

D&SCRN ELECTRONIC NEWSLETTER

March 2001

No. 1

A quarterly publication of the Disaster and Social Crisis Research Network of the European Sociological Association
Athens, Greece, erc@otenet.gr

D&SCRN Quarterly Report

Helsinki sessions. Despite some initial pessimism, we managed to organize 6 regular sessions for the 5th ESA Helsinki Conference(See below). However, some of the initially announced sessions (e.g. on American and European Disaster theory and the relation of disaster research to sociology) were merged. Other sessions (e.g. Disasters and Sociocultural Change...) were split into two to accommodate the plethora of submissions and also to achieve a more homogeneous composition. Finally, we also had a significant response to the new session on Disasters and Development. Unfortunately, we were not able to secure a time slot for the proposed six-hour workshop on “assessment of vulnerability and resilience,” and we look forward to this workshop in the upcoming World Congress of Sociology in Brisbane (2002). All our six regular sessions have at least 6 participants. Some of our participants have had problems securing funds. To help, the Conference organizers have offered registration discounts to participants from transitional economies and third world countries. We have endorsed these discounts and also recommended travel and/or lodging grants for some of these participants. We look forward to seeing all the participants in Helsinki this August.

D&SCRN Newsletter NO.1, March 2001

Table of Contents

- *D&SCRN Quarterly Report..... 1*
- *D&SCRN Helsinki Sessions..... 2*
- *Summary report of int'l reconnaissance team visit to Gujarat by M. Fordham..... 7*
- *Special interests and assessment of DU bombing Consequences by V. Vratasa..... 10*
- *Activity Report by B. Porfiriev.....13*
- *The ERC activity report: a proposal for collaborative action by N. Petropoulos15*
- *Disaster management: developing best practice, A Two day conference by A. Eyre.....16*
- *TIEMS 2001 – OSLO.....18*

Editor's Note: All “signed” texts reflect the opinions of the authors and not necessarily those of the D&SCRN, the Anglia Polytechnic University or ERC of Athens.

Membership Report. Since the publication of the last electronic newsletter, the D& SCRN has gained two new members: Susann Ullberg of Crisis Management, Research and Training, Swedish National Defense College and Douglas Spencer Moore Jr. of the Univ. of North Carolina School of Public Health. We welcome these new members to our Network. We also encourage our Helsinki Session participants who have become members of the ESA to also become members of our Network. During our business meeting in Helsinki, we shall discuss membership issues.

Weblinks. We would also like to bring to the attention of our electronic newsletter readers our continually expanding weblinks in our Webpage. Since the last issue several new address have been added including one for The International Emergency Society 8th World Conference in Emergency Management (June 19-21, Oslo Norway— See below). We now have about 50 weblinks which are classified into seven categories (periodical publications, data bases, academic and research institutions, discussion lists/networks, sociological practice/civil protection organizations, and miscellaneous/conferences etc.). We suggest that our readers consult these weblinks as they are of great research and policy value. We also like to thank the Anglia Polytechnic University Geography Department for hosting the Network's webpage and Maureen Fordham for managing it.

Call for newsletter materials. Readers of the D&SCRN are requested to submit relevant materials (e.g. conference reportage, book reviews, country disaster diaries, examples of good practices, brief reports of research activities, announcements of future conference etc.) for publication in the Network electronic newsletter. The availability of these materials will not only help in the more regular and timely publication of the newsletter, it will also hopefully increase collaborative efforts and contribute to an upgrading of civil protection. Contributors should also provide electronic addresses in case the readers would like further information.

Nikos Petropoulos
Coordinator of D&SCRN
Editor of the Newsletter
erc@otenet.gr

THE 5TH CONFERENCE OF THE EUROPEAN SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION
(Helsinki, August 28-September 1, 2001)

DISASTER AND SOCIAL CRISIS RESEARCH NETWORK SESSIONS

SESSION I. Wednesday 29.8./9:00-10:30

DISASTER RESEARCH AND MANAGEMENT: NEW SOCIOLOGICAL AND OTHER PERSPECTIVES, Chaired by E. L. Quarantelli, Disaster Research Center, University of Delaware, USA, elqdr@udel.edu

- “Re-examining the theory of collective stress,” Allen Barton, Professor Emeritus, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, USA, allenbarton@Mindspring.com
- “Disasters, epidemics, terrorism and other calamities: resurrecting Simmel’s form and content,” Robert Stallings, School of Policy, Planning and Development, University of Southern California, USA, rstallin@usc.edu
- “The influence of collective behavior on social research and vice versa,” Dennis Wenger, Hazard Reduction and Recovery Center, Texas A & M University, USA, wenger@taz.tamu.edu
- “Assessing resilience and vulnerability: a radical paradigm for disaster management,” Philip Buckle, State Emergency Recovery Unit, Department of Human Services, Victoria, Australia, p-buckle@msn.com.au
- “Pre-disaster situation: towards the prevention of hazards(a comparative survey in Russia, Ukraine and Lithuania),” V. Ivanova, Institute of Sociology, Russia Academy of Sciences, Russia, nika_i@go.ru

