that she should be a researcher rather than an on-air reporter. Wertheimer ignored the advice. She moved to NPR in 1971 and became the first director of its news magazine, *All Things Considered*. She remained there for 13 years. By 1974, Wertheimer was made a political correspondent and two years later became the first woman to anchor NPR’s coverage of the political conventions and election night. She has gone on to cover every political convention and presidential election since then, along with primaries. She has produced praiseworthy coverage of national politics and Congress, and witnessed major historical events from the Watergate impeachment hearings to the Iran-Contra affair. Wertheimer was also the first person to broadcast live from inside the U.S. Senate chamber when she did 37 days of coverage of the Panama Canal treaty debate.

Linda Wertheimer, senior national correspondent for National Public Radio, will give the annual Saltman Center for Conflict Resolution’s Peace in the Desert™ lecture on Nov. 6, 2011 in UNLV’s Artemus Ham Hall. Her talk will focus on the conflicts—and at times, the downright hatred—Americans are feeling between one another and their government. A veteran observer of politics for many years and a news anchor for 10 presidential elections, Wertheimer will discuss the role of partisanship in the government over the last 40 years, how today’s version compares with other eras, and how the public might possibly affect that role.

Wertheimer, a 1965 graduate of Wellesley College, began her career working for the BBC and CBS broadcasting companies. Interestingly, an executive at NBC at the time told her...
On April 8, 2011, the Saltman Center screened the documentary *Burma VJ* as part of its Peace in the Desert™ video screening series. Focusing on the 2007 protests against the Burmese government led by the country’s Buddhist monks, the documentary features footage filmed secretly by video journalists and smuggled out of the country. Michael Adler, a public policy scholar at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, was on hand to discuss the film’s impact and subsequent developments in the country.

In 2007, clandestine videographers working for the Oslo-based Democratic Voice of Burma successfully filmed and broadcast footage of the Burmese uprising, despite the efforts of the repressive military government to prevent them. The film chronicles the events of the uprising itself as well as the perils of the video journalists who covered it while under constant threat of arrest. *Burma VJ* won the Sundance World Cinema Documentary Film Editing Award and was nominated for the Best Documentary Academy Award. The film’s popularity has brought international attention to the events in Burma.

After the film, Michael Adler took questions from the audience and explained more about the effect of media coverage on Burmese politics. Adler previously worked in Burma as correspondent for Agence France-Presse News Agency and covered the 1988 Burmese uprising, which is shown briefly at the beginning of the film. He adeptly explained that the military government has been able to stay in power since 1962 because of a combination of support from China and a lack of interest by the U.S., as the country has no strategic significance. However, since the release of *Burma VJ*, international sanctions have increased, and in November 2010 Burmese citizens elected a new civilian government. Unfortunately, Adler explained, the new government is essentially a cover, enabling the former leaders to remain in power under the guise of democracy. He remains hopeful, however, that progress can continue.
Top right, Michael Adler, a former correspondent for Agence France-Presse News Agency who covered the 1988 Burmese uprising, discusses *Burma VJ* on April 8, 2011 at UNLV.

**Peace in the Desert™ Series**

The Peace in the Desert™ series invites experts with practical experience in particular conflict areas to share their intimate knowledge. These experts examine why the dispute arose, who the stakeholders and the quarrel are, and what might be done to resolve the dispute. By having an expert lay out the basis of the conflict, suggest possible solutions, and respond to challenging questions from the audience, the Saltman Center hopes to help people develop their own views based on informed, rational, and sound presentations.

**Watch the Talks**

Missed the lecture? Visit the Saltman Center’s webcasts page to view recent lectures at the UNLV Boyd School of Law.

[law.unlv.edu/saltman-center/webcasts]
The U.S. government, its citizens and its businesses espouse democracy just about everywhere in the world – except in their own nation’s workplaces. That contradiction will be one of the key topics of a two-day Saltman Center for Conflict Resolution labor and employment law symposium in the spring. Professor Ruben J. Garcia, who joins the Boyd School of Law faculty this fall, is teaming up with visiting Professor Lisa Blomgren Bingham of Indiana University, Bloomington, to present “Democracy and the Workplace.”

