

CHAPTER TWO

A GENDERED HUMAN RIGHTS APPROACH TO REBUILDING AFTER DISASTER

Alice: Would you tell me, please, which way I ought to go from here?

The Cat: That depends a good deal on where you want to get to.

Where are the women? Despite over two decades of advocacy, research, and policy development, the question must be still be asked. International women's organizations and development agencies are increasingly alert to gender concerns in crises such as those produced by conflict, climate change and natural disasters (UN Division for the Advancement of Women, 2001; Canadian International Development Agency, 2003; Roehr et al., forthcoming). New scholarship about gender and disaster has developed rapidly (Phillips & Morrow, 2008; Enarson, Peek & Fothergill, 2007; Enarson & Meyreles, 2004), is increasingly sophisticated (Enarson & Chakrabarti, forthcoming) and reflects a growing international community of scholars in the field—for example, through the Gender and Disaster Network. We have indeed learned a lot about how women's and men's lives are shaped by hazards and disasters, about gaps in operational and managerial responses to them, and about women's participation in recovering communities. Yet we have before us in Katrina a case study of the utter indifference to all three.

I suggest that this disjuncture between what is known and what is done is not rooted so much in a lack of clear communication to policy makers and practitioners ("why gender? why women?") or a lack of appreciation of efficacy claims ("more effective use of resources if women are included") but in the lack of a movement for social change that understands and advocates a human rights approach to disaster risk reduction.

The fundamental human rights of women and girls are manifestly jeopardized in the world as we know it, as evidenced by the need for treaties such as CEDAW, the Beijing Platform for Action, the UN Security Council's Resolution 1325 on Women, Peace and Security, and the panoply of women's human rights organizations around the world. This pre-disaster "normal" is or should be the context for all disaster planning, from mitigation and preparedness to response and long-term recovery. In

post-war or armed conflict contexts, the risk to the human rights of women and girls is transparent, most egregiously with respect to lack of autonomy and to gender-based violence. We cannot now imagine paths to post-war rehabilitation and reconstruction that do not take into account what happens to girls and women, as well as boys and men, when armed conflict simmers or erupts. Nor can we ignore the unique issues confronting women in the aftermath of conflict, and the leadership of women to marry peace and gender justice. This is the mantle we must pick up in our work around disaster.

To explore these issues further, this paper begins with a short discussion of gender and human security concerns, new and old, followed by a suggested approach to disasters. Hurricane Katrina is then employed to illustrate the urgency of a human rights approach and the barriers remaining. In the last section, I offer a set of guidelines for moving from knowledge to action, promoting a vision of sustainable recovery that ensures women's full and equal participation in creating a just, safe and disaster-resilient community for themselves and for their children.

Gender and Human Security

Sex, sexuality and gender are all part of the human experience and constructed historically and culturally. Each is relevant to human security, which is also a nuanced and emergent concept with complex implications for different social groups. Importantly, human security must be understood in the private realm, too, and may be outside the reach of the state. Gender-based violence, for example, jeopardizes the personal security of millions of women and girls on a daily basis around the world: women and girls in their everyday home lives are now on the "front lines."

Security issues considered through a gender lens raise important concerns related to armed conflict and terrorism, science and technology, epidemics, financial and political crises and transformation, as well as natural disasters. We must investigate gender inequality as a root cause of insecurity as well as a cross-cutting factor; consider how gender differences as well as inequalities cross-cut new challenges to security; and investigate how to integrate the capacities of women and men equally when we respond to these. For instance, we must identify barriers and opportunities for women's leadership in conflict resolution; gender disparities in demobilization; strategies for preventing the use of gender violence as a war weapon; new risks to reproductive health and women's autonomy implicit in emerging technologies; and challenges to democracy

based on the gendered digital divide and to women's safety based on new information technologies. We must certainly be alert to specific threats to women's security in health emergencies such as pandemics, both as caregivers and patients. With respect to financial and political crises endangering human security, we must address gender disparities in financial security, factors undermining the diversity and sustainability of women's livelihoods, barriers to utilizing women's leadership skills, gender-based forms of political suppression, and women's historic paths to political resistance. Gender disparities also exacerbate the threats posed to human security by disasters, whether these are natural, technological or human-induced.

Disasters, Gender and Human Security

Recent thinking about disasters provides an important framework (for the American context, see Rodríguez, Quarantelli & Dynes, 2006; Mileti, 1999; Bolin & Stanford, 1998; Peacock, Morrow & Gladwin, 1997). These fundamentals challenge many preconceived notions: there is nothing "natural" about what we call disasters. Disasters are fundamentally social events with long histories deeply rooted in human, economic, social, environmental and political choices about human and environmental development. A function of relative exposure to hazard, social and/or physical vulnerability, and capacity for prevention or mitigation, disasters are often confused with the natural, technological and/or human-induced hazards that trigger them. But a hazard is not a disaster. Disasters are also not the social levelers they are often thought to be but affect different regions, societies, population groups and individuals differently; as the poorest of the poor and often the least empowered politically, women and girls are particularly hard-hit by disasters. These events we call disasters—understood elementally as events transcending the coping capacities of local communities—are always unique, for disasters have complex and intertwining effects that are as much cultural as economic or physical. They are, in effect, a social process rather than a social event in many cases. The effects and consequences of disasters, whether short or long-lived, manifestly jeopardize human security at the collective and individual levels, especially with regard to "vulnerable" groups to whom disaster risk is ascribed or transferred. Furthermore, these "unpredictables" can in fact be predicted as a consequence of the ways we have organized life on this planet. Disasters are being normalized as they increase in frequency and severity, with rising costs of all kinds to rich and

poor nations alike whether triggered by extreme weather, technological disasters arising from the world's interlocking infrastructures and systems, or other hazards rooted in global politics. Like living with hazards in risky environments, "disasters" are part of the human experience to which both women and men have responded and from which people in all societies have historically struggled to learn. This (not as in disaster films) is the context within which we should think about disasters, men, women and children.

