Rebuilding Under Scarcity: Economic Strategies for Post-Conflict Reconstruction in Lebanon

Dr. Mohamad H. Jichi

Assistant Professor - Lebanese University – Faculty of Fine arts and Architecture

DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.51584/IJRIAS.2026.11013SP0012

Received: 14 March 2026; Accepted: 20 March 2026; Published: 02 April 2026

ABSTRACT

Post-conflict reconstruction represents a complex multidimensional process that extends beyond the physical rebuilding of destroyed infrastructure and housing systems. In Lebanon, reconstruction efforts following the recent Israeli war occur within the context of a severe economic and financial crisis that has significantly limited the fiscal capacity of the state. The destruction of residential buildings, transportation networks, energy infrastructure, and public facilities has intensified existing socioeconomic challenges while increasing the urgency of reconstruction initiatives. This research examines the economic strategies required to support post-conflict reconstruction in Lebanon under conditions of financial scarcity. The study adopts an analytical approach based on a review of post-conflict reconstruction literature, economic policy analysis, and examination of institutional frameworks relevant to reconstruction planning. Particular attention is given to the relationship between infrastructure investment, housing reconstruction, and economic recovery. The study also evaluates the role of international financial assistance, including infrastructure rehabilitation funding programs supported by international development institutions. The findings suggest that reconstruction in Lebanon cannot rely solely on traditional state-led rebuilding models due to severe fiscal constraints and institutional fragmentation. Instead, effective reconstruction requires a diversified economic strategy combining international financial assistance, public–private partnerships, diaspora investment, and community-driven rebuilding mechanisms. Furthermore, the research highlights the importance of prioritizing infrastructure investments that generate strong economic multiplier effects while simultaneously supporting housing reconstruction to restore social stability. Strengthening governance structures, improving transparency in reconstruction funding, and enhancing coordination between national and local institutions are also identified as essential factors for successful reconstruction implementation. The study concludes that reconstruction policies in Lebanon should integrate economic recovery strategies with infrastructure rehabilitation and housing rebuilding in order to promote sustainable post-conflict recovery and long-term development.

Keywords: Post-conflict reconstruction, Lebanon, Economic recovery, Infrastructure rehabilitation, Housing reconstruction, Reconstruction financing, Governance, Post-war development.

INTRODUCTION

Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Development Challenges

Post-conflict reconstruction represents one of the most complex challenges facing societies emerging from war and large-scale destruction. Armed conflicts typically generate extensive damage to housing, infrastructure systems, productive assets, and institutional structures, leaving affected countries with the difficult task of rebuilding their physical environment while simultaneously restoring economic stability and social cohesion (Barakat, 2003; Collier et al., 2003; del Castillo, 2008). Reconstruction processes therefore extend beyond the physical rebuilding of cities and infrastructure, encompassing the recovery of economic systems, governance institutions, and social services necessary for long-term development (World Bank, 2017; UN-Habitat, 2020; OECD, 2018).

In many post-conflict environments, reconstruction programs are implemented as large national initiatives supported by international aid, development loans, and donor coordination mechanisms (Addison, 2005; Barakat & Zyck, 2009; IMF, 2019). The success of these initiatives depends largely on the institutional capacity of the

state, the availability of financial resources, and the efficiency of governance structures responsible for managing reconstruction investments (Collier, 2007; Paris, 2004; Stiglitz, 2002). Countries experiencing fiscal crisis or institutional fragility often face considerable obstacles in mobilizing the resources necessary to support large-scale reconstruction programs (North et al., 2009; Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012).

Lebanon's Economic Crisis and Fiscal Constraints

Lebanon represents a particularly complex case of post-conflict reconstruction due to the convergence of multiple crises occurring simultaneously. Since 2019, the country has experienced one of the most severe economic collapses recorded in modern history, characterized by currency depreciation, banking sector instability, and a dramatic contraction in national economic output (World Bank, 2021; IMF, 2022; UNDP, 2022). Lebanon's gross domestic product has declined significantly, public debt has reached extremely high levels, and the government's capacity to finance public investment has been severely weakened (World Bank, 2023; ESCWA, 2021; IMF, 2023).

These economic conditions have significantly limited the ability of the Lebanese state to respond to infrastructure needs, urban development challenges, and public service requirements. Public investment programs have declined considerably, and many infrastructure systems have deteriorated due to limited maintenance and insufficient funding (World Bank, 2022; UN-Habitat, 2023; ESCWA, 2022). As a result, Lebanon entered the recent conflict period already facing major structural economic weaknesses and declining institutional capacity.

War Damage and Reconstruction Needs

The recent Israeli war has further intensified Lebanon's economic and urban challenges by causing widespread destruction to residential buildings, infrastructure networks, and local economic activities across several regions. Military confrontations and aerial bombardments have damaged housing units, transportation networks, energy systems, and public facilities, particularly in southern Lebanon and the southern suburbs of Beirut (UN-Habitat, 2024; Human Rights Watch, 2024; World Bank, 2024).

The destruction of residential buildings has displaced numerous families and disrupted local communities, while damage to infrastructure has significantly affected transportation, energy distribution, and public service delivery (UNDP, 2024; IOM, 2024). Such destruction not only affects the physical structure of cities but also generates broader economic consequences, including the disruption of commercial activities, employment losses, and reduced regional productivity (Collier et al., 2003; Addison, 2005).

Under these circumstances, reconstruction becomes a fundamental requirement for restoring normal economic and social life. However, the scale of reconstruction needs combined with Lebanon's limited fiscal capacity creates a particularly difficult policy challenge.

Reconstruction Under Financial Scarcity

The Lebanese government currently faces severe financial limitations that restrict its ability to finance large-scale reconstruction programs through traditional public spending mechanisms. Public debt levels remain extremely high, government revenues have declined significantly, and the banking sector—which historically played a central role in financing reconstruction—has experienced structural collapse (World Bank, 2022; IMF, 2023; Blominvest, 2022).

In this context, reconstruction must rely on alternative economic strategies combining international financing, donor assistance, private sector participation, and community-driven rebuilding mechanisms. International financial institutions have historically played an important role in supporting post-conflict reconstruction through development loans, technical expertise, and institutional support (World Bank, 2017; OECD, 2018; UN-Habitat, 2020).

In Lebanon's case, international assistance has already begun to support recovery efforts. Notably, the World Bank has allocated approximately 250 million US dollars for infrastructure rehabilitation, aiming to support the recovery of critical infrastructure systems affected by conflict and economic deterioration (World Bank, 2024).

Research Objectives and Questions

Given the severe fiscal constraints facing Lebanon and the extensive reconstruction needs generated by the recent war, there is a pressing need to explore economic strategies capable of supporting reconstruction under conditions of limited financial resources. Reconstruction policies must balance several priorities, including housing rebuilding, infrastructure rehabilitation, economic revitalization, and institutional governance reforms.

This research therefore aims to examine potential economic strategies that can support post-conflict reconstruction in Lebanon despite severe fiscal constraints. Particular attention is given to the relationship between infrastructure investment, housing reconstruction, and economic recovery, as well as the role of international financial institutions in supporting reconstruction initiatives.

The study addresses the following research questions:

1. How can Lebanon finance post-war reconstruction under conditions of severe fiscal scarcity?
2. What economic strategies can support housing reconstruction when state resources are limited?
3. How should international reconstruction funding be prioritized between infrastructure rehabilitation and property reconstruction?

By addressing these questions, the paper seeks to contribute to ongoing academic discussions on post-conflict reconstruction and development economics while providing policy insights relevant to the Lebanese reconstruction context.

Post-Conflict Reconstruction: Theoretical Framework

Concept and Evolution of Post-Conflict Reconstruction

Post-conflict reconstruction refers to the process through which societies recover from the physical destruction, economic disruption, and institutional breakdown caused by armed conflict. The concept has evolved significantly over the past decades, moving from a narrow focus on rebuilding infrastructure toward a broader understanding that integrates economic recovery, governance reform, and social stabilization (Barakat, 2003; Collier et al., 2003; Addison, 2005). Reconstruction is therefore increasingly viewed as a multidimensional process that includes rebuilding housing and infrastructure, restoring economic production, and strengthening institutional capacity (del Castillo, 2008; Paris, 2004; Stiglitz, 2002).

Early approaches to post-conflict reconstruction tended to emphasize rapid physical rebuilding and humanitarian assistance. However, research in development economics and political economy has demonstrated that reconstruction must also address deeper structural issues such as governance failures, economic fragility, and social inequality (North et al., 2009; Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012; Fukuyama, 2004). Without addressing these structural challenges, reconstruction programs often produce only temporary improvements while leaving the underlying drivers of instability unresolved (Collier, 2007; Barakat & Zyck, 2009).

International organizations have therefore increasingly adopted integrated reconstruction frameworks that combine physical rebuilding with institutional and economic reforms (World Bank, 2017; OECD, 2018; UN-Habitat, 2020). These frameworks emphasize the importance of linking reconstruction investments with long-term development objectives, ensuring that rebuilding efforts contribute to sustainable economic growth and improved governance systems (UNDP, 2022; IMF, 2019).

Economic Dimensions of Reconstruction

Economic recovery represents a central component of post-conflict reconstruction processes. Armed conflicts typically lead to the destruction of productive assets, disruption of markets, displacement of labor forces, and significant declines in national income (Collier et al., 2003; Addison, 2005; del Castillo, 2008). As a result, reconstruction programs must focus not only on rebuilding physical structures but also on restoring economic activity and generating employment opportunities (Rodrik, 2007; Stiglitz, 2002).

Infrastructure investment is widely recognized as a key driver of economic recovery in post-conflict environments. Transportation networks, energy systems, water supply infrastructure, and communication systems play a crucial role in facilitating economic production and enabling the movement of goods and labor (Calderón & Servén, 2010; Straub, 2011; Rodrigue, 2020). Improved infrastructure reduces transaction costs, enhances regional connectivity, and supports the expansion of markets and commercial activities (Banister, 2008; OECD, 2018).