The upheaval over public employee collective bargaining in Wisconsin and so many other states was the impetus for the conference but serves mainly as a springboard into a much broader subject, Garcia and Bingham explained. “We want to broaden out the question and look at the problem from a much bigger picture perspective, the perspective of voice in the workplace,” Bingham said.

“We want to have a wide ranging conversation to include reimagining democracy in the workplace,” Bingham said. “Research in industrial relations points to the benefits of processes that make workplaces more democratic. Collective bargaining is one set of processes but there are other processes in non-union settings—high performance workplaces, innovative management practices, teams, interactive decision-making, all the various ways of running the workplace not under a command-and-control hierarchical management structure but under a flatter structure with far fewer layers of middle management, a much more bottom up structure with delegated exercise of authority.”

Garcia said he is passionate about the subject of the conference, and that’s reflected in the amount of his research and writing that has focused on workers’ rights in the context of constitutional rights and international human rights. He came to Boyd from California Western School of Law in San Diego, but before his career in academia, he represented unions and employees in private practice in Los Angeles. Last year, he was inducted into the illustrious Labor Law Group, becoming one of its 40 academics committed to developing course texts and materials that accurately reflect the practice of labor law. His book, *Marginal Workers: How Legal Fault Lines Divide Workers and Leave Them Without Protection,* is being published this year.

Also slated for publication this year is a book Bingham co-authored, *Dispute Systems Design: Preventing, Managing and Resolving Conflict.* The “Democracy and the Workplace” symposium is a good fit for the Saltman Center, Bingham explained, “because collective bargaining is the mother of [Alternative Dispute Resolution]. Collective bargaining gave us the grievance procedure, which was the model for the use of mediation and arbitration in all sorts of other contexts – the courts, business transactions, etc. … So there is a vital intellectual tie between where ADR came from, the research on voice in ADR and this broader question of voice in the workplace.”

**Professors Lisa Blomgren Bingham and Ruben J. Garcia will present “Democracy and the Workplace” at the Boyd School of Law in the spring.**
Building upon its first-year success, the Summer Institute in Dispute Resolution added a fourth course for this year’s sequel, yet another indication that the fledgling is taking flight in exactly the direction its founders intended.

“We established the Summer Institute to provide excellent dispute resolution teaching to not only our own students, but also to law students and professionals from around the country or even the world,” said Professor Jean Sternlight, director of the Saltman Center for Conflict Resolution. “We believe that our students can also benefit from sharing a classroom experience with practitioners and professionals, as well as other law students. This year, we were delighted to see classes that included not only Boyd law students, but also attorneys and professionals from elsewhere.”

Visiting students came from as far as New Hampshire, New Orleans and Alabama to attend the 2011 Summer Institute, drawn by the ever growing reputation of the Saltman Center, the Institute’s customized courses and the caliber of the visiting professors who led the instruction.

“The professors we enticed to teach in our Summer Institute are all nationally respected leaders in the field of dispute resolution,” Sternlight explained. “They are prolific authors and expert teachers and trainers. We are most fortunate that they agreed to share their knowledge with our students.”

The 2011 roster included:

**Hal Abramson**, professor of law at Touro Law Center, New York, chairman of the ABA Committee that drafted its mediation representation competition rules and co-chairman of the International Mediation Institute Task Force in The Hague designing an Inter-Cultural Mediator Certification Program;

**Robert Kirkman Collins**, director of the Divorce Mediation Clinic at the Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law, who pioneered divorce mediation nearly three decades ago and has been teaching divorce mediation for more than 15 years;

**Forrest Mosten**, adjunct professor of law at the UCLA School of Law, 38 years of experience, a practicing collaborative attorney and mediator specializing in family law matters involving substantial assets; and

**Maureen Weston**, Associate Dean of Research and Professor of Law at Pepperdine University School of Law, co-author of casebooks on sports law and arbitration and author of numerous articles in the area of Olympic and international sports arbitration, disability law, sports law, and dispute resolution.

