

Former professor to preach Sunday

Duke celebrates Founders Day

By PETER APPLEBOOME

This weekend, Duke will celebrate the 41st anniversary of the founding of the University on December 11, 1924. Up until two years ago, the celebration of Founder's Day took place on December 11, the day James P. Duke

signed the indentures setting up the endowment for Duke University. Two years ago, a special committee decided to make it a weekend observance on the weekend closest to Founder's Day. This year's celebration will begin

tomorrow. The standing committees of the Duke University National Council will meet, followed by a meeting of the Council. Dr. James L. Price, Dean of Trinity College, will speak. At 3 p.m. the Alumni House will be dedicated.

Sunday's activities will include speeches by Dr. Knight, Dr. Albert C. Outler, and Charles B. Wade Jr., and a program of Christmas music by the Gimpf Quartet.

Dr. Knight will deliver "Words of Remembrance" at the Founders' Day Wreath Laying Ceremony. This will be followed by a service in the chapel in which Dr. Outler, Professor of Theology at Perkins School of Theology, Southern Methodist University, will preach.

At the Founders' Day Banquet, Wade, vice-president of R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Company and a member of the University Board of trustees will speak on the relationship of private industry to higher education.

The Gimpf Quartet will perform in the Chapel at 4 p.m. They will perform Christmas music and will be accompanied by Mildren L. Hendrix, organist, and Allen Bose, clarinetist.

Chapel tower museum displays bell, cornerstones from old Trinity campus

By KATHY MATTESON

The windows halfway up the Chapel tower do light up something — the only museum of Duke history on campus.

The Duke University Museum is the first permanent display of photographs, documents, and objects relating to the origins and history of the University. Created last spring by the 1950A Traditions Board (now under YMCA direction), the self-explanatory collection is open to all Chapel visitors.

An 1870 Victory bell and several cornerstones for Trinity College which highlight the display have long been in the room, originally designated by the architect as a trophy room. Until last year with the intervention of Traditions Board members Murray Brown, Tom Duke, and Richard Haydock, the room was used for storage. The transformation into a museum was effected with the help of Mattie Russell, the manuscript librarian who had previously arranged several temporary displays.



Trinity Room

Victory bell, photos in Duke museum in Chapel tower

WHILE ORIGINAL MATERIAL is hard to find and space is limited, the Board hopes to continue to improve the collection. Plans include a special display case to house temporary exhibits.

The current special exhibit centers on the uproar caused by the Buffalo class of 1917 when it refused its class pennant on the University flagpole. The administration's refusal to prevent their graduation led to the resignation of Dr. Kilgo.

Among the items on display are a letter from University President Fow asking Kilgo to reconsider, a letter from Kilgo returning his honorary degree, and a photograph, discovered just last year, of the incriminating pennant.

ANOTHER DISPLAY describes the establishment of the Trinity Guard by the class of 1891. Duke's participation in the Civil War is just one example of what Murray Brown terms "the important role of Duke University in the history of the South."

The school's early history is represented in a copy of the Constitution for the establishment of Union Institute drawn up by Randolph County farmers in 1838. An offer from Durham officials to locate Trinity College, which had been

incorporated from the Institute in 1859, can be seen.

Photographs from the early part of this century include the chapel, a just-completed East Campus, a basketball game in Card Gymnasium, an early Blue Devil, and the no-longer-traditional Maypole celebration.

Anyone interested in working on the museum and learning more about history is encouraged to contact Tom Duke, Chairman of the YMCA Traditions Board.

Chesson is tops

After three hours of card-playing, the champions of the TBP Poker Derby emerged last night. First place went to Phi Kappa Psi, followed by House L in second. Individual first place winner was Wesley Chesson, who took a grand total of \$8,500. Phil Weaver took the second place award.

Duke picketers participate in week's second war protest

By DAVID PACE

Local anti-Vietnam war protesters held a peaceful demonstration at the Raleigh induction center today that served to climax this week's national Stop the Draft efforts.

The first part of the demonstration was similar to one held Monday at the induction center. Student protesters picketed from 7:15 till 8:30 a.m., and in the meantime displayed leaflets explaining their purpose in demonstrating.

Thirty-five draft age men signed a "We Won't Go" statement and turned it over to State Selective Service Director W. H. McChesney. Several of those who signed were Duke students or alumni.

The confrontation followed early morning picketing by about 100 anti-war and anti-draft demonstrators at the Armed Forces induction station.

The "We Won't Go" statement said that those who signed would refuse induction into the military and service in Vietnam. Seventeen women, including some from Duke, signed a supporting statement promising to "aid and abet" the draft resisters. Picketing members from Duke and other state schools presented another supporting petition on behalf of over 200 professors.

Plans were made to keep the demonstration non-violent. Picketers planned to comply with the municipal ordinances and in case of violence, they were instructed to fall back to the street corners in a group in order to protect each other.

When protesters picketed the center, 30 students from Duke were among the approximately 85 picketers.

FEED to tackle projects priorities, improved counseling is hoped for

By PETER APPLEBOOME

FEED, the Fund for Experimental Education, Duke, met last night to decide what direction it would take for

the rest of the year and to discuss curriculum review.

