POST-DISASTER RECONSTRUCTION: AN OVERVIEW OF ISSUES AND PROBLEMS[1]

by Anthony Oliver-Smith
Department of Anthropology
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32611 USA

I INTRODUCTION

A disaster occurs when a natural or technological phenomenon brings damage or loss to the major social, organizational, and physical facilities of a community to the degree that the essential functions of the society are interrupted or destroyed, resulting in individual stress and social disruption of varying severity. The process of recovery thus involves the re-establishment of normal functions for every aspect of the society, including all basic services, housing, commercial and public buildings as well as the reconstitution of social, political, economic and cultural institutions. The potential inherent in reconstruction for enhancement or development of many dimensions of a community is clear.

Of all the stages of a disaster, reconstruction is probably the

---

[1]. This paper is intended to be a general discussion of the major social scientific dimensions, problems and issues in post-disaster reconstruction. Due to space limitations there will be little reference to forms of reconstruction required by specific disaster agents such as earthquakes or hurricanes, or technological disasters such as explosions or chemical or radiological contamination. In attempting to delineate the major outlines of research on reconstruction I have drawn on literature based on a wide variety of disaster agents in many different national and socio-cultural contexts. The bibliography, however lengthy, is far from exhaustive. The reader will note throughout the text frequent reference to a number of items, most notably Bates (1982), Cuny (1983), Geipel (1982), Haas et al (1977), Oliver-Smith (1992) and Wilches-Chaux (1989). These works constitute the most comprehensive and longitudinal research and analysis of post-disaster reconstruction to date. Drabek (1986) is also an extremely valuable resource on reconstruction and other aspects of disaster research.

longest, the most expensive and the most complex in terms of the problems encountered. Indeed, very few places are ever left to reconstruct themselves. Disasters commonly call for rapid local, state, national and international aid, depending on the scope of destruction, bringing private and public individuals and organizations into the area with personnel and materials. Modern disaster relief and reconstruction has become a "growth enterprize"(Green 1977:17). The technological capacity of donor nations or organizations to respond to disasters has expanded enormously. Improved communications technology, including satellite photography and world-wide telephone connections, make both urgent and long-term needs known more rapidly and graphically than ever before. Modern jet transport can put a major relief effort in place in a very few days and maintain a virtual aid bridge of continual supplies for extended periods of time (Green 1977:17). This convergence of people and goods, often foreign or strange to the local population, may ultimately be as great a source of stress and change as the disaster agent and destruction themselves. In large scale devastation the reconstruction process may last almost indefinitely, often evolving into development programs, and the experts and their work become permanent fixtures in the social landscape.

As Cuny outlines the process, reconstruction after disaster may be measured in four ways: 1) emotional recovery of the victims 2) economic recovery, including replacement of the income lost, the restoration of jobs and/or the means of production, and restoration

of the markets, 3) replacement of physical losses, which includes replacement of personal belongings, the home and in some cases, the replacement of land; and 4) replacement of opportunity (1983:197). Other scholars, most notably Mileti et al (1975), Bates et al (1982) and Rubin (1981) have developed inventories and scales of variables to measure the reconstruction process. Still others might include the criteria of reduced vulnerability and opportunities for improved efficiency, equity or amenity (Haas et al 1977). Thus, the problems of post disaster recovery and reconstruction are extremely complex and challenging, bringing together in one problematic setting an extremely broad array of technological, psychological, social, cultural, economic and political factors.

In a sense there might be a basis for distinguishing between the primarily social, cultural and psychological processes of recovery and the largely economic and infrastructural questions as well as the politics of resource allocation of reconstruction. If such a distinction is accepted, it is nonetheless clear that recovery in the sociocultural and psychological domains and the reconstruction process in economic and infrastructural factors are mutually reinforcing. Furthermore, despite the major emphasis given to material and infrastructural elements, reconstruction is primarily a social process involving a complex of interactions among institutions, groups, and individuals concerned with the allocation and form of material and non-material resources toward culturally derived goals for the society.

A disaster event, the level of social disruption and the

destruction of public and private property caused pose a number of conceptual problems for those engaged in reconstruction. As Kates has put it, reconstruction and recovery are made more complex by "mixed motivations: the tension between speed of restoration, reduction of future hazard and opportunity for improvement"(1977: 281). At the level of individual and community recovery disaster stricken peoples generally seek to re-establish themselves in forms similar to pre-disaster patterns (Aysan and Oliver 1987:12). The need and desire for continuity are profoundly rooted in human cognition and that need is made more acute by the disruption of disaster and is thus reflected in the forms reconstruction may take. Indeed, psychological recovery may be enhanced for some groups by adhering to the known and the familiar in reconstruction (Marris 1986; Oliver-Smith 1992). On the other hand, sectors both within and without the stricken society recognize disasters as opportunities to enact much needed social changes, particularly in societies characterized by rigid social stratification based on racial or ethnic ideologies of domination (Oliver-Smith 1990: 17).