Their summer courses covered a wide range of intensive studies compressed into relatively short time-frames. Professor Mosten’s course in collaborative law, for example, required only two days of class work. Among its more than 30 participants were a handful of attorneys, which was expected not only because the class was worth numerous CLE credits (as were all of the Institute courses), but because collaborative law is one of the fastest growing models of lawyering to improve legal access and dispute resolution.

“The passage of the Uniform Act on Collaborative Law and involvement of the ABA and state bars makes this a highly topical subject,” Mosten noted.

As part of his Saltman Center visit, Professor Mosten also presented a two-hour CLE seminar about advanced negotiation strategies.

Professor Abramson’s highly practical course, “Representing Clients in Mediation,” was so popular that hopefuls had to be placed on a waitlist. The instruction included an exploration of how effective advocacy in mediation requires attorneys to consciously depart from their default practices honed in the courtroom.

Professor Collins’ divorce mediation course grounded participants in the substantive and practical knowledge of family law, finances and personal dynamics required to act competently and confidently as divorce mediators.

Professor Weston’s course in sports law dispute resolution focused on the regulatory framework and alternative dispute resolution processes used in amateur, professional, and international/Olympic sports.
The Faustian legend warns that one should never bargain with the devil, but the legend got it wrong, acclaimed scholar Robert H. Mnookin told his Saltman Center for Conflict Resolution audience in February.

In his latest book, *Bargaining with the Devil: When to Negotiate, When to Fight*, the internationally renowned Harvard law professor, mediator and lecturer examines nine cases in which adversaries had no trust in each other; in fact they had strong, even bitter emotions toward one another, to the point where at least one side saw the other as evil. His conclusion: History teaches us that negotiating with one’s own Mephistopheles – whether in statesmanship, corporate clashes or bitter family disputes – can often be the right course even when it feels repugnant.

“Should you bargain with ‘the devil’?” Mnookin asked the crowd. “My answer is: Not always, but possibly more often than you feel like it.” It is almost always going to be very difficult to agree to such bargaining not only because it will stir strong emotions of fight or flight, but also because “the devil is going to get something out of it.”

“You’re going to have to give up your pursuit of the moral order, of righting the wrong that this person has done in the past,” Mnookin explained. The central question posed in Mnookin’s book is one that national leaders often face. He pointed to the U.S. government’s recent decisions about whether to negotiate with North Korea, Iran and Libya. Emotionally charged, high stakes stare-downs are not limited to the world political stage, however. Many people believe that all business conflicts are resolved mainly through rational assessment of risks and maximization of prospective returns, but such conflicts often are complicated by demonization of the adversary, Mnookin explained. Failed joint ventures can be akin to nasty divorces in that “the executives feel betrayed by one another.” When one competitor believes the other has stolen intellectual property, the furious aggrieved party can “want blood.” Demonization occurs within families too, in divorces and in inheritance disputes.

Mnookin, director of the Harvard Negotiation Research Project, told his Saltman audience that his goal was to analyze the thinking processes regarding negotiating intense conflicts. Thinking clearly about whether to negotiate is particularly difficult when you know the other party is out to hurt you or others for whom you are responsible. These situations also raise troubling questions about the limits of utilitarian, consequential thinking, and make all the usual decisions about whether and how to negotiate something far more complex. Because it is “the devil” on the other side, the worries about verification and enforcement of the deal are amplified. And what are the costs in terms of precedent, legitimacy, morality, identity and self-respect?

