





This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

A REVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF PARTICIPANT REACTION TO  
THE UNIVERSITY CIVIL DEFENSE EXTENSION  
TRAINING PROGRAM IN THE STATE OF FLORIDA

presented by

Glenn A. Goerke

has been accepted towards fulfillment  
of the requirements for

Ph. D. degree in Education

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Harold B. Lill".

Major professor

Date

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Glenn A. Goerke".

ROOM USE ONLY

ROOM USE ONLY

## ABSTRACT

### A REVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF PARTICIPANT REACTION TO THE UNIVERSITY CIVIL DEFENSE EXTENSION TRAINING PROGRAM IN THE STATE OF FLORIDA

By Glenn A. Goerke

The purpose of this study was to make a survey and analysis of the reactions obtained from participants in the Shelter Management and Radiological Monitoring Instructors courses offered by the Civil Defense Extension Training Program conducted by the Florida Institute for Continuing University Studies to determine ways in which the program might be strengthened and improved and to identify those elements not relevant to the objectives of the program.

A questionnaire was sent to the 100 individuals involved in the instructor training program and replies were received from 67.

Among the major findings of the study were:

1. Approximately 95 per cent of the participants were male and ranged in age from 20 to 60 years with 60 per cent between the ages of 39 and 59.
2. Thirty-six of the participants were college graduates and only one of the total sampled did not complete high school.
3. Eighty-two of the trainees indicated they considered Civil Defense to be an essential part of our total defense effort and approximately 70 per cent

Glenn A. Goerke

indicated they were more favorably impressed concerning the role of Civil Defense upon completing the training program than prior to their entry in it.

4. The two experiences rated as the most valuable were those involving confinement in a shelter and the opportunity to use the instruments available in the Radiological Monitoring settings.
5. Eighty-four per cent of the trainees rated the methodology used in classes as superior and lesson outlines as being most comprehensive.
6. The trainees indicated that the program should be extended in length from one to two weeks and class size limited to 25.

It was expected that those who were trained for leadership roles in Civil Defense would return to their communities and initiate programs at the local level to train the lay public. However, data indicated that only 12 of those who participated in the instructor training program organized such programs.

In examining the responses from the questionnaire, the writer found that it was the consensus of the trainees in the Shelter Management and Radiological Monitoring Instructors Courses that the training they received was most valuable and essential to survival.

Glenn A. George

They did, however, express concern that the lay public was not aware of the essentiality of such a program.

In conclusion, the writer found evidence that the program as presented by the Florida Institute for Continuing University Studies was favorably accepted by the Instructor trainees and the objectives as outlined in this study would be promoted on a national level.

A REVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF PARTICIPANT REACTION TO  
THE UNIVERSITY CIVIL DEFENSE EXTENSION  
TRAINING PROGRAM IN THE STATE OF FLORIDA

By

Glenn A. Goerke

A THESIS

Submitted to  
Michigan State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Education

1964

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to thank his major professor, Dr. Harold J. Dillon, for his constant encouragement and advice in the preparation of this study. He also wishes to recognize the assistance given him by the members of his Guidance Committee, Mrs. Clyde M. Campbell, Max S. Smith, and Jay Artis; and to Dr. Edgar Schuler for his willingness to assist in the examination of the dissertation.

He is appreciative of the efforts of Dr. Myron R. Elee, Director of The Florida Institute for Continuing University Studies, in making time available to him to complete his graduate work.

To my wife, Barbara, I shall always feel a debt of gratitude for her forbearance, without which I would have been unable to complete my doctoral studies.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                                                           | Page |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS. . . . .                                                 | ii   |
| LIST OF TABLES. . . . .                                                   | v    |
| CHAPTER                                                                   |      |
| I. THE PROBLEM. . . . .                                                   | 1    |
| Introduction. . . . .                                                     | 1    |
| Statement of the Problem. . . . .                                         | 7    |
| Assumptions. . . . .                                                      | 11   |
| Delimitations. . . . .                                                    | 12   |
| Definitions. . . . .                                                      | 12   |
| Significance of the Study. . . . .                                        | 13   |
| Procedure and Methodology. . . . .                                        | 14   |
| II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE. . . . .                                     | 17   |
| III. THE HISTORY OF CIVIL DEFENSE IN THE<br>UNITED STATES. . . . .        | 23   |
| Organization. . . . .                                                     | 31   |
| The National Plan. . . . .                                                | 31   |
| Radiological Defense. . . . .                                             | 33   |
| State and Community Needs. . . . .                                        | 34   |
| Continuity of Government. . . . .                                         | 36   |
| Community Action. . . . .                                                 | 36   |
| IV. THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS OF CIVIL DEFENSE. . . . .                    | 42   |
| The University Civil Defense Extension<br>Program. . . . .                | 50   |
| V. UNIVERSITY CIVIL DEFENSE EXTENSION IN<br>THE STATE OF FLORIDA. . . . . | 54   |
| VI. RESEARCH PROCEDURE. . . . .                                           | 63   |
| Construction and Preparation of the<br>Questionnaire. . . . .             | 65   |
| Sampling. . . . .                                                         | 65   |
| Treatment of the Data. . . . .                                            | 66   |

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

|                                                   | Page |
|---------------------------------------------------|------|
| CHAPTER                                           |      |
| VII. INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA. . . . .          | 67   |
| Personal Characteristics of the Respondents..     | 67   |
| Educational Background. . . . .                   | 68   |
| Program Promotion. . . . .                        | 70   |
| Previous Civil Defense Experience. . . . .        | 71   |
| Attitude Toward Civil Defense. . . . .            | 72   |
| Reasons for Participating in the Program. .       | 73   |
| Radiological Monitoring Graduates. . . . .        | 78   |
| Instruction and Methodology. . . . .              | 81   |
| VIII. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS. . | 85   |
| Summary. . . . .                                  | 86   |
| Conclusions. . . . .                              | 89   |
| Recommendations. . . . .                          | 90   |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .                             | 92   |
| APPENDICES. . . . .                               | 97   |

## LIST OF TABLES

|                                                                                                            | Page |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| TABLE                                                                                                      |      |
| I. WORLD-RECORD-BREAKING RANGES OF PROJECTILES 1953-1954. . . . .                                          | 4    |
| II. EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND OF RESPONDENTS. . . . .                                                         | 68   |
| III. MAJOR AREAS OF COLLEGE STUDY. . . . .                                                                 | 69   |
| IV. AREAS OF INSTRUCTION INCLUDED IN THE SHELTER MANAGEMENT COURSE AND PARTICIPANT REACTION. . . . .       | 74   |
| V. PARTICIPANTS' REACTION TO SHELTER EXPERIENCE. . . . .                                                   | 76   |
| VI. PARTICIPANT REACTION TO AREAS OF STUDY INCLUDED IN RADIOLOGICAL MONITORING INSTRUCTORS COURSE. . . . . | 78   |

CHAPTER I  
THE PROBLEM

Introduction:

America has grown great because of the imagination, courage, drive and energy of Americans. We no longer can revel in the fact that we were once nothing but a wilderness. What was once a haystack, a forest and trees, has now developed into the world's most complex industrial and social empire.

Where once America was able to insulate itself against the world by the mere fact of its geographical position, it has, because of the wonders of communication, transmission, and transportation, become a part of the entire world complex. Its emergence from isolation to a leader of the world's free nations, as indicated in January, 1942, when the United States and other allied countries assumed the name of the United Nations has caused it to examine most carefully and thoughtfully its position in the world community.

Our advances in science, notably the development of the Atom bomb and our reflection on the havoc it wrought on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, caused us not to revel in our greatness but rather to reflect upon the fact that other nations have similarly developed weapons of great destruction. These

factors have become a matter of great concern to those whose responsibility it is to preserve the democracy for which we so thoughtfully and effectively, and sometimes harshly fought. We, as a nation, are completely aware that our survival can no longer be tantamount to our saying that we are removed from the other nations of the world. We know that our safety depends not only upon our immense, and sometimes fierce, striking power and its incumbent retaliatory measures against any nation so thoughtless as to provoke a nuclear war, but we also know that our survival depends upon developing a kind of amicable society among other nations that will provide for our security.

However, through our long history we have been a practical people. We know full well that while trust begets trust, it is sometimes folly to believe that other nations are not so sound economically or politically to prevent acts of aggression from occurring. Therefore, mindful that we are not only vulnerable, but possibly a future target of nuclear warfare with the intent destruction of many millions of people as well as our physical complex, we have found need for a program that will provide for the survival of many people who might otherwise become the victim of such a holocaust. Too, we need to provide a program that will enable survivors to recoup their losses and to rebuild America.

Unfortunately, America tends to become cognizant of dangers only when a crisis is imminent. We well remember the

rationing of World War II, the many millions of tin cans carefully crushed, the total blackouts of our homes, and yet all this was the result of the prevalence of World War II. As the scars of such an encounter begin to heal, we too quickly forgot the need for preparedness against a continuing and malignant source of destruction devised by ideological determinations of other nations of the world. Russia and Red China, though at times making overtones of a peaceful nature, are committed to the Communist doctrine as indicated by Lin Shao-chi in his book, How To Be A Good Communist which states: "What is the most fundamental and common duty of us Communist Party members? As everybody knows, it is to establish Communism, to transform the present world into a Communist world." (42, 37) This most certainly provides reason for continual alertness on the part of our nation.

The state of readiness on the part of both military and non-military defense forces necessitated by our modern day world tensions occasioned President John F. Kennedy to issue Executive Order 10952 in July of 1961, which called for reorganization of our Civil Defense efforts under the total Department of Defense structure. (31)

Prior to detailing our current Civil Defense program, however, let us take a look at the historical origin and development of Civil Defense in the United States.

War has now become so astoundingly destructive that man must control it if he expects to survive. Since man's brute impulses may now be expressed with use of H-Bomb, radio-active cloud, germs, chemical agents, and destructive devices, he is faced with a clear-cut issue: he either controls war or he is likely to perish as a living species. Modern weapons have expanded the "killing area" more than a million fold since 1900 so that it now covers the entire surface of the earth. Since the human institutions that govern such destruction have progressed only a small fraction of this amount, we are concerned that natural science has far outstripped social science. We have learned how to split the atom but we have not learned how to make sure that it will be used for the improvement and not the destruction of mankind. The growth in the development of a nation's destructive power is indicated in Table I. (28:36)

TABLE I. WORLD-RECORD-BREAKING RANGES OF PROJECTILES,  
1853 - 1959

| Date | Type of Projectile    | Maximum<br>Range In<br>Miles | Killing Area<br>In Square<br>Miles |
|------|-----------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1853 | Cannon                | 1.0                          | 3                                  |
| 1870 | Cannon                | 1.1                          | 4                                  |
| 1897 | Rocket                | 2.0                          | 13                                 |
| 1930 | Coast Artillery       | 3.0                          | 20                                 |
| 1959 | Armstrong's Rifle Gun | 5.0                          | 70                                 |

TABLE I. (Continued)

| Date | Type of Projectile                           | Maximum Range In Miles | Killing Area In Square Miles |
|------|----------------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1900 | Coast Artillery                              | 6.3                    | 125                          |
| 1910 | Coast Artillery                              | 10.2                   | 326                          |
| 1912 | Coast Artillery                              | 11.4                   | 408                          |
| 1915 | Zeppelin Raid on London                      | 200.0                  | 126,000                      |
| 1918 | Bombing Plane                                | 200.0                  | 246,000                      |
| 1938 | Ave. Eu. Bombing Formation                   | 750.0                  | 1,761,000                    |
| 1943 | Bombing Plane                                | 1,200.0                | 4,180,000                    |
| 1944 | Bombing Plane                                | 2,050.0                | 12,900,000                   |
| 1945 | Bombing Plane                                | 2,500.0                | 19,000,000                   |
| 1946 | Bombing Plane                                | 3,900.0                | 45,000,000                   |
| 1949 | Bombing Plane                                | 5,000.0                | 69,000,000                   |
| 1954 | Bombing Planes -<br>Refueled from<br>the Air | 12,500.0               | 197,000,000                  |

Hart's study emphasizes four aspects of the atomic crisis:

The power to destroy has been increasing more and more rapidly. This has been true for centuries, but in recent decades, the speedup has increased to a point where civilization is menaced. The evidence supports predictions by Einstein and other atomic scientists that cities of warring nations may be practically wiped out, and that large fractions of national populations may be exterminated. Conceivably, the disorganization resulting from such disasters might mean

the complete breakdown of world civilization. But the menace is not merely the atomic bomb. It is rather the accelerating progress in all aspects of destructive technology and in scientific knowledge of plant, animal and human diseases. This study has shown that various trends of destructive power can be described mathematically, and can be predicted with measurable reliability.

The power to control such destructive forces has also been increasing over the centuries, but at only a tiny fraction of the speed with which destructive power has grown.

This lag of social control behind accelerating destructive power must be overcome if our civilization is to survive and progress.

Only a swift upsurge in the effectiveness of social science seems likely to bridge this gap of cultural lag. Progress in science has produced the Industrial Revolution, which has resulted in doubling and redoubling of the real income of American and other workers of the Western World. It has brought conquests of disease which have produced doubled and redoubled extensions of life expectation in American and European countries. Wherever the scientific method has been fully developed, and brought to bear upon basic human problems, the solution of the problems has surged forward to new levels of achievement and success. . . Evidence has been found which points toward the possibility that the needed upsurge may be achieved in time to bridge the otherwise fatal gap between destructive technology and social control. (28:4-5)

The salvation of the free world depends upon preparedness, upon an understanding of people whose hearts are dedicated to freedom through understanding and not an ability

to promote those mechanizations that could lead to world destruction. However, alertness to danger is a small price to pay for indifference and lethargy.

Statement of the Problem:

The introduction of nuclear weapons into modern warfare has brought about an entirely new concept in the area of Civil Defense.

Recent testimony before the Hebert Committee, (A House of Representatives Sub-Committee) by Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara cited the following:

Indeed, in the absence of adequate fall-out shelters, an active defense might not significantly increase the proportion of the population surviving an "all out" nuclear attack. (19:646-648)

Additional testimony of more than 100 expert witnesses including our top nuclear scientists, Joint Chiefs-of-Staff, Religious leaders, and political leaders gave overwhelming evidence of the immediate need for a strong national Civil Defense Program.

As a nation we have always held to a posture of strong armed forces but have never really had to face a situation in which a well-disciplined civilian force would operate in an emergency situation. Obviously, if nuclear holocaust should be the fate of our modern world, then that nation which has the protection and organization of resources available to facilitate recovery will be the victorious force.

For the last thirteen years the United States Government has had in operation either an Office of Civil Defense Management, or a Department of Defense Organization geared to the organization and training of the American public toward survival in the event of a national emergency.

This paper deals with the training program of these agencies and more specifically its current program. To date, these two organizations, the latter replacing the first in 1961, have seen little if any results in terms of attitudinal changes as a result of training.

In a recent publication on Civil Defense research, it was stated that,

A very important result of our surveys is the clear indication that public attitudes about nuclear disaster and civil defense are unstable. (27:7)

This article further alluded to the fact that the survey showed very few people with training in terms of current knowledges in the area of nuclear weapons and effects.

In the reorganization of the Civil Defense area, under the Department of Defense, immediate concern was projected in the area of training and information of the American public. The National Shelter Program calling for the identification, licensing and provisioning of 240 million shelter spaces for the American population was begun in 1962. This program has now established 70 million spaces which will be operationally ready in June, 1964, and further identified 22

million spaces to be ready three or four months later. An integral part of the National Shelter Program was the training of over 750,000 shelter managers and 750,000 radiological monitors to staff these spaces in emergency situations.

How could such a massive training program be instituted when to date little if any motivation was found on the part of the public to learn about the area of Civil Defense?

The Department of Defense, after lengthy discussion felt that Civil Defense could best be served by acquiring a new training image. With this in mind Universities or University Extension programs in all 50 states were contracted to present in cooperation with State Offices of Civil Defense training courses for instructions of Radiological Monitors and Shelter Managers. The hope of the Department of Defense being that the prestige of the institutions of higher learning would lend itself to recruitment and motivation of instructors of a calibre that would create a cadre of well informed leadership in the Civil Defense area.

Personnel from each institution contracted for the program were given a six-week training program in Battle Creek, Michigan, and then returned to their individual states to initiate this training program.

In view of the development of these facts, it seems vital to appraise the current status and development of this program in its first year in quest of answers applicable to the goals of any national training program of the American public.

Therefore, it will be the specific purpose of this study to:

1. Review and analyze the program of the Florida Institute for Continuing University Studies - University Civil Defense Extension in terms of:
  - A. The goals and purposes of the University Civil Defense Extension Program as established by the Department of Defense, Office of Civil Defense in conjunction with the University Civil Defense Extension Committee comprised of University Personnel.
  - B. The goals and purposes of a mass training program.
  - C. The characteristics of participants in the program in terms of:
    1. Age
    2. Sex
    3. Marital and Family Status
    4. Occupation
    5. Tenure in Position
    6. Number of years of formal school training
    7. Prior Civil Defense training
    8. Civil Defense Affiliation
    9. Participation in community activities

10. Knowledge of their purpose in participating in the Instructor Training Program.
  11. Knowledge of and agreement with the objectives of the University Civil Defense Extension program established by department of Defense, Office of Civil Defense and the University Committee.
- D. Factors motivating participation in the University Civil Defense Extension program.
  - E. Factors which have accelerated or inhibited the instructions in Shelter Management and Radiological Monitoring courses by participants upon completion of instructor training.
  - F. Curricular content as viewed by participants.
  - G. Recruitment processes as viewed by participants.
- II. Recommend methods of improving and stimulating University Civil Defense Extension programs on the basis of needs defined by participants in the program.