This same tension between the known and the new is present as well in the material and particularly the infrastructural domain, with important implications for both social well being and future physical security. In many respects, reconstruction has been conceptualized in terms of replacement of what was lost or restoration of the original system in place despite endemic problems and vulnerabilities. However, many view disasters as opportunities to address long-term material problems in housing and

infrastructure, recasting reconstruction into a development process with goals of reducing further vulnerability and enhancing social and economic capabilities (Cuny 1983; Wilches-Chaux 1989; Pantelic 1991; Anderson and Woodrow 1991). Furthermore, simple replacement of a community's homes and buildings constitutes in many respects reconstruction of its social structure. Reconstruction policies which favor replacement may basically reproduce the material expression of socially and economically inscribed patterns of inequality and vulnerability. However, some researchers warn against "overambitious post reconstruction planning" as counterproductive in its time consuming comprehensive procedures which lead to unrealistic expectations, bitterness and disappointment (Haas et al 1977:268). Regardless of the degree of change to be implemented in reconstruction, the process will be constrained significantly by pre-disaster development trends in the society and the interests those trends expressed (Drabek 1986: 299). Most recently there is a growing emphasis on prevention, mitigation and preparedness, favoring predisaster measures, such as retrofitting homes and buildings and land use planning, to reduce destruction and subsequent reconstruction needs.

II FORMAL INSTITUTIONS AND INITIATIVES IN RECONSTRUCTION

When disasters leave people in conditions of great need and distress, the formal institutions of the society generally respond with programs of immediate assistance and long-term reconstruction. The numbers and types of formal organizations and institutions involved in the reconstruction process and their capabilities and

resources to address the challenges are extremely varied. Research suggests that one primary differentiation to be made in the overall reconstruction process involves the degrees of centralization of authority and professionalism in implementation (Bates 1982; Cuny 1983; Geipel 1982). The potentials for successful government directed reconstruction reside in large part in the resources, internal capacities and abilities to cooperate effectively of the various ministries, departments and agencies involved in reconstruction. Mader et al (1980) assert that government pre-planning on land use, building codes, geological information and on-going development can facilitate the reconstruction process in important ways.

Governmental centralization in the form of elite professional direction of the process, may, however, lead to forms of reconstruction, particularly in housing and urban design which do not conform to local needs or culture (Davis 1977; Geipel 1982; Doughty 1986; Oliver-Smith and Goldman 1988; Aysan and Oliver 1987; Oliver-Smith 1992). However, in some cases the degree of governmental centralization is seen to positively affect certain aspects of reconstruction such as cooperative formation and self-help and training programs (Kreimer 1978; Gersony et al 1978). In cases where governmental institutions do assume the primary responsibility, Rubin and Barbee (1985) conclude that the speed and scope of reconstruction will depend on the degree to which local officials have the ability, motivation, knowledge and political awareness to act. In this context officials' motivation and local

knowledge, particularly of victims' need perceptions, are seen to be crucial for successful reconstruction by centralized authorities (Kreimer 1979; Cuny 1983). In some instances social attitudes held by professionals and other functionaries of central governments toward victims' racial, ethnic or social identities can be extremely destructive of positive, efficient and appropriate reconstruction. Indeed, regions or communities that are out of favor for whatever reason with central governments may find meaningful reconstruction aid simply not forthcoming.

A decentralized process of reconstruction, on the other hand, maintains greater flexibility of response and more accurate reflection of local perceptions of need and values. Specific NGOs are able to target specific needs more accurately and deliver reconstruction assistance both adequate in scale and culturally more appropriate (Cuny 1983:227). However, decentralized approaches are seen to lack the capability to provide comprehensive plans for the development of infrastructure and social facilities for communities (Kreimer 1978). Although there is frequent duplication of effort between different ministries or government agencies, such problems of poor coordination are also evident in decentralized, more laissez faire, efforts.

More often, reconstruction involves a combination of formal governmental planning and implementation with major participation by Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), pre-existing grass roots organizations, and emergent groups and organizations. Such combined efforts also frequently lead to conflict and competition

between different agencies of varying institutional identities and goals. Bates (1982) sees conflict emerging between bureaucratically run organizations oriented toward relief operations and more grass-roots developmentally oriented organizations which assume reconstruction tasks over how programs should be implemented.

In addition to both formal international and governmental agencies and NGOs and community organizations, individuals and households in particular frequently devise a variety of informal arrangements with great potential for reconstruction efforts. These informal arrangements and resources will be discussed below in the section on social issues in reconstruction.

