banning secular people from office (I think most or all are in the South)

- ▶ There is only one jurisdiction (Madison, Wis.) that bans non-religious discrimination — affording them the same freedom as religious people (the protections cover housing, public accommodations and employment)

One last thing: Gallup polls have always shown that atheists are the more distrusted group, year after year, below gays, Muslims, etc. This year atheists are actually 2nd place, behind, socialists! I guess I must be a really hated person being in the last two groups! That gave me a little laugh.

Sports and Entertainment Law Fall 2015 Attorney Symposium

Thursday, November 5th 6-8pm in the First Floor
Function Room

Please join Suffolk's Sports and Entertainment Law Association (SELA) for a riveting discussion on current legal issues within the sports and entertainment industry.

Panelists include:

Patti Jones: The Law Offices of Patti Jones
Jay Fee: Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough LLP
Sally Gaglini: Gaglini Law Group LLC
Michael "Mook" Williams: Symmetry Sports Agency
Mandy Petrillo: Boston Red Sox

Reception to follow panel



Phi Alpha Delta Karaoke Night

Wild Rover
October 23, 2015
6 PM

Challenge your friends for \$1 a song



Lawyer is hired to lead university

Continued from page 1

It was pretty amazing — that whole Memphis suit — because you think when you read about it that the problem had been solved. But it hadn't: The drivers of the trucks were still white. The guys picking up the garbage were still black. In Memphis they still had, by custom, a "black bed" rule in the fire department, which was if you had one African-American officer you had to have three of everything so that the white officers would not have to share the same bed and equipment for each of the eight-hour shifts.

Dicta: How did you go from civil rights law to education?

President McKenna: After I worked for the Civil Rights Division, I ran the association of all of the civil rights commissions conducting training around the country. Then I worked in the White House. It was while I was in the White House that I was trying to figure out what I wanted to do when I grew up. I was still interested in the same issues-social justice and access. I thought about what I could do that would have the most impact.

That's when I decided that being a college president would be the thing that would have the most influence. As a lawyer, I thought you could have a lot of ripple effect on people's lives with access issues, but I also thought as a university president you could create an environment that encourages people to be change agents and that would have a catalytic effect on lives. So, I decided that's what I wanted to be.

While I was still in the White House, I started to work on more issues surrounding education. I actually was involved in the Bakke [Supreme Court] case. Then, when we created the Department of Education-taking the "E" out of "H.E.W." [referring to the former Health Education and Welfare Department], I served on the transition team. I was the second employee of that department. I did it very purposefully. I spent a year there before President Jimmy Carter lost the election. I had to decide then what I was going to do.

I came to Boston. I did talk to a couple of (law) firms. But at that point, I knew that I wanted to go into education. I spent one semester teaching at Simmons [College] and was a fellow at the Kennedy School [of Government at Harvard University]. I took a job as the director of the Bunting Institute and vice president of Radcliffe [College of Harvard University]. Then I start-

ed looking at college presidencies. I really thought I wanted to run a public institution — because I'm committed to access — so therefore you go to public institutions.

People asked me then what are you doing at Radcliffe. But the more I found out about public institutions, the more I discovered that they didn't have the flexibility of private independent institutions. There were a lot more politics and dictates from legislators around line items in budgets. Before I could become a finalist for one job, I had to interview with a state senator. That didn't feel right to me. Then I thought maybe I could find a private institution whose mission is something different. I found Lesley University which is a private institution with a public mission — and that's like Suffolk in some ways.

Dicta: When asked about what accomplishments as president of Lesley University you thought you could transfer to being the president of Suffolk University, you mentioned having put "Lesley on very solid financial ground with both a significant growth in the endowment and the facilities." Do you see the changes at Suffolk Law School as being an example of that?

President McKenna: No, the situation at Lesley was very different than the situation here at Suffolk. Lesley grew very significantly. When I started there, there were 2,000 students. When I left, there were 10,000 students — so the campus grew significantly.

That's not going to happen at Suffolk. In terms of stability here, we need to diversify our revenues and raise some money. We need to focus on the programs that distinguish us from others. I did that at Lesley, too. And that's what I've said many times: "You should only do what you do as well or better than anyone else."