Discussants

- Anne Eyre, Center for Disaster Management, Coventry University, UK, a.eyre@cov.ac.uk
- Alla Mosgovaya, Institute of Sociology, Moscow, Russia, a.mozgovay@g23.relcom.ru
- Elke M. Geenen, Department of Sociology, Christian Albrechts University, Germany, geenen@antede

SESSION II. Wednesday 29.8/16:30-18:30

DECONSTRUCTING DISASTER MANAGEMENT: BEYOND THE COMMAND AND CONTROL MODEL, Chaired by Maureen Fordham, Geography Department, Anglia Polytechnic University, UK, m.h.fordham@anglia.ac.uk

- “Disaster policies and social organization,” Murat Balamir, Department of City and Regional Planning, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey, balamir@arch.metu.edu.tr

- “The organization of chaos: the structure of disaster management,” Avi Kirschenbaum, Faculty of Industrial Engineering and Management, Technion-Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa, Israel, avik@techunix.technion.ac.il
- “The case for deconstructing the command and control model,” Henry W. Fischer III, Department of Sociology, Millersville University of Pennsylvania, USA, Hank.Fischer@millersv.edu
- “Disaster management and the role of community in a post-modern age,” Graham Marsh, Risk and Crisis Management Program, Faculty of Business, RMIT University, Victoria, Australia, graham.marsh@rmit.edu.au
- “New models for managing disasters,” Philip Buckle, State Emergency Recovery Unit, Department of Human Services, Victoria, Australia, p-buckle@msn.com.au
- “Holistic eco-developmental framework for building local skills and capacity and reducing vulnerability of traditional rural settlements against earthquakes in South Asia,” Rohit Jigyasu, Department of Town and Regional Planning, Faculty of Architecture, Planning and Fine Arts, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Norway, Rohit.Jigyasu@ark.ntnu.no

Discussant

- Russel Dynes, Professor Emeritus, Disaster Research Center, University of Delaware, USA, c/o castelli@udel.edu

SESSION III. Thursday 30.8/9:00-10:30

GLOBAL ECONOMICS, TRANSITIONAL ECONOMIES, SOCIAL CRISES AND COMPLEX DISASTERS Chaired by Vera Vratosa, Department of Sociology, Faculty of Philosophy, Belgrade, Yugoslavia, vvratosa@dekart.f.bg.ac.yu

- “The resurrection of Marxist economics in the age of globalization,” Allen H. Barton, Emeritus Professor of Economic Policy, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, USA, allenbarton@Mindspring.com
- “South-eastern Europe after 1989: refutation of capitalism economic myth,” Ivan Angelov, Professor of International Relations, Sofia, Bulgaria, donka08@bgnet.bg
- “Catastrophic consciousness in contemporary post soviet countries,” V. Ivanova, Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia, konstant@isras.rssi.ru
- “What’s the direction of social attitudes developing in modern Russia?” Ju. M. Plusnin, Institute of Philosophy and Law, Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia, plusnin@philosophy.nsc.ru
- “The dark side of the economy in transition: the study of economic crime problems in the Ukraine,” A. Markovskaya, City University Business School of London, UK, aam28@hermes.cam.ac.uk
- “Global accumulation of capital and complex disasters-the case of Southern-Eastern Europe, V. Vratosa(-Zunjic), Department of Sociology, Faculty of Philosophy, Belgrade, Yugoslavia, vvratosa@dekart.f.bg.ac.yu

SESSION IV. Thursday 30.8/16:30-18:30

DISASTER AND SOCIOCULTURAL CHANGES OTHER THAN THOSE IN THE ORGANIZATION OF CIVIL PROTECTION, Chaired by Nicholas Petropoulos, Emergencies Research Center, Athens, erc@otenet.gr

- “Crisis and cultural change – the Buenos Aires blackout and Argentine democratization processes,” Susann Ullberg, Crisis Management, Research and Training (CRiSMART), Swedish National Defense College, Stockholm, Sweden, uggla@merlo-sl.com.ar
- “Traditional and modern approaches to peace-building initiatives: the case of Afghan refugees in Pakistan,” Ali Gohar, Commission Social Welfare Cell, Peshawar, Pakistan, gbacha@pes.comsats.net.pk
- “Natural disasters and religion: a socio-psychological study of the Marmara (August 17, 1999) Earthquake in Turkey,” Ali Kose, Faculty of Theology, Marmara University, Turkey and Talip Kucukcan, Center for Islamic Studies, Istanbul, Turkey, alikose@hotmail.com
- “Community, solidarity and legitimacy crisis: perspectives of female victims,” Ayse Gunes Ayata, Department of Sociology, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey, ayata@metu.edu.tr
- “Changing stereotypes after two major earthquakes in Turkey,” Serdar M. Degirmencioglu, Istanbul Bilgi University, Turkey and M. Ozdemir, Middle East Technical University, Ankara Turkey, serdard@bilgi.edu.tr
- “The impact of the August-September 1999 earthquakes on Greco-Turkish Relations,” Nicholas Petropoulos, Emergencies Research Center, Athens, Greece, erc@otenet.gr

