

For Official Use Only

#136
256

CIVIL DEFENSE
IN THE
UNITED STATES
1952

SURVEY RESEARCH CENTER
ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN

CIVIL DEFENSE IN THE UNITED STATES

1952

A NATIONAL STUDY OF PUBLIC
INFORMATION AND ATTITUDES
ABOUT CIVIL DEFENSE

SURVEY RESEARCH CENTER
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN

OCTOBER 1952

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Summary of Findings	4
Chapter 1 CIVIL DEFENSE: PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING OF THE PROBLEM	7
Chapter 2 INFORMATION ON DANGERS OF MODERN WARFARE	19
Chapter 3 KNOWLEDGE OF PERSONAL PROTECTIVE MEASURES UNDER ENEMY ATTACK	26
Chapter 4 COMMUNITY ASPECTS OF CIVIL DEFENSE	35
Chapter 5 ATTITUDES TOWARD VOLUNTEERING	42
Chapter 6 CITY DIFFERENCES	55
Chapter 7 CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RURAL POPULATION	66
APPENDIX A Demographic Data	73
APPENDIX B Sampling Errors for Cities	78

- - - - -

INTRODUCTION

- - - - -

This report gives factual answers to three kinds of important questions about public reactions to civil defense.

1. What do people know about civil defense matters?
2. How do people feel about civil defense problems?
3. What have people done, and what are they ready to do, about civil defense preparedness?

For the first time it is possible to report the total national situation on attitudes toward civil defense and on information about civil defense activities.

For the first time it is possible to study the differences in these attitudes among people living in different population-size areas of the country.

Three annual studies have now been made in the major metropolitan areas. It is now possible to begin to see the direction in which civil defense attitudes are moving and some of the factors that influence those directions.

The Scope of the Study

In April of 1952, the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan conducted its first national study of public attitudes toward civil defense for the Federal Civil Defense Administration. In this study the scientific sample was enlarged to represent the total adult population of the United States - metropolitan, urban, town, and rural. Computations based on the Bureau of the Census reports indicate that about 97 million people in these areas are adult - 21 years of age and older.

Two previous studies in September of 1950 and in August of 1951 had been limited to the adult population of eleven major American cities. Some of the information from these previous studies has been used here to indicate trends.

The people interviewed in this national study represent an accurate cross-section of the 97 million mentioned above. Each of these millions of people in the adult population had a known chance of being chosen for interview. The method of choosing people in a scientific way, so that they accurately represent the total population, is called probability sampling, a method which has been developed and refined by the cooperation of certain government agencies and universities.

Each of the people chosen in the sample is interviewed at home. The interview, lasting usually from an hour to an hour and a half, is conducted by a Survey Research Center staff member trained in the use of "free-answer" or "open-end" questioning. A standard schedule of questions was asked for all respondents.

Purposes of the Survey

The tables and discussion presented here are intended to give guidance to civil defense leaders at the state, national, and local levels. Some of the tables represent the way people respond to such civil defense activities as recruitment and public information campaigns. Other tables show the extent of public knowledge about self-protective measures. Still other tables provide understanding of problems which have influence on future civil defense operations. For example, how do people feel about the dangers from enemy attack? What needs to be done to give them a clearer understanding of these dangers and thereby stimulate them to take some preventive action now? Public thinking about such matters has been found in past studies to have a clear relationship with their acceptance of civil defense activities. A better understanding of public thinking will enable civil defense administrators to explain their operations in such a way as to gain maximum public acceptance of them. By knowing gaps in civil defense knowledge, programs and program priorities can be developed more efficiently.

Organization of this Report

Each chapter in this report deals with a major civil defense problem area. A brief discussion of major findings is presented to explain and interpret the tables which are included in the text. Following this, there is appended to each chapter a series of tables which serve to support the interpretations and to provide additional information about public reactions to related problems. These additional tables will be of interest to those readers who want to get a more complete picture of public thinking than is contained in the main body of the text.

The tables fall in the following categories:

1) National Tables and Tables Comparing Population Groups:

Four categories are used in these tables as follows:

<u>Categories</u>	<u>Definition</u>	<u>Approximate Adult Population</u>
Metropolitan	The 11 largest cities (*) exclusive of Washington, D.C.	15,000,000
Urban	Other cities over 50,000 plus metropolitan suburbs	32,000,000
Small City	Cities from 2,500 to 50,000	18,000,000
Rural	Open country and towns under 2,500	32,000,000
Total Estimated National Adult Population		97,000,000

* Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Los Angeles, New York, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, and San Francisco-Oakland.

2) Trend Tables: In these there are figures from earlier studies which can be compared to figures for the 1952 study. Since the samples of the earlier studies were of the eleven major cities only, the trend tables will include only percentages for the population of these major metropolitan areas.

3) Tables Comparing Metropolitan Areas: The numbers of interviews taken in the eight largest American cities (New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, Detroit, San Francisco, St. Louis, and Cleveland) were large enough to allow superficial comparison of the populations of those cities separately. Some mention will be made of smaller metropolitan areas when the differences between them are large enough to warrant it.

A civil defense leader whose locale is not a city mentioned in the city tables, can get useful information by examining the tables comparing the four population groups on various topics and adapting them to the situation where he works. For example, a civil defense director in a state which is largely rural should study the characteristics of rural people in the United States generally. For a state where there is a large rural population and also a large city (or cities), it is important to know both the characteristics of rural people and those of people living in cities of a size similar to those of the state in question.

The three civil defense surveys were conducted by the Public Affairs Program of the Survey Research Center and were directed by Dr. George Belknap. Collaborators in the recent 1952 study were William Scott and David F. Miller. Dr. Stephen B. Withey is the Public Affairs Program Director and supervisor of all program studies

- - - - -
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
- - - - -

Results from the third annual survey of public reactions to civil defense and related problems indicate, first of all, a decrease in war expectancy and a continued over-optimism about the extent of protection which could be expected from the armed forces in time of war. In spite of this relative feeling of security, the American public remains generally well-informed on measures for personal protection in case of enemy attack. The concept of "civil defense" is reasonably well understood by about half of the people, and realization of the need for such a community organization is high. While there have been no gains over the past year in the proportions of persons who are informed about personal protective measures and about civil defense matters, people are hearing about these things from more sources, and there is evidence that the more sources heard from, the more effective is the information.

Residents of metropolitan areas, where civil defense campaigns have been more intense, tend to be better informed about these factual matters than other people, and the proportion of informed respondents decreases steadily from urban to rural areas. There are wide differences among the eleven largest cities in level of information and attitude toward the local civil defense set-up. There is evidence that active programs in some of the cities -- including air raid drills -- have had definite effects in teaching people what the warning signal is and in evoking favorable public reaction toward them.

However, the percentage of volunteers has not increased at all, and there has apparently been a decrease in public willingness to take part in civil defense activity. Willingness to volunteer is lowest in the largest cities and highest in the rural areas. People who are willing to get into civil defense work are those who tend to express greater concern about the likelihood of war and about dangers of enemy attack, and who tend to feel that their cities could not at present do an adequate job of taking care of people in case of an attack.

The rural population evidences a surprising degree of concern about problems of civil defense and an overwhelmingly favorable attitude toward offering necessary aid to people in bombed cities. But they have evidently not given much thought to the nature of the problem that would be created by mass evacuation of urban areas.

HIGHLIGHTS OF SPECIFIC FINDINGS
REGARDING PUBLIC INFORMATION,
ATTITUDES, AND BEHAVIORS

Meaning of Civil Defense - Approximately half of American adults have a generally accurate knowledge of the meaning of Civil Defense. The proportion of people who understand the term is higher in the major cities (3 out of 5) than in rural areas (2 out of 5), and this figure for the cities has not changed appreciably in the past year.

Information on Personal Protection - Two-thirds of all adults have heard or read something about how to protect themselves in case of an atomic bomb attack. The number of people in the major cities who have this kind of information is about the same as it was a year ago. However, there is some evidence that the amount of useful information they have is somewhat greater. The greatest proportion of the behaviors mentioned had to do with taking shelter; also, a substantial number of people mentioned such measures as storing or covering food and water, turning off utilities, closing windows and doors, or having a medical kit and bandages handy. In response to a question about the frequency of receiving information of this kind, only one out of five people reported that they heard about protective measures fairly often; the rest had heard about them only occasionally or not at all.

Protection against Biological Warfare - Half the people interviewed said that they had heard something about biological warfare recently, but most of the "information" had to do with the Communist charge that the United Nations troops were using germ warfare in Korea. Only one out of five respondents had any general idea as to how germ warfare might be used against us and only one in ten had heard anything about measures to protect themselves against germ warfare.

Protection against Chemical Warfare - Only 9% of American adults had heard anything about gas warfare. Only 8% had any idea as to how it might be used against us and only 12% had heard anything about any kind of protective measure -- usually gas masks.

Mortality Radius of Atomic Bombs - One out of five persons has a fairly realistic idea as to how far away from where a bomb fell almost everybody would be killed. However, nearly three out of ten think the mortality radius would be five miles or more.

Knowledge of the Air-raid Warning Signal - While 68% of the people have some information about personal protective measures, only 43% have even a vague general idea of what the air-raid warning signal is. Only 15% know the warning signal clearly enough to distinguish it from sirens, horns, or whistles in general. Even in the major cities, only 64% have a general knowledge of the warning signal and 27% a clear, specific knowledge.

Actions After an Atomic Bomb Attack - Only 36% of all people reported they had heard or read anything about what a person ought to do after an atomic bomb attack. In the major cities, the proportion of informed respondents was somewhat higher -- 46%. One person in ten reported that he would stay where he was and follow instructions.

Knowledge of Local Civil Defense Activities - Nationally, only 18% of the people reported that they had heard or read anything about what civil defense was planning to do to protect their communities. This figure was slightly higher in the major cities, but even here it was only 27%. The nation-wide proportion of people who had actually seen signs of civil defense activity around their communities was 15%, and in the major cities the proportion was 32%.

Civil Defense Activity in Schools - Over the entire country 29% of the people have heard that the schools are doing something in civil defense. In the metropolitan areas this figure jumps to 42% as compared with 20% in small towns.

Civil Defense Activity at Work - Only 12% of the respondents could report any civil defense activity at their own or other family member's place of work; even in the larger cities, only 19% knew of any such activity.

Ability of City to Take Care of People after an Attack - Twenty-seven percent of all respondents (34% in the eleven metropolitan areas) felt their cities or towns could do a good job of taking care of people after an enemy attack. Their reasons for feeling either optimistic or pessimistic covered the same categories: status of hospitals, medical facilities, and shelters; quality of leadership, organizations, plans, training, communications, and information; degree of public interest.

Civil Defense Measures already Taken at Home - People were asked which of the following four things they had done: (a) Put together a first aid kit, (b) stored food for an emergency, (c) put up a civil defense alert card, (d) fixed up a shelter area. Only one person in five had done any of these things; 13% had put together first aid kits; 10% had stored food for an emergency; 6% had put up civil defense alert cards; 3% had fixed up shelter areas.