What are the things that we do? There are a number of things we do here that are unique — the Intellectual Property Program at the Law School, the Energy and the Environment Program, and the Housing Discrimination Clinic. What's the connection between the Intellectual Property Program at the Law School and the Entre-

preneurial Center at the Business School? They should be connected. There are so many possibilities for creating interdisciplinary programs.

Dicta: What do you think of the changes happening here — like those taking place at the Law School? Were you involved in any of the decision making?

President McKenna: These changes were all made before I came. But I do know that law schools all over the country have shrunk. This is not news. When you're graduating people and they can't get jobs, you need to be responsible and make sure that you right-size your population. Law schools all over the country are doing this — and Suffolk is doing this as well — and it seems to make sense. If you have a smaller population, you have to figure out what to do with your space. Plus, we need to support more cooperation between the Business School and the Law School.

Dicta: How does your training as an attorney help in your role as the president of the University?

President McKenna: Training as a lawyer can help you through life — the critical think-

ing, the questioning, the arguing. It gives you confidence to ask questions. My job is to ask questions until I understand. Also, it's good not to be intimidated by lawyers when you're a CEO. When people say you can't do that, I can say what do you mean I can't do that? Being a lawyer is helpful when you're a CEO.

Dicta: You mentioned in a previous interview that we need to ask alumni for help. What are your plans for attracting Law School alumni?

President McKenna: First, we [referencing the dean of the Law School Andrew Perlman] should ensure that people who want to enter the law profession can. Scholarships and financial aid are very important. We should also make sure that people who enter the profession and who wish to pursue public service are able to do that and repay debt

There are programs at the Law School that deserve and need to be supported — like the flagship programs — those that are as good as or better than anyone else's,

such as the Intellectual Property Program. That program has a rich history and there is a dramatic need in the commonwealth for [what Suffolk Law School grads have to offer]. There is a demand for the skills our graduates have and we need to make sure we have the solution to that demand.

Dicta: How can current law students help you?

President McKenna: I would like to hear from Law School students about what we can do to make the Law School better, academically and in terms of other ways we can support students. What would make the Law School a better experience than it is today? What is it missing? What is it we're doing that could be done in a different way? The best people to give you advice are the people receiving the services we provide-and those are our students.

Dicta: What's your vision for the Law School? What advice do you have for us?

President McKenna: I would say the same things I've said to the other schools [in the University], which is, "Focus — you can't be all things to all people." You need to be known for a few things and what are those things. When you're known for a few things, your rankings go up; it's cause and effect. You don't think about how to raise your rankings; you think about how do we get better — then you get known for those things, and your rankings go up.

Dicta: Some, students in particular, are not very happy about some of the changes taking place at the Law School. What are your thoughts about the concern that the Law School is losing its identity/exclusivity?

President McKenna: Sometimes people make assumptions [about the reason things were done]. The number one issue in universities is communication. One of the things I did [concerning some of the changes taking place at the University] was put up a website, put up Q & As, and put out weekly communications.

□□□□

We discussed the changes to the Law School's bookstore. President McKenna noted that the bookstores are on her list of issues to look at and encouraged students to be vocal about their desires concerning the bookstore.

Dicta: In an interview, you described yourself as having grown up in a working class community. Do you believe that your background put you at a disadvantage as a law student?

Continued on page 6

▼
'I would like to hear from Law School students about what we can do to make the Law School better, academically and in terms of other ways we can support students.'
 ▲

Suffolk President Margaret McKenna

Futuristic dean shares his insights

Continued from page 1

Dicta: You partnered to create the Legal Technology Audit. What would you like the Suffolk Law School community to know about it?

Dean Perlman: The Legal Technology Audit was created because so many lawyers don't know how to use basic software, like Word, Excel, and Acrobat, despite its importance to everyday practice. The Audit is designed to ensure that lawyers are using the basic tools at their disposal as efficiently and effectively as possible.

Dicta: Does an attorney or firm get access to the Legal Tech Audit through the website, www.legaltechaudit.com?

Dean Perlman: The website just gives information about the Audit itself. The Audit is not on that website. A law school or professor [or corporate entity or anyone else] wanting access to the Audit fills out a form that is available through the site and gets access that way.

