

## **Cultural Appropriateness on Disaster Reconstruction and Resilience Programs at Kunchok, Sindhupalchok**

***Madhu Giri\****

*Reconstruction and community resilience programs of the 2015 Earthquake led by the National Reconstruction Authority (NRA) have not finished yet though the agency was closed assuming the completion of the mandate. Even where the houses were built following models provided by NRA, people are using those houses for other purposes than shelter for themselves like for cattle, kitchen, store, and so on. Many newly constructed houses devalued cultural factors of the house what the NRA and its designs failed to address. The cultural appropriateness of the structure which was integrate aspects of agrarian life was ignored by the policymakers and technicians of the projects. The NRA formulated and implemented different policies and guidelines for the consistency of reconstruction and equal distribution of resources. Governance refers to the way major (policy) decisions are taken, their implementation is monitored and the outcome is evaluated for the analysis of effectiveness and sustainability of any program.*

*\* Lecturer of Anthropology in Central Department of Anthropology, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu (Nepal) E-mail: <madu.giri@gmail.com>*

*Earthquake disaster governance is nested within and influenced by overarching societal governance systems and cultural practices. To explore failure stories of house reconstruction and community resilience, the researcher developed questions like: What are rules of law and implementation policies of the NRA? What are peoples' experiences of reconstruction? Why villagers did not like funded houses and made a different house for them? What are community resilience practices among the villagers? Based on ethnographic data, the paper explored the poor participation of affected people both in policy formulation and implementation were major flaws for the failure of the NRA reconstruction and resilience programs. Although governance failures can occur in societies with stable governance systems, poorly governed societies and weak states are almost certain to exhibit deficiencies in disaster governance. Moreover, disaster reconstructions always occur in political spaces, in which societies invariably become spaces fraught with heightened contestation, negotiation, and cooperation in times of crisis, rupture, and displacement. Local elites and technicians manipulated policies of reconstruction and resilience. The communities were hierarchical and unequal in terms of power, prestige, and property whereas policies treated them equally. Homogeneous policies of the NRA about reconstruction and resilience neither addressed social and cultural diversity nor tried culturally meaningful housing and resilience programs.*

**[Keywords :** Disaster, Governance, Reconstruction, Resilience, Cultural appropriateness]

## **1. Introduction**

The April 25 earthquake (7.8 magnitudes) and the subsequent aftershocks destroyed 604,930 houses and further 288,856 houses were declared uninhabitable which were mostly mud brick and mud stone-built (Nepal Disaster Report, 2015 and 2017). The government of Nepal felt the need for a powerful agency for the reconstruction-resilience programs and formed the National Reconstruction Authority (NRA hereafter) with the mandate of leading and managing recovery, providing strategic governance for reconstruction. The NRA conducted many round surveys and selected beneficiaries who received support in two ways. The first was the direct cash support of NRs 400,000 in three installments and the second was technical support through technical persons. The earthquake beneficiaries were defined according to some criteria such as categorization of the house as severely damaged, absence of livable house in the same area or all over Nepal, and quantity of property and human loss.

People were desperate to build new houses and shift from a temporary shelter. They jumped to pick up one of those designs