Mary Ellen Fullerton, Abbie Doggett, Rich Reisman, Tom McClain and Dr. Richard White were appointed to evaluate the reports submitted to FEED by the nine organizations working on curriculum review.

They will give their report and declare priorities at an open meeting at 7:30 p.m. Thursday in 201 Flowers. All interested students and faculty members are urged to attend.

Miss Fullerton, chairman of the committee, stressed that FEED wants, above all, to stimulate interest among the students on curriculum review. Faculty members are vitally interested in the reaction to curriculum review, she said.

At the present time, FEED has three definite plans of action. First the com-

mittee wants to have the offices of the faculty in the dorms on East and West campuses.

Second, they want to improve the counseling services offered to freshmen prior to entering Duke. The committee feels that freshmen are not really aware of the courses they are offered.

Third, FEED wants to renew the TBP Lounge. It would be open two or three times a week at various places on campus. Faculty members will be in attendance.

Dr. Robert Krueger and Dr. Howard Strobel are now working with FEED. Dr. Krueger spoke on the residential college concept.

FEED is planning a retreat during semester break. It will be used to outline concepts and plan activities for the second semester.

Duke endowment originated in tobacco barn

By TAMEA SMITH

James B. Duke's Endowment, the financial foundation of Duke University, had its origin in a log barn a few miles from Durham, shortly after the Civil War.

There Washington Duke and his sons, James and Benjamin, started the tobacco industry that eventually made their fortune and ultimately resulted in the Endowment and the University.

In 1874 with the profit from their modest start, the Dukes moved into a two-story building in Durham where they lived and set up a small factory. Four years later they merged with another tobacco firm and commanded a capital of \$70,000.

James, then 14 years old, set as much of the firm and under his supervision the factory ventured into the new field of cigarette production. His

forefront in predicting the future popularity of cigarettes increased the company's total annual income to \$4.5 million by 1890.

That same year James Duke succeeded in arranging a merger of the five largest tobacco companies in the United States. This resulted in the establishment of the American Tobacco Company, valued at \$25 million. James Duke became president of the business.

IN ADDITION to his tobacco industry, Duke expanded into water power development and organization what is now the Duke Power Company in North and South Carolina, as well as smaller companies in Canada.

James Duke described his plans for the Duke Endowment in 1924. In his Indenture of Trust, dated Dec. 11 (now celebrated as Founder's Day), he

explained: "I have selected Duke University as one of the principal objects of this trust because I recognize that education, when conducted along sane and practical, as opposed to dogmatic and theoretical lines, is next to religion, the greatest civilizing influence."

Although the Endowment contributes financially to the University, it does not fully support Duke. It also benefits Davidson College and Johnson C. Smith University in North Carolina, Furman University in South Carolina, nearly 200 non-profit hospitals, and retired Methodist ministers from North Carolina, their widows and orphans.

DUKE'S INITIAL GIFT of \$40 million ranked at that time as the sixth largest in the nation. However, the Duke Endowment is, unlike most other foundations, a perpetual trust and therefore the value of



Chapel construction

When men moved into West Campus in 1932, this was how the chapel looked. It was the last building completed on West.

Fifth Decade entering 3rd year, fund campaign still behind

By BETTY WALDRON

Duke's Fifth Decade program is entering its third year of construction and campaigning for funds. The program is now \$69.8 million toward its three-year Phase I goal of \$102.8 million and its

ultimate ten-year goal of \$187.2 million.

Officially launched in September, 1965, the program includes building projects to total \$75.6 million, 74 per cent of the program.

Of major importance is the \$8.7 million addition to the Perkins Library, now under construction and scheduled for completion by fall 1968. The six-story addition will more than double the present size of the library and eliminate the chronic shortage of space.

The Chemistry building, at a cost of \$7.2 million, will be completed sometime in 1939. It will be located across from the Law School building.

The new hospital is partially completed.

Planned additions to the Medical Center include a \$5.2 million diagnostic and treatment center, a \$2.8 million clinical research building, a \$7.1 million medical sciences building, and a \$1.1 million rehabilitation center.

PHYSIOLOGICAL PLANT

Environment Laboratory (Phytotron) still under construction, will be completed soon. The originally scheduled date was October of this year. The Triangle Universities' Nuclear Laboratory should be finished by spring of next year, and the \$485,000 prime center in Duke Forest by the first of next year.

On East Campus the \$3.3 million, three-dorm project is still in the planning stages. Work has already begun on renovating the Science Building to create a University Art Center, which will include an art gallery, museum, art library, art classrooms, work space for

artists and the Department of Art.

General chairman of the Fifth Decade Program, George Allen, has called the program one of the "most ambitious capital fund campaigns yet undertaken by an American university." Said Allen, "Duke has now reached a plateau — a relatively exalted one when the institutions of the South are measured. The times cry out for a breakthrough!" So Duke can become "a force in the nation" in the sixth decade.

AS EXTRA INCENTIVE to the program, the Ford Foundation offered to Duke in the summer of 1966 an \$8 million grant if Duke can match the sum four to one, that is, if Duke can raise \$32 million from sources other than the government, Ford Foundation, Duke Endowment, or other trusts of which Duke is a beneficiary. The Ford challenge grant is the largest since the James B. Duke Endowment of 1924. Thus far Duke has received \$6.6 million toward the \$32 million goal.

