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Confirming Dr. Berman

It was an even four months ago that President Ford sent Dr. Ronald Berman’s name to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, nominating the distinguished analyst of contemporary culture for a second term as chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities. It’s still there.

The committee’s failure to act on the appointment in a third of a year reflects neither inefficiency nor an overcrowded agenda. Rather, it’s the deliberate tactic of Sen. Claiborne Pell, who heads the subcommittee on education where action must begin. He doesn’t like Dr. Berman. Seemingly, however, Sen. Pell does not trust his ability to persuade the rest of the committee to drop him — not enough, at least, to risk open hearings.

Using official prerogatives to obstruct the intended workings of the congressional system is despotism of a sort that seems particularly incongruous applied to an institution as elevated of purpose and conspicuous of achievement as the Endowment. The chairman’s personal vigor is such that he has not sunk into the lame duck limbo Sen. Pell appears to want for him. But his indeterminate status is bound to erode his authority and, with it, the effectiveness of the organization, if it goes on much longer.

If Dr. Berman is the right man for the job — and we think he is — his renomination should be confirmed without further delay. If he isn’t, there should be hearings to show why.

A classic in Boston

The fidelity of athletic endeavor to the daily activities of life — those at once more important and more mundane — was captured in the ultimate game in the Boston Celtics-Phoenix Suns championship series.

A part of that fidelity, of course, is that there are winners and losers in all competition; yet, most significant is the way victory is attained with sustained. In that sense, failure can be consequential. Dignity and effort can transform result.

The tenacious Boston Celtics, as any casual observer of the sports pages is aware, finally set the Phoenix Suns to their 13th National Basketball Association championship in 20 years. But it was that fifth game in Boston that was an unqualified classic — a contest that went into three periods before Boston prevailed. That game was simply magnificent. To appreciate it, it is not required that one be a basketball aficionado but merely was the focus of humbling as what the Californians did last year to our Bullets.

In the raucous Boston Garden, though, on Friday with the best-of-seven series at two games apiece, the fellows from Phoenix made an indelible claim on memory. After 63 ferocious minutes of basketball, the Suns were on the deficit end of a 128-126 score. To recite the final score, however, is as pallid as saying the North won the Civil War.

The Suns were down by 22 points in the second quarter; they clawed back to tie the game at the final whistle. Ah, the drama of that second overtime: Trailing by three points, Phoenix battled to a single point lead — only to have that splendid final shot by John Havlicek toss an off-balance shot that dropped home in the terminal seconds. A technical foul call against Phoenix, a brilliant bit of strategy by John McLeod, the Suns’ Iacur, put the Suns behind by two points, but gave the team the ball at half court with one second on the clock.

In 1967, it was expected that the change of a model of its kind, an interest and invest federal government in the welfare of mental health, that the control of Columbia about great majority of its patients. In 1973, Dr. Bertrand that the main reason for the control of the welfare system is the complexity of the insurance. Now, the hospital re the control of NIMF which has been desc reking.

It is obvious that despite taking place and it is a reasonable and unfair D.C. Health Department’s responsibility for it at the time of the time of the Senate’s has had the to superintendents for various including the present time an undesirable administration, regardless of the time the incumbents.

Six years ago, the geriatric patients at S reported in the leading newspapers, and the hospitals recognized for its lead medicol-legal problems. R eview concerning geriatric prison patients has been.

A lawyer’s view of uninhibited press

In your story on the 37th D.C. Judicial Conference you stated that I urged the ”orders ever be imposed against news media and that if that judges never use the tempt power to enforce orders.” That statement is half true. I did urge that no law should be imposed against the media. However, I recognize that judges may, on occasion, issue orders against lawyers, so I might say: The powers of the courts, as guaranteed by the Constitution, Where reporters are able to obtain information from individuals and in a way to the public. That was not the case for title X.

Joseph A. Califano
Washington, D.C.