As noted at the outset, academics and practitioners have clearly established the significance of gender relations (and everything that shapes these) throughout the disaster cycle of mitigation, preparedness, response and recovery—and the foreshadowing of the next disaster. Arguments have been accepted (in principle) for gender-sensitive emergency planning and response, either on equity grounds (women's rights to the same resources available to men in a crisis) or efficiency grounds (getting the right assistance to those most in need) or both: yet little changes in the field, either in the immediate aftermath or in the long, hard months and years of (attempted) recovery.

A human rights approach is now sorely needed, as disasters are above all moral events which arise from ethical choices about human and environmental development and which are "managed" from moral as well as economic premises. In any context, the pre-disaster "normal" state of affairs between women and men, boys and girls sets the stage for disparate impact and violation of rights in the realms of work, land, health, autonomy, safety, housing and mobility (Enarson & Fordham, 2001; Acar & Ege, 2001).

The effects of disastrous mishandling of "disasters" on indigenous populations, migrant workers, persons with disabilities, sexual minorities, disenfranchised political groups, and children are readily observed (e.g. Human Rights Center, 2005). In developing countries hit hard by the Indian Ocean tsunami, gender disparities and women's human rights were immediately highlighted (e.g., by Oxfam, 2005; see also the grassroots Charter on Violence Against Women Post-Tsunami, n.d.). Recent initiatives by UNDP and UNIFEM, for which the tsunami was a catalyst, are still underway during the prolonged recovery process. But in the discourse on disaster recovery in the US, threats to women's human rights are often overlooked.

Sustainable Recovery from an American Catastrophe: Through Women's Eyes

Over the past four years, as the nation watched warily during subsequent storms, disaster researchers, policy analysts and decision-makers looked away from gender and away from women as they set plans in motion for post-Katrina recovery.

Inattention to gender has been the hallmark of public discourse around Katrina, much of which was explicitly framed first around race and then class. Gender was certainly there from the beginning, but implicitly: strong images of “violent” (Black males), “heroic” (White male responders), “unruly” (ethnic minority men), and “strong” (male mercenaries and military personnel) alternated in the mainstream media with images of distraught women incapacitated by individual or collective stress. This much was predictable, but the gender silence in the flood of post-Katrina monographs, edited readers, policy reports, and research grants was striking in light of the advances in gender analysis internationally and in past US disasters.

Inattention to gender was evident long before the storms hit land, of course. Risk assessments were conducted without sex-specific quantitative or qualitative data needed for meaningful gender analysis, though warning signs were in evidence for the looking. The high proportion of low-income women heading families alone, women's relative lack of transportation, their dominance among the frail elderly, the disabled and institutionalized dependents, their insecure housing, their employment in the contingent labor force and their vulnerable health conditions were all readily apparent in census data and other statistical sources. Their strengths and capacities were also apparent (Gault et al., 2005): for example, the high percentage of African-American women in New Orleans with advanced education and degrees, historically Black universities and colleges with women's studies and women's services, and women's strong community organization base, especially in the church. These were critical things to know about community-wide and household vulnerabilities and capacities, and bear directly on preparedness and impact as well as recovery. It was there for the looking—and mostly, we didn't (but see Eisenstein, 2005; Enarson, 2005; Seager, 2005; Ross, 2005).

A counter-narrative is emerging, but slowly. Community organizers and cultural workers such as journalists, oral historians and film-makers have raised gender questions, especially around race and poverty (see Ransby, 2006, on the neglect of Katrina's “deadly discourse” for African-American women). Emergent or pre-existing women's groups are now

increasingly visible on the ground (Vail, 2006), and the sex- and gender-specific effects of these devastating storms is coming under examination by researchers outside the gender and disaster subfield (for example, biomedical researchers exploring effects on birth weights).

Of particular note is a wide-ranging report on the human rights of displaced persons (Kromm & Sturgis, 2008), which compares principle and reality based on the UN Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement. The authors refer to violations of women's rights with respect to accommodation (because of women's increased risk of sexual and domestic violence in emergency shelters and temporary FEMA trailer camps); and conditions for prisoners and detainees (because of health risks to pregnant women and the risk of miscarriage).