In addition to infrastructure development, housing reconstruction represents another essential dimension of economic recovery. The destruction of residential buildings often results in large-scale displacement, social instability, and the disruption of local economic networks (Barakat, 2003; UN-Habitat, 2020). Rebuilding housing allows displaced populations to return to their communities and supports the reactivation of neighborhood-level economic activities such as small businesses, retail services, and local employment (Barakat & Zyck, 2009; World Bank, 2017).

Economic research also highlights the importance of reconstruction spending as a stimulus for employment generation. Large-scale rebuilding projects create demand for construction materials, engineering services, transportation activities, and skilled and unskilled labor (Addison, 2005; Collier, 2007). This multiplier effect can contribute significantly to economic recovery in post-conflict societies, particularly when reconstruction activities involve local contractors and domestic labor markets (Calderón & Servén, 2010; OECD, 2018).

Institutional Governance in Reconstruction Processes

Effective governance structures are essential for managing reconstruction programs and ensuring the efficient use of financial resources. Post-conflict environments often suffer from weakened institutions, fragmented administrative systems, and limited regulatory capacity (North et al., 2009; Fukuyama, 2004). These institutional challenges can complicate reconstruction efforts and increase the risk of corruption, inefficiency, and misallocation of resources (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012; Leenders, 2012).

Successful reconstruction programs typically require strong coordination between national governments, international organizations, donor agencies, and local authorities (Barakat & Zyck, 2009; OECD, 2018). Clear institutional frameworks are necessary to define responsibilities, allocate financial resources, and monitor the implementation of reconstruction projects (World Bank, 2017; UNDP, 2022).

Transparency and accountability mechanisms are also critical components of reconstruction governance. Large flows of reconstruction funding can create opportunities for corruption and political manipulation if oversight systems are weak (Salloukh et al., 2015; Leenders, 2012). International experience suggests that effective monitoring systems, independent auditing procedures, and participatory decision-making processes can significantly improve the transparency and effectiveness of reconstruction programs (OECD, 2018; UN-Habitat, 2020).

Financing Post-Conflict Reconstruction

Financing represents one of the most significant challenges facing post-conflict reconstruction programs. The destruction caused by armed conflict often coincides with severe economic decline and fiscal crisis, limiting the ability of national governments to finance reconstruction through domestic resources (Collier et al., 2003; Addison, 2005). As a result, reconstruction programs frequently rely on international financial assistance, development loans, and donor contributions (del Castillo, 2008; IMF, 2019).

International financial institutions play a major role in supporting reconstruction efforts through financial assistance and technical expertise. Development banks and multilateral organizations often provide concessional loans and grants designed to support infrastructure rehabilitation and economic recovery (World Bank, 2017; OECD, 2018; UNDP, 2022). These financial mechanisms allow governments to initiate reconstruction programs despite limited domestic resources.

However, reliance on external financing also raises important policy challenges related to debt sustainability and long-term economic stability (Stiglitz, 2002; Rodrik, 2007). Countries recovering from conflict must carefully

balance the need for reconstruction investment with the risks associated with increased public borrowing (IMF, 2019; World Bank, 2021). Sustainable reconstruction strategies therefore require careful prioritization of investment projects and the development of diversified financing mechanisms that include public investment, private sector participation, and international assistance (OECD, 2018; UN-Habitat, 2020).

Reconstruction as a Driver of Long-Term Development

In addition to addressing immediate recovery needs, reconstruction programs can also create opportunities for long-term development and structural transformation. Large-scale rebuilding initiatives allow governments to modernize infrastructure systems, improve urban planning frameworks, and strengthen institutional governance mechanisms (Barakat, 2003; Collier, 2007).

Post-conflict reconstruction can therefore serve as a catalyst for economic modernization and spatial development if reconstruction investments are integrated with long-term planning strategies (Rodrigue, 2020; Banister, 2008). Infrastructure projects can improve regional connectivity, housing reconstruction programs can enhance urban living conditions, and institutional reforms can strengthen governance capacity (World Bank, 2017; UN-Habitat, 2020).

Nevertheless, achieving these long-term benefits requires careful planning and coordination between reconstruction initiatives and national development strategies. Without strategic planning, reconstruction programs risk reproducing pre-existing structural problems such as inefficient infrastructure systems, informal urban growth, and weak governance structures (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012; North et al., 2009).

Implications for the Lebanese Case

The theoretical perspectives discussed above highlight several key dimensions that are particularly relevant to Lebanon's reconstruction context. First, reconstruction must address both **physical rebuilding and economic recovery**, ensuring that infrastructure and housing investments contribute to broader economic revitalization. Second, effective governance mechanisms are essential for managing reconstruction funds and coordinating the various national and international actors involved in rebuilding efforts. Finally, financing strategies must carefully balance the need for reconstruction investment with the fiscal constraints currently facing the Lebanese state.

These theoretical considerations provide the analytical framework for examining Lebanon's reconstruction challenges in the following parts.

Lebanon's Economic Crisis and Fiscal Constraints

Overview of the Lebanese Economic Collapse

Lebanon has been experiencing one of the most severe economic crises in modern history since 2019. The crisis emerged from a combination of structural economic weaknesses, long-standing fiscal imbalances, political instability, and the collapse of the national banking system (World Bank, 2021; IMF, 2022; ESCWA, 2021). Over several decades, the Lebanese economy relied heavily on external capital inflows, remittances, and financial sector activity rather than productive economic sectors such as industry and agriculture (Diwan & Haidar, 2019; Salloukh et al., 2015). This economic model created significant vulnerabilities, particularly in relation to public debt accumulation and financial sector exposure.

By 2019, Lebanon's public debt had reached one of the highest levels in the world relative to national economic output, exceeding 150 percent of gross domestic product (World Bank, 2020; IMF, 2021). At the same time, economic growth had stagnated, and government revenues were insufficient to sustain increasing levels of public spending (ESCWA, 2021; UNDP, 2022). These structural imbalances ultimately led to a severe financial crisis characterized by banking restrictions, currency depreciation, and the decline of public sector capacity.

The Lebanese pound experienced dramatic depreciation following the onset of the crisis, losing a large portion of its value against foreign currencies (World Bank, 2022; IMF, 2023). This depreciation triggered rapid inflation, increasing the cost of living and significantly reducing the purchasing power of Lebanese households

(UNDP, 2022; ESCWA, 2022). As inflation accelerated, economic activity declined sharply, leading to rising unemployment and widespread social hardship.

The economic contraction during this period has been among the most severe recorded globally in recent decades. Lebanon's gross domestic product declined significantly between 2019 and 2022, reflecting a deep recession and the collapse of key economic sectors (World Bank, 2023; IMF, 2023). The crisis has therefore created an extremely difficult environment for public investment, infrastructure maintenance, and economic recovery.

Banking Sector Collapse and Financial System Instability

A central element of Lebanon's economic crisis has been the collapse of its banking sector. Historically, the Lebanese banking system played a dominant role in the national economy, attracting large volumes of deposits from both domestic and international investors (Diwan & Haidar, 2019; World Bank, 2020). These deposits were often used to finance government borrowing and support the country's fixed exchange rate policy (IMF, 2021; Salloukh et al., 2015).

However, the sustainability of this financial model depended heavily on continuous capital inflows and the confidence of depositors. When these inflows declined and fiscal imbalances intensified, the banking system became increasingly fragile (World Bank, 2021; IMF, 2022). In 2019, banks imposed restrictions on withdrawals and international transfers, effectively limiting access to depositors' savings (UNDP, 2022; ESCWA, 2021).

The collapse of the banking sector has had far-reaching consequences for the Lebanese economy. Businesses have faced severe difficulties accessing credit, investment activity has declined, and financial intermediation has been significantly disrupted (World Bank, 2022; IMF, 2023). In addition, the banking crisis has undermined the state's ability to finance public investment projects, including infrastructure development and reconstruction initiatives.

Because the banking system historically played a major role in financing public spending and development projects, its collapse has severely constrained the financial resources available for reconstruction programs (Diwan & Haidar, 2019; World Bank, 2023).

Declining State Capacity and Public Investment Constraints

The economic crisis has also significantly weakened the capacity of the Lebanese state to finance public infrastructure and development programs. Government revenues have declined substantially due to economic contraction, tax collection difficulties, and administrative inefficiencies (World Bank, 2022; ESCWA, 2022). At the same time, the government continues to face high debt servicing obligations and increasing social expenditures required to mitigate the effects of the economic crisis.

Public investment in infrastructure has therefore declined considerably over the past several years. Many infrastructure systems, including electricity networks, transportation infrastructure, and water supply systems, have suffered from inadequate maintenance and insufficient financial resources (World Bank, 2021; UN-Habitat, 2023). As infrastructure conditions deteriorate, the cost of rehabilitation and reconstruction increases, further complicating recovery efforts.

The weakening of public sector capacity has also affected the ability of government institutions to manage large development programs. Administrative fragmentation, limited financial resources, and political instability have reduced the efficiency of public investment planning and implementation (Salloukh et al., 2015; Leenders, 2012). These institutional constraints present significant challenges for managing large-scale reconstruction initiatives following the recent war.

War Damage and the Expansion of Reconstruction Needs

The recent Israeli war has added a new layer of pressure to Lebanon's already fragile economic environment. Military confrontations and aerial bombardments have caused significant destruction to residential buildings, transportation networks, and public infrastructure in several regions of the country (UN-Habitat, 2024; Human

Rights Watch, 2024; UNDP, 2024). Housing destruction has displaced numerous families and disrupted local communities, while damage to infrastructure has affected economic activities and service delivery.

The destruction of roads, electricity networks, and public facilities has significant economic implications. Infrastructure damage disrupts transportation systems, limits access to markets, and reduces the productivity of local economies (Rodrigue, 2020; Banister, 2008). As a result, reconstruction becomes essential not only for restoring physical structures but also for reactivating economic activities and supporting regional recovery.

