



## COVID-19 and crises of capitalism: intensifying inequalities and global responses

Sara Stevano, Tobias Franz, Yannis Dafermos & Elisa Van Waeyenberge

To cite this article: Sara Stevano, Tobias Franz, Yannis Dafermos & Elisa Van Waeyenberge (2021) COVID-19 and crises of capitalism: intensifying inequalities and global responses, Canadian Journal of Development Studies / Revue canadienne d'études du développement, 42:1-2, 1-17, DOI: [10.1080/02255189.2021.1892606](https://doi.org/10.1080/02255189.2021.1892606)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02255189.2021.1892606>



© 2021 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 10 Mar 2021.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 10287



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 5 View citing articles [↗](#)

# COVID-19 and crises of capitalism: intensifying inequalities and global responses

Sara Stevano, Tobias Franz, Yannis Dafermos and Elisa Van Waeyenberge 

Department of Economics, SOAS University of London, London, UK

## ABSTRACT

The COVID-19 pandemic has exposed multiple structural flaws of global capitalism. These have been reproduced through the intensification of inequalities and reinforced through policy responses that have failed to protect the most vulnerable from the health and socio-economic impacts of COVID-19. The COVID-19 pandemic has also revealed the materiality of human activity and complex geographies of inequality. It has highlighted how inequalities embedded in relations of production, reproduction and global finance continue to perpetuate the divide between the Global North and South. Using an interdisciplinary political economy lens with a focus on the Global South, this Special Issue brings together contributions that explore the dynamics underpinning the intensification of inequalities during the pandemic and that analyse the initial policy responses to the COVID-19 crisis.

## RÉSUMÉ

La pandémie de COVID-19 a révélé plusieurs failles structurelles du capitalisme mondial. Celles-ci se sont multipliées du fait de l'intensification des inégalités, et elles ont été renforcées par des interventions politiques qui n'ont pas su protéger les plus vulnérables de l'impact sanitaire et socio-économique de la COVID-19. La pandémie de COVID-19 a également révélé la matérialité de l'activité humaine et la géographie complexe des inégalités. Elle a montré comment les inégalités présentes dans les relations de production, de reproduction, et de finance globale perpétuent la division entre le Nord et le Sud planétaires. Ce numéro spécial concentre son analyse sur le Sud planétaire, appliquant une approche interdisciplinaire à l'économie politique. Y sont réunies des contributions explorant les dynamiques qui sous-tendent l'intensification des inégalités durant la pandémie, et analysant les premières réactions politiques à la crise causée par la COVID-19.

## ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 21 December 2020  
Accepted 12 February 2021

## KEYWORDS

COVID-19; capitalism;  
development; inequalities;  
Global South

## Introduction

In July 2020, the outgoing rapporteur on human rights and extreme poverty, Philip Alston (2020) presented his last Report, entitled *The Parlous State of Poverty Eradication*.

**CONTACT** Sara Stevano  [ss129@soas.ac.uk](mailto:ss129@soas.ac.uk)

© 2021 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group  
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

The Report, published as the COVID-19 pandemic ravaged across the world, makes for a sobering read. In its opening paragraph, it emphasises how the world is “at an existential crossroads involving a pandemic, a deep economic recession, devastating climate change, extreme inequality, and a movement challenging the prevalence of racism in many countries”. Rejecting traditional measures of poverty that have been the basis of self-congratulatory attitudes in global policy circles, the Report instead insists on the troubling realities of persistent poverty across the world, including in high-income countries, with child poverty rates increasing in almost two-thirds of the OECD countries in recent years.

The pandemic throws multiple failures of contemporary capitalism into sharp relief. While the previous deleterious crisis of the twenty-first century had originated in the financial system, COVID-19 provoked a public health crisis that rapidly translated into an economic and social crisis. This had immediate implications for both everyday life and the processes of production, reproduction and consumption – locally and globally. And, while the exploitative practices of global capitalism and its attendant climate crisis have been explored in rich scholarship across disciplines, the pandemic suddenly presents these through a magnifying glass dramatically amplifying them.

