Munich Personal RePEc Archive

Everything that Rises Must Converge: Huaicos, the Spirit of Solidarity and the Asymmetrical Uses of Humanitarian Aid in Peru

Leon, Vicente and Bird, Matthew and Leon, Erika and Hidalgo, Alejandra

Universidad del Pacifico

1 December 2018

Online at https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/92379/
MPRA Paper No. 92379, posted 02 Mar 2019 05:55 UTC

Everything that Rises Must Converge:
***Huaicos*, the Spirit of Solidarity**
and the Asymmetrical Uses of Humanitarian Aid in Peru

Matthew D. Bird, Universidad del Pacífico
Alejandra Hidalgo, Universidad del Pacífico
Erika León, Universidad del Pacífico
Vicente M. León, Universidad del Pacífico

Abstract

The *huaicos* and flooding caused in 2017 by the *El Niño Costero* phenomenon mobilized Peruvian society to give humanitarian aid. But to what extent did the humanitarian agenda and the victims' needs misalign, and what are the implications for this asymmetry for the reproduction of pre-existing social relations? We answer these questions via a qualitative study with 80 interviews and 30 participant observation notes covering state and private actors and victims. The disaster created by the *huaicos* challenged the response capacity and accentuated social hierarchies. Humanitarian aid temporarily activated a spirit of solidarity that created an asymmetrical exchange of material and symbolic goods, which resulted in multiple uses for the aid. For example, those who donated goods also received recognition from the victims generating *warm glow* and prestige. But to what extent were the voices of the affected heard? This research contributes to the identification of practical ways to make humanitarian aid more efficient. To this end, we incorporate anthropology of disaster, subaltern studies, and economic anthropology frameworks. Deepening our ethnographic knowledge of organizational cultures and their discourses about charity, solidarity, and social justice is fundamental to incorporating local perspectives and ensuring that disasters transform society, rather than reproduce social inequalities.

KEYWORDS: Disasters, exchange, reciprocity, redistribution, humanitarian aid

1. INTRODUCTION

Evangelina Chamorro lived with her husband and children in a farm next to a river, but the *huaico* took everything. Beginning in January 2017, heavy rain associated with the cyclical *El Niño Costero* phenomenon fell in Peru, filling watershed areas and causing rivers to flood. As the rivers made their way down the Andean mountainsides, they periodically became trapped by geological barriers, forming temporary tarns until the water broke through. Gravity then pulled the waters toward the sea with even greater force, descending and swelling like mini-tsunamis. By the time the *huaicos* reached Peru's desert coast they had turned into a muddy mass filled with debris. Wood, rocks, animals, fences, and tires had all become part of the *huaico*, making it more destructive. Evangelina Chamorro almost became part of the *huaico* herself.

Pre-Columbian civilizations were familiar with *El Niño* and *El Niño Costero* phenomena, which have occurred every two to seven years for millennia. The *huaico* term stems from the Quechuan word "lloclla", or flashfloods.

In January 2017, *huaicos* formed with the beginning of heavy mountain rainfall, but those in Lima, the country's capital, did not take notice until March 15, 2017, helped by the video of Evangelina Chamorro struggling to save herself from the rising waters. The clip went viral in Peru, was beamed globally by Reuters, and stills of Chamorro's struggles became the iconic images of the disaster. Subsequently, Lima and Northern coastal cities had intermittent access to water. Thousands of kilometers of roadways were destroyed, interrupting supply chains with the north. An estimated 361,000 people were directly affected with temporary or permanent housing damage.

The anthropological studies of disasters have become a vibrant discipline in light of the recent natural crises (Barrios 2017 for a recent review). A theory of vulnerability, which drew from political ecology and political economy, initially guided the anthropological gaze, as disasters were framed as stemming from human-environment relations which exacerbated the effects of the "natural" phenomenon (Oliver-Smith & Hoffman, 1999). They are revelatory crises in which "the fundamental features of society and culture are laid bare in stark relief by the reduction of priorities to basic social, cultural and material necessities" (Oliver Smith 1996: 304).

More recent work has pushed the study of disasters in new theoretical directions, questioning "for whom does a disaster reveal what?" (Barrios 2017: 154). Scholars have explored the phenomena from multiple theoretical perspectives: the most vulnerable (the subaltern), the state (bio-politics and governmentality), capitalism (neoliberalism), and technology (science technology studies).

We seek to contribute to the burgeoning research by analyzing the 2017 Peruvian *huaico* disaster from a different perspective. Although the "revelatory crisis" approach to disaster studies was inspired by Sahlins and his economic anthropological examination of famines (Sahlins 1972, Solway 1994, and Oliver-Smith 1996), most subsequent analyses do not view disasters from a perspective of exchanges and flows. One notable exception is the analysis of humanitarian aid in the context of the reconstruction in the Tamil Nadu state in India

following the 2004 Asian tsunami (Swamy 2017). The multitudinous reaction to the Peruvian *huaico* disaster in the form of mobilization of humanitarian aid offers an ideal case to build this alternative frame.

