



ROBIN SPENCE AND EMILY SO

**WHY DO BUILDINGS
COLLAPSE IN
EARTHQUAKES?**

BUILDING FOR SAFETY IN SEISMIC AREAS

WILEY Blackwell

Table of Contents

[Cover](#)

[Title Page](#)

[Copyright Page](#)

[Acknowledgements](#)

[1 Introduction](#)

[1.1 Earthquakes - An Underrated Hazard](#)

[1.2 Earthquakes, Buildings, People](#)

[1.3 The Authors' Experience of Earthquake Risk Assessment](#)

[1.4 Aims of This Book](#)

[1.5 Outline of the Book](#)

[References](#)

[2 How Do Buildings Behave in Earthquakes?](#)

[2.1 Learning from Earthquakes](#)

[2.2 Significant Earthquakes Since 2000](#)

[2.3 What Can We Learn from These Significant Earthquakes?](#)

[2.4 Earthquake Losses in Rich and Poor Countries](#)

[2.5 Are Earthquake Losses Decreasing Over Time?](#)

[References](#)

[3 How are Buildings Constructed in Earthquake Zones?](#)

[3.1 Introduction](#)

[3.2 Built Form, Climate and Earthquake Resistance](#)

[3.3 Building Construction Types by Earthquake Zone](#)

[3.4 Summary](#)

References

4 What Happens in an Earthquake?

4.1 What is an Earthquake?

4.2 Volcanic Earthquakes and Induced Seismicity

4.3 How Earthquakes Travel through Different Media

4.4 Secondary Hazards

4.5 Compound Threats

References

5 How Do Different Forms of Construction Behave in Earthquakes?

5.1 Introduction: Range and Classification of Building Construction Types

5.2 Masonry Construction

5.3 Reinforced Concrete Construction

5.4 Timber Frame Construction

5.5 Steel Frame Construction

5.6 Comparing the Vulnerability of Different Construction Types

References

6 How is the Population Affected?

6.1 Causes of Earthquake Casualties

6.2 Casualties due to Building Collapses

6.3 Survivability of an Occupant in a Building

6.4 Other Causes of Casualties

6.5 How Can We Estimate the Number of Injured and Killed in an Earthquake?

6.6 Estimating Fatalities Due to Building Collapses

6.7 Estimating Casualties from Secondary Hazards and Cascading Effects

[6.8 The Way Forward](#)

[References](#)

[7 How Can Buildings Be Improved?](#)

[7.1 Introduction](#)

[7.2 Design of Engineered Buildings](#)

[7.3 Strengthening Existing Buildings](#)

[7.4 Building for Safety Programmes](#)

[7.5 Public Awareness of Earthquake Risk: Creating a Safety Culture](#)

[References](#)

[8 Successes and Failures in Earthquake Protection:](#)

[8.1 Introduction: The survey](#)

[8.2 High Achievers](#)

[8.3 Limited Achievers](#)

[8.4 Continuing and Growing Risks](#)

[8.5 Country Comparison of Unsafe Structures](#)

[8.6 Comparison of the Country Groups](#)

[Acknowledgements](#)

[References](#)

[9 The Way Forward: What Part Can Different Actors Play?](#)

[9.1 International Agencies and Global Initiatives](#)

[9.2 Governments](#)

[9.3 Businesses and Organisations](#)

[9.4 Homeowners and Individual Citizens](#)

[9.5 Scientists and Engineers](#)

[9.6 NGOs](#)

[9.7 Insurers](#)

[9.8 The Way Forward](#)

[References](#)

[Index](#)

[End User License Agreement](#)

List of Tables

Chapter 2

[Table 2.1 Significant earthquakes worldwide since 2000, ordered by number of ...](#)

[Table 2.2 Distribution by World Bank Income Groups of deaths and damage costs...](#)

Chapter 3

[Table 3.1 The five primary classes of climatic zones in the Köppen-Geiger cla...](#)

Chapter 5

[Table 5.1 Principal classes of buildings and brief descriptions.](#)

[Table 5.2 Brief definitions of damage states for masonry and reinforced concr...](#)

[Table 5.3 Proportion of buildings of each vulnerability class expected to suf...](#)