PRESIDENT DOUGLAS KNIGHT explained the importance of the expansion program when he announced its advent: "For the first time since the completion of the West Campus in 1930 we have made a commitment involving the whole university."

At present time the construction is more than normally behind schedule because the funds from the campaign are lagging. Progress may pick up soon, however, optimistic officials predict.

Beginning next fall, the final portion of his request will be fulfilled when the Department of Economics and Business trustees received judicial permission to invest in private corporations and other property.

Although he compiled a tobacco empire and established a huge water power company, it is through his Endowment that James B. Duke achieved his degree of immortality. When asked in his old age what he felt about accomplishing what he had set out to do, Duke answered in realization, "The creation of the Endowment, because through it I make men."



Editorials

Endowed for leadership

"I was born in North Carolina and I am sixty-six years old. It is time I was beginning to think about a monument. I want to leave something in the state that five hundred years from now people can look upon and say Duke did that. Every man owes something to the State he was born in, and this is what I want to leave North Carolina."

Most of us don't get to pick a University as our monument. James B. Duke was an extraordinary man.

We are grateful and proud to be a part of James B. Duke's vision, a part of this region which he developed and re-directed through his energetic leadership in the field of electrification.

Founders' Day coming up Monday is the University's occasion on which it recognizes the debt which it owes to those concerned alumni and friends who have supported its programs over the years. Many of those who will be visiting the campus this weekend have donated thousands to the University's Loyalty Fund and Fifth Decade campaigns.

Mr. Duke left all of us an immense opportunity. He created out of a pine forest the essential material elements for a great University. He infused into his Gothic wilderness the moral strength and regional leadership of William Preston Few and Trinity College. But money couldn't do everything.

Ex-Trinity president John Crowell was sensitive to this when he said in the Alumni Register in April, 1925, "Let no petty narrowness from any quarter ever lay its cold, freezing hand upon those who aspire to make a great and noble institution."

In the year 1967 we as a University are plagued by petty narrowness. In our rush to become a great University we are cutting corners.

We see narrowness in the demands of a disoriented majority of donors to the University, those who would demand that the University become a reflection of their bigoted, short-sighted, anti-intellectual, fascist conservatism.

We see short-sightedness in some faculty who would not make the effort to "even their students, making education come alive by their enthusiasm."

We see dullness in the "privileged, conservative, white, Anglo-Saxon, protestant, Southern, intelligent, lazy, golden Duke students" of this generation, many of whom are not taking advantage of the immense resources of the University.

James B. Duke was many things to many people. But almost all commentators agree that he was, above all, supremely confident in his own ability. Our one wish for this University would be that it better reflect this aspect of the Founder's character.

We wish for an administrative mentality which combines the sensitivity of the scholar and the executive confidence of James B.

We wish for a forward-looking faculty which will approach the upcoming curriculum review with a sense of responsibility for the present academic morass of undergraduate University education.

We wish for students alive to their opportunities, relieved of the pettiness of their routine by enlightened administration and faculty, creative enough to make use of their new-found time to forge a new character into the fabric of modern America.

It is not ours to judge the appropriateness of purchasing a University as a monument to oneself. That has long since been done by a man of great stature. Ours is to appropriate his gift, making it a monument also to the free human spirit, a testament to man's ability to open his mind to the world of opportunity about him.

Big classes retard learning to look critically

By TOM JAMES

Every seat in the East Duke lecture room is taken for an Art 51 class. There are so many people in Chem 1, that students' grades fit a beautiful bell curve. Biology essays are subject to wide latitudes in grading because the large number of students

necessitates several graders, who grade on varying criteria.

The problem of the large lecture course is one of the traditional horrors of the freshman curriculum. The large lecture level courses are often excessively large, too. As a Chem major's smallest class is

that department has fifty students. One Zoology professor who prefers open class teaching, makes an attempt to make his course his three or four times as many students as he

CERTAINLY, MOST of us dislike very large classes; they

stifle interchange between the professor and the student. However, before we make rash plans to abolish classes larger than twenty students, we should consider the philosophical base. What is our philosophy of education?

Ralph Pounds and James Brynes in *The School in America* society offer several philosophical systems. They suggest the schools of Humanism, Realism, and Experimentalism.

Although some claim that this University itself has accepted the philosophy of the large class, and that individuals have gone through Duke with the wrong

If the science departments subscribe to the philosophy of Realism, then their course organization is entirely justified. Large lectures and moderate sized recitations and labs are the best way to turn out the students educated to the volume of information.

However, the science student cannot learn to think critically or analytically with such an arrangement. He would have to have a program of more faculty contact and more individual work. The science departments do not have the faculty, money, equipment, or space to institute such a program for every major - but they could expand their honors programs. The Zoo department does not have the faculty, but the Chem department does not. Why is this, Dr. Donk?

THE PHILOSOPHY of the social sciences and humanities is not so clear. The combination of Humanism and Experimentalism, such that it will yield a student without challenging that society - those necessary for social advance: language, computation, and essential character traits. The school attempts to train the man to fit well into society without challenging that society.

If that is the case, these departments can only partially defend larger classes—a lecture to expose the students to Milton can be made to five hundred as easily as to five. But to have students think and question critically, classes should be small. Thus these departments offer seminar courses.