However, the scale of reconstruction needs far exceeds the financial capacity of the Lebanese state. Rebuilding damaged housing units, restoring infrastructure networks, and revitalizing economic activities require substantial financial resources that are currently unavailable through domestic funding sources (World Bank, 2024; IMF, 2023).

International Financial Assistance and Reconstruction Funding

Given the limited financial capacity of the Lebanese government, international financial assistance is expected to play a critical role in supporting reconstruction efforts. Multilateral development institutions frequently provide financial support to countries recovering from conflict through concessional loans, grants, and technical assistance programs (World Bank, 2017; OECD, 2018; UNDP, 2022).

In the Lebanese context, international support has already begun to contribute to infrastructure rehabilitation and recovery initiatives. One of the most significant financial commitments has been the allocation of approximately **250 million US dollars by the** World Bank **to support infrastructure rehabilitation and economic recovery programs**. These funds are intended to assist in restoring critical infrastructure systems and improving economic conditions in affected regions (World Bank, 2024).

While international financial assistance can play an important role in supporting reconstruction, such funding is typically limited relative to the scale of destruction caused by conflict. As a result, reconstruction strategies must carefully prioritize investment projects and allocate financial resources efficiently (IMF, 2019; OECD, 2018).

Implications for Reconstruction Strategy

The economic crisis facing Lebanon significantly shapes the framework within which reconstruction must occur. Severe fiscal constraints, the collapse of the banking sector, and declining state capacity limit the ability of the government to finance large-scale reconstruction programs through traditional public investment mechanisms.

Under these circumstances, reconstruction policies must adopt innovative economic strategies capable of mobilizing financial resources from multiple sources. These strategies may include international development financing, private sector participation, public-private partnerships, and community-driven rebuilding initiatives (World Bank, 2017; OECD, 2018; UN-Habitat, 2020).

The economic conditions described in this part therefore highlight the necessity of developing reconstruction strategies that are both financially sustainable and economically efficient. The following part will examine the scale and spatial distribution of war damage, providing a more detailed assessment of housing destruction, infrastructure losses, and the geographic patterns of reconstruction needs across Lebanon.

Scale and Spatial Distribution of War Damage

Nature of War-Induced Urban Destruction

Armed conflicts typically generate extensive damage to the built environment, affecting residential buildings, infrastructure networks, public facilities, and productive assets. The physical destruction caused by warfare often leads to long-term socioeconomic disruption, particularly in countries where institutional capacity and financial resources are already limited (Barakat, 2003; Collier et al., 2003; Addison, 2005). Urban areas tend to experience particularly severe impacts because of the concentration of population, economic activities, and infrastructure systems within relatively dense spatial environments (UN-Habitat, 2020; OECD, 2018).

In the Lebanese case, the recent Israeli war has resulted in significant damage to housing units, transportation networks, energy systems, and public infrastructure in several regions of the country. Military operations, aerial bombardments, and artillery strikes have affected both urban and rural areas, leading to the destruction of buildings, roads, and essential infrastructure facilities (Human Rights Watch, 2024; UNDP, 2024; World Bank, 2024). Such destruction not only affects the physical structure of cities but also disrupts social networks, economic activities, and community life.

Urban destruction in conflict zones often occurs in a highly uneven spatial pattern. Certain regions and cities may experience concentrated damage depending on their proximity to military frontlines, strategic infrastructure, or densely populated urban centers (Collier, 2007; Barakat & Zyck, 2009). Understanding the spatial distribution of damage is therefore essential for designing effective reconstruction strategies and prioritizing reconstruction investments.

Housing Destruction and Property Damage

Housing destruction represents one of the most visible and socially significant consequences of armed conflict. The destruction or severe damage of residential buildings leads to the displacement of families, the disruption of local communities, and the loss of personal assets accumulated over many years (Barakat, 2003; UN-Habitat, 2020). Housing reconstruction is therefore a critical component of post-conflict recovery because it enables displaced populations to return to their homes and reestablish normal living conditions (World Bank, 2017; Addison, 2005).

In Lebanon, numerous residential buildings have been damaged or destroyed during the recent conflict, particularly in southern regions and areas located near the Lebanese-Israeli border. Entire neighborhoods in some villages have experienced structural damage to residential units, while urban districts have suffered partial destruction of apartment buildings and housing complexes (UNDP, 2024; Human Rights Watch, 2024).

The destruction of housing has significant economic implications. Residential properties represent a major component of household wealth, and their destruction can lead to long-term financial hardship for affected families (Collier et al., 2003; Addison, 2005). In addition, the loss of housing often disrupts local economic networks by forcing families to relocate and reducing the demand for local services and businesses.

Property damage assessment therefore becomes a crucial step in the reconstruction process. Accurate evaluation of structural damage allows authorities and international organizations to estimate reconstruction costs, prioritize rebuilding efforts, and design compensation mechanisms for affected property owners (World Bank, 2017; UN-Habitat, 2020).

Infrastructure Damage and Service Disruption

In addition to housing destruction, armed conflicts often cause extensive damage to infrastructure systems that support urban and regional economic activities. Infrastructure networks—including roads, bridges, electricity systems, water supply networks, and telecommunications infrastructure—are essential for maintaining economic productivity and providing basic services to the population (Rodrigue, 2020; Banister, 2008).

The recent war has caused damage to several infrastructure systems across Lebanon, particularly in areas located near conflict zones. Roads and transportation networks have been damaged by military operations, affecting mobility and limiting access to markets and services (UNDP, 2024; World Bank, 2024). Electricity infrastructure has also experienced disruptions due to damage to distribution networks and energy facilities.

Infrastructure damage has important economic consequences because it disrupts the functioning of supply chains, increases transportation costs, and reduces the efficiency of economic activities (Calderón & Servén, 2010; Straub, 2011). Businesses depend on reliable infrastructure systems to transport goods, communicate with suppliers and customers, and access energy resources required for production. When infrastructure systems are damaged, economic productivity declines and recovery becomes more difficult.

The rehabilitation of infrastructure systems is therefore a central priority in post-conflict reconstruction strategies. Restoring transportation networks, electricity systems, and water infrastructure can significantly accelerate economic recovery by facilitating the movement of goods, labor, and capital (OECD, 2018; World Bank, 2017).

Regional Distribution of War Damage

The spatial distribution of war damage in Lebanon reflects both geographic and strategic factors related to the dynamics of the conflict. Areas located near the Lebanese-Israeli border have experienced particularly high levels of destruction due to their proximity to military operations and frontline confrontations (UN-Habitat, 2024; Human Rights Watch, 2024). Many villages in southern Lebanon have suffered damage to residential buildings, agricultural infrastructure, and local economic facilities.

Urban areas have also been affected, particularly in the southern suburbs of Beirut where dense residential neighborhoods and urban infrastructure systems are located. These areas have experienced damage to housing units, commercial facilities, and public infrastructure networks (UNDP, 2024; World Bank, 2024). The concentration of population and economic activities in these urban districts means that destruction in these areas has significant social and economic consequences.

The spatial concentration of damage in specific regions presents important challenges for reconstruction planning. Reconstruction programs must address both urban and rural rebuilding needs while ensuring equitable allocation of financial resources across affected regions (Barakat & Zyck, 2009; OECD, 2018). Spatial analysis of war damage can therefore support more efficient prioritization of reconstruction investments.

Economic Consequences of War Damage

The destruction of housing and infrastructure has significant economic consequences that extend beyond the immediate costs of rebuilding physical structures. Armed conflicts typically disrupt economic activities by damaging productive assets, displacing workers, and interrupting commercial supply chains (Collier et al., 2003; Addison, 2005).

In Lebanon, war-related destruction has affected several sectors of the economy, including construction, transportation, retail commerce, and local services. Damage to infrastructure and housing reduces economic productivity by limiting mobility, disrupting markets, and discouraging investment (Rodrigue, 2020; Calderón & Servén, 2010). In addition, the displacement of populations can reduce labor supply in affected regions and weaken local economic networks.

The reconstruction process therefore plays a critical role in restoring economic stability and supporting recovery. Large-scale rebuilding activities can generate employment opportunities in construction and engineering sectors while stimulating demand for materials, equipment, and professional services (Collier, 2007; OECD, 2018). These economic multiplier effects can contribute significantly to economic recovery if reconstruction programs are carefully designed and effectively implemented.

Implications for Reconstruction Planning

The scale and spatial distribution of war damage highlight the complexity of reconstruction challenges facing Lebanon. Housing destruction, infrastructure damage, and economic disruption require coordinated reconstruction programs capable of addressing multiple sectors simultaneously.

Effective reconstruction planning must therefore prioritize investment projects based on both social and economic criteria. Housing reconstruction programs are essential for restoring living conditions and enabling displaced populations to return to their communities, while infrastructure rehabilitation plays a crucial role in reactivating economic activities and supporting regional development (World Bank, 2017; UN-Habitat, 2020).

Given the financial constraints facing the Lebanese government, reconstruction strategies must also consider the efficient allocation of limited financial resources. Prioritizing infrastructure projects that generate strong

economic multiplier effects may accelerate economic recovery while supporting long-term development objectives (Calderón & Servén, 2010; Straub, 2011).

Financing Reconstruction Under Scarcity

Financial Challenges in Post-Conflict Reconstruction

Financing represents one of the most critical challenges in post-conflict reconstruction processes. Armed conflicts often leave countries with extensive physical destruction while simultaneously weakening their economic capacity to finance rebuilding efforts (Collier et al., 2003; Addison, 2005; del Castillo, 2008). Governments emerging from conflict frequently face declining revenues, damaged productive sectors, and high levels of public debt, which limit their ability to mobilize domestic financial resources for reconstruction programs (IMF, 2019; World Bank, 2017).