Chapter 6

[Table 6.1 Table showing what happened to the occupants inside the two collaps...](#)

[Table 6.2 An excerpt of slope failure consequence data triggered by the Mw7.9...](#)

[Table 6.3 Sample of judgement-based fatality rates for 15 different building ...](#)

Chapter 7

[Table 7.1 Performance objectives set out in the new revision of Eurocode 8.](#)

[Table 7.2 School collapses in earthquakes yielding multiple casualties 2001-2...](#)

Chapter 9

[Table 9.1 Most costly events since 2000, and proportion of insurance cover.](#)

List of Illustrations

Chapter 2

[Figure 2.1 Stone masonry building in the Kutch district damaged in the Bhuj ...](#)

[Figure 2.2 Brick masonry building with reinforced concrete floors damaged in...](#)

[Figure 2.3 Reinforced concrete building in the Kutch district and typical da...](#)

[Figure 2.4 Damage to a reinforced concrete building in Bhuj, and view of the...](#)

[Figure 2.5 High-resolution satellite imagery of the centre of Bam taken \(lef...](#)

[Figure 2.6 Failure of adobe dwelling in the Bam earthquake.](#)

[Figure 2.7 Damage caused by the 26 December 2004 tsunami at Unawatuna, Sri L...](#)

[Figure 2.8 Damage caused by the 26 December 2004 tsunami at Unawatuna, Sri L...](#)

[Figure 2.9 2005 Kashmir earthquake: damage in the Muzaffarabad district. Aer...](#)

[Figure 2.10 2005 Kashmir earthquake: damage in the Muzaffarabad district. Da...](#)

[Figure 2.11 Collapse of house of traditional construction, Yogyakarta earthq...](#)

[Figure 2.12 Partially collapsed five-storey masonry middle school building i...](#)

[Figure 2.13 Typical damage to low-rise informal building in Port au-Prince....](#)

[Figure 2.14 Typical damage to pre-1930s masonry buildings in Christchurch.](#)

[Figure 2.15 Typical damage in tsunami-affected region. Timber frame building...](#)

[Figure 2.16 Typical damage in tsunami-affected region. Steel frame building ...](#)

[Figure 2.17 Typical damage to masonry construction in urban areas of Nepal....](#)

[Figure 2.18 Typical damage to masonry construction in urban areas of Nepal....](#)

[Figure 2.19 Earthquake damage and fatalities by country 2000-2019, using a l...](#)

[Figure 2.20 Global earthquake mortality rate since 1900 \(deaths per 100 000 ...](#)

Chapter 3

[Figure 3.1 Köppen-Geiger climate classification: boundaries of the major cli...](#)

[Figure 3.2 Timber-framed house with lightweight walls and roof in warm humid...](#)

[Figure 3.3 Village housing in the hot-dry area of Iran. Open courtyards, clo...](#)

[Figure 3.4 Estimated seismic resistance index for buildings designed with ap...](#)

[Figure 3.5 The GEM global seismic hazard map with the 10 zones identified in...](#)

[Figure 3.6 Distribution of urban residential building types by 10 seismic re...](#)

[Figure 3.7 Reinforced concrete dual frame and shear-wall apartment building ...](#)

[Figure 3.8 Stone masonry urban houses in Italy.](#)

[Figure 3.9 Rural adobe house in Iran.](#)

[Figure 3.10 Reinforced concrete frame apartment building in Turkey.](#)

[Figure 3.11 Dhajji Dewari building in Srinagar, Kashmir.](#)

[Figure 3.12 Qionglong building in Sichuan Province.](#)

[Figure 3.13 Damaged reinforced concrete frame building in Dujianyang after 2...](#)

[Figure 3.14 Ordinary urban wooden housing in Japan 1970s and 1980s.](#)

[Figure 3.15 Typical form of traditional shinkabe timber frame house used in ...](#)

[Figure 3.16 Confined masonry house in Bengkulu, Indonesia, 2007.](#)

[Figure 3.17 Traditional masonry house in Yogyakarta, Indonesia, 2006.](#)

[Figure 3.18 Typical New Zealand wood-frame house.](#)

[Figure 3.19 Soft-storey damage to older wood-frame house in 2011 Christchurch...](#)