But a host of other concerns might have been cited. Principle 4 is a nondiscrimination clause with specific reference to "expectant mothers, mothers with young children, female heads of households" (Kromm & Sturgis, 2008: 30), yet the most basic needs of women for reproductive health services and pre- and post-natal care were not met (Kissinger et al., 2007; Bennett, 2005; Callaghan et al., 2007). Low-income mothers displaced around the nation are challenged by lack of social connections, secure housing and employment, and the pressing needs of children and extended families far away (Peek & Fothergill, forthcoming; Tobin-Gurley, 2008). Principle 7 relates in part to the need to "involve those affected, particularly women, in the planning and management of their relocation," (Kromm & Sturgis, 2008: 31) a provision manifestly not adhered to in the chaotic Katrina diaspora that began with mothers separated from their children and continues today. Principle 11 speaks to prevention of gender-specific violence, including domestic violence and rape as well as forced prostitution, all of which have been identified as part of the Katrina experience for women (Bergin, 2006; Ransby, 2006). Principle 17 highlights that "every human being has the right to respect of his or her family life" (Kromm & Sturgis, 2008: 33), while mothers and children still remain separated at the time of this writing three years later and the experiences of lesbian and gay couples and transgendered people caught up in Katrina remain largely undocumented (see Eads, 2002, for the case of September 11th; Pincha et al., 2007, post-tsunami). In Principle 18, "special efforts" (Kromm & Sturgis, 2008: 34) are to be made so that women are full participants in distribution of basic supplies (women were indeed active in emergency social services such as the ARC and worked with men in the Superdome to organize the distribution of supplies). Principle 19 attests to the need to plan ahead so women can have access to female health care providers and receive post-violence counseling as well

as reproductive health care. Women's equal rights to documents necessary for establishing residence or housing status are articulated in Principle 20, yet remain a major challenge for displaced women with extensive responsibilities for kin as well as paid work and limited economic and transportation options. Finally, in Principle 23 the rights of young girls and women to education and training are articulated; little evidence of this is available in the FEMA camps, which tend to lack even safe play space for children. These standards for the period of displacement are precursors for the realization of other human rights guaranteed to women through CEDAW. It is encouraging to see them reflected in principle (if not fully in practice) in recent initiatives from UN agencies active in disasters (e.g. Enarson on the ILO, 2000) and gender-aware NGOs (e.g. Fordham on PLAN, forthcoming).

What Women are Doing to Recover

One of the legacies of war has been increased appreciation for women's work on the home front and in the front lines, as these converge, and their contribution toward economic stability and reconstruction—and so, too, in disaster. Case studies of women and recovery demonstrate that women are extremely involved, if generally behind the scenes and in informal roles, and often without compensation of any kind (for an excellent international summary, see Yonder et al., 2005). After virtually every disaster, women serve their communities and families in key recovery roles, just as they do in the aftermath of war. They are community workers/organizers, advocates, informal recovery counselors in their occupational roles as counselors, teachers, hair dressers, day care providers, and informal/unpaid “recovery specialists” to their kin and “family,” however they define this (for the 1997 Red River flood in the Upper Midwest, see Enarson & Scanlon, 1999; Enarson, 2001; Enarson & Fordham, 2001; Fothergill, 2004; and on the emergent group “Women Will Rebuild Miami” after Hurricane Andrew, see Enarson & Morrow, 1998). Women today are also increasingly present in paid relief and recovery roles, including outreach mental health workers, and among elected officials with emergency management responsibilities. They are also more likely now than in earlier disasters to take part in recovery as professional planners and architects in post-event charities geared to reconstruction, or as professional emergency managers in the private sector, FEMA or state emergency management agencies. As reporters, too,

women's voices are raised about the future of disaster-affected children, schools, wetlands and all the rest.

Finally, women's self-evident capacity and will to work collectively are apparent in the aftermath of Katrina, more often than not promoting a broad social justice agenda than an explicitly gendered agenda in this long period we call "after" (aka "before the next one"). Women split up by Katrina have come together again to assert their right of return, and in some cases to link the treatment they received after Katrina with the experiences of mothers in Iraq and Afghanistan or to broader environmental justice or political issues. In and around hurricane-affected hamlets, towns and cities up and down the Gulf Coast, a resurgence of grassroots organizing is underway (Vail, 2006; Pyles & Lewis, 2007; and see Jones-DeWeever, 2008). Native American women leaders are fighting for protection of land rights and cultural identities; domestic violence advocates are documenting the price women paid and proactively developing their capacity to respond through emergency preparedness; and long-time housing rights activists are leading the way to protect women's rights to safe, secure and healthy housing. These and many other movements build on existing organizations and also on emergent women's groups such as "Coastal Women for Change" and the elite women's group "Women of the Storm" (David, 2008). The significance of women's informal social networks for the survival of African-American families and their reunification has also been documented (Litt, 2008).

What Women are not Doing....Yet?

As private interests and capital play an ever larger role in recovery, we must certainly learn more about the involvement of upper-class women in key recovery plans and initiatives. But, for the most part, it is self-evident that women are far less present than men in all groups as recovery plans are made and assistance programs designed and redesigned. Women are rarely managers of recovery funds or funders of recovery programs, planners or consultants on recovery teams, keynoters in recovery conferences, leaders of empowered recovery organizations, or mainstream commentators on the post-Katrina future of the affected regions and the nation itself. The women of Katrina are manifestly not at the centre of gravity where key decisions are being made, or were made early on, by those who do have a vision of what New Orleans and sister cities should or will look like. They are rarely those with formal power or authority to intervene when new "affordable" housing is priced too high, the air in

their temporary shelters too dangerous to breathe, day-cares and schools too slow to reopen, or migrant women beaten or threatened with deportation.

Gender-Sensitive Recovery: What Would it Look Like?