In such contexts, reconstruction costs can be extremely high relative to national economic output. Infrastructure rehabilitation, housing reconstruction, and the restoration of public services often require substantial investment over extended periods of time (Barakat, 2003; OECD, 2018). Without adequate financing mechanisms, reconstruction programs may progress slowly or fail to address the full scale of damage caused by conflict.

The Lebanese case illustrates these challenges particularly clearly. The country is attempting to undertake reconstruction efforts in the midst of a severe economic and financial crisis that has significantly reduced the government's fiscal capacity (World Bank, 2021; IMF, 2023; UNDP, 2022). As a result, reconstruction strategies must rely on diversified financing mechanisms capable of mobilizing both domestic and international resources.

Role of International Financial Institutions

International financial institutions often play a crucial role in supporting reconstruction programs in countries affected by conflict. Multilateral development organizations typically provide concessional loans, grants, and technical assistance aimed at restoring infrastructure systems and promoting economic recovery (World Bank, 2017; OECD, 2018; UNDP, 2022). These institutions also assist governments in designing reconstruction strategies, strengthening institutional capacity, and improving project implementation mechanisms.

In Lebanon, international support has already begun to contribute to reconstruction efforts. A significant example is the allocation of approximately 250 million US dollars by the World Bank to support infrastructure rehabilitation and recovery programs. These funds are intended to finance the rehabilitation of critical infrastructure systems such as transportation networks, public facilities, and essential service infrastructure (World Bank, 2024).

International financial assistance can help initiate reconstruction activities in situations where domestic financial resources are insufficient. However, such funding is rarely sufficient to cover the full cost of rebuilding damaged infrastructure and housing systems. Reconstruction strategies must therefore combine international financing with additional sources of funding in order to meet the large investment needs associated with post-conflict recovery (Addison, 2005; Collier, 2007).

Public–Private Partnerships and Private Sector Participation

Private sector participation represents another important financing mechanism for reconstruction programs. Public–private partnerships (PPPs) have been widely used in infrastructure development projects to mobilize private investment while reducing the financial burden on public budgets (OECD, 2018; World Bank, 2017). Through such arrangements, private companies may participate in financing, constructing, and operating infrastructure projects under contractual agreements with government authorities.

In post-conflict environments, PPPs can play a particularly valuable role in accelerating infrastructure reconstruction and improving service delivery (Straub, 2011; Calderón & Servén, 2010). Private investors may contribute capital, technical expertise, and project management capacity that can enhance the efficiency of reconstruction projects.

However, the successful implementation of PPP models requires appropriate regulatory frameworks and stable institutional environments (Rodrik, 2007; Stiglitz, 2002). In countries experiencing political instability or economic uncertainty, attracting private investment may be challenging. Lebanon's current economic conditions therefore require careful design of PPP mechanisms that can reduce investment risks and encourage private sector participation in reconstruction initiatives.

Diaspora Investment and External Capital Flows

Diaspora communities can also play an important role in supporting reconstruction efforts in countries affected by conflict. Migrant communities often maintain strong economic and social ties with their countries of origin, providing remittances and investment flows that support local economies (World Bank, 2020; UNDP, 2022). In many developing countries, diaspora remittances represent a significant source of foreign exchange and household income.

Lebanon has historically benefited from large diaspora communities located in Europe, the Americas, Africa, and the Gulf region. Remittances from Lebanese expatriates have traditionally represented an important source of financial inflows supporting the national economy (Diwan & Haidar, 2019; World Bank, 2021). These financial flows could potentially contribute to reconstruction financing through investment programs, reconstruction funds, or targeted development initiatives.

Encouraging diaspora investment in reconstruction projects may therefore represent a viable strategy for mobilizing additional financial resources. However, such initiatives require transparent governance structures and credible financial management systems capable of ensuring that funds are used efficiently and responsibly (OECD, 2018; UN-Habitat, 2020).

Community-Driven Reconstruction Mechanisms

Community-driven reconstruction programs represent another approach to rebuilding in resource-constrained environments. These programs emphasize the participation of local communities in planning and implementing reconstruction projects, allowing affected populations to play an active role in rebuilding their homes and neighborhoods (Barakat, 2003; UN-Habitat, 2020).

Owner-driven housing reconstruction models have been successfully implemented in several post-conflict contexts. Under these models, financial assistance or construction materials are provided directly to households, enabling them to rebuild their homes according to local needs and priorities (Barakat & Zyck, 2009). Such approaches can reduce administrative costs, accelerate rebuilding processes, and strengthen community participation in reconstruction activities.

Community-based reconstruction can also contribute to local economic recovery by generating employment opportunities and supporting local construction industries (Addison, 2005; Collier, 2007). However, effective implementation requires technical supervision and appropriate regulatory frameworks to ensure structural safety and compliance with construction standards.

Strategic Allocation of Reconstruction Resources

Given the limited financial resources available for reconstruction in Lebanon, strategic prioritization of investment projects becomes essential. Reconstruction programs must balance several competing priorities, including housing rebuilding, infrastructure rehabilitation, and economic revitalization.

Infrastructure investments are often prioritized in post-conflict reconstruction because they generate strong economic multiplier effects and support the recovery of productive sectors (Calderón & Servén, 2010; Straub, 2011). Transportation networks, energy systems, and water infrastructure play essential roles in facilitating economic activity and improving living conditions.

At the same time, housing reconstruction remains a critical social priority because it enables displaced populations to return to their communities and restore normal living conditions (Barakat, 2003; UN-Habitat,

2020). Effective reconstruction strategies must therefore balance economic and social considerations while ensuring efficient allocation of limited financial resources.

The following section will examine **housing reconstruction strategies**, focusing on mechanisms for rebuilding residential properties and restoring urban communities affected by war damage.

Housing Reconstruction Strategies

Importance of Housing Reconstruction in Post-Conflict Recovery

Housing reconstruction represents one of the most critical components of post-conflict recovery. The destruction of residential buildings not only results in the physical loss of shelter but also disrupts social networks, community structures, and local economic activities (Barakat, 2003; Collier et al., 2003; Addison, 2005). Restoring housing is therefore essential for enabling displaced populations to return to their communities and resume normal social and economic life (UN-Habitat, 2020; World Bank, 2017).

In many post-conflict contexts, housing reconstruction also serves as a catalyst for broader economic recovery. Construction activities generate employment opportunities in sectors such as engineering, architecture, transportation, and building materials production (Collier, 2007; OECD, 2018). The demand created by reconstruction projects stimulates local economies and contributes to the recovery of construction industries and related economic sectors (Calderón & Servén, 2010).

In Lebanon, the recent conflict has resulted in the destruction or severe damage of numerous residential buildings, particularly in southern regions and areas located near conflict zones (UNDP, 2024; Human Rights Watch, 2024). Housing reconstruction is therefore a central priority for restoring living conditions and stabilizing affected communities.

Property Damage Assessment and Classification

An essential first step in housing reconstruction programs involves the systematic assessment of property damage. Accurate evaluation of structural damage allows governments and reconstruction agencies to estimate rebuilding costs, determine eligibility for financial assistance, and prioritize reconstruction efforts (World Bank, 2017; UN-Habitat, 2020).

Damage assessment processes typically involve technical inspections conducted by engineers and construction specialists. Buildings are commonly classified according to the degree of damage sustained, ranging from minor repairable damage to complete structural collapse (Barakat & Zyck, 2009; OECD, 2018). This classification allows reconstruction authorities to distinguish between buildings that can be rehabilitated and those requiring full reconstruction.

In post-conflict contexts, damage assessments must also consider the structural safety of buildings and the risks associated with partial structural failure. Buildings that have experienced damage to load-bearing elements such as columns, beams, or structural walls may require extensive rehabilitation or complete reconstruction to ensure safety and durability (World Bank, 2017; UN-Habitat, 2020).

The development of transparent and standardized damage assessment procedures is particularly important in order to ensure fairness and efficiency in reconstruction programs. Without clear evaluation criteria, reconstruction funding may be distributed unevenly or subject to political influence (OECD, 2018; IMF, 2019).

Compensation and Financial Support Mechanisms

Once damage assessments have been completed, reconstruction programs must establish mechanisms for compensating property owners and supporting rebuilding activities. Compensation mechanisms vary significantly across post-conflict contexts depending on the financial capacity of the state and the availability of international assistance (Addison, 2005; Collier et al., 2003).

Some reconstruction programs rely on direct financial compensation provided to homeowners for rebuilding

damaged properties. In such cases, financial grants or subsidies may be allocated according to the level of damage sustained by each property (Barakat, 2003; UN-Habitat, 2020). These funds allow property owners to hire contractors, purchase construction materials, and rebuild their homes.

In other cases, reconstruction programs provide in-kind assistance rather than direct financial compensation. This may include the provision of construction materials, technical support, or standardized housing designs intended to reduce rebuilding costs and accelerate reconstruction processes (Barakat & Zyck, 2009; World Bank, 2017).

In Lebanon's current economic context, the limited fiscal capacity of the government makes it difficult to provide full financial compensation for all damaged properties. Reconstruction programs must therefore rely on a combination of government assistance, international funding, and private investment in order to support housing rebuilding efforts (World Bank, 2024; IMF, 2023).

Reconstruction Versus Rehabilitation

Housing recovery strategies typically involve two primary approaches: reconstruction and rehabilitation. Reconstruction refers to the complete rebuilding of residential structures that have been destroyed or severely damaged, while rehabilitation involves repairing and strengthening buildings that remain structurally viable (UN-Habitat, 2020; World Bank, 2017).

Rehabilitation is often more cost-effective than full reconstruction because it preserves existing structural elements and reduces material and labor costs. Strengthening techniques such as structural retrofitting, column jacketing, and slab reinforcement can restore the load-bearing capacity of partially damaged buildings (Barakat, 2003; OECD, 2018).

