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1. Introduction: migration, housing and risk
2. Socio-ecological context: the Appennines
3. Comparing two case studies:
   1. Cerzeto
   2. San Mango sul Calore
4. Discussion and conclusions
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1. Risk outcomes of mobility

- (Necessarily?) intertwined
- Migration’s risk reduction outcomes?
  - For whom (when and where)?
  - Under what conditions?
- Reducing, transforming, reproducing or increasing vulnerability?
  - Mirror pre-existing patterns of access to resources and opportunities
- Linked with all population movements
  - Non-environmental mobility
1. Migration & housing, housing & risk

- Migrants invest in housing
- Housing is a key determinant of exposure & vulnerability to all hazards
- DRR focus on areas of destination
2. The Appennines: physical features

- N-S range, 1400 kms long
- Young and seismically active
- Highly exposed to landslides
  - Age/morphology
  - Soil structure
  - Land-use practices
2. The Appennines: social features

- Isolation
  - Transportation
  - Utility networks (including comms)
- Economic backwardness & limited livelihood diversification
- Emigration
  - Short-distance
  - Internal
  - International
3. Case studies: location & key features

- Far-off rural contexts
- Unsuitable for industrialization
- Largely unchanged throughout history until recently
- Affected by a major disaster in the last decades
3. Case studies: migration history

Number of inhabitants in Cerzeto and San Mango, 1861-2016. Source: ISTAT, 2018
3.1 Cerzeto

- Landslides recorded since 1635
- Little events with limited impacts, despite earthquakes & intense precipitations
- 1970’s: landslides become more frequent and more severe
3.1 Remittances, land use & exposure

- New buildings and building types
- Occupation of landslide-prone areas («Via degli Emigrati»)
- Infrastructural development to serve new buildings
  - Road
  - Water supply
3.1 Impacts of the 2005 landslide

- 124 destroyed houses, none in the center
- Over 300 people evacuated
- Relocation of the whole neighborhood
  - Social and cultural costs (loss of traditional Gjitonie)
  - Potential for new risk
3.2 San Mango sul Calore

- A history of earthquakes
  - 1649 (6.8, 20 victims)
  - 1732 (6.6)
  - 1930 (6.7, requiring rebuilding/maintenance)
  - 1962 (6.1, many houses damaged)

- 1980 earthquake (6.9)
  - 768 buildings destroyed or heavily damaged
  - 84 victims, 350 injured, 850 homeless (over 90% in the historical centre)
3.2 Demographic decline & vulnerability

- Traditional houses not repaired after 1962 earthquake
  - Loss of skill/manpower within the village
  - External (marketed) services unaffordable
  - No need to maintain/repair
- Domino effect in historical centre
3.2 Remittances & risk reduction

- Housing improvement and construction supported almost exclusively through remittances
- Investments on new housing outside the historical centre
  - Largely unaffected by the earthquake («Only the migrants’ neat houses are standing»)
3.2 Recovery from the 1980 earthquake

- Village completely rebuilt
- Investments for recovery largely unsuccessful
- Steady emigration trend
4. Discussion & conclusions/1

- Transformation of housing is a key risk variable
  - Affects hazard incidence, exposure, vulnerability and resilience
  - Linked to emigration in a variety of ways
- Urban/land use planning & building codes are key in areas of origin, too
  - Especially at key junctures of migration histories
4. Discussion & conclusions/2

- Positive impacts (if any) tend to be experienced by few
  - Likely those who can afford/plan for a migration project
- Negative impacts are likely to be felt by many more
  - Human and economic losses
  - Displacement
  - Loss of cultural and social capital (forms of habitat)
4. Discussion & conclusions/3

- Housing risks being a non-productive or very short-term investment
  - Key for status
  - Key for maintaining ties and individual well-being of migrants
  - Not very likely to be very valuable in the long term in high emigration contexts
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