III RECOVERY AND RECONSTRUCTION: LEVELS OF IMPLEMENTATION

The needs of individuals and communities and the organized responses to these needs in reconstruction are numerous, diverse and interconnected. To order this discussion a system of nested circles of needs expanding from the individual to the community to the larger system will be employed (Oliver-Smith 1977a). Due to constraints of space there will be no attempt to be exhaustive in this discussion and those interested in pursuing the topic further should consult Cuny (1983), Davis (1978), Geipel (1982) or Oliver-Smith (1992) among others.

Effective implementation at all levels of reconstruction must be based on accurate information to be adequate quantitatively and culturally appropriate qualitatively. Information gathering is a primary activity after every disaster, often to the degree (due

largely to duplication and lack of coordinated efforts) that victims quickly feel surveyed to death before they have perceived any real assistance. One means of allaying such resentments is to involve the victims themselves in survey efforts, thus initiating their participation in the process of reconstruction. One recent attempt at creating a cross-culturally valid standardized measure of impact to be used by researchers to ascertain the effects of disaster on households as social units employs household living conditions as the impact indicator (Bates and Peacock 1993). Other discussions of information gathering methods are included in Cuny (1983) and Geipel (1982).

Individual and Household Level Reconstruction

Homes and jobs are the most deeply felt needs at the level of individual and household in post-disaster reconstruction. Other individual and household level reconstruction concerns include household possessions and services such as health care, education, water, sewage, and electricity, frequently provided by the community (Cuny 1983, Geipel 1982; Oliver-Smith 1977a; 1992; Bates and Peacock 1993). Although in certain disasters or in certain regions or cultures, housing is not the highest priority, it probably the most researched and, in many disasters, the most pressing need felt at the individual and household level. The entire issue of post-disaster housing is pre-figured by the urgency of need to shelter people quickly in the aftermath of many disasters. The immediate need for shelter requires an immediate response which in the vast majority of cases involves temporary

quarters. There is often a transition paralleling the disaster stages of emergency, rehabilitation and reconstruction from emergency shelter in tents, to temporary housing (mobile homes, quonset huts, styrofoam igloos, modular barracks) to permanent housing. Unfortunately, the process often becomes stalled at the rehabilitative stage and the temporary, however inadequate, becomes permanent. This all too common result has generated considerable debate among researchers on the advisability of temporary structures as opposed to permanent housing. A recent contribution by Pantelic and Greene (1991) convincingly argues that an absolute rule for either case is ill-advised and that post-disaster housing policies must be elaborated on a case by case basis.

In post-disaster housing reconstruction there has been considerable attention paid to construction techniques and materials, focusing on prefabricated buildings, new low cost materials and technologies, adding modern materials to traditional structures, or the use of indigenous or intermediate technologies (Schupisser and Studer 1984; Davis 1981; Cuny 1983; Quarantelli 1982; Aysan and Davis 1992). Considerable criticism of much post-disaster housing has been based on popular rejection of many materials, structures and designs introduced into local contexts by national governments and international agencies (Hogg 1980; Coburn et al 1984; Mitchell 1976; Geipel 1982; Oliver-Smith 1990; 1992). Recently, greater attention has been paid to questions of cultural appropriateness (Aysan and Oliver 1987). Similarly, problems of housing reconstruction and social organization and stratification

as evidenced in the inequities in housing quality and distribution after disasters are receiving more scrutiny (Geipel 1982; Bolin and Bolton 1986; Low 1988; Bolin and Stanford 1991; Oliver-Smith 1991).

The other great need to be addressed in reconstruction at the level of individual and household is employment. From a material and psychological standpoint, economics drives the reconstruction process. Employment provides needed income to replace, restore and improve those personal and household needs not provided by aid (Bates and Peacock 1993), but it will also enable people to become actors again rather than being acted upon as victims of the disaster or recipients or objects of aid programs, which are both essentially passive rather than active roles. Many people lose their workplace or tools or both in disasters and are unable to resume normal activities until they are restored (Geipel 1982; Oliver-Smith 1992). Deserving of special attention in this domain are those people, shops or industries which are small or marginal (Haas et al 1977). Until people resume employment, they remain dependent on external resources and reconstruction remains incomplete. The protection of jobs as a major dimension of reconstruction at the individual and household level operates simultaneously at the community and system levels as well (Haas et al 1977:291).

Community Level Reconstruction

Many of the reconstruction concerns expressed at the level of household and individual are replicated at the community and system

levels, particularly those relevant to the provision of services to the community as a whole. However, there are a number of community level dimensions and institutions in reconstruction that bear special mention. Primary among these is land use and location. Reconstruction often requires major changes in land use. New land areas may need to be brought into use for temporary facilities or new development. Furthermore, some land may need to be withdrawn from use due to increased vulnerability to hazards. In all cases in which land use is changed, it is necessary to develop appropriate, efficient and fair mechanisms of compensation (Haas et al 1977:273-275).