The *huaico* disaster gave rise to a spirit of solidarity that engendered collective redistribution, mobilizing state agencies, businesses and civil society to provide humanitarian aid to the affected areas, similar to the solidarity discussed in his analysis of collective response to famines (Sahlins 1972). Yet those involved in the mobilization of humanitarian aid created their own discourses about the causes of the disaster, a series of partnerships, and multiple forms of intersectional collaboration.

Our interest is in the system of exchange that appeared after the disaster, the humanitarian aid stage when reactions were most immediate. We focus on the exchanges that occurred in the aftermath of the disaster, borrow from anthropological literature on economic anthropology, and compare it with other perspectives. We seek to answer the question "for whom does a disaster reveal what?" by focusing on the system of exchanges between people, rather than the dynamic between people and the environment, people and the state, and people and technology.

In analyzing the context of humanitarian aid we ask how actors "use" the aid and to what extent they reproduce structures of power, or whether the structures are temporarily inverted in a carnival-like manner in which spaces are created for the victim's voices, allowing them to briefly question inequity (Bakhtin 1984). Finally, we offer a theoretical explanation for why these forms of temporary asymmetric exchanges and collective redistribution emerged within the context of a weak state, an aspect which has not been fully explored in the disaster literature given the use of Foucauldian bio-politics and governmentality frameworks.

The observations and frameworks offered are relevant not only for Peru and Latin America, but for other countries in which there are marked social differences that create a divergence between the supply of and demand for humanitarian aid, whether material or symbolic. The disaster and mitigation analysis model is replicable, and we hope that our observations and frameworks may also be integrated into public policy.

In Section 2 we develop an initial theoretical framework. Section 3 describes the Methodology, and Sections 4 to 6 present our qualitative understanding of the disaster organized according to a before, during, and after framework. Section 7 offers final reflections.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The anthropological analysis of exchange offers principles for understanding modes of exchange and their symbolic and material elements. Economic anthropology has yet to treat humanitarian aid as a form of exchange, although some have begun to appropriate economic anthropology concepts for the analysis of disasters (e.g., Swamy 2017). The following section outlines principles from the economic anthropological analysis of exchange which will help guide the subsequent qualitative analysis.

Both Malinowski (1984 [1922]) and Mauss (1990 [1950/1924]) theorized the concept of reciprocity as a non-market form of exchange serving a function, though for Malinowski the function was individual while for Mauss it was societal. Both articulated a way of understanding non-market, symbol-mediated exchange within the context of stateless societies.

Polanyi (2001 [1944]) asserted principles for understanding the relationship between exchange, the state, and the market. Reciprocity and redistribution guide exchange in non-market societies. While reciprocity may be understood more as horizontal give-and-take between individuals or groups, the politically organized group uses principles of collective pooling and redistribution. To systematize the varied theoretical propositions and ethnographic facts within "primitive" economies, Sahlins (1972) proposed a continuum of generalized reciprocity, balanced reciprocity, and negative reciprocity. Generalized reciprocity is giving without an obligation or time-frame for returning the favor, and it occurs in the most socially proximate groups. Balanced reciprocity is a more immediate exchange and occurs more with less proximate social groups. Negative reciprocity refers to exchange seeking to extract advantage, as the case of barter, and occurs with socially distant groups. With respect to generalized reciprocity, however, two principles come into play: rank and wealth. We posit that forms of these principles *temporarily* come into play in humanitarian aid characterized by weak states and the disruption of markets.

While more has been written about these frameworks (Levi-Strauss 1969, Parry 1986, Strathern 1988, Weiner 1992, Graeber 2001, Sillitoe 2006), the concepts have not yet been applied to the analysis of humanitarian aid as a form of exchange. For the most part, humanitarian aid emerges in contexts in which states exist, though these states have varying degrees of strength. Aid also emerges in contexts where prior to the disaster, markets function as the dominant form of exchange in the affected community or society. Finally, the disasters strain the state and disrupt markets, requiring members of social groups to redistribute goods, as Sahlins (1972) observed when he studied famines.

In sum, we will argue that humanitarian aid observed in the wake of the *huaico* disaster in Peru is an example of collective redistribution in the absence of a strong state. Regardless, due to unequal relations between those affected and those that give humanitarian goods and services, humanitarian aid remains embedded in market-mediated practices (Swamy 2017 and Sirrat & Henkel 1997).

A material and symbolic transaction is framed by the relationship between those affected by the disaster and those involved in the mitigation effort – the state, the private sector, nonprofit organizations, and individuals. In this context, asymmetrical reciprocity is observed: "the subordinate accepts his or her status and is compensated by the advantages of the care given by those in dominant positions, and because of an upbringing that shapes the individual to participate in a collective system of interdependence and duties" (Killen & Smetana 2005: 17). As Swamy suggests "a gift exchange model can provide a useful framework to examine the relationship between humanitarianism and unequal exchange" (2017: 358).