Anticipated Behavior under Air Attack - Eighty-four percent of the people are able to give some specific indication of what they would do if they got the signal that there was going to be an enemy attack. Most of the behaviors are in line with the kind of instructions that civil defense has been giving out. However, 11% say "get home, get to family, look out for family"; 7% think they would get panicky ~~scramble~~ or act in some other irrational manner, and 5% indicate that they would flee or get out of town.

Chapter 1

CIVIL DEFENSE - PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING OF THE PROBLEM

World War Not the Major Concern

At the time of the most recent survey, the UN forces had been fighting in Korea for nearly two years. While there had been a good deal of public apprehension at first about the possibility of its spreading into a global war, by April, 1952, war expectations had decreased substantially, considerably less than half of the people expected a world war at all, and less than a third of them looked for war within two years. A large proportion of the population had apparently learned to "live with" the present tense world situation, without fear of an immediate, direct threat to this country. When respondents were asked what sorts of problems their friends and neighbors were most concerned about these days, less than half of them mentioned problems related to war; they mentioned general economic problems almost three times as frequently as they did war problems. War is evidently, then, not the major concern of most people.

Optimism on Military Defense

That the realities of war danger are quite remote from public thinking has been consistently indicated in all three studies by the tendency of most people to give extremely optimistic appraisals of the extent of protection from air attack that could be afforded by the armed forces. Well over half of the people believe that their cities could be saved from heavy air raid damage. It is very likely that this stems partly from an unrealistic notion of how well the U.S. air force could prevent enemy planes from reaching their targets. Table 1 gives an idea of this extent of unrealism. It should be evaluated in the light of persistent statements by top military officials that "seven out of ten enemy planes could get through."

Table 1

"Well, suppose that enemy planes tried to make a surprise attack on cities like Chicago, Philadelphia, and Washington: how many do you think would get through and bomb our cities? Would you think most of them would get through, only a few would get through, or what?"

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Small Town and Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Most, many would get through	11%	13%	12%	15%	13%
About half would get through	4	4	2	3	3
Few (or not many) would get through	57	62	65	57	60
None would get through	11	4	3	4	5
Don't know	12	13	12	15	14
Not ascertained	5	4	6	6	5
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

Idea of "Civil Defense" is Accepted

Since the people do not generally have strong fears of enemy attack, one might expect that they would not take civil defense seriously. This is not the case, however. Two statements were presented to the people interviewed. One idea suggests that civil defense is not an urgent problem, while the other suggests that it is futile. The public tended to reject both of them.

Table 2

"Here are two statements that people have made. I'm interested in how you feel about them. The first is, 'There's not much need for civil defense now because there's no real emergency yet.' How do you feel about this?"

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Small Town and Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Agree definitely	3%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Agree	7	7	10	14	11
Pro-con, depends	1	2	1	2	2
Disagree	58	62	64	61	61
Disagree definitely	25	21	19	16	19
Don't know	4	4	4	5	4
Not ascertained	2	3	1	1	2
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

Table 3

"Another statement you hear made is 'Atomic bombs are so destructive that civil defense couldn't really do very much if there were an attack'. How do you feel about this?"

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Small Town and Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Agree definitely	2%	3%	2%	-	2%
Agree	9	12	14	18%	14
Pro-con, depends	4	3	1	3	2
Disagree	57	49	60	54	54
Disagree definitely	20	22	16	11	17
Don't know	6	7	6	11	8
Not ascertained	2	4	1	3	3
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

Half know Meaning of "Civil Defense"

Just because people are unwilling to agree openly with such negative statements does not necessarily mean that they are ready to support a civil defense program actively. In the first place they may have completely inadequate or wrong notions of what civil defense is all about. Or secondly, even if they know what civil defense work involves, they may be quite content to let someone else do the job, without getting seriously involved themselves. The latter problem of willingness to participate in civil defense is discussed later in Chapter 5. For the present it is worthwhile to consider just how well people understand the meaning of "civil defense". Table 5 shows that slightly over half of them know what the words mean.*

* Criteria for "accurate understanding" were 1) knowledge of the purpose of civil defense (e.g., "protect the people in case of war or disasters") and 2) knowledge of the agency (e.g., "the city" or "the people themselves").

Table 4

"You hear a lot about "civil defense" these days. As you understand it, what does the term "civil defense" mean? (If not already mentioned) Well, what do you think the purpose of civil defense is?"

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Small Town and Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Had generally accurate understanding of civil defense	59%	57%	55%	40%	51%
Had inaccurate or vague understanding of civil defense	26	26	24	24	25
Did not know what civil defense was	13	15	20	34	22
Not ascertained	2	2	1	2	2
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

ADDITIONAL TABLES

Table 5

"What kinds of problems would you say that your friends, neighbors, or others you know are most concerned about these days? What other things are they concerned about?"

	<u>% Mentioning</u>	<u>% Mentioning First</u>
<u>Economic Problems</u>		
High prices, cost of living	68	37
Taxes	29	9
Unemployment, jobs	6	3
Wages	5	2
Farm, agriculture problems	5	3
Strikes, labor unrest	1	1
Production problems, costs	1	*
Other economic problems	6	2
<u>Political Problems</u>		
Presidential election	12	3
Corruption, graft, waste	3	1
Government spending		*
Foreign spending	1	*
Other political problems	10	3
<u>International Problems</u>		
War (unspecified)	24	13
War in Korea	12	5
Draft, U.M.T., Arming	4	1
Unsettled world conditions	2	1
Possible bombings	1	1
Communism	1	*
Other international problems	2	2
<u>Local Problems</u>		
Housing	3	1
Schools	2	1
Crime, immorality	1	*
Other local	8	2
<u>Personal Problems</u>		
Immediate family situation	3	1
Health problems	3	1
Children	3	1
Religious	2	*
Other personal	4	1
Don't know	4	4
Not ascertained	1	1
	<u>**</u>	<u>100%</u>

Totals more than 100% because some respondent's mentioned more than one problem

Table 6

Proportions of Respondents in Different Population
Density Areas Who Mentioned Various
Kinds of Problems

<u>Problem Category*</u>	<u>Population Size Category</u>				<u>National</u>
	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Small Town and Rural</u>	
Economic	82	82	85	77	81
International	38	41	44	39	39
Political	24	34	29	21	27
Local	13	15	12	15	14
Personal	18	11	11	8	11
	**	**	**	**	**

Only the political and personal problem categories show significant differences among the various population areas.

* The question asked was: "What kinds of problems would you say that your friends, neighbors, or others you know are most concerned about these days?"

** Totals more than 100% because some respondents mentioned more than one problem.

Table 7

"Which of these (problems) would you say
is causing them the most concern?"

	<u>National</u>
Prices, cost of living	38%
War	10
Taxes	6
War in Korea	5
Farm, agriculture problems	3
Unemployment, jobs	2
Political conditions (general)	2
Presidential Election	2
Wages	1
Corruption in government	1
Unsettled world conditions	1
Draft, U.M.T., arming	1
Housing	1
Immediate family situation	1
Health	1
Strikes, labor unrest	*
Production problems	*
Foreign spending	*
Communism	*
Relations with Russia	*
Schools	*
Crime	*
Other	11
No problems	5
Don't know	3
Not ascertained	6
	<u>100%</u>

* Less than one-half of one percent.

Table 8

"Now speaking for yourself, how likely do you think
it is that we're in for another world war?"

<u>Likelihood</u>	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Small Town and Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Very likely	12%	18%	15%	15%	15%
Likely	30	30	30	46	36
Maybe, pro-con	10	9	10	8	9
Unlikely	30	20	26	14	21
Very unlikely	3	*	3	*	1
Already in another world war	1	4	3	*	2
Expresses only wishes or hopes	2	1	1	2	1
Don't know	10	16	10	12	12
Not ascertained	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

* Less than one-half of one percent.

Table 9

"Why do you feel this way (that it is likely or unlikely that we are in for another world war)?"

(National Sample)

Reasons why we will be in another world war

	<u>% Mentioning</u>	<u>% Mentioning First</u>
<u>Russia's (communists') behavior -</u> aggressive; uncooperative; uncontrollable; will take over countries; force us to fight; instigate incidents; U.S. will have to stop, fight Russia	11	8
<u>Redundant -</u> you read it in the papers; hear it on the radio; people talk about it; etc.; no causal reasons given.	8	7
<u>World conditions -</u> Korean war won't stop, will spread; other trouble spots (Iran, etc.) will mushroom into war.	7	6
<u>Fatalism -</u> Religious, historical, or economic; "It can't be helped"; "There have always been wars."	7	6
<u>Countries irreconcilable -</u> Two different ways of life - can't get along.	6	5
<u>Symptoms -</u> defense work stepping up; boys being called into service; military goods being shipped abroad.	6	5
<u>Peace Talks -</u> not successful; haven't (or can't) solved problems by discussion.	6	5
<u>Armament race -</u> will bring more tension, war; both sides are preparing, building up.	3	2
<u>U.S. Policy -</u> too aggressive; leading to war.	1	1
<u>U.S. Policy -</u> blundering; inconsistent; weak; vacillating; no policy	1	1
<u>Other Reasons -</u>	6	5

Table 9 cont'd.

Reasons why we won't be in another world war

	<u>% Mentioning</u>	<u>% Mentioning First</u>
<u>Neither side wants war</u> (or is prepared for it); people have had enough of war, nobody wants war, no one wants to fight	4	4
<u>U.S. Policy</u> - We've shown Russia we mean business (by our policy in general, our Korean action, our rearming); Russia won't dare	4	3
<u>Russia doesn't want war</u> - won't go to war (for awhile) - no reference to not being prepared	2	2
<u>Russia not (yet) prepared for war</u> - not able to attack (yet); doesn't want war because not prepared	2	1
<u>Korean peace talks</u> - negotiations under way; expecting peace in Korea	2	1
<u>Fatalism</u> ; religious reasons	2	1
<u>U.S. does not want war</u>	2	1
<u>Countries will be able to iron out their difficulties</u> , settle them by conference or other peaceful means	2	1
<u>Presidential election</u> - Republican administration will keep us out; confidence in new leaders who will get in after election	1	1
<u>Absence of symptoms</u> - don't hear about it; people say we won't	1	1
<u>Confidence in present administration</u> ; leaders won't get us into war	1	*
<u>Other countries don't want war</u> , not prepared for it (no specific mention of Russia)	1	*
<u>Other reasons</u>	6	5

Table 9 cont'd.

Depends

	<u>% Mentioning</u>	<u>% Mentioning First</u>
On U.S. election	2	2
On Korean situation	1	1
On what U.S. does	1	1
On what Russia, Stalin does	1	*
<u>Don't know</u>	3	3
<u>Not ascertained</u>	6	6
<u>Inapplicable</u> - don't know whether or not we re in for another war	15	15
	<u>**</u>	<u>100%</u>

* Less than one-half of one per cent.