Assumptions:

- I. That a more accurate picture of the University Civil Defense Extension can be secured by having participants involved evaluate it.

- II. That current goals for the University Civil Defense Extension Program as perceived by Office of Civil Defense and University personnel can be determined.
- III. That current thinking on mass training, in terms of goals and purposes can be established.
- IV. That data collection instruments can be devised to secure the necessary data as set forth in the purpose of this study.

Delimitations:

- I. This study will be confined to the University Civil Defense Extension Program of the Florida Institute for Continuing University Studies.
- II. This study will involve a contract period beginning in 1963 and ending in 1964.
- III. The data reported will involve only the participants enrolled in the formal training program.
- IV. Pertinent relationships and interpretations will be pointed out in terms of the purposes of this study.

Definitions:

PARTICIPANT -- Any person enrolled in a class offered by the University Civil Defense Extension Program during the period covered by this study.

UNIVERSITY CIVIL DEFENSE EXTENSION PROGRAM -- Extension courses offered in the areas of Radiological Monitoring and Shelter Management Instructor Training.

CIVIL DEFENSE -- Organized government in action during an emergency situation.

FLORIDA INSTITUTE FOR CONTINUING UNIVERSITY STUDIES -- The University Extension Branch in the State of Florida.

RADIOLOGICAL MONITORING FOR INSTRUCTORS -- A course designed to train instructors of Radiological Monitors.

SHELTER MANAGEMENT FOR INSTRUCTORS -- A course designed to train instructors of fallout shelter managers.

Significance of the Study:

Civil Defense has been an often maligned and de-emphasized area and yet becomes increasingly important to our national survival. Public consensus points to Federal leadership in both the building of shelters and training of personnel in the Civil Defense Program.

The writer has pointed up the concern on the part of our Federal Government for information and training in this area. This paper will deal with a proposed five-year program in which approximately twelve and a half million dollars will be spent on the training of personnel for Radiological and Shelter staffing.

It is the contention of this investigator that a program funded through the Federal Government and handled by the University can meet this demand.

Figures are available, and will be presented in this paper, to show our current and projected demands for trained

Civil Defense Personnel. The writer proposed that this program was meeting those demands and that trained instructors were returning to their local areas to train those needed to realize the objectives of the program.

All of us are aware that Russia, Germany, Sweden and other European countries have mandatory Civil Defense programs and are far ahead in training such personnel. This is a challenge for our institutions of higher learning and, perhaps of greater significance, our training methods in a democratic society.

Procedure and Methodology:

- I. A search of the literature was completed.
- II. The primary data for this study was obtained by means of a questionnaire type survey, distributed to all participants involved in the 1963-1964 University Civil Defense Instructor Training courses.
  - A. A questionnaire was constructed to obtain information in accordance with the general purpose of the study. Criteria, selected from literature on educational research procedures guided the investigator in questionnaire construction. A sample form of the instrument was presented to Harold J. Lillon for evaluation by him as well as members of graduate seminars in Adult Education. All groups were

asked to evaluate the instrument in terms of stated purposes. These recommendations and suggestions were then applied in constructing the final instrument.

B. This questionnaire was used to secure responses from the following groups: Radiological Monitoring Instructors and Shelter Management Instructors.

C. The data obtained from the survey instrument were tabulated on a data processing card and were sorted by machine. Upon sorting, charts were drawn from data according to the range of frequency and relative importance of each item. These data were further studied to determine whether they substantiated factors as set forth in the proposal.

III. A list of the central purposes and goals of the Civil Defense Extension program was synthesized from authoritative sources in the field. This list served the investigator in both the thesis body and construction of the questionnaire.

IV. Lists of participants, university officials and Civil Defense officials, with addresses, were secured. Covering letters, where needed, were sent out over the signature of Harold J. Dillon.

- V. Other information required for this study was secured by means of an interview with those personnel whose contribution was relevant to the study.
- VI. Results were interpreted and analyzed, relationships appraised, conclusions drawn and implications described.

CHAPTER II  
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In reviewing the literature, the author found a great need for additional research and study. Without the wealth of pamphlet material issued by government agencies and testimony given before various committees, there would certainly be little to offer in the Civil Defense area.

Modern war has fathered the phenomenon of Civil Defense as it now exists for an age when an entire world is a battleground. (37) At a time when a world could be obliterated overnight concepts of shelter, protection, radiation buildup and such other terms must be carefully scrutinized and understood.

Civil Defense in its modern form is basically an outgrowth of the experience of World War II. "Modern civil defense had its conception during World War II when the civilian areas of England became targets for Nazi air-raids and buzz bomb attacks." (41:56)

T. H. O'Brien commented with reference to the origins of civil defense in Britain:

"Civil Defense" had origins of a kind during 1914-1916, a long period of desultory consideration in the 1920's and 1930's, a new practical application after 1935, a more rapid peacetime growth during and after the Munich crisis and a continuous modification in the long years 1939-1945. (37:XVI)

Although still not accepted in the minds of many people, W. H. Hancock has said:

The advent of a fourth service, "Civil" by designation yet destined to, in all probability take permanent place alongside the three fighting services, is an historical theme of exceptional importance. (37:1)

Civil defense in the United States has hit depths as on May 2, 1945, when President Harry S. Truman issued a statement of termination of the Office of Civilian Defense.

This change does not in any respect lessen the need for volunteer efforts in our states and communities. State and local governments are fully aware of their continuing responsibilities, and I am sure that we can depend upon their knowledge and the patriotism of the millions of volunteers to continue the war jobs in which the whole nation has had to be trained. Protection volunteers, such as auxiliary firemen and policemen, working with state and local governments have done a magnificent job through their defense councils in organizing to protect the nation against the threat of enemy action, sabotage, and other war hazards. Civilian War Services volunteers have likewise rendered invaluable assistance.

The millions of volunteer workers throughout the nation, giving freely of their time, have been basic to the strength of our democracy. I know they will willingly continue to serve. Under General Haskell's able direction the OGD has provided needed assistance to the defense councils and volunteers in carrying on their important work in advancing the war effort on the home front. (40:30-31)

The Honorable W. Stuart Symington submitted a plan for organizing the civil defense of the United States to President

Harry S. Truman on September 8, 1950, which said in part:

Adequate civil defense will require the interest and effort of hundreds of thousands of our people, contributed for the most part on a voluntary basis. (43)

Civil defense underwent its period of establishment during the 1950's as indicated by the following extracts from letters, speeches, etc.:

Let me warn you again that there is no such thing as bargain basement preparedness or escape from the hard realities of the time. There are no short cuts to civil defense preparedness. It is a tough, unpleasant but grimly necessary job.

Fortunately, civil defense is in the American tradition, dating back to the frontier days when all members of every family had a task to do in defending their homes and their stockades from marauding savages. (49)

On the first anniversary of civil defense, President Truman made the above statement to the press. On April 24, 1952, in a letter of transmittal of the first annual report by the Federal Civil Defense Administration to the Congress of the United States, President Truman stated:

Everyone in this country--all of us--must face the fact that civil defense is, and will continue to be, just as vital to American security as our Armed Forces, our defense production, and our aid to allies and friends abroad. (20)

President Eisenhower, in an address before the General Assembly of the United Nations, said:

. . .atomic bombs are more than 25 times as powerful as the weapons with which the atomic age dawned, while hydrogen weapons are in the ranges of millions of tons of TNT equivalent. (16)

In his State of the Union Message to the 84th Congress, President Eisenhower declared:

Our civil defense is a key element in the protection of our country. We are developing cooperative methods with State governors, mayors, and voluntary citizen groups as well as among federal agencies, in building the civil defense organization. Its significance in time of war is obvious, its swift assistance in disaster areas last year proved its importance in time of peace. (16)

He also stated in a message to the Senate on August 25, 1959:

. . .along with our military defense and retaliatory forces, civil defense and defense mobilization are vital parts of the nation's total defense--together they stand as a strong deterrent to war. (17)

The early years of 1960 saw a continuation of emphasis on the program of civil defense. At a White House Conference on Fallout Protection in January of 1960, Christian A. Herter said:

A vital part of our military strength for peace must be an effective civil defense program which, in conjunction with our retaliatory capacity, creates a strong deterrent to possible enemy attack upon the United States. If, despite our earnest efforts at the negotiating table and our defense preparations, we should nevertheless be subjected to nuclear attack, civil defense and measures

for fallout protection offer the most practicable and feasible means of saving the greatest number of lives. (29)

In the book, Fallout-A Study of Superbombs, Strontium 90 and Survival, it was indicated that the problem of civil defense is not one of saving everybody in the event of attack. People caught in the direct path of a nuclear weapon would not survive. The majority of the casualties in a nuclear attack would be suffered among persons not directly hit by the bombs. Many of these casualties might be avoided if the population were provided with moderate shielding against fallout, emergency food and medical supplies, instructions on how to avoid unnecessary exposure in contaminated areas, and other civil-defense measures which are within the realm of feasibility. (26) It is the task of civil defense to prepare a program which will accomplish the objective of minimizing the effects of a nuclear attack.

The threat of annihilation by nuclear weapons is with us to stay. However, fear tactics have now given away to sound planning as indicated by John F. Kennedy in his message to Congress on Urgent National Needs in May of 1961.

One major element of the national security program which this nation has never squarely faced up to is civil defense. . . civil defense can be justifiable as insurance for the civilian population in case of an enemy miscalculation. . .there is no point in delaying the initiation of a nationwide long-range program of identifying present fallout shelter capacity and providing shelter in new and existing structures. (32)

Norman Lahn, in Comments on Civil Defense, contributed to the forward movement of civil defense when he stated:

The case for civil defense today does not rest upon the contribution it can make to our war effort. Nor does it rest upon any possible strengthening of our ability to deter an attack. . . Civil defense measures are likely to be very effective in some possible kinds of attack and at least partially effective against most forms of attack we can now envision. Depending on the attack and the civil defense measures employed, the lives of as many as a hundred million people might be saved and, under some conditions, casualties limited to one or two million people. Civil defense preparation could also mean that the nation might recuperate in five years instead of twenty, or in twenty years instead of a hundred.(30)

Of greatest impact and significance were the Robert Hearings of 1963 in which P. Edward Robert, Chairman of The House Armed Services Committee, presented extended hearings on the question of the need or feasibility of a fallout shelter program in the United States. (19)

One hundred and eight witnesses were called during the seven weeks of the hearings with a good distribution of those in favor of the program and those opposed to it.

CHAPTER III  
THE HISTORY OF CIVIL DEFENSE  
IN THE UNITED STATES

The first United States Office of Civilian Defense was created by executive order in 1941 and was organized after a pattern set up by Great Britain for the protection of life and property from air raids during World War II. The organization in this country was used chiefly for such war time civilian functions as black out drills, blood donor programs, training programs and war bond drives. This office was discontinued with the end of World War II in 1945.

In June of 1945 the central responsibility for planning national civil defense policy and programs was assigned to the War Department. The responsibility for the program remained with the military until 1949.

During this period studies were initiated by the War Department Civil Defense Board to determine the future of civil defense.

The final report of this Board according to the publication United States Civil Defense stated: "The report of this Board, representing the view of the Armed Services, recognized and emphasized the principle that civil defense was a responsibility of civil government." (44:15)

Following this report the National Military Establishment (now the Department of Defense) was created and an Office

of Civil Defense Planning was established within the Office of the Secretary of Defense. This Office continued and extended civil defense planning and produced a report, Civil Defense for National Security, commonly known as the Hopley Report. The Hopley Report facilitated the movement of the civil defense program to the National Security Resources Board in March of 1949.

Civil defense remained under the jurisdiction of the National Security Resources Board until 1950.

On September 6, 1950, J. Stuart Symington, Chairman of The Board, issued a letter of transmittal along with the annual report of the group which read:

THE HONORABLE HARRY S. TRUMAN,  
The White House

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I submit to you herewith a plan for organizing the civil defense of the United States.

Adequate civil defense will require the interest and effort of hundreds of thousands of our people, contributed for the most part on a voluntary basis.

These citizens will get little material return. Their interest and effort at this time, however, will be both wise and prudent, because until effective international control exists over the use of modern weapons which can devastate our towns and cities, we must put into action those precautionary measures which past experience and new tests have shown would save thousands of lives in case of attack.

Such a program is needed. It will be expensive. We are working on the budget details of that cost, and will present them to you for your consideration as soon as they are available.

This report provides an outline of the organization and techniques which should be developed by the State and local communities on whom rest the primary responsibility for civil defense.

The plan presented here builds upon the wartime experience of Great Britain and Germany, as well as upon previous planning undertaken by agencies of the United States Government. In particular, it embraces material from the report entitled "Civil Defense for National Security" (Hopley Report) issued by the Department of Defense.

Contributions to this report have been made by many individuals, representing a number of Federal agencies; and also by organizations outside the Government. To all these people we express our appreciation.

The plan recommends a basic civil defense law, the establishment of a Civil Defense Administration, and the appointment of an Administrator.

It is our hope these steps will be taken promptly, in order that the Federal Government may exercise strong and effective leadership in acquainting the people of the United States with the great and growing importance of this branch of the national security program-- Civil Defense, a program which, to be successful "will require the cooperation of every man, woman, and child in this Nation."

Respectfully submitted.

W. Stuart Symington,  
Chairman

NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD (43)

The 81st Congress, in 1950, passed Public Law 875 known as the National Disaster Act. This original Act was broad in scope and included most any type of a major disaster such as flood, drought, fire, hurricane and many others.

Public Law 920 was also passed in 1950 and was known as the Federal Civil Defense Act.

Both Public Law 920 and Public Law 875 provided that all Federal Departments and Agencies prepare plans for, and provide their resources and personnel to assist civil governments in emergencies. The Director of the Federal Civil Defense Administration (FCDA), created by PL 920 was charged with the administration of both PL 920 and PL 875.

The Federal Civil Defense Administration was created, with Millard F. Caldwell, former governor of Florida, as Administrator. In January, 1951, Congress under Public Law 920, gave the Federal Civil Defense Administration the responsibility of conceiving and guiding the passive defense of this nation.

By late 1951, most major cities had developed individual civil defense programs, and some states were considering legislation for state-wide programs.

In March of 1953 former governor Val Peterson of Nebraska, who had wide experience in disaster relief as well as World War II, military experience was appointed Administrator by President Eisenhower. Earlier that same year, the Federal

Civil Defense Administration was also given the task of coordinating the work of all Federal agencies in Natural Disaster relief under the Federal Disaster Act, Public Law 875.

In 1955 Public Law 920 was amended to contain the following:

1. It provided for the establishment of a civil defense organization in each state, territory, dependency, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.
2. It directed the entities to extend their civil defense to include their own political subdivisions in the civil defense program.
3. Declared the policy and intent of Congress and defined civil defense.

Title I presented the organization of the Federal Civil Defense Agency. Title II detailed the functions of administering the civil defense program. This included:

1. Preparation of national plans and programs for the civil defense of the United States.
2. Delegation of appropriate civil defense responsibilities to other departments and agencies of the Federal Government.
3. Providing of communications networks and dissemination of attack warnings to the civilian population.
4. Study of and development of measures designed to afford adequate protection of life and property.

5. Conducting training, organizing and operating schools, paying prescribed travel expenses and subsistence and quarters and leasing of property.
6. Publicly disseminating civil defense information by all appropriate means.
7. Encouraging negotiation of interstate civil defense compacts.
8. Procuring materials and facilities for civil defense.
9. Making financial contributions, on the basis of Federally approved programs or projects for civil defense purposes.
10. Arranging for the sale or disposal of materials and facilities found to be unnecessary or unsuitable for civil defense purposes.
11. Authorizing contributions for personnel and administrative expenses.

Title III identified and defined what constituted a national emergency for civil defense purposes, outlined the use of the resources of Federal agencies at the direction of the President and spelled out the emergency powers of the Federal Government during such emergency.

Title IV described additional administrative authority given to the administration for the purpose of carrying out his powers and duties. (46)

By 1955 every state had passed legislation to establish civil defense organizations. In addition virtually every

city and numerous counties and rural communities had set up local civil defense organizations. In most states, territories and possessions, civil defense forces were authorized by law to provide rescue, relief and other passive measures in times of natural disasters. (5:27-31)

In July of 1957 former Iowa governor, Leo A. Hoegh, also a World War II officer, became administrator for The Federal Civil Defense Administration. By the Reorganization Act of July, 1956, the FCDA and the Office of Defense Mobilization (ODM) were merged in the Executive Office of President Eisenhower as the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization (OCDM). By Executive Order, the President delegated to the Director, OCDM, the authorities and responsibility for administering these two laws--the Civil Defense Act and the Natural Disaster Act.

The Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, an agency of the Executive Office of the President, was directed by Leo A. Hoegh, former administrator of the Federal Civil Defense Administration. "The mission of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization," as described by Director Hoegh, "is protection of life and property by preparing for, and carrying out, non-military functions and the mobilization and management of resources and production." (36)

Although the responsibility for civil defense preparations was shared by Federal, state and local governments, the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization was primarily

responsible for direction and coordination of these preparations, along with providing essential Federal aid. Resources which would become the direct responsibility of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization in a national emergency (such as nuclear attack or large scale natural disaster) included non-military manpower, finished goods and raw materials, the facilities for production, transportation and telecommunications, judged essential for the recovery of the nation. During the same session of Congress, in which the Federal Civil Defense Administration and the Office of Defense Mobilization were combined to form the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization, Public Law 606 was enacted. (39)

This law greatly amplified the authority of the Agency to make grants to the states and through the states to the local governments to pay half the cost of civil defense activities, materials and equipment. The Office of Defense Mobilization and its predecessor, Federal Civil Defense Administration, contributed approximately 100 million dollars. The new law also permitted contributions for certain civil defense personnel and administrative costs including travel and per diem expenses of students in approved civil defense study courses and for approved civil defense equipment and supplies. The law also authorized the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization to obtain and distribute to the states detection instruments and kits and protective masks for training and use against radiological and gas warfare. The financial aid was set up on a fifty-fifty share the cost basis.

Organization:

The Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization came directly under the Executive Office of the President and because of this and the need of being in close proximity to the other Federal agencies, Governor Hoegh directed the Agency from a national headquarters in Washington, D. C. The operational headquarters was located in Battle Creek, Michigan, in a well equipped building which was formerly the Percy Jones Hospital. The field organization was composed of eight regional offices, each commanded by a regional director who, in his region, acted for the national director. These offices had been carefully dispersed to locations to provide maximum safety from the effects of an attack upon this country.

The National Plan:

Any organization or service which was prepared at all times to provide assistance in emergencies must necessarily have operated according to a plan. The former National Plan governed all emergency actions and was virtually the Commander-in-Chief's order given in advance.

After the merger and the enactment of PL 606 in 1958, the National Plan for Civil Defense and Defense Mobilization was issued with the following statement signed by the President:

It is the clear and unequivocal position of the United States that conflict and disagreement among nations should not be resolved by the use of force. The United

States will continue through all available channels to attempt resolution of disagreements by all means that will allow peace with honor. Nevertheless, so long as direct or indirect aggression is used as an instrument of national policy by any nation, common prudence requires that every effort be made to protect the people of the United States by both active and passive means of defense. Civil defense and defense mobilization are vital parts of the nation's total defense.  
(16)

The plan established national non-military courses of action and the role of the Federal Government, the States, their political sub-divisions and the people. It anticipated three principal contingencies: international tension, limited war and general war.

The National Plan fixed the responsibilities of citizens and governments at all levels for civil defense and defense mobilization. A channel of coordination was established, down which could be transmitted instructions and up which requests for assistance would be made. Particular actions for protection of life and property were set forth including: preparations for continuity of government, public information and education, reduction of vulnerability, warning of attack, preparations for damage assessment, communications, maintenance of government, law and order, disaster services, and emergency protection from delayed or unconventional weapons effects including radiological, biological and chemical warfare agents.

Uniform warning signals were established. There were two courses of action which the public had to be capable of executing. One was evacuation or dispersement to prepared reception areas, if warning time permitted, and taking shelter if time and conditions did not permit evacuation. Target cities and other areas near assumed targets were to execute plans for either eventuality. The significant point is that action to be taken was a local decision.

Radiological Defense:

One of the great dangers of an attack by nuclear weapons is radio-active fallout. When a nuclear bomb is exploded on or near the earth, tons of dirt and debris are drawn up into the "mushroom" cloud. This material becomes radioactive and dangerous to people, animals, crops and water supplies. It can be carried long distances by the winds, then dropped back on cities, villages and open spaces. After exhaustive studies and tests, the Administration had concluded that fallout shelters offered the best single non-military protective measure for the greatest number of people. In 1958 the National Shelter Policy was announced under which the Federal government would:

1. inform every American fully on the possible effects of nuclear attack and of the actions that he and state and local governments could take to minimize them,

2. make surveys of existing structures, particularly in larger cities, to determine their shelter capabilities,
3. accelerate research to show how shelter could best be incorporated in both existing and new structures,
4. construct a limited number of prototype shelters which could have practical peacetime uses, and
5. incorporate fallout shelters in appropriate new Federal buildings.

Since a nuclear attack would pose radioactive fallout as the greatest post-attack problem, a four-part program to expand the nation's capability for detecting and measuring fallout radiation was initiated in 1958 through:

1. training Federal, state, other government personnel and high school science teachers,
2. equipping state and city civil defense organizations with radiological instruments,
3. equipping high schools with kits of training instruments by which over one million students a year could learn the fundamentals of radioactivity, and
4. establishing fixed radiation monitoring capability in 900 civil and military weather stations throughout the nation.

State and Community Needs:

The authority for civil defense planning and preparations in each state rested with the governor. He appointed a state

civil defense director, acting as his coordinator, to carry out this job. The director selected a staff of assistants; experienced persons in such work as industry, medicine and health, transportation, welfare, communications and so on. Basic organization was drawn from State government officials who have counterpart "peacetime" responsibilities. This staff was often helped by an advisory committee of experts in each activity. Together they worked out the state's emergency disaster plans and preparations, trained programs, and exercises to test the plans.

Each community had a similar emergency disaster plan with the authority given to the mayor, city manager, or other top city official. Usually, a city civil defense director coordinated this job with a staff made up much like the state civil defense office, but generally with more persons to do each specific job. As an example, the city police chief may be in charge of all emergency law-enforcement actions, including the work of auxiliary organizations. The fire chief directed fire fighting and rescue work, supported by trained auxiliaries.

In several parts of the United States there were county civil defense offices based on the authority of a board of supervisors or county commission. They were especially interested in rural civil defense--people evacuated from endangered cities, housing and feeding, the protection of farms and livestock against radioactive fallout and emergency food stockpiles.

Continuity of Government:

The 1958 National Plan for Civil Defense recognized the responsibility of all governments for the welfare and safety of the people they governed. The government (of the nation, a state, or a community) was obliged to protect the rights of the people. One of the most important programs in which the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization and state and local governments were cooperating was "Continuity of Government," or the preparations of governments to carry on during an extreme emergency and provide leadership and protection for the people. This program had four main objectives:

1. to establish by law "successors in depth" for officials, legislators, judges and other government leaders,
2. to provide emergency relocation sites for governments outside of potential damage areas,
3. to arrange for safe storage of vital public records, and
4. to prepare to use all government resources and employees in an emergency.

Community Action:

Generally speaking, evacuation and shelter (leaving an endangered place or getting under cover) were the two tactical actions which people could take to survive an enemy attack or natural disaster. Whether evacuation or shelter or both

were part of a plan, depended on the area's location, resources, nearby safe areas, and how far in advance warning could be given of an impending attack or natural disaster.

Ideal civil defense planning called for a threatened city or state to be able to care for itself to the limits of its resources; then to receive help, if available, from neighboring governments and when area resources were exhausted, from the Federal government.

During a nationwide emergency the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization would have directed America's total resources and the means to produce essential civilian survival materials, using broad powers to mobilize and shape those things into a single effort to restore the United States strength and hasten recovery.

The preceeding organization held firm until 1961. In May of 1961 President Kennedy expressed his concern for civil defense in his message to Congress on Urgent National Needs.

One major element of the national security which the Nation has never squarely faced up to is civil defense. This problem arises not from present trends but from national inaction in which most of us have participated. In the past decade we have intermittently considered a variety of programs, but we have never adopted a consistent policy. Public considerations have been largely characterized by apathy, indifference and skepticism; while at the same time, many of the civil defense plans proposed have been so far-reaching or unrealistic that they have not gained essential support. (33)

On July 20, 1961, President John F. Kennedy issued Executive Order 10952, assigning civil defense functions to the Secretary of Defense, effective August 1, 1961. The order also provided that the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, would advise and assist the President in connection with the total civil defense program and would be responsible for the continuity of government programs at the Federal, state and local level.

These recommendations were directly in accord with the recommendations of Frank B. Ellis of the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization. The July, 1961, Executive Order assigned the following operational responsibilities to the Department of Defense:

SECTION I. -- Delegation of Authority  
to the Secretary of Defense.

- (a) Except as hereinafter otherwise provided and as is reserved to the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization in section 2 of this order, the Secretary of Defense is delegated all functions (including as used in this order, powers, duties, and authority) contained in the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended (hereinafter referred to as the Act), vested in me pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1950 (72 Stat. 1799), subject to the direction and control of the President. Such functions to be performed by the Secretary of Defense, working as necessary or appropriate through other agencies by contractual or other agreements, as well as with State and local leaders, shall include but not be limited to the development and execution of:

- (i) a fallout shelter program;
  - (ii) a chemical, biological, and radiological warfare defense program;
  - (iii) all steps necessary to warn or alert Federal military and civilian authorities, State officials, and the civilian population;
  - (iv) all functions pertaining to communications, including a warning network, reporting on monitoring, instructions to shelters, and communications between authorities;
  - (v) emergency assistance to State and local governments in a post-attack period, including water, debris, fire, health, traffic, police, and evacuation capabilities;
  - (vi) protection and emergency operational capability of State and local government agencies in keeping with plans for the continuity of government; and
  - (vii) programs for making financial contributions to the States (including personnel and administrative expenses) for civil defense purposes.
- (b) In addition to the foregoing, the Secretary shall:
- (i) develop plans and operate systems to undertake a nationwide post-attack assessment of the nature and extent of the damage resulting from enemy attack and the surviving resources, including systems to monitor and report specific hazards resulting from the detonation or use of special weapons; and
  - (ii) make necessary arrangements for the donation of Federal surplus property in accordance with section 203

(j) (4) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 101 (j) (4)), subject to applicable limitations. (31:6-7)

The Secretary of Defense, Robert McNamara, established within the Department an Office of Civil Defense and designated Stewart L. Pittman as Assistant Secretary of Defense, Civil Defense. Mr. Pittman was then the established head of Civil Defense and the responsibilities, functions, powers, and authority assigned to the Secretary of Defense by Executive Order 10952 of July 20, 1961, were redelegated to the Assistant Secretary of Defense. The President's Executive Orders issued at the same time as 10952 fixed the civil defense functions and responsibilities for other Federal departments and agencies.

This move by the Executive Branch firmly fixed the position of civil defense as a primary goal of the United States Government in the period 1961-1963, and brought about legislative action and reorganization of various program aspects on a large scale.

In early May of 1964 the Secretary of Defense transferred the civil defense program and the Office of Civil Defense from the Department of Defense to the Secretary of the Army. This was done because the civil defense program is now fully operational and has become an integral part of continental defense. The delegation and civil defense will retain its civilian character. It will not be made a part of the military structure.

Nevertheless, civil defense must work closely with the military. General Wheeler recently said:

Speaking both for myself as a professional soldier and for the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a fallout protection oriented civil defense is clearly a necessary element of the total U. S. national security effort. Our potential enemies have a clear capability for nuclear warfare, and we cannot discount the possibility that such a war may occur. Prudence and plain common sense dictate that we be prepared for it. An adequate program of civil defense should give our population a reasonable degree of protection as well as increasing the credibility of our military deterrent posture. (15)

This, then, highlights the historical origin and development of the Civil Defense Movement in the United States from 1941 to the present.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS OF CIVIL DEFENSE

One of the primary functions and responsibilities assigned to the Federal Civil Defense Administration under Public Law 920 was that of training, education and public information.

Prior to that time civil defense had provided public information via mass media, but had neither proposed nor operated a planned program of training and education.

In 1951 the following schools were set up for training both professional civil defense personnel and volunteers.

1. Federal Civil Defense Administration Staff College (Clney, Maryland), April 30, 1951.
2. Central Training School, Stillwater, Oklahoma, July 30, 1951.
3. Western Training School, St. Mary's, California, October 6, 1951.
4. Eastern Training School, Ogontz, Pennsylvania, February 4, 1952.

As stated in the Federal Civil Defense Administration's Annual Report of 1951, the staff college was designed "for key administrative personnel from regions and states." (1:21) The curriculum for the Staff College at Clney, Maryland, was composed of the following topics, "Organization of Civil Defense, Vulnerability Analysis, the System of Mob Defense,

Zoning and Zone Control for Civil Defense, Mutual Aid and Mobile Support, Attack Warning and Communications, Civil Defense (Operational Services and Postattack Estimates." (1:23) The staff college seems to have been designed as a "graduate school" for advanced civil defense personnel. The schools in Oklahoma, California, and Pennsylvania were for "selected personnel concerned with the training of key civil defense workers at the state and municipal level." (1:21)

These schools offered a curriculum composed of several of the basic staff college courses with additional technical courses in Atomic, Biological and Chemical aspects of protection. The major emphasis in these schools was on teaching methodology.

It was recognized as early as 1951 that civil defense must be conducted at the local level to be successful. The Federal Civil Defense Administration based its nationwide training program on "the multi-plus principle; i.e., (that one woman or man trains ten and these ten each train ten more, etc." (1:21) This point is quite significant in the light of the fact that the current University Civil Defense Extension program, some thirteen years later is based on the same principle.

In 1952 the schools in Oklahoma and Pennsylvania were closed due to a reduced budget for the 1953 fiscal year and their staffs shifted to the Olney, Maryland, school. In the 1952 Federal Civil Defense Administration Annual Report, it

is stated that ". . . 3,218 civil defense instructors had been graduated from FCDA training schools since April, 1951. . . and conducted 650 local civil defense schools and courses. . . and graduated more than 200,000 students." (2:65)

In July of 1952, "The Olney, Maryland, center was reorganized and equipped for basic and advanced rescue training for wardens, firemen and rescue squads." (2:69) The school also remained the Staff College for the United States. The Western Training School at St. Mary's, California, served the western half of the country and graduated 339 students for the year.

During the 1953 fiscal year the Western Training School at St. Mary's, California, was closed and this left the Federal Civil Defense Administration with the two training schools -- The Staff College for Training in Civil Defense Administration and Operations and The Rescue School for training in Civil Defense rescue operations and related skills.

In order that the reader may more clearly understand the functions of these two training schools, the following descriptions of goals, courses and eligibility are stated from the 1953 Training Brochure.

The course in "Civil Defense Administration and Operations" is a one-week course and is scheduled to begin on Monday of alternate weeks. For specific starting dates phone or write the Director, National Civil Defense Training Center, Olney, Maryland.

This course provides training for civil defense executives in the knowledge

and skills necessary to plan, organize and administer broad overall civil defense programs. It is designed to give civil defense administrative personnel the plan for civil defense in the American community, to present a frame of reference by which communities may measure for themselves their progress in civil defense development, and to indicate steps by which any community may develop a complete civil defense organization.

A variety of teaching methods is used, including discussions, demonstrations, and problem-solving sessions of several kinds. Abundant opportunity is given for discussions of special topics as a supplement to the required sessions, and for a free exchange of State and local experiences.

The attendance of women should be encouraged by State and local directors because so large a portion of the civil defense load must be carried by women.

The objectives of the course are:

1. To show the role of civil defense in the light of the changing international situation.
2. To present information on the nature and scope of a probable enemy attack, including effects of such an attack, on the local community.
3. To present principles of organization and training upon which a community may build its civil defense program to fulfill its civil defense mission.
4. To review the assistance that State and local civil defense organizations may expect from the Federal Government.

5. To develop the principles of command and control in emergency operations.
6. To provide through field and map exercises and demonstrations an introduction to emergency operational problems.
7. To present a set of criteria by which the community may measure its progress in the development of its civil defense program.
8. To indicate how to develop a soundly phased plan for the further progress needed.

In order to achieve these objectives, the course in "Civil Defense Administration and Operations" includes the following subjects:

1. The International Situation,  
(Lecture - class discussion).
2. Organizing the Civil Defense Program, (Lecture - class discussion).
3. Recruitment, Training and Utilization of Volunteers, (Lecture - Class discussion - class committee reports).
4. Attack Warning and Communications,  
(Lecture - demonstration).
5. Principles of Tactical Operations,  
(Lecture - demonstration).
6. Civil Defense Urban Analysis and Principles of Ground Organization,  
(Lecture - demonstration).
7. Organization and Operations in Support Areas, (Lecture - demonstrations - class discussion).
8. Shelter, (Lecture - class discussion).

9. Supply, (Lecture - class discussion).
10. Schools in Civil Defense,
11. Post-Attack Operational Problem, (Class discussion - demonstration).
12. Exercise.
13. Rescue Field Exercise.
14. Map Exercise.
15. Natural Disaster Programs and Their Relations to Civil Defense.
16. Review and Evaluation, (Round table discussion.)

The Rescue Instructor Training Course is of two weeks' duration. Courses are scheduled to begin on Monday. For specific starting dates phone or write the Director, National Civil Defense Training Center, Olney, Maryland.

Instruction in this course is divided into two phases. The first week is devoted to teaching and demonstrating rescue techniques, with opportunity for individual practice by those in attendance. The second week is devoted to the practical application of rescue work by full participation and training in team leadership. The completion of the two weeks' course will qualify students to use highly specialized equipment and special techniques for working at extreme heights and depths in the rescue of trapped victims.

Each student is given an opportunity to lead a squad into a damaged area, study the problem and direct the squad in the removal of casualties. The removal of casualties includes: their location in damaged buildings; experience in breaching and shoring walls; and tunneling through

debris. Classroom instruction is held to a minimum. Realistic "down to earth" activity sessions on the "Rescue Street" are substituted for theoretical discussions.

The student starts the first day with a visit to the "Rescue Street." This provides the student with an insight into the problems of fire and rescue operations which will be of immense help to him in orienting himself to the course.