In disasters, asymmetrical reciprocity is the predominant form of exchange: "there is link, a continuity, between hostile relations and the provision of reciprocal prestations. Exchanges

are peacefully resolved wars and wars are the result of unsuccessful transactions" (Levi-Strauss 1969:67 quoted in Sahlins 1972: 182). Humanitarian aid presents itself as a tool to reestablish relations between groups, thereby reproducing social inequalities.

Humanitarian aid results from the use of private and public resources to public ends. The ecosystem involved during humanitarian aid are shaped by two basic premises: (i) neither of the actors is homogenous, and (ii) each of them have their own interests even if it seems that humanitarian aid is pure giving (Sulek 2010).

The model is applicable to disaster and its expressions include humanitarian logistics on a material level, and warm glow on a symbolic level. On a symbolic level, we posit the emergence of a spirit of solidarity, which we understand as a wish to contribute to a disaster scenario that manifests itself as humanitarian aid. However, contributing at a time of crisis does not exclude an actor from having other intentions in the medium term, depending on the sector to which that actor belongs. In our research, we show how the actors involved activate a philanthropic network of humanitarian assistance motivated by a spirit of solidarity.

Haskell (1985:357-358) argues that there are four preconditions for the emergence of humanitarianism: ethical maxims by which humanitarian aid is the right thing to do, the perception that the agent is causally involved in the event, the perception that the agent can stop the suffering, and that the intervention is easy to implement.

An objective of our research is to understand how the institutionalized philanthropic ecosystem reacted to the disaster. However, philanthropy can be non-institutionalized in which case we regard it as "a social relation governed by a moral obligation that matches a supply of private resources to a demand of unfulfilled needs and desires that are communicated by entreaty" (Sulek 2010: 203). There is a moral obligation to give when others give, so it is rational to contemplate the existence of forced philanthropy:

> In large, heterogeneous and anonymous communities in which the individual loses the sense of face-to-face contact with the other members, it is almost always necessary to reinforce philanthropy with coercion and to provide for unilateral transfers, such as taxes, under some kind of penalty for failure. (Boulding 1992: 62)

On the symbolic level, the act of giving creates a warm glow: "If we drop a dime in the blind man's cup, it is because the blind man gives us something. We feel a certain glow of emotional virtue, and it is this that we receive for our dime" (Boulding 1992: 57). This is the psychosocial satisfaction of recognizing and acting in response to the existence of an underlying social injustice (Andreoni 1998: 1448).

The mitigation process is also molded by a spirit of solidarity and we propose that disaster, just like carnival, is a moment of irruption in everyday life and a phenomenon that highlights the structures of social injustice. "Carnival celebrated temporary liberation from the prevailing truth and from the established order; it marked the suspension of all hierarchical rank, privileges, norms, and prohibitions. Carnival was the true feast of times, the feast of becoming, change, and renewal" (Bakhtin 1984: 10). As to the analogy that we establish between carnival and disaster, we note that humanitarian aid during mitigation has

consequences for social structures: “Previously existing stratifications like class and ethnicity can temporarily disappear in a short-lived waved of altruism” (Henry 2005: 12).

3. METHODOLOGY

We collected data on actors, their strategies and practices via qualitative, ethnographic-based methods *in situ* as the disaster and humanitarian aid unfolded. This methodology provided us with a unique perspective on the interactional dynamics between the actors before, during, and after the disaster. Fieldwork was conducted between March and June 2017 in Lima and Piura – the two of the coastal cities most affected by *huaicos*.

Living in Peru at the time of the disaster, our initial objective was to map nonprofit organizations as part of a separate project on national philanthropy. At the end of March 2017, we included the Northern city of Piura, which was most affected by the disaster, as the largest city in the area of the highest rainfall (include map as annex?). We chose this case to compare urban emergency zones in Lima with their urban and rural equivalents in Piura, incorporating the perspective of affected individuals in both cases. With this decision, we restructured and expanded our research objective to examine material and symbolic exchanges in the context of humanitarian aid.

We organized the data by type of actor and geography and focused on the narratives of disaster causality, supply and demand of humanitarian aid, and the perception of other actors' behaviors. We reconstructed the “before” and the “during,” in which the supply and demand exchange is created, and we described the “after,” which is the moment of exchange in post-disaster mitigation.

Data collection techniques included semi-structured interviews and participant observation. Secondary sources included documents, newspapers, and magazines, as well as analyses of social media, television and radio. To identify sources, we drew on the analysis of secondary sources and the snowball technique.