However, in cases where buildings have experienced extensive structural damage, reconstruction may be the only safe and viable option. Buildings with collapsed structural systems, severely damaged foundations, or unstable load-bearing elements typically require full demolition and rebuilding (World Bank, 2017).

Determining the appropriate strategy requires careful structural evaluation and technical analysis. Engineering assessments must consider both safety requirements and economic efficiency when deciding whether to rehabilitate or reconstruct damaged buildings.

Owner-Driven Reconstruction Models

Owner-driven reconstruction models have become increasingly common in post-conflict housing recovery programs. Under these models, affected households receive financial assistance or construction materials directly, allowing them to rebuild their homes according to their own needs and preferences (Barakat & Zyck, 2009; UN-Habitat, 2020).

This approach offers several advantages. It allows households to maintain control over the rebuilding process, ensures that reconstructed homes reflect local architectural traditions, and often accelerates reconstruction by reducing bureaucratic procedures (Addison, 2005; Collier, 2007). Owner-driven programs can also stimulate local economic activity by encouraging households to hire local contractors and purchase building materials from local suppliers.

However, owner-driven reconstruction requires technical oversight in order to ensure compliance with structural safety standards and urban planning regulations. Without appropriate technical supervision, reconstruction activities may result in unsafe building practices or unregulated urban expansion (World Bank, 2017; OECD, 2018).

Cost-Efficient Construction and Reconstruction Planning

Given Lebanon's current financial constraints, housing reconstruction strategies must emphasize cost efficiency and resource optimization. Reconstruction programs must seek to minimize construction costs while ensuring adequate structural safety and living standards.

One approach involves the use of standardized structural systems and modular construction techniques that reduce design complexity and material waste (UN-Habitat, 2020; OECD, 2018). Standardized housing models can accelerate reconstruction processes and reduce engineering and design costs.

Another important consideration involves integrating housing reconstruction with broader urban planning strategies. Reconstruction programs should not only replace destroyed buildings but also improve urban infrastructure, accessibility, and public space design (World Bank, 2017; Rodrigue, 2020). Such integrated planning approaches can contribute to more sustainable urban development and improved living conditions.

In Lebanon, reconstruction planning must also address issues related to land ownership, building regulations, and urban density. Coordinated planning efforts between national authorities, municipalities, and international organizations will be essential for ensuring efficient and sustainable housing reconstruction.

Implications for Lebanon's Reconstruction Process

Housing reconstruction represents a central element of Lebanon's post-conflict recovery strategy. Restoring residential buildings is essential for stabilizing affected communities, enabling displaced populations to return to their homes, and reactivating local economic activities.

However, the scale of destruction combined with the country's severe financial crisis requires reconstruction strategies that are both economically efficient and institutionally feasible. Owner-driven reconstruction models, international financial assistance, and cost-efficient construction techniques may provide viable solutions for rebuilding housing while minimizing financial pressures on the state.

At the same time, housing reconstruction must be integrated with broader infrastructure rehabilitation and economic recovery strategies. Coordinated planning efforts are necessary to ensure that reconstruction investments contribute not only to the rebuilding of housing but also to long-term urban development and economic stability.

The following section will examine infrastructure recovery and economic revitalization, focusing on the role of infrastructure investment in supporting post-conflict economic recovery and regional development.

Infrastructure Recovery and Economic Revitalization

Infrastructure as a Foundation for Economic Recovery

Infrastructure systems play a fundamental role in supporting economic activity, social stability, and regional development. Transportation networks, energy systems, water supply infrastructure, and communication systems form the backbone of modern economies by enabling the movement of goods, services, and labor (Rodrigue, 2020; Banister, 2008). When these systems are damaged or disrupted by armed conflict, economic productivity declines significantly and recovery becomes more difficult.

Post-conflict reconstruction strategies therefore often prioritize infrastructure rehabilitation as a central component of economic recovery programs. Infrastructure investment facilitates the restoration of economic activities by improving accessibility, reducing transportation costs, and enabling the functioning of supply chains (Calderón & Servén, 2010; Straub, 2011). Improved infrastructure also enhances the efficiency of markets and supports regional economic integration.

In Lebanon, the restoration of infrastructure systems is particularly important because many sectors of the national economy depend on efficient transportation and service networks. Damage to roads, energy infrastructure, and public facilities caused by the recent conflict has further weakened an already fragile economic environment (World Bank, 2024; UNDP, 2024). Rehabilitating these systems is therefore essential for supporting economic recovery and restoring public services.

Transportation Infrastructure and Economic Connectivity

Transportation networks are among the most critical infrastructure systems for economic recovery in post-conflict environments. Roads, bridges, and transportation corridors facilitate the movement of goods, labor, and services between urban centers and regional markets (Rodrigue, 2020). When transportation infrastructure is damaged, economic activities become less efficient and access to markets becomes more difficult.

The reconstruction of transportation infrastructure therefore contributes directly to economic revitalization. Improved road networks reduce transportation costs, enhance logistical efficiency, and support commercial activities such as trade, manufacturing, and agricultural distribution (Banister, 2008; Calderón & Servén, 2010). In addition, transportation infrastructure plays an important role in connecting rural and urban areas, allowing agricultural products and local industries to access larger markets.

In the Lebanese context, several transportation networks have been affected by military operations and conflict-related damage. Rehabilitation of these networks is essential for restoring regional connectivity and supporting economic activity in affected areas (UNDP, 2024; World Bank, 2024). Restoring road infrastructure also facilitates the movement of construction materials and equipment necessary for broader reconstruction activities.

Energy and Water Infrastructure Rehabilitation

Energy infrastructure represents another critical component of economic recovery. Reliable electricity supply is essential for industrial production, commercial activities, and the functioning of public institutions (OECD, 2018; World Bank, 2017). In post-conflict environments, damage to energy infrastructure can significantly reduce economic productivity and limit the capacity of businesses to operate effectively.

Lebanon has historically faced significant challenges related to electricity generation and energy distribution systems. Even before the recent conflict, the national electricity sector suffered from structural deficiencies and insufficient generation capacity (World Bank, 2021; ESCWA, 2022). Damage to energy infrastructure during the war has further complicated this situation by affecting electricity distribution networks and increasing pressure on already limited energy resources.

Water infrastructure also plays an essential role in supporting public health and economic activities. Water supply systems are required not only for household consumption but also for agriculture, industry, and urban services (UN-Habitat, 2020). Damage to water networks can therefore have serious consequences for both social welfare and economic productivity.

Rehabilitating energy and water infrastructure should therefore be considered a priority in Lebanon's reconstruction strategy. Improving these systems can support industrial activity, enhance living conditions, and contribute to long-term economic development.

Infrastructure Investment as an Economic Multiplier

One of the most important characteristics of infrastructure investment is its ability to generate strong economic multiplier effects. Large-scale infrastructure projects typically create employment opportunities across multiple sectors, including construction, engineering, transportation, and manufacturing (Collier, 2007; Addison, 2005). These employment opportunities contribute to income generation and stimulate demand for goods and services within the local economy.

Infrastructure investment also improves long-term economic productivity by reducing operational costs for businesses and facilitating market expansion (Calderón & Servén, 2010). Efficient transportation systems reduce travel times and logistics costs, while reliable energy infrastructure supports industrial production and commercial activities.

In post-conflict environments, infrastructure reconstruction programs can therefore serve as an important engine for economic recovery. By combining infrastructure rehabilitation with housing reconstruction and urban

development initiatives, governments can stimulate economic growth while rebuilding the physical structure of cities and regions (World Bank, 2017; OECD, 2018).

Employment Generation through Reconstruction Programs

Reconstruction programs typically generate significant employment opportunities, particularly in construction-related sectors. Large-scale rebuilding projects require engineers, architects, construction workers, technicians, and various support services involved in the construction supply chain (Addison, 2005; Collier et al., 2003).

In Lebanon, reconstruction activities could potentially create employment opportunities for local engineers, architects, and construction companies. This would not only support economic recovery but also help reduce unemployment resulting from the economic crisis. Engaging domestic contractors and professional services in reconstruction projects may therefore contribute to strengthening the national construction sector and retaining technical expertise within the country.

Moreover, reconstruction programs can stimulate demand for locally produced construction materials such as cement, steel, and building components. This demand can help revive industrial sectors associated with the construction industry and contribute to broader economic recovery.

Infrastructure Prioritization under Financial Constraints

Given the limited financial resources available for reconstruction in Lebanon, prioritizing infrastructure investments becomes essential. Not all damaged infrastructure systems can be rehabilitated simultaneously, and reconstruction programs must therefore identify projects that generate the greatest economic and social benefits.

Infrastructure prioritization typically involves evaluating projects based on their economic impact, social importance, and technical feasibility (OECD, 2018; World Bank, 2017). Transportation networks connecting major economic centers may receive priority due to their importance for regional economic activity, while energy infrastructure projects may be prioritized for their role in supporting industrial production and public services.

The allocation of international financial assistance also plays a role in determining reconstruction priorities. For example, funding provided by the World Bank for infrastructure rehabilitation may be directed toward projects that generate significant economic benefits and support long-term development objectives.

Infrastructure Reconstruction and Long-Term Development

Infrastructure reconstruction provides an opportunity not only to restore damaged systems but also to improve their design and efficiency. Post-conflict rebuilding efforts can incorporate modern infrastructure technologies, improved urban planning strategies, and more resilient infrastructure systems capable of withstanding future shocks (UN-Habitat, 2020; World Bank, 2017).

In Lebanon, reconstruction initiatives could therefore be integrated with broader development strategies aimed at improving transportation systems, modernizing energy infrastructure, and enhancing regional connectivity. Such improvements may contribute to long-term economic growth and improved living standards.

By linking infrastructure reconstruction with economic revitalization strategies, Lebanon can transform the rebuilding process into an opportunity for structural economic improvement. The next section will therefore examine **governance and institutional challenges in reconstruction**, focusing on the role of institutions, transparency, and coordination in managing reconstruction programs effectively.