The Rescue Instructor Training Course includes the following subjects:

1. Inspection of the Rescue Street.
2. Instruction Methods.
3. Uses of Tools for A Rescue Squad.
4. Introduction to Rescue Operations.
5. Handling and Care of Ladders.
6. Handling of Casualties.
7. Carries and Pick-Ups - Improvised Stretchers.
8. Fire Fighting.
9. Use of Lifting Levers.
10. Principles of Tunneling.
11. Lashing and Rigging.
12. Squad Rescue Exercises.
13. Shoring, Bracing and Breaching Walls.
14. Planning a Rescue by Stages.
15. Damage to Utilities.
16. Atomic Blast Effects.
17. Reconnaissance and Location of Casualties.

18. Surveying Damage and Condition of Buildings.
19. Rescue from Heights and Basements.
20. Casualty Faking.
21. Organizing and Building a Local Civil Defense Rescue School.
22. Practice Field Teaching and Lecturing.
23. Night Exercise.

The training schools remained as situated until February, 1955, when the Staff College was shifted to Battle Creek, Michigan, with the Rescue School remaining in Olney, Maryland. Through the fiscal year 1955 as stated in the Federal Civil Defense Administration Annual Report of that year, "a total of 1,465 persons were trained in 1955, making a grand total of 12,395 trained since April 30, 1951." (5:89)

It was during the years 1954-1955 that the Staff College began pilot extension programs with various states in attempting to increase the total number of graduates available within the general public.

On January 23, 1956, a Radiological Defense School was added to the Staff College site in Battle Creek, Michigan, and these schools, in addition to the Olney, Maryland, school remained in operation until the 1958 reorganization and the emergency of The Office of Civil Defense Mobilization.

Under the new organization, the Rescue Instructor Training School at Olney, Maryland, was closed at the end of the

1958 fiscal year. However, rescue training was shifted to the newly created Eastern Instructor Training Center at Brooklyn, New York, which opened June 9, 1958.

The Staff College and Radiological Defense School at Battle Creek, Michigan, were continued and along with the Eastern Center and a Western Instructor Training Center, opened July, 1960, at Alameda, California, have served to this date as the training complex for the Office of Civil Defense Management and the reorganized 1961 Office of Civil Defense.

The basic goals of civil defense training and its prime content have changed very little in this thirteen year period. The major changes have been to encompass the areas of radiological defense and shelter planning as dictated by the changing military technology.

The University Civil Defense Extension Program:

Under President John F. Kennedy's reorganization of civil defense in 1961, the key element was cited as being a national fallout shelter program.

The Federal Government under the National Shelter Program set a goal of 240 million shelter spaces by 1968. With this goal as a direction it soon became apparent that with the needed number of buildings and radiological monitoring capability in each of these buildings, as well as fixed Federal stations for monitoring, that the United States would need

approximately 750,000 trained radiological monitors and an equal number of trained shelter managers.

Faced with this awesome task of training, the Department of Defense - Office of Civil Defense began to evaluate all of the training that had taken place previously and attempted to formulate plans for future training.

In 1962 a committee of university personnel was asked to serve as an advisory committee to study a course in Medical Self Help to be offered through the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in conjunction with the Office of Civil Defense. From this committee came suggestions for handling civil defense courses through the extension divisions of various State universities. The Department of Defense - Office of Civil Defense approached the University Extension Association and asked that an advisory committee be formed to meet with Federal representatives to discuss possible planning for civil defense extension courses.

On November 14-15, 1962, the Universities' Committee for Civil Defense and the Regional Extension Directors met in Washington, D.C. with the Regional Office of Civil Defense training and education directors.

This meeting finalized months of discussion and consummated the University Civil Defense Extension Program with a goal of contracting extension divisions in each of the 50 states plus Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands to teach classes in Shelter Management for Instructors and Radiological Monitoring

for Instructors throughout their respective areas. The Department of Defense - Office of Civil Defense also asked that each contracting university hold conferences for state, municipal and county officials concentrating on the national civil defense program.

Extension services were contacted and requested to submit proposals for contracts by January 1, 1963. Colleges, universities and state extension services throughout the nation answered the challenge presented by the Department of Defense and contracts for the 1963 fiscal year were signed by 51 colleges and universities in 49 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

The contracts called for: (a) 516 civil defense conferences for government officials, (b) 392 shelter management instructor courses, and (c) 346 courses to train radiological monitoring instructors.

The objective of the University Extension Civil Defense Program is to materially increase and help maintain the United States' total civil defense effort by employing the resources of the nation's state universities and land grant colleges, operating through their extension services to provide instruction for specific audiences. More specifically, programs are designed to extend certain national and state civil defense training with the objective of meeting the operational readiness requirement of each state.

All programs have been in operation for one year and



reports as of April, 1964, show 453 conferences have been conducted with a total attendance of 20,707 community leaders and government officials. Two hundred Shelter Management Instructor courses have been conducted with 3,342 instructors certified, 126 Radiological Monitoring Instructor courses have been held with 1,764 instructors certified.

Final results certainly will have to be measured in terms of the training that these graduates contribute to their respective communities. This portion of the program will be covered in another chapter.

CHAPTER V  
UNIVERSITY CIVIL DEFENSE EXTENSION  
IN THE STATE OF FLORIDA

In February of 1963, the Department of Defense, through the Region Three office (Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Tennessee, Mississippi and Alabama) of the Office of Civil Defense entered into exploratory contract negotiations with The Florida Institute for Continuing University Studies. The negotiation meetings were held in conjunction with the State of Florida Civil Defense Agency and directed toward a goal of conducting classes in Radiological Monitoring for Instructors and Shelter Management for Instructors throughout the State of Florida.

The Florida Institute for Continuing University Studies was selected as the contracting agency on the basis of its responsibility for the off-campus extension service for the State of Florida University system.

In March, 1963, The Florida Institute for Continuing University Studies began a series of planning meetings with representatives of State and Regional Civil Defense Agencies to structure a contract which would encompass the costs reflected in carrying out such a program.

There followed a two month period of meetings involving representation from the Region Three Office of Civil Defense, the State of Florida Civil Defense Agency, the University

Civil Defense Extension ad hoc Committee and the Director of the Florida Institute for Continuing University Studies. The following budget areas were considered and finalized by the group:

1. The cost of sending a program coordinator and instructors to Staff College, Battle Creek, Michigan, for training.
2. The Florida Institute for Continuing University Studies' costs per instructional hour within the state, while conducting the educational program for Civil Defense instructors.
3. The Florida Institute for Continuing University Studies' costs for travel and per diem for program personnel in conducting the program at various points of service within the state.
4. Estimated costs for the development and preparation of instructional materials not provided by the Office of Civil Defense.
5. Salaries of full-time and part-time professional personnel to be utilized in the program.
6. Salaries of clerical personnel to be utilized in the program.
7. The cost of supplies and equipment and office operations during the contractual year.
8. Replacement costs for university personnel while undergoing training.

9. The costs of promotional materials and other printing for the program.
10. Postal, telephone and telegraph costs.
11. Miscellaneous expenditures.

The budget in its final form was submitted to the contracting officer, United States Office of Civil Defense, Department of Defense, Washington, D. C., in April of 1963 and was approved in June of 1963. (Appendix I, Page 96)

Following budget approval, a Coordinator of University Civil Defense Extension for the state of Florida was employed by The Florida Institute for Continuing University Studies in July of 1963.

The program coordinator, in turn, recommended the hiring of two full-time staff members for instruction and a full-time secretary. The recommendations were accepted by the Director of the Florida Institute for Continuing University Studies and the recommended personnel contracted for the program.

The contract had set forth the following qualifications for the selection and training of instructors:

1. All instructional personnel selected must attend a four week training program at the Staff College, Battle Creek, Michigan.
2. All personnel must be accepted and recognized as university level faculty.
3. The Director of the Florida Institute for Continuing University Studies would select and certify all personnel contracted for the program.

In discussions with representatives of the Region Three and State Offices of Civil Defense, it was recommended that personnel engaged in shelter management instruction come from Sociology and its related fields and those for Radiological Monitor training be qualified in the Physical Sciences and mathematics.

The possibility was discussed of using persons in the state of Florida who had already attended the Staff College at Battle Creek, Michigan, and the desirability of developing a staff from those persons who could commute from various points in the State to conduct the classes for instructors.

Both of these ideas were found to be impractical due to the lack of such trained personnel within the State and personnel employed for the program were located in Tallahassee, Florida, and trained for the program.

In July of 1963, the program coordinator and his staff attended a four week period of intensive civil defense training at the Staff College, Battle Creek, Michigan. The instruction encompassed courses in:

1. Civil Defense Management.
2. Elements of a Shelter System Capability.
3. Shelter Management for Instructors.
4. Radiological Monitoring for Instructors.
5. University Civil Defense Extension Workshop on Radiological Monitoring and Shelter Management.

While undergoing the training in Battle Creek, Michigan, the staff was joined by the Training and Education Director of the Florida Civil Defense Agency and initial planning of course locations, class schedules and initial dates of course offerings was begun.

The State of Florida Civil Defense Agency had been charged with the responsibility of course locations as directed by their training needs and the Training and Education Director recommended that one course in each of the subject areas (Radiological Monitoring and Shelter Management for Instructors) be offered in four Civil Defense areas of the State of Florida. It was agreed that courses be offered in:

1. Western Area -- Tallahassee, Florida.
2. Northern Area -- Gainesville, Florida.
3. Central Area -- Tampa, Florida.
4. Southern Area -- Miami, Florida.

Exact location of the courses in the designated cities was left to the University Program Coordinator to be announced at a later date.

The courses to be offered encompassed the following time periods: Radiological Monitoring for Instructors, 32 hours, and Shelter Management for Instructors, 26 hours of classroom instruction and an overnight shelter stay. The time involved was discussed by the group and the following time schedules posed as alternatives:

1. Five days - six hours per day - in a one-week period.

2. Ten sessions of three hours duration extended over a ten-week period.
3. Five Saturdays of six hours duration extended over five weeks.

The shelter stay would be in addition to these time allocations.

With the alternatives in hand, the group decided that a questionnaire constructed by the Florida Institute for Continuing University Studies staff and distributed by the State of Florida Civil Defense Agency to all county civil defense directors would provide the direction needed in scheduling classes throughout the State. (Appendix II) Survey returns directed offerings of one-week courses, six hours per day. This was followed in all future planning.

Discussions concerning the starting date of the program were held in abeyance until the group returned to Florida and could secure all necessary materials from Office of Civil Defense sources to support the courses.

The course materials were secured during the month of September and a schedule for offering these courses was finalized at a joint meeting of The Florida Institute for Continuing University Studies and the State of Florida Civil Defense Agency personnel. (See Page 60 )

With the finalization of course locations and dates, planning was directed to the publicity, mass media communication and recruitment aspects of the program. After several

SCHEDULE OF CLASSES

Radicalical Monitoring (Instructors)

| Class<br>No. | Starting Date  | Closing Date   | Location                                                         |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1            | 21 October 63  | 25 October 63  | Tallahassee Federal<br>Savings and Loan,<br>Tallahassee, Florida |
| 2            | 16 November 63 | 22 November 63 | County Courthouse,<br>Gainesville, Florida                       |
| 3            | 23 January 64  | 24 January 64  | Tampa Federal Savings<br>and Loan, Tampa,<br>Florida             |
| 4            | 9 March 64     | 14 March 64    | Dade County Emergency<br>Operating Center,<br>Miami, Florida     |

Shelter Management (Instructor)

|    |                |                |                                                                  |
|----|----------------|----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1  | 16 November 63 | 22 November 63 | Tallahassee Federal<br>Savings and Loan,<br>Tallahassee, Florida |
| 2. | 2 December 63  | 6 December 63  | County Courthouse,<br>Gainesville, Florida                       |
| 3  | 5 February 64  | 7 February 64  | Tampa Federal Savings<br>and Loan, Tampa,<br>Florida             |
| 4  | 23 March 64    | 27 March 64    | Dade County Emergency<br>Operating Center,<br>Miami, Florida     |

planning sessions the following procedures were agreed upon:

1. The State of Florida Civil Defense Agency would issue a memorandum to all civil defense personnel (county directors, state agencies, city government civil defense personnel) on the mailing lists detailing program goals, class schedules, course descriptions, enrollment procedures and administrative instructions. (Appendix III, Page 113)
2. The Coordinator of the Florida Institute for Continuing University Studies program would mail to each county civil defense director a letter of introduction including program goals and future direction. (Appendix IV, Page 116)
3. The Florida Institute for Continuing University Studies Coordinator would prepare and distribute to all state agencies, universities, public schools, junior colleges, civil defense agencies, industries, businesses and other anticipated sources of enrollment, a course brochure encompassing program goals, course offerings, qualifications for enrollment and class locations and schedules.
4. The Florida Institute for Continuing University Studies would issue to all the agencies cited in Point 3 several copies of an enrollment application to be processed through the office of the Training and Education Director of the State of Florida Civil Defense Agency. (Appendix V, Page 118)

5. The Florida Institute for Continuing University Studies, through its Office of Public Information, would release advance and follow-up publicity pertinent to course offerings to local and syndicated communication media.

With course recruitment completed, finalization of course content materials was completed with the preparation of a syllabus for both the Radiological Monitoring and Shelter Management courses. Additional handout materials for each lesson plan were selected from government publications and were given to each enrollee at the first meeting of the class. Newer publications in each area were mailed to course participants as they were received during the course of the year.

All course participants were awarded a single certificate for either successful attendance or successful completion of the course taken by The Florida Institute for Continuing University Studies in conjunction with the State of Florida Civil Defense Agency. The courses were based on balanced presentations utilizing lectures, discussions, exercises, films and filmstrips.

All courses for the fiscal year were held as scheduled in designated sites and total contractual obligations were fulfilled within the fiscal year. Total course enrollments for the year numbered 51 Shelter Management Instructors and 66 Radiological Monitoring Instructors.

CHAPTER VI  
RESEARCH PROCEDURE

As stated earlier in this paper, the purpose of this study involved:

1. A review and analysis of the program of the Florida Institute for Continuing University Studies - University Civil Defense Extension in terms of
  - A. the goals and purposes of the University Civil Defense Extension Program as established in conjunction with the University Civil Defense Extension Committee comprised of university personnel,
  - B. the goals and purposes of a mass training program as viewed by experts in the field, and
  - C. the characteristics related to the program participants in terms of age, sex, marital status, occupation, tenure in present occupation, number of years of formal schooling, prior civil defense training, civil defense affiliation, participation in community activities, knowledge of their purpose in participating in the Instructor Training Program, knowledge of and agreement with the objectives of the University Civil Defense Extension Program established by

the Department of Defense, Office of Civil Defense and the University Committee.

- D. Factors motivating participation in the University Civil Defense Extension program on the part of the participants.
- E. Factors which have allowed or inhibited the instructions of shelter management and radiological monitoring courses by participants upon completion of instructor training.
- F. Curricular content as viewed by participants.
- G. Recruitment processes as viewed by participants.

The study also hoped to provide methods for improving and stimulating University Civil Defense Extension programs on the basis of need as defined by the participants in the program.

To resolve these aims and purposes it was necessary to determine what procedure of research would be applicable to identify the present status of the program and further enable the writer to enlist the judgments of program participants to the end that an evaluation of the present program would be sufficient to project any changes in content or recruitment that would more effectively enhance and validate the objectives of the program. Too, the writer hoped that his identification of the suggested processes for improvement would be helpful to other states contemplating a similar program.

Construction and Preparation of the Questionnaire:

A questionnaire was constructed and presented to a seminar in Adult Education at Michigan State University in order that the writer might receive criticisms and suggestions that would make the instrument more effective. On the basis of suggestions received, the writer incorporated those ideas that appeared to strengthen and make more meaningful the questionnaire. In its revised form it was then presented to personnel in the Education Research Bureau of Florida State University. A pilot group of participants in the Florida Civil Defense Training Program were then sent the questionnaire, asking not only that they fill out the required information, but also that they be critical of the instrument in the light of whether it would meaningfully serve the purpose for which it was intended.

The questionnaire as finally revised also provided opportunity for the respondent to give additional or supplementary information that would add clarification and specificity to their responses. (Appendix VI, Page 121)

Sampling:

While it was first thought that a sampling of those who had participated in the program would be sufficient, it was finally decided to include all involved in the programs offered by the Florida Institute for Continuing University Studies. This involved a total audience of 100 individuals.

Because of the great distances from the campus to the locale of the participants, it was decided that personal interviews, though possibly desirable, were not feasible. The questionnaire, with a cover letter, was mailed to each who had participated in the training sessions. (Appendix VII) The cover letter not only explained the purpose of the study but also indicated that each respondent would be guaranteed anonymity. It was felt that this would cause the respondent to feel more free in indicating any negative reactions he might have entertained toward the program or personnel involved in its execution. Responses were received from 67 of the 100 whose reactions were solicited.

Treatment of the Data:

Each questionnaire was treated through a data processing card so that all information relevant to the study could be carefully studied and analyzed. Many of the questions provided for more than one response. This was especially significant in those items that listed various elements in the curriculum and asked the respondent to assign certain priorities to their answers or to indicate those that seemed most or least relevant. Data, therefore, were interpreted by percentage of totals or by numerical assignments. Decision on the method was dictated by which procedure would be more meaningful to the reader and which would provide greater clarity of interpretation.

## CHAPTER VII

### INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

The presentation of data in this chapter is based upon 87 respondents of a total sample of 100 who had participated in some phase of the program of civil defense training. It might be noted that the high percentage of returns, 87 per cent, is due in part to the fact that the author was involved in each of the training sessions and became personally acquainted with nearly every individual.