Dicta: You were one of 10,000 people chosen to sample Google Glass — the futuristic specs outfitted with a small computer screen over the right eye, a camera and an Internet connection. Can you talk about that experience? What are your thoughts on this tool being widely used by attorneys, given your interest in legal compliance and technology?

Dean Perlman: Being a part of the Google Glass Project was a lot of fun. I enjoyed getting my hands on a cutting edge piece of technology, and I used it in my classroom on a few occasions. Quite frankly, I don't view it as something that will change the landscape in terms of how lawyers practice. I think it's a very niche device that's going to have limited use, but there are other emerging technologies that I do think have the potential to change not just how legal services are delivered but change the economy more generally.

Dicta: How long was the trial?

Dean Perlman: It wasn't really a trial. I got my hands on it, and still have it. I'm happy to allow students to give it a try.

Dicta: You commented that the Google Glass could be useful to the shy student that would prefer to text a question. Did any students text questions to you while you were wearing the Google Glass?

Dean Perlman: Yes! I got lots of text messages, and many times it was from students who were not ordinarily participating in class—so it did seem to have that effect. It did have a purpose. I just don't think it's going to change the way we do

things in a fundamental way.

Dicta: Do you think a tool like Google Glass could potentially be counterproductive concerning use in the law school classroom, as lawyers need to be able and willing to speak up. Do you think Google Glass could be a crutch for some students?

Dean Perlman: I wouldn't want it to have [the effect of encouraging students to just sit back]. But it does give students the opportunity to ask questions they might not otherwise ask. I don't think it makes students less willing to participate. I think it gives them another avenue to participate.

Dicta: What were some takeaways from the Legal Tech Show in Chicago, where you spoke at the plenary session, that you would like implemented/ followed through with here at SULLS, maybe through the Accelerator Clinic or the legal tech program here? (Have you already seen the takeaways implemented here?)

Dean Perlman: The big picture point from a legal technology perspective is that the legal industry is undergoing significant change. Just like every other part of the economy, there are changes being driven by technology. If you're going to be a modern legal professional, you need to understand how technology is used in the industry. The big takeaway message is that lawyers of tomorrow need to embrace technological change and innovation and understand how they can use it to their advantage to deliver legal services more efficiently and effectively. If Suffolk Law students are able to do that, they will be better positioned to succeed in the 21st century legal marketplace.

Dicta: What's your vision for the law school?

Dean Perlman: Traditionally, Suffolk Law School has been focused on training practically-oriented professionals — people who hit the ground running. We've been known for that for a very long time. We need to make sure that we keep our curriculum up to date so that we ensure that continues to be the case in the 21st century. That includes making sure we have an understanding of technology and the new ways legal services are being delivered today.

I want to make sure our students contin-

ue to have the tools, knowledge, and skills they need to be successful. This includes an appreciation for innovation and having a better understanding of business and finance. That's one of the reasons I'm very excited that the Sawyer Business School — the graduate school — will have a presence on the 5th floor of Sargent Hall. The physical proximity of that type of knowledge and expertise will allow students to take better advantage of it. The bottom line is that there is a whole range of new knowledge and skills that students need to have today that they didn't need to have 20 or 30 years ago.

Dicta: Speaking of the changes taking place at the Law School, can you talk about the changes happening to the 5th floor? Some, students in particular, are not very happy about some of the changes taking place at the law school.

Dean Perlman: Sargent Hall was created for a student body of 1,600. Starting this fall, we will be a school of 1,200. It makes no sense for us to pay all of the expenses associated with a building intended to house 1,600 students with only 1,200 students. It wouldn't make sense for me to take your tuition money to pay for a building that's larger than we need. We need to be smaller for a variety of reasons: The number of students applying to law school has shrunk by half over the last six or seven years, and the number of jobs available for graduates has also declined. So, it's been a very concerted and intentional effort to become smaller.

Now to become smaller in a building that was created for a larger class size, we necessarily need to share it with other parts of the university. There was a very careful study done to figure out what would be the appropriate part of the university to include in Sargent Hall. And the graduate school of business is the perfect match, because lawyers today — legal professionals of all kinds — really need to have a good understanding of business and finance if they're going to be successful.