SESSION V. Friday 31.8/9:00-10:30

DISASTERS, CRISES AND ACCIDENTS: NEW CHALLENGES AND PARADIGMS FOR BUILDING DISASTER-RESISTANT COMMUNITIES, Co-chaired by Nicholas Petropoulos, Emergencies Research Center, Athens, Greece, erc@otenet.gr and Boris Porfiriev, Institute for Systems Analysis, Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia b_porfiriev@prin.msk.su

- “Disaster management, community capability, resilience and vulnerability,” Philip Buckle, State Emergency Recovery Unit, Department of Human Services, Victoria, Australia, p-buckle@msn.com.au
- “The process of risk institutionalization in Brazil: the flood case in the state of Santa Catarina,” Marcos Antonio Mattedi, Department of Social Sciences Regional University of Blumenau, Santa Catarina, Brazil, Cecile@cfh.ufsc.br

- “Technological change and domestic emergency telecommunications: a constructive technology assessment,” Gordon A. Gow, School of Communication, Simon Fraser University, British Columbia, Canada, gagow@sfu.ca
- “Social Phenomena and lessons from Chernobyl: 15 years after the catastrophe,” Yuri Sayenko, Institute of Sociology, Kiev, Ukraine, csep@carrier.kiev.ua
- “To “serve and protect” or deserve to regret? a sequence of organizational failures leading to socio-technical disaster in the fire-fighting services of a transitional state,” Lindy M. Newlove, Crisis Management Research and Training (CRiSMART), Stockholm, Sweden, lindy.newlove@fhs.mil.se
- “Re-conceptualization of disaster: from an emergency to a crisis theoretical framework,” Boris Porfiriev, Institute for Systems Analysis, Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia b_porfiriev@prin.msk.su

SESSION VI. Saturday 1.9/9:00-10:30

DISASTER AND DEVELOPMENT: A VITAL CONNECTION Chaired by Hanna Schmuck, German Red Cross , Berlin, Germany, schmuck@zedat.fu-berlin.de

- “Continuum or contiguum? Development for vulnerability reduction,” James Lewis, University of Bath, UK, datum@gn.apc.org
- “Whose agenda after hurricane Mitch? Potentials and pitfalls in linking relief and development,” Ian Christoplos, Collegium for Development Studies, Upsalla University, Sweden, ian.christoplos@intkursgard.uu.se
- “Institutional learning of disaster response in developing countries,” Francesco M. Battisti, University of Casino, Casino, Italy, Battisti@flashnet.it
- “Risk perception, culture and communication: a South Asian experience,” Anjad Bhatti, Journalists’ Resource Center, Islamabad, Pakistan, (jrc@isb.sdnpk.org).
- “Bringing together disaster and development, concepts and practice: some experience from South Asia,” Madhavi Ariyabandu, Disaster Mitigation, Intermediate Technology Development Group-South Asia, Colombo, Sri Lanka, madhavi@itdg.lanka.net
- “Disasters and social vulnerability: a comparative study of megacities in the Pacific Rim,” Juha I. Uitto, Global Environmental Facility, Washington, D.C., USA juitto@worldbank.org and Ben Wisner, Environmental Studies Program, Oberlin College, Ohio, USA, bwisner@igc.org
- “Normal” life, disasters and development: who sets the priorities, who decides what science and what can policies achieve?” Terry Cannon, School of Humanities, University of Greenwich, t.g.cannon@greenwich.ac.uk
- “Urban livelihoods and natural disasters,” (contributed paper), David Sanderson, CARE International UK, sanderson@ciuk.org

Discussant

M.H.Fordham, Geography Department, Anglia Polytechnic University, UK, m.h.fordham@anglia.ac.uk

“I don’t want money. I want livelihood.” A summary report of an international reconnaissance team visit to Gujarat by Maureen Fordham (m.h.fordham@anglia.ac.uk)

It is something of a stereotype to talk of India as a country of contrasts but fieldwork following the 26th January 2001 earthquake in Bhuj, Gujarat reinforced this notion. Figures for fatalities and injuries are (typically in disasters of such magnitude) uncertain at this stage but around 20,000 fatalities have been officially recorded. The actual number is likely to be greater than this as many bodies, recovered from the rubble some days after the catastrophe, were in an advanced state of decomposition and were cremated, officially unrecorded, at the rescue scene. Whole families died and left none to report their deaths. The damage was widespread with people of all social classes being impacted; however, one should not assume from this that the earthquake was a social leveler as, despite popular representations as such, inequalities in experiences and access to resources were apparent in the victims/survivors.