Sustainable recovery planning is a process tied as much to culture and place as to the politics of authority (Vale & Campanella, 2005; Oliver-Smith, 1986). Inescapably linked to sustainable mitigation planning (and vice versa), recovery is implicit in every decision made during the response phase (Peacock, Morrow & Gladwin, 1997; Mileti, 1999; Berke, Kartez & Wenger, 1993; Schwaab et al., 1998; and see Monday, 2001). Yet recovery planning is still the last tool at hand. Always a process (never an end), disaster recovery is fraught with political tension, financial challenge, uncertain and shifting aims, and insufficient resources, including clear thinking about the root causes of disaster vulnerability and consensus on desired futures. But the hallmarks of good recovery are clear, if only in the breach: it must be comprehensive, all-hazard, forward-looking, integrated, participatory, transparent and—I add here—gender-sensitive. Like that illusive concept of disaster resilience, it is difficult to imagine sustainable recovery without the full and equal participation of women and men, especially (but not exclusively) those directly affected. Certainly, the full recovery of children is supported by policies and practices that support their mothers and other key women in their lives. Women are key actors before disasters in the home, workplace and neighborhood as they prepare their families and kin against impending disasters and obvious hazards. They are, in the language of the UN ISDR, “the keys to prevention.” In the aftermath, they can be the “calm in the storm” (Vail, 2006) whose determined efforts to rebuild with social justice and sustainability in the forefront must be supported.

While gender-sensitive programming in other areas has been highlighted by the UN ISDR (e.g. ISDR, 2007), gender-sensitive indicators were not included for sustainable recovery or sustainable mitigation (Enarson, forthcoming). Yet both recovery and mitigation bear heavily on the potential to actually reduce risk and thereby prevent or reduce the impact of future disasters. Current efforts on the part of the UN ISDR and other UN agencies to develop gender-sensitive indicators of recovery are evidence of this.

The case must be made for gender-inclusive recovery based on appreciation of the rights of women and children. Specifically, as noted in

a report by funders of grassroots women's groups active in the aftermath (Vail, 2006), gender-fair recovery from the Gulf Storms calls for: 1) an integrated approach linking women's recovery work to the larger community; 2) childcare resources made available again as promptly as schools reopen; 3) ensuring affordable housing, especially for low-income women heading families alone and residing in public housing; 4) job training and access to capital for women to support their essential economic contributions in the broader community and in the household; and 5) mental health resources, including domestic violence counselors in emergency shelters.

The action points offered in *Appendix A: Guidelines for Gender-Sensitive Disaster Recovery* echo these concerns and reflect the work of international scholars, affected women, community organizers, and humanitarian relief and development workers following disasters (e.g. Enarson & Morrow, 1998; Buvinić, 1999; Ariyabandu & Wickramasinge, 2004; Sayeed, forthcoming; Masai, Kuzunishi & Kondo, forthcoming; Yonder et al, 2005). The guidelines are signposts on a path toward sustainable recovery which reflects, respects and promotes women's human rights. The guidelines are not negotiating points for a "special population" (such as women are sometimes described) or a part of that special population such as old, ethnic minority or poor women. Nor are they justified due to equity and effectiveness concerns alone. In my view, these are the parameters of sustainable recovery that create the bedrock for post-disaster conditions in which human security, freedom and rights can be imagined and realized. The full recovery of those who live through disasters cannot be imagined without this. These signposts to gender-fair recovery support and promote sustainable recovery for women and their families, and set the stage for transformative social change that alters the balance of power for women. In the absence of gender-sensitive participatory recovery planning and reasonably resourced recovery efforts, the post-disaster empowerment of women, so often documented in case studies, is very short-lived indeed (among many, see Bari, 1998; Bradshaw, 2001; Hoffman, 1998; Peterson, 1997).

Getting There from Here

Alice needs more than advice and a map, and so do we. We must work toward a collective vision of a safer, more just and more disaster-resilient future. To get there, we need strategies for structural and cultural change that will put security, sustainability and human rights at the top of

the national agenda—for all people. We need a policy framework that enables women to participate as decision-makers; we need careful monitoring and gender-sensitive evaluation of recovery programs, practices and policies; we must develop and strengthen the capacities of the many women's organizations that stepped into the void when afflicted women could not yet act on their own behalf; and we must certainly hear and materially support the women of Katrina all over this nation who know what they want for their children, partners, homes, neighborhoods and communities.

We need a new politics of disaster and a new social movement for disaster prevention. Before we had a new energy politics or women's health clinics or HIV/AIDS anti-retrovirals, we had galvanized publics with good science behind them and a sense of their own history and power. In the same way, we must reframe our work in the long tradition of women's struggles for social and environmental justice and for peace, working as always with men who share our vision, and reach out to women across the globe. We must put human rights first on behalf of those whose livelihoods, environments and ways of life are made less secure every day by the actions of the most powerful in our own nation.

Until the last child is indeed "home again" to a home that is safe, secure, and disaster-resilient, organizing around human rights in recovery planning is essential. I look forward to exchanging ideas at this wonderful gathering about how we might work together to do just that.

Acknowledgements

The ideas presented here reflect, as always, the excellent writing and analysis of my colleagues in this field around the globe. Special thanks to the members of the Gender and Development Network (www.gdnonline.org) and those who helped construct the Gender and Disaster Sourcebook (<http://gdnonline.org/sourcebook/>). The gender guidelines for recovery were developed for the Disaster Mitigation Institute in Ahmedabad, India, in 2001 and originally posted on the GDN. They are lightly edited here.