The disaster victim's desire for continuity is generally reflected in an attachment to and rebuilding efforts in the original site of the community. However strong the need for continuity may be in victims, there are also frequently very solid material considerations, often embedded in the sound economic and ecological reasons for the original location (Oliver-Smith 1977b). Indeed, the success record of post-disaster relocation is not impressive. Often, people faced with relocation either refuse to leave or abandon the new homes or communities constructed for them, frequently returning to their original homes (Aysan 1987;Oliver-Smith 1982; 1992).

Although successes are rare, the following principles have been derived from those successful relocation projects: 1) the community must be organized, 2) those to be moved must participate in the decision making process, 3) relocatees should understand the

multiorganizational system that will be required, 4) personal and social needs must receive special attention and 5) officals must be sensitive to the cultural and ethnic backgrrounds of the movers (Perry and Mushkatel 1984: 183-194 adapted by Drabek 1986: 302).

Key issues in successful post-disaster relocation involve four major categories: site choice, urban design, housing and popular participation (Oliver-Smith 1991). Successful relocation of a community can be assessed on the basis of six factors demonstrative of commitment to permanence: 1) the number of occupied houses, 2) modifications to form and design of provided housing, 3) maintenance and state of repair, 4) the development of gardens, tree planting and enclosures, 5) building extensions and investment in them, 6) construction of private buildings (Coburn et al 1984: 52). Other post-disaster resettlement findings also recommend proximity to employment and social services as important for successful projects (UNDRO 1982: 375).

Every community possesses certain public spaces, structures, or facilities which are basic to its functioning such as town meeting halls or spaces, municipal office buildings, clinics, schools, churches, market areas or buildings and reservoirs or irrigation systems. Reconstruction of these public spaces, structures or facilities is vital to the resumption of normal activities for the community and its members both on a material level and in terms of their symbolic value as well (Oliver-Smith 1977a; Geipel 1982). In the developed world many of these institutions will be reconstructed by their associated state or national agencies, but

in developing countries schools, clinics or hospitals, markets, churches, town halls, irrigation systems and other community structures or facilities are often local responsibilities . As such, the reconstruction of these buildings or facilities, which is given high priority by local people, if often relegated to secondary importance by outside professionals and reconstruction authorities who are primarily concerned with economic, housing or land use issues.

System Level Reconstruction

Every community, no matter how isolated it may be, constitutes part of a larger system of communities involving patterns of economic production and distribution, political authority, social stratification, and an interconnecting infrastructure of roads, communication systems, and often water and electrical power grids. This larger system and its subsystems, the infrastructural ones often referred to as "lifelines," connect communities to a wide variety of resources vital to its existence. In situations where the disaster is extremely localized, reconstruction must assure that the community, however it may have been altered by destruction, is reinserted into the larger systems. Where the disaster impact is widespread, either through primary destruction or secondary effects, the elements of the larger system must be reconstituted and reconstructed, particularly with a view to decreasing their overall vulnerability to future hazards. Most research on system wide lifelines such as electrical grids, water systems, highways and bridges is largely engineering or

technological in character (cf.Earthquake Investigations Committee 1992). The impacts of disaster and the need for relief and reconstruction on national and regional economic systems has also been explored (cf. Abril-Ojeda 1982; Cochrane 1974). The importance of economic systems such as both public and private insurance programs in reconstruction has been the focus of considerable examination (cf. Kunreuther et al 1978).

IV SOCIAL ISSUES IN RECONSTRUCTION

Social factors internal to the stricken community or between the stricken community and the larger society can be very important in the direction and form that reconstruction will take. As mentioned earlier, the social attitudes of donors, professionals, functionaries and victims can affect the efficiency, fairness and appropriateness of reconstruction. Victim's perception of such attitudes by aid personnel can lead to tensions and provoke conflict between the two groups as well (Quarantelli and Dynes 1976; Davis 1986).

The capacity of a disaster stricken community to organize itself will play a major role in the direction of reconstruction. Indeed, most recent research stresses community participation in all stages of reconstruction planning and implementation as vital to successful outcomes (Haas et al 1977; Glittenberg 1982; Perry and Mushkatel 1984; Cuny 1983; Wilches-Chaux 1989; Anderson and Woodrow 1991; Oliver-Smith 1992). The kingroup, one of the first resources for emergency needs, also constitutes a major internal resource for reconstruction assistance. Furthermore, disasters, particularly