prepared by the NRA without considering the physical and socio-cultural needs of the house. They were unaware that they could be built their houses without being victims of earthquakes. This situation led to the construction of small housing units in villages which neither fulfilled the actual needs based on family size, socioeconomic status, livelihoods, and culture nor they maintained their previous vernacular characteristics of the house. These houses were 1 or 2 rooms and most of them one-storied. The traditional housing patterns are in danger of being extinct. This article tries to focus devaluation of cultural appropriateness and social aspects of the reconstruction of the house. The designs and structure of the earthquake house killed agrarian flavors and rural ingredients of a village house. Newly constructed houses, irrespective of their designs, could not accommodate joint families and house in the agrarian village means shelter for humans as well as other properties. Moreover, the newly made house ignored socio-economic differences, festivals, ritual activities, occasional guests, shelter for cattle, birds, and bees. For villagers in Sidhupalchok, a house means more than physical and material things. They believed that the house must be the shelter of ancestors, gods, and other spirits. If non-human spirits did not accept to live in the house, the house turns into a ghost house or house without people. Researchers argue that a house is the expression of cultural, social, ecological, and cosmological of the people who live in it (Gray, 2011a; Rapoport, 1969; Ciaraad, 2012 and Rykwert, 1991). To live a meaningful life, people try to maintain the cultural appropriateness of the house. Some of the indigenous people around the world preferred to stay in traditional huts rather than concrete houses (Smith, 2012). It can be argued that a physically strong structure may not be culturally appropriate in all socio-cultural settings. For agrarian and certain cultural groups, a house is a more social and cultural institution where community people gather around the hearth and make decisions in the evening (Gray, 2011b). Devaluation of the social and cultural aspect of the newly constructed house in the village is subject to be studied because many of the newly constructed houses were left and used for another purpose in the village. I have observed that government- funded houses were used for goat, buffalo, and storehouses. This article concentrates on : what are the stories of the failure of reconstruction and resilience programs of the NRA? Why What are practices of recoveries including reconstruction and various kinds of loss in the village? An examination of earthquake disaster governance strengths and weaknesses.

## 2. Methodology

I have observed and studied contestations and negotiations in the processes of reconstruction and community resilience programs in a mixed (Sanyasi, Tamang, Chhetri, and Magar) community at Kunchok of Sidhupalchok in May 2018 and September 2019. Besides participation in meetings and living with the local community for about 3 months, observation, field visits, key informant interviews, and case study methods have been used to generate data. Specific cases and stories of the key informants better-told stories of the government-funded houses in the village.

## 3. Concept of Home in Rural Nepal

The definition of home and house is quite different and the conceptualization of home is a very complex phenomenon. Physical structure does not get the meaning of home unless it is culturally meaningful. After the earthquake disaster, the government was worried to make the physical structure. For the government, it was the reconstruction of the house of the people but for the villagers, it was the construction of the home. In the Nepali language, there is a single word 'ghar' to represent both house and home. When the villagers told their stories and ownership (not legal sense) of newly constructed structure, the NRA emphasized to make the technical house not home as per meaning. The notion of home is multifarious and 'deeply ingrained in the culture and societal organization' (Cieraad, 2012). For an anthropologist, home is purely a cultural construct (Gray, 2011). Cieraad writes her ideas about the concept of home in western societies and states that the home is opposite to office. It is what differentiates working and living. The once binary opposition between town and country is what today is represented by home and work. Why people need a home and when people need a home is because of their requirement of privacy and a sense of belongingness.

John Gray (2011a) reveals that there is 'doubleness' in Nepali domestic space, namely architect and architehne. The first one is related to 'the production of houses that express social reality, cultural meanings and/or cosmology', and the second one tales 'the embodied experience, tacit knowledge, and revelation produced by everyday living in domestic space' (Gray, 2011a : 89). What Gray was trying to tell us here is that the designs and types of dwelling and the domestic surrounding are intrinsically related to the people's vision

of the ideal life or cultural appropriateness. According to Gray especially in South Asian architectures, people's ideology, which is informed by the cultural, social, and cosmological background, is expressed in the physical form of house. It is people's social and cultural reality that is articulated in domestic architecture. The space people create domestic architectures must have the meaning as well as function. Susan Smith writes that a house is more than a physical structure but a social and cultural entity that influences the way of life of its residence (Smith, 2012). He increased attention to issues related to building strong houses such as 'better construction technologies, traditional and innovative building materials, or other cultural appropriateness of housing design' have impeded the policymaker's view upon the social aspects of shelter and housing programs. It is important to note that cultural appropriateness is crucial while doing reconstruction and resilience programs even if social aspects are somewhat given less priority.

The major flaw of the policymakers and technicians was that the construction of a house was not understood as a cultural task. A home is not just a structure but it is an institution. Cultural appropriateness transformed the house into a home. Hence structure's types and organization are largely influenced by the cultural settings of its surrounding which should fulfill various purposes of the culture it belongs to.

