

**UNCLASSIFIED**

---

**AD 404 511**

*Reproduced  
by the*

**DEFENSE DOCUMENTATION CENTER**

**FOR**

**SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION**

**CAMERON STATION, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA**



---

**UNCLASSIFIED**

NOTICE: When government or other drawings, specifications or other data are used for any purpose other than in connection with a definitely related government procurement operation, the U. S. Government thereby incurs no responsibility, nor any obligation whatsoever; and the fact that the Government may have formulated, furnished, or in any way supplied the said drawings, specifications, or other data is not to be regarded by implication or otherwise as in any manner licensing the holder or any other person or corporation, or conveying any rights or permission to manufacture, use or sell any patented invention that may in any way be related thereto.

**MICHIGAN  
STATE  
UNIVERSITY**

**Department of**

**COMMUNICATION**

**College of Communication Arts**

**404 511**

**THE VALLENT PROTECTION BOOKLET:**

**(I) Report of Public Attitudes Toward  
and Information about Civil Defense**

**David K. Berlo  
Erwin P. Bettinghaus  
Dan Costley  
Robert Van Dam**

**The FALLOUT PROTECTION Booklet:**  
**(I) A Report of Public Attitudes Toward**  
**and Information about Civil Defense**

**David K. Berlo**  
**Erwin P. Bettinghaus**  
**Dan Costley**  
**Robert Van Dam**

**Department of Communication**  
**College of Communication Arts**  
**Michigan State University**

**Communication Research Report**  
**April, 1963**

**Prepared for:**  
**Office of Civil Defense**  
**Department of Defense**  
**Contract #: OCD-OS-62-19**

**This report has been reviewed in the Office of Civil Defense and approved for publication. Approval does not signify that the contents necessarily reflect the views and policies of the Office of Civil Defense.**

**Qualified requestors may obtain copies of this report from DDC.**

### Acknowledgements

As is always the case in a study such as this, we are indebted to many people for the cooperation which made the study possible. First, those who collaborated with us in the collection of the telephone interview data. In Minneapolis, Bert Russick of Mid-Continent Surveys; in Boston, F. Earle Barcus of the Communications Research Center of Boston University; in Oklahoma City, Roger Nebergall, Chairman of the Department of Speech of the University of Oklahoma; in Santa Monica, California, Jack Lyle of Journalism at UCLA; in Manhattan, Kansas, Terry Welden of the Department of Speech at Kansas State; at Chapel Hill, North Carolina, Jim Mullen of Journalism at the University of North Carolina; and, at Seattle, Alex Edelstein of Journalism at the University of Washington. Each supervised the collection of data in his area and trained his own research staff to conduct our interview schedule.

At Michigan State, the processing of the data was completed under the direction of Dr. Verling Troidahl, Director of Data Processing for the Department of Communication. Pre-testing of the interview schedule was supervised by Mrs. Kay Bettinghaus.

Finally, we are indebted to Mr. Ralph Garrett and his colleagues of the Office of Civil Defense, Department of Defense, for their guidance, criticism, and financial support of the research reported here.

## Table of Contents

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	1
The Sample	1
Outline of the Report	3
Responses to the Questionnaire	5
The Likelihood of War	5
Personal Dangers: Protection from Direct Attack	6
Personal Dangers: Protection from Indirect Attack	8
Knowledge Level about Radiation and Shelters	10
Favorability of Beliefs about Radiation and Shelters	12
Levels of Shelter Construction Planning	15
Shelter Inducements and Inducement Agents	16
Level of Exposure to Shelter Information	18
General Media Behavior and Demographic Data	19
Attitudinal Correlates of Shelter Knowledge, Beliefs, and Plans	20
The Likelihood of War	20
The Timing of Nuclear War	22
Where the Bombs or Missiles Would Fall	23
Possibility of Protection Against Radiation	24
The Utility of Shelters	25
Summary and Discussion	26
Demographic Correlates of Attitudes Toward Nuclear War and Shelter Knowledge, Beliefs, and Plans	29
Role Within the Home	29
Age	31
Parental Status	32
Education	34
Home Ownership	36
Religious and Political Preference	36
Summary and Discussion	37
Appendix A: Responses to the Questionnaire in Each of Eight Cities	1-28
Appendix B: Attitudinal Correlates	1-15
Appendix C: Demographic Correlates	1-43

As part of our work under Contract OCD-OS-62-19 with the Office of Civil Defense, Department of Defense, we conducted a study of the impact of the Fallout Protection booklet which was published by OCD in December of 1961. While collecting data specific to that objective, we also were able to gather other useful information relevant to public information about and attitudes toward civil defense.

This report is the first of a series emanating from that study. In this report, we will present data on the accuracy of public knowledge about nuclear attack and civil defense, the favorability of public attitudes toward civil defense measures, public perceptions of the threat of nuclear war and the personal dangers represented by nuclear attack, the relative effectiveness of various shelter inducements and inducement agents, and the level of public exposure to shelter information. We also will present analyses of attitudinal and demographic correlates of shelter knowledge, belief, and plans.

Report #2 will relate attitudinal and informational responses to the level of personal interest in shelter construction. Report #3 will summarize a methodological study which compared the pre-test responses of those who responded, refused, or were non-reachable on the post-test. Finally, Report #4 will present the major findings of the impact of the Fallout Protection booklet.

#### The Sample

The sample was selected to provide information relevant to the communicative effectiveness of the Fallout Protection booklet. We were not specifically concerned with making generalizations to any particular population as to the audience size or impact of the booklet. We were primarily interested in making statements about what kinds of people read the booklet and what impact the booklet had on those who read it. At the same time, however, we did want a representative sample of respondents within the limitations of the

funds available for the study.

Within this context, we selected eight cities within the United States on the two criteria of size and geographical location. The test cities were: Minneapolis; Boston; Oklahoma City; Santa Monica, California; Lansing; Manhattan, Kansas; Chapel Hill, North Carolina; and Seattle.

For each city, pages of the telephone directory were selected randomly and every nth name from the top of each was selected as a respondent. Each respondent was contacted by telephone interviewers, and three call backs were made in an attempt to secure the interview. Alternate respondents, where needed, were selected by the same procedure.

The pre-test telephone interviews required approximately twenty minutes to complete and were conducted in the third week of December, 1961, approximately two weeks before the public issuance of the Fallout Protection booklet. In the first week of May, 1962, copies of the Fallout Protection booklet were sent to half of the respondents (selected randomly) and in the third and fourth weeks of May, we attempted to contact all of the respondents again.

This report includes data from the pre-test interviews only. A total of 3,514 respondents completed the interview. It should be emphasized that the data reported cannot be projected to the population with any statistical rigor. At the same time, however, in our judgment, the data are useful to those concerned with the question of the public's awareness of civil defense issues.

We say this for four reasons. First, the results among the eight test cities were surprisingly consistent. Where differences did occur, they can be accounted for in large part by differences in respondent age and education among the cities. Second, several questions are similar to those asked by us and others of national probability samples. The answers in the eight cities also are similar to those of the national surveys. Third, our national data



The third and final section reports an analysis of demographic correlates of attitudes toward nuclear war, and shelter knowledge, beliefs, and plans. We examined possible relationships between each of these variables and (a) the respondent's role within the home, (b) age, (c) parental status, (d) education, (e) home ownership, and (f) religious and political preferences. Again, the analyses are in Appendix C but are discussed in the text.

Responses to the Questionnaire

The Likelihood of War

We asked four questions related to the possibilities of a nuclear war. Three of the questions concerned the possibility of war, the timing of war, and general feelings of optimism or pessimism as to how things are going (see Table 1).

Table 1. Estimates as to the likelihood of a major war.

- 1.1 "One thing we're interested in is how people feel about the possibility of a major war occurring. In your opinion, is it likely or unlikely that there will be a major war between the U.S. and Russia or some other country?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Percentages</u>
Likely	34%
Unlikely	62
No answer	4
N (Sample Size)	3,514

- 1.2 "If a world war does come, when do you think it will come?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Percentages</u>
6 mo's or less	4%
6 mo's--2 years	16
Over 2 years	42
Not at all	30
No answer	8

- 1.3 "In general, do you think we are moving more toward war or more toward peace? (In other words, are things going well or badly?)"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Percentages</u>
Well (peace)	42%
Badly (war)	34
Neither	24

One respondent in three believed that war is likely and one in five believed that it will come within two years. Most people (62%), however, did not believe that war is likely, and three out of ten believed that it won't come at all. Finally, there was no consensus among the sample with respect to optimism or pessimism over the world situation. About one in three believed that we are moving more toward war, somewhat less than one in two believed we are moving more toward peace, and about one in four felt that the situation was neither getting better nor worse.

The final question postulated a situation in which the respondent was convinced that Russia wanted to start a war. In this context, Table 2 shows that about half of the sample would be in favor of an American first strike.

Table 2. Attitudes toward a U.S. "first strike."

"Suppose you were to become convinced that Russia would start a war. How do you feel about the U.S. striking first--before Russia had a chance to attack us? Would you be in favor of striking first or opposed?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Percentages</u>
In favor	49%
Opposed	37
Don't know-undecided	14

Personal Dangers: Protection from Direct Attack

Most respondents (70%) believed that bombs or missiles would fall on their community, and only one respondent in ten felt that his part of the country would escape direct attack in the event of war.

Given that bombs would fall on their home communities, the majority also believed that there is nothing that they could do now to protect

Table 3. Estimates as to where bombs or missiles would fall in the U.S., given an attack.

"If the U.S. is attacked, do you think any bombs or missiles would fall on (name of community)?" If answer was no, we asked: "Do you think this part of the country would be hit directly?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Percentages</u>
Community	70%
This part of country	18
Neither	10
No answer	2

themselves from blast, fire, or radioactive fallout. Understandably, they were more optimistic about possible protection from fallout (and fire) than they were about protection from direct blast effects. Only about one in four believed that he could do something to protect against blast but better than one in three believed that he could take action to protect against fallout.

Table 4. Estimates as to whether an individual can do something to protect against blast, fire, or fallout dangers--given that bombs or missiles will drop on or close to his community.

<u>Questions</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>		
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
1. Let's suppose that H-bombs or missiles were dropped on or close to (name of community). Do you feel that you could do something now to protect yourself from the blast of the bombs?	27%	73%	100%
2. Could you do something now to protect yourself from fire caused by bombs?	32	68	
3. Could you do something now to protect yourself from radioactive fallout?	36	64	

We were interested in the relationships among respondent estimates of the likelihood, timing, and location of attack and of their estimates as to whether they could do something to protect themselves against fall-out. Table 5 presents the percentage of the total sample which falls into each of the sixteen categories formed by a simultaneous analysis of these four questions.

Table 5. The percentage of respondents in each of sixteen categories formed from responses to four questions: is war likely, when will it occur, will bombs fall on your community, and is there something you could do now to protect against radioactive fallout.

<u>Likelihood</u>	<u>When Occur</u>	<u>My community</u>		<u>Not my community</u>		<u>Totals</u>
		<u>Protect</u>	<u>No protect</u>	<u>Protect</u>	<u>No protect</u>	
Likely	2 years or less	3%	6	1	2	12
	Over 2 years	6	9	2	3	20
	2 years or less	3	4	1	2	10
Unlikely	Over 2 years	14	25	7	12	58
	Totals	26	44	11	19	100%

Note: Percentages do not correspond exactly to Tables 1-4 because respondents who did not have an opinion on all four questions were eliminated.

#### Personal Dangers: Protection from Indirect Attack

Table 3 indicated that only 28% of the sample believed that their communities would escape a direct attack; however, we still were interested in respondents' perceptions of danger in the event of an indirect attack, as well as their perceptions as to the utility of shelters as a protective device.

Table 6 indicates that the respondents were split evenly on the question of whether they would be killed or injured by blast, given an indirect attack.

Table 6. Estimates of blast, fire, or fallout dangers to the individual--given that his community is not hit directly by bombs or missiles.

<u>Questions</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>		
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
1. Now let's suppose that (name of community) is not hit directly by bombs or missiles. Do you see any other dangers to you personally? For instance, do you think you would be killed or injured by the blast from bombs or missiles exploding somewhere else?	48%	52%	100%
2. Do you think you would be killed or injured by fire?	39	61	
3. Do you think you would be killed or made sick from fallout radiation?	77	23	

Interestingly, fewer people were concerned about fire than were concerned about blast. On the other hand, three out of four believed that they would die or become ill from fallout radiation--even if their community was not hit directly.

The salience of fallout as a perceived threat to life is obvious from the responses in Table 6. The question remained, to what extent did the respondents see fallout shelters as a protective device against radiation emanating from an indirect attack. On this point, three out of four respondents believed that shelters would provide some protection against fallout radiation; however, only 43% said that shelters would give the individual a "very good chance" of avoiding radiation sickness (see Table 7).

Table 7. Estimates of the utility of shelters in escaping radiation sickness.

"Let's think for a moment about people who live far enough away to escape the bomb blast. If these people had fallout shelters, what do you think their chances are for escaping serious radiation sickness from fallout? Do you think they would have a very good chance of avoiding radiation sickness, some chance, very little chance, or no chance of avoiding radiation sickness?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Percentages</u>
Very good chance	43%
Some chance	33
Very little chance	16
No chance	6
No answer	2

About one respondent in four saw shelters as providing two kinds of protection: slim and none.

#### Knowledge Level about Radiation and Shelters

Fourteen items were constructed to index public knowledge about nuclear radiation and fallout shelters. The items were selected from material covered in the Fallout Protection booklet, and were constructed primarily as one type of measure of the effectiveness of the booklet. These items can not necessarily be considered as a representative sample of the most important relevant information; however, they do provide some information as to both absolute and relative levels of public knowledge.

We hoped to combine the fourteen information items into one or two uni-dimensional scales; however, attempts to scale the items failed. Using a multiple scalogram analytic procedure, eleven scales were required to account for the variability of the fourteen items; i.e., practically none of the items allowed useful prediction of the responses to other items. Given this result, it was decided to report each item separately.

Table 8. Accuracy on 14 statements of fact relevant to nuclear radiation and fallout shelters.

Statements of Fact	Responses (in percentages)			
	Agree	Dis- agree	Don't Know	Total
1. If you get exposed to radiation at all, you are sure to die.	11	<u>80</u>	9	100%
2. Fallout from just one bomb may cover thousands of square miles.	<u>72</u>	17	11	
3. There is a new pill you can take that will protect you against radioactive fallout.	5	<u>64</u>	31	
4. If someone has radiation sickness, you should avoid getting near him so you won't catch it yourself.	18	<u>60</u>	22	
5. An atomic war would contaminate the water supply and almost everyone would die before the water was fit to drink again.	27	<u>58</u>	15	
6. An atomic war would destroy all food and ways of producing food, so you would die soon--even if you were protected by a shelter.	39	<u>54</u>	7	
7. A plastic suit with filtering mask is plenty of protection against fallout.	15	<u>48</u>	37	
8. Most fallout rapidly loses its power to harm people.	<u>43</u>	35	22	
9. After a nuclear attack, if you filter the dust out of the air, the air will be safe to breathe.	<u>39</u>	32	29	
10. The radioactivity after an attack would make the earth, or some areas of it, impossible to live in for years or even centuries.	48	<u>31</u>	21	
11. If we are attacked, great weather storms from the explosions would sweep the nation.	31	<u>29</u>	40	
12. A fallout shelter should have an air tight door to guard against radiation.	69	<u>21</u>	10	
13. Any adequate family shelter would cost at least three hundred dollars.	73	<u>13</u>	14	
14. You can not see fallout.	74	<u>11</u>	15	

Note: Statements are ordered in decreasing frequency of accuracy of responses. The answer corresponding to information presented in Fallout Protection is underlined.



Table 8. Accuracy on 14 statements of fact relevant to nuclear radiation and fallout shelters.

Statements of Fact	Responses (in percentages)			
	Agree	Dis- agree	Don't Know	Total
1. If you get exposed to radiation at all, you are sure to die.	11	<u>80</u>	9	100%
2. Fallout from just one bomb may cover thousands of square miles.	<u>72</u>	17	11	
3. There is a new pill you can take that will protect you against radioactive fallout.	5	<u>64</u>	31	
4. If someone has radiation sickness, you should avoid getting near him so you won't catch it yourself.	18	<u>60</u>	22	
5. An atomic war would contaminate the water supply and almost everyone would die before the water was fit to drink again.	27	<u>58</u>	15	
6. An atomic war would destroy all food and ways of producing food, so you would die soon--even if you were protected by a shelter.	39	<u>54</u>	7	
7. A plastic suit with filtering mask is plenty of protection against fallout.	15	<u>48</u>	37	
8. Most fallout rapidly loses its power to harm people.	<u>43</u>	35	22	
9. After a nuclear attack, if you filter the dust out of the air, the air will be safe to breathe.	<u>39</u>	32	29	
10. The radioactivity after an attack would make the earth, or some areas of it, impossible to live in for years or even centuries.	48	<u>31</u>	21	
11. If we are attacked, great weather storms from the explosions would sweep the nation.	31	<u>29</u>	40	
12. A fallout shelter should have an air tight door to guard against radiation.	69	<u>21</u>	10	
13. Any adequate family shelter would cost at least three hundred dollars.	73	<u>13</u>	14	
14. You can not see fallout.	74	<u>11</u>	15	

Note: Statements are ordered in decreasing frequency of accuracy of responses. The answer corresponding to information presented in Fallout Protection is underlined.

As shown in Table 8, the two "easiest" items concerned the effects of radiation and the diffusion of fallout. Eighty per cent of the sample answered correctly by disagreeing with the statement that death is sure, given exposure to radiation. Seventy-two per cent answered correctly by agreeing with the statement that fallout from just one bomb may cover thousands of square miles.

At the other end of the distribution, the two "hardest" items concerned the cost of a shelter and the visibility of fallout. Only 13% of the respondents accepted the statement that at least some adequate family shelters can be built for three hundred dollars or less. Only 11% disagreed with the incorrect statement that you can not see fallout.

Table 8 documents the proportion of this sample of respondents who responded correctly to each informational item.

#### Favorability of Beliefs about Radiation and Shelters

An additional eighteen items were constructed to index public beliefs about radiation and shelters. A "favorable" belief was defined as one consistent with the development of a shelter program. Again, we hoped to combine the items into a smaller number of uni-dimensional scales and again we were not successful. The multiple scalogram analysis indicated that fourteen separate scales would be necessary to account for responses to the eighteen items if minimally adequate reproducibility levels were to be maintained. It again was decided to report each item separately.

Table 9. Favorability of beliefs on 18 statements of opinion relevant to nuclear radiation and fallout shelters.