** Totals more than 100% because some respondents mentioned more than one reason.

Table 10

"If a world war does come, do you think it's likely to happen in the next six months, the next year or two, or when?"

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Less than six months	2%	1%	3%	2%	2%
Six months to a year	6	7	6	10	8
1 to 2 years	12	19	17	23	19
2 to 5 years	25	20	26	20	22
5 to 10 years	6	7	10	4	7
10 years or over	7	8	1	2	4
Already in another war	2	4	3	*	2
Soon; near future	1	1	-	1	1
Not soon, not for several years	5	6	5	6	5
Never, not at all	4	2	3	2	2
Don't know, depends	19	16	14	25	19
Not ascertained	11	9	12	5	9
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

* Less than one-half of one percent.

Chapter 2

INFORMATION ON DANGERS OF MODERN WARFARE

Threat of Bombing Considered Greatest Danger

While the public has a strong positive attitude toward the need for civil defense, and a reasonably good general grasp of what it involves, it has less recognition of dangers to the United States (in event of war) other than bombings.

Table 11

"If war were to break out, do you think people in the United States would be in danger of enemy attack? (If 'yes') In what ways do you think an enemy would attack us, that is, what sort of things would be used against us?"

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Small Town and Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Bombs (unspecified), planes	62%	59%	70%	69%	66%
Atomic bombs, H-bombs	41	41	30	28	35
Sea attack, subs, warships	22	10	20	11	14
Sabotage, subversion	17	16	13	11	14
Biological warfare	8	13	8	9	10
Rockets, missiles	10	10	5	8	8
Land invasion	5	3	3	3	3
Ordinary bombs	4	2	3	1	2
Chemical warfare	4	6	4	3	4
Other methods of attack	4	5	4	6	5
No danger anticipated	11	10	6	6	8
Don't know	4	5	3	5	5
Not ascertained	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
	**	**	**	**	**

** Totals more than 100% because some people mentioned more than one danger.

The above table gave people's ideas on the dangers which war would bring to Americans generally. Table 12 indicates the dangers which people feel their own communities would face in the event of war.

Table 12

"Would you say people right around here are in danger from any of these things? (If 'Yes') Which things?"

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Small Town and Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Bombs (unspecified, planes	26%	26%	19%	11%	19%
Atomic bombs, H-bomb	12	11	5	1	6
Sabotage, subversion	2	2	2	1	2
Biological warfare	*	1	1	3	1
Ordinary bombs	1	*	*	-	1
Other	2	2	-	*	1
No specific danger	21	26	21	13	19
No dangers at all "around here"	36	32	52	71	51
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

* Less than one-half of one percent.

Exaggeration of Atomic Destruction

The public's ideas of the devastation which can be caused by atomic bombs tend to be exaggerated, and there has been a slight increase in the proportion of these exaggerated estimates over the past year, following an increase in "realism" which had taken place during the previous period. Only a portion of this change can be explained by published information about larger and more deadly atomic weapons.

Table 13

(Metropolitan sample only)

"If an atomic bomb hit in the center of a large city, how far away from where it fell do you think almost everybody would be killed?"

	<u>Sept. 1950</u>	<u>August 1951</u>	<u>April 1952</u>
Realistic estimate ($\frac{1}{4}$ mile to 1 mile)	17%	29%	19%
Exaggerated estimate (1 to 5 miles)	29	27	32
Highly exaggerated estimate (over 5 miles)	23	19	25
Don't know	23	19	20
Not ascertained	8	6	4
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

Rural people are only slightly more inaccurate than urban people in their estimates of the atomic bomb mortality radius.

Table 14

"If an atomic bomb hit in the center of a large city, how far away from where it fell do you think almost everybody would be killed?"

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Small Town and Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Realistic estimate ($\frac{1}{4}$ mile to 1 mile)	19%	16%	21%	15%	18%
Exaggerated estimate (1 to 5 miles)	32	32	26	21	27
Highly exaggerated estimate (over 5 miles)	25	33	23	32	29
Don't know	20	15	27	26	22
Not ascertained	4	4	3	6	4
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

Ignorance of BW and CW Dangers

People have been receiving relatively little information about biological and chemical warfare. The only point that has made any sizeable impression is the Communist propaganda about the use of germ warfare in Korea.

Table 15

"Have you heard anything in the last few months about biological or germ warfare? (If 'Yes') What have you heard or read?"

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Small Town and Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Communist report of UN use in Korea	37%	32%	44%	33%	36%
Plans for use or development	7	5	8	5	6
Nature and effects	3	1	3	2	2
Other	2	2	1	3	2
Heard something, don't remember what	4	5	9	2	5
Heard nothing	47	54	35	53	48
Not ascertained	-	1	-	2	1
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

Fewer than one person in ten had any information about protective measures against biological warfare. Fewer than one person in ten had received any information at all (development, protection against, etc.) about chemical warfare.

ADDITIONAL TABLES

Table 16

"Would you say people right around here are in danger from any of these things (ways in which an enemy might attack us)?"

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Yes	51%	56%	36%	18%	37%
Yes, qualified	9	9	9	8	9
Pro-con	2	*	-	2	1
No, qualified	8	10	16	24	16
No	17	13	29	40	27
Don't know	3	3	2	1	2
Not ascertained	3	2	3	1	2
Inapplicable - doesn't think U.S. is in danger of attack in event of war	7	7	5	6	6
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

* Less than one-half of one percent.

Table 17

"Would you say that you personally get at all concerned or bothered about any of these dangers?"

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Very much concerned	6%	10%	9%	7%	8%
Concerned, a little concerned	35	32	29	25	30
Not concerned	43	41	45	55	48
Definitely unconcerned; complete lack of concern	7	6	9	3	5
Don't know	*	-	*	1	*
Not ascertained	2	3	3	3	3
Inapplicable - doesn't know whether U.S. would be in danger of enemy attack	<u>7</u> 100%	<u>8</u> 100%	<u>5</u> 100%	<u>6</u> 100%	<u>6</u> 100%

* Less than one-half of one percent.

Table 18

"From what you've heard, what would cause most of the deaths (in an atomic bomb attack)?"

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Fire, heat, burns	21%	23%	24%	18%	21%
Blast, explosions	16	20	23	19	20
Radiation, rays	24	18	18	19	19
Gas, fumes, chemicals	9	16	14	16	15
Falling buildings, debris	8	5	5	3	5
Panic, fright	8	3	1	3	3
"The bomb"	1	2	1	1	1
Disease	*	1	-	-	*
Other	2	1	1	2	1
Don't know	9	9	12	15	12
Not ascertained	<u>2</u> 100%	<u>2</u> 100%	<u>1</u> 100%	<u>4</u> 100%	<u>3</u> 100%

* Less than one-half of one percent.

Table 19

"Have you heard or read anything about how an enemy might use it (biological warfare) against us?"

(National Sample)

Carried by airplane	7%
Contamination of food, water	4
Spread by 5th column, saboteurs	1
Killing of plants, animals	1
Other	3
Heard something, DK what	4
Heard nothing	80
	<hr/> 100%

Table 20

"Have you heard or read anything about what can be done to protect against these things (biological warfare)?"

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Keep clean	*	1%	-	-	*
Store food or water	2%	1	1	-	1
Use masks	1	-	-	-	*
Avoid contaminated food or water	*	-	1	*	*
Other measures	8	6	4	7%	6
Nothing can be done	*	-	-	-	*
Heard something, DK what	2	3	4	2	3
Heard nothing	85	87	87	88	87
Not ascertained	2	2	3	3	3
	<hr/> 100%	<hr/> 100%	<hr/> 100%	<hr/> 100%	<hr/> 100%

* Less than one-half of one percent.

Table 21

"What about poison gas -- chemical warfare, that is. Have you read or heard anything about this in the last few months? What have you read or heard?"

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Small Town and Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Communist report of UN use	1%	1%	3%	1%	1%
Use or plans for use or development (U.S. or enemy)	2	3	3	1	2
Nature and effects	1	1	1	1	1
Protection against	1	*	1	1	1
Other	2	1	2	2	1
Heard something; DK what	3	4	4	2	3
Heard nothing	89	90	85	90	90
Not ascertained	1	-	1	2	1
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

Table 22

"Have you heard anything about how an enemy might use it (chemical warfare) against us?"

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Small Town and Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Spread by airplanes, bombs, guided missiles	7%	4%	6%	3%	5%
Other means	1	2	1	2	1
Heard something; DK what	2	3	1	2	2
Heard nothing	88	90	91	92	91
Not ascertained	2	1	1	1	1
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

Table 23

"Have you heard or read anything about what can be done to protect against these things (chemical warfare)?"

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Small Town and Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Wear gas masks	9%	4%	5%	2%	5%
Other preventive measures	4	1	4	3	2
Miscellaneous remedial measures	3	1	3	*	1
Heard something; DK what	2	6	7	2	4
Heard nothing	80	86	80	89	85
Not ascertained	2	2	1	4	3
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

* Less than one-half of one percent.

Chapter 3

KNOWLEDGE OF PERSONAL PROTECTIVE
MEASURES UNDER ENEMY ATTACK

One of the most effective of the civil defense information programs has been that of telling people how to take care of themselves in case of an air attack. In the eleven metropolitan areas an average of 84% of the respondents knew at least one protective measure they ought to take if their city were attacked.* The percentage of informed respondents falls off considerably as one moves from the urban to the rural areas. Table 24 presents this comparison of different population size areas.

Table 24

"Have you heard or read anything about what a person ought to do for his own safety and his family's safety if there were an atom bomb attack? What were some of these things?"

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Small Town and Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Had information	84%	69%	64%	46%	63%
Had no information	16	30	35	52	36
Not ascertained	**	1	1	2	1
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

This high percentage of informed people in the metropolitan sample has remained fairly stable over the past year. In August, 1951, about the same proportion of people had heard information about personal protective measures. Table 25 shows that a substantial increase in the proportion of informed persons had occurred between the 1950 and 1951 surveys, but that no further increase occurred by April 1952. It is likely that the remaining uninformed 15% or so of the population will be extremely difficult to reduce appreciably for the eleven metropolitan areas as a whole, although there is room for improvement in a few individual cities, which will result in a slight rise in the total figure.

* In some cities this proportion was much higher (over 90% in New York and San Francisco). See Chapter 6.

** Less than one-half of one percent.

Table 25

Proportions of People Who Had Read or Heard about
Personal Protective Measures under Enemy Attack

(Metropolitan Sample only)

Information Level	September 1950	August 1951	April 1952
Heard or read something	62%	87%	84%
No information	37	13	16
Not ascertained	1	*	*
	100%	100%	100%

* Less than one-half of one percent.

That this information on personal protective measures has been translated into a readiness-to-act by the people who heard it is indicated by their responses to a later question: "What do you think you'd do if you got the signal that there was going to be an enemy attack?" Three-fourths of the metropolitan respondents mentioned specific protective behaviors, while the proportions for other population size groups were correspondingly lower.

Table 26

"What do you think you'd do if you got the signal
that there was going to be an enemy attack?"