in their initial stages often have the capacity to mobilize populations in self-help efforts creating what has been terms a brief "post-disaster utopia" or "therapeutic community" (Fritz 1961; Barton 1970 Quarentelli 1986; Cuthbertson and Nigg 1987). Pre-existing organizations may adjust their focus to address major relief tasks (Taylor 1972). At the same time, the well-documented phenomena of emergent groups and organizations play important roles in relief efforts (Dynes 1970; Quarantelli 1970; Stallings and Quarantelli 1985). One of the more enduring and interesting sociological questions involves the persistence and institutionalization of such efforts into coherent community organizations or social movements that are capable of shifting from the tasks of relief to addressing the tasks of reconstruction (Smith 1978; McAdam et al 1988). Anderson and Woodrow's recent book is devoted in large measure to elucidating the principles and procedures for enhancing the capabilities of individuals and communities for post-disaster reconstruction and development (1991). Moreover, the less a community is able to participate in its own relief and rehabilitation process, whether for internal or external reasons, the more likely that a problem of long term dependency will emerge, inhibiting the full and successful completion of the reconstruction process (Anderson and Woodrow 1991: Wilches-Chaux 1989).

The internal organization of a community can similarly present major obstacles to the process of reconstruction. The existence of patterns of internal differentiation based on ethnicity, caste,

race or class may undermine the necessary levels of social solidarity for effective action on its own behalf in the community. Patterns of ethnic and racial prejudice often skew both disaster relief and reconstruction aid toward elites and away from disadvantaged groups, thereby perpetuating inequality in the local society and evoking considerable internal tension and conflict (Quarantelli and Dynes 1976; Oliver-Smith 1979; Peacock and Bates 1982). Such discrimination becomes particularly pernicious in the context of housing distribution and neighborhood and urban design in the reconstruction phase (Oliver-Smith and Goldman 1989; Oliver-Smith 1990).

V CULTURAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL DIMENSIONS OF RECONSTRUCTION

When a disaster brings damage or total destruction to the major social, organizational and physical structures of a community, reconstruction must deal not only with the material manifestations of those processes, but the social, cultural and psychological trauma as well. Cuny rightly considers emotional recovery as one of the four goals of reconstruction (1983: 197). There is significant evidence of long-term psychological effects of disaster impact and aftermath (Gleser et al 1981; Lifton and Olson 1976).

Disasters can be profoundly disruptive and disturbing events emotionally for victims. Post-disaster needs in reconstruction involve not only the reconstruction of a set of material needs, permanent housing, employment, educational and health care provision, etc., but also a set of social, cultural and psychological needs involving questions of identity, meaning

formulation, and predictability. Disaster disturbs or interrupts the satisfaction of all these needs. Furthermore, disaster not only endangers physical security, it also endangers confidence in one's culture. Serious disasters have a way of demonstrating the puniness of human effort and the fragility of the implicit contract that people have that "culture" or "society" will guarantee that life will be predictable, that it will make sense. People may be shown that they are powerless to defend themselves from nature. Self esteem and a sense of personal and community integrity may be endangered, and unless relief and reconstruction aid are structured in such a way as to enable people to demonstrate renewed capabilities, they may be further eroded. Clearly, disaster aid must also deal with the problem of compounding the social and psychological effects of the disaster by avoiding forms of aid and delivery of aid which undermine self-esteem, compromise community integrity and identity and create patterns of dependency.

One of the first tasks which survivors must master for successful recovery is that of grief over the losses experienced in the disaster. Loss, whether it be of material possessions or the death of a loved one, presents people with the difficult problem of how to hold on to what was significant in the lost past and invest it in the present and future without living in the past. Grief thus involves a negotiation between allegiance to the past and commitment to the present which is facilitated by mourning rituals (Marris 1986). Rituals of mourning permit the bereaved to integrate the loss into their lives, to come to terms with it, and

through the grieving process, resolve the conflicts inherent in loss between allegiance to the past and healthy reintegration into life.

In addition to individual losses, severe disasters often destroy whole communities, occasioning grief for lost homes, social contexts, and culturally significant places and structures. People grieve for their community and their lost way of life. When these elements are destroyed, they must be grieved for in ways similar to the loss of a loved one (Wallace 1957:24). Reconstruction aid should target culturally important structures and contexts to facilitate the grieving process. Churches, chapels, shrines, images, plazas, town squares and often schools are among those public places most symbolic of community identity (Bode 1989). Frequently, informal gathering places, trees, or other physical features may have important symbolic meanings for community as well.

The need to relocate communities represents a major threat and obstacle to the emotional recovery of a disaster stricken population. Recent research in anthropology underscores the importance of place in the construction of individual identities, in the encoding and contextualization of time and history, and in the politics of interpersonal, community, and intercultural relations (Low and Altman 1992; Rodman 1992). Ultimately, such place attachments lie close to the core of both individual and collective constructions of reality and removal from their "ground" may be profoundly traumatic (Oliver-Smith 1992; Perry and Mushkatel

1984). Resettlement should be adopted only in cases of the most extreme ecological threat after every effort to rehabilitate orignal sites has failed (Aysan and Oliver 1987:31).