#### Personal Characteristics of the Respondents:

Eighty-two, or approximately 95 per cent of the participants are male, range in age from 20 years to 68 years with 71, or nearly 80 per cent, being in the age brackets of 39 to 59. Thirty-three, or approximately 40 per cent are in the age range of 41 to 50. Their interest in civil defense may stem from the fact that many of these individuals participated in World War II while many were also involved in the Korean Conflict. Fifty-three, or approximately 60 per cent, have lived in Florida in excess of 11 years. Seventy-eight, or nearly 90 per cent, are married.

Certainly this group is well aware of the dangers of enemy missiles and remember well the "black outs" practiced during World War II and the days of the air raid wardens. That

younger men over the age of 30 are interested connotes a healthy concern on their part for our national safety and survival.

Educational Background:

Of the total number of respondents, only one had less than a high school education. Thirty-six or approximately 40 per cent were college graduates while the remainder had attended college for varying periods of time. (Table II.)

TABLE II. EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND OF RESPONDENTS.

| <u>Number of Respondents</u> | <u>Grade Completed</u> |
|------------------------------|------------------------|
| 1                            | Tenth Grade            |
| 15                           | Twelfth Grade          |
| 6                            | One Year College       |
| 20                           | Two Years of College   |
| 9                            | Three Years of College |
| 36                           | Four Years of College  |

Since some areas of civil defense training require a college education for participation accounts for the significant number who attained such training. Of the 36 who completed college, information was gathered to indicate the area of study in which they majored. (Table III) Specifically in the area of Radiological Monitoring, a college degree is required with courses in Engineering or Chemistry.

TABLE III.      MAJOR AREAS OF COLLEGE STUDY.

| <u>Number Participating</u> | <u>Major Area of Study</u>   |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| 12                          | Engineering                  |
| 3                           | Chemistry                    |
| 2                           | Business Admin-<br>istration |
| 1                           | Agriculture                  |
| 1                           | Architecture                 |
| 3                           | Medicine                     |
| 3                           | Science                      |
| 1                           | Philosophy                   |
| 2                           | Economics                    |
| 1                           | Music                        |
| 1                           | Mathematics                  |
| 2                           | Education                    |
| 1                           | Psychology                   |
| 1                           | Recreation                   |
| 2                           | Nursing                      |

Since program participation was voluntary in nature, evidence would indicate that it attracted a select group as measured by their educational background, training and experience. Data also indicate that they were a group who were active in civic, professional and fraternal organizations. All respondents indicated affiliation with at least two of

the aforementioned types of organizations while nearly 70 percent were active in more than two. It is also evident that they came from varied and diverse occupations since the group indicated employment in the following areas:\*

1. Chemist (1)
2. City Government (4)
3. Civil Defense Work (local and state) (17)
4. Engineering and Related Areas (15)
5. Hospital Administration (5)
6. Hotel Administration (1)
7. Industrial Coordinators or Managers (6)
8. Medicine - Medical Doctors and Veterinarians (4)
9. Plastics Manufacturing (1)
10. Police and Fire Departments - local and state (9)
11. Retired (2)
12. State Beverage Department (10)
13. State Board of Health (3)
14. State Department of Agriculture (3)
15. State Sanitation Agency (1)
16. University System (5)

Program Promotion:

Interest in a program of civil defense has gone through several cycles. Interest has always increased when a national

---

\*NOTE: Figures in parentheses indicate the number of Participants involved in the occupational field indicated.

crisis has been imminent and has seemed to decrease during periods of national or international tranquility. Respondents were asked how they first became aware of courses in Radiological Monitoring or Shelter Management and it was revealed that only eight had become aware of the program through the vehicles of mass media such as radio, television and newspaper advertising. Forty-six, or over 50 per cent were informed by their employer. County civil defense directors and state civil defense personnel accounted for recommending 10, or nearly 50 per cent. Fifty-four, or approximately 60 per cent, indicated they thought promotional and recruitment publicity was adequate while of the remaining 33 respondents, 30 felt the program was inadequate. Four indicated they were undecided. When asked to make suggestions as to how recruitment and promotional procedures might be improved, respondents felt greater use should be made of direct mailing to individuals in the community, personal phone calls, greater and more dramatic use of television and radio along with greater contact at the local level with those individuals already involved in civil defense or whose interests might be stimulated to more positive action and participation.

Previous Civil Defense Experience:

Of the total respondents, it was found that 53, or nearly 60 per cent had some previous experience or training in the area of civil defense. Thirty-nine had taken Civil Defense

Adult Education courses conducted by Florida Adult Education Centers while 14 had previous experience in the military forces with four participating in programs offered by the Air Force, four in Army courses and six had training in Naval courses.

Attitude Toward Civil Defense:

Respondents were asked to indicate their attitude toward civil defense prior to their training in the program and to indicate whether they thought of it to be an essential part of our total defense effort. The question was dictated in part because of the writer's knowledge, through a review of the literature along with a study of the background of civil defense, that there was general apathy on the part of the public toward the program and that interest waned as a need for black outs and brown outs were no longer deemed essential to our national safety. It is interesting to note that 62 indicated they felt that civil defense was an essential part of our total national defense effort and 73 indicated that their attitude was most favorable toward the program prior to becoming personally involved in classes. In reflecting on whether the general public had a similar attitude as the respondents, 54 indicated they felt the general public did not have a positive attitude toward the program nor felt it to be an essential and significant enterprise.

After completing the training sessions in civil defense 62, or approximately 70 per cent, indicated they were more

favorably impressed in their attitude toward the program.

Reasons for Participating in the Program:

There appeared to be two groups in terms of program participation. On the one hand there was a group whose participation in the program was recommended by the employer or who were members of county or state civil defense organizations while the other group was made up of those whose participation was due to their personal interest in the program.

Many employers were concerned about plant protection in the event of a national disaster and recommended some of their employees for participation in the program or training. Employer assignment accounted for 49, or over 50 per cent, of the course matriculants.

Only 23 indicated that their participation was completely voluntary. When asked to indicate their motive for such voluntary participation, reasons included: (1) a desire to prepare to help the community; (2) to be able to assist in an emergency; and (3) a desire to be knowledgeable in the techniques of civil defense in times of national unrest.

Since one of the writer's assumptions was that program content could best be evaluated by permitting the respondents to reflect their opinion of the content, the questionnaire provided opportunity for them to indicate the significance, or lack of it, of the various units of instruction including shelter management and radiological monitoring.

As will be noted, the questionnaire included the various topics dealt with in the two areas of study. Items were rated as significant, not significant, or omitted. Provision was also made for the respondents to indicate suggestions they might have for making more meaningful the shelter management and radiological monitoring units. Table IV indicates the topics that the participants considered to be significant, not significant or could have been omitted from the shelter management course.

TABLE IV. TOPICS OF INSTRUCTION INCLUDED IN THE SHELTER MANAGEMENT COURSE AND PARTICIPANT REACTION.

| Topic                                       | Significant | Not Significant | Omitted |
|---------------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|---------|
| Weapons Effects                             | 40          | 1               | 1       |
| Protection against weapons effects          | 41          | 0               | 1       |
| National Shelter Program                    | 38          | 4               | 0       |
| Community Shelter System                    | 39          | 2               | 1       |
| Visit to Shelter Facility                   | 35          | 2               | 5       |
| Shelter Organization and Staff Requirements | 41          | 1               | 0       |
| Shelter Facilities, Supplies and Equipment  | 42          | 0               | 0       |
| Shelter Operations                          | 41          | 1               | 0       |
| Shelter Exercise                            | 41          | 1               | 0       |
| Shelter Information Program                 | 39          | 3               | 0       |

TABLE IV. (Continued)

| Topic                                                  | Significant | Not Significant | Omitted |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|---------|
| Shelter Exercise Review                                | 39          | 3               | 0       |
| Shelter Emergence                                      | 39          | 3               | 0       |
| Group Dynamics and Inter-personal Relationships        | 42          | 0               | 0       |
| Shelter Living                                         | 42          | 0               | 0       |
| Planning and Administering Shelter Management Training | 41          | 1               | 0       |
| Course Summary                                         | 42          | 0               | 0       |
| Examination                                            | 39          | 2               | 1       |
| Course Evaluation                                      | 40          | 2               | 0       |
| Graduation                                             | 38          | 3               | 1       |

It will be noted that the table indicates those units of instruction included in the course had the overwhelming acceptance of the participants. While it is not important to discuss this in terms of percentages, the table clearly indicates few participants who considered certain areas to be not significant or that should have been omitted from the course.

It will be noted that a few individuals, five out of the 42 who participated in this course, indicated that the visit to the shelter facility could have been omitted as an area of instruction. However, these individuals indicated an overwhelming acceptance of the shelter stay and all said that the instruction covering the furnishing of a shelter was most significant. Therefore, the table would indicate that the units

of instruction included in the course had the overwhelming acceptance of the participants.

Participants were also given the opportunity to comment on their shelter experience. The literature reveals the importance and need that people feel toward the provision of shelters and this is borne by the fact that the respondents indicated the imperativeness of "test experiences" in a shelter. For example, the majority felt that their stay in a shelter and the providing of psychological situations was a real learning experience and a needed exercise. (Table V)

TABLE V. PARTICIPANTS' REACTION TO SHELTER EXPERIENCE

| Experience to be Rated                                                         | Yes | No |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|
| The stay was of too short a duration.                                          | 19  | 23 |
| The stay was of too long a duration.                                           | 1   | 41 |
| The stay was of sufficient duration to gain experience.                        | 34  | 8  |
| Enough psychological situations were included.                                 | 24  | 16 |
| Experiences were provided in all areas of shelter living.                      | 14  | 28 |
| The stay was too severe.                                                       | 2   | 40 |
| The stay provided a real learning experience.                                  | 38  | 4  |
| The same objectives could be accomplished without a shelter living experience. | 0   | 42 |
| Cots should have been provided.                                                | 10  | 32 |

TABLE V.            (Continued)

| Experience to be rated                                                         | Yes | No |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|
| Better bathing facilities should be provided.                                  | 9   | 12 |
| The shelter course should be used.                                             | 22  | 20 |
| Better communications equipment was needed.                                    | 28  | 18 |
| Government supplies should be supplemented with additional food and equipment. | 19  | 29 |

The questionnaire also provided for suggestions for improving the shelter living experience. Among those made by the participants included:

1. A longer exposure should be provided for rather than extended classroom instruction on shelter living,
2. The program would be more effective in reaching the general public if larger groups were involved in shelter occupancy,
3. Greater control should be provided for the distribution of air and heat in shelter quarters,
4. More effective communications equipment should be provided with the outside world, and
5. More psychological situations should be available to those occupying the shelter during the training session.

Participants also felt that shelter management courses should

be expanded to include techniques for setting up shelter management courses and instruction to the uninitiated.

Radiological Monitoring Graduates:

Similar provision was made for those involved in the Radiological Monitoring Instructors Course as were made for the Shelter Management Instructors Course. Table VI. relates the reaction of participants in this area of study.

TABLE VI. PARTICIPANT REACTION TO AREAS OF STUDY INVOLVED IN RADIOLOGICAL MONITORING INSTRUCTORS COURSE.

| Topic                                   | Significant | Not Significant | Omitted |
|-----------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|---------|
| Basic concepts of Nuclear Science       | 54          | 3               | 1       |
| Effects of Nuclear Weapons              | 56          | 0               | 0       |
| Civil Defense Radiological Instruments  | 56          | 0               | 0       |
| Operation Prospect (Exercise)           | 55          | 3               | 0       |
| Instrument Familiarization --(Exercise) | 57          | 1               | 0       |
| Radiological Monitoring Techniques      | 56          | 3               | 0       |
| Radiological Defense Equipment Program  | 54          | 4               | 0       |
| Instrument Calibration (Exercise)       | 57          | 1               | 0       |
| Area Monitoring (Exercise)              | 56          | 2               | 0       |
| Radioactive Fallout                     | 57          | 1               | 0       |
| Fallout Forecasting                     | 54          | 4               | 0       |
| Decontamination                         | 54          | 4               | 0       |

TABLE VI.      (Continued)

| Topic                                                   | Significant | Not Sig-<br>nificant | Omitted |
|---------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------|
| Dose and Dose Rate Calcula-<br>tions                    | 57          | 1                    | 0       |
| Effects of Fallout and Radia-<br>tion Exposure Guidance | 57          | 1                    | 0       |
| Radiation Protection (Exercise)                         | 56          | 2                    | 0       |
| National Civil Defense Program                          | 51          | 7                    | 0       |
| Protection from Fallout                                 | 57          | 1                    | 0       |
| Radiological Defense Monitor-<br>ing Operations         | 57          | 1                    | 0       |
| Source Handling Techniques                              | 57          | 1                    | 0       |
| Defense Against Chemical and<br>Biological Agents       | 50          | 8                    | 0       |
| Student Proficiency Exercise                            | 55          | 3                    | 0       |
| Course Examination                                      | 55          | 2                    | 1       |
| Course Examination Review                               | 52          | 5                    | 1       |
| Monitor Training Techniques                             | 56          | 0                    | 0       |
| Course Evaluation                                       | 55          | 4                    | 0       |
| Graduation                                              | 52          | 6                    | 0       |

As indicated earlier in this study, those selected for the Radiological Monitoring Instructors course were required to have a background in the field of engineering or science. As will be noted from the table, few if any items were considered as not significant or should be omitted from the course. The predominance of agreement, in the writer's opinion,

might be attributed to the fact that those participating in these exercises were well trained, in terms of education, in the area of technology.

There seemed to be a division of opinion on whether a sufficient number or variety of exercises were available in the Radiological Monitoring Instructors course. Twenty-one, or approximately one-third, of those involved in the program felt that additional experiences could be added. Among their comments were:

1. More time should have been available for the actual use of the instruments provided,
2. More intensive study should have been devoted toward the use of decontamination procedures,
3. Additional instruction should have been provided on techniques of handling resource materials, and
4. An extended internship experience under more realistic conditions.

When asked to indicate those areas of study which would make the experience more meaningful, respondents indicated that:

1. Extensive instruction on the licensing procedures for handling materials indicated in the course is needed.
2. Provision for instruction in report writing to the National office of Civil Defense should be provided.

3. A better understanding of the cohesiveness necessary between instruction in the area of shelter programs, radiological monitoring and the total national civil defense effort is necessary

Instruction and Methodology:

Because much of the success of the shelter management program and the radiological monitoring program depends upon the techniques of instruction and methodology used, participants were asked to react to their experiences in the various classes. Seventy, or 80 per cent, of the respondents indicated they believed the lessons were extremely well prepared, 12, or 14 per cent, felt they were well prepared while two or approximately six per cent indicated that the preparation was adequate. No one of the respondents felt the preparation had been poor.

Participants were asked to react to the following techniques of class instruction:

1. Do you feel the lecture method was overused? Seventy-two answered this question in the negative and 11 in the affirmative.
2. Do you feel there was sufficient time for discussion? Fifty-five answered in the affirmative and 16 said no.
3. Eighty of the respondents indicated they felt the printed materials given out were sufficiently informative while only three thought they were not.
4. Seventy-two of the respondents indicated they felt sufficient use had been made of visual aids. Eleven indicated an opposite reaction.



5. All 63 of the respondents indicated they thought the content of the course was pertinent to their local situations.

When asked to suggest ways to improve class instruction only 43, or approximately 50 per cent, responded to this question. There was a consensus among the respondents that the classes should be limited to 25 in number and that the course be extended to a two-week offering since they felt there was too much material to be adequately covered in a one-week session.

Seventy-seven, or approximately 90 per cent, of the program participants responded in the affirmative when they were asked if they felt they had had sufficient training to work effectively in the area of shelter management or radiological monitoring. The remaining respondents indicated a need for some supervision if they were to assume the role of instructor in either of the two areas mentioned. The need for refresher courses was also indicated by six respondents since they felt that the rate of technological change is such that much of their learning could well become obsolete in a short period of time.

One of the objectives of civil defense training was an earnest desire that those who completed the instructor courses would return to their community to initiate similar programs at the local level. It is regretful that only 12 of the trainees organized classes in shelter management or radio-

logical monitoring at the local level. The reasons given by those who did not conduct classes on the local level are as follows:

1. Inadequate cooperation by local civil defense personnel. (3)
2. No organized recruitment program. (15)
3. Lack of physical training facilities. (12)
4. Lack of or inadequate supply of course materials. (9)
5. No attempt was made to organize a course. (47)
6. An attempt was made to organize a course, but the response was inadequate to warrant a course offering. (3)
7. Failure of State Civil Agency and/or Florida Institute for Continuing University Studies to provide materials. (6)
8. Failure to secure Atomic Energy Commission Licensing. (3)
9. Failure to apply for Atomic Energy Commission Licensing. (15)

It is interesting to note that those who did conduct classes on the local level used the same recruitment techniques in the community as were used by the state organization in setting up the instructor training classes. Too, the sources from which membership was recruited were similar to

---

NOTE: The numbers in parentheses indicates the number replying to each question.

those that initially had supplied the nucleus for the state program. In neither case was the lay citizen involved but rather membership came from municipal, state and federal agencies.

