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Lynchburg — It is impossible to gauge the long-term effects of the lopsided basketball game played here Wednesday night. The Indians were in a state of utter despondency, while Virginia Tech had the feeling it couldn’t lose.

Certainly, events warrant Berger’s description. The Hokies utterly demolished William & Mary, 97-79, and the score might have been far more lopsided if Tech Coach Don DeVoe had not replaced his starters early in the second half.

It was the kind of night when Tech could do no wrong. The shooting obviously was sharp, passing was crisp and rebounding was impressively.

"That had to be the big factor in this game," Indians Coach George Balanis said. "Kyle McKee dominated the game. In the game at our place, Dennis Vall and Matt Courage controlled McKee. This time, he did everything.

"We have a saying at our place that when our center plays well, we’ll win. Tonight, that could be said for McKee. He really showed me something, and I’ve been watching him for three years."

"When he plays like he played tonight, not many teams are going to beat Tech."

McKee merely grinned, a slow, wide smile and shrugged.

"I guess I just decided to play," he said, referring to his recent performances. "Other than that, however, McKee appeared to be playing at a high level of comfort.

Meanwhile, DeVoe wasn’t the least bit hesitant to praise McKee. "Not only was he pulling in and down rebounds (12), he was getting on the floor for the last push better than he ever has," DeVoe said. "That’s critical to our style of offense."" Beside McKee’s aggressive play, Duke Thompson added 11 rebounds to Tech’s total of 46. "Man, that’s nice," Thompson said. "I really wanted revenge after the way we lost in Williamsburg. My home isn’t far from there, and I couldn’t have lived with myself if we lost to William and Mary twice."

"I got enough letters from the fans back home as it was."

Revenge seemed to be a mitigating factor here Wednesday night. Dave Sentzbaugh also admitted as much when he said, "We wanted to make up for that first game. Besides that, their coach said we couldn’t handle pressure very well, and we wanted to prove he was wrong."

The Hokies did that with a minimum of ease as they picked up their 15th consecutive win against in-state teams.

Scoring after the first, second and third, three seconds into the game, they built an 11-2 lead despite William and Mary’s slowdown, four-corner offense.

"We were expecting that," DeVoe said. "We wanted to control the tempo and pick up the pace. After we got ahead of them, pretty good, they had no choice but to come out in a regular offensive pattern."

During those early moments, it seemed as if the Hokies should have brought lounge chairs instead of gym shoes. Except for their own excursions into the opposition’s end of the floor, Tech was confined to watching a display of the Indians’ passing prowess.

Then, as the spread became wider and wider, the four-corner stall became a dead issue. Just as the Indians were dead.

"I knew we had to slow the game down," Balanis explained, "because there just wasn’t a way to run and play one-on-one against Tech. They’ll kill us, as we’ll kill them.

"They just blitzed us, plain and simple. I mean, any time you go in at halftime and you’ve got only six rebounds, it doesn’t take much to figure something’s wrong.""

"I’ll say this, though, Tech is a darn good basketball team that deserves to go somewhere in the post-season tournaments."

---

SPORTS

Thursday, February 13, 1975

WILLIAM & MARY

Field Goal Ratio: 40-65 (61.5)
Free Throw Ratio: 27-32 (84.4)
Turnovers: 12-6 (11)
Rebounds: 38-17 (15)
Points: 97-79 (19)

VIRGINIA TECH

Field Goal Ratio: 51-93 (54.9)
Free Throw Ratio: 21-22 (95.5)
Turnovers: 10-6 (17)
Rebounds: 46-17 (15)
Points: 100-80 (19)

Attendance: 1,000

---

Virginia Tech 79, William & Mary 65

---

Virginia Tech 100, William & Mary 80