Table 1: Methodological Design

Actors	Sources	Interview	Observation	Context
State	Ministries Municipalities Armed Forces Government Agencies	18	10	Headquarters, collection centers, shelters and local communities
Private Sector	Retail, Banks, Food, Manufacturing Logistics	13	4	Corporate offices, conferences and events

Civil Society	NGOs Foundations Citizens	41	6	Corporate offices, collection centers, shelters, and local communities
Affected	Lima and Piura: Affected Displaced	20	5	Shelters and local communities
Total		92	25	117

4. PRE-DISASTER VULNERABILITY

Vulnerability theory asserts that technical prevention and preparation are not neutral, and that "there are not really generalized opportunities and risks in nature, but instead there are sets of unequal access to opportunities and unequal exposures to risks which are consequence of the socio-economic system" (Cannon 1984: 14). As a revelatory crisis, the disaster exposes the pre-existing relationship between the social structure and the environment (Oliver-Smith & Hoffman 1999: 20). To diagnose pre-disaster vulnerability, we focus on the extent to which population groups are affected, considering that the *huaico* disaster reveals contradictory discourses on social inequality and public policies related to housing. These discourses generate a "multilogue" in which the political and economic interests of the actors are observed, positioning us to ask what disasters reveal and for whom (Barrios 2017).

References to structural factors mostly came from nonprofit organizations and individuals involved in the relief efforts. For them, physical vulnerability is not just a consequence of natural aspects such as climate change, it also has roots in disorderly urban and rural growth, which relates to the structural conditions of poverty and social vulnerability:

> Pre-existing situations of vulnerability can also cause a return of disasters to where they previously occurred for reasons of exclusion, poverty, and violence. This can erode certain processes, for example, in community terms, social tissues that are already weakened are pushed to the maximum during disasters. (VOL2)

The most common issue raised by the private sector and those affected was that responsibility for the disaster fell to regional and local authorities. A problem cited was the authorization of housing construction in unsuitable areas, such as along the edges of riverbanks. Another problem was the inactivity of the authorities responsible for overseeing housing as well as the lack of urban and rural planning: "Mismanagement by past authorities that didn't foresee that it wasn't sustainable to put people on the edge of a river […]. And in Peru, there has been no planning for either urban or rural growth" (EMP3). Informants link both problems to corruption and populism, which create loopholes regarding the legality of housing conditions for these populations: "Politicians do not want to confront the people either, because they lose votes" (FIL2).

In the case of those affected, most refer to the malfunctioning of the disaster prevention system. The lack of prevention by government authorities is the most-cited cause by actors in Lima and Piura. Specifically, they state that the *huaicos* can be attributed to shortcomings in both oversight of waterway upkeep and investment in retention barriers. This problem is linked to a shortage of resources and technical skills.

> The cause of the disaster was that the authorities didn't start working […], they did nothing because if they'd started doing something, […] along the riverbank, maybe we wouldn't have suffered this, but they did nothing. (DPIU2)

Actors from the private sector, the state, and specialized agencies link the disaster to land usage practices and to housing conditions of those who "choose" to live in hazardous areas. State actors also shift responsibility by stressing that the disaster was due to the absence of a culture of prevention borne of a lack of knowledge on how to act in an emergency. State authorities cite insufficient participation in evacuation drills and meetings that provide training, and a lack of in the issue. On the population's perception regarding prevention measures, a political leader in Piura said: "When there are drills, they look at those who participate as fools" (AUTP2).

The multiple discourses conflict in both the social causes of the disaster and the assignment of responsibility. The discourses reflect the existence of an ineffective state that struggles to enforce regulatory rules and invest in prevention. The multiple discourses also highlight beliefs about an unruly population that fails to follow societal norms, "choosing" to live in precarious areas and failing to prepare for possible disasters.

A consolidated discourse did not emerge regarding the responsibility of the private and non-profit sectors in creating the problem. Despite the panoply of narratives, there was little indication that the voices in the social structure were heard by others in the social space, something that appeared to shift with the onset of the disaster.

5. THE DISASTER: RESPONSES AND REACTIONS

Capacities are challenged during and after a disaster. What decision-making criteria do these actors use when confronted with the crisis? To what extent are new spaces created for actors to express themselves? And what is the meaning of these responses and reactions?

Initial Reactions to the Disaster

Overflowing rivers caused *huaicos* in Lima on March 15 and 16, 2017 and the municipality responded by erecting 25 shelters. *Huaicos* came as a shock to residents, most of whom refused to evacuate until they found themselves in their homes with the water level rising. Local administrators soon took the initiative, organizing evacuations and supporting rescue personnel. The aforementioned structural inequality was reflected in the rescue and erection of shelters: "The municipality of […] wasn't going to help them because they were squatters and didn't contribute" (AUTL4).

In Piura, on March 26, state authorities informed local governments that the river had burst its banks and residents were tasked with setting sandbags to disrupt the flow of water. On March 27, flooding began and local authorities lost their capacity for action when municipal buildings flooded. Regional governments and the Regional Center for Emergency Operations (*Centro de Operaciones de Emergencia Regional*, COER) assumed control and began monitoring the evacuations, while the National Institute of Civil Defense (*Instituto Nacional de Defensa Civil*, INDECI) built shelters. Residents had experienced flooding before, and it already formed part of their communal narrative: "that time the river came out." Residents admitted to some complacency before the threat because the river level had been higher in previous years without bursting its banks. The belated evacuation began with assistance from state authorities who, according to informants, did not identify the affected areas and lacked resources.