CHAPTER VIII  
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Florida Institute for Continuing University Studies accepted the responsibility for initiating programs to train participants in shelter management and radiological monitoring. The Institute was among the pioneers in the attempt to provide selected leaders with competencies in the fields indicated who could, upon returning to their local communities, become instructors of local individuals in the areas of shelter management and radiological monitoring. Prior to this study there had been no attempts to involve those who participated in the training sessions to evaluate the program and offer advice in areas they thought might be strengthened. The writer therefore assumed the following:

1. That a more accurate picture of the University Civil Defense Extension Program could be secured by having participants involved evaluate their experiences.
2. That current goals for the University Civil Defense Extension Program as perceived by Office of Civil Defense and University personnel could be determined.
3. That current thinking on mass training, in terms of goals and purposes, could be established.
4. That data collection instruments could be devised to secure the necessary data as set forth in the purpose of this study.

This chapter will present a summary of the findings of the study, draw pertinent conclusions and indicate those areas that warrant further attention.

Summary:

In pursuing the literature in the field of Civil Defense, the writer found no references to the area covered in this study but rather an historical account of the origin and development of civil defense in the United States. Writings and reports were confined to the many hearings before the House and Senate on the need for civil defense programs and stress the striking power of nations should they become involved in a nuclear war. Information and data relevant to the objectives of the study could only be obtained by directing attention to those who were actively involved in training programs.

The study was limited to those programs of training of civil defense instructors conducted by the Florida Institute for Continuing University Studies. This involved a total of 100 individuals who were instructor trainees in the program.

A questionnaire was constructed and after pre-testing it at an Adult Education Seminar at Michigan State University and further refinement by personnel at the Education Research Bureau of Florida State University, the writer submitted it to a pilot group of participants asking that they react to the information requested and, in addition, make whatever suggestions they felt would improve its objectivity.

After incorporating all suggestions for refinement that seemed relevant, it was mailed to a total of 100 individuals who had been involved in the program. Eighty-seven questionnaires were returned and this became the basis for the study. Data were processed on IBM cards and then were sorted in terms of characteristics of the participants, their reactions to the learning experiences and their recommendations for improvement or for experiences that should be incorporated in future training sessions.

Eighty-two, or approximately 95 per cent of the participants were male, ranged in age from 20 years to 60 years with 71, or nearly 80 per cent, being between the ages of 39 and 59.

Thirty-six of the participants were college graduates and only one of the total included in the study did not finish high school. Engineering led among the areas of specialization among those who were college graduates. They entered the training program from many areas of employment such as municipal, state and federal workers, engineering specialists, hospital administration and industrial management.

Nearly 60 per cent of the trainees had previous civil defense experience and training. Many had attended courses conducted by the Florida Adult Education Centers and others had received training in the various branches of the military service.

When the trainees were asked to indicate their attitude toward civil defense, 62 of them indicated they considered it

to be an essential part of our total defense effort, and approximately 70 per cent indicated that they were more favorably impressed concerning the role of civil defense upon completing the training program than prior to the training sessions.

Areas of instruction included in the classes were considered to be of significance by the trainees. Particular approval was given to the stay in the shelter and the unit covering shelter furnishing was rated as very significant. Suggestions for improving course offerings included recommendations that the training period be doubled in length and that class size be limited to 25 trainees for each session.

Greatest concern among those in the Radiological Monitoring Instructors course centered about the use and purpose of the many instruments used in the course and there was general agreement that this was one of the most worthwhile units. Since those selected to participate in this area of the program were required to have a technical background, their appraisal of the course content was based on a knowledge of the field.

Eighty-four per cent of the trainees rated the methodology used in classes as superior and that lesson outlines were most comprehensive and meaningful.

If the writer were to make a general summary statement, it would be to the effect that the program was most effective from the standpoint of the trainees. Their attitude was positive in their appraisal of its content, its methodology and

its objectives. The only improvement that could occur would come from enrichment of the experiences already included in the program rather than in the deletion of any of its component parts. In short, the program was a success and there is every reason to believe that its expansion along the lines outlined in this study will make for a greater consciousness of civil defense among the general public. Apathy will be reduced greatly as these trainees have the opportunity to bring to the local community the fruits of their training.

Conclusions:

Based upon a study of the historical development of the civil defense movement, the review of the literature, and the data secured in this study, the writer concludes the following:

1. That a continuing program as developed by the Florida Institute for Continuing University Studies in the area of training instructors in shelter management and radiological monitoring is an absolute necessity if this country is to remain in a state of readiness and preparation should international conditions cause us to require a mobilization of personnel trained in these areas.
2. That the content of the courses offered in these areas is relevant to the objectives of the program and the methodology used is effective in the training of instructors.

3. That a highly articulate group, as measured in terms of education and previous training, is participating in the training sessions.
4. That too few of the trainees return to their local communities and organize classes in civil defense.
5. That programs of publicity and promotion are inadequate and ineffective in arousing interest on the part of the general public.
6. That too little guidance is provided at the State level to assist local communities in the organization of programs.
7. That Florida has achieved leadership among the other states in providing civil defense training programs.

Recommendations:

Following are recommendations offered to strengthen an interest in civil defense and to provide for a public sympathetic to and knowledgeable in those areas which may well become vehicles for our survival as a nation.

1. That more effective communication should be developed between state, county and local office of civil defense.
2. That every effort should be exerted to overcome the general apathy on the part of the public to the program.
3. That notices should be available at the local level

to facilitate the efforts of the graduate trainees in organizing programs.

2. That the Atomic Energy Commission should expedite its procedure for licensing those who have completed the course in radiological monitoring.
3. That a continuing follow-up of graduate trainees in civil defense be provided to make sure that the best use of their potential is being made.
4. That facilities be provided at the local level for the conduct of classes and other exercises germane to the program of training.
7. That citizens' committees for civil defense be organized at the local level.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Annual Report for 1951 of the Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office.
2. Annual Report for 1952 of the Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office.
3. Annual Report for 1953, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office.
4. 1954 Annual Report, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office.
5. 1955 Annual Report, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D. C.: Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office.
6. 1956 Annual Report, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office.
7. 1957 Annual Report, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office.
8. 1958 Annual Report, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D.C.: Executive Office of the President, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, U. S. Government Printing Office.
9. 1959 Annual Report, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Washington, D.C.: Executive Office of the President, U. S. Government Printing Office.
10. 1960 Annual Report, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Washington, D.C.: Executive Office of the President, U. S. Government Printing Office.
11. 1961 Annual Report, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Washington, D.C.: Executive Office of the President, U. S. Government Printing Office.

12. 1962 Annual Report, Office of Civil Defense, Washington, D.C.: Department of Defense, U. S. Government Printing Office.
13. 1963 Annual Report, Office of Civil Defense, Washington, D.C.: Department of Defense, U. S. Government Printing Office.
14. Draft of Office of Civil Defense Mobilization Highlights-1960, Washington, D.C.: Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.
15. Eisenhower, Dwight D., Address to United Nations General Assembly, December 8, 1955.
16. Eisenhower, Dwight D., Letter of Transmittal, National Plan for Civil Defense and Defense Mobilization, White House, 1950, Washington, D.C.
17. Eisenhower, Dwight D., Message to Senate, August 25, 1959.
18. Eisenhower, Dwight D., State of Union Message to 84th Congress, Washington, D.C., 1954.
19. Excerpts from Hearings on the Civil Defense Fallout Shelter Program, Before Sub-Committee No. 3 of the House Armed Services Committees, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., May-August, 1963.
20. Federal Civil Defense Administration, Letter of Transmittal, Washington, D.C., 1952.
21. Federal Civil Defense Guide, Executive Order 11051, September 27, 1962, as Amended, Part B, Chapter 1, Appendix 5, Washington, D. C.: Department of Defense, Office of Civil Defense, April 15, 1963.
22. Federal Civil Defense Guide, Part B, Chapter 1, Appendix 5, Executive Order 10622, July 20, 1961, as Amended, Washington, D.C.: Department of Defense, Office of Civil Defense, April 15, 1963.
23. Federal Civil Defense Guide, Part B, Chapter 1, Appendix 2, Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1950, as Amended, Washington, D.C.: Department of Defense, Office of Civil Defense, April 15, 1963.
24. "Federal Guidance for State and Local Civil Defense," Chapter 6, Appendix 1, National Fallout Shelter Survey and Marking Program, Washington, D. C.: Department of Defense, Office of Civil Defense, October 1, 1962.

25. "Federal Guidance for State and Local Civil Defense," Chapter 15, Appendix 1, National Fallout Shelter Provisioning Program, Washington, D. C.: Department of Defense, Office of Civil Defense, October 1, 1962.
26. Fowler, John (editor), "Fallout--A Study of Superbombs, Strontium 90 and Survival--1960," Basic Books, Inc., New York.
27. Garrett, Ralph L., Summary of Studies of Public Attitudes Toward and Information About Civil Defense, Washington, D. C.: Systems Evaluation Division, 1963.
28. Hart, Hernell, "Acceleration in Social Change, Technology and Social Change (by Francis A. Allen, et. al.) New York: Appleton Century Crofts, Inc., 1957.
29. Herter, Christian, Speech to White House Conference on Fallout Protection, Washington, D.C.: January 25, 1960.
30. Kahn, E., Thinking About the Unthinkable, New York: Horizon Press, 1962.
31. Kennedy, John F., Executive Order 10952, White House, Washington, D.C., 1961.
32. Kennedy, John F., Message to Joint Session of Congress, Washington, D.C., May 25, 1961.
33. Kennedy, John F., Urgent National Needs, Report to Congress, Washington, D.C., May 25, 1961.
34. Martin, Thomas L., Jr. and Donald C. Latham, Strategy for Survival, Tucson, Arizona: The University of Arizona Press, 1963.
35. Newsletter, Thomasville, Georgia: Department of Defense, Office of Civil Defense, Volume 1, Mid-October, 1963, Number 10.
36. News Release, Battle Creek, Michigan: Federal Civil Defense Administration, May 6, 1958.
37. O'Brien, T. H., Civil Defense, London: Her Majesty's Stationery, Office and Longman's Green, and Company, 1955.

38. Public Law 81-875, 81st Congress, 1950, "An Act," Wash-  
ington, D. C.
39. Public Law 85-606, 85th Congress, H. R. 7576, August 8,  
1958, "An Act," Washington, D. C.
40. Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States,  
Harry S. Truman, April 12 to December 31, 1945.  
Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing  
Office, 1961.
41. "Public Support, Morale, Security," Economics of National  
Security, Vol. III, Washington, D. C.: Industrial  
College of the Armed Forces, 1954.
42. Shao-chi, Lin, How to Be A Good Communist, Moscow: Com-  
munist Press, 1956.
43. Symington, W. Stuart, Letter of Transmittal, Washington,  
D. C.: National Security Resources Board, 1950.
44. Symington, W. Stuart, United States Civil Defense, Wash-  
ington, D. C.: National Security Resources Board,  
Government Press, 1950.
45. Testimony - Armed Services Committee House of Represen-  
tatives, Washington, D.C.: January 1964.
46. "The Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 as Amended,"  
Public Law 920 - 81st Congress, Washington, D. C.
47. The White House, Washington, D. C.: Office of the White  
House Press Security, February 17, 1962. (Press  
release)
48. Training for Civil Defense Administrators and Rescue In-  
structors, Clney, Maryland: National Civil Defense  
Training Center, (Instructional pamphlet), 1953,  
Training and Education Office.
49. Truman, Harry S., Statement to the Press, Washington,  
D. C.: 1952.
50. Worth Investigating, Battle Creek, Michigan: CCD Staff  
College, Department of Defense, Office of Civil De-  
fense, 1964.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

1963-1964 CONTRACT

---

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS AND PROPOSAL (Cost Reimbursement Type Contract)

---

|                                                                              |                            |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Issued by: Office of Civil<br>Defense<br>Contract Division, Room 2-A-<br>318 | Department:<br><br>DEFENSE |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|

---

|                                 |                                                              |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| Address:<br>Washington 25, D.C. | Requisition Number or<br>Purchase Authority:<br>FA - T&E - 6 |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|

---

---

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

---

|                   |                                 |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|
| Date Issued:      | Request for Proposal<br>Number: |
| February 11, 1963 | 63/23-9                         |

---

Written proposals in triplicate\* subject to (1) the terms and conditions of this request for proposals, (2) the attached Schedule, (3) General Provisions (either DD Form 748, 1 May 60 edition, as it applies to the proposed procurement, incorporated herein by reference, or as may be attached), and (4) such other contract provisions and specifications as are attached or incorporated by reference in the Schedule, will be received at the above office until the close of business (date) March 12, 1963, for furnishing the services or supplies set forth in the accompanying Schedule.

General Information and instructions relative to proposals are contained in the Schedule.

---

\*IN ADDITION TO THE THREE COPIES OF THE PROPOSAL TO BE SUBMITTED AS STATED ABOVE, PLEASE MAIL CONCURRENTLY ONE COPY TO YOUR STATE CIVIL DEFENSE DIRECTOR FOR HIS REVIEW AND ADVISE TO US OF ACCEPTABILITY. FAILURE TO FURNISH A COPY TO THE STATE CIVIL DEFENSE DIRECTOR WILL RESULT IN DELAY IN CONTRACTING.

OCD BC 15247

---

PROPOSAL

Date of Proposal

---

In compliance with the above, the undersigned offers and agrees, if this proposal be accepted with \_\_\_\_\_ calendar days (90 calendar days unless a different period be inserted by the Offeror) after the last date for the receipt of proposals as indicated in the request for proposals, to furnish the services specified herein.

---

OFFEROR REPRESENTS

1. That it \_\_\_\_\_ IS, \_\_\_\_\_ IS NOT, a small business concern. Generally, a small business concern for the purpose of Government procurement is a concern that (1) is not dominant in its field of operation and, with its affiliates, employs fewer than 500 employees, or (2) is certified as a small business concern by the Small Business Administration. (See Code of Federal Regulations, Title 13, Part 103, as amended, which contains the detailed definition and related procedures.) If Contractor is a small business concern and is not the manufacturer of the supplies covered by this contract, it also represents that all supplies to be furnished hereunder \_\_\_\_\_ WILL, \_\_\_\_\_ WILL NOT, be manufactured or produced by a small business concern in the United States, its Territories, its Possessions, or The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.
2. That it is a \_\_\_\_\_ REGULAR DEALER IN \_\_\_\_\_ MANUFACTURER OF, the supplies covered by this contract.
3. (a) That it \_\_\_\_\_ HAS, \_\_\_\_\_ HAS NOT, employed or retained any company or person (other than a full-time bona fide employee working solely for the contractor) to solicit or secure this contract, and (b) that it \_\_\_\_\_ HAS, \_\_\_\_\_ HAS NOT, paid or agreed to pay any company or person (other than a full-time bona fide employee working solely for the contractor) any fee, commission, percentage or brokerage fee, contingent upon or resulting from the award of this contract; and agrees to furnish information relating to (a) and (b) above as requested by the Contracting Officer. (For interpretation of the representation, including the term "bona fide employee," see Code of Federal Regulations, Title 44, Part 130.)

4. That it operates as INDIVIDUAL PARTNERSHIP  
CORPORATION incorporated in the State of FLORIDA

The Florida Institute is a unit of the State University System of Florida.

---

FULL NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS  
OF OFFEROR (Street, city, zone,  
and State) (Type or print)

TELEPHONE NUMBER

224-5184

The Florida Institute for  
Continuing University Studies  
Beard at Thomasville Highway  
Post Office Box 1562  
Tallahassee, Florida

---

SIGNATURE OF PERSON  
AUTHORIZED TO SIGN  
PROPOSAL:

---

TYPED OR PRINTED SIGNER'S  
NAME AND TITLE:

Myron R. Blee, President

---

---

| SCHEDULE                              |                   |                |                                |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|--------------------------------|
| Request for Proposals<br>and Proposal | Request<br>Number | Page<br>Number | Number of Pages<br>of Schedule |
|                                       | 63/23             | 1              | 4                              |

---

Scope of work, including specific duties and required reports:

I.

A. The Contractor, in consultation and cooperation with the Office of Civil Defense shall furnish the necessary facilities, personnel, and such other services as may be required to conduct civil defense training and conferences and courses through its extension service. The work and services shall be performed as specifically provided for in this contract, and generally consistent with the outline of work contained in the Contractor's proposal.

B. The Contractor shall:

1. Develop conference and course design and content which shall be submitted through the State Civil Defense Director to the CCD Regional Office for review and approval prior to use. Provide for attendance of a representative of the State Civil Defense Director and representatives of CCD Region at the first conference and course. Improvements shall be made in conducting the conference and courses as suggested and approved by the State Civil Defense Director and CCD Region provided that the improvement shall not conflict with the scope of work herein except as may be modified by the Contracting Officer.

2. Conduct not less than 16 Office of Civil Defense content-approved, six hours per day, one or two day conferences on civil defenses as shown in the attached outline, for State, county, and municipal officials. Insofar as practicable, each conference should be conducted for a minimum of twenty-five such officials.

3. Conduct not less than 4 courses in Shelter Management (Instructor) and not less than 4 courses in Radiological Monitoring for Instructors in accordance with the attached outline. Each course shall consist of not less than thirty (30) hours of instruction over a five day period or an equivalent period in accordance with the Contractor's usual practice for similar courses. Insofar, as practicable, each course shall be conducted for a minimum of twenty-five students.

C. Professional full-time personnel of the Contractor specifically employed under this contract to develop and conduct training conferences and courses shall complete a minimum of four (4) weeks of training at the Office of Civil Defense Staff College, Battle Creek, Michigan prior to undertaking any instructional duty required by this contract.

1. Full-time personnel selected to conduct courses in Shelter Management (Instructor) shall complete CCD courses entitled "Civil Defense Management," "Shelter Management (Instructor)," "Shelter Utilization," and one week special instruction provided by the CCD Staff College.