However, due to a lack of funds and professors, there are not enough seminars. More would be available if more students requested them. Until the departments can afford to bring their philosophies more in line with student demands for a greater emphasis on Experimentalism, then it is the responsibility of each student to educate himself with less than full University and departmental support.

No philosophy of education for guidance

Report from the Tin Molchill

Why are we in Vietnam?

By LOCHNIVAR HUNKASHER

In most current discussions, debates and arguments concerning the War in Vietnam, the last audible word heard before hostilities break out are "Oh yeah, well, would you rather fight them in Vietnam or in Saigon (Portland or Bueky-Varina)?"

For those five or six people in the country still willing to discuss the question rationally, an extension of this traditional "either/or" question, one who considers this statement a logical point should be required to answer several questions.

First, exactly who are the "them" of the statement, and assuming "them" is an enemy who threatens an invasion and or takeover of the United States, what would be the most successful approach, tactically, to combat this attack?

To say THE COMMUNISTS is not good enough. He's going to have to do better than that. Like for strategic purposes, what would be the best way to come from? It is obvious that we can eliminate both the Russian and Chinese as a consideration in that only a fool would attempt to defeat such a threat by tying down a half million American troops, an American fleet in an area where they are not needed, intelligence assures us there are neither Russian or Chinese

troops.

Especially since every American military figure in the last twenty-five years has warned against a land war with anyone in Asia.

We are left, then, with the proposition that it is the Vietnamese Communists, of the combined Northern and Southern variety, who would like to seize our country by force. How do we now choose to defend ourselves?

We fight them on their home ground, in their villages and in their rice paddies. They fight on their home ground and unless they are armed we have absolutely no means of determining whether or not they are, in fact, the enemy.

We, on the other hand, are forced to transport our men and supplies 10,000 miles to a totally unfamiliar and hostile environment. The Communists know all at times their enemy is. For them, shooting any male in Southeast Asia who is either black or white is a safe bet.

Is this any way to fight a war? Of course not - and that is what the war is being lost.

What is the alternative? Make them come to us, in order to best prepare for the attack the logical route of the invading Vietnamese army must first be determined. As I see it there are but three

possible routes: air, sea and land.

The land invasion route would entail a cross-continent march or bicycle ride 20,000 miles across Central China and Siberia, and the ice bridge to the north. The sea route is down along the Canadian Pacific and finally into Washington state.

A NAVAL INVASION would present even greater difficulties for the invader due to the fact that, again according to the military intelligence sources, his navy is composed of patrol torpedo (PT) class vessels and motorized junks.

Predicated on a combined North-South Vietnamese military force of 200,000 men, their invasion flotilla could zip across the Pacific in a lightning quick time of about five weeks. Unfortunately for them, they'd have to make about twenty trips to transport all of their army.

An air invasion could more effectively utilize the element of surprise. If only initially, what is left of the Vietnamese Air Force could transport its troops to the vicinity of a United States within a week, although since MIGs, which are the force's mainstay, can carry at the most one passenger per flight, it would take about fifty years to get everyone across.

In some seriousness, however, there are those in this country who believe that the real threat to this country is from within. From Black Power, from the New Leftists, pacifists, campus activists, intellectuals, atheists and sexual deviants. If this what they sincerely believe, it merely testifies to the absurdity of keeping so many of our troops fighting and dying in Vietnam while leaving the country unprotected.

Why not bring the troops home and deal with this threat in a straightforward manner? In the event that these subversive elements are more extensive than is currently estimated, shooting or incarceration could conceivably become economically infeasible. Certainly in such a case American technology would once again rise to the occasion and provide us with a lasting, if not final solution.

ACCORDING TO HUMANISM

The primary purpose of education is to develop the intellect. This is best accomplished by contact with the product of great minds, the great books. This is, in part, the thought behind the survey courses at Duke.

The school of Social Evolutionism claims that the purpose of education is the passing on of the sure elements of our social heritage - those necessary for social advance: language, computation, and essential character traits.

REALISM is the school that declares that education exists to train people for what they are best adapted to do. Under this system universities merely serve as professional schools, with no attempt made to expose the students to anything outside their field of study. Courses in the science departments often accept this posture.

According to Experimentalism, education is designed to equip critically minded individuals to make independent tests and retest their values, and attempt to improve society by bringing it in line with their clarified values. Many of the courses in the humanities and social sciences operate under this system.

OF THESE FOUR philosophies we can discard that of Social Evolutionism as not applying to our case, here.

Letters from readers

Curriculum change has disadvantages

I would like to praise and reiterate some of the very perceptive statements made by Dave Henderson about curriculum reform in the December 1 Chronicle. I take time to do this only because I wish to be doubly sure that the Duke student body, faculty, and administration do not overlook the relevancy of his satirical approach to the unseen dangers in curriculum reform.

While Dave's first point—that curriculum reform has been rather arbitrarily designated valuable, with little thought for its consequences—is very significant, his key message, I think, lies in the possible harm generated by the tight integration of social and intellectual life.

I myself am in favor of changes which will allow a closer relationship between academics and forms of social expression. But to blunder into a full-scale reform which affect all students in all living groups, without first considering the disadvantages of

such a move, is clumsy if not idiotic.