Mnookin advocated a pragmatic approach. “You’ve got to compare all the costs and benefits of alternative courses of action.” Too often bargaining with a Beelzebub is rejected based on intuition rather than analysis, and that’s particularly unwise, Mnookin warned, when the decision’s impact goes beyond just the decision-maker.
On April 4, 2011, experienced Canadian international Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) attorney Babak Barin gave a presentation to Boyd Law School students entitled “Developing a Practice as an International Mediator and Arbitrator.”

“It’s a growing industry,” said Barin encouragingly. “More people are interested in doing it than ever before.”

Born in Tehran and educated in Europe, the United States and Canada, Barin said that when he first started working in international ADR the field was still very small and just starting to grow. He was fortunate enough to get a job with the Canadian firm ADR Chambers which offers dispute resolution services to the legal and business communities. This led to a position as a Senior Legal Advisor at the Claims Resolution Tribunal for Dormant World War II Accounts in Switzerland, which established his reputation. Today, Barin is a lecturer at the University of Sherbrooke and a partner at BCF LLP, a Montreal business law firm that also specializes in international ADR.

For students interested in pursuing a career in international ADR, Barin recommended not only taking relevant classes – including Alternative Dispute Resolution, International Law, and Conflict of Laws – but also stressed the importance of getting real-world experience through an internship with an international ADR organization like the International Chamber of Commerce (which offers many dispute resolution services, including the Paris-based International Court of Arbitration) or the London Court of International Arbitration. He emphasized that getting firsthand experience and meeting people can be very important to finding career opportunities.

Though the field is now much better established, it is still growing. Many companies have found that ADR provides the most efficient way to resolve disputes arising from international contracts. So, as more and more companies do business and form partnerships in foreign countries, Barin believes the demand for attorneys experienced in international ADR will continue to increase in the future.
Dear Mr. Mediator:

My husband served me with divorce papers two months ago. We have agreed to try to mediate our break-up. What is the single biggest mistake a soon-to-be-divorced spouse can make when trying to mediate her divorce?

—Worried Wife

Dear Worried:

The biggest mistake anyone can make in mediation is not being prepared. I know that sounds like a Boy Scout directive, but it’s true. If you sit down to negotiate spousal support with your husband, for example, you need to have a good idea what your expenses will be as a single woman. You cannot guess on the gas bill or the car payment, you have to have those numbers. And those numbers cannot be aspirational or on a wish list. They must have a firm basis, one that can be backed up by some documents that you can show at the mediation.

So if you’re planning on sitting down with your husband to negotiate your return to singlehood, my advice is: do your homework!

---

Mediation Clinic Update

In the fall of 2011 the Strasser Mediation Clinic will be training its sixth class of mediators. Twelve eager, nervous students will be coming back to school a week early to participate in an intensive mediation theory training, and then jumping right into live disputes the next week (with the help of mentors, of course!)

The students usually follow a traditional pattern. During the training week they role-play with their fellow students, which often invokes laughter and allows them to loosen up. It is also easy for them to start again if they make a mistake or give an opinion when they should stay quiet. Still, the students are presented with what can aptly be called an overload of information in that first week and it can seem overwhelming.

In addition, the work of a mediator is antithetical to the work of a lawyer, something they have been groomed for in law school. So they need to come to terms with being able to step into a role quite different than the one for which they are preparing.

During the first few weeks of working with real people, the trainees work very hard at learning to be comfortable with the process of mediation—the steps a mediator takes to go from a party’s original position to a negotiated agreement. Sometimes they are so concerned with getting the process right that they miss the substantive material the parties are offering. That’s when having a co-mediator and a mentor present is so helpful.

Eventually, somewhere between halfway and two-thirds of the way through the semester, the light dawns and the process becomes a part of them. They begin to demonstrate true confidence and begin to think of themselves as...mediators!

Our clinic has been working for the past two years in Las Vegas’ Eighth District Family Court system and the Clark County Neighborhood Justice System (NJC), dealing with divorce and post-divorce issues along with community disputes. This year we will be offering our students the opportunity to deal with cases referred from Small Claims Court.