Perhaps the most basic task that survivors of major disasters must face is the formulation of meaning for the event and its integration into some context consistent with the values and beliefs of his or her culture (Lifton 1967: Bode 1977; 1989; Loizos 1977; Oliver-Smith 1992). Experiences of loss and suffering incurred in the disaster have to be placed in some sort of context which renders them meaningful. In effect, disasters must be explained in ways that help people restore some sense of order or logic to life. Post disaster assistance programs that include active participation by victims enable them to formulate new meanings, new logics for life, in the process of reconstructing their communities.

VII CONCLUSIONS

Any discussion of post-disaster reconstruction must consider the element of change occasioned by both the disaster event and aftermath at both microscopic and macroscopic levels. Since the disaster damages or destroys the society's ability to provide for the needs of its members, new arrangements or adjustments have to be formulated for the society to continue to function. Most recent research points to the importance of focused, specific, ground level projects involving the active participation of people in developing new strategies, new means of confronting the challenges of the environment. Anderson and Woodrow have developed a

framework for "capacities and vulnerabilities analysis" to assist aid deliverers "to learn how to give it so that it supports the efforts of people to achieve social and economic development"(1989: 1). Such an approach signifies a much more long-term,"hands-on" approach on the part of both people and professional reconstruction specialists.

In addition to the changes provoked by the disaster and implemented in the aftermath, reconstruction must take into account the trajectories of change in the larger system underway prior to the disaster. Social and economic systems are in constant evolution and reconstruction authorities as well as communities must be aware of such changes and accommodate them in their plans (Jones 1989). Appropriate reconstruction must take into account the patterns of growth or decline experienced in the total system prior to impact if it is to adequately address the problems facing a disaster stricken community. For example, disaster reconstruction may provide the opportunity and means to revitalize aging local or regional industrial plants, but if larger markets for their products are shrinking, efforts might be best employed in developing other sectors. In summary, at both microscopic and macroscopic levels what is indicated is a much more context specific application of our accumulated knowledge and experience to both relief and reconstruction with an emphasis on potentials for economic and social development and with less reliance on formulated or generalized policies and practices.

REFERENCES CITED

Abril-Ojeda, Galo
1982 The Role of Disaster Relief for Long-Term Development in LDCs. Stockholm: University of Stockholm, Institute of Latin American Studies.

Altman, Irving and Setha Low
1992 Place Attachment. Volume 8, Human Behavior and Environment: Advances in Theory and Research. New York: Plenum.

Anderson, Mary and Peter Woodrow
1991 Rising from the Ashes: Development Strategies in Times of Disaster. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Aysan, Yasemin
1987 "Homeless in 42 m2," Open House International 12:21-26.

Aysan, Yasemin and Ian Davis
1992 Disasters and the Small Dwelling: Perspective for the UN IDNDR. London: James and James.

Aysan, Yasemin and Paul Oliver
1987 Housing and Culture after Earthquakes. Oxford: Oxford Polytechnic.

Bates, F.L.
1982 Recovery, Change and Development: A Longitudinal Study of the 1976 Guatemalan Earthquake

1989 "Long Term Recovery," International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters 7:3:349-65.

Bates, F. L. and Walter Peacock
1993 Living Conditions, Disasters and Development: An Approach to Cross-Cultural Comparisons. Athens and London: University of Georgia Press.

Barton, Allen
1970 Communities in Disaster. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, Doubleday & Company Inc.

Bode, Barbara
1989 No Bells to Toll: Destruction and Creation in the Andes New York: Scribners.

1977 "Disaster, Social Structure and Myth in the Peruvian Andes: The Genesis of an Explanation," Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 293:246-274.

Bolin, Robert and Patricia Bolton
1986 Race, Religion, and Ethnicity in Disaster Recovery Boulder, CO: Program on Environment and Behavior Monograph #42, Institute of Behavioral Science.

Bolin, Robert and Lois Stanford
1991 "Shelter, Housing and Recovery: A Comparison of U.S. Disasters," Disasters 15:1:24-34.

Coburn, A. W., J.D.L. Leslie, and A. Tabban
1984 "Reconstruction and Resettlement 11 Years Later: A Case Study of Bingol Province, Eastern Turkey," in Schupisser, S. and Studer, J. (eds.) Earthquake Relief in Less Industrialized Areas. Rotterdam: A.A. Balkema, pp. 49-58.

Cochrane, Harold
1975 Natural Hazards and their Distributive Effects.Boulder: Co: Institute of Behavioral Sciences, The University of Colorado.

Cuny, F.
1983 Disasters and Development. New York: Oxford University Press.

Davis, Ian
1978 Shelter After Disaster. Oxford: Oxford Polytechnic Press.