Remarkably, the pandemic draws attention to the oft-hidden material realities of social and economic life and its embeddedness in nature. Despite the significant transformations of globalised contemporary capitalism through financialisation and technological progress, the COVID-19 crisis is a stark reminder that the kernel of human activity is intrinsically material and embedded in the socio-economic and biophysical basis of production and reproduction. The agro-ecological root of the COVID-19 crisis (Akram-Lodhi 2020 this issue; Picchioni, Po, and Forsythe 2021 this issue; Wallace et al. 2020); the unfolding trail of human death and suffering, sharply aggravated by the systemic squeeze of waged and unwaged social reproduction (Federici 2004; Ossome 2020 this issue); the plight of workers and the macroeconomic challenges facing countries in the Global South (UNCTAD 2020) – all shed light on the centrality of how we produce necessities, care for each other and trade across the world. The failings of global capitalism as a system fundamentally built on the material exploitation of nature and of gendered and racialised global working classes have been vividly foregrounded.

At the same time, the COVID-19 crisis has revealed the possibilities of political action and radical policy change and shed a new light on the role of the state. After decades marked by the neoliberal ideology that views the state as a mere fixer of market failures, the COVID-19 pandemic has made it impossible to downplay the active role that the state plays in capitalism. The visibility and scale of state intervention have increased dramatically during the pandemic, both in terms of the rediscovery of fiscal levers – much spurned in economic policy since the widespread adoption of the principles of the (post-) Washington Consensus – and of new forms of surveillance pioneered via public health interventions. Yet, whilst wealthier states have been able to mobilise (re)discovered “fiscal space”, poorer states face multiple constraints. Indeed, although the effectiveness of managing the public health crisis has varied significantly across countries, giving rise to complex geographies of inequality, the COVID-19 crisis risks perpetuating (if not aggravating) Global South-Global North structural divides.<sup>1</sup> This is emblematic in the exposure of vaccine inequities triggered by countries in the Global North hoarding vaccines and blocking their wider production and distribution (Aryeetey et al. 2021).

Furthermore, as the COVID-19 pandemic threw the inequalities of global capitalism into sharp relief, yet another murder of a young black man at the hands of the police in the United States highlighted how capitalism is inextricably linked to race. Indeed, women and people of colour often face the most violent practices of exploitation and oppression. An analysis of the current crisis must hence be driven by the recognition of such intersecting inequalities inherent to global capitalism.

This Special Issue explores the crises of global capitalism by mapping the dynamics underpinning the intensification of inequalities and the responses to the COVID-19 crisis through a Global South lens. It contributes to the emerging progressive scholarship on the COVID-19 crisis, by centring its analyses on and from the Global South.<sup>2</sup> While the Special Issue allows for important variegation, COVID-19 exposes vulnerabilities specific to countries in the Global South, owing to the nature of the global architecture of market-based finance, specific trajectories of structural adjustment and stabilisation, and global structures of production and reproduction. Furthermore, the Special Issue seeks to promote an interdisciplinary understanding of the COVID-19 crisis by bringing together contributions from radical political economists, political scientists, heterodox economists, development economists and public health specialists. Thus, the overarching aim is to make a novel and timely contribution by anchoring interdisciplinary and Global South perspectives in a political economy analysis that sees the pandemic as yet another prism through which the contradictory and violent tendencies of global capitalism are exposed.

We proceed as follows. In section two, we outline what the COVID-19 magnifying glass reveals. Section three explains how the policy responses to the pandemic have protected the status quo. Section four provides an overview of the contributions to the Special Issue. In the fifth section, we reflect on the challenges we – as researchers in the social sciences – face when dealing with the analytical imperatives implied by the COVID-19 crisis.