2. Full-time personnel selected to conduct courses in Radiological Monitoring for Instructors shall complete CCD courses entitled "Civil Defense Management," "Radiological Monitoring for Instructors," "Radiological Defense Officer," and one week special instruction provided by the CCD Staff College.

D. The Contractor shall, if possible, arrange for the use of, at no cost to the Government, a locally available licensed fallout shelter for training purposes. In the event a licensed fallout shelter is not available, the Contractor shall provide, as part of the required instructional equipment, a simulated fallout shelter. The shelter shall have a capacity of not less than thirty (30) persons with space dimensions calculated on

the basis of ten (10) square feet per person. If possible, space should be obtained permitting classes of up to fifty (50) trainees. The shelter shall be located where there is access by both students and instructors, such as in a school or other public-building basement or on the upper floors. Windows, if any, shall be covered during shelter simulation periods. Moveable, lightweight walls may be constructed to make the inclosure. Lightweight walls may be of fire resistant material, if required by code. For smaller classes, the design shall permit the moving inward of one or two moveable walls to conform to the variations in size of classes and maintaining the realism of shelter living. The shelter shall be located where there is adequate ventilation. Contractor shall provide a method of communication with instructional staff outside the shelter. Costs for providing the simulated shelter shall be kept to a minimum. Food, water containers, sanitation equipment, and medical kits shall be provided for training purposes at no expense to the Contractor from Government stocks of shelter supplies.

- E. To insure standardization of instruction, Office of Civil Defense-developed training materials shall be used exclusively by the Contractor as the basis for the Shelter Management (Instructor) and the Radiological Monitoring for Instructors courses.
- F. The Government shall:
  - 1. Assist the Contractor in the recruitment of students to attend conferences and courses.
  - 2. Furnish on a continuing basis, information which will permit the Contractor to keep current with OCD policies, plans, programs, and operational procedure affecting performance under this contract.
  - 3. Provide consultation by OCD specialists, as required.
  - 4. Promote cooperative relations between Contractor and State Civil Defense Director through the appropriate OCD Region.

## II. CONSIDERATION AND PAYMENT

The Government shall pay the Contractor, as compensation for all work and services performed and materials furnished, direct and indirect allowable costs as allowed by the Armed Services Procurement Regulation, Section XV. The contract amount will be based on the amount reflected in your proposal, less any amount of reduction as a result of further negotiations with you.

## III. TERM OF CONTRACT

The term of the contract shall be one year from the effective date. Following receipt of your proposal and additional negotiation as may be required the contract will be forwarded for your acceptance and return. Upon receipt and subject to negotiation of any further changes you may desire, the contract will be signed by the Contracting Officer. The effective date of the contract will be the date signed by the Contracting Office, which will be the first date on which your services are reimbursable. A copy of the fully signed contract will be forwarded to you by Air Mail. No advance can be made.

## IV. SCHEDULE PERFORMANCE AND REPORTS

The Contractor shall commence performance following the effective date of the contract and receipt of his copy of the contract, and shall complete such portion of service as follows:

- A. The first conference shall be conducted on or before \_\_\_\_\*\_\_\_\_.
- B. The first course shall be conducted on or before \_\_\_\_\*\_\_\_\_.
- C. The Contractor shall submit to the Regional Director, CCD Region 3, Attention: Training and Education, a monthly progress report (5 copies) on or before the fifteenth day of each month which will include the number of courses, the number of trainees, the names and addresses of each trainee

---

\* Dependent upon personnel's completion date of classes at CCD Staff College.

satisfactorily completing the conferences and/or courses conducted during the previous month, together with any recommendations of an improvement in the program. One additional copy of the progress report shall be furnished to the Contracting Officer and one copy for the Director, Training and Education.

- D. Four copies of a final report containing a summary of work and services performed and recommendations of the Contractor shall be submitted on or before the completion date of the contract. Two copies shall be furnished to the CCD Regional Director, one copy to the Contracting Officer, and one copy to the Director, Training and Education.

NOTE:

Please complete your proposal including the blanks in Sections I and IV, above. Be sure that all direct costs are itemized by name, proposed number of hours, and salary for each university employee proposed to be employed under the contract. Instructional qualifications of university employees need not be furnished.

All written questions should be directed to the issuing office as shown on the first page. Telephone queries of a contractual nature may be directed to Mr. G. H. Harbin, Jr., Oxford 5-9538, Washington 25, D. C. Telephone queries of a technical nature may be directed to the CCD Region.

| <u>SCHEDULE</u>                           | <u>Request</u> | <u>Page No.</u> | <u>Number of Pages</u> |
|-------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| <u>Request for Proposals and Proposal</u> | <u>Number</u>  |                 | <u>of Schedule</u>     |
|                                           | 63/23          | 2               | 4                      |

Offeror's concept of scope requirements, including preliminary plan for completion:

1. Initial emphasis will be placed on the Shelter Management (Instructor) course. Courses will be planned for each of the four (4) State Council Civil Defense Areas in Florida. The number of courses in each area has been determined by the State Office of Civil Defense according to the needs in that area for shelter managers.

Each course will be staffed with four (4) trained instructors. Barring unforeseen contingencies a full-time staff member of the Florida University System will be the principal instructor for each course.

2. The University intends to conduct one (1) course in Radiological Monitoring for Instructors in each of the four (4) State Council of Civil Defense areas in Florida. The courses will commence within approximately 120 days after notification to the Florida Institute by the Atomic Energy Commission that a faculty member has been licensed to teach instructors of radiological monitors.
3. The Institute will share responsibility for promotion of the courses with the State Council of Civil Defense. The Institute will prepare printed announcements for distribution by the State Council to local Civil Defense Directors. Announcements will be mailed to appropriate businesses and other agencies. Direct contacts in the service areas will be made by the Coordinator within the limitations of his schedule.

Offeror's estimate of time required for completion: One year.

QUALIFICATIONS, including

(1) experience in related work; (2) names, experience and amount of time to be assigned on this project for all principal technical personnel; and (3) equipment and facilities available for performance of this project.

1. Experience in related work:

The Florida Institute for Continuing University Studies operates a large and diversified continuing education program serving more than 50,000 adults throughout the State of Florida each year.

In addition to staff personnel at the Institute Office in Tallahassee the Florida Institute has twenty-six (26) full-time men and women working on a state-wide basis. This staff devotes its full time to the development and organization of adult classes, graduate work, workshops and seminars. Programs are conducted at Florida's state owned campuses as well as other locations convenient to students.

2. Amount of time to be assigned on this project for all principal technical personnel:

(Refer to budget pages for time allocation)

3. Equipment and facilities available for performance of this project:

The Florida Institute has, or can obtain classroom facilities in all locations in Florida wherein classes may be held. In communities where there is no State University Campus, the Florida Institute has access to public school buildings, private university and college facilities, classrooms and conference facilities in major industries, institutions, hotels and restaurants.

Institute Offices and University Campuses are equipped with most necessary visual aids and general instructional equipment that are required for educational programs.

The Institute will depend upon the State Council of Civil Defense and local civil defense agencies for access to necessary fallout shelters. The Institute will also depend upon the State Council for radio-active sources which may be used for instructional purposes and for necessary Civil Defense kits.

Breakdown of estimated costs for furnishing services in accordance with the attached:

(Use of attached breakdown sheet is recommended. Failure of any other format to incorporate the minimum breakdown required may result in the proposal being considered non-responsive.)

| ESTIMATED COSTS |  |  |  |        |  |
|-----------------|--|--|--|--------|--|
| DIRECT COSTS    |  |  |  | AMOUNT |  |

PERSONNEL (Itemize all positions by indicating (1) type; (2) classification within type if more than one salary rate; (3) manhours months/years; and (4) actual current hourly/monthly/yearly salary rate.)

| (1) & (2) | (3) | (4) | (1) & (2) | (3) | (4) |
|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|-----|-----|
|           |     |     |           |     |     |
|           |     |     |           |     |     |
|           |     |     |           |     |     |
|           |     |     |           |     |     |

EQUIPMENT (Itemize) RENTALS

|  |
|--|
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

EQUIPMENT (Itemize)

|  |
|--|
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

CONSUMABLE SUPPLIES (Itemize)

|  |
|--|
|  |
|  |
|  |

PRINTING, (Including labor and materials)

|  |
|--|
|  |
|  |
|  |

TRAVEL (Government Standardized Travel Regulations will apply unless offeror's established travel policy is attached to proposal)

COMMUNICATIONS

|  |
|--|
|  |
|--|

SUBCONTRACTS (Itemize if in excess of \$1,000.00)

---

---

---

CONSULTANT SERVICES (Itemize)

---

---

---

OTHER EXPENSES (Itemize) (Costs for royalties exceeding \$250.00 will require additional information - A.S.P.R. 9-110)

---

---

---

TOTAL DIRECT COSTS

---

OVERHEAD (Provisional Rate \_\_\_\_\_%)

---

FIXED FEE (If Applicable)

---

---

TOTAL ESTIMATED COSTS

---

CURRENT PROVISIONAL OVERHEAD RATE, IF ANY, AS ESTABLISHED BY THE COGNIZANT AUDIT AGENCY \_\_\_\_\_%

NAME OF COGNIZANT AUDIT AGENCY (If Applicable) \_\_\_\_\_

---

ATTACH COPY OF LAST PUBLISHED FINANCIAL STATEMENT TO PROPOSAL, IF THERE IS NO COGNIZANT AGENCY ASSIGNED.

LS-753

APPENDIX II

UNIVERSITY EXTENSION CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRAM

QUESTIONNAIRE

CONFERENCES FOR GOVERNMENTAL OFFICIALS - 6 HRS.

1. If offered in your areas, what day of the week would seem most desirable?
2. What areas listed below do you feel need additional clarification and emphasis in your local situation?
  - A. Why Civil Defense \_\_\_\_\_
  - B. Weapons and Effects \_\_\_\_\_
  - C. Protective Measures \_\_\_\_\_
  - D. Legal Authority & Responsibility \_\_\_\_\_

Federal \_\_\_\_\_

State \_\_\_\_\_

Local \_\_\_\_\_
  - E. Shelter Planning \_\_\_\_\_

(Federal program  
& local imple-  
mentation)
  - F. Operational Planning - \_\_\_\_\_

Local
  - G. Organization at the \_\_\_\_\_

Local level for Civil  
Defense
  - H. Training & Education \_\_\_\_\_
  - I. Federal Financial Assistance \_\_\_\_\_
  - J. Communication & Warning \_\_\_\_\_
  - K. Other \_\_\_\_\_

RADIOLOGICAL MONITORING FOR INSTRUCTORS AND SHELTER MANAGE-  
MENT FOR INSTRUCTORS - 32 HRS. EACH

1. Do you feel your area (50 mile radius) could provide 25 students for the above courses?
2. What method of recruitment do you feel would be most successful?
  - A. Brochures and Publicity through University \_\_\_\_\_
  - B. Personal contact by local Civil Defense Official \_\_\_\_\_
  - C. Publicity from State Civil Defense Office \_\_\_\_\_
  - D. All of the above \_\_\_\_\_
  - E. Others \_\_\_\_\_
3. If offered in your area, which of the following arrangements do you feel would be most suitable.
  - A. Three hour per evening 10 week course. \_\_\_\_\_
  - B. A two hour per evening 15 week course. \_\_\_\_\_
  - C. A Tues.-Thurs., Mon.-Wed. (6 hour per week) five week course. \_\_\_\_\_
  - D. A full week 5 day course (6 hours per day). \_\_\_\_\_
  - E. A Friday evening - Saturday course (3 week-ends - 10 hours each) \_\_\_\_\_
  - F. Other suggestions \_\_\_\_\_
4. The shelter management course calls for an in-shelter stay. Which of the following time periods do you feel would be of most benefit to participants?
  - A. Enter 5:00 P.M. - Emerge 11:00 A.M. (following day)
  - B. Enter 4:00 P.M. - Emerge 4:00 P.M. (following day)
  - C. Enter 6:00 P.M. - Emerge 11:00 A.M. (following day)

(Please keep in mind participants work schedules.)
5. I would like to see the following personnel contacted (Publicity and Brochures) in my area. (eg. Schools, industry, service clubs.)  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
6. Please indicate which day or days of the week you feel would be most acceptable in your area. \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

7. Please note below any local conditions you feel should be taken into account concerning your own area.

---

---

8. We would greatly appreciate your suggestions concerning all proposed course offerings, and hope you will assist us in our planning by commenting on them in the remaining space.

---

---

---

9. Additional comments: \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_

TELEPHONE \_\_\_\_\_

CIVIL DEFENSE RESPONSIBILITY \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

### APPENDIX III

#### CIVIL DEFENSE COURSES CONDUCTED UNDER THE UNIVERSITY EXTENSION PROGRAM

The Florida Institute for Continuing University Studies (FICUS) under contract to Department of Defense, Office of Civil Defense will conduct for this Agency, eight Civil Defense Instructors Courses during FY 64. These courses will consist of a 36-hour Shelter Management for Instructors and a 32-hour Radiological Monitoring for Instructors. The courses are CCD approved and designed to train qualified instructors to assist local Civil Defense organizations and State Agencies in the training of Shelter Managers and Radiological Monitors.

In addition to the instructor courses FICUS will conduct, in conjunction with this Agency, a series of 6-hour Civil Defense Conferences for Government Officials. The purpose of these conferences is to reappraise government officials of the continuing need for Civil Defense and to evaluate the present status of the Civil Defense Program including the shelter program at Federal, State, and local levels. Conference dates and locations will be announced at a later date.

#### SCHEDULE OF CLASSES

##### RADIOLOGICAL MONITORING (INSTRUCTORS)

| <u>CLASS<br/>NO.</u> | <u>STARTING DATE</u> | <u>CLOSING DATE</u> | <u>LOCATION</u>               |
|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1                    | 21 October 63        | 25 October 63       | West CD Area,<br>Tallahassee  |
| 2                    | 18 November 63       | 22 November 63      | North CD Area,<br>Gainesville |
| 3                    | 20 January 64        | 24 January 64       | Central CD Area,<br>Tampa     |
| 4.                   | 9 March 64           | 14 March 64         | South CD Area,<br>Miami       |

SHELTER MANAGEMENT (INSTRUCTOR)

| <u>CLASS NO.</u> | <u>STARTING DATE</u> | <u>CLOSING DATE</u> | <u>LOCATION</u>               |
|------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1                | 18 November 63       | 22 November 63      | West CD Area,<br>Tallahassee  |
| 2                | 2 December 63        | 6 December 63       | North CD Area,<br>Gainesville |
| 3                | 3 February 64        | 7 February 64       | Central CD Area,<br>Tampa     |
| 4                | 23 March 64          | 27 March 64         | South CD Area,<br>Miami       |

(Class Time: 9:00 A.M. to 4:00 P.M.)

COURSE DESCRIPTION

RADIOLOGICAL MONITORING: A 32-hour course designed to qualify selected individuals as radiological monitor instructors, to provide the technical background necessary for advanced training as radiological defense officers, or assistant radiological defense officers, and to provide a training source for other personnel whose assignments require extensive knowledge of radiological defense.

The course covers basic concepts of nuclear science and nuclear weapons effects; types, operation and use of radiological defense equipment and practical experience in using radiological equipment in radiation areas; formation, prediction and decay of radioactive fallout; protection against fallout; source handling techniques; monitoring operations; and defense against chemical and biological agents.

SHELTER MANAGEMENT: A course designed to cover 36 hours of instruction, and to provide technical background and training required by shelter management instructors, who may then train those who are to serve as shelter managers and their staffs. Participants will be required to spend some portion of their time in shelter living using shelter accommodations.

The course provides the prospective shelter management instructor with technical information required for shelter management and for training others. The problem of nuclear weapons effects is reviewed in relation to the national

shelter program and protection against these effects. The course offers understanding of the community shelter system and includes a field study of prototype and other community fallout shelters.

Emphasis is placed upon management of community fallout shelters and instruction includes: organization and staff requirements, supplies and equipment, shelter entry, shelter operations, shelter living, and emergence from shelter. A shelter exercise enables class members to apply that they have studied in the classroom to get on-the-job training, and to gain experience in shelter living, including the physiological and psychological aspects.

STUDENT QUALIFICATIONS FOR FICUS INSTRUCTOR COURSES ARE THE SAME AS REQUIRED FOR CCD STAFF COLLEGE COURSES AS OUTLINED IN THE CCD STAFF COLLEGE COURSE CATALOG.

#### COURSE INSTRUCTORS

##### SHELTER MANAGEMENT:

Mr. Glenn Goerke  
Coordinator for the  
University  
CD Extension Program,  
FICUS

##### RADIOLOGICAL MONITORING:

Mr. Robert Kohler  
Radiological Safety  
Officer  
Florida State University

##### CIVIL DEFENSE CONFERENCES:

Mr. Harry Hughey  
Assistant Coordinator,  
University CD Extension  
Program, FICUS; and the  
State Civil Defense Staff

#### ENROLLMENT PROCEDURES

Application for enrollment in the Instructor Courses should be submitted through this Agency to FICUS, Tallahassee, Florida, at least two weeks prior to starting date. Classes are limited to 25 students. Priority for enrollment will be given to those organizations who do not have a trained Shelter and Radiological Instructor.

Enrollment applications are included in a course brochure being distributed to all County CD organizations and State Agencies by FICUS.

