

令和 2 年 9 月 25 日現在

機関番号：14401

研究種目：基盤研究(C) (一般)

研究期間：2017～2019

課題番号：17K12612

研究課題名(和文) The Impact of Nepal Earthquake 2015 on State-Civil Society Relationship

研究課題名(英文) The Impact of Nepal Earthquake 2015 on State-Civil Society Relationship

研究代表者

L A M L A I M I N G (Lam, Lai Ming)

大阪大学・人間科学研究科・招へい研究員

研究者番号：60618502

交付決定額(研究期間全体)：(直接経費) 3,000,000円

研究成果の概要(和文)：このプロジェクトでは、2015年のネパール大地震後の国家と市民社会の関係のダイナミックな変化と復興支援の効果を調査をします。ネパールの復興プロセス全体は、低レベルのコミュニティ参加の1つとして特徴づけられ、脆弱なグループは除外され、強固な社会を構築するという希望を損う結果となった。ネパールの経験によると、人道主義の専門職がネパールのような資源の乏しい国が災害から復興し、より回復力のある未来に進むことを真剣に考える場合、人道主義と開発政策における不平等な組織と権力の実施を変えることが重要であることを示唆しています。調査は2016年から2020年の間に実施されました。

研究成果の学術的意義や社会的意義

The study contributes to disaster studies particularly the importance of social sciences perspective to understand the dynamic changes of state-civil society relationships in the post-disaster time. It helps improve better understanding the challenges of key recovery paradigms at the ground level.

研究成果の概要(英文)：This project investigates the dynamic changes of state-civil society relationship in the post-Nepal Earthquake 2015 and the effectiveness of reconstruction aid delivery. The entire Nepal reconstruction process was characterized as one of low level community participation and vulnerable groups were excluded; this undermined the hope for building a resilient society. Nepal experience suggests that if humanitarian professions seriously think about assisting a resource-poor country like Nepal to recover from the disaster and move on to a more resilient future, it is important to change the unequal organization and implementation of power in humanitarian and development policies and procedures.

The study was conducted between 2016 to 2020. A mixed methodology was employed, including a policy analysis of key disaster recovery documents and extensive field study in two heavily earthquake-hit districts, Nuwakot and Dhading.

研究分野：Development Anthropology

キーワード：2015 Nepal Earthquake Resilience Disaster governance Housing reconstruction Community participation Build back better Disaster recovery

科研費による研究は、研究者の自覚と責任において実施するものです。そのため、研究の実施や研究成果の公表等については、国の要請等に基づくものではなく、その研究成果に関する見解や責任は、研究者個人に帰属されます。

1 . 研究開始当初の背景 (Research Background)

(1) State-Civil Society Relationship in Post-Disaster Context

State, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and citizens have played crucial role in disaster relief management which is widely recognized in literature. For example, effective coordination between state and civil society helps overcome the relief and recovery challenges in particular to resources-poor countries (e.g. Turkey 1999.8.17 earthquake); civil society's involvement strengthens the community resilience to future disasters (e.g. Sichuan 2008. 5.12 and 2013. 4.20 earthquakes); disasters can also transform the society in multiple levels (e.g. Kobe 1995 earthquake). While these empirical cases clearly show that the involvement of civil society in post-disaster management is positive; however civic cooperation does not appear in a vacuum, it relies on the state policy (Jalal, 2002) and local community (Daly and Feener, 2016). In other words, the interactions between state, NGOs and citizens in post-disaster time are dynamic in regard to different social contexts. To further contribute to the intellectual discussion, this project aims to investigate the changes of state-civil society relationship in post-disaster time with specific attention to social and historical contexts through the case of Nepal earthquake 2015.

(2) What's Wrong with Rebuilding Nepal?

