Russian Youth Officials Speak

Tonight at 7:30 p.m., an inter-
galactic group of student religious
workers from the various camp-
uses in the Boston area will have
an opportunity to engage in "public conversation" with four representatives of the Com-
mittee of Youth Organizations of
the USSR. All students in the
Greater Boston area are invited
to share in this discussion to
be held in the student lounge
of the First Church in Boston,
64 Marlborough Street.

This will be an unrehearsed
conversation followed by an
open question period and an
informal reception. The partici-
pants, who represent major re-
ligious categories ranging from
Roman Catholicism through
Judaism and Protestantism to
Marxism, will respond to ques-
tions relating to "Soviet and
United States student perspec-
tives on life." (For the purpose
of this discussion Marxism will
be considered as one religious
perspective.)

The four Soviet representa-
tives are: ALBERT ANDREEV-
ICH — a member of the Cen-
tral Committee of the Soviet
Youth Communist League and the
presently a postgraduate stu-
dent at the USSR Academy of
Sciences.
VLADLEN MITROFONO-
VICH DUBOVIC — a member of
the Presidium of the Student
Council of the USSR. At present
he is a postgraduate student
at the Moscow State Institute
of International Affairs.
YURI BORISOVICH KASH-
LEV — a member of the Presi-
dium of the Committee of Youth
Organizations of the USSR.
He is a historian by educa-
tional background.
MIKHAIL YAKOVIEVICH
NIKKTIN — the executive sec-
cretary of the Central Council
of the Lenin Young Pioneers'
Organization. He is also a mem-
ber of the board of the Institute
of Soviet American Relations.
Three of the four Russian
speakers are:

The Young Adult Council
(New York) is sponsoring the
appearance of the Soviet deleg-
ates in this country. The par-
ticular discussion is sponsored
by Student Religious Librarians
and the office of Unitarian Uni-
versalist College Centers.

The major controversy
wrestling college campuses these
days seems to be whether or not
to build bomb shelters. About
380 professors from MIT and
other Boston schools have ad-
dressed an open letter to Presi-
dent Kennedy through The New
York Times opposing shelters.
More recently, almost 200 pro-
ducers from colleges and uni-
versities in the Cleveland area
have submitted a similar open
letter through The Cleveland
Plain Dealer (see story on this
page).

School newspapers through-
out the country are carrying
stories on this issue. Approximately 90 per cent of them (including The Tech) have
come out in opposition to the
shelters. Speakers, at the Uni-
versity of Minnesota have said
that the basements of existing
buildings would adequately
serve as fail-safe shelters and
that the expense of building
bomshelter would be un-
necessary. Most newspapers
state that a national shelter
construction program would be
likely to induce a mass hysteria,

that the cost of the program
would equal about half the
present gross national product,
and that merely the undertak-
ing of such a program would
substantially increase the
chance of a nuclear war. Many
newspapers have made sugges-
tions about steps to be taken
in the event of a nuclear at-
tack, but very few of these rec-
nendations include building
bomshelter.

Faculty Councils Lectures
At some colleges the fight
against shelter construction is
opposed to nuclear testing and
warfare in general has gone far
beyond editorials in school pa-
pers. At Cornell, for example, close to 300 faculty members cancelled all their classes Nov.
17 and replaced them with in-
formal discussions on war and
nuclear testing. Professors spoke to a mass meeting of stu-
dents and faculty later in the
afternoon.

On the more optimistic side,
sectors are still finding uses
for construction funds, other
than for shelters. Fredonia
State College seems to have

found a unique way of spending
$50,000. The college was going
to open on a recently completed
building to house 48 Steinway
pianos.

The Tech (MIT) and The
U Guide (University of Min-
nesota) are also planning to
build shelters. The statement
got out as a half page advertisement in The Cleveland Plain Dealer. A similar advertisement had been placed earlier in The New
York Times by 180 professors at
MIT and other Boston insti-
tutions.

The text called the encour-
agement to build shelters a
"crude deception," claiming that
the cost of a really effective
shelter program would be equal
to the entire capital investment
of the country. It questioned
whether people have really been
able to imagine what the world
would look like after a nuclear
war, with millions dead, lying,
vomiting, poisoned, injured and
hungry, with billions dead, lying,
vomiting, poisoned, injured and
hungry, the false sense of security en-
grafted on to the entire capital investment of the country.

Almost 200 professors from
universities and colleges in the
Cleveland area have made
known their opposition to the
idea of building fallout shelters.
Many of the most prominent
leaders of Cleveland's academic
life, including 4 deans and 12
department heads at Western
Reserve University and Case
Institute of Technology, signed
an open letter to President
Kennedy which was published
as a half page advertisement in
The Cleveland Plain Dealer. A
similar advertisement had been
placed earlier in The New
York Times by 180 professors
at MIT and other Boston insti-
tutions.

The text called the encour-
agement to build shelters a
"crude deception," claiming that
the cost of a really effective
shelter program would be equal
to the entire capital investment
of the country. It questioned
whether people have really been
able to imagine what the world
would look like after a nuclear
war, with millions dead, lying,
vomiting, poisoned, injured and
hungry, the false sense of security en-
grafted on to the entire capital investment of the country.

The statement went on to
say that the shelter program
proposes to spend $500,000. The
statement went on to say that the shelter program
proposes to spend $500,000. The
statement went on to say that the shelter program
proposes to spend $500,000. The
statement went on to say that the shelter program
proposes to spend $500,000. The