To take just one example, consider the situation (already proposed) wherein students with the same major would live side by side. Now on the surface this sounds like a logical and sophisticated way to provide direct stimulation for each student through his dormmates, and to bring together those with common intellectual interests.

But to this proposal I offer three objections which, if not profound, are at least pertinent: first, despite what

anyone publicly affirms, every student appreciates the luxury of returning to his dorm or room and finding poems, novels, and books scattered about.

Second, the major primary factors for their academic success, such as the difficulty or reputation of a particular department, and the best teachers, are away from what lead them to choose that discipline; third, even assuming that such socio-intellectual integration by areas of major study is too narrow an integration.

The fact that students attend college primarily to learn academically does not subordinate the "other" that students are above all human beings, and as such they have more responsibilities to themselves than merely intellectual ones. To put it another way, although each human being has a mind, he also has a body, a personality, and perhaps a soul which all need attention.

Therefore would not any committee or organization which introduced the aforementioned situation, guilty of treating each student not as a whole human being, but as an actor in an academic role? And, in fact, is it not the basic function of the university to exploit all those features which make humans more than just animals?

Before the move is made, then, let those who have to decide think carefully, and let those who care to influence the decision remember that the university is not a place for change, but choice of change; not a place for blind reform, but considered refinement; not a place for intellectual specialization, but intellectual diversity.

Doug Stackburg '68

housing wouldn't move on market

This fall I felt the price of living in a convoluted room not compare favorably with that of friends off campus. I find the proposed room rate increases not interestingly incredible. Although the problems of transportation and acquisition of a lease for the

desired period are of significant to a prospective leasee, I am concerned with what the University provides per dollar as opposed to the offerings of the business community.

Any of the local papers will list offers of furnished one bedroom apartments with kitchen, bath, dining-living room for a price no significantly greater per month than the cost of two living in a double but less than two living in singles.

To be just, I mustn't forget the five minutes worth of bed-making, the five minutes of the amount of hand and head cleaning the University must pay the man.

But the issue remains, could the University Housing compete successfully in a free market, one where they have no advantage of location and group adherence? I've considered my experience with the residential system as one of my most valuable, but why must the University, through financial harassment, force me away from what, I thought, they too favored.

My investment of \$28 in secure parking is but another facet.

Tim Siz '68

CHRONICLE

CLASSIFIED

Duke Chronicle Classified Advertising Rates

3c per word
50c minimum per insertion
Prepayment required

Copy Deadline

Two days prior to date of publication. Classified ads should be sent to Box 2200, Durham, N.C. 27706.

Does anyone know Bob Lewis?

Tim Siz '68



TRACK TO TAKE: STRIPES



The Establishments collection includes every possible type of stripe, after the fashion of the excellent chevron with vest, is typical of a group that includes wide-track, narrow-track and every width of spacing now in fashion.

From \$69.50

THE YOUNG MEN'S SHOP

Downtown and Northgate Shopping Center

Please don't zlupf Sprite. It makes plenty of noise all by itself.

Sprite, you recall, is the soft drink that's so tart and light. It's just what you need when you're thirsty. It's just what you need when you're thirsty.

Sprite, you recall, is the soft drink that's so tart and light. It's just what you need when you're thirsty. It's just what you need when you're thirsty.

Sprite, you recall, is the soft drink that's so tart and light. It's just what you need when you're thirsty. It's just what you need when you're thirsty.

Sprite, you recall, is the soft drink that's so tart and light. It's just what you need when you're thirsty. It's just what you need when you're thirsty.

Sprite, you recall, is the soft drink that's so tart and light. It's just what you need when you're thirsty. It's just what you need when you're thirsty.

Sprite, you recall, is the soft drink that's so tart and light. It's just what you need when you're thirsty. It's just what you need when you're thirsty.

Sprite, you recall, is the soft drink that's so tart and light. It's just what you need when you're thirsty. It's just what you need when you're thirsty.

Sprite, you recall, is the soft drink that's so tart and light. It's just what you need when you're thirsty. It's just what you need when you're thirsty.

Sprite, you recall, is the soft drink that's so tart and light. It's just what you need when you're thirsty. It's just what you need when you're thirsty.

Sprite, you recall, is the soft drink that's so tart and light. It's just what you need when you're thirsty. It's just what you need when you're thirsty.

Duke wins

For a half, the 8000 plus crowd at the University of Michigan's new coliseum sensed an upset—Duke led by two points and had been behind by as much as six. But Duke played much better basketball in the second half and won going away, 93-72.

Duke, starting Steve Vandenberg and Joe Kennedy at the forward, Mike Lewis at center, and Ron Wendelin and Dave Golden at the guards, took a lead on Kennedy's foul shot shortly after the tip off. But Rudy Tomjanovich, Michigan's 6-7 sophomore wing, quickly sunk one for the Wolverines and for the first time in the first half, not a shooting contest between Kennedy and Tomjanovich. With the score 5-4 in favor of Duke, Michigan got hot and was quickly ahead 9-3.

The two teams traded baskets and then Michigan guard Jim Pitts hit a jumper from the baseline to give Michigan its biggest lead of the night, 13-7. Duke then called time out to reorganize. Back on the floor, Duke was quickly pulled from behind by Mike Lewis, who hit two quick baskets to make it 13-11. But Duke could get no closer than two points, and Tomjanovich hit again to keep Michigan ruling.