On 25 April 2015, Nepal was struck by a devastating earthquake with a magnitude of 7.8, culminating in massive losses of life and property. Approximately 8790 people died and 22,300 more were injured. It was also estimated that at least 98,852 private houses and 2656 government buildings were completely destroyed, while another 256,697 private houses and 3622 government buildings were damagedⁱ. Despite the fact that the Nepalese state has received over US\$ 4 billion international aids for rebuilding the country and the concepts such as *equity*, *local participation*, *owner-driven approach* and *partnership with NGOs* are often highlighted in the reconstruction policy, the reconstruction progress is slow. Until the end of October 2016, only 8,856 out of 28,064 damaged classrooms are in process to rebuild and majority of earthquake-affected families remain living in unsafe temporary shelters (National Reconstruction Authority, 2016). Why the reconstruction progress (particularly the housing sector) is so slow? What is the relationship between the state, NGOs and citizens after the earthquake? Does the reconstruction policy reshape the state power and civic engagement in the long term?

2 . 研究の目的 (Objectives of Research Project)

(1) The power of state: To examine the decision-making process of reconstruction policy: who are the major actors to influence the reconstruction policy? How does the policy redistribute the power?

(2) Civic participation and local leadership: To investigate how local government officials, NGOs and local community react to the reconstruction policy and how does the policy affect their decision.

(3) Reconstruction aid delivery and effectiveness: To evaluate the impact of state-civil society relationship on the overall reconstruction outcomes.

3 . 研究の方法 (Research Methods)

(1) History: A study of previous state-civil society relationship in Nepal provided insights on understanding the dynamic interactions between them in the post-earthquake time.

(2) Ethnographic fieldwork: By living with the community, I could understand more how earthquake-affected communities think of the reconstruction policy and NGOs' projects and how these influence their daily life in post-earthquake time. A mixed methodology was employed, including a policy analysis of key disaster recovery documents and extensive field study (indepth interview, household survey and participant observation) in two heavily earthquake-hit districts, Nuwakot and Dhading. The intensive fieldwork lasted from September to December 2017 and January to March 2019. Nuwakot and Dhading share similar geographic, demographic and economic characteristics. The dominant house design is a

two-storey stone house with mud mortar and the own-driven housing reconstruction approach was adopted as the major housing strategy in both districts. The major difference between Nuwakot and Dhading is that NGO/ INGOs were directly involved in housing reconstruction programs in some villages in Nuwakot. They provided housing grants to eligible households but this did not occur in Dhading. A questionnaire was developed and translated into the Nepali language to enhance clarity and understandability of the study. A total of 69 questions were divided into 5 groups: household characteristics; economic well-being and food security; civic participation and community; decision-making on rebuilding houses: and emotional being. The interviewees were informed about the purpose of the study and they gave their consent. A total of 390 households made up the sample on the basis of random sampling from the selected villages according to ethnic composition, economic well-being of the household, name was recorded on the eligible beneficiary list, single and/or family women households. Apart from this, the household survey sample was developed in such a way to avoid households that had close-knit relationship networks and bloodlines of the same families. In order to understand the progress made in the house rebuilding, a second round of household surveys was also conducted in 2019 with 200 Dhading households who participated in the first round survey. The study focused on five aspects 1) update rebuilt house progress; 2) self-empowerment; 3) community recovery and social capital; 4) Safety concern on rebuilt houses and 5) future vision. Apart from the household survey, following the earthquake, I first visited Nepal in August 2015. Since then I have revisited Nepal on a regular basis to conduct fieldwork (December 2015; March and September 2016; April and December 2017; March and December 2018; April and August 2019). During the past three and half years, my research team conducted focus group discussions, in-depth interviews and key informant interviews with over 100 stakeholders including government officers, community leaders, teachers, engineers and NGO personnel. As the founder of a grass-roots organization, I am also deeply involved in humanitarian relief work and community-based housing reconstruction programs. My involvement in recovery projects allows me to act as both participant and observer. I discussed with villagers the recovery plan at local meetings. I observed how villagers formed the reconstruction committee to coordinate all house rebuilding matters. All these activities made it possible for me to observe closely how the earthquake affected villagers, and the ways in which they responded to the catastrophe.