APPENDIX IV  
LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

October 2, 1963

Dear

I would like to take this opportunity to introduce both myself and our program for the current year.

My name is Glenn A. Goerke, Coordinator of University Civil Defense Extension, and I represent the Florida Institute for Continuing University Studies.

Our institution, along with universities in the other 49 states, has contracted with the Department of Defense, with the full cooperation of the Florida State Civil Defense Agency, to conduct a series of courses for Shelter Management and Radiological Monitoring Instructors. The courses will be offered in various parts of the state through our extension services to make them more readily available.

In addition to these courses, we will be offering a series of Conferences for public officials delineating the civil defense responsibilities of federal, state, and local government.

The contract for this fiscal year calls for 4 Shelter Management courses, 4 Radiological Monitoring courses, and 16 Conferences for Governmental officials. I point this up to show that full state coverage will not be attained this year but rather on an ongoing basis over a period of time.

In the event that your area is either directly involved or within a reasonable distance of course offerings, we would be deeply appreciative of your assistance in both program publicity and recruitment.

If courses or conferences are situated in your particular county, I will be contacting you personally for background information and assistance in securing necessary facilities.

Detailed descriptions of both course offerings and personnel involved will be forthcoming from the State Office of Civil Defense in the immediate future.

In closing, I would like to say that we are pleased to have the opportunity to work with you on this cooperative program, and we hope that you will feel free to avail yourselves of our services in any way we can be of assistance. Your suggestions and criticisms of our offerings will be welcomed as a base upon which to strengthen our common goal of total Civil Defense operational capability.

Sincerely,

Glenn A. Goerke  
Coordinator, University Civil  
Defense Extension  
Florida Institute for Continuing  
University Studies

GAG:oh

APPENDIX V

APPLICATION FOR ENROLLMENT

---

This Enrollment Form should be completed and forwarded through your local and/or State Civil Defense Office to the Florida Institute for Continuing University Studies in Tallahassee. Please type or print information requested. Application for enrollment are considered in the order in which they are received. It is therefore important that you mail this enrollment well in advance of the beginning date of the course you wish to attend.

---

TITLE OF COURSE

City \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

---

LAST NAME-FIRST NAME-MIDDLE  
INITIAL OF APPLICANT (Mr.-  
Mrs.-Miss-Military-or other)

HOME ADDRESS (St.-City-  
Zone-State)

BY WHOM EMPLOYED:

POSITION:

---

YOUR CIVIL DEFENSE ASSIGNMENT    Full Time \_\_\_\_\_  
Part Time \_\_\_\_\_  
Volunteer \_\_\_\_\_

HOW LONG HAVE YOU HELD  
THIS POSITION

---

STATE BRIEFLY YOUR EXPERIENCE IN CIVIL DEFENSE -

---

EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE

---

|                        |                              |               |
|------------------------|------------------------------|---------------|
| COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY | DATES ATTENDED               | MAJOR DEGREES |
|                        | From                      To |               |

---

---

LIST CIVIL DEFENSE COURSES PREVIOUSLY TAKEN -

---

---

STATE EXPERIENCE IN TEACHING OR TRAINING -

---

---

STATE OTHER EXPERIENCE RELATED TO THE COURSE YOU DESIRE -

---

---

PLEASE INDICATE YOUR TRAINING IN COLLEGE SCIENCE AND/OR  
EXPERIENCE IN RADIOLOGICAL DEFENSE -

---

---

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, IF ANY (identify by item number) -

---

Upon successful completion of any instructor course for which I have applied, I agree to serve as an instructor and to conduct similar courses for the Civil Defense organization in my area.

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of State Civil Defense Director

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Local Civil Defense Director

---

ADMINISTRATIVE INSTRUCTIONS

Reimbursement to students under AM 25-3 (Student Reimbursement Program) for attendance at FICUS courses is not eligible. However, political subdivisions participating in the Personnel and Administrative Expenses Matching Funds Program may receive 50% reimbursement for expenses involved in sending civil defense personnel or volunteers with definite civil defense responsibilities to these courses. Travel must be in accordance with State Travel Regulations and travel of non-paid civil defense personnel must be authorized in advance by the State Civil Defense Agency.

No registration fee is required for either course and all instructional material will be furnished by FICUS.

Course schedule and classroom location and other administrative information will be provided each student upon confirmation of enrollment.

BY AUTHORITY OF THE STATE DIRECTOR

OFFICIAL:

---

C. E. Aldrich  
Deputy Director

Distribution:  
Schedule "C"

APPENDIX VI  
QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Age \_\_\_\_\_
2. Sex: Male \_\_\_\_\_ Female \_\_\_\_\_
3. Martial Status: Single \_\_\_\_\_ Married \_\_\_\_\_  
Divorced \_\_\_\_\_ Widowed \_\_\_\_\_ Separated \_\_\_\_\_
4. Please check highest grade of schooling completed:  
7th \_\_\_\_\_ 8th \_\_\_\_\_ 9th \_\_\_\_\_ 10th \_\_\_\_\_ 11th \_\_\_\_\_  
12th \_\_\_\_\_  
College: 1 year \_\_\_\_\_ 2 years \_\_\_\_\_ 3 years \_\_\_\_\_  
4 years \_\_\_\_\_ Grad. \_\_\_\_\_
5. If a college graduate, please indicate major: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
6. Please list the Civic, Professional or Fraternal organizations of which you are a member:  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
7. What is your present occupation, and by whom employed?  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
8. How were you first made aware of Radiological Monitoring and/or Shelter Management Instructor course(s)?

|                               |                                        |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| _____ Newspaper               | _____ Program Director                 |
| _____ Radio                   |                                        |
| _____ Television              | _____ Civil Defense Director (county)  |
| _____ Employer                | _____ Civil Defense Personnel (county) |
| _____ Other (Please Indicate) | _____ Friend                           |

9. Do you feel course recruitment publicity was adequate?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No

If not, what suggestions would you make for improvement? \_\_\_\_\_

10. Prior to taking the Radiological Monitoring and/or Shelter Management Instructor courses, did you have other Civil Defense Training and/or experience?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

If so, please specify training and/or experience and where it was received. (Course, City and State)

11. How long have you been a resident of Florida? \_\_\_\_\_

12. Were you requested to enroll in the course(s)?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

If so, by whom:     \_\_\_ Employer  
                      \_\_\_ County Civil Defense Personnel  
                      \_\_\_ State Civil Defense Personnel  
                      \_\_\_ Friend  
                      \_\_\_ Other (Please specify)

13. If your enrollment in the course(s) was voluntary,  
please state the reason for participation.     \_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

14. Prior to taking your training did you consider the  
Civil Defense program to be an essential part of our  
total defense effort?

Yes     \_\_\_     No     \_\_\_

15. What was your attitude toward Civil Defense prior to  
taking the classes?

\_\_\_ Favorable     \_\_\_ Indifferent     \_\_\_ Un-  
favorable

16. As a result of having taken the training, what is your  
present attitude toward Civil Defense?

\_\_\_ More favorable  
\_\_\_ Less favorable  
\_\_\_ Essential program  
\_\_\_ Not essential program

17. Do you now believe that the general public considers the Civil Defense program to be essential and/or significant?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

SHELTER MANAGEMENT GRADUATES

18. Kindly check the topics that you considered to be significant, not significant and those that could have been omitted from the Shelter Management course. Please check each topic listed below in one of the categories.

|    | <u>Topic</u>                               | <u>Significant</u> | <u>Not Significant</u> | <u>Omitted</u> |
|----|--------------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|----------------|
| A. | Weapons Effects                            | _____              | _____                  | _____          |
| B. | Protection<br>against weapons effects      | _____              | _____                  | _____          |
| C. | National Shelter Program                   | _____              | _____                  | _____          |
| D. | Community Shelter system                   | _____              | _____                  | _____          |
| E. | Visit to Shelter Facility                  | _____              | _____                  | _____          |
| F. | Shelter Organization and Staff             | _____              | _____                  | _____          |
| G. | Shelter Facilities, Supplies and Equipment | _____              | _____                  | _____          |
| H. | Shelter Operations                         | _____              | _____                  | _____          |
| I. | Shelter Exercise                           | _____              | _____                  | _____          |
| J. | Shelter Information Program                | _____              | _____                  | _____          |
| K. | Shelter Exercise Review                    | _____              | _____                  | _____          |

|    | <u>Topic</u>                                                        | <u>Significant</u> | <u>Not Significant</u> | <u>Omitted</u> |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|----------------|
| L. | Shelter Emer-<br>gence                                              | _____              | _____                  | _____          |
| M. | Group Dynamics<br>and Interper-<br>sonal Relation-<br>ships         | _____              | _____                  | _____          |
| N. | Shelter Living                                                      | _____              | _____                  | _____          |
| C. | Planning and Ad-<br>ministering<br>Shelter Manage-<br>ment Training | _____              | _____                  | _____          |
| P. | Course Summary                                                      | _____              | _____                  | _____          |
| Q. | Examination                                                         | _____              | _____                  | _____          |
| R. | Course Evalua-<br>tion                                              | _____              | _____                  | _____          |
| S. | Graduation                                                          | _____              | _____                  | _____          |

19. In reviewing your shelter experience, do you feel:

- A. The stay was of too short a duration? Yes ☐ No ☐
- B. The stay was of too long a duration? Yes ☐ No ☐
- C. The stay was of sufficient duration  
to gain experience? Yes ☐ No ☐
- D. Enough psychological situations were  
included? Yes ☐ No ☐
- E. Experiences were provided in all areas  
of shelter living? Yes ☐ No ☐
- F. The stay was too severe? Yes ☐ No ☐
- G. The stay provided a real learning  
experience? Yes ☐ No ☐
- H. The same objectives could be accom-  
plished without a shelter living ex-  
perience? Yes ☐ No ☐
- I. Cots should have been provided? Yes ☐ No ☐
- J. Better bathing facilities should be  
provided? Yes ☐ No ☐
- K. The shelter commode should be used? Yes ☐ No ☐
- L. Better communications equipment was  
needed? Yes ☐ No ☐
- M. Government supplies should be sup-  
plemented with additional food and  
equipment? Yes ☐ No ☐
- N. Pre-shelter instruction was adequate? Yes ☐ No ☐

If not, what else could have been done? \_\_\_\_\_

C. Shelter assignments should be made earlier and discussed with each person? Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_

20. Please list any other suggestions you may have for improving the shelter living experience.

---

---

---

21. What topics should be added to the Shelter Management course? \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

RADIOLOGICAL MONITORING GRADUATES

22. Kindly check the topics that you considered significant, not significant and those that could have been omitted from the Radiological Monitoring courses. Please check each topic listed below in one of the categories.

|    | <u>Topic</u>                           | <u>Significant</u> | <u>Not Significant</u> | <u>Omitted</u> |
|----|----------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|----------------|
| A. | Basic concepts of Nuclear Science      | _____              | _____                  | _____          |
| B. | Effects of Nuclear Weapons             | _____              | _____                  | _____          |
| C. | Civil Defense Radiological Instruments | _____              | _____                  | _____          |



|                                                                    | <u>Significant</u> | <u>Not Significant</u> | <u>Omitted</u> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|----------------|
| D. Operation Pros-<br>pect (Exercise)                              | <hr/>              | <hr/>                  | <hr/>          |
| E. Instrument Fa-<br>miliarization<br>(Exercise)                   | <hr/>              | <hr/>                  | <hr/>          |
| F. Radiological<br>Monitoring<br>Techniques                        | <hr/>              | <hr/>                  | <hr/>          |
| G. Radiological<br>Defense Equip-<br>ment (Exercise)               | <hr/>              | <hr/>                  | <hr/>          |
| H. Instrument Cal-<br>ibration<br>(Exercise)                       | <hr/>              | <hr/>                  | <hr/>          |
| I. Area Monitor-<br>ing (Exercise)                                 | <hr/>              | <hr/>                  | <hr/>          |
| J. Radioactive<br>Fallout                                          | <hr/>              | <hr/>                  | <hr/>          |
| K. Fallout Fore-<br>casting                                        | <hr/>              | <hr/>                  | <hr/>          |
| L. Decontamination                                                 | <hr/>              | <hr/>                  | <hr/>          |
| M. Dose and Dose<br>rate calcula-<br>tions                         | <hr/>              | <hr/>                  | <hr/>          |
| N. Effects of Fall-<br>out and radia-<br>tion exposure<br>guidance | <hr/>              | <hr/>                  | <hr/>          |
| O. Radiation Pro-<br>tection (ex-<br>ercise)                       | <hr/>              | <hr/>                  | <hr/>          |
| P. National Civil<br>Defense Pro-<br>gram                          | <hr/>              | <hr/>                  | <hr/>          |
| Q. Protection from<br>Fallout                                      | <hr/>              | <hr/>                  | <hr/>          |
| R. Radiological<br>Defense Moni-<br>toring Opera-<br>tions         | <hr/>              | <hr/>                  | <hr/>          |
| S. Source handling<br>techniques                                   | <hr/>              | <hr/>                  | <hr/>          |
| T. Defense against<br>Chemical and<br>Biological<br>Agents         | <hr/>              | <hr/>                  | <hr/>          |

|                                 | <u>Significant</u> | <u>Not Significant</u> | <u>Omitted</u> |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|----------------|
| U. Student Proficiency Exercise | _____              | _____                  | _____          |
| V. Course Examination           | _____              | _____                  | _____          |
| W. Course Examination Review    | _____              | _____                  | _____          |
| X. Monitor Training Techniques  | _____              | _____                  | _____          |
| Y. Course Evaluation            | _____              | _____                  | _____          |
| Z. Graduation                   | _____              | _____                  | _____          |

23. Were there enough exercises in the Radiological Monitoring course?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

If no, please indicate what additional exercises could be added? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

24. What topics should be added to the Radiological Monitoring Courses? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

#### INSTRUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

25. Do you consider that your instructor was:

\_\_\_\_\_ Extremely well prepared.

\_\_\_\_\_ Well prepared.

\_\_\_\_\_ Adequately prepared.

\_\_\_\_\_ Poorly prepared.

26. In reviewing your class instruction, do you feel:

- A. The lecture method was over used? Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_  
B. There was sufficient time for discussion? Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_  
C. Printed materials given to you were sufficiently informative? Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_  
D. Sufficient use was made of visual aids? Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_  
E. Content was pertinent to your local situation? Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_

27. What suggestions do you have for improving course instruction? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

28. Do you believe you have had sufficient training to be an effective Radiological Monitoring and/or Shelter Management Instructor?

Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_

If not, what do you feel should be added to your training? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

END PRODUCT TRAINING

29. Have you conducted any classes in Radiological Monitoring and/or Shelter Management since completing your training period?

Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_

If yes, please signify in which area:

Radiological Monitoring \_\_\_\_\_

Shelter Management \_\_\_\_\_

Number of classes held to date: \_\_\_\_\_

Total enrollment of all classes: \_\_\_\_\_

Where held (City) \_\_\_\_\_

30. What recruitment techniques were used in organizing your classes?

|                  |                        |
|------------------|------------------------|
| _____ Radio      | _____ Brochures        |
| _____ Television | _____ Personal Contact |
| _____ Newspaper  | _____ Other            |

31. Please indicate below the source(s) from which your class membership came.

|                           |                              |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| _____ Municipal Employees | _____ Business               |
| _____ State Employees     | _____ Civic Organizations    |
| _____ Federal Employees   | _____ School Personnel       |
| _____ Industry            | _____ Other (Please specify) |

32. What suggestions have your trainees made concerning course improvement? \_\_\_\_\_

33. What problem have you encountered in organizing and teaching your classes? (Such as scheduling difficulties, publicity, materials, space for classes, shelter supplies, etc.) \_\_\_\_\_

---

34. If you have not conducted any classes, kindly check the appropriate reasons listed below:

- A. Inadequate cooperation by local Civil Defense Personnel. \_\_\_\_\_
- B. No organized recruitment program. \_\_\_\_\_
- C. Lack of physical training facilities. \_\_\_\_\_
- D. Lack of or inadequate supply of course materials. \_\_\_\_\_
- E. I have not attempted to organize a course. \_\_\_\_\_
- F. I tried to organize a course but the response was inadequate to warrant a course offering. \_\_\_\_\_
- G. Failure of State Civil Agency and/or Florida Institute for Continuing University Studies to provide materials. \_\_\_\_\_
- H. Failure to secure Atomic Energy Commission Licensing. \_\_\_\_\_
- I. Failure to apply for Atomic Energy Commission Licensing. \_\_\_\_\_
- J. Other \_\_\_\_\_

---

35. Do you believe that your trainees considered the problem of Civil Defense to be a significant one?

Most \_\_\_\_\_ About Half \_\_\_\_\_ Very Few \_\_\_\_\_

36. Do you now consider our national goal of training 750,000 Radiological Monitors and 750,000 Shelter Managers attainable? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

---

APPENDIX VII

QUESTIONNAIRE COVER LETTER

Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

We have just completed our first year of The University Civil Defense Extension Program. Sessions have been conducted in the Four Florida Civil Defense Regions involving upwards of 150 participants.

As you know we have been anxious to make this program as effective as possible, and I am asking for your help in achieving this goal. Your response to the items in the enclosed questionnaire will provide us the opportunity to evaluate our efforts and to strengthen those areas which you may reveal need a new emphasis.

I would be most grateful if you would take the time to complete the questionnaire and return it to me in the enclosed stamped envelope. Your frank answers are needed and the questionnaire need not be signed.

I enjoyed working with you and am looking forward to visiting you when I am in your area.

With warmest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 03061 4972