Duke's shooting then went cold temporarily and within a short time Michigan led again 19-14. But Vandenberg and Golden salvaged it for Duke this time and tied the score at 19-19 within the next minute. Then Duke proceeded to go ahead 20-19 and 22-21 on free throws by Lewis and then Golden. But Duke still did not have control of the offensive boards (the problem that plagued them the whole first half), and fell behind again 25-22.

Constantly outbounced, the Duke was unable to gain any ground in the next minutes, and when the score was 31-27 Vandenberg and C. B. Clarkson hit for two and started Duke on a comeback that was to put them back at the half. A basket by Lewis, a foul shot by Kennedy, a basket by Wendelin, and Duke was ahead 31-31.

Michigan forward Bob Sullivan scored made it 34-33, however, and Michigan once again drove ahead, this time by free throws and a basket following a turnover, 37-34. But a shot by Kennedy, a three-

point play by Vandenberg, and a layup by Kolditz put Duke back in the lead 41-36. But the spunky Wolverine kept coming, and Jim Pitts tapped one with -02 left, and the score at the half was 41-39.

The statistics at the half explained why the score was so close. Duke had outshot the Wolverines 47.2 to 33.3, but had been outscored by an equally wide margin, having gotten only 15 to Michigan's 33.

The second half was a different story. Lewis and Vandenberg, who had been doing more than their share of the scoring in the first half, now only continued their scoring. Pitts started grabbing rebounds. For the first minute and a half the score remained close, but with the score 47-44, Mike Lewis broke up a Michigan play, and Vandenberg quickly sank one in to give Duke a five point lead 49-44. Kennedy, making a habit of hitting when counted, scored two, and with the score 51-44, Michigan called time out.

Back in action, Sullivan sank a 25-footer for Michigan, and within a minute Michigan had cut the Duke lead to 52-48. But Steve Vandenberg, playing with perhaps his greatest game, quickly broke the game open with three straight scores to make the score 62-48. Michigan then got two, but Lewis and then Vandenberg each scored for Duke, and after scoring again Michigan called time out, 71-51 left in hopes of cooling down the hot-shooting Devils.

All this was in vain, as Golden threw one in from the corner, and incredible Mike Lewis got one from in close to give Duke a fourteen point lead, 66-52. Then came the breaking away now, and with their hot shooting and Vandenberg's great defense, the game was now out of reach for the Wolverines. Michigan never again got within 12 points, and with continued dead-eye shooting, the Blue Devils increased their lead and coasted to victory.

The outstanding players for Duke were undoubtedly Mike Lewis (32 pts) and Steve Vandenberg (22 pts) whose rebounding and shooting seemed to be the decisive factors in the win. But again, the game was a great team effort, and it was the all around team, especially in the second half, that assured Duke of the victory.

Football schedule

Five attractive (hopefully) home games, the most since 1963, highlight Duke's 1968 season. The annual annual game by Athletic Director Eddie Cameron.

THE BLUE DEVILS will meet all seven conference members and play in inter-sectional contests against Michigan, Army and Georgia Tech.

We hope the loyal people who follow Duke football will be as pleased with this schedule as we are. "We were sorry that only three games were able to be played in Wade Stadium in 1967, but we're all looking forward to these five home games next fall."

THE LAST TIME Duke met five opponents in a season at home was in 1963 when South Carolina, Clemson, Wake Forest, Navy and North Carolina visited the Blue Devils home field.

Duke launches its 1968 schedule September 21 against strong conference rival South Carolina at Columbia. The home opener is scheduled one week later when Michigan has returned date at Wade Stadium. The Wolverines edged the Blue Devils 10-7 this fall on a field goal in the final 10 seconds.

OTHER HOME DATES include Virginia Tech (Nov. 24), North Carolina State University (Nov. 9) and Wake Forest (Nov. 16).

Returning to the schedule after a one-year absence is Maryland. The Blue Devils and Terrapins will clash in the 22nd annual Orange Bowl Oct. 5 at Norfolk, Va. Duke has defeated the Terrapins in 11 of 15 meetings and will be facing them for the first time under their new head coach, Bob Ward.

DUKE will be seeking its third straight victory over Army when the teams meet at Michie Stadium, West Point, N. Y. Oct. 26. Duke registered a 19-7 win there this past fall after topping the Cadets 63 in 1964. Army, however, still leads the series, 6-2.

The Blue Devils will be meeting Georgia Tech for the 26th consecutive season in one of the South's most colorful rivalries. Tech leads the series 19-15-1.

Reading Attendance Awarded!
Back in that sun!
WJA-WGBM-MES

SPORTS Comment

News

They run athletics



Edmund McCullough Cameron
Director of Physical Education
at Athletics



H. M. Lewis
Business Manager of Athletics



Harold McElhany
General Administrative
Assistant



Mrs. Florence Blacklock
Assistant Business Manager
of Athletics



Dr. Robert S. Rankin
Faculty Chairman of Athletic
Council, President of ACC



Coach Tom Harp
Football

DUAU unheralded

Their pictures are often glossed over as the Duke fan reads his program. They deserve better treatment. The Chronicle sports page will try to feature these people in future articles, so that the student body can better know

DUAU. There is a distinct lack of communication between the campus as a whole and the Athletic Association. We hope to do something to remedy this.