The Army, police, fire brigade, and specialized international agencies were first to respond to the evacuation and rescue needs. Residents took shelter in high areas where they built shelters. This stage was characterized by fear, uncertainty, worries about material losses, and the risk of looting. Determining factors were the pre-existing levels of vulnerability and the established networks of mutual assistance. Affected individuals reacted in a variety of ways, and recalled different moments during and after the disaster:

> In the beginning it was hubris, because they thought the disaster wasn't going to happen, people were saying "nothing's going to happen." (DPIU6)

Disaster Iconography and the Birth of Solidarity

A disaster is created by the way in which the natural phenomenon is represented. In this case, narratives about the flooding, *huaicos*, and the victims took root in the popular imagination, leading to a sense of solidarity. A criticism leveled at the media is that "they appropriate images and stories of experiences of pain and suffering of others as a good to be shared, sold, manipulated, and commercialized to attract more donations" (Doug 2005: 14). Although the symbolic representation was continuous, we stress the form it took after two key dates: March 15, 2017 for Lima and March 27, 2017 for Piura.

The state provided one account of the situation. The images that generated the largest impact were the broadcasts from the COER showing a roundtable where government ministers reported from the affected areas (RPP 2017). These images suggested that there was coordination between central government authorities, and not between local authorities in the regions themselves.

Even though media is part of the private sector, in this case it took an independent form, creating the disaster in the popular imagination and keeping it on the public agenda through reports and iconic images. State weather forecasts began reporting on the phenomenon in late 2016, but news coverage did not begin until March 15 when five rivers flooded in Lima. In many cases, it was the media that first gave the victims the opportunity to share their concerns and expectations. The disaster thus created a utility for the subaltern persons affected: "a disaster may also serve as a means to illustrate the precarious circumstances imposed on them by racism, economic systems, and development policies" (Barrios 2017: 155).

Affected residents had a positive perception of the media due to their documentation of the events, which is useful in letting others know that they need help. Although the increase in rainfall across several regions was mentioned in all national newspapers in the context of reports on health emergencies caused by the collapse of drainage systems in the North, the disaster was not yet headline news because the *huaicos* had not yet reached Lima.

In Lima, the most significant date was March 15, 2017, when the rivers overflowed. The most popular images were those showing individuals forming human chains to cross the street, the first home rescue efforts, the collapse of bridges and roofs, and the effects of severe water shortages in parts of Lima.

In Piura, the city was flooded and the most affected area was Catacaos, where residents also expressed a positive perception of the media presence. Actors remarked on the importance of media in generating a spirit of solidarity insofar as these images stirred feelings of collaboration, mobilizing social actors to engage in a spontaneous collective redistribution of resources.

Civil society and the private sector not only shared formal media, but also generated their own images, in the process generating the creation of solidarity campaigns to provide humanitarian aid.

In sum, the disaster itself became shared signs which the multiple actors interpreted from their respective social positions. The spirit of solidarity engendered an organic and spontaneous redistribution of resources from those most distant both socially and geographically in Lima, to those perceived as most vulnerable.

6. POST-DISASTER MITIGATION

In this section we explain how a spirit of solidarity emerges during a disaster, which we consider to be a carnival-like period. Then, we describe the dual process of material and symbolic supply and demand, set within a context of exchange explained by economic anthropology studies. We begin by explaining: (i) the supply of the actors who give aid, which we call the “solidarity sector”, (ii) the demand from the population affected, (iii) the demand from the solidarity sector, and (iv) and the supply from the affected population.

The spirit of solidarity, in which the media plays a key role, accounts for the mitigation process. As mentioned earlier, we propose an analogy between carnival and disaster since both are temporary spaces where the social order is altered and the predominant structures governing everyday life fade from view (Bakhtin 1984). The materialization of a spirit of solidarity transforms into humanitarian aid during the mitigation stage which as Oliver-Smith proposes results in the disappearance of divisions such as class and ethnicity. (Henry 2005: 12).

Once the supply of the solidarity sector and the demand of those involved in the mitigation has unfolded, actors engage in a process of material and symbolic exchange based on pre-existing social relations:

> These dimensions (of a social structural formation) express consistency and inconsistency, coherence and contradiction, cooperation and conflict, hegemony and resistance. They reveal the operation of physical, biological and social systems and their interaction among populations, groups, institutions and practices, and their concomitant sociocultural constructions (Oliver-Smith 1999, 20-21).

The unequal positions between actors and the negotiations they undertake also occur during mitigation. In this process various actors acquire legitimacy to get involved in the mitigation process, but they have limited knowledge of mitigation following major emergencies. In this context, those who receive are always indebted, despite returning at the symbolic level. However, this entails the creation of demand spaces that would not normally be open to these local populations.