The new Justice Court Chief Judge, Karen Bennett-Haron, appears to be an enlightened jurist, because she has decided to change the rules for Small Claims cases significantly. All complaints filed in Small Claims Court will need to go to mediation first, under the auspices of the NJC, and clinic students will be handling those cases in one of their placements in the fall.

Small claims courts offer beginning mediators a rich variety of scenarios to deal with. Because the court has the power to give a monetary award, cases tend to be more ‘meaty’ than some of the community disputes that normally find their way to the NJC. And mediation is true to its definition as “bargaining in the shadow of the law,” since the parties are free to go to court and battle it out in front of a judge if they are unable to reach any resolution with the mediators.

Next year’s student mediators will be the first to deal with all court-connected cases. We look forward to a most promising semester.
Missy’s Case: A New York Tale

Missy, a tiny mini-pinscher, was out walking with her mistress in New York’s Greenwich Village and didn’t see it coming. Unexpectedly, an off-leash pit bull passing by with his owner grabbed her head in his mouth and dug his teeth into her. Both owners dropped to their knees, trying vainly to open those vise-like jaws. All they could see of Missy’s face was one eye, staring helplessly from between parallel rows of good-sized teeth. Blood was starting to drip on the sidewalk and both dog owners were in a panic. Finally, a Good Samaritan applied the lit end of a cigarette to the opening below the pit bull’s tail, and the dog opened its mouth. Missy was free, but in had shape. Her owner scooped her up and hailed a taxi to take her to the animal hospital as fast as possible.

That was the story Missy’s owner told the mediator trainees and me, their mentor, one cold winter’s night in Manhattan’s Small Claims Court. I could see the students blanch as they visualized the scene in their heads, and even I wasn’t initially sure we could (or even should) mediate the case. But Missy’s owner, there with her lawyer, and the pit bull’s owner, there on her own, were not going to be able to see the judge that night, so in we plunged.

It turned out that Missy’s owner had filed a claim to recover all veterinary expenses. In addition, she was seeking payment for her own doctor bills incurred by the incident, since she said she had recently recovered from spinal surgery and had re-injured her back trying to separate the dogs. There were also bills for psychotherapy, necessitated, she said, by the trauma of seeing her little Missy in such danger. She informed us during the course of mediation that she was also planning a career in doggie modeling for Missy, and wanted compensation for lost future income. This was the first time the pit bull’s owner heard these demands and she was shocked, to say the least.

Dear Mr. Mediator:

The neighbors next door to me have a big Rottweiler dog they keep chained in the backyard. They both go to work early during the week, about 6:30 am. As soon as they’re gone that dog starts barking and howling and it continues the whole day. As luck would have it, I’m recuperating at home from a back operation and really need my rest. I’m afraid to say anything to them directly. After all, you never know how some people might react. Any advice on how to handle this situation?

Signed—Sleep Deprived

Dear Sleepy:

You’ve described the most common scenario we see in dog barking complaints at our local community dispute resolution center: people keep their dog outside during the day while a neighbor (who is either retired, recuperating, or running a business from home) gets to listen to the animal howl when that neighbor wants to either sleep or work.

It is also a common theme in those cases that neighbors are afraid to ring one another’s doorbell; apparently for fear that the person behind the door will greet them with an AK-47. Authorities who are supposed to help in these situations, such as Animal Control, the police, and home owner associations, frequently advise people not to approach their neighbors directly. (We assume they buy into that AK-47 scenario.) But our work suggests that they are mostly wrong. While there may be a wing nut or two out there, in almost all our cases the dog owner wonders why the complaining neighbor didn’t just come over and let them know there was a problem.

My advice to you would be to try to talk to your neighbor first. Go over and ring that bell. Be positive, not accusatory. Ask if there’s anything you can do together to help alleviate the problem. If that doesn’t work, then you can go to the appropriate agency.
Putting It in Writing

Last spring, Boyd School of Law Professor Terry Pollman taught for the first time an advanced legal writing course to teach students how to negotiate.