Whether you're representing large companies, or individuals with trusts and estates needs, or small businesses — you need to have a good sense of business and

finance. If you run your own small practice, that's a business. So understanding business is really a big part of what lawyers need to be able to do. The law school needs to be smaller, and sharing the space with a natural partner in our educational efforts makes a lot of sense.

Dicta: Do you have any specific plans for collaboration between the Law and Business Schools?

Dean Perlman: I want us to look at our curriculum to figure out how we might incorporate more business and financial education. The specifics of that would be up to our curriculum committee. Another possibility is to find synergies between the entrepreneurship offerings of the business school, and our programming. More cross-teaching—perhaps some business school faculty teaching more law-related courses and vice versa — might be helpful to both schools' students.

One thing I want to make sure that students understand — because I've heard this misunderstanding come up in a number of different contexts — is that there is no merging of the schools. There is a Sawyer Business School. There is a Suffolk Law School. Those are two different entities with two different deans and two different faculties. I've heard people say things like "the Business School is taking over the Law School" and misinformation of that sort. Of course, I hope we'll be able to work more closely with each other, but at the end of the day, we are still two different schools that are part of a single university.

Dicta: Have any faculty or students shared any of their concerns about the changes with you?

Dean Perlman: When I've heard concerns, it's usually been based on some kind of misinformation — like when people have raised the concerns about the Business School taking over the Law School. I have heard that as a concern, but it's based on something that's not accurate.

Dicta: Some students are unhappy about the Law School bookstore selling very few items with the Suffolk Law School logo on it. What are your thoughts on this concern that some students feel that we're losing our identity and exclusivity behind some of the changes?

Dean Perlman: I haven't heard any concerns along those lines, but students certainly should be able to buy Suffolk Law sweatshirts [and other items] that say "Suffolk Law" on them.

▼
'I view my role as helping students, not the other way around. I guess the way that you all can help me is by telling me what you need.'

Suffolk Law Dean Andrew Perlman



Continued on page 6

Futuristic dean

Continued from page 5

If that's not the case, let me know and I will look into it! {We then discussed that the Suffolk Law School bookstore is now a spirit store—a store that sells items mostly with the Suffolk University logo, and that this location was chosen for a spirit store due to the prominence of its location.}

Dicta: How can current law students help you?

Dean Perlman: I think the better question is how I can help you. I really want to hear from students about the concerns they have and the issues they want to see addressed. I view my role as helping students, not the other way around. I guess the way that you all can help me is by telling me what you need.

Dicta: Do you have any particular plans for engaging alumni?

Dean Perlman: I want to engage alumni at every turn — in every aspect of the Law School's work — such as speaking with prospective students as well as students who are looking for jobs. We need alumni to help support a lot of the Law School's initiatives. I want to keep alumni involved in the life of the Law School.

Dicta: You obtained an LLM. Many people think the LLM is for attorneys who went to law school in other countries that

just want to learn about American legal system. Do you agree? What is the value of an LLM? Why did you pursue one? When you went to law school, why did attorneys pursue the LLM?

Dean Perlman: Yes, there are a lot of foreign students who pursue an LLM in this country. That's one use. They also can be useful to people who already have a JD and are looking for additional education in a specific field. The most common one is an LLM in tax. So people who want to focus on tax often get an LLM for that purpose. But there are other types as well. The one that I pursued was a general LLM that I got while pursuing a career in academia. It was the kind of LLM one would get only if you wanted to get into legal education. There are different kinds of LLMs, and they serve different purposes. They aren't for everyone. The vast majority of lawyers don't need LLMs.

Dicta: Is there anything you want to say to the SULS community.

Dean Perlman: It is a deep honor to be dean of this law school, where I have been on the faculty for 14 years. I love the students here. I want to help them in any way I can. My door is always open. If people have questions or concerns, or want me to attend a particular event, please reach out to me. I really want to stay in touch with students even though I won't be teaching my normal courses anymore.

Lawyer to lead

Continued from page 4

President McKenna: It's interesting. I went to Emmanuel College, which is a pretty middle class place. I think the first time I experienced a class difference was my first year at Radcliffe, at Harvard. I had already been in Washington. I had already been in the White House. But there were certain cultural experiences that others at Radcliffe and Harvard had and assumed that I had that I did not, and certain language that was new to me even though I had done all these things.