Fall intramural roundup

Other results:
Tennis: Singles 1, Lawson; 2, Hodge. Doubles: 1, Crowe-Whitemuth; 2, Flech-Lange.

Handball: Singles 1, Anderson; 2, Park. Doubles: 1, Anderson-Paine; 2, Canning-Perry.

There will be a Lacrosse meeting Monday, December 11, in the Card Gymnasium classroom, at 7:30 p.m. Anyone interested is invited. No experience is needed. A list of the 1967 North-South All-star game will be shown.

Horseback: Singles, 1, Schoenfeld; 2, Wilhelm. Doubles: 1, Miller-Washburn; 2, Andrews-Paine.

Sigma Chi was the team champion in wrestling. Windsor with the runner-up. Individual winners were: Heavywt. 1, Arnold 2, 191 Royal 197 Bernz 177 Klutz 147 Farquar 140 Ross 140 Pearson 147 Zeidner 137 Green 137 Farthum 129 Lundholm 125 Koons

Final M standings

Fraternity A League			W L T F
1. Phi Delta Theta			8 0 2 0
2. Sigma Chi			7 2 0 0
3. Phi Kappa Sigma			6 3 1 0
4. Alpha Tau Omega			6 3 1 0
5. Pi Kappa Phi			6 4 0 0
6. Yow A			5 5 1 0
7. Lambda Chi Alpha			4 4 2 2
8. Biochemistry			3 6 1 1
9. Delta Tau Delta			3 7 0 0
10. Delta Sigma Phi			2 7 0 0
11. Kappa Sigma			0 10 0 0
Fraternity B League			W L T F
1. Law B			9 1 0 0
2. Pi Kappa Alpha			9 1 0 0
3. Chemistry			8 1 0 0
4. Zeta Beta Tau			8 1 0 0
5. Beta Theta Pi			5 5 0 0
6. Sigma Nu			4 4 2 0
7. Sigma Alpha Epsilon			3 5 2 0
8. Theta Chi			3 5 0 0
9. Forestry			3 7 0 1
10. Sigma Epsilon			1 9 0 0
11. Phi Kappa Psi			0 0 2 0
Independent League			W L T F
1. Manchester			9 1 1 0
2. Divinity			8 2 2 0
3. Lacrosse			6 2 1 0
4. Canterbury			8 3 0 0
5. Buchanan			6 4 1 0
6. Yow A			5 4 1 0
7. Taylor			4 6 0 0
8. Mircourt			5 6 0 0
9. Windsor			3 8 0 0
10. Beta Theta Pi			2 7 0 0
11. Tabard			0 0 2 0
Freshman League			W L T F
1. House L			7 0 1 0
2. House N			6 1 1 0
3. House O			5 2 1 0
4. Churchill			5 2 1 1
5. House P			4 4 0 0
6. House P			3 5 0 0
7. House G			0 0 2 0
8. House G			0 0 2 0
9. House M			0 0 2 0

GIFT BASKET

It's That Time Again!
Christmas Is Near
Select

Gourmet Gift Basket
Custom Made
To Your Specifications
An Unusual Gift for the Hard to Please!

The Gourmet Center Operating
Ivy Room Restaurant

100 W. Main St. (Fayetteville) (910) 481-0641-0671

Pizza Inn

2425 Guess Road off I-85

Carry Out or Eat In

Open 'til 1 A.M. Friday thru Saturday
12 P.M. Sunday thru Thursday

Order by Phone for Faster Service

286-9857

Allow Approximately 20 Minutes

Come in and see why **Dual** is the 'critics' choice'

Dual 10095 Dual Precision

World-renowned Dual precision in the medium range

- Fully automatic and manual play, single play and changeover
- Dynamically balanced tonearm tracks flawlessly as well as 1/2 gram
- Convenient and precise direct-dial styli force adjust and Tracking-Balanced Control (anti-skating)
- Automatic manual cueing with feather-touch "stick" shift
- Rotating single play spindle eliminates record slipage
- 4 in. 1 in. one-piece turntable
- Constant-speed Continuous-Pole motor

Vickers Electronics
and Stereo Center
506 E. Main St. Ph. 688-6319

MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND

is spacious CAREER COUNTRY for people who live here—and people who should

Dynamic Pace—Fast Growing—Unlimited Opportunities

Montgomery County Opportunities offers careers in the following:
Aerospace Engineering • Banking and Finance • City Planning • Civil & Electrical Engineering • Insurance • Nursing • Office Management • Psychology • Public Accounting • Public School Teaching • Social Service

and many others offering high-paying jobs—right in the County you call home.

Write today for facts on how to arrange an interview during your holidays vacation.

INTERVIEWS—December 27, 28 and 29

WASHINGTONIAN MOTEL, GAITHERSBURG, MARYLAND

Write for brochure today! It's filled with exciting information about careers in Montgomery County!