Governance and Institutional Challenges in Reconstruction

Institutional Governance in Post-Conflict Reconstruction

Effective governance structures play a crucial role in determining the success of post-conflict reconstruction programs. Reconstruction initiatives typically involve multiple actors, including national governments, local

authorities, international organizations, donor agencies, and private sector stakeholders (Barakat & Zyck, 2009; OECD, 2018). Coordinating these actors requires strong institutional frameworks capable of managing financial resources, supervising project implementation, and ensuring transparency and accountability.

In many post-conflict contexts, however, institutional capacity is weakened by the effects of conflict and economic instability. Administrative fragmentation, political divisions, and limited regulatory enforcement can significantly complicate reconstruction efforts (North et al., 2009; Fukuyama, 2004). Weak institutional coordination may lead to delays in project implementation, inefficient allocation of resources, and increased risks of corruption (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012).

For reconstruction programs to succeed, governance mechanisms must therefore ensure clear institutional responsibilities, transparent financial management, and effective coordination among the various actors involved in rebuilding processes (World Bank, 2017; UNDP, 2022).

Institutional Fragmentation in Lebanon

Lebanon's institutional framework presents several challenges that may affect the implementation of large-scale reconstruction programs. The Lebanese political system is characterized by complex administrative structures and overlapping institutional responsibilities among national ministries, public agencies, and local authorities (Salloukh et al., 2015; Leenders, 2012). These institutional arrangements often result in fragmented decision-making processes and difficulties in coordinating public policies.

The reconstruction process may involve multiple governmental institutions responsible for infrastructure, housing, public works, and municipal administration. Without effective coordination mechanisms, reconstruction initiatives may face administrative delays and inefficient allocation of resources (World Bank, 2021; ESCWA, 2022). Institutional fragmentation can also complicate communication between national authorities and international donor organizations.

Furthermore, political instability and governance challenges have historically affected the implementation of development programs in Lebanon. Periodic government changes and political disagreements may disrupt policy continuity and delay the implementation of reconstruction projects (Salloukh et al., 2015; Baumann, 2016). These institutional conditions highlight the importance of establishing clear governance frameworks capable of supporting efficient reconstruction management.

Transparency and Accountability in Reconstruction Funding

Transparency and accountability are essential components of effective reconstruction governance. Large-scale reconstruction programs typically involve significant financial resources provided by both domestic and international sources. Without appropriate monitoring and oversight mechanisms, the risk of financial mismanagement and corruption increases (OECD, 2018; IMF, 2019).

International experience demonstrates that reconstruction programs benefit from transparent financial management systems that allow public institutions, donors, and citizens to monitor the allocation and use of reconstruction funds (World Bank, 2017; UN-Habitat, 2020). Such systems may include independent auditing mechanisms, public reporting of reconstruction expenditures, and open procurement procedures.

In Lebanon, improving transparency in reconstruction programs will be particularly important in order to maintain the confidence of international donors and financial institutions. External funding provided by international organizations is often accompanied by strict monitoring requirements designed to ensure that financial resources are used efficiently and in accordance with project objectives (World Bank, 2024; IMF, 2023).

Transparent governance structures can therefore strengthen the credibility of reconstruction programs and facilitate continued international support for rebuilding efforts.

Coordination Between National and Local Authorities

Reconstruction programs typically require strong coordination between national governments and local authorities. While national institutions are responsible for establishing policy frameworks and securing financial resources, local governments often play an important role in implementing reconstruction projects at the municipal level (UN-Habitat, 2020; OECD, 2018).

Municipalities are frequently responsible for managing local infrastructure systems, urban planning regulations, and community development initiatives. Their involvement in reconstruction planning is therefore essential for ensuring that rebuilding efforts respond to the specific needs of local communities (Barakat, 2003; World Bank, 2017).

In Lebanon, municipalities may play an important role in facilitating reconstruction activities, particularly in areas where housing destruction and infrastructure damage are concentrated. Local authorities can assist in identifying priority projects, coordinating community participation, and supervising reconstruction activities at the neighborhood level.

However, many Lebanese municipalities face financial and administrative constraints that limit their capacity to manage large reconstruction programs. Strengthening municipal institutions and improving coordination between local and national authorities will therefore be necessary for effective reconstruction planning.

Role of International Organizations in Reconstruction Governance

International organizations frequently play a significant role in post-conflict reconstruction governance by providing financial support, technical expertise, and institutional guidance. Development institutions often assist governments in designing reconstruction strategies, managing financial resources, and implementing infrastructure projects (World Bank, 2017; UNDP, 2022).

In Lebanon's reconstruction process, international institutions are expected to play an important role in supporting infrastructure rehabilitation and development initiatives. Financial assistance programs provided by organizations such as the World Bank may contribute to rebuilding infrastructure systems and strengthening economic recovery efforts.

International organizations may also provide technical support related to project management, procurement procedures, and monitoring systems. Such assistance can enhance the efficiency of reconstruction programs and help ensure that projects meet international standards of quality and accountability (OECD, 2018; UN-Habitat, 2020).

Nevertheless, effective collaboration between national institutions and international organizations requires clear governance frameworks and strong institutional coordination mechanisms.

Institutional Reforms and Reconstruction Effectiveness

Post-conflict reconstruction programs often create opportunities for institutional reforms aimed at improving governance structures and strengthening administrative capacity. Reconstruction initiatives frequently involve the modernization of regulatory frameworks, improvements in project management systems, and enhanced transparency mechanisms (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012; North et al., 2009).

In Lebanon, reconstruction programs may provide an opportunity to introduce institutional reforms that improve the efficiency of public investment management and strengthen coordination between government agencies. Such reforms could contribute to improving the long-term effectiveness of infrastructure planning and urban development policies.

Institutional reforms may include the development of centralized reconstruction authorities, improved procurement procedures, and enhanced monitoring systems designed to reduce administrative fragmentation and improve project implementation efficiency (OECD, 2018; World Bank, 2017).

Governance Implications for Lebanon's Reconstruction Strategy

The governance challenges discussed in this section highlight the importance of establishing clear institutional frameworks capable of managing reconstruction programs effectively. Lebanon's reconstruction strategy must address issues related to institutional coordination, financial transparency, and administrative capacity in order to ensure efficient implementation of rebuilding initiatives.

Strengthening governance mechanisms can improve the credibility of reconstruction programs, facilitate cooperation with international donors, and enhance the effectiveness of reconstruction investments. Transparent financial management, coordinated institutional structures, and active participation of local authorities can significantly improve the success of reconstruction initiatives.

The following section will present a **proposed economic framework for reconstruction in Lebanon**, integrating the economic, institutional, and planning considerations discussed throughout the previous sections of this study.

Proposed Economic Framework for Reconstruction in Lebanon

Need for an Integrated Reconstruction Framework

Post-conflict reconstruction in Lebanon requires a comprehensive framework capable of addressing the multiple economic, institutional, and spatial challenges associated with rebuilding efforts. The destruction caused by the recent conflict has affected housing, infrastructure systems, and local economic activities, while the ongoing financial crisis has significantly limited the fiscal capacity of the Lebanese government (World Bank, 2023; IMF, 2023; UNDP, 2022). Under these circumstances, reconstruction cannot rely solely on traditional public expenditure mechanisms.

Instead, reconstruction policies must adopt an integrated approach that combines international financial assistance, private sector participation, community involvement, and institutional coordination. Such an approach can mobilize diverse financial resources while ensuring that reconstruction activities contribute to broader economic recovery and long-term development objectives (Barakat, 2003; OECD, 2018).

An effective reconstruction framework must therefore address three key dimensions: financing mechanisms, institutional governance, and spatial planning strategies. Integrating these dimensions allows reconstruction initiatives to rebuild physical infrastructure while simultaneously supporting economic revitalization and institutional strengthening.

Multi-Source Financing Strategy

Given the limited financial capacity of the Lebanese state, reconstruction financing must rely on multiple funding sources. International financial assistance represents an important starting point for reconstruction programs, particularly for large infrastructure rehabilitation projects. Financial support provided by institutions such as the World Bank can contribute to restoring transportation networks, public facilities, and essential infrastructure systems affected by conflict.

However, international loans alone are unlikely to cover the full cost of reconstruction. Additional financial resources must therefore be mobilized through complementary mechanisms. Public–private partnerships can provide opportunities for private investors to participate in infrastructure projects, reducing the financial burden on the state while introducing technical expertise and project management capacity (OECD, 2018; World Bank, 2017).

Diaspora investment may also represent a potential source of reconstruction financing. Lebanese expatriate communities have historically played an important role in supporting the national economy through remittances and investments (World Bank, 2021; Diwan & Haidar, 2019). Establishing reconstruction funds or investment platforms designed specifically for diaspora participation could help mobilize additional capital for rebuilding projects.

Community-driven reconstruction initiatives may further complement these financial mechanisms by enabling households and local communities to participate directly in rebuilding housing and neighborhood infrastructure. Such initiatives can reduce administrative costs and accelerate reconstruction processes while supporting local economic activity (Barakat & Zyck, 2009; UN-Habitat, 2020).

Prioritization of Reconstruction Investments

The limited financial resources available for reconstruction require careful prioritization of investment projects. Not all damaged infrastructure and housing systems can be rebuilt simultaneously, and reconstruction strategies must therefore focus on projects that generate the greatest social and economic benefits.

Infrastructure projects that support economic connectivity and productivity should receive particular attention. Rehabilitation of major transportation networks can facilitate trade, improve regional accessibility, and support the movement of goods and labor across the country (Rodrigue, 2020; Banister, 2008). Similarly, investments in energy infrastructure can enhance industrial productivity and improve the reliability of public services.

Housing reconstruction must also be prioritized in order to restore living conditions for displaced populations. Owner-driven reconstruction models may offer an effective approach for rebuilding residential properties while minimizing administrative complexity and reducing financial costs (UN-Habitat, 2020; Barakat, 2003).