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Small Town</u>	<u>National (except open) Country</u>
Mentioned Specific Protective Behaviors	74%	57%	61%	56%	62%
"Get to home or family"	9	12	13	8	11
"Flee", "get out of town"	2	4	7	5	4
Other inappropriate behavior	7	9	7	5	7
Don't know	6	17	11	23	15
Not ascertained	2	1	1	3	1
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

There is considerably less public knowledge of post-attack safety measures than of behavior before and during an attack. Table 27 shows that this kind of information is far less widespread, and, as expected, rural respondents are less well informed than urban.

Table 27

"Have you heard or read anything about what a person ought to do to take care of himself or his family after an atomic bomb attack? What was it you heard?"

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Small Town and Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Had heard or read something	40%	34%	30%	20%	29%
No information	59	66	69	79	70
Not Ascertained	1	*	1	1	1
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

Knowledge of the Air Raid Warning Signal

How are the people going to know when to do these things they have mentioned? Some sort of air raid warning system has been set up in most urban communities, so that each person is notified directly that "now is the time to take those protective measures you've been hearing about". Of course, if there were an air raid, many people would hear about it through other means besides the standard signal, but if the alert came at the last minute before attack, these other means of communication might reach the population too late to enable them to save their own lives. So it is quite essential that they know how to interpret the warning signal which reaches them directly and immediately.

The standard signal used to sound the alert has been designated as either a wavering blast on horns, sirens, or whistles, or a series of short blasts. Only a very small percentage of the population knows this signal correctly. However, another sizeable proportion knows that there is some sort of warning signal, and perhaps these people would also react directly with the appropriate protective measures. Table 28 shows that there is still a large part of the population who have no idea what sort of a signal to expect to warn them of an impending air attack.

Table 28

"Do you know what the warning signal is which tells people that enemy planes are headed for your city? "What is it?"

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Small Town</u>	<u>National</u>
Correct knowledge of warning signal	19%	9%	8%	5%	10%
Know there is some sort of signal	45	36	26	21	33
Don't know	35	52	65	73	55
Not ascertained	1	3	1	1	2
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

Of course, it is not reasonable to expect that most people will learn what the signal is just by reading about it in a newspaper or pamphlet. A far more effective teaching device is to actually sound the alarm and have them go through the appropriate behaviors, so that the two will become connected by habit. That this has actually worked better is evident in Table 77 which shows that knowledge of the warning signal is much higher in those cities which have had major air raid drills.

Sources of Information on Personal Protection

If one regards a respondent's memory of having heard some information through a particular medium as a criterion of the effectiveness of that medium, then it is legitimate to say that most information media have increased in effectiveness during the past year. A few of them have remained at their previous levels, and none has decreased significantly. This would indicate then, that although the percentage of informed people (that is, informed on measures for personal protection in an air attack) has remained about the same, they have been getting their information from more sources than previously. Table 29 presents a comparison of the proportions of respondents recalling information from various media in the three civil defense surveys conducted so far. Table 30 shows the relative "effectiveness" (or penetration) of these media for different population size areas in the most recent study. These responses were made to an "open question": "Where have you heard or read about these things (personal protection)?" This means that the respondents had to recall where they had heard the information, rather than reply "yes" or "no" to the interviewer's specific question on each medium. So they may actually have heard about personal protection from more sources, but were just unable to recall others at the time. Furthermore, it should not be assumed that all civil defense information reaches people through the various media in the proportions indicated -- just that having to do with personal protective measures under air attack.

Table 29

Proportions of Respondents Who Had Received Information
About Personal Protection from Various Media
(Metropolitan Sample Only)

<u>Information Source</u>	<u>Date of Survey</u>		
	<u>September 1950</u>	<u>August 1951</u>	<u>April 1952</u>
Newspapers	42%	41%	52%
Magazines	22	11	14
Radio	7	16	33
Pamphlets, circulars	1	30	27
Television	3	8	15
Motion pictures	4	2	4
Formal talks, exhibits	1	3	3
Books	2	2	*
Posters	*	*	9
Schools	*	*	5
Place of work	*	*	4
Personal contact	3	7	8
Other sources	*	*	10
Total media percentages**	87%	120%	184%
Total percentage of informed respondents**	62%	87%	84%

* Less than one-half of one percent.

** The total percentage figures for the media are greater than the corresponding percentages of informed persons, because some respondents mentioned more than one source of information. The ratios of media % to informed persons % can be taken as indicative of the average relative numbers of media through which informed respondents had been reached.

Table 30

Proportions of Respondents Who Had Received Information
about Personal Protection Measures from Various Media
(April 1952)

<u>Information Source</u>	<u>Population Size Category</u>				
	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Small Town and Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Newspapers	52%	44%	34%	26%	37%
Magazines	14	19	27	17	19
Radio	33	24	31	22	26
Pamphlets, circulars	27	19	9	6	14
Television	15	16	9	6	11
Motion pictures	4	5	7	1	3
Formal talks, exhibits	3	4	3	7	5
Books	*	1	1	-	1
Posters	9	2	1	-	2
School	5	2	1	2	2
Place of work	4	2	1	2	2
Personal contact	8	6	9	6	7
Other sources	10	8	6	5	7
Total media percentages	184%	152%	139%	100%	136%
Total percentages of informed respondents	84%	69%	64%	46%	63%

* Less than one-half of one percent.

** The statement at the bottom of table 29 applies.

Neither of the above tables should be interpreted to imply that one medium should be preferred over others. While previous studies have indicated that the better informed people get more information from magazines and poorly informed people are more apt to have received theirs through personal contact, there is better evidence that the more sources through which a person is reached, the greater is the effectiveness of the information presented regardless of the source.

ADDITIONAL TABLES

Table 31

"Have you heard or read anything about what a person ought to do for his own safety and his family's safety if there were an atom bomb attack? What were some of these things?"

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Go into basement, cellar, shelter	46%	38%	29%	19%	36%
Take shelter, get under table, away from windows, next to walls	39	24	20	16	23
Lie face down, lie on ground, fall flat	29	26	31	16	24
Cover exposed skin, face, hands, wear white clothes, loose clothes	25	28	19	15	21
Stay inside, remain in home	7	7	8	5	7
Store, cover water, food	10	8	7	4	7
Turn off gas, heat, lights	13	5	4	4	6
Close windows, doors	8	5	4	2	4
Get official instructions	6	2	3	1	3
Don't eat, drink contaminated food	3	2	4	3	3
Build shelters, prepare home	2	5	2	3	3
Nothing, remain where are	2	3	*	2	2
Have medical kit, bandages handy	3	3	2	1	2
Preventive actions; learn signals, block warden	*	2	1	2	2
Destroy clothes, wash clothes	1	2	2	1	1
Other preparations (flashlights, radio)	-	3	1	*	1
Try to adjust, get along	2	*	2	*	1
Other	4	5	6	5	5
Heard something, DK what	2	5	4	7	5
Heard nothing	14	24	31	44	31
Not ascertained	1	*	*	2	1
	**	**	**	**	**

* Less than one-half of one percent.

** Totals more than 100% because same respondents mentioned more than one behavior.

Table 32

"Would you say you've heard about these things
(protective measures) pretty often or not?"

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Often	27%	26%	23%	12%	21%
Occasionally	3	1	3	*	1
Not very often	42	41	31	36	37
Less now than previously	9	5	7	2	5
Not at all	1	1	1	-	1
Don't know	*	-	1	-	*
Not ascertained	3	2	3	4	3
No information	15	24	31	46	32
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

* Less than one-half of one percent.

Table 33

"Have you heard or read anything about what a person
ought to do to take care of himself or his family
after an atomic bomb attack? What was it you heard?"

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Avoid contamination of food, water	12%	17%	12%	8%	12%
Wait for instructions, stay where are, wait for clear signal	14	12	11	8	10
Remove, burn, wash, clothing, wash self	11	9	6	4	7
Help others, first aid, medical	3	2	3	3	3
Avoid contaminated areas, buildings	3	3	2	1	2
Avoid Radio-activity	2	*	1	-	1
Seek CD instructions	*	2	*	1	1
Other	9	4	7	5	6
Heard something; DK what	6	6	10	7	7
Heard nothing	53	59	60	72	63
Not ascertained	1	*	1	1	1
	<u>**</u>	<u>**</u>	<u>**</u>	<u>**</u>	<u>**</u>

** Totals more than 100% because some respondents mentioned more than one behavior.

Table 34

"Would you look at this card and tell me if you have done any of these things in your home. What were some of the things?"

	<u>National</u>
Put together a first aid kit	13%
Stored food for an emergency	10
Put up a civil defense card	6
Fixed up a shelter area	3
None of these things	80
	<u>***</u>

*** Totals more than 100% because some respondents had taken more than one measure.

Chapter 4

COMMUNITY ASPECTS OF CIVIL DEFENSE

Few Know What Local Civil Defense is Doing

Although all the metropolitan areas and a large number of urban and rural areas have set up active civil defense programs, public knowledge of their recent activities is extremely low. Approximately four out of five respondents report that they have not heard or read anything recently about their community's civil defense protective measures.

Table 35

"Have you heard or read anything recently about what
civil defense is doing or planning to do to protect
your community? What did you hear or read?"

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Small Town and Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Training people for first aid, police	5%	8%	8%	3%	6%
Getting organized, appropriating money	6	6	3	2	4
Building shelters	7	3	1	-	2
Getting information to people	3	4	1	*	2
Recruiting people	4	3	*	*	2
Air raid drills, exercises	3	1	*	2	2
Putting up signs, highway markers	2	2	-	-	1
Other	3	3	2	3	3
Heard something, don't know what	2	3	2	2	2
Heard nothing	72	75	83	88	81
Not ascertained	1	1	1	1	1
	<u>**</u>	<u>**</u>	<u>**</u>	<u>**</u>	<u>**</u>

** Totals more than 100% because some respondents gave more than one answer.

Less than One-third Believe City can Now do a Good Job of Civil Defense

Respondents in all but the rural areas were also asked to evaluate their communities in respect to their ability to care for citizens in case of an enemy attack. Evaluation of metropolitan set-ups was generally higher than in other areas. In all areas, those who felt their communities could not do a good job, and those who didn't know how well their communities could do, outnumbered by a wide margin those who felt that their community set-up was adequate.

Table 36

"How about the way your city is set up now? Do you think it would be able to do a good job of taking care of people after an attack if it were to happen right now?"

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Small Town and Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Yes, definitely	3%	2%	2%	3%	2%
Yes	31	25	21	21	25
Pro-con	6	7	6	2	6
No	31	31	41	41	36
No, definitely	4	4	11	11	7
Don't know	22	28	17	16	21
Not ascertained	3	3	2	6	3
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

The important criteria of a good community civil defense organization, according to the respondents in our sample, are adequate facilities, active leaders, and a well-integrated training program.