APPENDIX

GUIDELINES FOR GENDER-SENSITIVE DISASTER RECOVERY

With respect to participation and empowerment. Women's local knowledge and expertise are essential assets for communities and households struggling to rebuild. To capture these capacities, disaster responders must work closely with women, remembering that the greatest need of survivors is for empowerment and self-determination.

- Integrate disaster mitigation initiatives into on-going community activities and concerns. Know what local women are doing and partner with them, resourcing their efforts to the greatest degree possible.
- Ensure that women who are knowledgeable about women's issues are proportionally represented when key decisions are made about the distribution and use of donated relief funds and government funds.
- Plan ahead for ongoing and long-term consultation with grassroots women in affected areas, women's bureaus, and women's advocacy groups. Formalize their participation. Strengthen or develop informal social networks between these groups and disaster-responding agencies and offices.
- Organize reconstruction planning meetings and events with attention to women's ability to participate, for example by providing child care and transportation and meeting at times and in places convenient and safe for women.
- Monitor and respond to women's need for legal services throughout long-term recovery, e.g. in the areas of housing, employment, and family relations.
- Monitor the relief and rehabilitation process for possible gender bias and inequities which may develop over time, e.g. the unintentional overburdening of women who have extensive overlapping responsibilities at home, at work, and in the community.
- Monitor as far as possible the degree to which relief and recovery assets are equitably distributed within the household.

With respect to livelihood and work. Women's work is often socially invisible, but in the great majority of households around the world their life-sustaining and income-generating activities of everyday life are essential. Economic rehabilitation and reconstruction planning must target economically active women of all ages and social groups.

- Assume women are economic providers and plan accordingly; target the informal sector.
- Implement economic initiatives which reflect the economic losses of women whose work depends on sustainable natural resources; prioritize the restoration of economic resources vital to their recovery.
- Target self-employed artisans and home-based women workers for grants and loans to replace damaged or destroyed tools, work spaces, equipment, supplies, credit, capital, markets and other economic resources.
- Expand women's limited employment and work opportunities as much as possible in the process of redeveloping local and regional economies.
- Monitor access to work, wages, training and working conditions in private and public relief work projects and assess their impacts on women and girls.
- Commit to long-term monitoring of the indirect economic effects of disasters on women's livelihoods, e.g. disrupted markets, loss of clients, forced sale of assets, involuntary migration, increasing proportion of female-headed households, secondary unemployment, etc.
- Develop gender accountability measures, e.g. record the percentage of females in construction trade employment, numbers of disabled women trained, proportion of economic recovery grant and loan funds received by women, etc.
- Evaluate women's ability to participate in and benefit from economic recovery packages, e.g. with attention to women's mobility, access to child care and health services for themselves and injured family members.
- Incorporate gender analysis into all empirical assessments. Collect or generate sex-specific data to make this possible.
- Partner with women's grassroots organizations to avoid overlap; capitalize on and scale up their local expertise, supporting indigenous initiatives.

- Support women's dual responsibilities as paid and family workers; work with employers to develop or strengthen "family-friendly" policies for those needing time to apply for assistance, move into new housing, help injured family members, and in other ways promote family recovery.
- Extend government stipends to family caregivers as needed throughout the long-term recovery period in order to support caregivers economically and ensure continuity of care to the injured, unaccompanied children, and the disabled.

With respect to emergency shelter, temporary housing, and permanent accommodation. Safe and secure shelter is vital for women, as much of their daily life revolves around the household. As home-based workers, household managers, and family caregivers, women must be centrally involved in the design, siting, construction, and retrofitting of local housing and community facilities.

- As "temporary" shelter is often long-lasting, make women's safety a priority in the social organization of temporary camps, e.g. through adequate lighting, on-site security, and provisions to protect privacy.
- Provide space and services in temporary accommodation for the care of post-operative and newly disabled survivors and their caregivers.
- Increase housing security for women by prioritizing affordable housing that is safe and secure; where relevant, deed permanent housing in both women's and men's names.
- In determining priorities for occupancy of new housing, target single mothers, widows, below-poverty and unemployed women, socially marginalized women and others identified at the local level by knowledgeable women.
- Provide women fair access to construction-related employment. Include employment-relevant job training. Seek out women with technical qualifications for training to help construct safer residences, e.g. more seismically resistant or "green."
- Contract with women-owned businesses and solicit the participation of women professionals in the construction industry and related fields.
- Partner with women's grassroots organizations and community-based groups to evaluate and monitor the process of housing reconstruction.

- Promote the participation of women across class/caste, ethnicity, age, faith and other divisions in all decisions about community relocation, the siting of new settlements, the design of new structures, and construction of new community facilities.
- Collaborate with local women in planning housing design innovations which may reduce or simplify their workloads or otherwise improve living/working conditions.

With respect to training and education. Women are significant informal and formal educators who provide vital links between households and emergency responders, and whose social networks make them effective trainers in community-based technical assistance projects. Girls in disasters are at risk of early school leaving, and many women are unable to work due to lack of child care.