[Figure 3.20 Confined masonry apartment buildings in Chile.](#)

[Figure 3.21 Concrete shear wall apartment building in Chile.](#)

[Figure 3.22 Distribution of housing by construction type in Zone 8 countries...](#)

[Figure 3.23 Reinforced concrete frame construction in Mexico.](#)

[Figure 3.24 Confined masonry housing in Guatemala 2019.](#)

[Figure 3.25 Bahareque reconstruction after the 1986 earthquake in El Salvador...](#)

[Figure 3.26 Typical wood-frame single-family housing in California.](#)

[Figure 3.27 Wall framing system used in wood-frame housing construction in C...](#)

Chapter 4

[Figure 4.1 Diagrams showing different types of earthquakes.](#)

[Figure 4.2 Þingvellir National Park in Iceland, where the Eurasian and North...](#)

[Figure 4.3 The San Andreas fault in California, USA.](#)

[Figure 4.4 An irrigation tunnel \(qanat\) has been dug through alluvium toward...](#)

[Figure 4.5 Diagrams showing \(TOP\) relative peak bedrock ground accelerations...](#)

[Figure 4.6 Figure showing the natural periods of structures of different hei...](#)

[Figure 4.7 This diagram shows the most damaged types of buildings in the 198...](#)

[Figure 4.8 Clean-up operations of damage caused by liquefaction in Christchu...](#)

[Figure 4.9 Disaggregation of shaking and secondary effects economic costs fr...](#)

[Figure 4.10 The massive landslide that severely damaged the highway and coll...](#)

[Figure 4.11 View of the landslides in the affected area caused by the Mw6.6 ...](#)

[Figure 4.12 Landslide in the town of Beichuan after the Mw7.9 Wenchuan earth...](#)

[Figure 4.13 Image showing the quake lakes that formed along the Mianyuan Riv...](#)

[Figure 4.14 Map showing the areas at risk from tsunamis around the world....](#)

[Figure 4.15 Fire following the Mw6.9 Kobe earthquake in 1995 in Japan.](#)

Chapter 5

[Figure 5.1 Traditional adobe construction in Iran.](#)

[Figure 5.2 Stone masonry construction with roofs of stone tiles, India, Cham...](#)

[Figure 5.3 Progressive damage states for random rubble stone masonry buildin...](#)

[Figure 5.4 Impulse Table testing of stone masonry houses in Eastern Turkey: ...](#)

[Figure 5.5 Traditional unreinforced brick masonry.](#)

[Figure 5.6 Progressive damage in unreinforced masonry construction; top left...](#)

[Figure 5.7 Wall collapse in masonry building with timber upper floor and roof...](#)

[Figure 5.8 Confined masonry construction, showing typical locations of confinement...](#)

[Figure 5.9 Confined masonry construction in Chile: detail of wall-column intersection...](#)

[Figure 5.10 Reinforced masonry construction. Typical reinforcing details.](#)

[Figure 5.11 Reinforced masonry using concrete block masonry in Canada.](#)

[Figure 5.12 Reinforced masonry construction for urban housing in Colombia, 2000...](#)

[Figure 5.13 Forms of reinforced construction. From left: concrete frame, infill...](#)

[Figure 5.14 Soft-storey collapse of reinforced concrete building, Kocaeli earthquake...](#)

[Figure 5.15 Collapse of reinforced concrete shear wall structure, Concepcion...](#)

[Figure 5.16 Modern Dhajji Dewari construction.](#)

[Figure 5.17 Timber stud-wall construction - general form and detail of corner...](#)

[Figure 5.18 Typical forms of damage to timber stud-wall structures. From top...](#)

[Figure 5.19 Damaged timber-framed building in Christchurch, New Zealand, in 2011...](#)

[Figure 5.20 Damaged recently built timber-frame building in Mashiki Town, in 2011...](#)

[Figure 5.21 Forms of steel frame construction. From left: moment frame, brac...](#)

[Figure 5.22 Collapsed 21-storey steel-frame Pino Suarez building, Mexico Cit...](#)

[Figure 5.23 Latino American Tower, Mexico City, in 2015. This landmark steel...](#)

[Figure 5.24 Details of failed connections in steel-framed buildings, 1995 Ko...](#)