That's the first time I recognized that I was truly from a different kind of environment, that I was not upper middle class, and that I had come from a much more working class background. There were words that I had never heard before.

I remember going to a meeting of the Seven Sister Schools [when they existed] and this guy said, you know I really miss the old days when our students came and they appreciated the opera, and museums, and they understood the importance of culture and they had been to Europe, and they understand the Renaissance.

He went on and on and on: and now they come — they don't understand any of this. We have to expose them to everything. I thought, isn't that what college is about? Isn't that a good thing? Isn't that exciting for you? I'm one of those people who had not experienced opera, and museums, and that kind of culture. I thought: Okay, I get it. I'm not one of you.

Dicta: Is there anything you want to add? Anything you want to tell the Law School community? Anything we should know about our new president?

President McKenna: The University is stronger if all three parts of the University work together. So, one, one, and one don't make three; they make five. And the bridges and the programs that we can create will strengthen this place.

I'm anxious and excited to see that happen. I'm looking forward to working with the Law School to see what kind of emphasis the Law School will have with its new dean. I'm interested in working with the faculty. I'm interested in working with the Law School, and the Business School, and the College of Arts & Sciences to see what we can create as a university that uses the strengths of all of our programs and schools.

Pursuing a successful social life in law school

You've probably heard that law school is a lot like high school. That seems to be especially true here at Suffolk, where many are insecure about the School's ranking-or lack thereof. It seems that the competition is heightened here because students believe that coming from a Tier 4 school, it is especially important that they "beat out" others for the top spot—as only the top students have a chance at "Big Law."

This false belief is probably why many students go to bed wondering "how other people are doing," why many students are frustrated by students who keep to themselves and do not share information about themselves, and the reason some of the relationships formed in law school are superficial and the source of a lot of confusion.

Insecurity is a funny thing. Some law students need so badly to size up their competition, that when students do not readily share information about themselves, they get "investigated" by others. This can include the insecure student attempting to gain access to another's grades, or making up information about others to make themselves feel better about the unknown.

And of course: This is "school." There seems to be something about putting people together in a room with one person that holds the balance of their fate that provokes competition and gossip-yes gossip. Yet, lawyers are supposed to represent the epitome of critical thought! What is critical about jumping to conclusions about people you do not know, and repeating-and believing-information, the source of which you are unsure-and information that is none of your business in the first place?!

So, for those of us who are committed to staying sane, here is some advice for navigating law school social life.

1. T.H.I.N.K. I wish I could take credit for this, but can't. It's good advice for lawyers and life. THINK before you speak. Ask:

T — Is it true? This should be a no-brainer for lawyers. Why say or repeat a statement that you cannot verify?

H — Is it helpful? What you're about to say about someone may be true, but will it add value to anyone's existence?

I — Is it inspiring? Are the words you are uttering going to build someone up or tear someone down. (And what's your motive for saying it?)

N — Is it necessary? Every fact you know and opinion you have does not need

to be uttered. Like when you're writing a legal memo: Make every word count. Every word should have a positive purpose.

K — Is it kind? If you're saying something about someone that you would not like said about you, you probably should not say it — even if it is true.

2. Decide what type of winner you want to be. Do you want to win because others are not as good as you, or because you are excellent even when not being compared to anyone? If you are excellent — irrespective of your surroundings — others' grades and accomplishments won't matter to you. You will focus on yourself and your goals, and not worry about what "your competition" is doing. It's natural to wonder why people are all dressed up: "Is there an interview going on today that I don't know about?" "Where's that person going?" Get over it: If you've done what you're supposed to do, you'll know what interviews are scheduled and when you need to be dressed up.

3. Don't hang around people who provoke panic. That person in your study group who spends the first 15 minutes whining about being stressed out will probably transfer that stress to you. Maybe you should just peek at each other's notes every once in a while, and study by yourself — or with people who handle stress a little better.

4. Stay away from negativity. People tell who they are by their actions. That classmate that (thinks) telling someone's business is cute, is really probably just lonely and insecure and thinks that you will find him or her more interesting if they seem to "know" others. And newsflash: This person will potentially talk about you at some point, too. Nice people do nice things. And since law school is largely about networking, don't get caught with the wrong crowd. Further: Law school is stressful enough.