Statements of Opinion	Responses (in percentages)			
	Agree	Dis - agree	Don't Know	Total
1. Building a shelter is like hiding in a hole-- only a coward would do it.	7	<u>90</u>	3	100%
2. It is a person's duty to try to live as long as he or she can.	<u>89</u>	8	3	
3. An attack would destroy the morale of the U.S. so much that it would not be possible to rebuild the country.	11	<u>85</u>	4	
4. Building a shelter is wrong in the eyes of God.	7	<u>83</u>	10	
5. It would take a little while after an attack, but law and order would be restored.	<u>79</u>	14	7	
6. If we build shelters for everyone, war will be more likely to happen.	16	<u>75</u>	9	
7. If a person builds a family shelter, his neighbors and friends probably will laugh at him or think he is crazy.	24	<u>70</u>	6	
8. After an attack, life would be such a savage man-to-man struggle that it wouldn't be worth living through.	27	<u>66</u>	7	
9. There isn't any safe way to live in this world any more, so it's just a question of what chances or risks we want to take.	27	<u>66</u>	7	
10. I wouldn't want to live through an attack if I knew most of my friends and neighbors were dead.	30	<u>64</u>	6	
11. Most people have the space to put in a shelter if they really want one.	<u>64</u>	30	6	
12. Scientists don't understand things well enough to make predictions that we can rely on.	31	<u>59</u>	10	
13. The ending or saving of the world is up to the will of God. Man can't protect himself.	35	<u>57</u>	8	

Table 9 (continued)

<u>Statements of Opinion</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>			
	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Dis- agree</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>
14. Parents have a duty to protect their children by building a fallout shelter.	<u>52</u>	37	11	100%
15. A person who builds a shelter now will be respected by his neighbors.	<u>32</u>	51	17	
16. If an attack comes, a person with a shelter will have to protect it from neighbors who will try to break in.	59	<u>30</u>	11	
17. Living in a shelter for a long period of time would drive many people insane.	64	<u>29</u>	7	
18. Shelters cost more than most families can afford.	67	<u>25</u>	9	

Note: Statements are ordered in decreasing frequency of favorability of responses. The answer which is favorable to shelter construction is underlined.

Only 7% of the respondents said that building a shelter is like hiding in a hole, only 8% rejected the idea that a person has a duty to try to live as long as he or she can, and only 11% believed that an attack would destroy morale so much that the U.S. could not be rebuilt. These results are all encouraging to a civil defense program. On the other hand, two out of three respondents felt that shelters cost more than most families can afford, and that living in a shelter for a long period would drive many people insane. Furthermore, better than half of the sample felt that a person with a shelter would have to protect it from neighbors in case of an attack. Half also rejected the idea that a person who builds a shelter will be respected by his neighbors. These results are not encouraging to a shelter program.

Table 9 contains the percentage of favorable and unfavorable responses given to each of the eighteen opinion statements.

Levels of Shelter Construction Planning

Before asking respondents to talk about their own shelter planning or construction, if any, we asked them whether they thought the government desires a family shelter program. As indicated in Table 10, two-thirds of the sample

Table 10. Estimates as to whether the government desires a family shelter program.

"Do you think the government would like you to build a family fallout shelter or not?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Percentages</u>
Yes	66%
No	16
Don't know	18

correctly perceived that the government does (or, more accurately, did in December of 1961) want a family shelter program; however, a sixth of the sample said that they did not think the government desired such a program and the other sixth didn't know what the government wanted.

As illustrated above, two out of three respondents believed that the government desired a family shelter program, three out of four believed that shelters would help protect them against fallout radiation, and three out of four believed that fallout radiation would harm them in case of attack; however, only 1.4% of the respondents indicated that they had a shelter in their own home and only an additional 7% indicated that they had a specific plan to build a shelter. Four out of ten respondents indicated that they had thought about shelters but that they did not have any plans to build one. Better than half of the sample said that they had not thought about building a shelter and that they did not have any plans to build one.

Table 11. Respondent categories of planning, investigation, and construction of fallout shelters.

"Do you have any specific plans for building a shelter?" If answer was no, we asked: "Have you thought about building a shelter for your family?" If respondent said he had plans or said he had thought about building a shelter, we asked: "Have you investigated methods of building a shelter? For instance, have you talked to a builder, written away for literature, or things like that?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Percentages</u>
Has a shelter now	1.4%
Has plans and has investigated	5
Has plans but has not investigated	2
Has no plans but has thought and investigated	13
Has no plans and has thought but not investigated	27
Has no plans and has not thought	52

#### Shelter Inducements and Inducement Agents

We were interested in examining the possible impact which various shelter inducement programs might have on the public's willingness to construct shelters. We also were interested in the source credibility or impact of various individuals and organizations; i.e., the effect testimony from these sources might have on respondent attitudes.

Three out of four of the respondents said they would be willing to have a shelter if the government built it for them. This is the most extreme inducement suggested within the questionnaire and the one which secured the best reception from respondents. Respondents did not respond very favorably to the idea of having someone come to their home and explain shelter construction to them. The sample was split approximately fifty-fifty with respect to the value of (a) having the government provide the materials, (b) using a shelter for an extra room, or (c) deducting shelter expenses from their income tax.

Table 12. Estimates of the extent to which 5 possible shelter inducements would influence the decision to build a shelter.

Questions	Responses (in percentages)			
	Yes	No	Don't Know	Total
1. If the government offered to build you a free shelter, would you be willing to have one?	75%	22	4	100%
2. If the government provided the materials and asked you to provide the labor, would this make you more likely to build one?	56%	39	5	
3. If you could use a shelter for an extra room, would this make you more likely to build one?	52	46	2	
4. If the government allowed you to take your building expenses off your income tax, would this make you more likely to build a shelter?	47	50	3	
5. If someone offered to come to your house to explain how and where to build one, would this make you more likely to build one?	28	67	5	

Table 13. Estimates of the extent to which 5 possible communication sources would influence the decision to build a shelter.

Questions	Responses (in percentages)			
	Yes	No	Don't Know	Total
1. Would you want to know the recommendations given by physicists or other scientists?	79%	18	3	100%
2. Would you be interested in getting opinions of other public officials?	57	40	3	
3. If the President of the United States asked us to build a shelter, would it make any difference?	48	46	6	
4. Would the opinion of your church make any difference to you in your own plans?	33	64	3	
5. If several other people in your neighborhood built shelters, would this make any difference to you?	23	74	3	

Given the five kinds of communication sources mentioned in the questionnaire, the recommendations of physicists or other scientists would seem to carry most weight with the respondents (see Table 13). Eight out of ten would want to know what these recommendations are. On the other hand, only one in three felt that his church's opinion is relevant to his personal shelter plans and slightly less than one in four felt that his neighbors' shelter behaviors would affect his own.

#### Level of Exposure to Shelter Information

Seven out of ten respondents reported that they had noticed discussions of radiation and shelters in their local newspapers, about six out of ten said they had talked with others about shelters, and slightly less than half reported having read at least one shelter article in a national magazine.

Table 14. Level of public exposure to 12 possible communication situations involving nuclear radiation and fallout shelters.

<u>Questions</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>			
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>
1. Have you seen any discussions of radiation and shelters in your local newspapers.	70%	27	3	100%
2. Have you talked with anybody on either the advantages or disadvantages of fallout shelters?	59	40	1	
3. Some national magazines have had articles about radiation and shelters. Did you happen to read any of these articles?	47	49	4	
4. Have you received a copy of the government booklet called <u>Your Family Fallout Shelter</u> ?	18	78	4	
5. Have you read any other government literature on fallout shelters?	25	73	2	
6. Did you see the movie, <u>On the Beach</u> ?	17	81	2	
7. Did you read the book?" ( <u>On the Beach</u> )	12	87	1	
8. Have you gone out to hear any speeches about nuclear radiation and fallout?	14	85	1	



Table 14 (continued)

Questions	Responses (in percentages)			
	Yes	No	Don't Know	Total
9. Have you heard any sermons in church on the subject of fallout or fallout shelters?	13%	86	1	100%
10. Did you see the movie, <u>Hiroshima</u> ?	14	84	2	
11. Did you read the book of the same name?	11	88	1	
12. Have any fallout shelter salesmen contacted you?	4	95	1	

Other communication situations were less used. About one in five said he had received a copy of Your Family Fallout Shelter, one in four had read other government literature. One in seven or eight reported having seen or read On the Beach or Hiroshima, or having heard speeches or sermons about fallout shelters and nuclear radiation. One out of twenty-five said he had been contacted by a fallout shelter salesman.

#### General Media Behavior and Demographic Data

We indexed each respondent's use of the major public media (television, radio, and newspapers). We also obtained data on the usual demographic variables: age, number of children, education, home ownership, religious and political preference. These data are used in subsequent analyses. They are not of particular relevance to this report and are not reported here; however, detailed data for each city on each of these variables is included in Appendix A (see Tables 15-1 through 16-6).

### Attitudinal Correlates of Shelter Knowledge, Beliefs, and Plans

One of our research objectives is a better understanding of the determinants of public attitudes toward and knowledge about fallout shelters. The study reported here provides some preliminary information which is relevant to this area of concentration. In this section of the report, we will discuss the relationship to shelter knowledge, beliefs, and construction plans of respondent estimates of (a) the likelihood of war, (b) the timing of a war, (c) the closeness to the respondent of probable target areas, (d) the possibility of protection against attack, and (e) the utility of shelters as radiation protection.

All of the cross-tabulation analyses are presented in Appendix B of this report. The following discussion is based on those analyses.

#### The Likelihood of War (Tables B-I-1--B-I-3)

Thirty-four per cent of our total sample (N=3514) said that they thought that a major war between the U.S. and Russia or some other country was likely. Sixty-two per cent thought that such a war was unlikely. We compared the responses of these two groups on the (a) fourteen information items, (b) eighteen statements of opinion, and (c) questions related to thinking, planning, and constructing a home shelter.

People who believed that war is likely were slightly more knowledgeable about nuclear radiation and fallout shelters. The two groups did not differ appreciably on any one of the fourteen information items; however, the "war likely" group more frequently gave the correct answer on ten of the items and the "war unlikely" group was superior on only two. Only three of the items produced a significant difference between the two groups: people who thought

a war was likely were less likely to say that such a war would contaminate the water supply, destroy all ways of producing food, or cause great weather-storms to sweep the nation.

There also was a consistent (though small) difference between the two groups' attitudes toward nuclear radiation and fallout shelters. More of the "war likely" group held attitudes favorable to civil defense on twelve of the opinion statements, while "war unlikely" people held more favorable opinions on only four statements. Again, it should be emphasized that the differences on any single item were quite small. Only six items produced differences of five per cent or more, and the "war likely" group was more favorable on three of these and less favorable on the other three. With respect to these items, "war likely" respondents were less likely to believe that life wouldn't be worth living after an attack, less willing to agree that scientists don't understand things well enough to make reliable predictions, or that life is just a question of selecting among risks--given that there isn't any safe way to live. On the other hand, "war unlikely" respondents were more likely to believe that most people could find space for a shelter if they wanted one, that a person who builds a shelter will be respected by his neighbors, and that parents have a duty to protect their children by building a shelter.

People who thought war is unlikely were slightly more likely to have plans for building a shelter, and slightly less likely to report that they haven't thought about shelters; however, these differences were not statistically significant.

In summary, we did not find any sizable knowledge, opinion, or shelter plan differences between these two groups. From these data, one could argue

that perceptions as to the likelihood of war have only a slight relationship to shelter beliefs and plans. To the extent there is a difference, those who believe that war is likely are somewhat more knowledgeable about shelters, somewhat more favorable to shelters, and slightly less likely to have developed plans for building one.

The Timing of Nuclear War (Tables B-II-1--B-II-3)

Twenty per cent of our original sample estimated that a world war, if it comes, would come within two years. Forty-two per cent said war is at least two years away and thirty per cent said they did not believe a war would come at all. These three groups were compared with respect to knowledge, opinions, and shelter plans.

Knowledge about radiation and shelters consistently was higher among those who believed that a war would not come within the next two years. This group ranked first (or tied for first) in knowledge on thirteen of the fourteen items. There was no consistent or appreciable difference in knowledge levels between those who thought a war would come within two years and those who didn't think a war would come at all.

Similar findings were obtained for opinions about radiation and shelters. Those who thought a war was at least two years away held consistently and appreciably more favorable opinions about fallout shelters and civil defense. The "less than 2 years" and the "no war" groups did not differ from each other.

The three groups did not differ significantly in their plans or lack of plans for constructing a family shelter.

In summary, the data indicated that people who believed that there might be a war but that it will be at least 2 years away were more knowledgeable about and favorable to the construction of shelters; however, they were not

more likely than the other groups to have made plans for constructing their own shelter.

Where the Bombs or Missiles Would Fall (Tables B-III-1---B-III-3)

In our total sample, seventy per cent of the respondents said they believed that bombs or missiles would fall on their community in case of attack. Another eighteen per cent said that bombs would fall in their part of the country. Ten per cent said that their part of the country would escape direct attack. We compared these three groups' responses.

The highest level of knowledge about radiation and shelters was found in the group which believed that their communities would escape attack but that their part of the country would be hit. This group ranked first in information accuracy on thirteen of the fourteen information questions. There was no difference in knowledge level between those who thought their communities would be hit and those who thought their part of the country would escape.

There also were differences in the favorability of the three groups' opinions about radiation and shelters. The "not my community, but this area" group held the most favorable opinions toward civil defense, the "my community" group was next most favorable, and the "neither my community nor this part of the country" group was least favorable. These differences were consistent over most of the opinion items.

Of those who believed that bombs would fall in their area, forty-five per cent said they had not thought about building a shelter. This percentage was larger for the other two groups. Fifty-four per cent of the "my community" group admitted that they had not thought about building a shelter, and the corresponding figure for the third group was sixty per cent. Other than this, the three groups did not differ with respect to shelter planning.

A summary across these three analyses indicates that maximum knowledge about and favorability toward civil defense measures were possessed by those who believed that a war may be likely but that it won't come within two years and that the bombs would fall on their part of the country but not on their community.

Possibility of Protection Against Radiation (Tables B-IV-1---B-IV-3)

We asked all respondents whether they thought there was something they could do now to protect themselves against blast, fire, or fallout radiation. For our purposes, the question on radiation protection is most appropriate as a basis for comparison. Of the original sample, thirty-six per cent thought they could do something to protect themselves and sixty-four per cent didn't think so. We compared the knowledge, opinions, and shelter plans of these two groups.

This analysis produced striking differences. The group which thought they could do something to protect themselves were appreciably more knowledgeable about and favorable to civil defense. Their responses differed on every one of the fourteen information and eighteen opinion statements. Typically, the two groups differed by more than ten per cent in their responses to the items. Tables B-IV-1 and B-IV-2 report the percentage figures for the two groups.

The two groups also differed appreciably with respect to their shelter plans. Fifteen per cent of those who thought they could do something to protect themselves said that they had plans for building a shelter. Only four per cent of the other group said this. In addition, only thirty-nine per cent of the "can protect" admitted that they had not thought about a shelter at all.

Caution is needed in interpreting these data as to possible causal relationships. The data do not permit conclusions as to whether (a) people who

believe they can help themselves are more likely to develop favorable attitudes and plans about shelters or (b) people who learn and think more about building shelters are likely to convince themselves that they can protect themselves. The causal direction of this relationship is a crucial piece of information to the development of an effective public information program, and further research of an experimental nature is required. These data do indicate, however, that a respondent's belief as to the possibility of protection is highly related to his knowledge about, opinions toward, and plans to construct fallout shelters.

The Utility of Shelters (Tables B-V-1---B-V-3)

Seventy-six per cent of our sample stated that they thought shelters would provide a "very good" or "some" chance of escaping serious radiation sickness, provided that people were far enough away from the target area to escape blast effects. Twenty-two per cent said that shelters would provide "very little" or "no" chance of avoiding radiation. The final analysis reported here compares these two groups.

The results of this analysis are similar to those of the previous comparison of those who thought they could or could not protect themselves. The level of knowledge was consistently and appreciably higher for those who thought shelters would help. For two items (contamination of the water supply and destruction of ways of producing food) the percentage of correct answers for the "shelters help" group was almost twice as high as it was for the "shelters not help" group. The data reveal quite clearly that people who believe that shelters would help are significantly more knowledgeable about the effects of nuclear radiation.

Analysis of the opinion statements produced the same kind of result. The "shelters help" group was more favorable on all eighteen items. The two groups did not differ significantly in their beliefs as to whether a person has a duty to try to live as long as he can (both groups agreed quite strongly) or as to whether shelter owners will have to protect their shelters against their neighbors (approximately seventy per cent of both groups also agreed with this); however, on every other item, the "shelters help" group was significantly more favorable in their beliefs.

Not surprisingly, the two groups also differed with respect to their plans for building a shelter. Of the "shelters help" group, ten per cent said they had plans to build a shelter--as compared to only three per cent of the "shelters not help" group. Correspondingly, forty-eight per cent of the "help" group said they had not thought about building a shelter as compared to sixty-eight per cent of the "not help" group.

#### Summary and Discussion

The analyses reported above indicate that, for the variables under study, the maximally receptive audience for civil defense messages consists of those people who believe that war may be likely but it will not come within two years, who believe that if it does come bombs will fall in their part of the country but not in their own community, and who believe that there is something they could do now to protect themselves against nuclear radiation and that shelters would help. This group knew more about nuclear radiation and fallout shelters, and were most favorable in their opinions about things related to civil defense.

In contrast, the group which knew the least and which was least favorable in its opinions consisted of people who believed that war is unlikely but that if it does come at all it will come within two years, who believed that



bombs either would fall on their own communities or else not in their area of the country, and who believed that there is nothing they could do to protect against radiation effects and that shelters would not help.

Estimates as to the likelihood of war, the timing of an attack, and the probable target areas did not seem to be related to whether respondents had made plans to build a shelter. On the other hand, estimates as to whether something could be done to protect against radiation and as to whether shelters would help were significantly related to shelter planning. People who believed there was something they could do and that shelters were part of that something were significantly more likely to be planning to build shelters.

The analyses further indicated that views on protection and the utility of shelters were highly related to shelter knowledge and opinions. Estimates as to the likelihood, timing, and location of attack, though related to knowledge and opinions about shelters, were not efficient predictors of knowledge and opinion levels. Protection in general and shelters in particular were the crucial predictive variables.

One might reasonably have expected that both the perceived need for shelters (likelihood, timing, and location of attack) and the perceived value of shelters would be related to shelter knowledge and opinions. The fact that perceived need was not related as strongly as was perceived value tentatively supports the hypothesis that perceptions of need and of value operate quite differently as behavioral predictors. Such a hypothesis would suggest that perceived need would be required before people would translate their favorable attitudes into actual shelter-building or shelter-supporting behaviors. This type of hypothesis has important implications for shelter information programs; however, it needs considerable further testing before it can be deemed acceptable.