[Figure 5.25 Mean probability of a building of weak masonry exceeding each of...](#)

[Figure 5.26 Vulnerability for building classes A-F, showing expected composi...](#)

[Figure 5.27 Most likely vulnerability range \(solid lines\) and possible vulne...](#)

Chapter 6

[Figure 6.1 Chart showing the causes of deaths from the casualty database. Bu...](#)

[Figure 6.2 Flow-chart showing the different causal factors to consider when ...](#)

[Figure 6.3 GHI's evidence-based guidance describes the process to use and th...](#)

[Figure 6.4 Figure showing collapsed buildings in Balakot, Kashmir, after the...](#)

[Figure 6.5 Sketches showing the movement of residents and their furniture im...](#)

[Figure 6.6 Postulated changes in survival rate of occupants in different col...](#)

[Figure 6.7 Flowchart showing the Cambridge casualty estimation model in coll...](#)

[Figure 6.8 Catastrophic collapse of the five-storey Pyne Gould Corporation \(...\)](#)

[Figure 6.9 Summary of the information provided by PAGER in its fifth release...](#)

[Figure 6.10 Basic paradigm of linear regression models for earthquake loss a...](#)

[Figure 6.11 Engineering-based earthquake loss estimation approach.](#)

[Figure 6.12 Flow diagram showing a multi-severity casualty model framework p...](#)

[Figure 6.13 Collapsed buildings where a few may have managed to escape or ge...](#)

[Figure 6.14 Photograph showing the nine collapsed buildings of the WJ Comple...](#)

[Figure 6.15 Diagram showing the physical locations of patients registered in...](#)

[Figure 6.16 Sketches showing the differences in indoor volumetric reduction ...](#)

[Figure 6.17 Casualty ratios for different collapse patterns of typical Japan...](#)

[Figure 6.18 Sketches of different collapse mechanisms of a midrise reinforce...](#)

[Figure 6.19 Relationship between fatality rates and IVR.](#)

[Figure 6.20 Examples of photographs used for IVR analysis.](#)

[Figure 6.21 Examples of photographs analysed for the peril of falling debris...](#)

[Figure 7.1 Retrofitted elementary school in Istanbul under ISMEP programme....](#)

[Figure 7.2 School building in Nepal, before and after strengthening, 1998....](#)

[Figure 7.3 Use of modified mould for rammed earth construction in Ecuador, 1...](#)

[Figure 7.4 'Alien technology' in reconstruction. Reconstructed houses in Ace...](#)

[Figure 7.5 Graduate of the NSET mason training programme applies lessons lea...](#)

[Figure 7.6 Artisan skill up-gradation programme in Gujarat, India, 2019.](#)

[Figure 7.7 Drop, Cover and Hold On graphic from the Great California Shakeou...](#)

[Figure 7.8 Extract from Tokyo Metropolitan Government Manual on Earthquake P...](#)

[Figure 7.9 Shock-table demonstration to convince people of the effectiveness...](#)

Chapter 8

[Figure 8.1 Soft storey timber apartment block in San Francisco, retrofitted ...](#)

[Figure 8.2 Reduction in death rate \(proportion of population killed in the z...](#)

[Figure 8.3 Damaged reinforced concrete building in Christchurch after 2011 e...](#)

[Figure 8.4 Reinforced concrete building on pilotis \(Athens, Greece\). This fo...](#)

[Figure 8.5 CASE post-earthquake housing system used in L'Aquila earthquake....](#)

[Figure 8.6 Pre-1977 reinforced concrete apartment block in Bucharest, showin...](#)

[Figure 8.7 Strengthened school building, the İhsan Hayriye Hürdoğan Elementa...](#)

[Figure 8.8 Damage to low-rise masonry building in Newcastle, 1989 - still a ...](#)

[Figure 8.9 Partially collapsed five-storey restrained masonry building in th...](#)

[Figure 8.10 Strengthened University building in Bogota, Colombia.](#)

[Figure 8.11 Techniques for strengthening non-engineered buildings in Indones...](#)

[Figure 8.12 Partially collapsed building in Ahmedabad, 230 km from epicentre...](#)

[Figure 8.13 Country comparison of estimated proportion of unsafe structures,...](#)