This summary provides a brief description of a reconnaissance survey, conducted by a team of 21 including representatives from the fields of engineering, disaster management, public administration, political science, social geography and seismology. The individuals were sponsored by numerous organizations, including the World Seismic Safety Initiative (WSSI), Earthquakes and Megacities Initiative (EMI), OYO Corporation, US National Science Foundation and individual universities and research institutes. The team members came from Bangladesh, Germany, India, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Kyrgyz Republic, Malaysia, Nepal, The Philippines, Uganda, United Kingdom, and United States. The trip spanned a period of eight days beginning February 25, 2001 and ending on March 4, 2001, and included affected regions of the Districts of Ahmedabad, Kachchh, Rajkot, and Surendranagar. The mission of the trip was to investigate the Gujarat earthquake catastrophe from several angles including: engineering, rebuilding and reconstruction, social, economic, political, organizational, and disaster management perspectives, and identify: (1) factors leading to the catastrophe and (2) ways to mitigate it.

Clearly, such a short visit leaves as many questions as answers and many aspects remain to be researched. Below I report briefly on some of the contrasts that were apparent in this disaster. One important distinction is emphasised by the quote in the title. While those outside the disaster might regard money as the most appropriate relief provision, the survivors – despite the abject poverty of many – aren’t looking for charity but for opportunities to help themselves. We heard from one woman in Bhuj: “I don’t want money. I want livelihood.” She referred to the considerable influx of money, supplies and relief workers that are of less help to her than livelihood protection and reconstruction. This points to the consideration of much more fundamental social processes than charity giving and is returned to at the end of this piece.

We spoke to many people who told the same story of relief resources coming to Gujarat in huge quantities (the Times of India, 2nd March 2001, reported relief supplies piled up at airports) but not reaching certain groups or locations. Bhuj may have the dubious

honour of naming the earthquake but it does bring benefits. Relief supplies have been concentrated here and many people elsewhere claimed that other areas had been neglected in its favour. Yet even within Bhuj there were inequalities of access: one low-level government worker there said that he had been requesting tents from the district collector for his family, but was denied in favour of higher-level government workers. Although it is unclear how true or widespread are stories like these, it is clear that people *perceive* unfairness and this perception is likely to intensify throughout the reconstruction period when larger resources are at stake.

A frequent story in the press concerns the importance of Gujarati cultural links across the world, which mobilized aid to the region. Also, often referred to is the entrepreneurial spirit of Gujaratis that engenders resilience and speedy recovery. We saw many examples of this and yet we were also told, or read, of variations in the experiences of people due to gender, age, class and caste differences. For example, we read¹ that many Gujarati women had soon restarted their businesses (often in the informal sector) and their lives while their husbands (more often operating in the formal economic sector) had been totally brought down by the disaster.

We were told by some of our local guides that those in the age group of 60 and above seemed hardest hit by the disaster because they had lost everything and felt they did not have enough time left to rebuild their lives. However, we also saw grandparents sorrowfully but resolutely accepting the challenge of their new role as heads of bereaved families of young children. We heard of the thousands of children orphaned and traumatized but also saw many smiling, welcoming children eager to guide visitors to their destroyed homes and committed to finding something positive in this tragedy through a reinforced commitment to success in their school work. We read² about inequality of access to resources because of caste differences, with those from the lowest castes being excluded from relief supplies. On the other hand, people with nothing left except relief rations, shared what they had with neighbours who didn't even have this.

We spoke to doctors, some of whom spoke of an excess of resources, excellent organization, and a lack of significant health impacts; while others spoke of being personally traumatized, unable to continue their work, and unevenness in service to outlying areas. We also heard of doctors withholding their signatures on essential forms which would provide medical benefits to the needy because they feared the responsibility. One report³ spoke of the medical relief teams who flew in with just a 12-hour commitment, carried out inappropriate 'heroic' surgery, took photographs, and left - leaving the less glamorous post-operative care (greatly increased by their inappropriate medical procedures) to others.

We saw locations with 90% destruction of buildings and also examples of well-constructed buildings that remained as testimony to our ability to build safely, with seismic tolerance. "Look! My grandparents' house is one of the only two standing amidst rubble," said a man in Anjar. This was a 2-storey wooden house that, at a time when everyone was changing over to 'modern' concrete structures, his grandmother had told him not to tear down because it had withstood the 1956 earthquake.

Finally, we observed a wealth of government announcements in newspapers concerning their proposals for rebuilding but a lack of real communication between government

and the people. This was particularly evident in the relocation issue – favoured by the government but generally refused by the people (according to one newspaper report, 90% of Kachchh villagers rejected relocation (Times of India, 28th February 2001)). We concluded that communication was hindered by a top-down bureaucratic culture, which is not conducive to a truly participatory process of rehabilitation.

Future research must foreground socio-cultural differences, by disaggregating disaster victim/survivors and examine these aspects further. Only with much greater sensitivity in social measurement indicators will we begin to place the spotlight on the many inequalities that make daily living a permanent disaster for many. Ultimately, however, research can do little but help us understand the processes involved; change must come through political processes.