As mentioned earlier, caution also must be exercised in attributing causal properties to attitudes toward the utility of shelters. The data might indicate that shelter information programs should emphasize the utility of shelters as a major theme; however, again, further testing is needed to increase confidence in the hypothesis that belief in the utility of shelters is the crucial variable in predicting acceptance of a shelter policy. In any case, though, the relatively low level of public confidence in the utility of shelters reflected in this and other attitudinal studies would indicate that a considerable portion of a public information program effort should be devoted to messages on the utility of shelters.

The fact that the information and opinion statements were not combinable into even an ordinal measurement instrument provides indirect statistical evidence as to the lack of structure or consistency of existing public knowledge about or attitudes toward nuclear radiation and civil defense. The data indicated that one could not predict whether an individual would or would not know one piece of information--given that he did or didn't know another. The data indicated that one could not predict whether an individual was favorable or unfavorable toward one opinion statement--given that he was or wasn't favorable toward another.

This finding supports the conclusion reached by many that public knowledge and opinion are highly uncertain and unstructured in the civil defense area, that knowledge and opinion levels can be expected to change somewhat erratically for a time, and that a major public information program for or against shelter construction can be expected to have a significant effect on public attitudes and knowledge levels. From a methodological point of view, it also indicates that unusual care must be taken in the construction and combination of measuring instruments intended to tap information and attitudes.

Demographic Correlates of Attitudes Toward Nuclear War and  
Shelter Knowledge, Beliefs, and Plans

In the preceeding section of this report, we concentrated on the relationship between public estimates of such things as the likelihood, timing, and location of nuclear attack and attitudes, information, and planning about fallout shelters. This final section reports analyses of possible relationships between each of these variables and various demographic indices: role within the home, age, parental status, education, home ownership, religious and political preferences. We also related attitudinal and information responses to an index of "involvement" which was constructed by combining responses to the questions related to home ownership, parental status, and age. All of the cross-tabulation analyses are presented in Appendix C of this report. The following discussion is based on those analyses.

Role Within the Home (Tables C-I-1---C-I-9)

In the total sample, forty-seven per cent of the respondents were male heads of households and thirty-three per cent were wives. The remaining twenty per cent were female heads of households. We compared responses of these three groups on the major information and attitudinal items.

There were no striking differences among the three groups with respect to their opinions as to the likelihood and timing of war, the location of target areas, the personal danger to them resulting from attack and the possibilities of protection. In general, the men were somewhat more optimistic. Men were less likely to believe that war is likely, less likely to believe that bombs would fall on their community, more likely to believe that they could do something now to protect themselves, and less likely to think they would be killed or injured by blast, fire, or fallout. In no case, however, were the differences among the three groups sizable.

Male heads did not differ from wives in their estimates of the utility of shelters nor in the extent of their shelter plans. Both groups were more optimistic than the female heads in estimating the value of shelters and both groups had thought more than had the female heads about the construction of shelters.

On the fourteen statements of fact relevant to radiation and shelters, the men consistently knew more than did the women and the wives knew slightly more than did the female heads. More of the men gave the correct answer on thirteen of the fourteen questions and fewer of the female heads gave the correct answer on twelve of the questions. The three groups did not differ in their knowledge about the visibility of fallout--eight out of nine answered incorrectly in all three groups.

Male heads and wives were very similar in the favorability of attitude toward civil defense and fallout shelters. Female heads were consistently and significantly less favorable. On two of the items, females were more favorable than males. The females were less likely than the men to believe that neighbors and friends would laugh at a person who built a shelter or think he is crazy. They were more likely to believe that parents have a duty to protect their children by building a shelter. The three groups did not differ on whether a person with a shelter would have to protect it from neighbors. In all three groups, about seven out of ten people believed that a person would have to protect his shelter.

In summary, men were slightly more optimistic about the possibilities, timing, location and effects of attack than were women but the differences were not large. Female heads were minimally optimistic about the value of shelters and had thought least about building a shelter. Male heads and wives responded

similarly and were more favorable on our eighteen attitudinal questions than were female heads. Men also knew more than either of the two female groups and wives knew somewhat more than did female heads. Females were more favorable on two attitudinal items. One related to the parent-child responsibility for shelters and the other dealt with the social consequences of building a shelter; i.e., ridicule by one's neighbors and friends.

Age (Tables C-II-1---C-II-9)

Thirty-five per cent of the total sample were thirty-five years of age or younger. Another thirty-four per cent were between thirty-six and fifty. The remainder were over fifty years of age. These three groups differed significantly on most of our attitudinal and information questions, and the analyses indicated that people over fifty years of age present a special problem to civil defense advocates.

People over fifty responded least often that war is likely or that we are moving more toward war. Older people were somewhat more likely, however, to believe that if war does come, it will come in two years or less. Similarly, older people were more likely to believe that bombs would fall on their communities--or that they wouldn't fall anywhere in their part of the country. People under thirty-five were more likely to believe that bombs would fall in their part of the country.

The older the respondent, the less likely he was to believe that he could do something to protect against blast, fire, or fallout; however, he also was less likely to believe that he would be killed or made sick by fallout. The three age groups did not differ in their beliefs as to whether they would be killed or injured by blast or fire. Similarly, the older the respondent, the less likely he was to believe that shelters would help. Older respondents also

were less likely to have plans for building a shelter or even to have thought about building a shelter. Only four out of ten of those under thirty-five years of age said they hadn't thought about building a shelter whereas seven out of ten of those over fifty years of age said they had not thought about shelter building.

The "over fifty" group knew least on each of the fourteen information items and were least favorable toward most of the eighteen attitudinal statements. The two younger age groups were similar in their knowledge and attitudes; however, the youngest age group knew somewhat more and was somewhat more favorable.

With respect to favorability of attitudes, there were two or three interesting reversals of the above relationship. The three groups did not differ in their belief that it is a person's duty to try to live as long as he or she can nor did they differ in their belief that law and order would be restored eventually after an attack. The three groups also responded similarly with reference to a parent's duty to protect his children with a shelter and with reference to the respect a shelter builder would get from his neighbors. Finally, the youngest group actually was slightly less likely to believe that a shelter owner could avoid the necessity of protecting his shelter against his neighbors. Other than the exceptions noted, however, there was a consistent relationship between age and responses. The younger the respondent, the more he was likely to know about radiation and civil defense, the more favorable he was likely to be, and the more optimistic he was likely to be about what he could do to protect himself through the use of fallout shelters.

Parental Status (Tables C-III-1---C-III-9)

For this analysis, the original sample was divided into three groups. We separated the fifty-nine per cent of the respondents who had children living

at home from the seventeen per cent whose children had left home and the twenty-four per cent who had no children.

The three groups did not differ in their estimates as to the likelihood of war. The "child-gone" group was somewhat more likely to believe that a war would come within two years if it comes at all but somewhat more likely to believe that we are moving more toward peace. (Note: the "child-gone" group tended to be somewhat older than the other two groups; therefore, the findings of the preceeding analysis among age groups are not independent of the findings of the parent status analysis).

The three groups did not differ in their estimates as to where bombs or missiles would fall if the U.S. were attacked; however, those with children at home were most likely to feel that they could do something to protect against fire, blast, and fallout and those whose children had left home were least optimistic about their abilities to protect themselves. The three groups also did not differ in their estimates as to whether they would be killed or injured by blast or fire. The "child-gone" group was least likely to believe that fallout radiation would kill or injure them.

Those with children at home did not differ from those without children in their beliefs as to the utility of shelters. Both groups, however, were more optimistic about the value of shelters than were the "child-gone" group. Those with children at home were most likely to have plans for building a shelter and least likely to say that they have not even thought about building a shelter. Those whose children have left home were least likely to have thought about or planned to build a shelter. Only forty-four per cent of the "child-home" group said they had not thought about building a shelter. For the "child-gone" groups, the corresponding figure was seventy-two per cent.

Those with children at home and those without children did not differ in their level of knowledge about radiation and fallout. Both groups knew significantly more than did the "child-gone" group. Similarly, the "child-no" and "child-home" groups did not differ appreciably in the favorability of their attitudes on the eighteen opinion statements but both groups were significantly more favorable than the "child-gone" group on most of the statements. The three groups did not differ in their beliefs as to whether (1) it is a person's duty to try to live, (2) neighbors and friends will laugh at a shelter builder or think he is crazy, (3) parents have a duty to protect their children with a shelter, (4) a shelter builder will be respected by his neighbors, or whether (5) a person with a shelter will have to protect it from neighbors.

Education (Tables C-IV-1---C-IV-9)

For this analysis, respondents were divided into five groups on the basis of level of education: (1) elementary school or less---thirteen per cent; (2) high school---forty-three per cent; (3) one or two years of college---fourteen per cent; (4) three or four years of college---eighteen per cent; and, (5) post-graduate education---twelve per cent.

The elementary school education group was most likely to believe that war is likely, and that it may come within the next two years. The other education groups did not differ among themselves on these questions. The post-graduate group was least likely to believe that bombs would fall on their communities and most likely to believe that bombs would fall in their part of the country. The elementary education group was most likely to believe that bombs wouldn't fall in their part of the country at all.



The five groups did not differ in their estimates as to whether they could protect themselves against blast or whether they would be killed or injured by blast, fire, or fallout. The higher the respondent's education level, the more likely he was to believe he could do something to protect against fire and fallout and the more likely he was to believe that shelters would help protect against fallout.

Education was directly related to shelter thinking and planning. The more education, the more likely one was to have thought about or to have had plans to build a shelter. Similarly, education was directly related to level of knowledge about radiation and fallout; i.e., the higher the education level, the more one knew. Most of these differences, however, are attributable to the low level of knowledge of the elementary school group. The other four groups did not differ a great deal, even though there was a consistent tendency for knowledge to be correlated with education.

Education level also was positively correlated with favorability of attitude toward civil defense and fallout shelters, although the groups did not differ on whether most people have space to put in a shelter. There were three interesting reversals of this correlation. Education was negatively related to attitudes as to whether (1) parents have a duty to protect their children with a shelter, (2) it is a person's duty to try to live as long as he or she can, and whether (3) a person who builds a shelter will be respected by his neighbors. On these three items, those with a higher education level were less likely to respond favorably.

In summary, we found that those with only an elementary school education (thirteen per cent of the sample) were least optimistic about the likelihood and timing of war, most likely to believe that their part of the country

would escape, and least likely to believe that they could protect themselves or that shelters would help. This minimal education group also was least well informed and least favorable on most of the attitude items. There were similar differences among the other educational levels; however, the differences were most striking for the low education group.

Home Ownership (Tables C-V-1---C-V-9)

Sixty-four per cent of the sample said they owned or were buying their home and the remaining thirty-six per cent were renting or living with others. We compared the responses of these two groups; however, we found that the responses to most of the items were quite similar. Those who own their own home were slightly more likely to believe that bombs would fall on their communities and that they could do something to protect against fallout. The home-owners also were more likely to have plans for building a shelter, more likely to have thought about a shelter, and much more likely to believe that most people have the space to put in a shelter if they really want one. There were no appreciable differences between the two groups with respect to estimates as to the likelihood or timing of an attack, the probability of being killed or injured by blast, fire, fallout, or the utility of shelters. The groups also did not differ significantly in their level of information about radiation and fallout or in the favorability of their attitudes toward civil defense and shelters (except for the "space" item mentioned above). In general, the distinction between home-owners and renters was not as significant as we had expected it might be.

Religious and Political Preference (Tables C-VI-1---C-VI-9 and C-VII-1---C-VII-9)

Sixty-four per cent of the sample stated that they were Protestants, twenty per cent said they were Roman Catholics, four per cent were Jews, and

the remaining twelve per cent had no religious preference. As for political preference, fifty-three per cent considered themselves as Democrats, thirty-five per cent were Republicans, and the remaining twelve per cent had no political preference.

We had no reason to expect that religious or political preference would differentiate respondent information or attitude levels; however, we included these analyses to gather data for future research of our own and by others in this area. We did not find any meaningful or consistent differences among religious or political groups; therefore, we will not discuss the results of these two analyses. The analyses themselves, however, are included in Appendix C as specified above and are available for examination by those readers who might have special interest in them.

#### Summary and Discussion

The analyses reported above indicate that, for the demographic variables under study, the maximally receptive audience for civil defense messages consists of males under thirty-five years of age, and beyond the elementary school in their educational level (and the further beyond, the better), either with children living at home or without any children at all. Respondents with this combination of demographic characteristics knew more about nuclear radiation and fallout shelters, and were most favorable in their opinions about things related to civil defense.

In contrast, the group which knew the least and which was least favorable in its opinions consisted of females who were themselves the head of a household, and people in general who were over fifty years of age and who had not received more than an elementary school education, whose children had left home already.

The most significant single predictive variable was age. Quite consistently, the older the respondent, the less favorable he was toward civil defense. The other variables mentioned, though significant predictors of knowledge and attitude, did not discriminate as clearly or as consistently. We did not find knowledge and attitudes to be particularly related to home ownership or to religious or political preference.

Four of the attitudinal questions pose special problems. On these four questions, we either did not obtain any difference among various age, parental status, family role, or educational groups -- or else the direction of difference was actually reversed. For example, two of our questions asked whether neighbors and friends would respect a person who built a shelter or whether they would laugh at him or think he is crazy. About twenty-five per cent of the respondents did not think their friends and neighbors would react favorably. There were no differences among our three age groups or our three parental status groups; furthermore, both males and highly educated groups were less favorable than were females or lowly educated groups (a reversal of responses to most other questions).

A second question area which has interesting implications concerns the possibility that those with shelters will have to protect them from neighbors who will try to break in. Only thirty per cent of the total sample indicated that they were not worried about this, and responses did not differ as a function of family role or parental status. More importantly, the younger respondents, more favorable to civil defense in general, were least likely to feel that they had no danger from neighbors and they also were more worried as to whether law and order would be restored after an attack.

( )

The remaining two problem-type questions were related to whether parents have a responsibility to protect their children by building a shelter, and whether a person has a duty to try to live as long as he can. Parental status and age did not discriminate on either of these questions, nor did educational level discriminate on whether a parent has a duty to protect his child. More highly educated groups, however, were less likely to believe that a man has a duty to live as long as he can, and women were more likely than men to believe that the parent has a duty to protect his child.

In summary, then, the issues of social support or criticism of shelter building, the social consequences of shelter building--both during and after an attack, the parental responsibility to the child, and the individual's duty to himself to prolong life are all significant variables in understanding shelter attitudes. For one thing, the younger group, more favorable in general, are not more confident of social support for shelter building. Secondly, the appeal to the parent to protect his or her child and the appeals to the individual to fulfill his duty to live seem to be relatively high and universal in their attractions -- with two exceptions: (a) women are more impressed than men with the parental duty to protect the child and (b) less educated people are more impressed with the individual's duty to live as long as he can. We now are exploring the impact of these appeals as part of our experimental research program.

The remaining two problem-type questions were related to whether parents have a responsibility to protect their children by building a shelter, and whether a person has a duty to try to live as long as he can. Parental status and age did not discriminate on either of these questions, nor did educational level discriminate on whether a parent has a duty to protect his child. More highly educated groups, however, were less likely to believe that a man has a duty to live as long as he can, and women were more likely than men to believe that the parent has a duty to protect his child.

In summary, then, the issues of social support or criticism of shelter building, the social consequences of shelter building--both during and after an attack, the parental responsibility to the child, and the individual's duty to himself to prolong life are all significant variables in understanding shelter attitudes. For one thing, the younger group, more favorable in general, are not more confident of social support for shelter building. Secondly, the appeal to the parent to protect his or her child and the appeals to the individual to fulfill his duty to live seem to be relatively high and universal in their attractions -- with two exceptions: (a) women are more impressed than men with the parental duty to protect the child and (b) less educated people are more impressed with the individual's duty to live as long as he can. We now are exploring the impact of these appeals as part of our experimental research program.

Appendix A Responses to the questionnaire: a comparison of the eight cities.

Table 1-1. Q: "One thing we're interested in is how people feel about the possibility of a major war occurring. In your opinion, is it likely or unlikely that there will be a major war between the U.S. and Russia or some other country?"

Responses	Cities								Total
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Likely	32%	30	42	26	39	33	32	36	34%
Unlikely	65	65	51	73	58	62	67	62	62
No answer	3	5	7	1	3	5	1	2	4
N(Sample Size)	496	491	493	296	500	429	369	440	3514

Table 1-2. Q: "If a world war does come, when do you think it will come?"

Responses	Cities								Total
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
6 mo's or less	3%	2	5	3	4	3	4	4	4%
6 mo's -- 2 years	17	13	18	10	19	14	14	13	16
Over 2 years	43	40	42	30	39	42	50	46	42
Not at all	26	34	20	51	31	30	29	26	30
No answer	11	11	15	6	7	11	3	6	8

Table 1-3. Q: "In general, do you think we are moving more toward war or more toward peace? (In other words, are things going well or badly?)"

Responses	Cities								Total
	Minneap	Boston	Ok City	Sta Mon	Lansing	Man.K.	Ch Hill	Seattle	
Well (peace)	42%	50	44	40	42	41	39	38	42%
Badly (war)	33	30	36	37	35	32	33	34	34
Neither	25	20	20	23	23	27	28	28	24

Table 2. Q: "Suppose you were to become convinced that Russia would start a war. How do you feel about the U.S. striking first--before Russia had a chance to attack us? Would you be in favor of striking first or opposed?"

Responses	Cities								Total
	Minneap	Boston	Ok City	Sta Mon	Lansing	Man.K.	Ch Hill	Seattle	
In favor	52%	48	58	60	48	39	47	47	49%
Opposed	37	40	27	28	37	48	40	39	37
Don't Know- Undec.	11	11	14	12	15	13	13	14	14
No Answer	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	

Table 3. Q: "If the U.S. is attacked, do you think any bombs or missiles would fall on (name of community)?" If answer was no, we asked: "Do you think this part of the country would be hit directly?"