Chapter 9

[Figure 9.1 Diagram showing the seven targets of the Sendai Framework for Dis...](#)

[Figure 9.2 Visual showing the contributions by GEM's OpenQuake program.](#)

[Figure 9.3 Cover page of the Homecoming cartoon, produced as part of a joint...](#)

[Figure 9.4 The Japanese earthquake intensity scale depicted as a series of c...](#)

[Figure 9.5 A furoshiki containing useful tips and information on disaster ri...](#)

[Figure 9.6 Photographs taken of the live demonstrations of the earthquake de...](#)

[Figure 9.7 Pablo Suarez explaining 'Risk and Time: A Data Sculpture on Natur...](#)

Why Do Buildings Collapse in Earthquakes?

Building for Safety in Seismic Areas

Robin Spence

Emeritus Professor of Architectural Engineering and Fellow of Magdalene College, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom

Director, Cambridge Architectural Research Ltd, United Kingdom

Emily So

Reader in Architectural Engineering and Fellow of Magdalene College, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom

Director, Cambridge Architectural Research Ltd, United Kingdom

WILEY Blackwell

his edition first published 2021
© 2021 John Wiley & Sons Ltd

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, except as permitted by law. Advice on how to obtain permission to reuse material from this title is available at <http://www.wiley.com/go/permissions>.

The right of Robin Spence and Emily So to be identified as the authors of this work has been asserted in accordance with law.

Registered Offices

John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 111 River Street, Hoboken, NJ 07030, USA
John Wiley & Sons Ltd, The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 8SQ, UK

Editorial Office

9600 Garsington Road, Oxford, OX4 2DQ, UK

For details of our global editorial offices, customer services, and more information about Wiley products visit us at www.wiley.com.

Wiley also publishes its books in a variety of electronic formats and by print-on-demand. Some content that appears in standard print versions of this book may not be available in other formats.

Limit of Liability/Disclaimer of Warranty

In view of ongoing research, equipment modifications, changes in governmental regulations, and the constant flow of information relating to the use of experimental reagents, equipment, and devices, the reader is urged to review and evaluate the information provided in the package insert or instructions for each chemical, piece of equipment, reagent, or device for, among other things, any changes in the instructions or indication of usage and for added warnings and precautions. While the publisher and author have used their best efforts in preparing this work, they make no representations or warranties with respect to the accuracy or completeness of the contents of this work and specifically disclaim all warranties, including without limitation any implied warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose. No warranty may be created or extended by sales representatives, written sales materials or promotional statements for this work. The fact that an organization, website, or product is referred to in this work as a citation and/or potential source of further information does not mean that the publisher and author endorse the information or services the organization, website, or product may provide or recommendations it may make. This work is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering professional services. The advice and strategies contained herein may not be suitable for your situation. You should consult with a specialist where appropriate. Further, readers should be aware that websites listed in this work may have changed or disappeared between when this work was written and when it is read. Neither the publisher nor author shall be liable for any loss of profit or any other

commercial damages, including but not limited to special, incidental, consequential, or other damages.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication data

Names: Spence, R. J. S. (Robin J. S.), author. | So, Emily, (K. M.), author.

Title: Why do buildings collapse in earthquakes? : building for safety in seismic areas / Robin Spence and Emily So.

Description: Hoboken, NJ : Wiley-Blackwell, 2021.

Identifiers: LCCN 2020053851 (print) | LCCN 2020053852 (ebook) | ISBN 9781119619420 (hardback) | ISBN 9781119619451 (adobe pdf) | ISBN 9781119619468 (epub)

Subjects: LCSH: Buildings--Earthquake effects. | Earthquake resistant design.

Classification: LCC TH1095 .S65 2021 (print) | LCC TH1095 (ebook) | DDC 693.8/52-dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2020053851>

LC ebook record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2020053852>

Cover Design: Wiley

Cover Image: © Professor Mauricio Beltran

Acknowledgements

We have been generously supported in the preparation of this book by many friends and colleagues, who have read and commented on parts of the text, provided suggestions and illustrations and have been a valuable source of ideas and inspiration over many years.