### **Through the COVID-19 magnifying glass**

As the pandemic was declared by the World Health Organisation (WHO) on 11 March 2020, governments across the world successively crafted more or less apt responses, including declarations of nationwide lockdowns. In this context, COVID-19 has amplified pre-existing inequalities and created some odd juxtapositions. We list a few.

First, many so-called “advanced economies”, despite having the strongest health security capabilities, as captured by the Global Health Security (GHS) index,<sup>3</sup> were unable, or unwilling, to protect their citizens while various countries in the Global South seem to have been more successful at managing the pandemic. The United States as the richest country in the world, for instance, commanding one of the highest concentration of scientific skill and ranking first globally according to the GHS, registered more US Americans dying in the first three months of the US outbreak than during the entire Vietnam war (Horton 2020a, 47). At the same time, Vietnam, now a lower middle-income country with just short of 100 million people, recorded a total of 35 deaths as of December 2020, while deaths in the United States reach top 300,000. Across the world, more than 103 million people have been infected by COVID-19 and over 2.2 million have died at the time of writing.<sup>4</sup> Despite only making up around a

sixth of the world population, countries of the Global North have so-far accounted for nearly half of the deaths. On the other hand, some countries in the Global South, including Vietnam, Rwanda, Sri Lanka, Mali, Laos, Cambodia, and Cuba have been more effective at containing the spread of the virus. In a recent study of the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on global income inequality, Deaton (2021) finds that income inequality between countries has decreased because national per capita income has fallen more rapidly in high-income countries than in poor countries, unless income inequality is weighted by population.<sup>5</sup> In addition, the presumed trade-off between protecting health and the economy is not supported by the data, which shows that countries with higher deaths per million are also those with lower predicted income per capita growth (*ibid.*).

Second, pre-existing inequalities of class, race and gender within countries have been laid bare dramatically. When national lockdowns started to be enforced across most countries in the world, people were told not to step out of their homes except for a limited set of activities. Entire sectors came to a standstill and mobility – within and across countries – all but ceased. Initial studies demonstrate that lockdown policies had direct adverse effects on all economies across the globe (e.g. Jackson et al. 2020). Lower socio-economic groups have been more likely to bear the brunt of the negative economic fallouts, apart from often being disproportionately represented in the fatality rate. Alston (2020, paragraph 34) insists that:

The public health community's mantra for coping with COVID-19 encapsulates the systemic neglect of those living in poverty. The pithy advice to “stay home, socially distance, wash hands, and see a doctor in case of fever” highlights the plight of the vast numbers who can do none of these things. They have no home in which to shelter, no food stockpiles, live in crowded and unsanitary conditions, and have no access to clean water or affordable medical care. Far from being the “great leveler,” COVID-19 is a pandemic of poverty, exposing the perilous state of social safety nets for those on lower incomes or in poverty around the world.

The class impacts of coronavirus are shaped by the unequal ability of different socio-economic groups to follow social distancing measures as well as their uneven underlying health and housing conditions (Reeves and Rothwell 2020). A key factor is employment. Depending on job type, the pandemic has differentiated effects on workers' earnings, the likelihood of becoming unemployed, ability to work from home and exposure to the disease, with those in informal, precarious and front-line work most severely affected (Adams-Prassl et al. 2020; ILO 2020a). With labour markets in the Global South marked by a high degree of informality, job vulnerability during the COVID-19 crisis is particularly high. There are also significant intersections across class, race, gender and migrant status, with racial disparities underpinning the disproportionate effects of the pandemic on ethnic minorities in various countries including Brazil, the United Kingdom and the United States (Tai et al. 2020). Young workers, women, migrants, racialised minorities who are overrepresented in services and informal occupations are more likely to lose their jobs and not receive a replacement income. Those who had to continue working, including workers who have been deemed essential, face increased health risks (ILO 2020b).