4 . 研究成果 (Research Results)

(1) The entire Nepal reconstruction process was characterized as one of low level community participation and vulnerable groups were excluded; this undermined the hope for building a resilient society. In the Nepal case, being resilient remains a largely conceptual and descriptive goal, and that the key components for good disaster governance are missing. I argue that resilience practice must focus on the empowering process. Intervention and particularly the decentralizing governance structure and flexible, inclusive and adaptive reconstruction policies will enhance local participation and collaboration which are the keys to building resilience. Without a local empowerment process, resilience will simply serve as a 'buzz word' or slogan, and its effectiveness is doomed to failure (Lam and Kuipers, 2018; Lam, Khanna and Kuipers, 2017)

(2) My study finds that the implementation of neoliberal doctrines of governance has reinforced the existing asymmetrical relationships between the Nepali State, international agencies and citizens. Particularly, three issues, namely the risk of disempowering local communities' capacity, lack of commitment to long-term recovery, and commodification of the recovery process, have ensured that the recovery policy basically favors the interests of international donors and NGOs, not those of local realities. Consequently, many vulnerable groups are left behind and lose access to basic human needs, specifically safe shelters as shown in Nepal's case (Lam, 2020a).

(3) My study shows that the outcomes of owner-driven reconstruction (ODR) housing program in Nepal is mixed and ineffective. Although the quantity of house rebuilds has proved to be impressive, more and more families have chosen to rebuild themselves a one-room or one-storey earthquake-safe house, yet such houses are often too small to fulfil family needs (HRRP, 2018; Limbu, Rawal, Suji, Subedi & Baniya, 2019). This practice is a contradiction of the ODR primary principle: people rebuild their houses on the basis of their needs. My study finds that 5 key factors including reconstruction institution structure, technical support, public-private partnership, policy communication and support for vulnerable groups which can

better ensure in the high quality ODR reconstruction outcomes are all missing in the Nepal housing reconstruction program. Nepal experience suggests that the success of ODR is highly reliant on an enabling environment – especially the decentralizing governance approach that can successfully mobilize all civil society organizations, the private sector, as well as the local communities. It is essential that they work well together to make reconstruction successful. Without these serious considerations being implemented, ODR would simply be at best another donor-preferred housing strategy, and it will not benefit these disaster-affected communities (Lam, 2020b).

(4) My study also documents that 2015 earthquake has brought significant social changes in Nepali society. In the national level, it led to the new constitution and local government election in 2017. In the local level, the housing reconstruction program has further led to the commodification of social relationships and the breakdown of informal safety net. Economic power has become the major currency of any recovery effort. The vulnerable groups especially women, disable and old people, who could not participate the labor exchange or hire the labors, were left behind in the recovery process.

<引用文献> References

Daly, P & Feener, R.M. (2016). *Rebuilding Asia Following Natural Disasters*. Cambridge University Press

HRRP (Housing Recovery and Reconstruction Platform) (2018). Weekly Bulletin 25 June.

Jalai, R 2002. Civil society and the state Turkey after the Earthquake, *Disasters*, 26 (3):120-139

Lam, L. M. (2020a). Under peer review. Neoliberalism, Recovery and 2015 Nepal Earthquake: “People Gain Nothing. No Safe Houses, Our Government Just Wants to Finish the Project Faster”.

Lam, L. M. (2020b). Under peer review. Key Factors for the Successful Owner-Driven Approach in Post-Disaster Housing Reconstruction.

Lam, L. M. & Kuipers, R. (2018). Resilience and Disaster Governance: Some insights from the 2015 Nepal Earthquake, *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijdr.2018.10.017

Lam, L. M., Khanna, V., & Kuipers, R. (2017). Disaster governance and challenges in a rural nepali community: Notes from Future Village NGO, *Himalaya, the Journal of the Association for Nepal and Himalayan Studies*, 37 (2), 75-86.

Limbu, B., R. Nabin., M. Suji., P. C. Subedi. and J. Baniya. (2019). Reconstructing Nepal: Post-earthquake experiences from Bhaktapur, Dhading and Sindhupalchowak. Working Paper. Social Science Baha, Kathmandu, Nepal.