We would like first to thank Yutaka Ohta whose dedication to earthquake risk reduction and foresight has been a constant motivation to us both. We would also like to acknowledge the late Laurie Baker and the late Paul Oliver, whose understanding of vernacular architecture and its value has been an inspiration for us.

In the preparation of this book, we greatly appreciate the comments and advice on particular chapters from Andrew Coburn, Antonios Pomonis, Svetlana Brzev, Edmund Booth, Mary Comerio and Rashmin Gunasekera.

We appreciate also the cooperation of Rajendra and Rupal Desai, Amod Dixit, Lucy Jones Toshitaka Katada, Randolph Langenbach, Tracy Monk and Edward Ng in reviewing our profiles of them and their work.

We thank our colleagues Hannah Baker and Weifeng Victoria Lee for help in the preparation of maps and diagrams used, as well as for reviewing parts of the manuscript, Yue Zhu for her help with preparation of a number of the images used, and Sandra Martinez-Cuevas for supplying the diagram of fragility curves used in [Chapter 5](#), based on her analysis of the Cambridge Earthquake Impact Database (CEQID).

We especially appreciate the painstaking work of Charlotte Airey in developing the building construction type and damage mode drawings used in [Chapters 5](#) and [6](#).

We also greatly appreciate the contributions made by the global panel of experts who responded to the surveys of national successes and failures reported in [Chapter 8](#). An acknowledgement to them is given at the end of that chapter. We would like to acknowledge the help of our colleagues at EEFIT, to Allan Brereton and the committee for their help in making available appropriate illustrations. And to our colleagues at Cambridge Architectural Research and the Department of Architecture at the University of Cambridge for their support of the book.

Finally, we would like to express our personal thanks to our families. *From Emily*: my gratitude to Alex and Clara for being the perfect lockdown husband and baby during this challenging year. *From Robin*: my thanks as always to Bridget for her unfailing support and wise counsel through this, and so many projects in the past.

1

Introduction: Why This Book

1.1 Earthquakes - An Underrated Hazard

Earthquakes have been a threat to human habitation throughout history, but until relatively recently, their causes were poorly understood. In the pre-scientific era, they were commonly ascribed to divine intervention. By the time of the Lisbon earthquake in 1755, there were many who understood that earthquakes had natural causes, but the mechanism remained unexplained, and the supernatural explanation was widely proclaimed, especially from church pulpits (Udias and Lopez Arroyo [2009](#)). And over 150 years later, according to observer Axel Munthe ([1929](#)), the inhabitants of Messina, destroyed by a massive M7 earthquake in 1908, cried 'Castigo di Dio' ('punishment from God').

Only with the development of plate tectonics in the twentieth century has it become understood that earthquakes are associated with active faults in the earth's crust, with most of the largest occurring at the boundaries of the tectonic plates as they interact with each other (as explained in [Chapter 4](#)). We can now identify with some precision whereabouts on the earth's surface large earthquakes will occur. From measurements of the movements at plate boundaries, and from the historical record, we can make estimates of the largest magnitude event which can occur on a fault section, and approximately, the frequency with which events of different magnitude will occur. But the largest events commonly

have return periods of several centuries or more (Bilham [2009](#)), and science is still unable to predict, even to within a few decades, when the next large earthquake on any fault section will occur.

There is some evidence that the global earthquake mortality rate (deaths per 100 000 of the world's population) has been rather gradually reducing over the last century or so. But it is a very slow rate of improvement, and the variation from decade to decade is very large. The first decade of the twenty-first century was a bad one, with several earthquakes resulting in more than 50 000 deaths. Yet, over the same timescale, death rates from many other causes, such as infectious diseases and road accidents, have been very significantly reduced (ourworldindata.org/causes-of-death 2020). This has been made possible with the introduction of public health programmes and protection measures, backed by government legislation and action programmes, but supported and implemented by the general public. Such programmes could similarly be applied to reduce earthquake risk, but in many countries most at risk, this has not so far happened. Why is this?

The greatest impact from earthquakes is nearly always the damage to buildings (and other built artefacts - roads, buildings, dams) from the ground shaking caused by the propagation of the earthquakes' waves through the earth's crust, which can result in destruction over a wide area. Over the twentieth century, understanding the nature of ground motion and the way in which this is transmitted through structures has enabled engineers to develop ways to build buildings which are able to withstand the expected ground shaking with limited damage. This understanding, gradually increasing through the development of structural engineering theory and practice, combined with detailed field investigation of the effects of successive earthquakes

has enabled codes of practice for building design to be developed, and these are nowadays mandatory for new construction in most cities of the world.