#### **4. Stories of Reconstructed House**

Narayan Bharati (75 years old man) at Kunchok said, "I lost three-floored, stone slat, round balcony with veranda with a wooden carved big house. There were about 10 rooms for a different purposes. Doors and wooden pillars of the old house were beautifully carved and unique in the village. The house was named 'Bharati Thulo Ghar' (Bharati's big house). The round wooden balcony and veranda added beauty to the typical house. I missed the house forever. This model house could not be built again because there are not such skillful carpenters and traditional architecture in the village. I have been living in the tin-roofed -hut. It is very difficult during the monsoon, summer, and winter seasons. The hut is extremely cold during winter and extremely hot during summer. I am also constructing a two-story government-funded house. I am not excited about this house because it is incomplete for a family like me. I have 7 daughters, 2 sons, and their children. About 20 families

gather in my house during festivals. The NRA's house fund is like "Nakha'um bhane dinabhariko sikara, kha'um bhane kancho ba'uko anuhara, ke ho" (If we don't eat it, it will be the prey/bread of the day. If we eat it, it will be the face of the youngest father). It is very difficult to accept and reject the reconstruction fund. The Government supported the two stories house which will be inadequate for me. I am thinking to make a different house for my family.

Fulmaya BK (57 years woman) was sitting in the tin-roofed hut and a newly constructed two-stories cemented house was used to keep goats. Five goats and their 2 kids were eating fodders that are kept in the house. She said "the new house was made not only fund given by the government. My son has spent 2 Lakhs in this house. We have not received the final installment from the government. While building, I and my husband were excited to shift to the new house. When we shifted, I and my husband got sick. He was suffering from fever and headache. I got leg swelling and back pain. Both doctors and believers suggested to us not sleep in the cemented house. The doctor said it is too cold which harms swelling. Believers said that the house was not auspicious. When we started to live in the hut, we became well. Then we decided to sleep in the new house. Therefore, we make the new house as storeroom and goat-house.

Sukdev Giri (65 years old) and Gaumati Giri (60 years old) were not satisfied with one story house constructed by the government fund. Technicians persuaded them to make a one-story house that was easy to pass and had minimum expenditure. In the name of support, technicians attached pictures of the next house and received the final installment. Technicians charged Rs. 5000 for doing a fake proof. They said, "When the son returned from a foreign country, he rejected the government house. It was too cold and inappropriate to make a fire in the winter. If doors are closed, there is a chance of suffocation. During festivals, daughters and grandchildren gather in the village. There is no space for sleeping, cooking, and seating for the relatives. Moreover, there is no sacred space and place for Family gods (Kuldavta). Though daughter-in-law and grandchildren live in Kathmandu, son panned to make another house adjoining government house in the village. Relatives and doctors also suggested making a traditional house which is considered healthy for the elderly people".

Bishnu Giri (65 years old ex-Pradhan of the village) recalls the event the displacement after the earthquake and explains that



villagers had made three stages of temporary shelters before moving to a new house. He said :

At that time, most of the villages demanded tents and tin to make huts. Space was not a problem. But few households whose settlements were damaged by landslides needed space for making hut/home. The journey from tent to the tin-roofed hut and certified house after three to five years have different stories. My house made with technical support of the government is not family-kin friendly. When family guests come to stay overnight, then there is trouble. All my sons who were together with me were separated and received separate Rahat (bonus) after the earthquake by giving bribery to the government officers. Luckily, four different houses for three sons and myself make us comfortable to share space for the guest and storing food.