Responses	Cities								Total
	Minneap	Boston	Ok City	Sta Mon	Lansing	Man.K.	Ch Hill	Seattle	
Community	82%	90	86	75	61	47	20	90	70%
This part of Country	8	4	5	12	28	38	48	4	18
Neither	8	4	6	10	10	13	31	4	10
No answer	2	2	3	3	1	2	1	2	2



Table 4-1. Q: "Let's suppose that H-bombs or missiles were dropped on or close to (name of community). Do you feel that you could do something now to protect yourself from the blast of the bombs?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Yes	29%	17	36	24	29	32	27	21	27%
No, Don't know	71	83	64	76	71	68	73	79	73
No Answer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 4-2. Q: "Could you do something now to protect yourself from fire caused by bombs?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Yes	32%	25	39	25	34	35	33	33	32%
No, Don't know	68	75	61	75	66	65	67	67	68

Table 4-3. Q: "Could you do something now to protect yourself from radioactive fallout?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Yes	40%	28	42	29	31	41	35	37	36%
No, Don't know	60	72	58	71	69	59	65	63	64

Table 6-1. Q: "Now let's suppose that (name of community) is not hit directly by bombs or missiles. Do you see any other dangers to you personally. For instance, do you think you would be killed or injured by the blast from bombs or missiles exploding somewhere else?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Yes	40%	56	48	54	47	52	46	40	48%
No, Don't know	60	44	52	46	53	48	54	60	52

Table 6-2. Q: "Do you think you would be killed or injured by fire?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Yes	37%	49	46	50	35	36	30	33	39%
No, Don't know	63	51	54	50	65	64	70	67	61

Table 6-3. Q: "Do you think you would be killed or made sick from fallout radiation?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Yes	81%	77	81	64	77	81	80	72	77%
No, Don't know	19	23	19	36	23	19	20	28	23

Table 7. Q: "Let's think for a moment about people who live far enough away to escape the bomb blast. If these people had fallout shelters, what do you think their chances are for escaping serious radiation sickness from fallout? Do you think they would have a very good chance of avoiding radiation sickness, some chance, very little chance, or no chance of avoiding radiation sickness?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Very good chance	39%	33	48	39	40	50	50	49	43%
Some chance	38	38	26	31	35	30	30	32	33
Very little chance	15	19	15	18	14	15	15	15	16
No chance	7	7	7	9	9	4	3	3	6
No Answer	1	3	4	3	2	1	2	1	2

Table 8-1. Q: "If you get exposed to radiation at all, you are sure to die."

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Agree	9%	17	13	10	10	7	8	9	11%
Disagree	84	73	78	77	80	86	82	82	80
Don't Know	7	10	9	13	10	7	10	9	9

Table 8-2. Q: "Fallout from just one bomb may cover thousands of square miles."

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Agree	76%	74	73	60	73	74	75	70	72%
Disagree	15	17	15	21	16	17	14	18	17
Don't Know	9	9	12	19	11	9	11	12	11

Table 8-3. Q: "There is a new pill you can take that will protect you against radioactive fallout."

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Agree	2%	7	8	9	4	3	5	5	5%
Disagree	66	58	58	65	63	70	64	65	64
Don't Know	32	35	34	26	33	27	31	30	31

Table 8-4. Q: "If someone has radiation sickness, you should avoid getting near him so you won't catch it yourself."

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Agree	16%	22	22	16	20	14	14	16	18%
Disagree	65	53	53	62	54	67	68	60	60
Don't Know	19	25	25	22	26	19	18	24	22

Table 8-5. Q: "An atomic war would contaminate the water supply and almost everyone would die before the water was fit to drink."

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Agree	25%	34	34	24	30	20	24	23	27%
Disagree	63	52	53	61	54	63	58	60	58
Don't Know	12	14	13	15	16	17	18	17	15

Table 8-6. Q: "An atomic war would destroy all food and ways of producing food, so you would die soon--even if you were protected by a shelter. Do you agree or disagree?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Agree	40%	44	42	34	46	35	35	32	39%
Disagree	55	50	51	58	47	59	59	60	54
Don't Know	5	6	7	8	7	6	6	8	7

Table 8-7. Q: "A plastic suit with filtering mask is plenty of protection against fallout."

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Agree	16%	15	18	21	12	12	10	15	15%
Disagree	56	45	46	43	42	54	55	48	48
Don't Know	28	40	36	36	46	34	35	37	37

Table 8-8. Q: "Most fallout rapidly loses its power to harm people."

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Agree	46%	40	44	42	35	45	48	48	43%
Disagree	38	40	35	29	39	31	31	31	35
Don't Know	16	20	21	29	26	24	21	21	22

Table 8-9. Q: "After a nuclear attack, if you filter the dust out of the air, the air will be safe to breathe."

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Agree	44%	33	48	38	32	40	37	39	39%
Disagree	31	39	26	31	34	31	30	29	32
Don't Know	25	28	26	31	34	29	33	32	29

Table 8-10. Q: "The radioactivity after an attack would make the earth, or some areas of it, impossible to live in for years or even centuries."

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Agree	49%	50	49	39	49	48	50	47	48%
Disagree	35	29	29	41	29	30	27	29	31
Don't Know	16	21	22	20	22	22	23	24	21

Table 8-11. Q: "If we are attacked, great weather storms from the explosions would sweep the nation."

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Agree	36%	35	34	30	30	30	22	31	31%
Disagree	32	28	27	34	30	28	28	27	29
Don't Know	32	37	39	36	40	42	50	42	40

Table 8-12. Q: "A fallout shelter should have an air tight door to guard against radiation."

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Agree	68%	72	74	63	68	73	64	65	69%
Disagree	26	18	16	21	21	18	21	24	21
Don't Know	6	10	10	16	11	9	15	11	10

Table 8-13. Q: "Any adequate family shelter would cost at least three hundred dollars."

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Agree	82%	70	74	67	70	75	73	70	73%
Disagree	9	17	14	17	12	9	12	16	13
Don't Know	9	13	12	16	18	16	15	14	14

Table 8-14. Q: "You can not see fallout."

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Agree	82%	67	71%	64	77	78	80	73	74%
Disagree	6	14	14	20	8	12	6	12	11
Don't Know	12	19	15	16	15	10	14	15	15

Table 9-1. Q: "Building a shelter is like building a hole--only a coward would do it."

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Agree	77	8	8	11	7	7	6	6	7%
Disagree	90	91	89	86	90	91	90	90	90
Don't Know	3	1	3	3	3	2	4	4	3

Table 9-2. Q: "It is a person's duty to try to live as long as he or she can."

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Agree	94%	88	92	81	91	90	81	87	89%
Disagree	5	9	6	14	7	6	12	8	8
Don't Know	1	3	2	5	2	4	7	5	3

Table 9-3. Q: "An attack would destroy the morale of the U.S. so much that it would not be possible to rebuild the country."

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Agree	8%	13	13	9	9	7	25	6	11%
Disagree	88	84	83	85	86	90	74	89	85
Don't Know	4	3	4	6	5	3	1	5	4



Table 9-4. Q: "Building a shelter is wrong in the eyes of God."

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Agree	9%	6	8	7	9	5	8	6	7%
Disagree	82	85	82	85	79	87	81	84	83
Don't Know	9	9	10	8	12	8	11	10	10

Table 9-5. Q: "It would take a little while after an attack, but law and order would be restored."

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Agree	82%	72	79	76	80	83	76	85	79%
Disagree	13	24	13	18	14	11	12	10	14
Don't Know	5	4	8	6	6	6	12	5	7

Table 9-6. Q: "If we build shelters for everyone, war will be more likely to happen."

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Agree	14%	21	14	18	18	15	16	16	16%
Disagree	81	72	76	71	71	76	75	76	75
Don't Know	5	7	10	11	11	9	9	8	9

Table 9-7. Q: "If a person builds a family shelter, his neighbors and friends will probably laugh at him or think he is crazy."

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Agree	24%	30	17	16	28	27	24	20	24%
Disagree	72	64	79	72	66	64	69	71	70
Don't Know	4	6	4	12	6	9	7	9	6

Table 9-8. Q: "After an attack, life would be such a savage man-to-man struggle that it wouldn't be worth living through."

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Agree	25%	32	31	23	28	24	21	23	27%
Disagree	70	62	62	68	64	68	72	69	66
Don't Know	5	6	7	9	8	8	7	8	7

Table 9-9. Q: "There isn't any safe way to live in this world any more, so it's just a question of what chances or risks we want to take."

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Agree	23%	30	35	20	26	30	28	24	27%
Disagree	72	65	59	69	66	66	64	69	66
Don't Know	5	5	6	11	8	4	8	7	7

Table 9-10. Q: "I wouldn't want to live through an attack if I knew most of my friends and neighbors were dead."

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Agree	28%	34	32	32	32	30	27	28	30%
Disagree	68	62	62	58	62	64	65	65	64
Don't Know	4	4	6	10	6	6	8	7	6

Table 9-11. Q: "Most people have the space to put in a shelter if they really want one."

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Agree	68%	39	82	44	73	71	58	65	64%
Disagree	27	56	13	44	18	25	37	29	30
Don't Know	5	5	5	12	9	4	5	6	6

Table 9-12. Q: "Scientists don't understand things well enough to make predictions that we can rely on."

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Agree	31%	34	30	36	31	28	27	31	31%
Disagree	61	57	60	53	58	61	61	60	59
Don't Know	8	9	10	11	11	11	12	9	10

Table 9-13. Q: "The ending or saving of the world is up to the will of God. Man can't protect himself."

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Agree	34%	38	45	26	39	32	31	29	35%
Disagree	57	57	45	64	54	59	62	62	57
Don't Know	9	5	10	10	7	9	7	9	8

Table 9-14. Q: "Parents have a duty to protect their children by building a fallout shelter."

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Agree	52%	53	56	52	55	55	49	46	52%
Disagree	36	41	31	40	33	31	39	43	37
Don't Know	12	6	13	8	12	14	12	11	11

Table 9-15. Q: "A person who builds a shelter now will be respected by his neighbors."

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Agree	29%	29	38	30	32	36	30	28	32%
Disagree	56	57	46	54	51	41	50	52	51
Don't Know	15	14	16	16	17	23	20	20	17

Table 9-16. Q: "If an attack comes, a person with a shelter will have to protect it from neighbors who will try to break in."

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Oh Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Agree	58%	64	70	53	54	60	60	49	59%
Disagree	34	30	21	33	35	28	28	36	30
Don't Know	8	6	9	14	11	12	12	15	11

Table 9-17. Q: "Living in a shelter for a long period of time would drive many people insane."

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Agree	65%	66	70	59	61	62	58	64	64%
Disagree	30	29	26	32	29	31	33	25	29
Don't Know	5	5	4	9	10	7	9	11	7

Table 9-18. Q: "Shelters cost more than most families can afford."

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Agree	71%	69	73	69	60	60	68	65	67%
Disagree	23	23	19	20	28	30	26	26	25
Don't Know	6	8	8	11	12	10	6	9	8

Table 10. Q: "Do you think the government would like you to build a family fallout shelter or not?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Yes	64%	77	69	52	68	66	67	61	66%
No	19	16	13	27	16	14	10	17	16
Don't Know	17	7	18	21	16	20	23	22	18

Table 11. Q: "Do you have any specific plans for building a shelter?"  
If answer was no, we asked: "Have you thought about building a shelter for your family?" If respondent said he had plans or said he had thought about building a shelter, we asked: "Have you investigated methods of building a shelter? For instance, have you talked to a builder, written away for literature, or things like that?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
1) Has shelter now	1%	1	2	1	1	1	3	2	1%
2) Has plans & has investigated	5	3	6	2	5	5	7	3	5
3) Has plans but has not investigated	2	2	2	1	3	2	2	2	2
4) Has no plans but has thought & investigated	13	11	14	8	11	14	11	13	13
5) Has no plans & has thought but not inv.	29	20	25	13	25	32	33	29	27
6) Has no plans & has not thought about building	50	63	51	75	55	46	44	51	52

Table 12-1. Q: "If the government offered to build you a free shelter, would you be willing to have one?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Yes	74%	77	74	70	72	75	80	68	74%
No	23	21	21	26	23	20	16	24	22
Don't Know	3	2	5	4	5	5	4	8	4

Table 12-2. Q: "If the government provided the materials and asked you to provide the labor, would this make you more likely to build one?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Yes	53%	55	60	39	56	61	62	54	56%
No	43	41	34	56	37	33	31	41	39
Don't Know	4	4	6	5	7	6	7	5	5

Table 12-3. Q: "If you could use a shelter for an extra room, would this make you more likely to build one?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Yes	51%	48	53	41	48	62	60	49	52%
No	46	51	45	55	48	36	37	49	46
Don't Know	3	1	2	4	4	2	3	2	2

Table 12-4. Q: "If the government allowed you to take your building expenses off your income tax, would this make you more likely to build a shelter?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Tota</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Yes	49%	44	49	43	46	53	46	43	47%
No	48	53	47	55	49	44	51	53	50
Don't Know	3	3	4	2	5	3	3	4	3

Table 12-5. Q: "If someone offered to come to your house to explain how and where to build one, would this make you more likely to build one?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Tota</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Yes	21%	35	20	22	25	33	41	26	28%
No	75	60	73	74	68	63	53	70	67
Don't Know	4	5	7	4	7	4	6	4	5

Table 13-1. Q: "Would you want to know the recommendations given by physicists or other scientists?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Tota</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Yes	78%	80	71	74	81	85	86	76	79%
No	21	18	25	24	16	12	12	22	18
Don't Know	1	2	4	2	3	3	2	2	3



Table 13-2. Q: "Would you be interested in getting opinions of other public officials?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Yes	57%	60	54	50	60	58	59	55	57%
No	41	38	41	47	36	38	38	42	40
Don't Know	2	2	5	3	4	4	3	3	3

Table 13-3. Q: "If the President of the United States asked us to build a shelter, would it make any difference?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Yes	45%	55	43	39	48	53	53	49	48%
No	49	42	50	58	45	43	41	46	46
Don't Know	6	3	7	3	7	4	6	5	6

Table 13-4. Q: "Would the opinion of your church make any difference to you in your own plans?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Yes	37%	42	30	21	31	37	28	31	33%
No	61	55	66	76	64	59	68	66	64
Don't Know	2	3	4	3	5	4	4	3	3

Table 13-5. Q: "If several other people in your neighborhood built shelters, would this make any difference to you?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Yes	22%	22	22	16	22	31	30	21	23%
No	77	76	76	81	74	65	66	76	74
Don't Know	1	2	2	3	4	4	4	3	3

Table 14-1. Q: "Have you seen any discussions of radiation and shelters in your local newspaper?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Yes	78%	67	66	82	68	62	68	73	70%
No	19	31	31	17	30	32	28	24	27
Don't Know	3	2	3	1	2	6	4	3	3

Table 14-2. Q: "Have you talked with anybody on either the advantages or disadvantages of fallout shelters?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Yes	70%	58	55	53	54	57	71	59	59%
No	30	42	45	45	46	43	29	40	40
Don't Know	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	1

Table 14-2a. Q: "Whom did you talk with?" (Asked of those who said they had talked)\*

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Tota</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Friends	51%	42	40	40	38	39	53	45	43%
Family	30	24	23	23	24	25	28	30	26
Fellow workers	22	18	16	14	17	13	20	21	18
Other	2	4	5	3	3	3	4	2	3
Don't Remember	30	42	45	46	46	44	28	39	40

\*Totals add to more than 100% in that many respondents listed more than one category.

Table 14-3. Q: "Some national magazines have had articles about radiation and shelters. Did you happen to read any of these articles?"  
If answer was yes, we asked: "Can you remember the names of the magazines in which you read the articles?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Tota</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
1 Article	17%	20	19	30	20	21	25	27	22%
2 Articles	14	15	9	12	14	21	13	13	14
3 or more articles	13	10	10	6	7	16	11	10	11
No Article	49	49	60	46	56	40	44	45	49
Don't Know	7	6	2	6	3	2	7	5	4

Table 14-4. Q: "Have you received a copy of the government booklet called Your Family Fallout Shelter?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Tota</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Yes	21%	16	20	13	18	16	24	20	18%
No	74	81	76	85	79	80	75	73	78
Don't Know	5	3	4	2	3	4	1	7	4

Table 14-5. Q: "Have you read any other government literature on fallout shelters?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Tota</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Yes	23%	22	30	20	22	30	25	26	25%
No	75	77	68	79	77	68	74	71	73
Don't Know	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	3	2

Table 14-6. Q: "Did you see the movie, On the Beach?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Tota</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Yes	12%	18	16	22	13	18	25	17	17%
No	86	80	83	74	86	81	74	82	81
Don't Know	2	2	1	4	1	1	1	1	2

Table 14-7. Q: "Did you read the book?" (On the Beach)

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Yes	14%	15	5	17	8	9	21	15	127
No	86	84	95	81	92	90	78	84	87
Don't Know	0	1	0	2	0	1	1	1	1

Table 14-8. Q: "Have you gone out to hear any speeches about nuclear radiation and fallout?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Yes	16%	9	13	14	15	18	17	15	147
No	84	90	87	85	85	82	83	85	85
Don't Know	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

Table 14-9. Q: "Have you heard any sermons in church on the subject of fallout or fallout shelters?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Yes	17%	10	11	10	16	17	15	12	137
No	82	90	89	89	84	82	84	86	86
Don't Know	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	1

Table 14-10. Q: "Did you see the movie, Hiroshima?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Yes	12%	19	18	14	16	9	13	10	14%
No	85	79	79	84	82	90	85	88	84
Don't Know	3	2	3	2	2	1	2	2	2

Table 14-11. Q: "Did you read the book of the same name?" (Hiroshima)

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Yes	9%	10	7	14	11	9	21	12	11%
No	90	89	92	84	89	91	78	87	88
Don't Know	1	1	1	2	0	0	1	1	1

Table 14-12. Q: "Have any fallout shelter salesmen contacted you?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Yes	3%	1	9	2	5	1	2	6	4%
No	96	99	91	94	95	99	98	93	95
Don't Know	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	1

Table 15-1. Q: "About how many hours have you watched television in the past week?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Tota</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
1-5 hours	36%	30	26	33	30	26	39	30	31%
6-15 hours	32	31	32	30	32	31	30	32	31
16 hours or more	23	25	34	22	26	28	14	24	25
Not at all	9	14	8	15	12	15	17	14	13

Table 15-2. Q: "About how many hours have you listened to radio in the past week?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Tota</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
1-5 hours	39%	37	40	38	37	42	44	35	39%
6-15 hours	23	27	16	28	23	22	21	20	22
16 hours or more	25	20	18	15	20	17	10	24	19
Not at all	13	16	26	19	20	19	25	21	20

Table 15-3. Q: "Did you look into or read a newspaper yesterday?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Tota</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Yes	86%	80	77	80	81	88	81	88	83%
No	14	20	23	20	19	12	19	12	17

Table 16-1. Q: "What is your age?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
35 & Under	33%	36	37	23	32	43	44	29	357
36-50	38	33	33	34	34	29	32	36	34
51 & Over	27	29	28	41	32	26	22	33	29
No Answer	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2

Table 16-2. Q: "Do you have any children?" If answer was yes, we asked:  
"How many children do you have who still live at home?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
3 or more at Home	27%	19	22	9	27	25	21	23	237
2 at Home	20	16	20	17	18	18	17	20	18
1 at Home	20	16	20	16	18	17	22	17	18
Children, not home	17	15	17	27	18	16	15	18	17
No Children	16	34	21	31	19	24	25	22	24