But, as the world's population grows, and urbanisation increases in pace, there are many places where new buildings are being constructed without any reference to good engineering practice for earthquake resistance.

This is partly because those responsible for constructing the new buildings are unaware or possibly unconcerned that a large earthquake may occur any time soon, and building controls are lax. It is also due to lack of education, information, skill and sense of urgency on the part of builders and building owners (Bilham [2009](#); Moullier and Kringold [2015](#)).

In rural areas of many poor countries, buildings are largely constructed using highly vulnerable materials such as adobe and unreinforced masonry. Poverty and lack of understanding, combined with a vast demand for new dwelling places, are thus fuelling the creation of a series of future disaster scenarios (Musson [2012](#)).

In order to understand why buildings collapse in earthquakes and to find out what we can do about it, we must look at each of the three ingredients of the problem: earthquakes, buildings and people.

1.2 Earthquakes, Buildings, People

One of the reasons why earthquake risk does not get acted on is because it is not well understood by the public. Although the likely locations of large earthquakes are now known, the timescale of their recurrence is very long, and for most people at risk the last occurrence of 'the big one' for which they need to be prepared is many centuries ago, often before the present cities existed. People may be

aware that they are living in an earthquake zone but fail to appreciate the possibility of events much larger than recent experience. In 2008, a modelling exercise, the California Shakeout, was done to support earthquake protection action for Southern California, which is threatened by a large earthquake on the San Andreas Fault (Jones and Benthian [2011](#)). Lucy Jones, who led the modelling team speaks of the 'normalisation bias, the human inability to see beyond ourselves, so that what we experience now or in our recent memory becomes our definition of what is possible'. Seismologists had identified much greater earthquakes in the past than those in recent memory, but the last great earthquake on that section of the San Andreas Fault was in 1688. The modelling exercise, based on a plausible, but by no means worst-case scenario magnitude 7.8 earthquake on the southern section of the San Andreas Fault, showed that around 1500 buildings would collapse, and 300 000 would be severely damaged, causing around 1800 deaths and \$213 billion losses. Fires would break out and could become uncontrollable. And the disruption caused to roads and pipelines would cause massive disruption to business, lasting for months. This modelling exercise led to a huge public awareness and preparation programme which has resulted in much reduced risks in California over the past decade.

But considerably more devastating consequences face many of the growing cities in other earthquake zones, particularly in Asia. The southern edge of the Eurasian Plate, stretching from the Mediterranean to China, and including Myanmar and Indonesia, is responsible for 85% of the world's historic earthquake deaths. And this is a region in which cities are today growing rapidly both in size and in number, fuelled by global population rise and urbanisation. Seismologist Roger Musson points to the risk in Tehran, today a city of 12 million people. The last major

earthquake on the North Tehran Fault, passing close to the city centre, was in 1834 at a time when Tehran was a small town: an earthquake of $M > 7$ hitting Tehran today could cause as many as 1.4 million deaths. And seismologist Roger Bilham ([2009](#)) has estimated that a direct hit on a megacity (>10 million population) somewhere in the world once a century is now statistically probable, with a possible death toll exceeding one million, because of the combination of hazardous locations and structural vulnerability. The World Bank estimates that three billion people will live in substandard housing by 2030. By 2050, the UN projects that two-thirds of the world's population, around 7 billion people, will live in urban areas.

Unfortunately, because the threat to each city is seen as remote, protection from earthquakes is given a lower priority than other issues. Few households prioritise spending on safety from future earthquakes above pressing immediate concerns, like providing extra space or better comfort, unless required to do so by regulation. And elected governments tend to look for expenditure programmes and new regulations which will give returns within their current tenure of office, despite evidence that money spent on disaster mitigation often avoids much greater losses over time. For this reason, general development expenditure is given priority over disaster risk mitigation. And even within that part of government budgets devoted to natural disasters, those from other natural hazards are often given priority. Windstorm and flood damage are more immediate risks, particularly as these are becoming worse as a result of climate change.

