**To what extent do the effects of a tectonic hazard vary between areas of contrasting wealth? Use one or more named examples in your answer. (9 marks)**

The effects of tectonic hazards can vary significantly between areas of contrasting wealth. Chile 2010 and Nepal 2015 earthquakes are two examples of tectonic hazards that affected countries of different levels of economic development.

On the one hand in Chile, despite the magnitude 8.8 earthquake, the number of casualties was relatively low, only 500, and the damage to infrastructure was minimal. In contrast, the Nepal earthquake, despite being of a lower magnitude of 7,1, caused significant loss of life of over 9000 and destruction to buildings and infrastructure including the destruction of 7000 schools and countless buildings. One of the reasons for this difference is that Chile has a higher level of economic development, allowing it to better prepare and respond to such hazards. Chile has invested in earthquake-resistant infrastructure and has better access to resources and technology to respond to disasters.

On the other hand, Nepal is one of the poorest countries in the world, and its infrastructure is less prepared to cope with natural disasters. The country has limited resources and lacks the necessary infrastructure to withstand the impact of a natural disaster. In addition, Nepal is a mountainous country, and many communities are located in remote areas, making it difficult to provide aid and relief efforts in a timely manner. This was evidenced with the Mt. Everest avalanche which killed 22 people.

In conclusion, the effects of tectonic hazards can vary greatly between areas of contrasting wealth, as demonstrated by the examples of Chile 2010 and Nepal 2015 earthquakes. Wealthier countries tend to have better infrastructure and access to resources to prepare and respond to disasters, while poorer countries are more vulnerable to the impact of natural disasters. However, other factors, such as population density and government preparedness, can also influence the impact of tectonic hazards, and thus, it is important to consider all these factors when assessing the impact of natural disasters.

**Long-term responses to a tectonic hazard are more important than immediate responses.’ Do you agree? Using the photographs above and one or more examples, explain your answer. (9 marks)**

While immediate responses are necessary to save lives and alleviate suffering, long-term responses are equally critical in mitigating the effects of tectonic hazards on communities. Haiti and Chile 2010 are two examples of tectonic hazards where the immediate and long-term responses differed significantly. In the case of Haiti from the photos, the immediate response was not good from the government. They required immediate aid from the government but it is clearly not being provided from within. Instead the people were reliant on the aid from other countries. This was also true of the Nepal 2015 earthquake which was left in a similar situation. Tents and food were provided to immediately save lives and while this did help, it could be argued that the longer term responses of rebuilding homes and buildings to a higher standard could be considered more important for the future of the country.

In contrast, Chile was better prepared to respond to the 2010 earthquake, and the immediate response was more effective. The government had invested in earthquake-resistant infrastructure and implemented early warning systems and evacuation plans. The immediate response, therefore, involved the activation of emergency plans and the provision of aid and resources to affected communities. However, the long-term response was equally important. The Chilean government invested in the reconstruction of damaged infrastructure and the improvement of earthquake-resistant buildings. The country also implemented measures to mitigate the effects of future earthquakes, such as enhancing building codes.

In conclusion, the statement is true to some extent. While immediate responses are crucial in saving lives and alleviating suffering, long-term responses are necessary to mitigate the effects of future hazards and enable communities to recover fully. The examples of Haiti, Nepal and Chile show the importance of both immediate and long-term responses and therefore are both important in saving lives.