5. Get to know people for yourself. As a law student, you are being trained to get the facts for yourself. Don't rely on others' perceptions or interpretations. Feel your own emotions. Remember that people provide descriptions and characterizations based upon their own experiences, background and understanding — which may not be accurate. It's tempting to follow the crowd and have common enemies, but you might miss out on important relationships and networking opportunities when you pass up interacting with someone based upon another's (probably) false perception.

What went wrong with Boston 2024

By Elizabeth Mollie Heintzelman

In January 2015, during the beginnings of an epic Boston winter, the city was granted the U.S. bid for the Summer 2024 Olympics. On Feb. 6, 2015, Suffolk Law School held the first public meeting on Boston 2024. However, six months later, Mayor Marty Walsh informed Bostonians that the dream for a Boston Olympics was dead. So, what was wrong with Boston 2024?

With mistakes upon mistakes mounting, Boston 2024 was doomed from the start. Lack of public support and a brutal winter, which affected the city's already ailing public transportation system, were only the beginning of issues for the Olympic bid. While architectural plans were magnificent, ideas such as having beach volleyball in Boston Common, and having Harvard be the host of multiple events did not garner much support.

Also, people involved in Boston 2024 cited money as an issue with the bid, and individuals running the Olympic Commit-



tee lacked experience in orchestrating an event of this magnitude. On the other hand, supporters thought Boston 2024 would be positive for the city by improving infrastructure and promoting tourism; but their voices were muted by opposition. With all these issues looming and citizens' taxes inevitably increasing, it was hard for anyone to get excited for such an undertaking.

As public support dwindled, the negatives overshadowed the positives, and Suffolk Law students agreed with the public's dislike for Boston 2024. Second year law student John Wilton has lived in the Boston area all his life.

Although he thought Boston 2024 would

have been great for the city and its infrastructure, he said, "I think the drama surrounding the bid and its ensuing failure was an embarrassment to the city, and many of the people involved." While Wilton sided with the majority that the bid was going to fail, he cited a Lord Byron quote stating that "the road to hell is paved with good intentions" and that the people involved were not to blame.

Also, 2L Jen King, who lives on the South Shore, an hour from downtown Boston, had similar opinions on Boston 2024 to Wilton. King said, "I don't think it would have been wise for Boston to participate in the 2024 Olympics [because] construction jobs, especially such urban large scale ones as this, are difficult to budget for, thus the final cost is unclear and not transparent to taxpayers and city residents." While increasing jobs in the city would be great, King makes an excellent point that taxpayers would be burdened by the question of the final budget. Without a concrete num-

ber for the Olympic budget, it was difficult for Bostonians to support this venture.

If Boston would have the opportunity to host again, Suffolk Law students remain apprehensive. As Wilton said, "the 2024 bid left a bad enough taste in the International Olympic Committee mouth that they will likely not offer another opportunity for a while." This statement could not be more true, as the city deals with transportation, education and housing issues.

"Our city's residents can barely rely on the MBTA to get them to work or school — why should we promise upgrades for the sole benefit of tourists that will be here for less than three weeks?" exclaims King.

As Suffolk students weigh in, they agree with the general consensus: Boston 2024 was doomed from the start. While new arenas and exciting fanfare would have been great for the city, there are desperate improvements needed to restore Boston's infrastructure as a modern American city. Boston should focus on 2015, not 2024.

McDonald's
TM

WELCOME SUFFOLK LAW STUDENTS AND FACULTY

**SERVING BREAKFAST ALL DAY
STARTING OCT 6th**

**146 TREMONT STREET
JUST A FEW BLOCKS FROM SUFFOLK**

**CUT HERE FOR ONE
HASHBROWN FREE
WITH ANY BREAKFAST
ITEM PURCHASE**

STAPLES
MAKE more HAPPEN™

MAKE a strong start HAPPEN

Whether you're starting your first semester at Suffolk Law, jumping into an internship or getting ready to give a big presentation, your neighbors at Staples are ready to help with the supplies and services you need.

- Technology and accessories
- Copies and prints
- Presentation essentials
- Office supplies
- Coffee and snacks
- And more

**Stop by our flagship store today —
right in Government Center.**

Staples
1 Washington Mall, Boston, MA
617-248-8975