Effective prioritization strategies should therefore balance economic and social considerations, ensuring that

reconstruction investments contribute to both economic recovery and social stability.

Institutional Coordination and Governance Structure

Successful reconstruction requires strong institutional coordination among national authorities, municipalities, international organizations, and private sector actors. Establishing a centralized reconstruction coordination mechanism may help improve the efficiency of decision-making processes and facilitate communication between different stakeholders involved in rebuilding initiatives (OECD, 2018; World Bank, 2017).

Such coordination structures could oversee project prioritization, financial resource allocation, and monitoring of reconstruction activities. Transparent governance mechanisms would also be essential for maintaining public trust and ensuring accountability in the management of reconstruction funds.

Local authorities and municipalities should also play an active role in reconstruction planning and implementation. Municipal institutions possess valuable knowledge of local conditions and community needs, allowing them to contribute to the identification of priority reconstruction projects and the supervision of rebuilding activities at the local level (UN-Habitat, 2020).

Strengthening cooperation between national institutions and municipal authorities may therefore improve the effectiveness of reconstruction programs and ensure that rebuilding efforts respond to local development priorities.

Integration of Reconstruction with Spatial Planning

Reconstruction programs provide an opportunity to improve urban and regional planning frameworks while rebuilding damaged infrastructure and housing systems. Instead of simply replacing destroyed buildings, reconstruction initiatives can incorporate improved urban design principles, enhanced infrastructure systems, and more resilient urban environments (World Bank, 2017; UN-Habitat, 2020).

Integrating reconstruction with spatial planning strategies can also support balanced regional development. Investments in transportation networks, public spaces, and infrastructure services can contribute to improving urban living conditions and strengthening economic connectivity between regions.

In Lebanon, reconstruction planning may benefit from coordinated land-use planning policies that address issues such as urban density, infrastructure accessibility, and environmental sustainability. Such planning strategies can enhance the long-term effectiveness of reconstruction investments while supporting broader development objectives.

Reconstruction as an Opportunity for Economic Transformation

Although post-conflict reconstruction is primarily focused on restoring damaged infrastructure and housing systems, it also provides an opportunity for economic transformation and structural reform. Reconstruction investments can stimulate employment, support the recovery of local industries, and encourage the modernization of infrastructure systems (Collier, 2007; Calderón & Servén, 2010).

In Lebanon, reconstruction programs could contribute to revitalizing the construction sector, generating employment opportunities for engineers, architects, and construction workers. Encouraging the participation of local contractors and professional services may strengthen domestic technical capacity while retaining financial resources within the national economy.

Furthermore, reconstruction initiatives may provide an opportunity to improve governance mechanisms and introduce institutional reforms aimed at strengthening public investment management and transparency. Such reforms could enhance the long-term effectiveness of development policies and contribute to greater economic stability.

Framework Implications for Lebanon's Reconstruction Strategy

The proposed reconstruction framework emphasizes the importance of combining financial diversification, institutional coordination, and strategic planning in order to support effective rebuilding efforts in Lebanon. By integrating these elements, reconstruction programs can address both immediate recovery needs and long-term development objectives.

Given the severe financial constraints currently facing the Lebanese state, reconstruction policies must prioritize efficiency, transparency, and collaboration between national authorities, international organizations, and private sector actors. Diversified financing mechanisms, community participation, and coordinated planning strategies can significantly enhance the feasibility and effectiveness of reconstruction initiatives.

The final section of this study will present the **discussion and conclusions**, summarizing the main findings of the research and outlining policy recommendations for supporting post-conflict reconstruction in Lebanon.

DISCUSSION

Reconstruction Under Conditions of Economic Crisis

The analysis presented in the previous sections highlights the unique challenges associated with post-conflict reconstruction in Lebanon. Unlike many post-conflict environments where reconstruction is initiated after a period of economic stabilization, Lebanon is attempting to rebuild infrastructure and housing while simultaneously facing a severe financial and institutional crisis (World Bank, 2021; IMF, 2023; UNDP, 2022). This situation significantly limits the ability of the state to finance reconstruction through conventional public investment mechanisms.

Economic constraints therefore play a central role in shaping the reconstruction strategy. Limited fiscal capacity, the collapse of the banking sector, and declining public revenues restrict the financial resources available for rebuilding infrastructure and residential properties. Under these circumstances, reconstruction cannot rely solely on government funding but must incorporate diversified financing mechanisms capable of mobilizing international assistance, private investment, and community participation (Addison, 2005; Collier, 2007).

At the same time, the reconstruction process must address the immediate needs of affected populations, particularly those whose homes have been destroyed or severely damaged. Housing reconstruction is essential

for restoring social stability and enabling displaced populations to return to their communities (Barakat, 2003; UN-Habitat, 2020). Balancing these social priorities with economic constraints represents one of the central policy challenges facing Lebanon's reconstruction efforts.

Infrastructure Investment as a Catalyst for Economic Recovery

Infrastructure rehabilitation has been widely recognized as a key driver of economic recovery in post-conflict environments. Transportation networks, energy systems, and public service infrastructure play a fundamental role in supporting economic productivity and facilitating the movement of goods and labor (Rodrigue, 2020; Banister, 2008). When these systems are damaged, economic activities become less efficient and regional connectivity is weakened.

The reconstruction of infrastructure therefore has the potential to generate significant economic benefits beyond the immediate restoration of physical structures. Infrastructure investments often produce strong multiplier effects by creating employment opportunities and stimulating demand for construction materials, engineering services, and transportation activities (Calderón & Servén, 2010; Straub, 2011). These multiplier effects can contribute to broader economic revitalization if reconstruction programs are carefully designed and implemented.

In Lebanon, infrastructure rehabilitation may play an especially important role in supporting economic recovery due to the country's dependence on efficient transportation networks and service infrastructure. Investments in roads, electricity systems, and public facilities can improve economic connectivity and enhance the functioning of local markets.

However, infrastructure reconstruction requires substantial financial resources that may exceed the fiscal capacity of the Lebanese government. International financial assistance therefore becomes a crucial component of reconstruction financing. Programs supported by institutions such as the World Bank may provide essential funding for infrastructure rehabilitation and development initiatives.

Housing Reconstruction and Social Stability

Housing reconstruction represents a critical social dimension of post-conflict recovery. The destruction of residential buildings disrupts family life, community networks, and local economic activities. Rebuilding housing allows displaced populations to return to their communities and restore social stability (Barakat & Zyck, 2009; UN-Habitat, 2020).

The Lebanese reconstruction process must therefore prioritize housing rebuilding while ensuring that reconstruction programs remain financially sustainable. Owner-driven reconstruction models may provide an effective solution in this context by allowing households to participate directly in rebuilding their homes. Such models reduce administrative costs and accelerate reconstruction processes while preserving local architectural traditions (Addison, 2005; Collier et al., 2003).

Nevertheless, housing reconstruction must be accompanied by appropriate technical supervision to ensure compliance with structural safety standards and urban planning regulations. Without proper oversight, reconstruction activities may result in unsafe construction practices or unregulated urban expansion.

Governance Challenges and Institutional Coordination

The effectiveness of reconstruction programs depends heavily on the governance structures responsible for managing financial resources and supervising project implementation. Weak institutional coordination, fragmented administrative systems, and limited regulatory enforcement can significantly reduce the effectiveness of reconstruction investments (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012; North et al., 2009).

Lebanon's institutional framework presents several governance challenges related to administrative fragmentation and political divisions. Multiple governmental institutions may share responsibility for

infrastructure development, housing reconstruction, and public investment planning. Without clear coordination mechanisms, reconstruction programs may face delays and inefficiencies (Salloukh et al., 2015; Leenders, 2012).

Strengthening institutional coordination and improving transparency in financial management will therefore be essential for ensuring the success of reconstruction initiatives. Transparent governance structures can increase the confidence of international donors and facilitate the mobilization of external financial resources necessary for rebuilding efforts (OECD, 2018; World Bank, 2017).

Reconstruction as an Opportunity for Structural Reform

Although post-conflict reconstruction is primarily focused on restoring damaged infrastructure and housing systems, it also provides an opportunity to introduce structural reforms aimed at improving governance and economic development. Reconstruction programs often involve modernization of infrastructure systems, improvements in urban planning frameworks, and the introduction of more efficient project management practices (Barakat, 2003; Collier, 2007).

In Lebanon, reconstruction initiatives could contribute to strengthening the national construction sector, improving infrastructure systems, and enhancing coordination between national and municipal institutions. Reconstruction programs may also create employment opportunities for engineers, architects, and construction professionals, contributing to economic recovery and technical capacity development.

By integrating reconstruction efforts with broader economic and institutional reforms, Lebanon may transform the rebuilding process into an opportunity for long-term development rather than simply a response to wartime destruction.

Key Policy Implications

The discussion presented in this study highlights several policy implications for reconstruction planning in Lebanon. First, reconstruction strategies must recognize the severe fiscal constraints facing the Lebanese government and adopt diversified financing mechanisms that combine international assistance, private investment, and community participation.

Second, reconstruction investments should prioritize infrastructure projects that generate strong economic multiplier effects while also addressing housing reconstruction needs. Balancing economic and social priorities is essential for achieving sustainable recovery.

Third, strengthening governance mechanisms and improving institutional coordination are critical for ensuring the efficient management of reconstruction funds and the successful implementation of rebuilding projects.

These policy considerations provide a foundation for the conclusions presented in the following section, which summarizes the main findings of the research and outlines recommendations for supporting post-conflict reconstruction in Lebanon.

CONCLUSION

Summary of the Research

Post-conflict reconstruction represents one of the most complex challenges faced by societies recovering from armed conflict. The destruction of housing, infrastructure systems, and productive assets disrupts economic activity, displaces populations, and weakens institutional capacity. Successful reconstruction therefore requires coordinated strategies that integrate physical rebuilding, economic recovery, and institutional governance reforms (Barakat, 2003; Collier et al., 2003; Addison, 2005).