The contrasts evident here reinforce the necessity of bringing disaster and development issues together. The earthquake hazard did not create the distinct and divergent experiences of social groups: these are embedded within existing, unequal social structures and cultural practices. Martin Macwan, the Convenor of the National Campaign for Dalit Human Rights and the head of Navsarjan Trust, has said⁴:

The earthquake broke many myths. The largest among all is that India is a poor nation. The wealth that poured out to respond to the situation was enormous. If even a little of this wealth was distributed to the fellow citizens in normal times, where millions live in abject poverty whether there are earthquakes or not, India would be a different nation.

References

1. See “Pride survives amid the ruins” BBC News online: http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/world/south_asia/newsid_1163000/1163204.stm
2. See “Indian quake widens rifts between the castes” Guardian Unlimited: <http://www.guardianunlimited.co.uk/naturaldisasters/story/0,7369,439143,00.html>
3. “Disaster Tourism, Fly-By-Night Operations and Other Travelogues from the Bhuj Earthquake Front” by Medico Friends Circle, <http://www.lavochka.com/relief/mfc-tourism.html>
4. ” “Human-Quake Followed by the Earthquake” by Martin Macwan, Ahmedabad, February 2001 <http://www.lavochka.com/relief/witness5.html>

Social Interests and the Assessment of the Depleted Uranium Bombing Consequences (A Continuation of the Yugoslav Complex Disaster Diary)

In the ongoing debate on the use of a nuclear waste radioactive and toxic substance called depleted uranium (DU) for coating of military appliances and ammunition in general, and on the consequences of its use during the 1999 bombing of Yugoslavia in particular, two opposed standpoints have crystallised. They are grounded in easily detectable opposed social interests.

The first is espoused by experts close to the war industry and military authorities of NATO member states that ordered production of such weapons, tested them in their own countries, and have so far used them in military operations in Iraq, Bosnia and Herzegovina (B&H) and Yugoslavia. They are praising its enhanced piercing power, denying or minimising the existence of risk to human health, especially of the Gulf and Balkan veterans, and belittling its environment pollution threat. The Peace Stabilisation Force Coalition Press Information Office in B&H in its January 4, 2001 press statement, underlined that the International Committee on Radiation Protection (ICRP) does not list DU as a health hazard and that it is 40% less radioactive than naturally occurring Uranium. The Stabilization Force (SFOR) representatives concluded that they do not believe that either the troops serving within SFOR or the civilian population in B&H were at risk from DU Ammunition (cpic_mediaops@sfor.nato.int).

They failed to mention that a U.S. Navy document (Pacific Missile Test Centre Cruise Missile Recovery Instruction, COMPMTCINST 88001), which dates from May 14, 1984, reveals that the US authorities were fully aware of the radiological hazard risks of DU used in tested Tomahawk missile tips long before the DU shelling of Iraq, B&H and Yugoslavia. The instructions namely stipulated that recovery teams must use radiological protection clothing, gloves, respirators, and dosimeters (<http://www.iacenter.org/>). Martin Meissonnier, Frederic Loore and Roger Trilling even produced evidence concerning the Pentagon's knowledge that some of its armour-piercing shells and bombs contained substances more environmentally menacing than the "natural" DU, repeatedly defended in public as "safe" (<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/World/Europe/2001-01/pentagon290101.shtml>). The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) confirmed that plutonium was found in depleted uranium ammunition fired in Kosovo and Metohija (K&M) (<http://un.org/News/dh/latest/page2.html#30>).

European and American scientists who investigated for United Nations Environment Programme just 11 of the some 80 DU-shelled sites in K&M indirectly helped NATO authorities by reporting on March 13, 2001 that depleted uranium contamination was not widespread in K&M and hence presented no significant risk to health. They could not nevertheless conceal their concern that the drinking water could be contaminated as the uranium dissolves and infiltrates into the groundwater. They suggested therefore that water should be monitored and the shelled sites cleaned up (latestnews@newscientist.com).

An important reason for the denial of the link between DU ammunition and cancer incidence by NATO member states' authorities and even by some EU and UN agencies

heavily dependent on their funding, is to continue with the cheap disposal of nuclear waste and to avoid criminal charges and payment of tens of billions of dollars for health care, compensations and reparations.

The second interested standpoint is upheld by the experts close to victims of the DU "enriched" weapons among the NATO ordinary soldiers themselves and especially the bombed civilian population. They are emphasising both theoretically predictable and empirically registered – immediate and protracted - disastrous consequences of their military use instead of its more expensive safe storage or its use for peaceful energy production. Michel Chossudovsky thus quotes a renowned radiologist Dr. Rosalie Bertell : "When used in war, the depleted uranium (DU) bursts into flame [...] releasing a deadly radioactive aerosol of uranium, unlike anything seen before. It can kill everyone in a tank. This ceramic aerosol is much lighter than uranium dust. It can travel in air tens of kilometres from the point of release, or be stirred up in dust and re-suspended in air with wind or human movement. It is very small and can be breathed in by anyone: a baby, pregnant woman, the elderly, the sick. This radioactive ceramic can stay deep in the lungs for years, irradiating the tissue with powerful alpha particles within about a 30 micron sphere, causing emphysema and/or fibrosis. The ceramic aerosol can also be swallowed and do damage to the gastrointestinal tract. In time, it penetrates the lung tissue and enters into the blood stream. ...It can also initiate cancer or promote cancers which have been initiated by other carcinogens". In this article, entitled "Low Intensity Nuclear War", Chossudovsky also points out that according to official records, some 1800 Balkans "peacekeepers" (Bosnia, Croatia and K&M) suffer from health ailments related to DU radiation. Assuming the same level of risk (as a percentage of population), the numbers of civilians throughout former Yugoslavia affected by DU radiation would be in the tens of thousands. He cites British scientist Roger Coghill who suggests that "throughout the Balkan region, there will be an extra 10,150 deaths from cancer because of the use of DU." (<http://emperors-clothes.com/articles/choss/dep.htm>)