The four snapshots articulate the failure of housing reconstruction projects of the NRA in the highly affected district of the 2015 earthquake. In spite of the technical and financial support of the government, many houses were not culturally appropriate for the family or many villagers used the house for another purpose. There was a rigorous process and procedure of making houses and making houses was the main indicator of the resilience of the community. Technically, people did not have many ideas about the resilience capacity of the houses. Every year the NRA highlighted the number of completed houses as if houses could erase all kinds of loss of the affected people. Anthony Oliver-Smith states that humans 'live in environments that they at least partially design and construct themselves' (Oliver-Smith, 1990 : 7). He stressed that human perceptions about their physical, cultural, and social needs were culturally induced and they 'sensed, interpreted and responded' according to that culturally derived perception (Oliver-Smith, 1990). How humans organize and construct their shelters is also a part of that built environment. He argued that in post-disaster urban reconstruction social aspects of the community for which the reconstruction is being carried out must be given considerable importance and it is mandatory for the provision and success of temporary shelters as well as permanent reconstruction. Further, he insisted that the social dimensions of post-earthquake shelter and housing provision are one of the most difficult tasks faced by

reconstruction agencies (Oliver-Smith,1990). The NRA policymakers and technicians did not realize that a permanent home should be socio-culturally appropriate.

## **5. Monolithic Model of House**

Reconstruction brought two important changes to the village. They are roadside houses and monolithic structures of the house. Most of the houses under construction and made were either one or two rooms with similar structure and design. Though Nepal Reconstruction Authority (NRA) authorized eight different models of house construction, local technicians promoted a single model. Their indirect promotion was single room cemented house. The smaller and one-room houses are easily and quickly passed without an observational check of technicians. Technicians are like the authoritative and highly welcomed person in the village. One of the villagers said that there were varieties of arts, architecture, and structures of houses before the earthquake. There arts and architecture were made by older people. Most of them were already passed, and the rest of them could not work. He argued that those arts and architecture were lost forever. Their newborn children will not observe new-style houses in the village. According to Man Bharati (96 years old) said that new members of my family never get an opportunity to observe the art and architecture of my old house. It was full of wooden art and structure like outer balconies. He stressed that stone roofed house would be a big surprise and strange for the coming generation. He added that stone slat-roofed houses were symbolic markers of prosperity, caste, and social status in the village. He remembered his heydays when lower castes were not allowed to make slat-roofed houses. He stressed, "Bhotes (Tamangs) were poor and many of the Sanyasis had not stone roofed houses in the village. Recently (before 10 to 20 years) stone roofed houses became a fashion among all caste ethnic peoples. Bhotes, Sanyasi, Magars, and Dalits constructed stone roofed houses in the village. Then Earthquake collapsed fashion, competition, and differentiation. Now all of the villagers are building a similar house. There were no caste ethnic, class, or status differences. All are equal." The traditional building designs were declined and replaced by concrete buildings in urban areas. But in rural villages, those traditional buildings were the typical identity of the community and place.



## **6. Socio-cultural Inappropriateness of House**

Narayan Bharati showed me the village where massive houses were constructed. After returning to his shelter, he showed me the photo of the village before the earthquake. He told me that if I were here before the earthquake, the picture of the village was like the photo picture. Traditional settlements and caste ethnic clusters were different. He again showed me a mobile photo and said that if I was in the village after six months of earthquake, the village was set up with homogeneous tin-roofed huts. There were no caste, ethnic, or class differences. After two years of the earthquake, there was a dramatic reconstruction of houses and roads in a different manner. When the road and house were constructed, the household was listed as Rahatwala (Authentic victims who were supposed to get the bonus). Number of the new houses was the only indicator of reconstruction/recovery in the village. The RNA's reports also stressed a number of houses, without considering socio-cultural appropriateness, as the main indicators of the recovery from the earthquake.

Narayan Bharati said that the allocated budget was insufficient to reconstruct the house of the family. Some of them made houses by the fund and converted them to the shade/ goats' houses. An interesting aspect was the naming of the new house Sarkari Ghar (Government house). It sounds like the house is public because it is made with government funds. It is not personal. It was an exciting process of 'Othering' the construction. Many of them showed newly constructed government-funded houses because they thought that these visitors came to observe 'government houses'. When I started about the earthquake and reconstruction, they requested me to observe government houses made out of government funds. Fulmaya BK said that she made a house, but her family members did not like to live in the narrow room. There was no space for the relatives who came during festivals. There was no space for the god and goddess. Sukdev said that his culture was 'god first'. The traditional culture of house construction was the astrological observation of the site for the good fortune of the family members. At the beginning of the foundation, a priest should worship and offer good and evil spirits. But this time, technicians and engineers identified the house construction site. They replaced astrologers, priests, and gods. Therefore, most of the villagers thought that government-made houses were not fortunate for the family. Then,

they started to keep goats and cows. The technical model of resilience created problems in the government-supported houses. The negligence of the culture turned the human houses into a cowshed.