Table 16-3. Q: "How many grades of school have you finished?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
8 or less	13%	9	14	11	22	9	14	10	13
9-12	56	52	49	36	45	36	20	45	45
13-14	11	11	16	17	11	15	12	19	14
15-16	14	16	16	24	15	23	22	17	18
17 or more	6	12	5	12	7	17	32	9	12



Table 16-4. Q: "Do you own your home or rent it?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Own-buying	78%	38	77	40	78	58	56	76	64%
Rent	21	59	21	54	20	38	42	20	33
Live with others, or other answer	1	3	2	6	2	4	2	4	3

Table 16-5a. Q: "Do you have a preference for a particular religious faith?"  
If answer was yes, we asked: "Are you a member?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Preference, member	81%	78	80	58	70	83	80	63	75%
Preference, no member	12	11	12	24	17	8	6	17	13
No preference	7	11	8	18	13	9	14	20	12

Table 16-5b. Q: If respondent indicated a preference for a religious faith,  
we asked: "Which one?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Roman Catholic	24%	49	9	17	19	14	5	17	20%
Methodist	8	3	15	6	11	29	18	6	12
Baptist	5	2	29	3	10	6	27	2	11
Lutheran	32	0	3	2	7	6	3	9	8
Presbyterian	8	1	5	4	2	11	11	8	6
Episcopal	2	7	2	5	3	3	10	7	5
Other Prot.	12	11	22	14	11	17	6	11	12
General Prot.	1	2	6	19	23	6	4	20	10
Jewish	1	14	1	10	1	0	2	1	4
No Answer	7	11	8	20	13	8	14	19	12

Table 16-6. Q: "Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Republican or a Democrat?" If answer was neither, we asked: "Do you think of yourself as closer to the Republican or Democratic party?" If answer to the first question was either Republican or Democrat, we asked: "Would you call yourself a strong Republican (Democrat) or not a very strong Republican (Democrat)?"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Cities</u>								<u>Total</u>
	<u>Minneap</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Ok City</u>	<u>Sta Mon</u>	<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Man.K.</u>	<u>Ch Hill</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	
Strong Republican	17%	9	9	19	14	15	6	15	13%
Not Strong Republican	20	11	13	21	23	33	13	19	19
Lean toward Republican	2	3	4	2	5	4	4	4	3
Strong Democrat	24	27	29	20	12	13	29	23	22
Not Strong Democrat	23	25	35	25	17	19	34	18	25
Lean toward Democrat	5	11	3	2	8	4	6	8	6
No party leaning	9	14	7	11	21	12	8	13	12

Appendix B Analyses of the accuracy of knowledge about, favorability of beliefs toward, and plans to build fallout shelters:

These five analyses compare the responses of (1) those who believe war is likely and those who don't, (2) those who believe war will come in 2 years or less, over 2 years, or not at all, (3) those who believe bombs would fall on their community, in their area, or neither, (4) those who believe they could do something to protect against fallout and those who don't, and (5) those who believe shelters would help and those who don't.

Part I: A comparison between those who believe a major war is likely and those who believe it is unlikely:

Table B-I-1: Accuracy of public belief on 14 statements of fact relevant to nuclear radiation and fallout shelters:

<u>Statements of Fact</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Correctly</u>	
	<u>War Likely</u>	<u>War Unlikely</u>
1. If you get exposed to radiation at all, you are sure to die (disagree):	31%	78%
2. Fallout from just one bomb may cover thousands of square miles (agree):	72	75
3. There is a new pill you can take that will protect you against radioactive fallout (disagree):	64	64
4. If someone has radiation sickness, you should avoid getting near him so you won't catch it yourself (disagree):	61	58
5. An atomic war would contaminate the water supply and almost everyone would die before the water was fit to drink again (disagree):	59	54
6. An atomic war would destroy all food and ways of producing food, so you would die soon--even if you were protected by a shelter (disagree):	56	52
7. A plastic suit with filtering mask is plenty of protection against fallout (disagree):	49	43
8. Most fallout rapidly loses its power to harm people (agree):	44	42
9. After a nuclear attack, if you filter the dust out of the air, the air will be safe to breathe (agree):	33	41

Table B-I-1 (continued)

<u>Statements of Fact</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Correctly</u>	
	<u>War Likely</u>	<u>War Unlikely</u>
10. The radioactivity after an attack would make the earth, or some areas of it, impossible to live in for years or even centuries (disagree).	32%	28%
11. If we are attacked, great weather storms from the explosions would sweep the nation (disagree).	31	25
12. A fallout shelter should have an air tight door to guard against radiation (disagree).	21	19
13. Any adequate family shelter would cost at least three hundred dollars (disagree).	13	13
14. You can not see fallout (disagree).	12	10

Table B-I-2: Favorability of beliefs on 10 statements of opinion relevant to nuclear radiation and fallout shelters;

<u>Statements of Opinion</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Favorably</u>	
	<u>War Likely</u>	<u>War Unlikely</u>
1. Building a shelter is like hiding in a hole--only a coward would do it (disagree).	90%	89%
2. It is a person's duty to try to live as long as he or she can (agree).	89	89
3. An attack would destroy the morale of the U.S. so much that it would not be possible to rebuild the country (disagree).	83	84
4. Building a shelter is wrong in the eyes of God (disagree).	84	83
5. It would take a little while after an attack, but law and order would be restored (agree).	80	78
6. If we build shelters for everyone, war will be more likely to happen (disagree).	75	76
7. If a person builds a family shelter, his neighbors and friends probably will laugh at him or think he is crazy (disagree).	70	69
8. After an attack, life would be such a savage man-to-man struggle that it wouldn't be worth living through (disagree).	68	63

Table B-I-2: (continued)

<u>Statements of Opinion</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Favorably</u>	
	<u>War Likely</u>	<u>War Unlikely</u>
9. There isn't any safe way to live in this world any more, so it's just a question of what chances or risks we want to take (disagree).	69%	61%
10. I wouldn't want to live through an attack if I knew most of my friends and neighbors were dead (disagree).	64	63
11. Most people have the space to put in a shelter if they really want one (agree).	62	67
12. Scientists don't understand things well enough to make predictions that we can rely on (disagree).	62	55
13. The ending or saving of the world is up to the will of God. Man can't protect himself (disagree).	58	55
14. Parents have a duty to protect their children by building a fallout shelter (agree).	49	60
15. A person who builds a shelter now will be respected by his neighbors (agree).	30	35
16. If an attack comes, a person with a shelter will have to protect it from neighbors who will try to break in (disagree).	32	28
17. Living in a shelter for a long period of time would drive many people insane (disagree).	30	28
18. Shelters cost more than most families can afford (disagree).	25	25

Table B-I-3: Respondent categories of planning, investigation, and construction of fallout shelters:

<u>Categories</u>	<u>Percentage in Each Category</u>	
	<u>War Likely</u>	<u>War Unlikely</u>
1. Has a shelter.	1%	2%
2. Has plans; has investigated.	4	6
3. Has plans; has not investigated.	2	3
4. Has no plans; has thought and investigated.	12	13
5. Has no plans; has thought, has not investigated.	25	28
6. Has no plans; has not thought.	56	48

Part II: A comparison among those who (a) believe that, given a war, it will occur in 2 years or less, (b) believe that a major war is at least 2 years away, and (c) don't believe that a war will come at all.

Table B-II-1: Accuracy of public belief on 14 statements of fact relevant to nuclear radiation and fallout shelters.:

<u>Statements of Fact</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Correctly</u>		
	<u>2 years or less</u>	<u>More than 2 years</u>	<u>Not at all</u>
1. If you get exposed to radiation at all, you are sure to die (disagree).:	75%	85%	78%
2. Fallout from just one bomb may cover thousands of square miles (agree).:	73	76	69
3. There is a new pill you can take that will protect you against radioactive fallout (disagree).:	62	68	62
4. If someone has radiation sickness, you should avoid getting near him so you won't catch it yourself (disagree).:	54	64	60
5. An atomic war would contaminate the water supply and almost everyone would die before the water was fit to drink again (disagree).:	50	65	56
6. An atomic war would destroy all food and ways of producing food, so you would die soon--even if you were protected by a shelter (disagree).:	44	62	53
7. A plastic suit with filtering mask is plenty of protection against fallout (disagree).:	45	55	45
8. Most fallout rapidly loses its power to harm people (agree).:	43	46	41
9. After a nuclear attack, if you filter the dust out of the air, the air will be safe to breathe (agree).:	41	41	35
10. The radioactivity after an attack would make the earth, or some areas of it, impossible to live in for years or even centuries (disagree).:	25	32	32
11. If we are attacked, great weather storms from the explosions would sweep the nation (disagree).:	23	33	29

Table B-II-1: (continued)

<u>Statements of Fact</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Correctly</u>		
	<u>2 years or less</u>	<u>More than 2 years</u>	<u>Not at all</u>
12. A fallout shelter should have an air tight door to guard against radiation (disagree).	15%	23%	21%
13. Any adequate family shelter would cost at least three hundred dollars (disagree).	10	14	14
14. You can not see fallout (disagree).	12	11	13

Table B-II-2: Favorability of beliefs on 10 statements of opinion relevant to nuclear radiation and fallout shelters:

<u>Statements of Opinion</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Favorably</u>		
	<u>2 years or less</u>	<u>More than 2 years</u>	<u>Not at all</u>
1. Building a shelter is like hiding in a hole--only a coward would do it (disagree).	87%	93%	88%
2. It is a person's duty to try to live as long as he or she can (agree).	92	88	87
3. An attack would destroy the morale of the U.S. so much that it would not be possible to rebuild the country (disagree).	82	89	88
4. Building a shelter is wrong in the eyes of God (disagree).	81	87	81
5. It would take a little while after an attack, but law and order would be restored (agree).	78	82	77
6. If we build shelters for everyone, war will be more likely to happen. (disagree).	72	80	73
7. If a person builds a family shelter, his neighbors and friends probably will laugh at him or think he is crazy (disagree).	66	71	71
8. After an attack, life would be such a savage man-to-man struggle that it wouldn't be worth living through (disagree).	61	71	65
9. There isn't any safe way to live in this world any more, so it's just a question of what chances or risks we want to take (disagree).	60	72	66

Table B-II-2: (continued)

-6-

B

<u>Statements of Opinion</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Favorably</u>		
	<u>2 years or less</u>	<u>More than 2 years</u>	<u>Not at all</u>
10. I wouldn't want to live through an attack if I knew most of my friends and neighbors were dead (disagree);	59%	70%	61%
11. Most people have the space to put in a shelter if they really want one (agree);	70	66	59
12. Scientists don't understand things well enough to make predictions that we can rely on (disagree);	57	62	60
13. The ending or saving of the world is up to the will of God. Man can't protect himself (disagree);	50	61	58
14. Parents have a duty to protect their children by building a fallout shelter (agree);	61	53	45
15. A person who builds a shelter now will be respected by his neighbors (agree);	36	31	30
16. If an attack comes, a person with a shelter will have to protect it from neighbors who will try to break in (disagree);	27	31	34
17. Living in a shelter for a long period of time would drive many people insane (disagree);	25	33	23
18. Shelters cost more than most families can afford (disagree);	22	30	21

Table B-II-3: Respondent categories of planning, investigation, and construction of fallout shelters;

<u>Categories</u>	<u>Percentages in Each Category</u>		
	<u>2 years or less</u>	<u>More than 2 years</u>	<u>Not at all</u>
1. Has a shelter;	2%	1%	1%
2. Has plans; has investigated;	5	5	4
3. Has plans; has not investigated;	2	2	2
4. Has no plans; has thought and investigated;	10	15	10
5. Has no plans; has thought, has not investigated.	28	27	24
6. Has no plans; has not thought.	53	50	59



Part III: A comparison among those who (a) believe bombs would fall on their community, (b) believe bombs would fall in their area--but not on their community, and (c) believe bombs would not fall in their area.

Table B-III-1: Accuracy of public belief on 14 statements of fact relevant to nuclear radiation and fallout shelters.

<u>Statements of Fact</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Correctly</u>		
	<u>Community</u>	<u>Area</u>	<u>Neither</u>
1. If you get exposed to radiation at all, you are sure to die (disagree);	80%	86%	77%
2. Fallout from just one bomb may cover thousands of square miles (agree);	73	73	73
3. There is a new pill you can take that will protect you against radioactive fallout (disagree);	63	68	62
4. If someone has radiation sickness, you should avoid getting near him so you won't catch it yourself (disagree);	58	70	59
5. An atomic war would contaminate the water supply and almost everyone would die before the water was fit to drink again (disagree);	56	66	60
6. An atomic war would destroy all food and ways of producing food, so you would die soon--even if you were protected by a shelter (disagree);	53	61	57
7. A plastic suit with filtering mask is plenty of protection against fallout (disagree);	48	52	45
8. Most fallout rapidly loses its power to harm people (agree);	42	48	45
9. After a nuclear attack, if you filter the dust out of the air, the air will be safe to breathe (agree);	39	41	38
10. The radioactivity after an attack would make the earth, or some areas of it, impossible to live in for years or even centuries (disagree);	30	34	30
11. If we are attacked, great weather storms from the explosions would sweep the nation (disagree);	27	34	31
12. A fallout shelter should have an air tight door to guard against radiation (disagree);	20	25	16
13. Any adequate family shelter would cost at least three hundred dollars (disagree);	13	13	15

Table B-III-1: (continued)

<u>Statements of Fact</u>	<u>Percentage</u>	<u>Responding Correctly</u>	
	<u>Community</u>	<u>Area</u>	<u>Neither</u>
14. You can not see fallout (disagree).	11%	11%	10%

Table B-III-2: Favorability of beliefs on 18 statements of opinion relevant to nuclear radiation and fallout shelters.

<u>Statements of Opinion</u>	<u>Percentage</u>	<u>Responding Favorably</u>	
	<u>Community</u>	<u>Area</u>	<u>Neither</u>
1. Building a shelter is like hiding in a hole--only a coward would do it (disagree).	90%	93%	86%
2. It is a person's duty to try to live as long as he or she can (agree).	89	87	86
3. An attack would destroy the morale of the U.S. so much that it would not be possible to rebuild the country (disagree).	86	89	86
4. Building a shelter is wrong in the eyes of God (disagree).	84	86	79
5. It would take a little while after an attack, but law and order would be restored (agree).	79	84	75
6. If we build shelters for everyone, war will be more likely to happen (disagree).	75	78	72
7. If a person builds a family shelter, his neighbors and friends probably will laugh at him or think he is crazy (disagree).	70	68	67
8. After an attack, life would be such a savage man-to-man struggle that it wouldn't be worth living through (disagree).	64	74	69
9. There isn't any safe way to live in this world any more, so it's just a question of what chances or risks we want to take (disagree).	65	73	65
10. I wouldn't want to live through an attack if I knew most of my friends and neighbors were dead (disagree).	62	71	62
11. Most people have the space to put in a shelter if they really want one (agree).	64	64	64
12. Scientists don't understand things well enough to make predictions that we can rely on (disagree).	59	63	57

Table B-III-2: (continued)

<u>Statements of Opinion</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Favorably</u>		
	<u>Community</u>	<u>Area</u>	<u>Neither</u>
13. The ending or saving of the world is up to the will of God. Man can't protect himself (disagree).	57%	62%	51%
14. Parents have a duty to protect their children by building a fallout shelter (agree).	53	54	48
15. A person who builds a shelter now will be respected by his neighbors (agree).	32	32	31
16. If an attack comes, a person with a shelter will have to protect it from neighbors who will try to break in (disagree).	30	31	33
17. Living in a shelter for a long period of time would drive many people insane (disagree).	28	33	29
18. Shelters cost more than most families can afford (disagree).	24	30	21

Table B-III-3: Respondent categories of planning, investigation, and construction of fallout shelters:

<u>Categories</u>	<u>Percentages in Each Category</u>		
	<u>Community</u>	<u>Area</u>	<u>Neither</u>
1. Has a shelter.	1%	2%	2%
2. Has plans; has investigated.	5	6	2
3. Has plans; has not investigated.	2	3	2
4. Has no plans; has thought and investigated.	12	14	8
5. Has no plans; has thought, has not investigated.	26	30	26
6. Has no plans; has not thought.	54	45	60

Part IV: A comparison between those who believe they could do something now to protect against fallout and those who believe they couldn't.

Table B-IV-1: Accuracy of public belief on 14 statements of fact relevant to nuclear radiation and fallout shelters:

<u>Statements of Fact</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Correctly</u>	
	<u>Could Protect</u>	<u>Couldn't Protect</u>
1. If you get exposed to radiation at all, you are sure to die (disagree).	88%	75%
2. Fallout from just one bomb may cover thousands of square miles (agree).	74	72
3. There is a new pill you can take that will protect you against radioactive fallout (disagree).	60	60
4. If someone has radiation sickness, you should avoid getting near him so you won't catch it yourself (disagree).	70	54
5. An atomic war would contaminate the water supply and almost everyone would die before the water was fit to drink again (disagree).	71	50
6. An atomic war would destroy all food and ways of producing food, so you would die soon--even if you were protected by a shelter (disagree).	69	46
7. A plastic suit with a filtering mask is plenty of protection against fallout (disagree).	55	45
8. Most fallout rapidly loses its power to harm people (agree).	52	38
9. After a nuclear attack, if you filter the dust out of the air, the air will be safe to breathe (agree).	46	36
10. The radioactivity after an attack would make the earth, or some areas of it, impossible to live in for years or even centuries (disagree).	33	26
11. If we are attacked, great weather storms from the explosions would sweep the nation (disagree).	36	25
12. A fallout shelter should have an air tight door to guard against radiation (disagree).	28	17

Table B-IV-1: (continued)

<u>Statements of Fact</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Correctly</u>	
	<u>Could Protect</u>	<u>Couldn't Protect</u>
13. Any adequate family shelter would cost at least three hundred dollars (disagree).	16%	11%
14. You can not see fallout (disagree).	12	10

Table B-IV-2: Favorability of beliefs on 10 statements of opinion relevant to nuclear radiation and fallout shelters.