- On a priority basis, restore all preschool and childcare facilities, schools, and community education programs targeting women and girls.
- Closely monitor short- and long-term effects of injury, displacement, and rehabilitation on girls' access to school; avoid relief projects not enabling school attendance.
- Monitor all disaster-related jobs programs to avoid stereotypic training which limits rather than expands women's options; offer nontraditional training to boys and men.
- Disaster recovery information must reach all women; use a wide variety of media and all community languages to ensure that women are informed and able to contribute and share information.
- Women's social networks are a valuable resource in community disaster education. Capitalize on women's local knowledge about vulnerable people in the village or neighborhood, environmental conditions, coping strategies in past disasters, etc.
- In professional and governmental outreach projects, provide on-the-job training as needed for women to take up decision-making roles; include women with professional/technical expertise in leadership roles.
- At the community level, partner with women's organizations to recruit and train women as disaster outreach specialists with technical skills in the areas of livelihood reconstruction, earthquake-resistant housing, post-disaster mental health issues, special needs of children, disaster-mitigation strategies, etc.

- Develop targeted disaster mitigation materials for integration into the training programs of women's grassroots, professional/technical, and advocacy organizations.
- Make disaster-related training employment relevant; increase women's capacities in nontraditional areas.

With respect to health and safety. Women's good health keeps families healthy after disasters through sanitation, nutrition, and medical care. As caregivers to the young, old, sick, disabled, and injured, women tend to put their own needs last but their own health must be promoted throughout long-term recovery. Women's reproductive health needs attention, as does the increased risk of sexual and/or domestic violence in the aftermath of a major disaster.

- Throughout the long-term recovery period, include antenatal and postnatal care and nutritional supplements for pregnant and lactating women.
- Ensure that mobile health services include a full range of reproductive and family-planning health services.
- Integrate post-disaster public health outreach with existing community-based health systems and informal healthcare providers, e.g. midwives and home health workers.
- Target mothers and grandmothers in post-disaster grassroots campaigns promoting public health.
- Incorporate knowledge about women's increased risk of violence into emergency planning, shelter operations and post-disaster public health education. Provide increased resources to grassroots women's groups responding to women hit both by violence and disaster.
- Provide training for mental health providers on gender-specific factors in post-traumatic stress, targeting highly vulnerable groups such as women heading households, grandmothers caring for orphans, battered women, women with disabling injuries, newly widowed women and men.
- Prioritize the health needs of disabled women, women whose injuries are permanently disabling, and those recovering from temporary disabilities. Support their immediate family caregivers, e.g. through respite care, financial assistance, and extended counseling services.
- Allocate resources for elderly women's health needs as their well-being will be vital to the extended family.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

CHAPTER TWO

A GENDERED HUMAN RIGHTS APPROACH TO REBUILDING AFTER DISASTER

- Acar, F., and G. Ege. 2001. "Women's Human Rights in Disaster Contexts: How Can CEDAW Help?" UN Division for the Advancement of Women. Retrieved September 22, 2008 from http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/csw/env_manage/documents.html
- Ariyabandu, M., and M. Wickramasinghe. 2004. *Gender Dimensions in Disaster Management*. Colombo, Sri Lanka: Practical Action.
- Bari, F. 1998. "Gender, Disaster, and Empowerment: A Case Study from Pakistan." In Elaine Enarson and B. H. Morrow, eds. *The Gendered Terrain of Disaster*. Westport, CT: Greenwood: 125–132.
- Bennett, T. 2005. "Women's Health: After the Fall." *Women's Health Issues* 15: 237–239.
- Bergin, K. 2007. "Witness: The Gendered Implications of Katrina." In M. Marable and K. Clarke, eds. *Seeking Higher Ground: The Hurricane Katrina Crisis, Race, and Public Policy Reader*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Berke, P., J. Kartez and D. Wenger. 1993. "Recovery after Disaster: Achieving Sustainable Development, Mitigation and Equity." *Disasters* 17 (2): 93–109.
- Bolin, R., and L. Stanford. 1998. *The Northridge Earthquake: Vulnerability and Disaster*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Bradshaw, S. 2001. "Reconstructing Roles and Relations: Women's Participation in Reconstruction in Post-Mitch Nicaragua." *Gender and Development* 9 (3): 79–87.
- Buvinić, M. 1999. *Hurricane Mitch: Women's Needs and Contributions*. Inter-American Development Bank, Sustainable Development Department. Retrieved July 28, 2009 from <http://www.iadb.org/sds/doc/SOC-115E.pdf>.
- Callahan, W., S. Rasmussen, D. Jamieson, S. Ventura, S. Farr, P. Sutton, T. Mathews, B. Hamilton, K. Shealy, D. Brantley and S. Posner. 2007. "Health Concerns of Women and Infants in Times of Natural Disasters: Lessons Learned from Hurricane Katrina." *Maternal and Child Health* 11: 307–311.
- Canadian International Development Agency. 2004. *Gender Equality and Humanitarian Assistance: A Guide to the Issues*. Retrieved September