The construction of a new house was the only focus of the NRA's reconstruction project. Neither policymaker nor technicians paid attention to the socio-cultural appropriateness of the house. The social and cultural aspects of collective house construction and labor sharing were collapsed with the earthquake. Traditional norms and values of respect were lost. None of the authorities talked about the reconstruction of the old architectural aspect of the house, old social ties, and cultural functions.

Narayan added that this model of reconstruction was gender and kinship unfriendly. He added that there was no space for night stay for the guests and other family members who visited on festivals. He shared that his daughters and sisters complained that there was no space for an overnight stay for them. Daughters and their children visited on the occasion of Dashain, Tihar, Teej, and other cultural occasions. He said, "In a traditional house, there was sufficient space for guests and family members. Because of lack of sleeping space, daughters shortened their living packages with their parents. Similar situations occurred in Dashain and Tihar. In Dashain, many relatives visited but they returned quickly because of the same reason. If they stayed overnight, it was uneasy to the host. There were only two small rooms. Women and girls felt uneasy to adjust with male members". Narayan Bharati argued that this two-room construction was gender and kinship unfriendly. His voice was clear that the single-room house construction project promotes a nuclear family. It is against joint family culture. The villagers prefer joint family relations. Relatives were interested in staying with old people. Most single elderly made one-room house. He questioned, "How close relatives like in-laws and could live overnight within a room?" Similarly, women and girls mostly engaged in the kitchen and cleaning. There was no space for the kitchen and water management. Therefore, the reconstruction project neglected villagers' kinship networks, gender relations in local contexts. Many villagers complained that this reconstruction planning devalued the socio-cultural life of the people. It was planned technicians who counted the number of humans/people in a household. In the village, baby dogs, goats, calf, and poultry have to adjust within space allocated for humans. Bharati claimed that it was

a great mistake to count family members exclusively in the village cultural recoveries strategies. Until and unless villagers feel comfortable adjusting relatives, occasional guests, domestic animals within their house, the project of reconstruction will be counted unfinished. He concluded that sooner or later socio-cultural inappropriate houses will turn into barns and goat-shed.

## **7. Earthquake Disaster Reconstruction Governance**

The NRA is a primary institution of the government of Nepal that coordinates the reconstruction works, manages, and oversees following the April 2015 Nepal earthquake. Furthermore, NRA also facilitates Nepal's effort to build back better during the reconstruction policy, assesses the damages caused by the earthquake, examines reconstruction, prepares policies, plans, and programs, and facilitates implementation. Although the Prime Minister has a crucial role in designing the work of the agency, the earthquake-affected districts also have a representative each in the governing bodies of the agency. Except for the distribution of relief materials and foods for earthquake-affected households, the government of Nepal played two major roles in reconstruction periods : 1) Assist with temporary shelter and 2) Support for building a new house (Nepal Disaster Report, 2017).

Dal bahadur Bharati said that the villagers shifted from emergency shelters to temporary shelters after a month of the earthquake. He remembered that most of the temporary shelters were more personal though the government has supported tin. They were made of old and local materials from the destroyed house. A few months later of the earthquake, the government of Nepal began to distribute initial cash grants through VDC secretaries. Government bodies with the help of technicians identified beneficiaries on the basis of damage assessments undertaken in the early weeks after the earthquakes. This was the first round of assessment of government conducted by VDCs, generally in coordination with local teachers, leaders, and residents. Those whose houses were fully destroyed received Rs. 15,000. and partial damage households received Rs. 3,000. This assessment aimed to inform district and central government officials and agencies about the level of damage for immediate relief if required. Hence, each earthquake-affected household received a defined amount of cash to make a temporary shelter. The government worried about cascading damage of the