Optimistically and opportunistically, the climate change agenda has provided a global focus on resilience of communities to natural threats. It is recognised that especially in developing countries, cycles of disasters have depleted decades of progress made in development. The

deaths and destruction from earthquakes are preventable. Whilst the hazard itself is natural, the disasters are largely man-made, and completely preventable with proactive interventions.

1.3 The Authors' Experience of Earthquake Risk Assessment

The overall aim of our work over four decades at the University of Cambridge's Department of Architecture and at Cambridge Architectural Research Ltd has been to understand the vulnerability of buildings to earthquakes globally, in order to estimate the damage which is likely to occur from future earthquakes. This knowledge can be used to provide a sound basis to improve the building stock, and reduce damage, loss of life and disruption from future earthquakes. We have developed our knowledge of building vulnerability through a series of collaborative research projects, supported by the European Union and the UK Government and Research Councils, and through work for individual cities, companies managing portfolios of buildings and insurance companies. But the primary source of our knowledge and experience of buildings' behaviour in earthquakes has been post-earthquake field missions. We have been involved in EEFIT, the UK's Earthquake Engineering Field Investigation team, since it was founded in 1982, and have between us participated in field missions in Japan, Italy, Turkey, India, Pakistan, Peru, Indonesia, China, New Zealand and the South Pacific. The detailed nature and aims of these field missions are discussed in [Chapter 2](#): but an essential element in all cases is to describe and document the types of building affected and the types of damage observed.

Successive projects have examined in detail the problems of particular regions. In the 1980s, we examined the

traditional stone-masonry construction of rural Eastern Turkey and conducted shake-table tests in Ankara to investigate simple ways to reduce their vulnerability, the cause of many deaths in earthquakes of the previous decade. In the 1990s, we investigated the options for protecting historic European cities such as Lisbon and Naples from likely future earthquake damage, and we looked at the performance of buildings which had been strengthened following previous earthquake damage. We also developed a method for assessing human casualties from earthquakes based on the level of building damage, and with colleagues in New Zealand applied this to the city of Wellington.

Since 2000 we have worked with others to develop loss modelling approaches to estimating damage and casualties, on a city-scale (in EU collaborative projects), for insurance companies, or with the US Geological Survey, for rapid post-disaster damage assessment. And we have applied our knowledge to assist organisations with large portfolios of buildings to identify those which should be upgraded.

We have also worked with teams developing new ways to assess earthquake damage using remote sensing, and led the team developing the Earthquake Consequences Database (So et al. [2012](#)) for the Global Earthquake Model (GEM). And we have applied similar approaches to assessing vulnerability and damage to buildings from other natural hazards such as windstorms and volcanic eruptions. All this work is described in detail in technical project reports and published papers, referred to in the chapters which follow.

1.4 Aims of This Book

The title of this book asks a question: Why do buildings collapse in earthquakes? In exploring the many layers of

the answer to this question, and the many answers in differing contexts across the world, we want to demonstrate that this is not just, not even primarily, a technical question, but also a social, organisational and even political question. In this book, we look at buildings not only as assemblages of materials and components put together to achieve certain functional ends, but also as products of a society and a culture. We aim to explain the physical reasons why buildings fail to withstand earthquakes, but also to attempt to understand the social, economic and political reasons why earthquake disasters continue to happen. And through this combined understanding, we want to point to the actions that can be taken to improve seismic safety, and identify who should be taking them.

With this aim, we hope to reach a wider audience than those interested in the purely technical aspects of earthquake protection, who would prefer a non-mathematical approach to the subject, with limited technical detail. Thus, the book is designed to be read by all those interested in the consequences of earthquakes, or concerned for their own safety as occupants of buildings in earthquake areas. It is also intended for those who have responsibility for ensuring the safety of others in earthquakes, whether as government officials, political representatives, building owners or managers of businesses. The book is written for a non-technical readership, but will also be of interest to all those professionally involved in disaster preparedness and earthquake engineering, as well as to students and practitioners of architecture and engineering seeking a broad overview of the consequences of earthquakes for buildings.

Some readers of the book will live in an earthquake zone, in which case they will want to know if their homes or