Yugoslav army experts reported that radiation levels in a significant number of the 112 areas -that were bombarded with 29,561 DU antitank shells and the great majority of which were concentrated in K&M - were from several tens to several thousands times higher than what is considered safe. They at first insisted, however, that all accessible contaminated areas near the administrative border with K&M were marked, that no soldier who served in K&M has shown evidence of contamination, and that among the local population which was instructed to take precautionary measures there has been no cases of illnesses reported (Alessio, Vinci, CNN Belgrade Bureau Chief, Web posted on January 11, 2001 at <http://europe.cnn.com/EUROPE/>) . One of the reasons for such restraint on the side of Yugoslav authorities could have been the desire not to sow panic among the population and maybe to prevent panic's negative effects on tourism in bombarded areas.

An increasing number of media report a 200% augmentation in the incidence of leukaemia and other forms of tumors among civilians in DU shelled area near Kosovska Mitrovica in comparison to the situation in 1998 (News B2-92, January 10, 2001). The evidence on the victims of "unknown disease" among soldiers that served in K&M ("Novosti", February 21, 2001), compelled the army spokesperson to admit in the Yugoslav main newspaper "Politika" on March 6, 2001 that some people already died and that many more were ill.

No doubt still much needs to be learned about how DU affects human health and environment in combination with other cancerogenous and mutagenous factors like toxic chemical and/or bacteriological aggressives. Some scientists voiced the opinion at the Athens conference that toxic pollution may be worse than DU (<http://www.ekathimerini.com/news/content.asp?id=68228>) It is also beyond any doubt, that the clean up, curing, monitoring and legislative work prosecuting previous and forbidding future use of DU in war industry must begin immediately and last as long as necessary.

Professor Vladimir Ajdacic, now retired nuclear physicist, developed a method for the detection of submicrogram quantities of uranium isotopes in human urine even ten years after the exposure. He also developed a safe and cheap method for their removal from the human organism. Prof. Ajdacic appeals to people of good will, since the NATO authorities are denying any responsibility, to help him get access to a mass spectrometer and thus enable him to contribute to curing of people suffering from the effects of ionising radiation (vlajda@yubc.net).

Vera Vratusa (-Zunjic)
vvratusa@f.bg.ac.yu

The Boris Porfiriev January-March 2001 Activity Report

1. 'Legal Regulation of Natural Hazards: Russian and International Experience'. Presentation at the International Conference 'Law in the CIS Countries: Harmonization of Environmental Issues' (18-19 January 2001, Moscow, Russia).
2. 'Overview of Emergencies and Disasters, Development Trends of Emergency Management and Disaster Policy in Russia'. Presentation at the Annual Conference of the Institute of Emergency Management in England (17 March 2001, Northampton, UK).
3. 'Socioeconomic and Legal Issues of Emergency Risk Management'. Keynote Presentation at the EMERCOM Conference on 'Emergency Risk Management' (18-19 January 2001, Moscow, Russia).
4. Organization and chairing of the session on socioeconomic and legal issues of emergency risk management at the EMERCOM Conference 'Emergency Risk Management' (18-19 January 2001, Moscow, Russia).
5. Finishing the paper 'Institutional and Legislative Issues of Emergency Management Policy in Russia' for the Special Issue of Hazardous Materials International Journal on social aspects of management of emergencies and disasters involving hazardous components(See next paragraph).
6. Co-editing the special issue of Hazardous Materials International Journal (see above) with Prof. Ronald Perry from Arizona State University. The issue includes six papers from Europe (UK, Netherlands, Sweden and Russia), US and Canada and is scheduled for publication in first quarter of 2002.
7. Finishing the paper 'The Major Crisis Revisited: Alleviation of the Neftegorsk Earthquake Disaster of 1995 in Russia' for the volume on *Crisis Management in Russia*. The volume will be co-edited with Swedish colleagues from Crisis Management Research and Training Center (CHRISMART) this summer and published in Stockholm in the fall this year.