Table 37

<u>Reasons Why City is Able To Do A Good Job</u>	<u>National</u>
Good hospitals, medical facilities	6%
Adequate (good) conditions, facilities	5
Good organization, plans, leaders	5
Good training, communication, information	5
Faith, confidence in people	5
Faith in government, officials	1
Names particular organization	2
Other	3
 <u>Reasons Why City Is Unable To Do A Good Job</u>	
Inadequate (bad) conditions, preparations, facilities	13
Lack of organizations, plans	8
Poor hospitals, medical facilities	7
People aren't prepared, trained	7
Lack of a core of trained people	6
Lack of shelters	2
People apathetic, uninterested	3
Other	3
Not ascertained	6
Inapplicable (No knowledge of local CD set-up)	24
	<u>**</u>

** Totals more than 100% because some respondents gave more than one answer.

Civil Defense in the Schools

Much of civil defense activity in communities has been directed toward training school children in the correct measures to take in the event of an attack. In the metropolitan areas over two-fifths of the sample report hearing of civil defense activities in the schools, while only about one person in four reports this in the smaller cities and towns.

Table 38

"Have you heard of anything that the schools are doing in civil defense? What was that?"

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Small Town and Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Drills	22%	19%	7%	10%	15%
Teaching children about protection	13	10	3	9	9
Sending pamphlets home	2	3	-	-	2
CD registration	1	-	-	-	*
Other activity	2	2	1	1	2
Some activity, don't know or not ascertained what	2	1	1	-	1
No activity	57	63	85	76	69
Don't know	*	1	1	2	1
Not ascertained	1	-	1	2	1
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

Civil Defense at Work

Only a very small proportion of respondents report any civil defense activity at their place of employment.

Table 39

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Small Town and Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Instruction, training in CD jobs	5%	5%	1%	2%	4%
Specific preparations made	7	4	1	1	3
Meetings (unspecified)	1	1	1	1	1
Pamphlets, posters	2	2	1	-	1
Recruiting of volunteers	*	1	-	1	*
Other activities	3	2	2	3	2
Some activities, don't know or not ascertained what	1	-	2	1	1
No activity	76	80	91	82	83
Don't know	4	4	1	4	3
Not ascertained	1	1	-	5	2
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

* Less than one-half of one percent.

Other Civil Defense Activities

People were also asked to name any other civil defense activities which they may have noticed in their communities.

Table 40

"Have you seen any other signs of civil defense activity anywhere else around here? What have you seen?"

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Small Town and Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Shelter signs	16%	5%	-	-	5%
Posters, recruiting signs	5	4	-	1	2
Air raid drills	5	1	1	1	2
Road signs	4	3	-	1	2
Sirens	2	2	1	-	1
"Alert America" convoy	*	1	-	-	*
Red Cross blood bank	*	-	-	-	*
Other	5	5	3	1	3
Has seen other signs; doesn't know or not ascertained what they were	1	1	-	-	1
Hasn't seen any other signs	67	80	93	91	83
Not ascertained	1	1	1	4	2
	**	**	**	**	**

* Less than one-half of one percent.

** Totals more than 100% because some respondents mentioned more than one activity.

Civil Defense Drills and Tests

Two percent of the sample mentioned air raid drills spontaneously when they were asked to name other evidence of civil defense activity. When asked specifically about drills and tests, however, a much larger proportion recalled that they had taken place.

Table 41

"Do you happen to know if there have been any air raid drills or civil defense tests in (your city or town)?"

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Small Town and Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Yes - had definite drills	44%	27%	14%	13%	24%
Yes - had only minor tests (sounded sirens, etc.)	10	5	5	5	6
No	44	66	80	79	68
Not ascertained	2	2	1	3	2
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

Those people who knew of drills or tests were asked what they thought of them and what they had learned from them. The following tables list the responses given by members of the metropolitan sample.

Table 42

"What did you think of them (drills or tests)?"

<u>Attitude toward Drills and Tests</u>	<u>Metropolitan</u>
<u>Favorable Comments</u>	
Favorable, (general)	21%
People followed instructions	3
Other	1
<u>Unfavorable Comments</u>	
No good, not worth all the trouble	6
Respondent didn't pay much attention	5
People didn't follow instructions	2
Other	5
Don't know	6
Not ascertained	5
Inapplicable - didn't know there were any drills or tests	46
	<u>100%</u>

Table 43

"Would you say you learned anything about civil
defense from them? What was it you learned?"

<u>Things Learned from Civil Defense Tests</u>	<u>Metropolitan</u>
How to follow instructions	8%
How to avoid panic	2
Stay under cover	2
Other specific things	1
Other - general	7
Nothing	29
Don't know	1
Not ascertained	4
Inapplicable - didn't know there were any drills or tests	46
	<hr/>
	100%

Chapter 5

ATTITUDES TOWARD VOLUNTEERING

Most Have Not Heard That Volunteers Are Needed

An important source of concern to civil defense authorities is the small proportion of people who are enrolled as volunteers in civil defense organizations. In the current study only two percent of the national sample reports that they are now participating in civil defense. This shows a need for continued emphasis on the recruitment phase of the public information program.

The initial step in a recruiting program is publicity about the need for volunteers. It is seldom that an individual will spontaneously offer his services to civil defense. He must be made to realize that there is a civil defense organization in his community and that they need more volunteers.

Only one person in four indicates any knowledge of a civil defense recruiting campaign. A higher proportion of people in metropolitan areas have heard requests for volunteers, but even here the proportion who know about recruiting is less than one-half. Table 45 shows that during the period between the two most recent surveys the percentage of metropolitan residents who knew about recruiting actually dropped off significantly.

Table 44

"Have you heard or read anything asking
people to get into civil defense work?"

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Small Town and Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Yes	45%	34%	18%	15%	25%
No, don't know	54	66	80	84	74
Not ascertained	1	-	2	1	1
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

Table 45

<u>Information about Recruitment</u>	<u>August 1951</u>	<u>April 1952</u>
Had information	55%	45%
Had no information	43	54
Not ascertained	2	1
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

Most Have Not Thought of Volunteering

A large majority of respondents say that they personally have not thought about volunteering. People in rural areas are less apt to have thought about this.

Table 46

"Have you ever thought about signing up for civil defense?"

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Small Town and Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Yes	19%	17%	16%	9%	14%
No	73	73	74	83	77
Already in CD	2	3	1	1	2
Not ascertained	6	7	9	7	7
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

City People Less Willing to Volunteer

To determine the amount of acceptance of an active recruitment program respondents were asked, "If you were asked to sign up to give 2 or 3 hours a week for at least six months learning about civil defense, would you do it?"

Table 47

<u>Willingness to Volunteer</u>	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Small Town and Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Yes	26%	29%	43%	46%	38%
Yes, qualified; probably, think so, suppose so	17	22	24	19	21
Pro-con, might	2	2	1	1	1
No, qualified; probably not, don't think so	13	8	10	7	9
No	37	34	20	23	27
Depends	3	2	1	1	1
Already in Civil Defense	1	2	-	1	1
Don't know	1	1	1	1	1
Not ascertained	*	*	-	1	1
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

A greater proportion of people in rural communities express a willingness to volunteer than do people in more densely populated areas. The reasons for this difference are not too clear and require further study.

One likely explanation is that an active civil defense program in the larger cities gives many people the impression that their city would already do a good job in case of an attack, so there is no need for them to offer their services; while in the less prepared areas not so many people have this sense of security which lulls them into passive indifference. On the other hand it may be that people in the metropolitan areas have given more thought to the question and have come to a definite decision, positive or negative, whereas rural people, not having thought about the matter, are more apt to respond positively, in an off-hand manner, just because they were asked. A third possible reason may be that people in less populated areas feel a deeper community spirit than do those in the cities; they may consider working in civil defense a matter of "being a good neighbor".

Table 48 suggests that the proportion of people who express willingness to volunteer for civil defense job training has decreased, rather than increased, during the period between the most recent surveys. The drop from 71% willing to 44% willing may not be so bad as it appears, since in the 1952 survey the question included the phrase "sign up", and thereby probably made the criterion for willingness more stringent than it had been previously. (In the first two studies respondents were merely asked: "How would you feel about giving a few hours a week for at least six months to learn this kind of work?") Nevertheless, at least part of the difference can probably be attributed to an increasing public apathy toward the civil defense program as the war emergency continues with no apparent direct threat to their cities.

Table 48
(Metropolitan Sample only)

Willingness to Volunteer for CD	September 1950	August 1951	April 1952
Willing (or already in CD)	68%	71%	44%
Pro-con, depends	3	2	5
Unwilling	21	24	50
Don't know	-	-	1
Not ascertained	8	3	*
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

Reasons For Unwillingness

Those people who did not express unqualified willingness to participate in civil defense activities were asked their reasons why:

Table 49

Reasons for Unwillingness to Give Time for CD	Metro	Urban	Small City	Rural	National
Family responsibilities	11%	15%	8%	9%	11%
Not enough time	15	13	8	6	10
Occupation, hours	12	12	10	5	9
Health	10	10	10	6	9
Age	8	8	7	5	7
No emergency, no need for CD	5	3	1	2	2
Language problem	2	3	-	-	1
Distance, location	1	3	1	3	2
DK what work would involve	1	1	*	1	1
Other	7	4	5	6	5
Not ascertained	8	10	11	12	10
Inapplicable, (willing to sign up or doesn't know whether willing to sign up)	<u>28</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>40</u>
	**	**	**	**	**

* Less than one-half of one percent.

** Totals more than 100% because some respondents gave more than one answer.

Many Excuses For Not Joining Civil Defense

It is interesting to note that a large number of people express a willingness to participate in civil defense, but only a small proportion have actually signed up. Is this because they have never been approached, or are there other reasons? When respondents who expressed willingness to sign up were asked why they had not yet done so, more than half indicated that they did not know of a local organization or of a need for volunteers.

Table 50

"Many people who are willing to work in civil defense have not signed up. We would like to know why this is. Could you tell me why you have not volunteered for civil defense yet?"

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Small Town and Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Haven't been asked	20%	22%	24%	29%	25%
No place to sign up, no local CD; didn't know about CD around here	11	13	42	34	25
Too busy	10	5	5	5	6
Local CD not organized, no recruiting going on	4	6	7	5	6
No need for CD	6	3	2	6	5
Job, occupation	7	5	3	4	5
Family responsibilities	8	5	3	2	4
Health problems	5	4	3	2	3
Apathy, neglect	4	5	2	2	3
Too old	3	2	1	3	2
Already doing similar work	2	4	1	2	2
Lack of ability	1	1	1	2	1
Didn't know <u>where</u> to sign up	1	2	3	*	1
Don't know	1	2	1	2	1
Not ascertained	8	9	3	8	7
	**	**	**	**	**

* Less than one-half of one percent.

** Totals less than 100% because some respondents were not asked the question.

Active Participation in Civil Defense

Since it is important to know how many volunteers can be depended upon for active participation in civil defense activities, the following question was asked of all people who expressed a willingness to give time to civil defense: "How about a really active job where you would organize people in this block (or community or apartment house) for civil defense work and get things started; would you be willing to do this?"