“It’s half negotiating and half writing,” she explains. The course grew out of Pollman’s experience teaching traditional negotiating classes. In those classes she found students were not as careful about what they agreed to, because they did not fully understand the consequences their agreements might have. Because of this, Pollman created a hybrid course where students negotiated agreements, wrote documents to support those agreements, and then used those documents to deal with the consequences.

“When you write a contract, it creates a world,” she says, “and you can create nearly any world you want.”

Pollman found that when students knew they would later be legally responsible for the deal they created,

that knowledge changed their Best Alternative to a Negotiated Agreement (BATNA) and caused them to negotiate differently. Students became more careful about misrepresenting their positions, and more cautious about what warranties they offered. Pollman explained that sometimes the desire to complete a deal can compete with the need to protect a client, so she designed her class to help students become the type of lawyers who can do both.

In one long project, Pollman had teams of students negotiate a deal through multiple drafts of a contract. In the process, students found that when they negotiated from a draft, they examined boilerplate provisions more carefully and discovered more issues than they initially recognized. Finally, when students finished their negotiations and agreed on a final contract, Pollman provided a new scenario, describing a breach. Then students had to use their own contracts to deal with the breach through a new round of negotiations.

In these exercises, Pollman’s students got to experience the consequences of their writing in a much more immediate way than is possible in other law school classes. Instead of writing to please a judge or a client, Pollman’s students wrote to accomplish a task. They were able to see firsthand what worked in their writing, and what didn’t – the type of valuable feedback most attorneys don’t receive until after they start practicing.

Pollman praised her students as cheerful about being guinea pigs as well as enthusiastic and engaged while she refined the course. Now, Pollman is looking forward to using what she learned last semester and expects to have an even better course for future students.

Student ADR Group Plans for Future

Four friends’ success in the 2011 Saltman Center and Clark County Bar Association Negotiation Competition inspired them to take over the Saltman Dispute Resolution Society (SDRS).

Dane Whipple, Travis Akin, Mary Urbanski, and Micah Ginapp had come to know each other well long before the March competition. After their two-person teams finished first and second, “the four of us decided together that we wanted to be involved in SDRS because we really want to make a difference at Boyd,” Urbanski, the Society’s incoming president, said.

Ginapp, the Society’s newly elected vice president, said the quartet “already had some sense of the potential and value of alternative dispute resolution,” but the negotiation competition further opened their eyes to all that the Saltman Center, the field of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) and the Saltman Dispute Resolution Society had to offer.

Even in the wake of U.S. News & World Report ranking Boyd and its Saltman Center as the ninth best dispute resolution program in the nation, “many students still, unfortunately, really don’t fully appreciate how important and valuable all of this is – the Saltman Center, SDRS and ADR, in general. It’s huge,” Ginapp said. “We see tremendous opportunity here.”

“We have discussed some great new ideas for this coming year to increase student interest and involvement in the organization,” Urbanski said. She, like the rest of the new board, is just starting her second year at the law school. “I think Boyd will be hearing a lot more from SDRS in the coming years,” she said.

The Saltman Center’s November 2010 “Lessons from Poker for Negotiators” event fueled Akin’s initial interest in ADR. After the Negotiation Competition, he committed “to get involved with the administrative side of the ADR community at Boyd.”

He looks forward “to putting on another Poker and ADR night, to organizing and coaching next year’s negotiation competition, and to getting more students interested in participating in inter-school competitions.”
In addition to continuing her administrative work as Director of the Saltman Center, Jean Sternlight focused her academic energy in 2010-11 on psychology, mandatory arbitration, and an array of other dispute resolution projects. With respect to psychology, Sternlight’s book, *Lawyering and Psychology* (co-authored with Jennifer Robbenolt) is expected to be published in January 2012 by the American Bar Association. Sternlight and Robbenolt also gave a talk at the ABA Section of Dispute Resolution Conference in Denver, discussing ethical insights which can be drawn from psychology. In addition, Sternlight taught a seminar at Boyd, “Lawyering and Psychology”, in which students learned how to use psychological insights to help them improve their interviewing, counseling, negotiating, writing, discovery and other legal skills, as well as to increase their happiness and success as attorneys.