- 22, 2008 from [http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/INET/IMAGES.NSF/vLUImages/Africa/\\$file/Guide-Gender.pdf](http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/INET/IMAGES.NSF/vLUImages/Africa/$file/Guide-Gender.pdf)
- “Charter on Violence against Women Post-Tsunami: Demanding an End to Violence against Women in Disasters.” (n.d.) Retrieved September 22, 2008 from <http://www.actionaid.org/assets/pdf/%5CVAW%20Charter.pdf>
- David, Emmanuel. 2008. “Cultural Trauma, Memory, and Gendered Collective Trauma: The Case of *Women of the Storm* following Hurricane Katrina.” *National Women’s Studies Association Journal* 20 (3): 138–162.
- Eads, M. 2002. “Marginalized Groups in Times of Crisis: Identity, Needs, and Response.” *Natural Hazards Quick Response* 152. Retrieved September 22, 2008 from <http://www.colorado.edu/hazards/qr/qr152/qr152.html>.
- Eisenstein, Z. 2005. “Katrina and Her Gendering of Class and Race.” Retrieved September 22, 2008 from <http://www.whrnet.org/docs/issue-katrina.html>
- Enarson, E. 2000. *Gender and Disaster*. Working Paper #1, International Labor Organization’s InFocus Program on Crisis and Reconstruction. Accessed September 22, 1998 from: <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/employment/recon/crisis/gender.htm>
- . 2001. “What Women Do: Gendered Labor in the Red River Valley Flood.” *Environmental Hazards* 3 (1): 1–18.
- . 2004. *Making Risky Environments Safer: Women Building Sustainable and Disaster-Resilient Communities. Women 2000 and Beyond*, UN DAW. Retrieved September 22, 2008 from <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/public/w2000.html>
- . 2005. “Women and Girls Last?: Averting the Second Post-Katrina Disaster. Post to Social Science Research Council, Understanding Hurricane Katrina.” Retrieved September 22, 2008 from <http://understandingkatrina.ssrc.org/Enarson/>
- Enarson, E., and M. Fordham. 2001. “Lines that Divide, Ties that Bind: Race, Class and Gender in Women’s Flood Recovery in the US and UK.” *Australian Journal of Emergency Management* 15 (4): 43–53.
- . 2001a. “From Women’s Needs to Women’s Rights in Disasters.” *Environmental Hazards* 3: 133–136.
- Enarson, E., and L. Meyreles. 2004. “International Perspectives on Gender and Disaster: Differences and Possibilities.” *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* 14 (10): 49–92.
- Enarson, E., and B. H. Morrow. 1997. “A Gendered Perspective: The Voices of Women.” In W. G. Peacock, B. H. Morrow and H.

- Gladwin, eds. *Hurricane Andrew: Race, Gender and the Sociology of Disaster*. London, UK: Routledge. 116–140.
- , eds. 1998. *The Gendered Terrain of Disaster: Through Women's Eyes*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publications.
- . 1998. "Women Will Rebuild Miami: A Case Study of Feminist Response to Disaster." In Elaine Enarson and B. H. Morrow, eds. *The Gendered Terrain of Disaster*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publications. 185–200.
- Enarson, Elaine, and J. Scanlon. 1999. "Gender Patterns in a Flood Evacuation: A Case Study of Couples in Canada's Red River Valley." *Applied Behavioral Science Review* 7 (2): 103–124.
- Fordham, M. (forthcoming). "'We Can Make Things Better for Each Other': Women and Girls Organize to Reduce Disasters in Central America." In Elaine Enarson and D. Chakrabarti, eds. *Women, Gender and Disaster: Global Issues and Initiatives*. New Delhi, India: Sage International.
- Fothergill, A. 1998. "The Neglect of Gender in Disaster Work: An Overview of the Literature." In Elaine Enarson and B. H. Morrow, eds. *The Gendered Terrain of Disaster: Through Women's Eyes*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publications. 11–25.
- . 2004. *Heads above Water: Gender, Class and Family in the Grand Forks Flood*. Ithaca, NY: SUNY Press.
- Gault, B., H. Hartmann, A. Jones-DeWeever, M. Werschkul and E. Williams. 2005. "The Women of New Orleans and the Gulf Coast: Multiple Disadvantages and Key Assets for Recovery." Institute for Women's Policy Research. Retrieved September 22, 2008 from <http://www.iwpr.org/pdf/D464.pdf>
- Hoffman, S. 1998. "Eve and Adam among the Embers: Gender Patterns after the Oakland Berkeley Firestorm. In Elaine Enarson and B. H. Morrow, eds. *The Gendered Terrain of Disaster: Through Women's Eyes*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publications. 55–61.
- Human Rights Center. 2005. *After the Tsunami: Human Rights of Vulnerable Populations*. Berkeley, CA: East West Center.
- Jones-DeWeever, A. 2008. "Women in the Wake of the Storm: Examining the Post-Katrina Realities of the Women of New Orleans and the Gulf Coast." Institute for Women's Public Affairs. Retrieved September 22, 2008 from <http://www.iwpr.org/pdf/D481.pdf>
- Kissinger, P., N. Schmidt, C. Sanders and N. Liddon. 2007. "The Effect of the Hurricane Katrina Disaster on Sexual Behavior and Access to Reproductive Care for Young Women in New Orleans." *Sexually Transmitted Diseases* 34 (11): 883–886.