NRA (2016). Rebuild Nepal. Progress report Oct 2016-Jan 2017. National Reconstruction Authority.

5. 主な発表論文等

〔雑誌論文〕 計2件（うち査読付論文 1件/うち国際共著 2件/うちオープンアクセス 1件）

1. 著者名 Lam Lai Ming & Kuipers Rob	4. 巻 33
2. 論文標題 Resilience and Disaster Governance: Some insights from the 2015 Nepal Earthquake	5. 発行年 2018年
3. 雑誌名 International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction	6. 最初と最後の頁 321-331
掲載論文のDOI（デジタルオブジェクト識別子） DOI: 10.1016/j.ijdrr.2018.10.017	査読の有無 有
オープンアクセス オープンアクセスではない、又はオープンアクセスが困難	国際共著 該当する

1. 著者名 Lam, L. M., Khanna, V., & Kuipers	4. 巻 37
2. 論文標題 Disaster governance and challenges in a rural nepali community: Notes from Future Village NGO	5. 発行年 2017年
3. 雑誌名 Himalaya, the Journal of the Association for Nepal and Himalayan Studies,	6. 最初と最後の頁 75-86
掲載論文のDOI（デジタルオブジェクト識別子） なし	査読の有無 無
オープンアクセス オープンアクセスとしている（また、その予定である）	国際共著 該当する

〔学会発表〕 計8件（うち招待講演 0件/うち国際学会 8件）

1. 発表者名 Lam Lai Ming, Otani Junko
2. 発表標題 Taking a Child to Conduct Fieldwork: Challenges for Female Researchers' Mental Health and Wellbeing
3. 学会等名 日本国際保健医療学会（国際学会）
4. 発表年 2019年

1. 発表者名 Lam Lai Ming
2. 発表標題 The Political Economy of Caste, Displacement and Welfare in Nepal
3. 学会等名 Asian Development Bank Institute（国際学会）
4. 発表年 2018年

1. 発表者名 Lam Lai Ming
2. 発表標題 Rethinking Community Resilience in Practice through the Lens of Anthropology
3. 学会等名 IUAES World Congress (国際学会)
4. 発表年 2018年

1. 発表者名 Lam Lai Ming
2. 発表標題 The “ Community ” in Community-based Reconstruction Projects: Lesson Learnt from Nepal Earthquake 2015
3. 学会等名 the 13th APRU Multi-Hazards Symposium (国際学会)
4. 発表年 2017年

1. 発表者名 Lam Lai Ming
2. 発表標題 Dominant Narratives of Community Participation in Post-disaster Recovery: Critical insights from a Community-Driven Housing Reconstruction Project in Nepal
3. 学会等名 RGS-IBG Annual International Conference (国際学会)
4. 発表年 2017年

1. 発表者名 Lam Lai Ming
2. 発表標題 Social Dynamics of Disaster Suffering, Recovery and Reconstruction: Reflection from Gorkha Earthquake 2015 Nepal
3. 学会等名 Mobile Cultures of Disaster, (国際学会)
4. 発表年 2017年

1. 発表者名 Lam Lai Ming
2. 発表標題 Is Community Participation and Traditionalism Necessary Good Practice for Post-Disaster Recovery? A Critique from the Vantage Point of Anthropology
3. 学会等名 The Third Northern European Conference on Emergency and Disaster Studies (国際学会)
4. 発表年 2018年

1. 発表者名 Lam Lai Ming, Khanna Varun, Kuipers Rob
2. 発表標題 Resilience and Disaster Governance: Some insights from 2015 Nepal Earthquake
3. 学会等名 The Third Northern European Conference on Emergency and Disaster Studies (国際学会)
4. 発表年 2018年

〔図書〕 計0件

〔産業財産権〕

〔その他〕

-

6. 研究組織

	氏名 (ローマ字氏名) (研究者番号)	所属研究機関・部局・職 (機関番号)	備考
研究 分担者	大谷 順子 (Otani Junko) (90403930)	大阪大学・人間科学研究科・教授 (14401)	