<u>Statements of Opinion</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Favorably</u>	
	<u>Could Protect</u>	<u>Couldn't Protect</u>
1. Building a shelter is like hiding in a hole--only a coward would do it (disagree).	94%	88%
2. It is a person's duty to try to live as long as he or she can (agree).	90	88
3. An attack would destroy the morale of the U.S. so much that it would not be possible to rebuild the country (disagree).	91	84
4. Building a shelter is wrong in the eyes of God (disagree).	88	80
5. It would take a little while after an attack, but law and order would be restored (agree).	87	75
6. If we build shelters for everyone, war will be more likely to happen (disagree).	80	72
7. If a person builds a family shelter, his neighbors and friends will probably laugh at him or think he is crazy (disagree).	71	69
8. After an attack, life would be such a savage man-to-man struggle that it wouldn't be worth living through (disagree).	70	60
9. There isn't any safe way to live in this world any more, so it's just a question of what chances or risks we want to take (disagree).	72	63
10. I wouldn't want to live through an attack if I knew most of my friends and neighbors were dead (disagree).	74	58

Table B-IV-2: (continued)

<u>Statements of Opinion</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Favorably</u>	
	<u>Could Protect</u>	<u>Couldn't Protect</u>
11. Most people have the space to put in a shelter if they really want one (agree).	72%	59%
12. Scientists don't understand things well enough to make predictions that we can rely on (disagree).	67	55
13. The ending or saving of the world is up to the will of God. Man can't protect himself (disagree).	64	52
14. Parents have a duty to protect their children by building a fallout shelter (agree).	57	50
15. A person who builds a shelter now will be respected by his neighbors (agree).	36	29
16. If an attack comes, a person with a shelter will have to protect it from neighbors who will try to break in (disagree).	33	29
17. Living in a shelter for a long period of time would drive many people insane (disagree).	36	25
18. Shelters cost more than most families can afford (disagree).	34	20

Table B-IV-3: Respondent categories of planning, investigation, and construction of fallout shelters:

<u>Categories</u>	<u>Percentages In Each Category</u>	
	<u>Could Protect</u>	<u>Couldn't Protect</u>
1. Has a shelter.	3%	1%
2. Has plans; has investigated.	2	2
3. Has plans; has not investigated.	4	1
4. Has no plans; has thought and investigated.	13	9
5. Has no plans; has thought, has not investigated.	28	25
6. Has no plans; has not thought.	39	62

Part V: A comparison between those who believe shelters would help and those who believe they wouldn't.

Table B-V-1: Accuracy of public belief on 14 statements of fact relevant to nuclear radiation and fallout shelters:

<u>Statements of Fact</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Correctly</u>	
	<u>Shelters Help</u>	<u>Shelters Not Help</u>
1. If you get exposed to radiation at all, you are sure to die (disagree).	84%	70%
2. Fallout from just one bomb may cover thousands of square miles (agree).	74	70
3. There is a new pill you can take that will protect you against radioactive fallout (disagree).	65	60
4. If someone has radiation sickness, you should avoid getting near him so you won't catch it yourself (disagree).	63	50
5. An atomic war would contaminate the water supply and almost everyone would die before the water was fit to drink again (disagree).	65	34
6. An atomic war would destroy all food and ways of producing food, so you would die soon--even if you were protected by a shelter (disagree).	61	32
7. A plastic suit with filtering mask is plenty of protection against fallout (disagree).	50	46
8. Most fallout rapidly loses its power to harm people (agree).	46	35
9. After a nuclear attack, if you filter the dust out of the air, the air will be safe to breathe (agree).	43	28
10. The radioactivity after an attack would make the earth, or some areas of it, impossible to live in for years or even centuries (disagree).	33	23
11. If we are attacked, great weather storms from the explosions would sweep the nation (disagree).	31	21
12. A fallout shelter should have an air tight door to guard against radiation (disagree).	21	19

Table B-V-1: (continued)

<u>Statements of Fact</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Correctly</u>	
	<u>Shelters Help</u>	<u>Shelters Not Help</u>
13. Any adequate family shelter would cost at least three hundred dollars (disagree).	14%	12%
14. You can not see fallout (disagree).	11	12

Table B-V-2: Favorability of beliefs on 18 statements of opinion relevant to nuclear radiation and fallout shelters:

<u>Statements of Opinion</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Favorably</u>	
	<u>Shelters Help</u>	<u>Shelters Not Help</u>
1. Building a shelter is like hiding in a hole--only a coward would do it (disagree).	94%	78%
2. It is a person's duty to try to live as long as he or she can (agree).	89	86
3. An attack would destroy the morale of the U.S. so much that it would not be possible to rebuild the country (disagree).	90	75
4. Building a shelter is wrong in the eyes of God (disagree).	87	74
5. It would take a little while after an attack, but law and order would be restored (agree).	84	63
6. If we build shelters for everyone, war will be more likely to happen (disagree).	79	64
7. If a person builds a family shelter, his neighbors and friends will probably laugh at him or think he is crazy (disagree).	72	64
8. After an attack, life would be such a savage man-to-man struggle that it wouldn't be worth living through (disagree).	73	45
9. There isn't any safe way to live in this world any more, so it's just a question of what chances or risks we want to take (disagree).	70	54
10. I wouldn't want to live through an attack if I knew most of my friends and neighbors were dead (disagree).	68	50



Table B-V-2: (continued)

<u>Statements of Opinion</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Favorably</u>	
	<u>Shelters Help</u>	<u>Shelters Not Help</u>
11. Most people have the space to put in a shelter if they really want one (agree).	66%	57%
12. Scientists don't understand things well enough to make predictions that we can rely on (disagree).	64	45
13. The ending or saving of the world is up to the will of God. Man can't protect himself (disagree).	60	46
14. Parents have a duty to protect their children by building a fallout shelter (agree).	56	41
15. A person who builds a shelter now will be respected by his neighbors (agree).	35	22
16. If an attack comes, a person with a shelter will have to protect it from neighbors who will try to break in (disagree).	32	28
17. Living in a shelter for a long period of time would drive many people insane (disagree).	33	17
18. Shelters cost more than most families can afford (disagree).	27	17

Table B-V-3: Respondent categories of planning, investigation, and construction of fallout shelters:

<u>Categories</u>	<u>Percentages in Each Category</u>	
	<u>Shelters Help</u>	<u>Shelters Not Help</u>
1. Has a shelter.	27	17
2. Has plans; has investigated.	6	1
3. Has plans; has not investigated.	2	1
4. Has no plans; has thought and investigated.	14	8
5. Has no plans; has thought, has not investigated.	28	21
6. Has no plans; has not thought.	40	68

**Appendix C** Analyses of beliefs as to the likelihood of war, the value of a "first strike," probable target areas, the possibility of protection, the dangers that exist, and the utility of shelters--as well as an index of plans to build fallout shelters, accuracy of knowledge about and favorability of beliefs toward shelter construction.

These seven analyses compare the level of belief among (1) three role positions within the family, (2) three age groups, (3) those who have children at home and those who don't, (4) five levels of education, (5) those who own their homes and those who rent, (6) four different religious preferences and (7) three different political preferences.

**Part I:** A comparison of responses among (a) male heads of households, (b) female heads of households, and (c) wives.

**Table C-I-1.** Estimates as to the likelihood of a major war:

<u>Question--Responses</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>		
	<u>Male Heads</u>	<u>Female Heads</u>	<u>Wives</u>
1. It is likely that there will be a major war between the U.S. and Russia, etc.	31%	35%	39%
2. If war does come, it will come in 2 years or less.	17	21	22
3. In general, we are moving more toward war (rather than more toward peace--or neither).	32	32	38

**Table C-I-2.** Attitudes toward a U.S. "first strike:"

<u>Question--Responses</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>		
	<u>Male Heads</u>	<u>Female Heads</u>	<u>Wives</u>
"Suppose you were to become convinced that Russia would start a war. How do you feel about the U.S. striking first--before Russia has a chance to attack us?"			
In favor	53%	46%	48%
Opposed	37	35	39
Undecided	10	19	13

Table C-I-3. Estimates as to where bombs or missiles would fall in the U.S., given an attack:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>		
	<u>Male</u> <u>Heads</u>	<u>Female</u> <u>Heads</u>	<u>Wives</u>
Bombs would fall on my community.	68%	73%	75%
Bombs would fall in this part of the country.	19	14	16
Bombs wouldn't fall in this part of the country.	13	13	9

Table C-I-4. Estimates as to whether an individual can do something to protect against blast, fire, or fallout dangers--given that bombs or missiles will drop on or close to his community:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>		
	<u>Male</u> <u>Heads</u>	<u>Female</u> <u>Heads</u>	<u>Wives</u>
1. I could do something now to protect against the blast of the bombs.	29%	19%	28%
2. I could do something now to protect against fire caused by bombs.	39	23	28
3. I could do something now to protect against radio-active fallout.	41	24	34

Table C-I-5. Estimates of blast, fire, or fallout dangers to the individual--given that his community is not hit directly by bombs or missiles:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>		
	<u>Male</u> <u>Heads</u>	<u>Female</u> <u>Heads</u>	<u>Wives</u>
1. I think I would be killed or injured by the blast from bombs or missiles exploding somewhere else.	45%	50%	51%
2. I think I would be killed or injured by fire.	37	44	40
3. I think I would be killed or made sick by fallout radiation.	75	74	81

Table C-I-6. Estimates of the utility of shelters in escaping radiation sickness:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>		
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	
	<u>Heads</u>	<u>Heads</u>	<u>Wives</u>
Given that they had fallout shelters, people who lived far enough away to escape the bomb blast would have:			
1. A very good or some chance of escaping radiation sickness.	78%	68%	77%
2. Very little or no chance of escaping radiation sickness.	20	28	21
3. No Answer	2	4	2

Table C-I-7. Respondent categories of planning, investigation, and construction of fallout shelters:

<u>Categories</u>	<u>Percentages in each Category</u>		
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	
	<u>Heads</u>	<u>Heads</u>	<u>Wives</u>
Has a shelter	2%	1%	2%
Has plans; has investigated.	6	2	5
Has plans; has not investigated.	2	2	2
Has no plans; has thought and investigated.	15	5	13
Has no plans; has thought, has not investigated.	26	22	30
Has no plans; has not thought.	49	68	48

Table C-I-8. Accuracy on 14 statements of fact relevant to nuclear radiation and fallout shelters:

<u>Statements of Fact</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Correctly</u>		
	<u>Male Heads</u>	<u>Female Heads</u>	<u>Wives</u>
1. If you get exposed to radiation at all, you are sure to die (disagree).	84%	72%	79%
2. Fallout from just one bomb may cover thousands of square miles (agree).	74	70	71
3. There is a new pill you can take that will protect you against radioactive fallout (disagree).	68	57	61
4. If someone has radiation sickness, you should avoid getting near him so you won't catch it yourself (disagree).	68	48	55
5. An atomic war would contaminate the water supply and almost everyone would die before the water was fit to drink again (disagree).	68	45	52
6. An atomic war would destroy all food and ways of producing food, so you would die soon--even if you were protected by a shelter (disagree).	63	44	48
7. A plastic suit with filtering mask is plenty of protection against fallout (disagree).	53	40	46
8. Most fallout rapidly loses its power to harm people (agree).	53	33	35
9. After a nuclear attack, if you filter the dust out of the air, the air will be safe to breathe (agree).	46	34	33
10. The radioactivity after an attack would make the earth, or some areas of it, impossible to live in for years or even centuries (disagree).	37	22	27

Table C-I-8 (continued)

<u>Statements of Fact</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Correctly</u>		
	<u>Male Heads</u>	<u>Female Heads</u>	<u>Wives</u>
11. If we are attacked, great weather storms from the explosions would sweep the nation (disagree).	40%	19%	20%
12. A fallout shelter should have an air tight door to guard against radiation (disagree).	31	10	13
13. Any adequate family shelter would cost at least three hundred dollars (disagree).	14	10	13
14. You can not see fallout (disagree).	11	11	11

Table C-I-9. Favorability of beliefs on 18 statements of opinion relevant to nuclear radiation and fallout shelters:

<u>Statements of Opinion</u>	<u>Percentages Responding Favorably</u>		
	<u>Male Heads</u>	<u>Female Heads</u>	<u>Wives</u>
1. Building a shelter is like hiding in a hole--only a coward would do it (disagree).	91%	87%	90%
2. It is a person's duty to try to live as long as he or she can (agree).	89	88	88
3. An attack would destroy the morale of the U.S. so much that it would not be possible to rebuild the country (disagree).	88	84	86
4. Building a shelter is wrong in the eyes of God (disagree).	84	80	84
5. It would take a little while after an attack, but law and order would be restored (agree).	81	73	80
6. If we build shelters for everyone, war will be more likely to happen (disagree).	76	70	77
7. If a person builds a family shelter, his neighbors and friends probably will laugh at him or think he is crazy (disagree).	65	70	75

Table C-I-9 (continued)

<u>Statements of Opinion</u>	<u>Percentages Responding Favorably</u>		
	<u>Male Heads</u>	<u>Female Heads</u>	<u>Wives</u>
8. After an attack, life would be such a savage man-to-man struggle that it wouldn't be worth living through (disagree).	74%	59%	60%
9. There isn't any safe way to live in this world any more, so it's just a question of what chances or risks we want to take (disagree).	68	60	67
10. I wouldn't want to live through an attack if I knew most of my friends and neighbors were dead (disagree).	73	51	58
11. Most people have the space to put in a shelter if they really want one (agree).	66	53	67
12. Scientists don't understand things well enough to make predictions that we can rely on (disagree).	61	54	60
13. The ending or saving of the world is up to the will of God. Man can't protect himself (disagree).	59	54	56
14. Parents have a duty to protect their children by building a fallout shelter (agree).	50	56	53
15. A person who builds a shelter now will be respected by his neighbors (agree).	30	36	31
16. If an attack comes, a person with a shelter will have to protect it from neighbors who will try to break in (disagree).	30	31	31
17. Living in a shelter for a long period of time would drive many people insane (disagree).	34	25	25
18. Shelters cost more than most families can afford (disagree).	29	17	23

Part II: A comparison among those(a) 35 years of age or younger, (b) 36-50 years of age, and (c) over 50 years of age.

Table C-II-1. Estimates as to the likelihood of a major war:

<u>Question--Responses</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>		
	<u>35 or Less</u>	<u>36-50</u>	<u>51 or More</u>
1. It is likely that there will be a major war between the U.S. and Russia, etc.	36%	36%	31%
2. If war does come, it will come in 2 years or less.	15	21	22
3. In general, we are moving more toward war (rather than more toward peace--or neither).	37	34	28

Table C-II-2. Attitudes toward a U.S. "first strike:"

<u>Question--Responses</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>		
	<u>35 or Less</u>	<u>36-50</u>	<u>51 or More</u>
"Suppose you were to become convinced that Russia would start a war. How do you feel about the U.S. striking first--before Russia has a chance to attack us?"			
In favor	48%	50%	52%
Opposed	41	37	32
Undecided	11	13	16

Table C-II-3. Estimates as to where bombs or missiles would fall in the U.S., given an attack:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>		
	<u>35 or Less</u>	<u>36-50</u>	<u>51 or More</u>
Bombs would fall on my community.	66%	72%	73%
Bombs would fall in this part of the country.	23	15	12
Bombs wouldn't fall in this part of the country.	11	13	15



Table C-II-4. Estimates as to whether an individual can do something to protect against blast, fire, or fallout dangers--given that bombs or missiles will drop on or close to his community:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>		
	<u>35 or Less</u>	<u>36-50</u>	<u>51 or More</u>
1. I could do something now to protect against the blast of the bombs.	33%	28%	18%
2. I could do something now to protect against fire caused by bombs.	37	34	25
3. I could do something now to protect against radio-active fallout.	42	38	26

Table C-II-5. Estimates of blast, fire, or fallout dangers to the individual--given that his community is not hit directly by bombs or missiles:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>		
	<u>35 or Less</u>	<u>36-50</u>	<u>51 or More</u>
1. I think I would be killed or injured by the blast from bombs or missiles exploding somewhere else.	48%	49%	46%
2. I think I would be killed or injured by fire.	38	39	41
3. I think I would be killed or made sick by fallout radiation.	82	77	71

Table C-II-6. Estimates of the utility of shelters in escaping radiation sickness:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>		
	<u>35 or Less</u>	<u>36-50</u>	<u>51 or More</u>
Given that they had fallout shelters, people who lived far enough away to escape the bomb blast would have:			
1. A very good or some chance of escaping radiation sickness.	83%	77%	66%
2. Very little or no chance of escaping radiation sickness.	16	21	30
3. No Answer.	1	2	4

Table C-II-7. Respondent categories of planning, investigation, and construction of fallout shelters:

<u>Categories</u>	<u>Percentages in each Category</u>		
	<u>35 or Less</u>	<u>36-50</u>	<u>51 or More</u>
Has a shelter.	2%	1%	1%
Has plans; has investigated.	6	6	2
Has plans; has not investigated.	3	2	2
Has no plans; has thought and investigated.	16	15	6
Has no plans; has thought, has not investigated.	32	26	20
Has no plans; has not thought.	41	50	69

Table C-II-8. Accuracy on 14 statements of fact relevant to nuclear radiation and fallout shelters:

Statements of Fact	Percentage Responding Correctly		
	35 or Less	36-50	51 or More
1. If you get exposed to radiation at all, you are sure to die (disagree).	87%	84%	68%
2. Fallout from just one bomb may cover thousands of square miles (agree).	81	72	63
3. There is a new pill you can take that will protect you against radioactive fallout (disagree).	73	66	50
4. If someone has radiation sickness, you should avoid getting near him so you won't catch it yourself (disagree).	65	63	51
5. An atomic war would contaminate the water supply and almost everyone would die before the water was fit to drink again (disagree).	66	61	45
6. An atomic war would destroy all food and ways of producing food, so you would die soon--even if you were protected by a shelter (disagree).	64	57	41
7. A plastic suit with filtering mask is plenty of protection against fallout (disagree).	58	52	35
8. Most fallout rapidly loses its power to harm people (agree).	45	43	42
9. After a nuclear attack, if you filter the dust out of the air, the air will be safe to breathe (agree).	40	41	27
10. The radioactivity after an attack would make the earth, or some areas of it, impossible to live in for years or even centuries (disagree).	32	32	27
11. If we are attacked, great weather storms from the explosions would sweep the nation (disagree).	31	33	23

Table C-II-8 (continued)

<u>Statements of Fact</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Correctly</u>		
	<u>35 or Less</u>	<u>36-50</u>	<u>51 or More</u>
12. A fallout shelter should have an air tight door to guard against radiation (disagree).	22%	23%	17%
13. Any adequate family shelter would cost at least three hundred dollars (disagree).	16	14	8
14. You can not see fallout (disagree).	12	12	9

Table C-II-9. Favorability of beliefs on 18 statements of opinion relevant to nuclear radiation and fallout shelters:

<u>Statements of Opinion</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Favorably</u>		
	<u>35 or Less</u>	<u>36-50</u>	<u>51 or More</u>
1. Building a shelter is like hiding in a hole--only a coward would do it (disagree).	95%	92%	82%
2. It is a person's duty to try to live as long as he or she can (agree).	88	90	89
3. An attack would destroy the morale of the U.S. so much that it would not be possible to rebuild the country (disagree).	90	89	80
4. Building a shelter is wrong in the eyes of God (disagree).	88	86	74
5. It would take a little while after an attack, but law and order would be restored (agree).	80	81	77
6. If we build shelters for everyone, war will be more likely to happen (disagree).	81	79	63
7. If a person builds a family shelter, his neighbors and friends probably will laugh at him or think he is crazy (disagree).	70	72	65

Table C-II-9 (continued)

<u>Statements of Opinion</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Favorably</u>		
	<u>35 or Less</u>	<u>36-50</u>	<u>51 or More</u>
8. After an attack, life would be such a savage man-to-man struggle that it wouldn't be worth living through (disagree).	75%	69%	54%
9. There isn't any safe way to live in this world any more, so it's just a question of what chances or risks we want to take (disagree).	77	69	51
10. I wouldn't want to live through an attack if I knew most of my friends and neighbors were dead (disagree).	77	67	45
11. Most people have the space to put in a shelter if they really want one (agree).	70	66	56
12. Scientists don't understand things well enough to make predictions that we can rely on (disagree).	71	63	42
13. The ending or saving of the world is up to the will of God. Man can't protect himself (disagree).	63	60	45
14. Parents have a duty to protect their children by building a fallout shelter (agree).	55	49	54
15. A person who builds a shelter now will be respected by his neighbors (agree).	34	28	32
16. If an attack comes, a person with a shelter will have to protect it from neighbors who will try to break in (disagree).	27	34	30
17. Living in a shelter for a long period of time would drive many people insane (disagree).	35	28	23
18. Shelters cost more than most families can afford (disagree).	33	25	15

Part III: A comparison among these (a) without children, (b) with children, but none who still live at home, and (c) with one or more children who still live at home.

