

and educated people with respect to earthquake-resistant technology. This was a very good idea and would have ensured sustainability. Unfortunately, all these building centres were shut down within three to four years as they were completely dependent on external support.

4. Houses with heavy roofs covered with soil, and thick stone walls with weak bonding, especially at the joints, suffered enormous damage. This caused huge loss of life. On the basis of a quick damage assessment immediately after the earthquake, the traditional techniques of local housing were deemed to be the major cause of loss of life. All local construction practices were rejected by the 'official expert agencies'. Local people who saw their loved ones die under a heap of stone rubble also developed an acute fear. Consequently, traditional building materials and techniques were considered to be 'unsafe' for use in future housing.

References

- Jigyasu, R. 2001. From natural to cultural disaster: consequences of the post-earthquake rehabilitation process on the cultural heritage in Marathwada region, India. *Bulletin of the New Zealand Society for Earthquake Engineering*, 34(3): 237-242.
- Jigyasu, R. 2002. *Reducing Disaster Vulnerability through Local Knowledge and Capacity – The Case of Earthquake-prone Rural Communities in India and Nepal*. Trondheim, Norwegian University of Science and Technology. (PhD dissertation)
- Government of Maharashtra. 1993. *Proposal for Maharashtra Earthquake Rehabilitation Programme*. Bombay.
- Nikolic-Brezev, S., Green, M., Kringold, F. & Seeber, L. 1999. *Lessons learned over time, Vol II*. Oakland, Earthquake Engineering Research Institute.
- Salazar, A. & Jigyasu, R. 2010. A Decade of Lessons from Marathwada: Earthquake Vulnerability, Politics and Participatory Housing. In S. Patel and A. Revi, eds. *Recovering from Earthquakes. Response, Reconstruction and Impact Mitigation in India*, pp. 79-117. New Delhi, Routledge.