coming monsoon. Because of cracks and fragile landscapes, there was a possibility of huge landslides. The survivors were afraid of insecurity, landslides, and frequent irregular aftershocks. At the beginning of winter, the government also distributed Rs. 10,000 for all earthquake collapsed recorded households as winter relief so that they could buy warm clothes, blankets, and fuel. Because of the lack of elected representatives, people felt difficult to receive material and support. Bharati said that the government tried to support the villagers but the policy does not recognize the diversity of the village. There were well up people who have more than one concrete house in Kathmandu valley also received the same package of the village. There were socio-economic differences in the village. But the policy of the government treats them as homogeneous only because they lost their houses in the village. Some people completely left the village house and started to live in Kathmandu. After Earthquake, they came to the village to make the identity of the earthquake victim. They received government packages and made village homes for rare visits. For them, the NRA packages were the best package for bouncing back better. Monolithic policy and treatment of the government made injustice for the real victims and hampered socio-cultural appropriate recovery programs.

The Government of Nepal had conducted a series of damage assessments to decide on who should receive beneficiary cards for housing grants. One of the objectives of this assessment was to collect more comprehensive and standardized data than the previous survey. This assessment was more formal and was coordinated by the District Disaster Relief Committees (DDRCs), who deployed external assessment teams, led by Centre Bureau Statistics in collaboration with engineers in most locations. In the end, the data helped to prepare beneficiary lists and distribute the 'Earthquake Victim Identity Card' that would be used for the provision of earthquake assistance and housing grant. These cards had details of damages suffered by them which were used as a basis to provide facilities by the state. These assessment teams graded the level of damage to houses on a scale of 1-5, with 1 being the lowest damage ('negligible to slight damage') and 5 being the highest ('destruction'). Heavily damaged houses were listed under damage grades 3, 4, and 5 depending on the extent of structural damage and levels of destruction and these graded were deemed eligible for the reconstruction cash grant assistance. The CBS assessment led to a reduction in the number of beneficiaries in most districts and many earthquake

victims, as well as some local officials and leaders, complained that the assessment was conducted inconsistently without sufficient staff and technical knowledge. Complaints were registered by local people against the second assessment. For example, many houses that had not been fully destroyed were listed as 'partially damaged', even though they were unlivable and would have to be rebuilt. People complained about inconsistent assessment procedures between and within districts, the lack of technical knowledge of the assessment teams, and the absence of local monitoring mechanisms. Political interference was reported by locals and political leaders in several areas leading to protests by political parties and residents against the cash distribution aimed at pressuring district-level officials to adjust the beneficiary lists. A process emerged whereby beneficiary lists were adjusted and readjusted based on new data and incoming complaints. The government developed Nepal Rural Housing Reconstruction Program (RHRP) to assist earthquake-affected villagers. The objective of the program was to ensure that houses destroyed in the most-affected districts of the country will be rebuilt using earthquake-safer building techniques through grants. Those houses that have been declared fully damaged declared eligible for the RHRP reconstruction grant. According to the Nepal Disaster Report 2017, those who wish to repair their partially damaged houses will get a sum of NPR 25,000 per family and those who wish to rebuild their houses on their own will get relief assistance of NPR 200,000 (latter Prachand led government decided to give NPR 300,000.) plus a concessional loan up to NPR 25,00,000 in the valley and NPR 15,00,000 outside the valley at just a two percent interest rate under "the Earthquake Victim Special Loan" scheme (NDR, 2017). In order to support the earthquake community, the National Planning Commission (NPC) has recommended a low-cost model of houses to the Government for necessary approval so that the community could make an earthquake-resistant permanent house. Nonetheless, in July 2016, the government began to disburse the first tranche of the reconstruction grant (NPR 50,000) into bank accounts opened specifically for the purpose in the name of those who were declared eligible (Nepal Disaster Report, 2017). In spite of all, there were serious policy and governance flaws, particularly socio-cultural dimensions of recovery of the village home. Village home was considered a beautiful socio-cultural institution as John Gray depicted ethnographic detail of 'The Householder's World' (Gray, 2008). Devaluation of joint family agrarian village life and



ignoring cultural appropriateness of the newly constructed house resulted in unintended consequences of the reconstruction and recovery programs of the government.