1981 Disasters and the Small Dwelling. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Davis, Nancy Yaw
1986 "Earthquake, Tsunami, Resettlement and Survival in Two North Pacific Alaskan Native Villages," in Oliver-Smith, A. (ed.) Natural Disasters and Cultural Responses Publication #36). Williamsburg, VA: Studies in Third World Societies, Department of Anthropology, College of William and Mary.

Doughty, Paul
1986 "Decades of Disaster: Promise and Performance in the Callejon de Huaylas, Peru," in Oliver-Smith, A. (ed.) Natural Disasters and Cultural Responses (Publication # 36). Williamsburg, VA: Studies in Third World Societies, Department of Anthropology, College of William and Mary.

Drabek, Thomas
1986 Human System Responses to Disaster. New York:Springer-Verlag.

Dynes, Russell
1970 Organized Behavior in Disasters. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company.

Earthquake Investigations Committee
1992 Guide to Post-Earthquake Investigation of Lifelines. New York: American Society of Civil Engineers.

Fritz, Charles
1961 "Disasters," in Merton, R.K. and Nisbet, R.A.(eds.) Contemporary Social Problems. New York: Harcourt.

Geipel, Robert
1982 Disaster and Reconstruction: The Friuli (Italy) Earthquakes of 1976.London: George Allen and Unwin.

Gersony, Robert, Tony Jackson and Jo Froman
1977 A Contrastive Analysis of Alternative Reconstruction Models After the February, 1976 Guatemalan Earthquake. Washington DC: Agency for International Development (AID) Disaster Relief Program Reports on Post-Earthquake Distribution of Building Materials.

Gleser, Goldine C, Bonnie L. Green and Carolyn Winget
1981 Prolonged Psychosocial Effects of Disaster. New York: Academic Press.

Glittenberg, Joanne K.
1982 "Reconstruction in Four Urban Post-Disaster Settlements" in Bates, F.L.(ed.) Recovery, Change and Development: A Longitudinal Study of the 1976 Guatemalan Earthquake

Green, Stephan
1977 International Disaster Relief: Toward a Responsive System. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Haas, J. Eugene, Robert W. Kates and Martyn J. Bowden
1977 Reconstruction Following Disaster. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Hogg, Sarah Jane
1980 "Reconstruction Following Seismic Disaster in Venzone, Friuli," Disasters 4:2:173-185.

Jones, Barclay
1989 "The Need for a Dynamic Approach to Planning for Reconstruction After Earthquakes," Paper Presented at the Conference Reconstruction After Urban Earthquakes, National Center for Earthquake Engineering Research, Buffalo, NY, September 13-16, 1989

Kates, Robert W.
1977 "Major Insights: A Summary and Recommendations," in Haas, J.E., Kates, R.W. and Bowden,M.J.(eds.) Reconstruction Following Disaster. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press

Kreimer, Alcira
1979 "Emergency, Temporary and Permanent Housing After Disasters in Developing Countries,: Ekistics 46:361-365.

1978 "Post-Disaster Reconstruction Planning: The Cases of Nicaragua and Guatemala," Mass Emergencies 3:23-40.

Kreimer, Alcira and Mohan Munasinghe (eds.)
1991 Managing Natural Disasters and the Environment. Washington DC: The World Bank.

Kunreuther, Howard, Ralph Ginsburg Louis Miller, Philip Sagi, Paul Slovic, Bradley Borkan, and Norman Katz
1978 Disaster Insurance Protection: Public Policy Lessons. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Lifton, Robert Jay
1967 Death in Life: Survivors of Hiroshima. New York: Random House.

Lifton, Robert Jay and Eric Olson
1976 "The Human Meaning of Total Disaster: The Buffalo Creek Experience," Psychiatry 39:1-18.

Loizos, Peter
1977 "A Struggle for Meaning: Reactions to Disaster amongst Cypriot Refugees," Disasters 1:3:231-239.

Low, Setha
1988 "Housing, Organization and Social Change: A Comparison of Programs for Urban Reconstruction in Guatemala," Human Organization 47:1:15-24.

Mader, George G., William E. Spangle, Martha L. Blair, Richard L. Meehan, Sally W. Bilodeau, Henry J. Degan Kolb, George S. Duggar, and Norman Williams, Jr.
1980 "Land Use Planning After Earthquakes," Portola Valley, CA: William Spangle and Associates, Inc.

Marris, Peter
1986 Loss and Change (2nd Edition), London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

McAdam, Doug, John D. McCarthy and Mayer N. Zald
1988 "Social Movements," in Smelser, N. (ed.) Handbook of Sociology, Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Mileti, Dennis, Thomas E. Drabek and J. Eugene Haas
1975 Human Systems in Extreme Environments. Boulder, CO: Institute of Behavioral Science, The University of Colorado

Mitchell, William
1976 "Reconstruction After Disaster-Gediz Earthquake of 1970," Geographical Review 66: 296-313.