Some additional data on the conferences mentioned above

(1) Annual Conference of the Institute of Emergency Management (IEM) in England (17 March 2001, Northampton, UK). **The Program included the presentations (in sequential order) by:**

- Introduction and welcome by Bill Blake (Chairman, IEM)
- Embracing Europe and EU candidate countries by Tom Pine, (IEM, Hon. Secretary)
- Overview of Emergencies and Disasters, Development Trends of Emergency Management and Disaster Policy in Russia' by Prof. Boris Porfiriev (see above)
- Searching for the truth - crisis management and post event investigation in the Netherlands. Case study criminal justice system by Sander Dekker, Crisis Research Center, Leiden University (Netherlands)

- The French Connection - management and response by Roy Hitchings, Emergency Planning and Response Manager, Eurotunnel
- Urban crisis management and natural hazards: earthquake case study by Julij Jeraj, Senior Advisor for Disaster Management Planning for the City of Ljubljana, Slovenia
- European cooperation: case study of the European maritime emergency project by Rosanna Briggs, Senior Emergency Planning Officer, Essex County, UK
- European liaison - pre-planning and post event (???????) by Erik Johanssen, Superintendent, Danish National Police, Denmark

(2) EMERCOM Conference 'Emergency Risk Management' (18-19 January 2001, Moscow, Russia). **The program included:**

- Plenary session (chair: EMERCOM Minister Sergei Shoigu) 12 presentations including those by the EMERCOM first deputy, Yuri Vorobiov (MS) and deputy minister Mikhail Faleev (MS), and chairs of the topical sessions (see below)
- Four topical sessions:
 - Managing Risk of Natural Disasters (chair: Dr. Alexei Rogozin)
 - Managing Risk of Technological Emergencies and Disasters (chair: Prof. Nickolai Makhoutov)
 - Methods and Tools of Risk Analysis and Risk Management (co-chairs: Prof. Andrei Bykov and Prof. Gennady Malinetski)
 - Socioeconomic and Legal Issues of Emergencies and Disasters Risk Management (chair: Prof. Boris Porfiriev)

The Emergencies Research Center of Athens and N. Petropoulos Disaster and Crisis-Relevant Activity Report: Some Proposals for Action.

During March 2001, N. Petropoulos attended two seminars/conferences, the first in his capacity as Sociology Counselor at the Pedagogical Institute and the second in his capacity as Director of the Emergencies Research Center following nomination by the General Secretariat for Civil Protection.

The first of these took place in Norrköping, Sweden, was organized by the Ministry of Development, Migration and Asylum of Sweden in the context of the EU Presidency and focused on the Children as Victims of Armed Conflict and Displacement. According to UNICEF and NGO estimates, during the decade of the 1990s 2.000.000 children lost their lives, 6.000.000 were injured and maimed, 1 million had become orphans, 10.000.000 were psychically traumatized, 20.000.000 were internally or externally displaced and some 300.000 under the age of 18 were at any one time taking part as “child-soldiers” in armed conflict. A shocking observation of Graca Machel who had been commissioned by the UN to review the problem was that the victimization of children and non-combatants were no longer a side-effect, but a tactic/strategy of conflict.

More specifically, the presentations, the workshops and the proposals centered around the Children-Victims’ rights to psycho-social rehabilitation, education and a hearing/participation in the decisions that concern them. An important feature of the seminar was the participation of young refugees from Bosnia living in Sweden. Proposals were made for securing the children’s rights in the context of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights (Nice December 2000) and also through the addition of an “Optional Protocol” to the 1989 Convention of the Rights of Children. Furthermore, many referred to the need to respond to the fundamental causes of conflict including the re-distribution of world resources through developmental assistance. Many of these proposals will be taken up by the upcoming “Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly on Children” which will take place 19-21 September 2001 in New York.

The other – “The First Working Conference on Psychosocial Support in Mass Emergencies” took place in Brussels on 9-10 March and was organized by the Ministry of Health of Belgium. Participants were 44 high level representatives (researchers, disaster managers, etc.) of EU countries as well as experts from the U.S. who presented research on the “post-traumatic stress syndrome” in disasters. The various countries presented their model of “psycho-social intervention”, using a case study to illustrate it. Most EU countries have institutionalised some kind of “psychosocial intervention”, especially following a mass emergency with victims. The two models which emerged were the emergent and the incremental models. The first, presupposes qualitative differences between individual and mass emergencies and requires special organization (e.g. Belgium, Sweden, Holland, Luxembourg, France, Austria). The second does not presuppose qualitative differences among “individual” and “collective” emergencies and manages all emergencies by scaling up the existent services (e.g. UK, Ireland, Germany). Nonetheless, in some of these countries (e.g. UK) there were indications that a “mixed” model was in the making.

A number of other relevant issues pre-occupied the working conference including the categories of victim-beneficiaries (direct victims, relatives, rescue workers), the documentation for psycho-social impacts (e.g. acute stress reaction and “post-traumatic stress disorder”), the effectiveness of de-briefing, the need for psycho-social triage, the type and timing of psycho-social intervention, the psycho-social training of civil protection decision-makers and personnel, and the evaluation of the impact of psycho-social intervention. A critical analysis of the “post-traumatic stress disorder” which fits more our own sociological biases was made by Derek Summerfield (See “The invention of post-traumatic stress disorder and the social usefulness of a psychiatric category”, *BMJ*, 322:95-98, 13 January 2001). At the suggestion of the Belgian organizers, a hyphen is necessary in the word “psycho-social” in order to stress the equal importance of the two behavioural domains in the rehabilitation process.