## **8. Conclusion**

There was the excitement of making a new home with the technical support of the government among the earthquake victims at the beginning. When houses were made, many of them were used for cattle and storehouses. Reconstruction narratives of the villagers revealed that the houses were socio-culturally inappropriate because the house lacked space for gods, guests, and social gatherings around the hearth in the evening. They were not only homogenous in the model but also human-centered. Agrarian livelihood is a comprehensive combination of family members, livestock, ancestors, gods and relatives, guests, and neighbors. This cultural sense of reconstruction and recovery was completely ignored in the practices of house construction. It can be argued that the human-centered approach of reconstruction of the house was guided by the western concepts of modernity and culture of individualism. It prefers a lesser number of family members (called nuclear family), a lesser amount of local production, and consumerism.

In the contexts of earthquake disaster and reconstruction of agrarian villages of Nepal, human-centered houses could not address the recoveries of the village life. The NRA policy and designs were monolithic structure, socio-culturally inappropriate house, and promotion of individual culture. The structure of the houses promotes a nuclear family which is considered an appropriate condition of individual progress. On the basis of narratives and observations, it can be argued that the NRA's models of houses were suitable for unitary families and urban lifestyles. The projects of village reconstruction and recovery failed to address the needs of Nepali agrarian communities because the policies were prepared by the engineers/experts heavily influenced by the western idea of progress. Furthermore, it can be noted the fact that the human-centered housing project is the western notion of person and the concept is understood as synonymous with the western type of single-family house. This type of human-centered housing could be useful in an urban setting.



## Acknowledgment

I am thankful to University Grand Commission, the authors who have referred in this article, and the informants who have shared their stories during my field at Kunchok-Sindhupalchok. The article is developed on the research carried out under the Small Research Development and Innovation Grant (SRDIG-75/76-H&S-8) of the University Grand Commission.

## References

- Cieraad, I., "Anthropological perspectives on home", Smith, S. J. (eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Housing and Home*, 2012, 65-69.
- Gray, J., *The householder's World : Purity, Power and Dominance in a Nepali Village*, Delhi : Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Gray, J., "Architecture and Architechne: Building and Revealing in High-Caste Nepalese Houses", *Journal of South Asian Studies*, XXXIV(1), 2011a, 89-112.
- Gray, J., "Building a House in Nepal: Auspiciousness as a Practice of Emplacement", *Social Analysis*, 55(1), 2011b, 73-93.
- Nepal Disaster Report, *Nepal Disaster Report*, The GoN, Ministry of Home Affairs (MoHA) and Disaster Preparedness Network-Nepal (DPNet-Nepal), 2015.
- Nepal Disaster Report, *Nepal disaster report 2017 : The Road to Sendai*, The GoN, Ministry of Home Affairs (MoHA), 2017.
- Oliver-Smith, A. & Hoffman, S. M., *The Angry Earth : Disaster in Anthropological Perspective*, New York : Routledge, 1999.
- Oliver-Smith, A., "Post-Disaster Housing Reconstruction and Social Inequality : A Challenge to Policy and Practice", *The Journal of Disaster Studies and Management*, 14(1), 1990, 7-19.
- Oliver-Smith, A., "Anthropological Research on Hazards and Disasters", *Annual Review of Anthropology*, (25), 1996, 303-328
- Rapoport, A., *House Form and Culture*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J. : Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969.
- Rykwert, J., "House and Home", *Social Research*, 58(2), Spring 1991, 51-62.
- Smith, S. J., *International Encyclopedia of Housing and Home*, Oxford : Elsevier Science, 2012. ★