MONTGOMERY COUNTY OPPORTUNITIES
P. O. Box 1211
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850
EOE—M&F

Carolina **Northgate**

Hour of the Gun **Seventeen**

Cool Hand Luke **To Sir With Love**

Re-evaluation of Football program

By MARK WASSERMAN
Sports Editor

Every once in a while the strange malady strikes me. It is not contagious and rarely fatal, but very dangerous. The decisive symptom is irritability. The only dependency and complete cure is to purge myself of the source of disgruntlement.

I have to get things off my chest. Otherwise I cannot function properly. The strange malady is the "fed up bug". I'm fed up, so here goes the cure.

If you're going to do something, damn it, do it right! It seems, however, that very few instances around this University are done in the proper manner. Take for instance our wonderful athletic program.

There are several important programs that the Duke University Athletic Association seems totally incapable of handling. The most important and irrefutable of these is football.

The Duke football record over the last four years has been nothing short of abhorable. The team has had only one winning season in this period. In 1964 the record was 4-5. The Devils were humiliated by perennial patsy Tulane, 17-0. In 1965 the record was 6-4. That year the Blue won their first 4 and then fold.

In 1965 Duke was 5-5, including the terrible 6-0 defeat at the hands of Notre Dame. The year 1967 brought the worst season since 1959. The record was the worst in Blue Devil history, 4-6.

Semingly, Duke football is slipping downhill. Devil football shone in 1959-62, highlighted by a Cotton Bowl victory over Arkansas. But the glory days are over. The talent is just not there.

The decline of Duke football coincides with its loss forward academically. More stringent entrance requirements make it very hard to recruit top high school athletes. Duke is known as a difficult school as well. This deters some prospects who would prefer a better social life and less studying.

There is also no physical education major, which would make it easier on athletes. The Duke athlete gets no more advantage than the average Duke student.

There are other disconcerting elements in recruiting boys to Duke. Our football prestige is low at present. It is hard to get boys to play for a mediocre program. The coach doesn't have a national reputation. In addition, the location of the school is a disadvantage. Northern prospects do not want to come to the wasteland of Durham.

Then, there is the inability of Duke football to recruit Negro players. The school's location has much to do with this. Matters aren't helped much when our state loses blunder in public over racial problems. he recent sit-in over basic rights. Duke's students certainly did not help Duke recruiting. You can't blame a Negro boy for wanting to go somewhere where he can make a living.

DUAU wants to play big time football. Ed Cameron, athletic director, arranged the schedule through 1973 thinking in the terms. The trouble is that at its present state Duke football cannot compete at a big time level. The 1967 season is the case in point.

Every one of the so-called tough opponents experienced substandard seasons. At the beginning of the season the Devils were ranked second in N. C. State. Yet the Blue had the worst record in history.

They played the best football in four years and they still lost. Michigan had a bad year. Georgia Tech had an off year. UNC had an average year. Yet Duke lost to all three teams.

Coach Cary broke backs. Well, luck played an important part in our victories, too. A freak penalty beat Army, for example. The catch here is that good football teams make their own breaks. Duke University football is not that bad, however. It is over its head.

There are various theories for de-emphasism. Some of them are ridiculous, others ridiculous. I'll not sure any of them are workable. At any rate, they can't be instituted for another decade, at least, even if the decision was made now. The difficulty lies in hesitation, excuse-making and rationalization.

If Duke, to have to have one football in a vicious cycle, it needs right. Right now it is caught in the middle; it is caught in mediocrity. There is nothing worse or more frustrating than mediocrity. If Duke wants big time football, it has to sacrifice somewhere. But, for goodness sake, either do it right or de-emphasize.

One of the major problems is that DUAU is a separate entity from the rest of the campus community. It is financially independent, and thus is unable to solve its own problems more effectively. It would not have to go to Notre Dame to be humiliated for the sake of one hundred or so thousand dollars.

Duke has an excellent physical education department. Why not use it? A temporary experiment with a P. E. Department might well be in order. An easy street for athletics it cannot be. But a well-run, well taught program could be a definite asset to the University. Graduates from this kind of department are sorely needed in secondary education. It brings more athletes to Duke all the better.

The most obvious retort to my questioning Duke's capabilities in big time athletics is Duke basketball. The answer to this is simple. It is much easier to recruit five or seven good ballplayers than to recruit 22 or more.

Duke basketball, furthermore has followed the exact opposite course from football. It's record has been fantastic over the last seven or eight years. It has a national reputation. The Coach is one of the best in the nation and has the best record of any coach over the last eight years. Vic Bubas knows how to do things right.

Another striking inadequacy of the present athletic system is the facilities themselves. They are totally inadequate. The intramural program, headed ally by Bruce Corrie, has progressed considerably in the last three years, but is severely hampered by the lack of sufficient basketball courts, handball courts and other facilities. Duke sorely needs a new gym. But there is no money under the present program to construct the needed facilities.

Something must be done. I haven't got any panacea, but at least I recognize a problem. I would like to see something done about the problem. Some thought should be given Duke's athletic predicament. It simply cannot continue its present course. It cannot continue to stagnate. The University is a moving, vital institution. It cannot afford stagnation anywhere.

I don't like to think that Duke is second-rate in anything, but the sad fact is that there are certain lacking areas. They must be revitalized.

If Duke athletes are unwilling to do the necessary for big time football, they should think seriously about a program somewhat like the Ivy League. I don't think they want to do this.