Table C-III-1. Estimates as to the likelihood of a major war:

<u>Questions-Responses</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>		
	<u>No Child</u>	<u>Child-Gone</u>	<u>Child-Home</u>
1. It is likely that there will be a major war between the U.S. and Russia, etc.	32%	31%	36%
2. If war does come, it will come in 2 years or less.	17	25	18
3. In general, we are moving more toward war (rather than more toward peace--or neither).	33	27	35

Table C-III-2. Attitudes toward a U.S. "first strike:"

<u>Question-Responses</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>		
	<u>No Child</u>	<u>Child-Gone</u>	<u>Child-Home</u>
"Suppose you were to become convinced that Russia would start a war. How do you feel about the U.S. striking first--before Russia has a chance to attack us?"			
In favor	49	54	49
Opposed	37	31	39
Undecided	14	15	12

Table C-III-3. Estimates as to where bombs or missiles would fall in the u.s., given an attack:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>		
	<u>No Child</u>	<u>Child-Gone</u>	<u>Child-Home</u>
Bombs would fall on my community.	71%	72%	70%
Bombs would fall in this part of the country.	19	14	18
Bombs wouldn't fall in this part of the country.	10	14	12

Table C-III-4. Estimates as to whether an individual can do something to protect against blast, fire, or fallout dangers--given that bombs or missiles will drop on or close to his community:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>		
	<u>No Child</u>	<u>Child-Gone</u>	<u>Child-Home</u>
1. I could do something now to protect against the blast of the bombs.	26%	17%	30%
2. I could do something now to protect against fire caused by bombs.	32	22	35
3. I could do something now to protect against radio-active fallout.	31	25	40

Table C-III-5. Estimates of blast, fire, or fallout dangers to the individual--given that his community is not hit directly by bombs or missiles:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>		
	<u>No Child</u>	<u>Child-Gone</u>	<u>Child-Home</u>
1. I think I would be killed or injured by the blast from bombs or missiles exploding somewhere else.	48%	43%	48%
2. I think I would be killed or injured by fire.	40	42	38
3. I think I would be killed or made sick by fallout radiation.	77	69	79

Table C-III-6. Estimates of the utility of shelters in escaping radiation sickness:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>		
	<u>No Child</u>	<u>Child-Gone</u>	<u>Child-Home</u>
Given that they had fallout shelters, people who lived far enough away to escape the bomb blast would have:			
1. A very good or some chance of escaping radiation sickness.	75%	65%	79%
2. Very little or no chance of escaping radiation sickness.	23	30	19
3. No Answer	2	5	2

Table C-III-7. Respondent categories of planning, investigation, and construction of fallout shelters:

<u>Categories</u>	<u>Percentages in each Category</u>		
	<u>No Child</u>	<u>Child-Gone</u>	<u>Child-Home</u>
Has a shelter.	1%	1%	2%
Has plans; has investigated.	3	2	6
Has plans; has not investigated.	2	1	2
Has no plans; has thought and investigated.	9	6	16
Has no plans; has thought, has not investigated.	22	18	30
Has no plans; has not thought.	63	72	44



Table C-III-8. Accuracy on 14 statements of fact relevant to nuclear radiation and fallout shelters:

Statements of Fact	Percentage Responding Correctly		
	No Child	Child-Gone	Child-Home
1. If you get exposed to radiation at all, you are sure to die (disagree).	82%	66%	84%
2. Fallout from just one bomb may cover thousands of square miles (agree).	75	61	75
3. There is a new pill you can take that will protect you against radio-active fallout (disagree).	64	51	67
4. If someone has radiation sickness, you should avoid getting near him so you won't catch it yourself (disagree).	60	51	62
5. An atomic war would contaminate the water supply and almost everyone would die before the water was fit to drink again (disagree).	60	42	62
6. An atomic war would destroy all food and ways of producing food, so you would die soon--even if you were protected by a shelter (disagree).	58	36	58
7. A plastic suit with filtering mask is plenty of protection against fallout (disagree).	41	35	53
8. Most fallout rapidly loses its power to harm people (agree).	42	39	45
9. After a nuclear attack, if you filter the dust out of the air, the air will be safe to breathe (agree).	36	36	42
10. The radioactivity after an attack would make the earth, or some areas of it, impossible to live in for years or even centuries (disagree).	31	23	33
11. If we are attacked, great weather storms from the explosions would sweep the nation (disagree).	30	19	32

Table C-III-8 (continued)

<u>Statements of Fact</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Correctly</u>		
	<u>No Child</u>	<u>Child-Gone</u>	<u>Child-Home</u>
12. A fallout shelter should have an air tight door to guard against radiation (disagree).	21%	15%	22%
13. Any adequate family shelter would cost at least three hundred dollars (disagree).	16	7	14
14. You can not see fallout (disagree).	12	9	12

Table C-III-9. Favorability of beliefs on 18 statements of opinion relevant to nuclear radiation and fallout shelters:

<u>Statements of Opinion</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Favorably</u>		
	<u>No Child</u>	<u>Child-Gone</u>	<u>Child-Home</u>
1. Building a shelter is like hiding in a hole--only a coward would do it (disagree).	90%	80%	92%
2. It is a person's duty to try to live as long as he or she can (agree).	88	90	89
3. An attack would destroy the morale of the U.S. so much that it would not be possible to rebuild the country (disagree).	86	79	89
4. Building a shelter is wrong in the eyes of God (disagree).	84	73	87
5. It would take a little while after an attack, but law and order would be restored (agree).	79	74	81
6. If we build shelters for everyone, war will be more likely to happen (disagree).	74	65	78
7. If a person builds a family shelter, his neighbors and friends probably will laugh at him or think he is crazy (disagree).	66	67	72
8. After an attack, life would be such a savage man-to-man struggle that it wouldn't be worth living through (disagree).	71	51	69

Table C-III-9. (continued)

<u>Statements of Opinion</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Favorably</u>		
	<u>No Child</u>	<u>Child-Gone</u>	<u>Child-Home</u>
9. There isn't any safe way to live in this world any more, so it's just a question of what chances or risks we want to take (disagree).	67%	50%	70%
10. I wouldn't want to live through an attack if I knew most of my friends and neighbors were dead (disagree).	67	45	68
11. Most people have the space to put in a shelter if they really want one (disagree).	59	55	68
12. Scientists don't understand things well enough to make predictions that we can rely on (disagree).	62	39	64
13. The ending or saving of the world is up to the will of God. Man can't protect himself (disagree).	31	43	61
14. Parents have a duty to protect their children by building a fallout shelter (agree).	52	50	53
15. A person who builds a shelter now will be respected by his neighbors (agree).	32	31	32
16. If an attack comes, a person with a shelter will have to protect it from neighbors who will try to break in (disagree).	30	30	31
17. Living in a shelter for a long period of time would drive many people insane (disagree).	31	20	31
18. Shelters cost more than most families can afford (disagree).	27	15	26

Part IV: A comparison among those with (a) 0-8 years of formal education, (b) 9-12 years, (c) 13-14 years, (d) 15-16 years, and (e) 17 years or more of formal education.

Table C-IV-1. Estimates as to the likelihood of a major war:

Question--Responses	Responses (in percentages)				
	0-8	9-12	13-14	15-16	17 or more
1. It is likely that there will be a major war between the U.S. and Russia, etc.	43%	36%	30%	28%	32%
2. If war does come, it will come in 2 years or less.	32	21	21	11	10
3. In general, we are moving more toward war (rather than more toward peace--or neither).	36	33	35	36	34

Table C-IV-2. Attitudes toward a U.S. "first strike:"

Question--Responses	Responses (in percentages)				
	0-8	9-12	13-14	15-16	17 or More
"Suppose you were to become convinced that Russia would start a war. How do you feel about the U.S. striking first--before Russia has a chance to attack us?"					
In Favor	54%	54%	50%	46%	38%
Opposed	23	32	39	44	50
Undecided	13	14	11	10	12

Table C-IV-3. Estimates as to where bombs or missiles would fall in the U.S., given an attack:

Responses	Responses (in percentages)				
	0-8	9-12	13-14	15-16	17 or More
Bombs would fall on my community.	68%	76%	72%	68%	56%
Bombs would fall in this part of the country.	14	13	13	20	32
Bombs wouldn't fall in this part of the country.	13	11	10	12	12

Table C-IV-4. Estimates as to whether an individual can do something to protect against blast, fire, or fallout danger--given that bombs or missiles will drop on or close to his community:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>				
	<u>0-8</u>	<u>9-12</u>	<u>13-14</u>	<u>15-16</u>	<u>17 or More</u>
1. I could do something now to protect against the blast of the bombs.	20%	27%	27%	31%	29%
2. I could do something now to protect against fire caused by bombs.	22	30	36	38	39
3. I could do something now to protect against radioactive fallout.	21	32	35	46	49

Table C-IV-5. Estimates of blast, fire, or fallout dangers to the individual--given that his community is not hit directly by bombs or missiles:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>				
	<u>0-8</u>	<u>9-12</u>	<u>13-14</u>	<u>15-16</u>	<u>17 or More</u>
1. I think I would be killed or injured by the blast from bombs or missiles exploding somewhere else.	47%	49%	49%	45%	46%
2. I think I would be killed or injured by fire.	39	43	39	37	31
3. I think I would be killed or made sick by fallout radiation.	71	78	80	76	76

Table C-IV-6. Estimates of the utility of shelters in escaping radiation sickness:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>				
	<u>0-8</u>	<u>9-12</u>	<u>13-14</u>	<u>15-16</u>	<u>17 or More</u>
Given that they had fallout shelters, people who lived far enough away to escape the bomb blast would have:					
1. A very good or some chance of escaping radiation sickness.	67%	74%	79%	81%	80%
2. Very little or no chance of escaping radiation sickness.	29	21	19	17	17
3. No Answer.	4	5	2	2	3

Table C-IV-7. Respondent categories of planning, investigation, and construction of fallout shelters:

<u>Categories</u>	<u>Percentages in each Category</u>				
	<u>0-8</u>	<u>9-12</u>	<u>13-14</u>	<u>15-16</u>	<u>17 or More</u>
Has a shelter.	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%
Has plans; has investigated.	1	4	7	6	6
Has plans; has not investigated.	2	2	2	2	2
Has no plans; has thought and investigated.	4	10	14	17	21
Has no plans; has thought, has not investigated.	24	27	27	26	29
Has no plans; has not thought.	63	56	49	47	40

Table C-IV-8. Accuracy on 14 statements of fact relevant to nuclear radiation and fallout shelters:

<u>Statements of Fact</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Correctly</u>				
	<u>0-8</u>	<u>9-12</u>	<u>13-14</u>	<u>15-16</u>	<u>17 or More</u>
1. If you get exposed to radiation at all, you are sure to die (disagree).	47%	78%	89%	90%	94%

Table C-IV-8 (continued)

Statements of Fact	Percentage Responding Correctly				
	0-8	9-12	13-14	15-16	17 or More
2. Fallout from just one bomb may cover thousands of square miles (agree).	72%	71%	72%	74%	77%
3. There is a new pill that you can take that will protect you against radioactive fallout (disagree).	41	60	67	71	83
4. If someone has radiation sickness, you should avoid getting near him so you won't catch it yourself (disagree).	35	53	66	71	86
5. An atomic war would contaminate the water supply and almost everyone would die before the water was fit to drink again (disagree).	33	52	66	69	75
6. An atomic war would destroy all food and ways of producing food, so you would die soon--even if you were protected by a shelter (disagree).	28	34	61	68	76
7. A plastic suit with filtering mask is plenty of protection against fallout (disagree).	30	46	53	53	64
8. Most fallout rapidly loses its power to harm people (agree).	43	39	40	50	54
9. After a nuclear attack, if you filter the dust out of the air, the air will be safe to breathe (agree).	39	38	39	40	42
10. The radioactivity after an attack would make the earth, or some areas of it, impossible to live in for years or even centuries (disagree).	23	27	33	36	42

Table C-IV-8 (continued)

<u>Statements of Fact</u>	<u>Percentages Responding Correctly</u>				
	<u>0-8</u>	<u>9-12</u>	<u>13-14</u>	<u>15-16</u>	<u>17 or More</u>
11. If we are attacked, great weather storms from the explosions would sweep the nation (disagree).	20%	24%	31%	36%	45%
12. A fallout shelter should have an air tight door to guard against radiation (disagree).	13	16	19	28	36
13. An adequate family shelter would cost at least three hundred dollars (disagree).	6	12	16	15	16
14. You can not see fallout (disagree).	11	11	12	10	11

Table C-IV-9. Favorability of beliefs on 13 statements of opinion relevant to nuclear radiation and fallout shelters:

<u>Statements of Opinion</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Favorably</u>				
	<u>0-8</u>	<u>9-12</u>	<u>13-14</u>	<u>15-16</u>	<u>17 or More</u>
1. Building a shelter is like hiding in a hole--only a coward would do it (disagree).	71%	90%	92%	95%	97%
2. It is a person's duty to try to live as long as he or she can (agree).	93	92	88	85	79
3. An attack would destroy the morale of the U.S. so much that it would not be possible to rebuild the country (disagree).	67	87	90	93	92
4. Building a shelter is wrong in the eyes of God (disagree).	32	83	88	90	91
5. It would take a little while after an attack, but law and order would be restored (agree).	72	79	81	83	82



Table C-IV-9 (continued)

Statements of Opinion	Percentage Responding Favorably				
	0-3	9-12	13-14	15-16	17 or More
6. If we build shelters for everyone, war will be more likely to happen (disagree).	48%	76%	81%	81%	79%
7. If a person builds a family shelter, his neighbors probably will laugh at him or think he is crazy (disagree).	54	71	72	74	70
8. After an attack, life would be such a savage man-to-man struggle that it wouldn't be worth living through (disagree).	46	62	72	78	81
9. There isn't any safe way to live in this world any more, so it's just a question of what chances or risks we want to take (disagree).	35	65	74	78	74
10. I wouldn't want to live through an attack if I knew most of my friends and neighbors were dead (disagree).	40	60	68	74	80
11. Most people have the space to put in a shelter if they really want one (agree).	65	64	66	64	59
12. Scientists don't understand things well enough to make predictions that we can rely on (disagree).	33	59	66	67	66
13. The ending or saving of the world is up to the will of God. Man can't protect himself (disagree).	30	50	61	70	82
14. Parents have a duty to protect their children by building a fallout shelter (agree).	72	56	49	43	38

Table C-IV-9 (continued)

<u>Statements of Opinion</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Favorably</u>				
	<u>0-8</u>	<u>9-12</u>	<u>13-14</u>	<u>15-16</u>	<u>17 or More</u>
15. A person who builds a shelter now will be respected by his neighbors (agree).	47%	33%	29%	31%	18%
16. If an attack comes, a person with a shelter will have to protect it from neighbors who will try to break in (disagree).	20	30	31	34	36
17. Living in a shelter for a long period of time would drive many people insane (disagree).	16	26	29	35	42
18. Shelters cost more than most families can afford (disagree).	8	22	30	32	69

Part V: A comparison between those who own or are buying their own home, and those who are renting or living with others.