Table 2: Symbolic and Material Supply and Demand

		Material	**Symbolic**
Supply	Private sector	GOODS AND SERVICES	SOLIDARITY
		Knowledge	Mission
		Collaboration	Social responsibility
		Relationships [these 3 rows are not material]	Civic duty
	Affected population	VULNERABIILTY [not Material]	WARM GLOW Social vulnerability Inequality
		Physical vulnerability [not Material]	
		Lack of resources	
Demand	Civil society State Private sector	ECONOMIC RESOURCES	RECOGNITION OF SOLIDARITY
		Tax exemption	Prestige Warm glow Marketing
		Financing of projects	
		Increase in budgets	
	Affected population	QUALITY OF LIFE	CIVIC RECOGNITION
		Goods and services	
		Economic activity	Social equity
		Infrastructure	

Supply from the Solidarity Sector

The awareness raised by media coverage and the use of social media created a powerful spirit of solidarity. But what were the motivations behind the solidarity? In the case of the state and its specialized organizations, part of their mission was to help citizens. In the case of the Universities and the private sector, aid was part of their perceived social responsibility.

However, we found that in the case of the non-institutionalized aid some individuals acted from a sense of civic duty, having seen situations in which the supply of humanitarian aid was not reaching the victims: "Then we said, 'hey, why don't we see what we can do ourselves?' because things were critical […] and I didn't see aid getting through" (ESPON2).

The material supply of humanitarian aid was heterogeneous in terms of the episodes of intervention, the management of information, the ways in which goods and services were distributed, and the exchange relations established with those affected. This supply was characterized by the establishment of intersectorial models in which each actor contributed based on its institutional strengths. With the exception of specialized entities, the only prior experience that most Universities and private sector organizations could draw on was volunteering or philanthropic efforts for the former, and social responsibility initiatives for the latter. Regarding the state, specialized institutions reorganized in response to the scale of the event, increasing their human and material resources.

> It wasn't just a case of aid coming from Lima, but of it getting to those who it had to get to, and this created a great deal of mobilization from us, we've had to coordinate, hold meetings, do several inventory reviews, and we did this along with the government ministries. (EMP3)

Demand from the Affected Population

The population most affected by the disaster was the subaltern group, since it was already excluded from the formal system. In the case of Lima, we observed that many of the affected individuals did not possess property titles. The disaster gave the affected population the opportunity to evidence their needs, especially for basic utilities, which meant pushing to place their demands on the agenda of central, regional, and municipal government authorities. Finally, the affected population called for recognition as citizens, and demanded social equity with other groups that had access to the state services and utilities: "What concerns me and the population of […] is formalization, so that they can have access to the housing programs that the state provides. […] With basic utilities, such as sewage, you live a different life" (DP5).

We observed that the divergences between material supply and demand stemmed from the fact that demand for goods and services associated with humanitarian aid are but one of the needs of those affected. In Lima and Piura, the disaster largely affected populations from the informal sector and rural communities. In both cases this meant that the needs of these populations were not confined to the effects of the disaster on their homes and extended to limited employment and access to basic utilities. Likewise, demand went beyond the immediate need for food, which made up the bulk of the supply. Those affected cite the cleanup operation, psychological services, fumigation, restoration of utilities, and the dynamism of the local economy, including agricultural work, among their demands. Besides these specific demands, the search for social stability and an improved quality of life frames their discourse in terms of relocation, acquisition of title deeds, and access to basic utilities and social programs:

> We had material things that were affected but where we ask for support is in agriculture because I want to stay in the home that I built with much sacrifice [...]. I want to rebuild, but the state can't give us everything because the country is big and has to look to many areas. (DP2)

Demand from the Solidarity Sector

The distinct actors that contributed to the mitigation effort demanded recognition in the form of solidarity, which assumed different manifestations. At the individual level, actors seeked warm glow, that is the satisfaction that comes from helping solve a problem in the context of a social injustice (Andreoni, 1989). On a collective level, many companies and philanthropic organizations expected legitimacy in their domains of action. Along similar lines, the business sector also expected its brands to be strengthened in the consumers' eyes: "Strengthening […] the presence of the company […].This was an opportunity […] to say "hey, we're here" (EMP2).

> To be able to awaken in people […] the desire to help others is really gratifying. When you see people at collection points […] asking how they can help, and they stay there helping. I mean, you see that in reality there is a whole deal of unity, then you say "how great that this type of thing can happen. (EMP1)

The interests of the solidarity sector depend on the type of organization, and even though they do not express it specifically, there are material benefits from participating in the mitigation effort. In the case of collective actors, we observed that the private sector receives donation certificates issued by philanthropic organizations which provides tax breaks in exchange for material contributions. "[The private sector] has played an important role because there were a lot of donations. They calculate the donation and request certificates of donation to offset against taxes with SUNAT [Peru's tax authority]. The difference between charity and solidarity […] in exchange for a certificate" (ESP3). In the case of philanthropic organizations, events of this type allow for the receipt of funds and financing for projects or activities in affected areas. In turn, the budgets of government institutions increased, particularly those for infrastructure and/or utility recovery works and projects. As for individual citizen actors, material demand was circumscribed to the experience of being in the affected area or to participating in certain activities. These experiences were made tangible through testimonials, photographs, and videos:

> [The local company] and [a financial entity] have also committed money to build 57 houses, modules of 24 square meters […]. Also, we have a project to restore the resources of 800 women in Catacaos who are involved in hat-making. (ESP1)

Supply from the Affected Population

On a symbolic level, we find that the affected population is on the margins of vulnerability and social inequality. As such, they supply a warm glow to the individuals who give them humanitarian aid.