The Belgian Ministry of Health seems committed to promote the integration of psycho-social support in mass emergency services of the EU countries, especially during July-December 2001, when the presidency of the EU rotates to Belgium. The 2nd Working Conference on the Psycho-social Support will take place in September, 2001. Perhaps we in the D&SCRN should take advantage of this opportunity and propose to the EU that we establish a Psycho-Social Observatory or Documentation Center, with correspondents from all European Countries that would document and publish abstracts not only on the psycho-social impact of disasters and social crises but also on the results from the assessment of psycho-social interventions. I am looking forward to receiving suggestions.

Nicholas Petropoulos
erc@otenet.gr

Disaster Management: Developing Best Practice , 18-19 June 2001 :A two-day conference at the TechnoCentre, Coventry University Technology Park sponsored by the Association of Traumatic Stress Specialists

In the years since the 1980s' decade of disasters how has peacetime emergency planning evolved in terms of preparing and responding to major incidents? What are the key issues and what recommendations should be made in the current Home Office Review of emergency planning? How can contemporary research into disasters - causes, emergency response and consequences - contribute to the development of best practice? To what extent might the bereaved and survivors from future disasters benefit from the lessons learned and applied from the past? These questions and others will be addressed at this conference.

Following on from the success of last year's event (April 2000), the conference is aimed at academics, practitioners and disaster action groups interested in sharing ideas about innovative developments, contemporary best practice and current research projects. There will be presentations from a range of speakers on themes such as emergency planning and response, post-trauma interventions, crisis management, the role of

volunteers, issues for the emergency services, the media and disasters and multidisciplinary approaches.

During the conference participants will have the opportunity to meet and discuss both during and outside of the structured sessions. We see this as an important part of the conference aim to bring people together and facilitate sharing of ideas across different approaches, perspectives and experiences. For this reason too, the presentations will reflect the multifaceted and multidisciplinary nature of disaster experience and management.

Provisional Programme

Monday 18 June

13.30.14.0 Welcome and introduction

14.0.17.0 Psycho-Social Issues in Disaster Management
Dealing with Disasters: Organisational Perspectives

Key themes: Disaster action groups - learning from experience; children and disasters: what should we do? Company procedures for victim support; the role of faith reps after disaster; dealing with disasters: issues for the emergency services; the role of health and safety inspectors; ethical issues and media coverage

Dinner (optional)

19.30.21.30 Disaster Analysis

Key themes: human error in airline disasters; issues in selection & training; risk management cultures; individual & organisational performance in emergencies; death notification with professionalism and compassion - a workshop

Tuesday 19 June

9.15.10.30 Emergency Planning: The Home Office Review

An introduction to the background and structure of the current Home Office Review into Emergency Planning; an opportunity to meet the review team and contribute to the consultation process

11.12.30 International Disasters: Lessons Learned
Issues in Professional Practice

Key themes: Working with UNHCR: lessons from Kosovo; responding to air disasters: an American Red Cross perspective; cultural issues in disaster response; coping with floods;

12.30.14.0 Lunch

14.00-16.00 Training & Development

Key themes: The role of police family liaison officers & local authorities; innovations in emergency management practice: competence-based qualifications

16.30 Conclusions and close

Delegate rates: £175 for 2 days; £100 one day
 Members of disaster action groups: £25 per day
 Student/unwaged: £25 per day

Presenter rate: £50 per day

For further information about the programme/presentations please contact:

Dr Anne Eyre

Coventry Centre for Disaster Management

Coventry University

Tel/fax: 02476-888485

Email: a.eyre@cov.ac.uk

For an application form to attend or other queries please contact the Conference Team:

Tel: 0247676 236016

Email: conference.cad@cov.ac.uk

TIEMS 2001 –OSLO

The International Emergency Management Society (TIEMS) (www.tiems.org) is organizing its 8th World conference on Emergency Management (TIEMS 2001) in OSLO, 19-21 June 2001. The themes of the Conference will be (1) the mustering and evacuation performance evaluation of vessels, (2) Web based and virtual decision support tools for risk and emergency, (3) Disaster and risk management in transport systems, (4) Natural disaster and risk management (5) Decision support in emergency response (6) Technology for disaster information network (7) Legal proceedings and judicial sanctions, (8) Experience management in emergencies (8) The role of social science in emergency management , (9) Building a successful disaster management system, (10) Personnel training and selection in emergency management and (11) Global harmonization and chemical regulations. As of 11.4.2001, over 100 abstracts had been submitted to the conference by participants from 24 countries in Europe (Western, Eastern and southern), North America (Canada and U.S.), Asia (India, Korea, Malaysia, Sri Lanka), Australia and N Africa. For more information regarding participation in this very crucial to policy -makers, practitioners and researchers conference, we refer you to www.tiems.org/tiems_2001.html. -N.P.