On her longtime interest in mandatory arbitration, Sternlight gave three talks: one to a group of experienced journalists at the Journalist Law School at Loyola Law School in Los Angeles, one at the American Association of Law Schools annual meeting (discussing nursing homes’ use of the practice), and one at a symposium at George Washington University Law School. Her work on mandatory arbitration was also cited by the Canadian Supreme Court (albeit the dissent) in *Seidel v. Telus Communications Inc.* (2011). In addition, Sternlight actively brainstormed with the plaintiffs’ attorneys in *AT&T v. Concepcion*, recently decided by the U.S. Supreme Court. While the pre-argument brainstorming did not help plaintiffs win the battle, perhaps the post-decision brainstorming will help consumers and employees ultimately win the war to defeat mandatory arbitration.

On the eclectic front, Sternlight and her co-authors published the second edition of their text *Dispute Resolution: Beyond the Adversarial Model*. Sternlight also taught courses in civil procedure and “what it’s really like to be a lawyer,” and moderated a panel discussion on “Jurisdiction, Arbitration and the Gaming World.”

This year, besides his day-to-day duties as the Associate Director of the Saltman Center for Conflict Resolution, Ray Patterson has been heavily involved in practice-oriented activities in the ADR arena. He has found most of his weeks are filled with mentoring students in the Strasser Mediation Clinic, and on Monday and Wednesday afternoons he was in Clark County’s Family Court working with couples on the distribution of their assets (not much) and debts (a lot). Furthermore, he deals with spousal and child support requests, assisting couples in developing creative parenting plans and helping them decide whether legal and physical custody should be shared or not. In addition to the married couples who asked for the clinic’s help, a number of cases were post-divorce complaints. There were even some couples who never bothered getting married in the first place but had some issues to resolve nonetheless.

Tuesday nights Patterson settled in at the Clark County Neighborhood Justice Center’s free dispute resolution program. There, he and his four intrepid students assigned to that placement developed an expertise in dog-barking complaints, an uncanny ability to predict the scenario of such complaints, and a surprising insight into the fear that neighbors seem to have of one another. There were, of course, regular community-type disputes between neighbors, too.

Thursday evenings (spring semester) and Friday mornings (fall semester) Patterson would meet with all the students in a debriefing seminar to discuss those things that good mediators need to think about. His spring evening seminar is important for Boyd students, as all have been assured the opportunity to have an experiential learning experience. The Strasser Mediation Clinic is one of the few clinics that meets that goal for our evening students who work full time.

As usual, Patterson supervised the in-house competitions in client counseling and negotiation that would determine what student teams would represent Boyd in the ABA’s Regional Competitions. During the year he was also asked to apply his skill in mediating internal university disputes.

In February 2010 he became a founding member of a steering committee composed of members of local mediation programs that has been searching for ways to develop the mediation community in southern Nevada and the state as a whole. These practitioners are looking to form a larger union, provide more resources to current and future members, and develop more political clout for mediation in this state.
Linda Wertheimer, senior national correspondent for National Public Radio, will give the annual Saltman Center for Conflict Resolution’s Peace in the Desert™ lecture on the role of partisanship in the government over the last 40 years.

Clark County Bar Association/Saltman Center Client Counseling Competition November 2011

Democracy and the Workplace
Spring 2012
Professor Lisa Blomgren Bingham of Indiana University, Bloomington and Professor Ruben J. Garcia, who joins the Boyd faculty this fall, will present this two-day Saltman Center symposium on contemporary issues in labor and employment law.

For more information, visit www.law.unlv.edu/saltman_events.html.