Table 51

<u>Willingness to take active part in civil defense</u>	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Small Town and Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Yes	14%	18%	32%	24%	22%
Yes, qualified: probably would, think so, sup- pose so	9	11	12	17	13
Pro-con, might	1	1	1	1	1
No, qualified: probably won't, don't think I would	6	10	10	8	9
No	14	13	10	14	13
Depends	1	1	2	1	1
Already in civil defense	1	2	1	-	1
Don't know	*	-	1	1	*
Not ascertained	2	2	*	2	2
Inapplicable - did not indicate willingness to sign up for civil defense training	52	44	31	32	38
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

* Less than one-half of one percent.

Characteristics of People Willing to Participate

The tables presented thus far in this chapter point out the fact that there are wide differences among people in their willingness to participate in civil defense activities. More than half the sample express unwillingness to give time to civil defense. What are the characteristics which distinguish the willing individuals from the unwilling?

Concern about war and willingness

People who report that they are concerned about the possibility of another world war are more likely to be willing to volunteer. Those who feel that the United States is in danger of enemy attack in the event of war are also more likely to express willingness.

Table 52

Relation Between War Concern
and Willingness to Volunteer**

(Metropolitan Sample only)

<u>Willingness</u>	<u>Very Much Concerned</u>	<u>Concerned</u>	<u>Not Concerned</u>	<u>Completely Unconcerned</u>
Willing to give time	50%	46%	44%	32%
Pro-con, depends	5	5	4	5
Unwilling to give time	41	46	51	60
Already in CD	2	2	1	1
Don't know	2	1	*	1
Not ascertained	-	*	*	1
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

* Less than one-half of one percent.

** "Is the possibility of a world war breaking out bothering or concerning you much or not?"

Table 53

Relation Between Concern About
Attack and Willingness**

(Metropolitan Sample only)

<u>Willingness</u>	<u>Very much Concerned</u>	<u>Concerned</u>	<u>Not Concerned</u>	<u>Completely Unconcerned</u>
Willing to give time	53%	48%	43%	31%
Pro-con, depends	4	6	3	9
Unwilling to give time	42	43	52	57
Already in CD	-	1	1	2
Don't know	-	1	1	-
Not ascertained	1	1	*	1
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

* Less than one-half of one percent.

** "Would you say that you personally get at all concerned or bothered about any of these dangers (ways in which an enemy might attack us)?"

Information level and willingness

People who have an accurate notion of the meaning and purpose of civil defense are more likely to express willingness to volunteer.

Table 54

Relation between Understanding of
"Civil Defense" and Willingness

(Metropolitan Sample only)

<u>Willingness</u>	<u>Generally accurate Understanding</u>	<u>Inaccurate or Vague Understanding</u>	<u>Complete Lack of Understanding</u>
Willing to give time	51%	41%	41%
Pro-con, depends	3	5	6
Unwilling to give time	44	51	49
Already in CD	2	1	-
Don't know	*	1	2
Not ascertained	*	1	2
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

* Less than one-half of one percent.

! There is evidence that people who have heard or read of their community's civil defense activities are more willing to give their time to civil defense.

Table 55

Relation between Information about Civil Defense
Activity and Willingness**

(Metropolitan Sample only)

<u>Willingness</u>	<u>Has Heard or Read Something</u>	<u>Has not Heard or Read Anything</u>
Willing to give time	53%	41%
Pro-con, depends	4	5
Unwilling to give time	42	51
Already in civil defense	1	1
Don't know	*	1
Not ascertained	-	1
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

* Less than one-half of one percent.

** "Have you heard or read anything recently about what civil defense is doing or planning to do to protect your community?"

Evaluation of present city set-up and willingness

People who felt their community could do a good job in the event of enemy attack were less likely to be willing to volunteer than those who rated their city set-up as inadequate. It is not immediately clear why this relationship exists. It may be that people who rate their city set-up high are operating at a level of wishful thinking -- a blind faith in city officials' ability to protect their citizens without any need for the citizens to participate actively themselves. If this is the case, it would indicate a need to convince these people that they have a false sense of security, that more active cooperation from citizens is necessary for the achievement of a strong civil defense organization.

Table 56

Relation between Evaluation of City's
Present Set-up and Willingness

(Metropolitan Sample only)

<u>Willingness</u>	<u>Evaluation: City could do a --</u>		
	<u>Good Job</u>	<u>Poor Job</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>
Willing to give time	42%	56%	26%
Pro-con, depends	4	4	9
Unwilling to give time	51	37	63
Already in CD	2	1	-
Don't know	1	1	1
Not ascertained	-	1	1
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

The data presented in the preceding tables provide a clue to the manner in which the general level of willingness may be raised. This may perhaps be best accomplished if the civil defense organizations keep citizens informed about their activities and plans, but at the same time emphasize the fact that the job is far from being done, that the civil defense set-up is inadequate unless every citizen contributes his share. If people get the impression that the city is already well prepared, they are apt to think that their assistance is not needed.

Age and sex composition and willingness

Other characteristics which appear to be related to willingness to participate in civil defense activities are age and sex. Men are more willing than women to volunteer; in addition, they express a greater willingness to take an active part in civil defense. In regard to age, people under 45 are more likely to express willingness to volunteer. Age is also a determining factor in willingness to take an active part in civil defense.

Table 57

Relation between Sex and
Willingness to Volunteer

(Metropolitan Sample only)

<u>Willingness</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>
Willing to give time	49%	39%
Pro-con, depends	5	5
Unwilling to give time	44	52
Already in civil defense	2	1
Don't know	*	2
Not ascertained	*	1
	<hr/> 100%	<hr/> 100%

* Less than one-half of one percent.

Table 58

Relation between Sex and Willingness
to Take an Active Job

(Metropolitan Sample only)

<u>Willingness</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>
Willing to take active part	29%	19%
Pro-con, depends	2	1
Unwilling to take active part	65	77
Already in civil defense	2	1
Don't know	*	*
Not ascertained	2	2
	<hr/> 100%	<hr/> 100%

* Less than one-half of one percent.

Table 59

Relation between Age and
Willingness to Volunteer

<u>Willingness</u>	<u>Age</u>			
	<u>21-35</u>	<u>36-44</u>	<u>45-59</u>	<u>60 and over</u>
Willing to give time	48%	53%	42%	28%
Pro-con, depends	3	7	6	3
Unwilling to give time	48	38	50	68
Already in civil defense	1	1	1	*
Don't know	-	1	1	*
Not ascertained	-	*	-	1
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

* Less than one-half of one percent.

Table 60

Relation between Age and Willingness
to Take an Active Job

<u>Willingness</u>	<u>Age</u>			
	<u>21-35</u>	<u>36-44</u>	<u>45-59</u>	<u>60 and over</u>
Willing to take active part	28%	29%	22%	10%
Pro-con, depends	1	1	2	*
Unwilling to take active part	68	67	73	87
Already in civil defense	1	1	1	*
Don't know	-	*	*	-
Not ascertained	2	2	2	3
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

* Less than one-half of one percent.

ADDITIONAL TABLES

Table 61
"Have you signed up for civil defense
work in the last two years?"

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Yes	3%	5%	1%	2%	3%
No	96	95	99	97	96
Not ascertained	1	*	*	1	1
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

*

Less than one-half of one percent.

Table 62

"Are you now in civil defense work of any sort?"

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Yes	2%	3%	1%	1%	2%
No	97	95	99	98	97
Not ascertained	1	2	-	1	1
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

Table 63

"Do you know anybody doing work in civil defense?"

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Yes	17%	17%	10%	7%	12%
No	82	82	90	92	87
Not ascertained	1	1	-	1	1
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

Table 64

"Where did you hear (or read) it (asking people to get into civil defense work)?"

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Newspapers	18%	17%	10%	8%	12%
Radio	15	8	3	2	6
Television	6	3	1	*	2
Personal contact	5	4	2	1	3
Notices, posters	5	*	-	-	1
Organized groups	3	3	*	2	2
Booklets, pamphlets	1	2	1	-	1
Don't know	1	*	2	1	1
Not ascertained	2	1	1	1	1
Inapplicable (had not heard about recruitment)	55	66	83	85	75
	**	**	**	**	**

** Totals more than 100% because some respondents gave more than one answer.

Table 65

"Here is a list of jobs that people working for civil defense will be asked to do. Which of these would you be most likely to sign up for if you were asked to volunteer? What other things would you be willing to do?"

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Firefighting	10%	10%	15%	15%	13%
Air raid or block warden	12	10	9	6	9
Police work	8	5	13	11	9
First aid and care of injured	26	27	32	27	28
Getting housing for people, taking care of children	31	32	37	45	37
Rebuilding, cleaning up	9	8	10	17	12
Transportation work	16	17	27	24	21
Clerical records, office work	18	20	20	10	16
Messenger service, communication	9	6	8	7	7
Other	2	3	1	2	2
Anything	12	12	24	13	15
Already in CD	1	2	-	*	1
Don't know	*	1	-	*	*
Unwilling to work in civil defense	17	24	10	11	15
Not ascertained	2	*	1	1	1
	**	**	**	**	**

* Less than one-half of one percent.

** Totals more than 100% because some respondents gave more than one answer.

Chapter 6

CITY DIFFERENCES

City Differences Striking

The number of interviews obtained from the larger metropolitan areas was sufficient to allow approximate comparisons among these cities. So it is possible to get an indication of the cities in which the civil defense program has been more effective. It is obvious from the tables that appear below that striking differences among cities do occur. This suggests that a well-organized and well publicized civil defense program can have a decided effect on people's attitudes and information level. Cities used for comparison purposes include Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Los Angeles, New York, Philadelphia, St. Louis, and San Francisco-Oakland.*

The reader should use considerable caution in judging the relative merits of a city's program from the figures given here. No percentage figure computed from just a sample of the total population can be a perfectly precise estimate of the total population figure; even with a very large sample, the estimate may be a few percentage points off, one way or the other, and the smaller the sample becomes (that is, the smaller the number of people interviewed in any one place), the larger this error might be. For example, there were 211 people interviewed in New York, so the figures shown here would probably not be off by more than 8%. But for St. Louis, where only 63 people were interviewed, the percentages might be as much as 15% off. Appendix B shows approximate "sampling errors" for each of the eight cities.

Understanding of Civil Defense

A substantially higher proportion of New York residents understand the meaning of "civil defense" than the average proportion for the other cities listed.

Table 66

Understanding of "Civil Defense"	New York	Chi- cago	Phila- delphia	Detroit	San Francisco	Los Angeles	St. Louis	Cleve- land
Generally accurate	70%	60%	60%	58%	55%	54%	51%	44%
Inaccurate or vague	21	30	25	18	26	28	17	34
Don't know	8	8	14	19	16	15	27	21
Not ascertained	1	2	1	5	3	3	5	1
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

* In the remainder of this chapter, reference is made to "San Francisco", but this term includes both San Francisco and Oakland.

Knowledge of Civil Defense Activities

Residents of Chicago are less likely to have heard about the activities or plans of their civil defense organization. Although a substantial proportion of Chicago residents are familiar with the meaning of "civil defense" (see Table 66), only a very small percent report any civil defense activity in their city.