> I'm motivated by the idea of knowing that if I have a roof, I'd like others to also have that, and if I can help them improve their situation, I'll do it. This makes me proud and if I can help someone, so much the better. (ESPON2)

The motivation to receive warm glow from the affected population can galvanize two types of practices, shaped by different interests and executed during different periods. First, there is so-called solidarity tourism. Secondly, there is the tangible medium-term relief efforts undertaken by groups of individuals. Solidarity tourism is characterized by an *in situ* visit for a short period, usually one day or a few hours, and by actions limited to distributing donations and taking photos with the individuals for posting on social media. In addition, there are initiatives that unfold over longer periods and depend on internal management processes such as financing. In both cases, participants obtain the direct experience of the reality of those affected, which raises awareness of the difficulties they face. In the case of more permanent aid initiatives, we note a logic in which inequality is subject to constant questioning, with the ultimate aim of denunciating inequalities.

> When we went to help, it raised a lot of questions among the volunteers […] such as why do I have the opportunity to go to university when other people are going through this disaster? The problem stems from the fact that we have to stop othering these people and start asking questions related to social justice, be horizontal, but also be careful with the use of the word "empowerment", since it is a two-way learning process. This experience not only leaves you satisfied, it also leaves you with voids and questions. (VOL2)

In the material sphere, natural disasters expose the physical vulnerability associated with the areas where people live, housing materials, and the shortage of resources to invest in reconstruction. The lack of material supplies for the affected population was the basis of the structural inequality in which relations between the affected group and providers of humanitarian aid, all framed by an asymmetrical exchange. This asymmetrical exchange creates conditions in which the actors that seek to mitigate the effects of the disaster enact a material supply that may prove excessive and poorly suited to the local context, based on a discourse of temporary solidarity and demand for warm glow and economic benefits. Also, it allows the affected population to express material demands beyond humanitarian aid related to improving quality of life and the pursuit of recognition as citizens.

7. FINAL REFLECTIONS: THE CREATION OF SPACES FOR NEGOTIATION

Each actor has their own agenda, evidenced in the multiple uses of the supply, demand, and flow of humanitarian aid in a post-disaster situation. In this regard, we note the types of demand presented by the actors in exchange for their participation in this process. As such, across all kinds of social phenomena actors are engaged in constant negotiations, and each has their rationale and strategies for their benefit. This variety of "uses" is reflected in the material and symbolic demands of those who give aid and those who receive it.

Table 3: Uses of Humanitarian Aid and Demands

Actors	State	Private Sector	Civil Society	Affected Population
Interests	Political and Economic	Economic	Economic and symbolic	Socioeconomic
Needs	Collaboration and negotiation	Marketing, CSR, Economic activity	Donations and civic lessons	Services and legal status
Opportunities	Populism and corruption	Tax reduction and public policies	Solidarity tourism	Aid

Oliver-Smith points to the disappearance of social stratifications during the immediate response to a disaster: “Once national and international aid appears, old divisions can reemerge and conflicts over access to resources begin again” (Henry 2005: 12). Therefore, during post-disaster mitigation there are two approaches that can be taken: one that reproduces or one that transforms the vulnerabilities exacerbated by the disaster. On the one hand, it is possible to opt for a focus on vertical relief, in which the solutions are external coming in many cases from the capital. These vertical relief solutions often fail to recognize the needs of the population, generate dependency, and culminate at the genesis of pre-disaster vulnerabilities.

Resilience will be generated in the population if the approach focuses on developing horizontal capacities and concentrates not only on temporary relief and immediate rehabilitation, but also on uses of local knowledge and capacities as a means of support during mitigation, thereby breaking the cycle of disasters and vulnerabilities (Barrios 2017). As part of this approach, it is important to develop the capabilities of those affected so that they can improve their living conditions by tackling three types of vulnerabilities: (i) physical and material, in terms of infrastructure and access to services; (ii) social and organizational, to create effective and legitimate institutions that result in support networks; and (iii) skills and attitudes (Pérez-Sales 2002).

Natural disasters are spaces characterized by social instability, unpredictable or variable demands, and lack of resources. In this context, material supply is characterized by the formation of partnerships, information management, and relations with the local affected communities. Humanitarian logistics from the state, the philanthropic and business sectors are more effective if based on the quality of the goods and services, at the required time and place, lowest cost, and optimum beneficiary satisfaction.