The case of Lebanon presents a particularly challenging reconstruction context due to the coexistence of war-related destruction and a severe economic crisis. Since 2019, Lebanon has experienced significant economic contraction, currency depreciation, and banking sector collapse, which have substantially reduced the fiscal

capacity of the state (World Bank, 2021; IMF, 2023; UNDP, 2022). These conditions limit the ability of the Lebanese government to finance large-scale reconstruction programs through traditional public investment mechanisms.

The recent Israeli war has further intensified these challenges by causing significant destruction to residential buildings, infrastructure networks, and local economic activities in several regions of the country. Housing destruction has displaced numerous families and disrupted community structures, while infrastructure damage has weakened economic connectivity and service delivery systems (UN-Habitat, 2024; Human Rights Watch, 2024; World Bank, 2024). As a result, Lebanon faces the dual challenge of rebuilding its physical infrastructure while simultaneously managing a severe financial crisis.

Reconstruction Under Fiscal Constraints

A central finding of this research is that reconstruction in Lebanon must be approached within the context of significant fiscal scarcity. Public debt levels remain extremely high, government revenues have declined, and the collapse of the banking sector has reduced access to domestic financing sources (IMF, 2023; World Bank, 2023). These financial constraints require reconstruction strategies that move beyond traditional state-led rebuilding models.

International financial assistance therefore plays a critical role in supporting reconstruction initiatives. Programs supported by institutions such as the World Bank can provide essential funding for infrastructure rehabilitation and economic recovery projects. However, international loans and grants alone are unlikely to cover the full cost of rebuilding damaged infrastructure and housing systems.

Reconstruction strategies must therefore incorporate diversified financing mechanisms capable of mobilizing resources from multiple sources. Public–private partnerships, diaspora investment, and community-driven rebuilding initiatives may complement international funding and help expand the financial resources available for reconstruction programs.

Infrastructure and Housing as Pillars of Reconstruction

The analysis presented in this study highlights the importance of both infrastructure rehabilitation and housing reconstruction as central components of post-conflict recovery. Infrastructure systems such as transportation networks, energy supply systems, and water infrastructure support economic productivity and facilitate the functioning of markets and public services (Rodrigue, 2020; Banister, 2008).

Infrastructure investments also generate strong economic multiplier effects by creating employment opportunities and stimulating demand for construction materials and engineering services (Calderón & Servén, 2010; Straub, 2011). In Lebanon's current economic environment, infrastructure reconstruction may therefore serve as a catalyst for economic recovery and employment generation.

At the same time, housing reconstruction remains essential for restoring social stability and enabling displaced populations to return to their communities. Owner-driven reconstruction models may provide an effective approach for rebuilding residential properties while reducing administrative costs and accelerating reconstruction processes (UN-Habitat, 2020; Barakat & Zyck, 2009).

Balancing infrastructure investment with housing reconstruction is therefore a key component of an effective reconstruction strategy.

Governance and Institutional Coordination

The effectiveness of reconstruction programs depends not only on financial resources but also on the governance structures responsible for managing reconstruction initiatives. Institutional fragmentation, limited administrative capacity, and weak coordination mechanisms can significantly reduce the efficiency of reconstruction investments (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012; North et al., 2009).

In Lebanon, strengthening governance mechanisms will be essential for ensuring transparent management of reconstruction funds and effective coordination between national authorities, municipalities, and international organizations. Transparent procurement procedures, independent auditing systems, and clear institutional responsibilities can improve the credibility and efficiency of reconstruction programs (OECD, 2018; World Bank, 2017).

Improved institutional coordination can also facilitate cooperation between international donors and national authorities, enabling more effective mobilization and allocation of reconstruction funding.

Reconstruction as an Opportunity for Long-Term Development

Although post-conflict reconstruction is often perceived as a response to destruction, it can also create opportunities for long-term economic and spatial development. Rebuilding infrastructure and housing systems allows governments to modernize urban environments, improve infrastructure efficiency, and strengthen institutional governance structures (Barakat, 2003; Collier, 2007).

In Lebanon, reconstruction initiatives may provide an opportunity to revitalize the construction sector, generate employment opportunities for engineers and construction workers, and stimulate economic activity across multiple sectors. Integrating reconstruction programs with urban planning and regional development strategies may therefore contribute to more sustainable long-term development outcomes.

However, achieving these benefits requires strategic planning and effective governance mechanisms capable of coordinating reconstruction investments and ensuring efficient use of financial resources.

Final Remarks

Reconstruction in Lebanon must be approached as a complex economic and institutional challenge rather than simply a process of rebuilding damaged infrastructure. Severe fiscal constraints, institutional fragmentation, and the scale of destruction require innovative reconstruction strategies capable of mobilizing diverse financial resources and coordinating multiple actors involved in rebuilding efforts.

By combining international financial assistance, private sector participation, community involvement, and transparent governance mechanisms, Lebanon can develop reconstruction strategies that support both immediate recovery and long-term development objectives. Infrastructure rehabilitation and housing reconstruction must be integrated within broader economic and spatial planning frameworks in order to ensure sustainable recovery.

Ultimately, the success of Lebanon’s reconstruction efforts will depend on the ability of policymakers, institutions, and international partners to implement coordinated strategies that rebuild the country’s physical infrastructure while revitalizing its economic and social foundations.

REFERENCES

1. Acemoglu, D., & Robinson, J. (2012). Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity and Poverty. New York: Crown Publishers.
2. Addison, T. (2005). The economics of post-conflict reconstruction. World Economics, 6(3), 1–18.
3. Banister, D. (2008). The sustainable mobility paradigm. Transport Policy, 15(2), 73–80.
4. Barakat, S. (2003). Housing reconstruction after conflict and disaster. London: Humanitarian Practice Network.
5. Barakat, S., & Zyck, S. (2009). Housing reconstruction after conflict and disaster: Lessons from international experience. Humanitarian Policy Group Report. London: Overseas Development Institute.
6. Baumann, H. (2016). Citizen Hariri: Lebanon’s Neoliberal Reconstruction. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
7. Blominvest Bank. (2022). Lebanon Economic Outlook Report. Beirut: Blominvest Bank.

8. Calderón, C., & Servén, L. (2010). Infrastructure and economic development in Sub-Saharan Africa. Journal of African Economies, 19(1), 13–87.
9. Collier, P. (2007). The Bottom Billion: Why the Poorest Countries are Failing and What Can Be Done About It. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
10. Collier, P., Hoeffler, A., & Söderbom, M. (2003). Post-conflict risks. Journal of Peace Research, 40(1), 5–24.
11. del Castillo, G. (2008). Rebuilding War-Torn States: The Challenge of Post-Conflict Economic Reconstruction. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
12. Diwan, I., & Haidar, J. (2019). Political economy of public debt in Lebanon. Economic Research Forum Working Paper.
13. ESCWA. (2021). The Impact of the Economic Crisis in Lebanon. Beirut: United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia.
14. ESCWA. (2022). Arab Sustainable Development Report. Beirut: United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia.
15. Fukuyama, F. (2004). State Building: Governance and World Order in the 21st Century. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
16. Human Rights Watch. (2024). Lebanon: Conflict Damage and Civilian Impact Report. New York: Human Rights Watch.
17. International Monetary Fund (IMF). (2019). Macroeconomic Policy in Fragile and Post-Conflict Situations. Washington DC: IMF.
18. International Monetary Fund (IMF). (2021). Lebanon Financial Sector Assessment. Washington DC: IMF.
19. International Monetary Fund (IMF). (2022). Lebanon Economic Outlook. Washington DC: IMF.
20. International Monetary Fund (IMF). (2023). Lebanon Country Report. Washington DC: IMF.
21. International Organization for Migration (IOM). (2024). Lebanon Displacement Monitoring Report. Geneva: IOM.
22. Leenders, R. (2012). Spoils of Truce: Corruption and State-Building in Postwar Lebanon. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
23. North, D., Wallis, J., & Weingast, B. (2009). Violence and Social Orders. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
24. OECD. (2018). States of Fragility Report. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
25. Paris, R. (2004). At War's End: Building Peace after Civil Conflict. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
26. Rodrigue, J. P. (2020). The Geography of Transport Systems. New York: Routledge.
27. Rodrik, D. (2007). One Economics, Many Recipes: Globalization, Institutions and Economic Growth. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
28. Salloukh, B., Barakat, R., Al-Habbal, J., Khattab, L., & Mikaelian, S. (2015). The Politics of Sectarianism in Postwar Lebanon. London: Pluto Press.
29. Stiglitz, J. (2002). Globalization and Its Discontents. New York: W. W. Norton.
30. Straub, S. (2011). Infrastructure and development: A critical appraisal of the macro level literature. Journal of Development Studies, 47(5), 683–708.
31. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2022). Lebanon Socioeconomic Impact Assessment. Beirut: UNDP.
32. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2024). Lebanon War Damage Assessment Report. Beirut: UNDP.
33. United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat). (2020). Housing Reconstruction Guidelines. Nairobi: UN-Habitat.
34. United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat). (2023). Lebanon Urban Profile. Nairobi: UN-Habitat.
35. United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat). (2024). Lebanon Post-Conflict Urban Damage Assessment. Nairobi: UN-Habitat.
36. World Bank. (2017). Reconstruction and Recovery Framework. Washington DC: World Bank.
37. World Bank. (2020). Lebanon Economic Monitor. Washington DC: World Bank.

38. World Bank. (2021). Lebanon Sinking into Crisis. Washington DC: World Bank.
39. World Bank. (2022). Lebanon Public Finance Review. Washington DC: World Bank.
40. World Bank. (2023). Lebanon Economic Monitor: Time for Reform. Washington DC: World Bank.
41. World Bank. (2024). Lebanon Infrastructure Recovery and Reconstruction Program. Washington DC: World Bank.