Table 67

[illegible]

* Less than one-half of one percent.

Information about Personal Safety Measures

One index of the degree to which civil defense organizations are keeping the public informed is the proportion of people who report hearing about ways to protect themselves in an atomic bomb attack. Residents of San Francisco and New York are more likely to know about means of personal protection than are people in other large cities.

Table 68

[illegible]

Civil Defense Activities in Schools and Places of Employment

In New York and San Francisco more than half of the respondents mention civil defense activities which the schools are conducting. The proportion is considerably lower in other cities, especially in Chicago and St. Louis. A similar pattern exists for knowledge of civil defense in places of employment.

Table 69

[illegible]

Table 70

[illegible]

Knowledge of Recruiting Program

People in the New York and San Francisco areas are more likely to know about requests for volunteers in civil defense. Only about one Chicago resident in six and one St. Louis resident in five has heard of recruiting programs.

Table 71

<u>Heard about Recruiting?</u>	<u>New York</u>	<u>San Francisco</u>	<u>Detroit</u>	<u>Cleve- land</u>	<u>Phila- delphia</u>	<u>Los Angeles</u>	<u>St. Louis</u>	<u>Chi- cago</u>
Yes	68%	62%	53%	50%	38%	32%	19%	16%
No	32	37	44	50	62	68	81	84
Not ascertained	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	-
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

Volunteering for Civil Defense

New York ranks highest in the proportion of people who have thought about signing up for civil defense, while Chicago and St. Louis residents are least likely to have given thought to this matter. This may possibly be explained by the lack of knowledge of civil defense activities in the two latter cities.

Table 72

<u>Thought about Volunteering?</u>	<u>New York</u>	<u>Cleve- land</u>	<u>Phila- delphia</u>	<u>San Francisco</u>	<u>Detroit</u>	<u>Los Angeles</u>	<u>St. Louis</u>	<u>Chi- cago</u>
Yes	28%	25%	22%	21%	18%	15%	13%	7%
No	63	61	72	70	65	81	83	92
Already volunteered	6	3	3	9	2	-	2	-
Not ascertained	3	11	3	-	15	4	2	1
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

It is interesting to note that while New Yorkers are more likely to have thought about signing up for civil defense, a smaller proportion of them express willingness to volunteer than do residents of other large cities. One may speculate that this is due to the fact that New Yorkers, in thinking about signing up, have come to a definite decision, positive or negative, while residents of other cities are considering the question for the first time and do not realize what volunteering will demand of them. But there is insufficient evidence to support this speculation at the present time.

Table 73

Willing to Volunteer?	Phila- delphia	Cleve- land	Detroit	Los Angeles	Chi- cago	San Francisco	St. Louis	New York
Yes	56%	55%	51%	47%	47%	41%	41%	34%
Pro-con, might, depends	3	3	9	5	6	10	3	3
No	40	41	36	45	47	46	54	60
Already in civil defense	-	-	-	2	-	3	2	2
Don't know	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	1
Not ascertained	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	*
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

* Less than one-half of one percent.

Evaluation of Present City Set-up

Residents of Cleveland, Chicago, and Los Angeles are less optimistic than people in other cities about their city's ability to take care of citizens after an atomic attack. People in New York, Philadelphia, and San Francisco express greater than average optimism, but even in these three cities less than half of the respondents feel that their city set-up is adequate.

One should note the large percentage of people who admit that they don't know how well their city is set-up. This may be considered another indication of lack of information about civil defense activities.

Table 74

Rating of City Set-up	New York	Phila- delphia	San Francisco	St. Louis	Detroit	Los Angeles	Chi- cago	Cleve- land
Good job	42%	41%	40%	31%	29%	23%	23%	19%
Pro-con	6	6	10	11	11	7	6	3
Poor job	31	34	26	45	41	43	37	49
Don't know	18	16	21	13	15	24	34	22
Not ascertained	3	3	3	-	4	3	*	7
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

* Less than one-half of one percent.

Knowledge of Drills and Tests

Within the past year, major civil defense drills have been held in New York City and San Francisco.* A small fraction of the people in these two cities do not know that the drills have taken place.

Table 75

Knowledge of Occurrence of Drills or Tests	New York	San Francisco	Chi- cago	Cleve- land	Los Angeles	Phila- delphia	Detroit	St. Louis
Yes, had <u>definite</u> drills	77%	74%	32%	31%	17%	15%	12%	11%
Yes, had only minor tests (sounded sirens, etc.)	6	16	7	26	9	15	22	6
No	14	10	61	37	71	69	60	76
Don't know	2	-	-	3	2	-	2	5
Not ascertained	1	-	-	3	1	1	4	2
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

* A major drill was also held in Boston, but there were not enough interviews taken in Boston to allow comparisons with other cities.

Respondents who reported that drills had taken place in their cities were asked what they thought of them. In New York the ratio of favorable comments to unfavorable ones is about three to one. In San Francisco, there are almost as many unfavorable comments as favorable ones, especially comments to the effect that citizens did not pay attention to instructions. Minor drills held in Cleveland appear to have been regarded unfavorably, since adverse comments outweigh favorable ones by a ratio of four to one.

Table 76

[illegible]

* Less than one-half of one percent.

Knowledge of the Air Raid Warning Signal

As one might expect, residents of San Francisco and New York, where major drills were held recently, are more likely to know what the warning signal is than residents of most other cities; although Philadelphia also has a sizeable proportion of accurate responses.

Table 77

[illegible]

Overall Effect of Major Drills

New York and San Francisco rank above other metropolitan areas in several respects. People in these cities are more likely to have heard about recruiting programs. They are more likely to have information about personal safety measures in the event of an atomic attack. A larger proportion of these people report civil defense activities at school and work. They are more likely to rate their city set-up adequate than residents of other cities.

A greater proportion of New York and San Francisco respondents mention that major drills have taken place, and their evaluations of the drills are in general more favorable than those given by respondents in other cities. A much smaller proportion of New York and San Francisco residents report that they do not know what the warning signal is. Finally, these people are less likely to be willing to volunteer for civil defense than the average city resident.

Are these differences between New York and San Francisco residents, and residents of the other cities, a consequence of the civil defense drills? At first glance this would appear to be so, but other data show that some of these differences existed even before the drills took place. Respondents from these same cities were asked some of the same questions on the survey of August, 1951. Results of that study also show that, even then, people from New York and San Francisco were more likely to assign a good rating to their city set-up and to be less willing to volunteer for civil defense work. In other words, with respect to these questions people exhibited the same pattern of attitudes before and after the drills.

So, it is not possible at present to assess the effects of the drills in anywhere near adequate fashion. They undoubtedly increased public knowledge of closely related aspects of civil defense, such as the air raid warning signal. But whether they had a positive or negative effect - or no effect at all - on more complex attitudes, such as extent of concern about war and bombing, or the perceived urgency of civil defense, cannot be answered without more intensive study of the communities both before and after major drills.

ADDITIONAL TABLES

Table 78

"Now, speaking for yourself, how likely do you think it is that we're in for another world war?"

[illegible]

Table 79

"Is the possibility of a world war breaking out bothering or concerning you much or not?"

[illegible]

Table 80

"How do you feel about the ability of the army, navy, and air forces to protect our cities in case they are attacked?"

[illegible]

Table 81

"Well, suppose that enemy planes tried to make a surprise attack on cities like Chicago, Philadelphia, and Washington: How many of the enemy planes do you think would get through and bomb our cities? Would you think most of them would get through, only a few would get through or what?"

[illegible]

Table 82

"How about a really active job where you would organize people in this block (or community, or apartment house) for civil defense work and get things started; would you be willing to do this? (If R says there already is a warden in his block) Well, would you be willing to help in out him organizing the block?"

Willingness to take active part in civil defense	Chi cago	Cleve- land	Detroit	Los Angeles	Phila- delphia	St. Louis	San Francisco	New York
Yes	12%	15%	14%	13%	14%	11%	13%	16%
Yes, qualified:								
probably would,								
think so, suppose so	4	10	10	7	14	13	7	9
Pro-con, might	-	-	-	2	-	1	1	*
No, qualified: prob-								
ably won't, don't								
think I would	6	15	8	11	5	2	7	3
No	25	10	17	13	22	13	12	7
Depends	1	-	1	1	1	-	-	*
Already in civil defense	-	-	-	2	-	1	3	3
Don't know	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-
Not ascertained	2	6	4	2	1	5	4	-
Inapplicable - did not indicate will- ingness to sign up for civil defense training	49	44	45	48	43	54	53	62
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

* Less than one-half of one percent.

- - - - -

Chapter 7

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RURAL POPULATION

- - - - -

The Problem of Rural Civil Defense

For the first time in the series of three surveys on public reactions to civil defense, it was possible in April, 1952, to expand the scope of the study beyond the metropolitan population and investigate the characteristics of people living outside of the eleven largest cities. It would be profitable to undertake a detailed analysis of the respondents in each of the three non-metropolitan population groups indicated in the tables of previous chapters. But for the purposes of this report, we shall concentrate on the extreme rural group only.

The reason that the rural group is of particular interest is that the areas in which these people reside present unique problems for civil defense. It is highly unlikely that they would be the direct targets of enemy attack in the event of war. Effects of bombing would be largely secondary: certain kinds of weapons - chemical or bacteriological - might spread from their primary urban targets to rural areas; residents of bombed or endangered cities might be evacuated to the country, and thus put a severe strain on transportation, food, and housing facilities of rural areas.

So a primary civil defense job in the open country might well be that of conditioning the residents to the idea of a mass overflow from the cities and enlisting their help in preparing to take care of evacuees, rather than teaching them what to do if the air raid alarm sounds.

The Rural Sample

Of the estimated 20 million adults living in open country areas, 150 were interviewed in the present survey. It may seem unwarranted to talk about the entire rural population from data on only 150 cases, but the scientific sampling procedure of the Survey Research Center was set up to enable us to do just that. These interviews were scattered at random through 16 states, which had been selected at random, so that each of the open country adult residents had an equal or known chance of being chosen as a respondent. Therefore, within the limits of "sampling error" - which have been calculated precisely - it is possible to say that the characteristics reported here very likely represent accurately those of the entire rural population. This does not mean that any particular country settlement is represented by these figures - there are wide deviations and many atypical cases - but, for the country as a whole, and on the average, these results may be regarded as accurate.

Preliminary Findings from the Survey

Some people have expressed the notion that there exists a wide cleavage of interest between urban and rural residents - to the extent of mutual resentment - which would make rural people extremely unsympathetic with the problems of "city folks" and unwilling to help them out in time of crisis. This may be true in a very broad sociological sense, but, in the realm of civil defense, at least, the present study failed to detect such a cleavage. Rural respondents reacted overwhelmingly in favor of the suggestion that they be ready to help city residents in time of war disaster.

Table 83

"If _____ (nearby city) _____ were bombed there would be a lot of homeless people. How do you think people farther out here in the country would feel about taking care of them in their homes?"