However, state, private sector, and government agencies have their own agendas that do not always correspond with people’s needs, particularly because many actors concentrate more on aid than on necessities. Each sector contributes to disaster mitigation based on its strengths, but we observed less divergence between supply and demand when organizations prioritized interaction with the population and focused their logistics on managing local needs.

Prevention, mitigation, and reconstruction are more effective when the perspectives of local institutions and populations are taken into account and local knowledge, capabilities, and needs are incorporated into disaster management. The questions posed by the disaster mitigation models lead us to discussions related to the humanitarian aid discourses. What motivates people and organizations to help? How do they perceive the affected populations? Is it charity, solidarity, or social justice?

The discourse in which vulnerabilities stem from a structure characterized by social inequality leads to questions of political and economic power, lack of social protection for the affected population, and their position in relation to the state, civil society, and the private sector. As such, the socioeconomic situation marginalizes those affected, but disaster frees spaces for inclusion on the agenda of demands that should extend beyond the period in which humanitarian aid is provided.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Andreoni, J. (1989). Giving with Impure Altruism: Applications to Charity and Ricardian Equivalence. *Journal of Political Economy* 97(6): 1447-1458.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1984). *Rabelais and his World*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Boulding, K. (1992). "Notes on a Theory of Philanthropy." In F. Dickinson, *Philanthropy and Public Policy,* Cambridge, MA: NBER: 57-72.

Cannon, T. (1994). "Vulnerability Analysis and the Explanation of 'Natural Disasters'. In Varley Ann: *Disasters, Development and Environment.* Pp. 13-30

Graeber, D. (2001). *Toward an Anthropological Theory of Value: The False Coin of our Own Dreams.* New York: Palgrave

Henry, D. (2005) Anthropological Contributions to the Study of Disasters. In D. McEntire and W. Blanchard, eds. *Disciplines, Disasters and Emergency Management: The Convergence and Divergence of Concepts, Issues and Trends from Research Literature.* Emittsburg, MD: Federal Emergency Management Agency.

Instituto Nacional de Defensa Civil (INDECI). (2010) *Terminología de Defensa Civil - Perú*. Lima: INDECI. Dirección Nacional de Educación y Capacitación.

Killen, M., & Smetana, J. (Eds.). (2005). *Handbook of Moral Development*. Psychology Press.

Levi-Strauss, C. (1969). *The Elementary Structures of Kinship.* Beacon Press. Boston.

Malinowski, B. *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Maskrey, Andrew (ed.). (1993). Los desastres no son naturales. Lima: La Red.

Mauss, M (1990). *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies.* London: Routledge Press.

Oliver-Smith, O. (2009) "Anthropology and the Political Economy of Disasters". In Eric C. Jones and Arthur D. Murphy (eds.), *The Political Economy of Hazards and Disasters*. Lapham, MD: AltaMira Press: 11-28

-----. (1996) Anthropological Research on Hazards and Disasters. In *Annual Review of Anthropology* 25: 303-328.

Oliver-Smith A., and Susannah M. Hoffman. (1999) "What is a Disaster? Anthropological Perspectives on a Persistent Question." In Oliver-Smith and Susannah M. Hoffman *The Angry Earth: Disaster in Anthropological Perspective*. London: Routledge: 18-34,

-----. (2002) Why Anthropologists Should Study Disasters. In: *Catastrophe & Culture; The Anthropology of Disaster*. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press. Pp. 3- 22.

Parry, J. (1986). “The Gift, The Indian Gift, and the “Indian Gill”, Man 21. 453 47).

Pérez-Sales, P. (2002). La concepción psicosocial y comunitaria del trabajo en catástrofes. Nuevas perspectivas en el marco de la elaboración de un programa internacional de formación de formadores. *Cuadernos de psiquiatría comunitaria* 2(1), pp. 6-17.

Portocarrero et. al. (2005). *La Iglesia Católica como proveedora de servicios sociales: mitos y realidades*. Documento de trabajo N°69. Lima: Centro de Investigación de la Universidad del Pacífico.

RPP Noticias. (22 de marzo del 2017). Así se organizan los ministros para atender las zonas afectadas por los huaicos. *RPP*, http://rpp.pe/politica/gobierno/asi-se-organizan-los-ministros-para-atender-las-zonas-afectadas-por-los-huaicos-noticia-1038713.

Sahlins, M (1972) Stone Age Economics. Chicago: Aldine & Atherton, Inc.

Sillitoe, P. (2006). “Why Spheres of Exchange.” *Ethnology* 45(1): 16

Strathern. H. (1988). *The Gender of the Guilt.* University of California Press. Berkeley

Sulek, M. (2010). On the Modern Meaning of Philanthropy. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, Vol. *39*, N°2, pp. 193-212.

Weiner. A. (1992). *Inalienable Possessions.* University of California Press, Berkeley