Nigg, J. and B. Cuthbertson
1982 "Pesticide Application Near Urban Areas: A Crisis in Confidence for Public Health Agencies," Journal of Human Resources Administration 4:3:284-302.

Oliver-Smith, Anthony
1992 The Martyred City: Death and Rebirth in the Andes. (2nd Edition), Homewood, IL: Waveland Press

1991 "Successes and Failures in Post-Disaster Resettlement," Disasters 15:1:12-23.

1990 "Post Disaster Housing Reconstruction and Social Inequality: A Challenge to Policy and Practice," Disasters 14:1:7-19.

1982 "Here There is Life: The Social and Cultural Dynamics of Resistance to Resettlement in Post-Disaster Peru," in Hansen, A. and Oliver-Smith, A. (eds.) Involuntary Migration and Resettlement: The Problems and Responses of Dislocated Peoples. Boulder: CO: Westview Press.

1979 "Post-Disaster Consensus and Conflict in a Traditional Society: The 1970 Avalanche of Yungay, Peru," Mass Emergencies 4: 39-52.

1977a "Disaster Rehabilitation and Social Change in Yungay, Peru," Human Organization 36: 5-13.

1977b "Traditional Agriculture, Central Places and Post-Disaster Urban Relocation in Peru," American Ethnologist 4:1:102-116.

Oliver-Smith, Anthony and Roberta Goldman
1988 "Planning Goals and Urban Realities: Post-Disaster Reconstruction in a Third World City," City and Society 2:2: 105-126.

Pantelic, Jelena
1991 "The Link Between Reconstruction and Development," in Kreimer, A. and Munasinghe, M. (eds.) Managing Natural Disasters and the Environment. Washington DC: The World Bank.

Pantelic, Jelena and Marjorie Greene
1991 "Reconstruction After Earthquakes: Some Multinational Experiences," Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the Society for Applied Anthropology, Charleston, SC, March 13-17, 1991.

Peacock, Walter G. and Bates, F.L.
1982 "Ethnic Differences in Earthquake Impact and Recovery," in Bates, F.L. (ed.) Recovery, Change and Development: A Longitudinal Study of the 1976 Guatemalan Earthquake. Athens, GA: The University of Georgia .

Perry, Ronald W. and Alvin H. Mushkatel
1984 Disaster Management: Warning Response and Community Relocation. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Quarantelli, E. L.
1986 "What is a Disaster? The Need for Clarification in Definition and Conceptualization in Research," in Sowder, B. (ed.) Disasters and Mental Health: Contemporary Perspectives. Washington DC: American Psychiatric Press, 49-81.

1982 "Sheltering and Housing After Major Community Disasters: Case Studies and General Conclusions," Columbus,OH: Disaster Research Center, The Ohio State University.

1970 "Emergent Accommodation Groups: Beyond Current Collective Behavior Typologies," in Shibutani, T. (ed.) Human Nature and Collective Behavior: Papers in Honor of Herbert Blumer. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Quarantelli E.L. and Russell Dynes
1976 "Community Conflict: Its Absence and its Presence in Natural Disasters," Mass Emergencies 1:139-152.

Rodman, Margaret
1992 "Empowering Place: Multilocality and Multivocality," American Anthropologist 94:3: 640-656.

Rubin, Claire
1981 "Long Term Recovery from Natural Disasters: A Comparative Analysis of Six Local Experiences," Washington DC: The Academy for Contemporary Problems, The Resource Referral Service.

Rubin, Claire and Daniel G. Barbee
1985 "Disaster Recovery and Hazard Mitigation: Bridging the Intergovernmental Gap," Public Administration Review 45::57-63.

Schippisser, S and J. Studer
1984 Earthquake Relief in Less Industrialized Areas. Rotterdam: A.A. Balkema.

Smith, Martin H.
1978 "American Religious Organizations in Disaster: A Study of Congregational Response to Disaster," Mass Emergencies 3:133-142.

Stallings, Robert A. and E.L. Quarantelli
1985 "Emergent Citizen Groups and Emergency Management," Public Administration Review 45: 93-100.

Taylor, James B.
1972 "An Approach to the Analysis of Emergent Phenomena," in Proceedings of the Japan-United States Disaster Research Seminar: Organizational and Community Responses to Disasters. Columbus, OH: Disaster Research Center, The Ohio State University.

UNDRO
1982 Shelter After Disaster. New York: United Nations.

Wallace, Anthony F. C.
1957 "Mazeway Disintegration: the Individual's Perception of Sociocultural Disorganization," Human Organization 16: 23-27.

Wilches-Chaux, Gustavo
1989 Desastres, Ecologismo y Formacion Profesional.Popayan, Colombia: Servicio Nacional de Aprendizaje (SENA).