Reaction

Very favorable	40%
Favorable	42
Favorable, with qualifications	7
Neutral or unfavorable	1
Don't know	5
Not ascertained	5
	<hr/> 100%

Table 84

"Another plan is that people around here would get prepared to get into other parts of the country after an air raid and help cities that had been bombed. How would you feel about this?"

Reaction

Very favorable	10%
Favorable	46
Favorable, with qualifications	20
Neutral or unfavorable	13
Don't know	8
Not ascertained	3
	<hr/> 100%

Tables in previous chapters which compared rural respondents with those of other population groups showed that the former were considerably less informed about matters which had been heavily publicized in the larger cities (such as meaning of "Civil Defense," personal protective measures or air raid warning signals), but that on topics which had received less active publicity (such as mortality radius of atomic bombs, extent of protection from air attack or biological and chemical warfare) the differences were very small or non-existent.

While less than 10% of the rural people have heard of any civil defense activity "around here," two-fifths of them think that civil defense is needed.

Table 85

"Well, do you think there really is any need to have a civil defense set-up around here at the present time?"

Yes, definitely	4%
Yes	35
Pro-con	4
No	38
No, definitely	7
Don't know	9
Not ascertained	3
	<hr/> 100%

The most frequent reasons for having a civil defense organization had to do with the "need to be prepared"; while nearly all the reasons for not having one were "because there's no danger around here." Few respondents reported spontaneously any concern over urban residents or anticipated a need to take care of them in the event of enemy attack. Before the specific questions reported in tables 83 and 84, interviewers asked them if they thought it likely that any place nearby would be bombed, and if so, how would it affect them. A negligible proportion volunteered the suggestion that city people might be evacuated to their areas. So it is probably fair to say that, while rural people express great willingness to do that kind of a job when they are asked specifically about it, they haven't yet given the problem much thought. Whether or not further consideration of the difficulties involved would make them less willing is a question which can't be answered at present.

Table 86

"How likely do you think it is that any place in this state or area would be bombed if war were to break out?"

Very likely	7%
Likely	51
Perhaps	8
Unlikely	19
Very unlikely	1
Don't know	9
Not ascertained	5
	<hr/> 100%

Table 87

"If any of these places were bombed, do you think it would affect people living right around here?"

Yes, definitely	15%
Yes; yes, qualified	29
No; no, qualified	14
No, definitely	2
Don't know	2
Not ascertained	4
Inapplicable - respondent did not mention places likely to be bombed	34
	<hr/> 100%

Table 88

"How would it affect them?"

Economic effects: food, supplies, jobs, prices "around here"; lose market in the city	14
Heighten anxiety of people around here	8
City people would be evacuated; we would take care of them	7
Effects of weapons used in the city might spread to here - gas, poisoned water, etc.	5
Disrupt transportation	4
Weapons might be used here directly	2
They might need help in the city	2
Other effects	4
Don't know	2
Not ascertained	5
Inapplicable - respondent did not anticipate any effects or did not mention places likely to be bombed	52
	<hr/> **

** Totals more than 100% because some respondents mentioned more than one possible effect.

ADDITIONAL TABLES

Table 89

(Rural Only)

"In the last year or so, have you read or heard anything about the effects of atomic bombs; that is, what happens when an atomic bomb explodes? What sort of things have you read or heard?"

Physical destructive power	22%
Extent of killing, death, injury	20
Test, experiments	12
Radiation effects	8
Heat effects, burns	6
Protective measures	5
Destruction of animal life, vegetation	3
Other	5
Heard something, DK what	5
Heard nothing	32
Not ascertained	4
	<hr/>
	**

* Totals more than 100% because some respondents gave more than one answer.

Table 90

(Rural Only)

"Have you seen or heard of anything going on in civil defense around here?"

Yes	8%
No	89
Not ascertained	3
	<hr/>
	100%

Table 91

"Why (is a civil defense set-up needed -
or not needed - around here)?"

REASONS FOR HAVING CIVIL DEFENSE

Need to be prepared	27%
Need to be educated, or to know what to do	8
So we can help others (cities)	2
Other reasons	2
Don't know	1
Not ascertained	3

REASONS FOR NOT HAVING CIVIL DEFENSE

No danger (general)	13
No danger - too far out	3
No danger - no emergency	5
No danger - no targets	11
No danger - population not dense	6
Other reasons	4
Don't know	1
Not ascertained	2
Don't know or not ascertained whether there is need for civil defense or not	12
	<hr/> 100%

Table 92

(Rural Only)

(If respondent mentioned no places that were likely
to be bombed) "If (nearest city) were bombed, do
you think it would affect people living around here?"

Yes definitely	2%
Yes	13
No	7
No, definitely	3
Don't know	6
Not ascertained	7
Inappropriate -- question not asked since respondent had mentioned places likely to be bombed (see Table 87)	62
	<hr/> 100%

Table 93

(Rural Only)

"How would it affect them?" (If the city
mentioned by interviewer were bombed)

Heighten anxiety of people around here; they would get excited	5%
City people would be evacuated; we would take care of them	3
Other effects	7
Don't know	1
Not ascertained	9
Inappropriate - respondent had mentioned cities so his response was included in Table 88, or else effects were not anticipated	77
	<hr/>
	**

** Totals more than 100% because some people mentioned more than one effect.

Appendix A

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA
CIVIL DEFENSE STUDY
APRIL 1952

The sample was distributed geographically as follows:

- a) 11 major cities: 974 interviews
- b) Cities over 50,000 population and metropolitan suburbs: 186 interviews
- c) Cities between 2,500 and 50,000 population: 147 interviews
- d) Towns under 2,500 population and rural (there were 150 rural interviews): 252 interviews

Demographic percentages for these four population groups are presented in the following tables, together with the percentages for the total national sample.

<u>1. SEX</u>	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Small Town and Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Male	44%	38%	48%	48%	45%
Female	56	62	52	52	55
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

<u>2. RACE</u>					
White	88%	92%	88%	93%	89%
Negro	11	6	9	4	9
Other	1	1	1	1	1
Not ascertained	-	1	2	2	1
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

Demographic Data (continued)

<u>3. AGE</u>	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Small Town and Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
21-25	8%	8%	14%	5%	8%
26-29	8	9	7	6	7
30-34	15	12	12	15	15
35-39	10	12	11	14	11
40-44	12	12	7	9	11
45-49	11	10	8	12	10
50-54	8	10	9	11	9
55-59	8	9	7	6	7
60-64	7	8	5	7	7
65 & over	12	10	19	13	14
Not ascertained	1	*	1	2	1
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

4. MARITAL STATUS

Married	71%	77%	75%	85%	73%
Divorced, separated	5	2	3	2	4
Widowed	11	14	15	9	12
Single	13	7	7	4	11
Not ascertained	*	-	-	-	*
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

5. NUMBER OF CHILDREN

None	54%	48%	49%	34%	51%
One	19	17	17	17	20
Two	16	18	14	21	16
Three	7	11	11	11	8
Four	2	3	5	8	3
Five	1	2	2	3	1
Six or more	1	1	2	6	1
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

6. AGES OF CHILDREN

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Small Town and Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
a) 0-5 yrs.	13%	14%	16%	12%	14%
b) 6-11 yrs.	7	10	3	5	7
c) 12-17 yrs.	5	5	7	8	5
d) 18-20 yrs.	4	3	4	4	4
e) both a) and b)	7	8	6	12	7
f) both a) and c)	1	2	1	1	1
g) both b) and c)	3	4	3	7	3
h) both c) and d)	2	1	4	4	2
i) other combinations	4	5	7	13	6
No children	54	48	49	34	51
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

7. NUMBER OF ADULTS
IN HOUSEHOLD

One	16%	13%	12%	10%	15%
Two	62	67	70	77	65
Three	14	14	14	9	13
Four	5	5	3	2	5
Five	2	1	1	2	2
Six or more	1	-	-	-	*
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

* Less than one-half of one percent.

8. OCCUPATION

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Small Town and Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
Professional and semi-professional	8%	12%	7%	6%	8%
Self-employed busi- nessmen and artisans; managers & officials	13	14	13	8	12
Clerical & sales; buyers agents & brokers	19	12	14	5	16
Skilled; semiskilled	30	34	26	24	30
Unskilled; service workers; farm laborers	14	12	12	10	13
Protective service; armed forces	1	1	1	*	1
Unemployed	2	2	1	2	2
Farm operators	-	1	7	31	5
Retired	7	9	10	8	7
Housewives	3	4	7	4	3
Students	1	-	2	*	1
Not ascertained	2	2	1	2	2
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

9. INCOME

Under \$2000	11%	11%	18%	24%	13%
\$2000-2999	16	16	24	20	17
\$3000-3999	25	22	15	22	23
\$4000-4999	19	23	19	17	19
\$5000-7500	18	18	15	9	17
Over \$7500	8	9	5	5	7
Don't know	1	1	2	2	2
Not ascertained	2	-	2	1	2
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

10. EDUCATION

	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Small City</u>	<u>Small Town and Rural</u>	<u>National</u>
None	3%	3%	1%	3%	2%
Some grade school	16	16	15	25	17
Completed grade school	17	13	18	21	17
Some high school	19	17	21	17	18
Completed high school	16	19	17	17	17
High school incom- plete, plus non- college training	5	4	3	4	5
Completed high school, plus non- college training	8	9	10	5	8
Some college	9	7	8	4	8
Completed college	7	11	7	3	7
Not ascertained	*	1	-	1	1
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

11. RELIGION

Protestant	42%	64%	82%	89%	53%
Catholic	43	33	13	10	35
Jewish	12	3	1	*	9
Other	2	*	2	*	2
No preference	1	*	1	1	1
Not ascertained	*	*	1	*	*
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

* Less than one-half of one percent.

APPENDIX B

When percentages from a sample of people are used to estimate the percentages for a total population, there is always a possibility of error. However, when scientific sampling procedures are used this margin of error can be calculated. For most of the percentages reported in the various tables, this error is negligible (not over 5%). But the smaller the sample of people, the larger the possible error becomes. So for cities, in which the numbers of people interviewed were 200 or less, it is necessary to exercise particular caution in interpreting the results from samples. For this reason the following table of "sampling errors" is appended. It may be read as follows: "Whenever a figure of around 75% appears for Detroit, it will probably* not be in error by more than 10%."

<u>City</u>	<u>If the Percentage Reported is Around:</u>		
	<u>50%</u>	<u>25% or 75%</u>	<u>10% or 90%</u>
Then the range of "sampling error" is within:			
Chicago	11%	10%	7%
Cleveland	15	13	9
Detroit	12	10	7
Los Angeles	11	10	7
Philadelphia	11	10	7
St. Louis	15	13	9
San Francisco-Oakland	15	13	9
New York	8	7	5

* "Probably" here means that the chances are only 1 in 20 that the figure is more than 10% off. If one is satisfied with a greater chance of being wrong - one chance in three, that is - then he can divide the percentages in the table by two.