Table C-V-1. Estimates as to the likelihood of a major war:

<u>Questions-Responses</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>	
	<u>Own-buying</u>	<u>Rent-Live with Others</u>
1. It is likely that there will be a major war between the U.S. and Russia, etc.	35%	33%
2. If war does come, it will come in 2 years or less.	21	17
3. In general, we are moving more toward war (rather than more toward peace--or neither).	33	36

Table C-V-2. Attitudes toward a U.S. "first strike:"

<u>Question-Responses</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>	
	<u>Own-buying</u>	<u>Rent-Live with Others</u>
"Suppose you were to become convinced that Russia would start a war. How do you feel about the U.S. striking first--before Russia has a chance to attack us?"		
In favor	49	51
Opposed	37	38
Undecided	14	11

Table C-V-3. Estimates as to where bombs or missiles would fall in the U.S., given an attack:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>	
	<u>Own-buying</u>	<u>Rent-Live with Others</u>
Bombs would fall on my community.	74%	66%
Bombs would fall in this part of the country.	15	20
Bombs wouldn't fall in this part of the country.	11	14

Table C-V-4. Estimates as to whether an individual can do something to protect against blast, fire, or fallout dangers--given that bombs or missiles will drop on or close to his community:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>	
	<u>Own-buying</u>	<u>Rent-Live with Others</u>
1. I could do something now to protect against the blast of the bombs.	28%	25%
2. I could do something now to protect against fire caused by bombs.	34	29
3. I could do something now to protect against radio-active fallout.	38	32

Table C-V-5. Estimates of blast, fire, or fallout dangers to the individual--given that his community is not hit directly by bombs or missiles:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>	
	<u>Own-buying</u>	<u>Rent-Live with Others</u>
1. I think I would be killed or injured by the blast from bombs or missiles exploding somewhere else.	47%	50%
2. I think I would be killed or injured by fire.	39	41
3. I think I would be killed or made sick by fallout radiation.	78	76

Table C-V-6. Estimates of the utility of shelters in escaping radiation sickness:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>	
	<u>Own-Buying</u>	<u>Rent-Live with Others</u>
Given that they had fallout shelters, people who lived far enough away to escape the bomb blast would have:		
1. A very good or some chance of escaping radiation sickness.	76%	77%
2. Very little or no chance of escaping radiation sickness.	22	21
3. No Answer.	2	2

Table C-V-7. Respondent categories of planning, investigation, and construction of fallout shelters:

<u>Categories</u>	<u>Percentages in each Category</u>	
	<u>Own-Buying</u>	<u>Rent-Live with Others</u>
Has a shelter.	27	17
Has plans; has investigated.	6	2
Has plans; has not investigated.	2	1
Has no plans; has thought and investigated.	14	9
Has no plans; has thought, has not investigated.	28	24
Has no plans; has not thought.	48	63

Table C-V-8. Accuracy on 14 statements of fact relevant to nuclear radiation and fallout shelters:

<u>Statements of Fact</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Correctly</u>	
	<u>Own-buying</u>	<u>Rent-Live with Others</u>
1. If you get exposed to radiation at all, you are sure to die (disagree).	80%	81%
2. Fallout from just one bomb may cover thousands of square miles (agree).	72	74
3. There is a new pill you can take that will protect you against radioactive fallout (disagree).	62	65
4. If someone has radiation sickness, you should avoid getting near him so you won't catch it yourself (disagree).	60	59
5. An atomic war would contaminate the water supply and almost everyone would die before the water was fit to drink again (disagree).	57	58
6. An atomic war would destroy all food and ways of producing food, so you would die soon--even if you were protected by a shelter (disagree).	53	57
7. A plastic suit with filtering mask is plenty of protection against fallout (disagree).	48	49
8. Most fallout rapidly loses its power to harm people (agree).	44	42
9. After a nuclear attack, if you filter the dust out of the air, the air will be safe to breathe (agree).	41	36
10. The radioactivity after an attack would make the earth, or some areas of it, impossible to live in for years or even centuries (disagree).	31	30
11. If we are attacked, great weather storms from the explosions would sweep the nation (disagree).	28	30

Table C-V-8 (continued)

<u>Statements of Fact</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Correctly</u>	
	<u>Own-buying</u>	<u>Rent-Live with Others</u>
12. A fallout shelter should have an air tight door to guard against radiation (disagree).	22%	18%
13. Any adequate family shelter would cost at least three hundred dollars (disagree).	13	14
14. You can not see fallout (disagree).	10	13

Table C-V-9. Favorability of beliefs on 18 statements of opinion relevant to nuclear radiation and fallout shelters:

<u>Statements of Opinion</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Favorably</u>	
	<u>Own-buying</u>	<u>Rent-Live with Others</u>
1. Building a shelter is like hiding in a hole--only a coward would do it (disagree).	89%	91%
2. It is a person's duty to try to live as long as he or she can (agree).	89	88
3. An attack would destroy the morale of the U.S. so much that it would not be possible to rebuild the country (disagree).	87	87
4. Building a shelter is wrong in the eyes of God (disagree).	82	85
5. It would take a little while after an attack, but law and order would be restored (agree).	81	77
6. If we build shelters for everyone, war will be more likely to happen (disagree).	75	75
7. If a person builds a family shelter, his neighbors and friends probably will laugh at him or think he is crazy (disagree).	70	69
8. After an attack, life would be such a savage man-to-man struggle that it wouldn't be worth living through (disagree).	65	70

Table C-V-9 (continued)

<u>Statements of Opinion</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Favorably</u>	
	<u>Own-buying</u>	<u>Rent-Live with Others</u>
9. There isn't any safe way to live in this world any more, so it's just a question of what chances or risks we want to take (disagree).	65%	69%
10. I wouldn't want to live through an attack if I knew most of my friends and neighbors were dead (disagree).	61	69
11. Most people have the space to put in a shelter if they really want one (agree).	71	50
12. Scientists don't understand things well enough to make predictions that we can rely on (disagree).	57	63
13. The ending or saving of the world is up to the will of God. Man can't protect himself (disagree).	55	60
14. Parents have a duty to protect their children by building a fallout shelter (agree).	52	54
15. A person who builds a shelter now will be respected by his neighbors (agree).	31	32
16. If an attack comes, a person with a shelter will have to protect it from neighbors who will try to break in (disagree).	31	29
17. Living in a shelter for a long period of time would drive many people insane (disagree).	28	31
18. Shelters cost more than most families can afford (disagree).	23	28



Part VI: A comparison among those who indicate (a) a Protestant preference, (b) a Roman Catholic preference, (c) a Jewish preference, or (d) no religious preference.

Table C-VI-1. Estimates as to the likelihood of a major war:

<u>Questions--Responses</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>			
	<u>Prot.</u>	<u>Cath.</u>	<u>Jewish</u>	<u>No Pref.</u>
1. It is likely that there will be a major war between the U.S. and Russia, etc.	34%	35%	27%	33%
2. If war does come, it will come in 2 years or less.	20	19	11	16
3. In general, we are moving more toward war (rather than more toward peace--or neither).	35	31	41	32

Table C-VI-2. Attitudes toward a U.S. "first strike:"

<u>Question--Responses</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>			
	<u>Prot.</u>	<u>Cath.</u>	<u>Jewish</u>	<u>No Pref.</u>
"Suppose you were to become convinced that Russia would start a war. How do you feel about the U.S. striking first--before Russia has a chance to attack us?"				
In Favor	40%	56%	56%	47%
Opposed	38	34	40	38
Undecided	14	10	4	15

Table C-VI-3. Estimates as to where bombs or missiles would fall in the U.S., given an attack:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>			
	<u>Prot.</u>	<u>Cath.</u>	<u>Jewish</u>	<u>No Pref.</u>
Bombs would fall on my community.	60%	70%	34%	66%
Bombs would fall in this part of the country.	19	11	4	20
Bombs wouldn't fall in this part of the country.	13	11	12	14

Table C-VI-4. Estimates as to whether an individual can do something to protect against blast, fire, or fallout dangers--given that bombs or missiles will drop on or close to his community:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>			
	<u>Prot.</u>	<u>Cath.</u>	<u>Jewish</u>	<u>No Pref.</u>
1. I could do something now to protect against the blast of the bombs.	28%	23%	16%	22%
2. I could do something now to protect against fire caused by bombs.	34	30	30	28
3. I could do something now to protect against radioactive fallout.	30	34	24	32

Table C-VI-5. Estimates of blast, fire, or fallout dangers to the individual--given that his community is not hit directly by bombs or missiles:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>			
	<u>Prot.</u>	<u>Cath.</u>	<u>Jewish</u>	<u>No Pref.</u>
1. I think I would be killed or injured by the blast from bombs or missiles exploding somewhere else.	46%	50%	60%	47%
2. I think I would be killed or injured by fire.	30	43	46	37
3. I think I would be killed or made sick by fallout radiation.	77	80	76	74

Table C-VI-6. Estimates of the utility of shelters in escaping radiation sickness:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>			
	<u>Prot.</u>	<u>Cath.</u>	<u>Jewish</u>	<u>No Pref.</u>
Given that they had fallout shelters, people who lived far enough away to escape the bomb blast would have:				
1. A very good or some chances of escaping radiation sickness.	76%	76%	70%	74%
2. Very little or no chance of escaping radiation sickness.	19	22	25	24
3. No answer	5	2	5	2

Table C-VI-7. Respondent categories of planning, investigation, and construction of fallout shelters:

Categories	Percentages in each Category			
	Prot.	Cath.	Jewish	No Pref.
Has a shelter.	2%	1%	0%	1%
Has plans; has investigated.	5	4	3	5
Has plans; has not investigated.	2	3	0	1
Has no plans; has thought and investigated.	14	11	11	7
Has no plans; has thought, has not investigated.	28	27	16	24
Has no plans; has not thought.	49	54	70	62

Table C-VI-3. Accuracy on 14 statements of fact relevant to nuclear radiation and fallout shelters:

Statements of Fact	Percentage Responding Correctly			
	Prot.	Cath.	Jewish	No Pref.
1. If you get exposed to radiation at all, you are sure to die (disagree).	32%	73%	30%	30%
2. Fallout from just one bomb may cover thousands of square miles (agree).	73	74	75	71
3. There is a new pill you can take that will protect you against radioactive fallout (disagree).	64	62	61	67
4. If someone has radiation sickness, you should avoid getting near him so you won't catch it yourself (disagree).	61	57	51	62
5. An atomic war would contaminate the water supply and almost everyone would die before the water was fit to drink again (disagree).	53	60	46	57

Table C-VI-8 (continued)

<u>Statements of Fact</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Correctly</u>			
	<u>Prot.</u>	<u>Cath.</u>	<u>Jewish</u>	<u>No Pref.</u>
6. An atomic war would destroy all food and ways of producing food, so you would die soon--even if you were protected by a shelter (disagree).	55%	54%	50%	56%
7. A plastic suit with filtering mask is plenty of protection against fallout (disagree).	50	47	45	47
8. Most fallout rapidly loses its power to harm people (agree).	43	41	36	48
9. After a nuclear attack, if you filter the dust out of the air, the air will be safe to breathe (agree).	39	42	18	41
10. The radioactivity after an attack would make the earth, or some areas of it, impossible to live in for years or even centuries (disagree).	30	32	23	33
11. If we are attacked, great weather storms from the explosions would sweep the nation (disagree).	28	28	24	33
12. A fallout shelter should have an air tight door to guard against radiation (disagree).	21	20	16	21
13. Any adequate family shelter would cost at least three hundred dollars (disagree).	13	13	23	13
14. You can not see fallout (disagree).	11	13	11	11

Table C-VI-9. Favorability of beliefs on 10 statements of opinion relevant to nuclear radiation and fallout shelters:

Statements of Opinion	Percentage Responding Favorably			
	Prot.	Cath.	Jewish	No Pref.
1. Building a shelter is like hiding in a hole--only a coward would do it (disagree).	90%	91%	90%	89%
2. It is a person's duty to try to live as long as he or she can (agree).	90	93	84	82
3. An attack would destroy the morale of the U.S. so much that it would not be possible to rebuild the country (disagree).	87	89	84	81
4. Building a shelter is wrong in the eyes of God (disagree).	82	88	85	81
5. It would take a little while after an attack, but law and order would be restored (agree).	80	79	70	78
6. If we build shelters for everyone, war will be more likely to happen (disagree).	76	76	74	67
7. If a person builds a family shelter, his neighbors probably will laugh at him or think he is crazy (disagree).	71	69	73	63
8. After an attack, life would be such a savage man-to-man struggle that it wouldn't be worth living through (disagree).	67	68	55	67
9. There isn't any safe way to live in this world any more, so it's just a question of what chances or risks we want to take (disagree).	66	72	66	61

Table C-VI-9 (continued)

<u>Statements of Opinion</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Favorably</u>			
	<u>Prot.</u>	<u>Cath.</u>	<u>Jewish</u>	<u>No Pref.</u>
10. I wouldn't want to live through an attack if I knew most of my friends and neighbors were dead (disagree).	66%	72%	57%	67%
11. Most people have the space to put in a shelter if they really want one (agree).	68	58	47	59
12. Scientists don't understand things well enough to make predictions that we can rely on (disagree).	59	61	67	56
13. The ending or saving of the world is up to the will of God. Man can't protect himself (disagree).	56	54	70	66
14. Parents have a duty to protect their children by building a fallout shelter (agree).	53	55	33	49
15. A person who builds a shelter now will be respected by his neighbors (agree).	33	35	15	26
16. If an attack comes, a person with a shelter will have to protect it from neighbors who will try to break in (disagree).	30	32	32	30
17. Living in a shelter for a long period of time would drive many people insane (disagree).	28	34	30	28
18. Shelters cost more than most families can afford (disagree).	25	26	22	23

Part VII: A comparison among those who indicate (a) a Republican preference, (b) a Democratic preference, or (c) no political preference.

Table C-VII-1. Estimates as to the likelihood of a major war:

<u>Questions--Response</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>		
	<u>Repub</u>	<u>Democ</u>	<u>Independent</u>
1. It is likely that there will be a major war between the U.S. and Russia, etc.	31%	36%	38%
2. If war does come, it will come in 2 years or less.	19	20	18
3. In general, we are moving more toward war (rather than more toward peace--or neither).	38	32	32

Table C-VII-2. Attitudes toward a U.S. "first strike:"

<u>Question--Responses</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>		
	<u>Repub</u>	<u>Democ</u>	<u>Independent</u>
"Suppose you were to become convinced that Russia would start a war. How do you feel about the U.S. striking first--before Russia has a chance to attack us?"			
In favor	49%	51%	45%
Opposed	40	36	34
Undecided	11	13	21

Table C-VII-3. Estimates as to where bombs or missiles would fall in the U.S., given an attack:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>		
	<u>Repub</u>	<u>Democ</u>	<u>Independent</u>
Bombs would fall on my community.	70%	71%	70%
Bombs would fall in this part of the country.	19	16	17
Bombs wouldn't fall in this part of the country.	11	13	13

Table C-VII-4. Estimates as to whether an individual can do something to protect against blast, fire, or fallout dangers--given that bombs or missiles will drop on or close to his community:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>		
	<u>Repub</u>	<u>Democ</u>	<u>Independent</u>
1. I could do something now to protect against the blast of the bombs.	27%	28%	25%
2. I could do something now to protect against fire caused by bombs.	33	32	30
3. I could do something now to protect against radio-active fallout.	39	35	30

Table C-VII-5. Estimates of blast, fire, or fallout dangers to the individual--given that his community is not hit directly by bombs or missiles:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>		
	<u>Repub</u>	<u>Democ</u>	<u>Independent</u>
1. I think I would be killed or injured by the blast from bombs or missiles exploding somewhere else.	45%	49%	50%
2. I think I would be killed or injured by fire.	36	41	42
3. I think I would be killed or made sick by fallout radiation.	75	79	76



Table C-VII-6. Estimates of the utility of shelters in escaping radiation sickness:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses (in percentages)</u>		
	<u>Repub</u>	<u>Democ</u>	<u>Independent</u>
Given that they had fallout shelters, people who lived far enough away to escape the bomb blast would have:			
1. A very good or some chance of escaping radiation sickness.	77%	76%	73%
2. Very little or no chance of escaping radiation sickness.	20	22	23
3. No Answer.	3	2	4

Table C-VII-7. Respondent categories of planning, investigation, and contribution of fallout shelters:

<u>Categories</u>	<u>Percentages in each Category</u>		
	<u>Repub</u>	<u>Democ</u>	<u>Independent</u>
Has a shelter	2%	1%	1%
Has plans; has investigated.	4	5	5
Has plans; has not investigated.	2	2	2
Has no plans; has thought and investigated.	14	12	10
Has no plans; has thought, has not investigated.	27	26	23
Has no plans; has not thought.	51	54	59

Table C-VII-8. Accuracy on 14 statements of fact relevant to nuclear radiation and fallout shelters:

<u>Statements of Fact</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Correctly</u>		
	<u>Repub</u>	<u>Democ</u>	<u>Independent</u>
1. If you get exposed to radiation at all, you are sure to die (disagree).	84%	78%	79%
2. Fallout from just one bomb may cover thousands of square miles (agree).	70	74	71
3. There is a new pill you can take that will protect you against radioactive fallout (disagree).	66	64	53
4. If someone has radiation sickness, you should avoid getting near him so you won't catch it yourself (disagree).	66	56	59
5. An atomic war would contaminate the water supply and almost everyone would die before the water was fit to drink again (disagree).	63	56	52
6. An atomic war would destroy all food and ways of producing food, so you would die soon--even if you were protected by a shelter (disagree).	59	52	51
7. A plastic suit with filtering mask is plenty of protection against fallout (disagree).	49	50	42
8. Most fallout rapidly loses its power to harm people (agree).	46	42	41
9. After a nuclear attack, if you filter the dust out of the air, the air will be safe to breathe (agree).	40	40	36
10. The radioactivity after an attack would make the earth, or some areas of it, impossible to live in for years or even centuries (disagree).	34	29	28

Table C-VII-8 (continued)

<u>Statements of Fact</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Correctly</u>		
	<u>Repub</u>	<u>Democ</u>	<u>Independent</u>
11. If we are attacked, great weather storms from the explosions would sweep the nation (disagree).	31%	28%	26%
12. A fallout shelter should have an air tight door to guard against radiation (disagree).	23	19	24
13. Any adequate family shelter would cost at least three hundred dollars (disagree).	12	14	13
14. You can not see fallout (disagree).	10	12	11

Table C-VII-9. Favorability of beliefs on 18 statements of opinion relevant to nuclear radiation and fallout shelters:

<u>Statements of Opinion</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Favorably</u>		
	<u>Repub</u>	<u>Democ</u>	<u>Independent</u>
1. Building a shelter is like hiding in a hole--only a coward would do it (disagree).	90%	90%	88%
2. It is a person's duty to try to live as long as he or she can (agree).	89	89	87
3. An attack would destroy the morale of the U.S. so much that it would not be possible to rebuild the country (disagree).	88	86	84
4. Building a shelter is wrong in the eyes of God (disagree).	84	84	80
5. It would take a little while after an attack, but law and order would be restored (agree).	82	78	77
6. If we build shelters for everyone, war will be more likely to happen (disagree).	77	74	72
7. If a person builds a family shelter his neighbors and friends probably will laugh at him or think he is crazy. (disagree).	71	69	67

Table C-VII-9 (continued)

<u>Statements of Opinion</u>	<u>Percentage Responding Favorably</u>		
	<u>Repub</u>	<u>Democ</u>	<u>Independent</u>
8. After an attack, life would be such a savage man-to-man struggle that it wouldn't be worth living through (disagree).	70%	65%	65%
9. There isn't any safe way to live in this world any more, so it's just a question of what chances or risks we want to take (disagree).	70	64	64
10. I wouldn't want to live through an attack if I knew most of my friends and neighbors were dead (disagree).	66	63	61
11. Most people have the space to put in a shelter if they really want one (agree).	66	63	58
12. Scientists don't understand things well enough to make predictions that we can rely on (disagree).	59	60	53
13. The ending or saving of the world is up to the will of God. Man can't protect himself (disagree).	61	55	53
14. Parents have a duty to protect their children by building a fallout shelter (agree).	49	55	50
15. A person who builds a shelter now will be respected by his neighbors (agree).	30	33	29
16. If an attack comes, a person with a shelter will have to protect it from his neighbors who will try to break in (disagree).	32	30	28
17. Living in a shelter for a long period of time would drive many people insane (disagree).	30	29	27
18. Shelters cost more than most families can afford (disagree).	27	23	23