- Kromm, C., and S. Sturgis. 2008. "Hurricane Katrina and the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement. Institute for Southern Studies." Retrieved September 22, 2008 from <http://www.southernstudies.org/ISSKatrinaHumanRightsJan08.pdf>
- Kweit, M., and R. Kweit. 2004. "Citizen Participation and Citizen Evaluation in Disaster Recovery." *American Review of Public Administration* 34 (4): 354–373.
- Litt, J. 2008. "Getting Out or Staying Put: An African-American Women's Network in Evacuation from Katrina." *National Women's Studies Association Journal* 20 (3): 32–48.
- Masai, R., Kuzunishi, L., & Kondo. T. (forthcoming). "Women in the Great Hanshin Earthquake." In Elaine Enarson and D. Chakrabarti, eds. *Women, Gender and Disaster: Global Issues and Initiatives*. New Delhi, NY: Sage International.
- Mileti, D. 1999. *Disasters by Design: A Reassessment of Natural Hazards in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: Joseph Henry Press.
- Monday, J. 2001. *Holistic Disaster Recovery*. Boulder, CO: University of Colorado Natural Hazards Center. Retrieved September 22, 2008 from <http://www.colorado.edu/hazards/publications/holistic/holistic2001.html>. 2006 edition available through Public Entity Risk Institute: https://www.riskinstitute.org/peri/index.php?option=com_bookmarks&task=detail&id=149
- Morrow, B. H., and E. Enarson. 1996. Hurricane Andrew through Women's Eyes: Issues and Recommendations. *International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters* 14 (1): 1–22.
- Oliver-Smith, A. 1986. *The Martyred City: Death and Rebirth in the Peruvian Andes*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.
- Oxfam International. 2005. The Tsunami's Impact on Women. Oxfam Briefing Note. Retrieved September 22, 2008 from: http://www.oxfam.org.uk/what_we_do/issues/conflict_disasters/downloads/bn_tsunami_women.pdf
- Passerini, E. 2000. Disasters as Agents of Social Change in Recovery and Reconstruction. *Natural Hazards Review* 1 (2): 67–72.
- Peacock, W., B. H. Morrow and H. Gladwin, eds. 1997. *Hurricane Andrew: Ethnicity, Gender and the Sociology of Disasters*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Peek, L., and A. Fothergill (forthcoming). "Parenting in the Wake of Disaster: Mothers and Fathers respond to Hurricane Katrina." In Elaine Enarson and D. Chakrabarti, eds. *Women, Gender and Disaster: Global Issues and Initiatives*. New Delhi, India: Sage International.

- Peterson, K. 1997. "From the Field: Gender Issues in Disaster Response and Recovery." *Natural Hazards Observer* 21 (5): 3–4.
- Phillips, B., and B. H. Morrow, eds. 2008. *Women and Disasters*. Xlibris Publications. Available online at <http://www2.xlibris.com>
- Pincha, P. et al. 2007. *Understanding Gender Differential Impacts of Tsunami and Gender Mainstreaming Strategies in Tsunami Response*. Retrieved September 22, 2008 from http://www.gdnonline.org/resources/Gender_mainstreaming_Pincha_etal.pdf
- Pyles, L., and J. Lewis. 2007. "Women of the Storm: Advocacy and Organizing in Post-Katrina New Orleans." *Affilia* 22 (4): 385–389.
- Ransby, B. 2006. "Katrina, Black Women, and the Deadly Discourse on Black Poverty in America." *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race* 3: 215–222.
- Röhr, U., M. Hemmati and Y. Lambrou. (forthcoming). "Working for Gender Equality in Climate Change Policy." In Elaine Enarson and D. Chakrabarti, eds., *Women, Gender and Disaster: Global Issues and Initiatives*. New Delhi, India: Sage International.
- Rodríguez, H., E. L. Quarantelli and R. Dynes. eds. 2006. *Handbook of Disaster Research*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Ross, L. 2005. "A Feminist Perspective on Katrina." Retrieved September 22, 2008 from http://weblog.law.ucla.edu/crs/archives/2005/10/a_feminist_pers.html
- Sayeed, A. T. (forthcoming). "Victims of Earthquake and Patriarchy: The 2005 Pakistan Earthquake." In Elaine Enarson and D. Chakrabarti, Eds., *Women, Gender and Disaster: Global Issues and Initiatives*. New Delhi, India: Sage International.
- Schwab, J., K. Topping, C. Eadie, R. Deyle and R. Smith. 1998. *Planning for Post-Disaster Recovery and Reconstruction*. Chicago, IL: American Planning Association.
- Seager, J. 2005. Noticing Gender (or Not) in Disasters. *Social Policy* 36 (2): 29–30.
- Tobin-Gurley, J. 2008. "Hurricane Katrina: Displaced Single Mothers, Resource Acquisition, and Downward Mobility." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Colorado State University.
- UN International Strategy for Disaster Reduction [ISDR]. 2007. *Gender Perspective: Working Together for Disaster Risk Reduction, Good Practices and Lessons Learned*. Retrieved September 22, 2008 from http://www.unisdr.org/eng/about_isdr/isdr-publications/09-gender-good-practices/gender-good-practices.pdf
- UN Division for the Advancement of Women. 2001. *Environmental Management and the Mitigation of Natural Disasters: A Gender*

- Perspective*. Retrieved September 22, 2008 from http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/csw/env_manage/documents/EGM-Turkey-final-report.pdf
- Vail, S. 2006. "The Calm in the Storm: Women Leaders in Gulf Coast Recovery." Women's Funding Network and Ms. Foundation for Women. Retrieved September 22, 2008 from http://www.wfnet.org/documents/publications/katrina_report_082706.pdf
- Vale, L., and T. Campanella. Eds. 2005. *The Resilient City: How Modern Cities Recover from Disaster*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Yonder, A., with S. Akcar and P. Gopalan. 2005. *Women's Participation in Disaster Relief and Recovery*. Population Council, Pamphlet 2. Retrieved September 22, 2008 from: <http://www.popcouncil.org/pdfs/seeds/SEEDS22.pdf>