In addition to labour markets reproducing inequalities through the internal segmentation that exposes specific social groups to super-exploitation (see Elson 1999; Elson and

Pearson 1981), the patterns of exclusion, marginalisation and expulsion from regular employment underpin processes of racialisation that are integral to the functioning of global capitalism (Bhattacharyya 2018). COVID-19 has illuminated how multiple inequalities are formed and re-constituted through divides of work/non-work, productive/reproductive work that fragment the global working classes and those expelled from them. A gender lens reveals the complex ways in which inequalities filter the impacts of the pandemic, with women at a lower risk of mortality than men but, at the same time, disproportionately impacted through their concentration in jobs exposed to the disease, increased care needs, unemployment and domestic violence (Hawkes and Buse 2020 this issue; ILO 2020b; Wenham, Smith, and Morgan 2020).

Third, aside from increasing intersecting inequalities within countries, the uneven power dynamics of capitalism manifest themselves in the perpetuation of the divide between Global South and North. The COVID-19 crisis reminds us of the stark topography of the unlevelled playing field of global capitalism, particularly through dynamics of production, reproduction and finance, in spite of the differential effectiveness of governments' responses to the COVID-19 pandemic that escape South–North divides and new data analysis showing a decrease of global between-country income inequality (see Deaton 2021). The subordinate position of the Global South in the global economy exposes specific vulnerabilities, not just at the level of the nation but more structurally with regard to the organisation of the global economy as a whole. Relations of dependence, structured by re-iterations of colonial configurations of production, reproduction and exchange, continue to shape processes of development in the Global South. For instance, the growth underpinning the “Africa rise” phenomenon has been mostly jobless but was accompanied by a significant increase in the income payments made by African economies to the rest of the world in the form of primary income on foreign direct investment (Sylla 2014). Furthermore, the participation of Global South firms in global supply chains enables new forms of economic imperialism. In her study of imperialist practices, Suwandi (2019), for example, finds that Indonesian suppliers—pressured by Multinational Corporations (MNCs) to adapt to flexible production regimes—transfer unreasonable demands onto workers through various forms of control of the labour process (see also Mezzadri 2016).

What are the structural conditions of the South–North divide that are relevant to understand the unequal impacts of the COVID-19 crisis on a global scale? The integration of countries of the Global South at the lower end of global value chains generates three distinct forms of vulnerabilities. First, the export-oriented growth model focussing on primary commodity extraction and labour-intensive manufacturing exposes countries directly to international price volatility and demand shocks (Blattman 2007; Niskanke and Thorbecke 2007). Whilst this is a recognised long-standing issue, the COVID-19 pandemic has had additional effects on export logistics, commodity prices, labour markets and demand composition (OECD 2020). The drastic drop in global demand, the dramatic fall in exports, and the sudden stop (and reversal) of capital inflows will have long-run ramifications for the sustainability of commodity exporting economic models (Asante-Poku and van Huellen 2021 this issue; Franz 2020 this issue; Hanieh 2020 this issue; UNCTAD 2020). Second, the unequal distribution of power in global supply chains has meant that Global North corporations have been able to transfer costs and risks down the chain, with severe implications for firms and especially

workers at the bottom (Anner 2020). Again, the mechanism is not new, but the magnitude of the effects is. As a result of the informality of work arrangements, the lack of social protection and job security, the workforce in the Global South is in an overall position of structural vulnerability, both within and without global supply chains (ILO 2020c). This is another key dimension of how the pandemic is disproportionately affecting economies and workers in the Global South. Finally, the subordinate position of the Global South in the global financial architecture underpins the responses to the COVID-19 crisis that we have seen enacted so far (see section 3).

However, before we reflect on whether (and if so how) policies implemented so far are likely to lead to any reconfiguration of global power dynamics, we want to point to a further dimension of inequality that is likely to play an important role in the COVID-19 recovery. As we write this article, the rollout of the COVID-19 vaccine is underway in many countries, with Israel, the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom and the United States spearheading the rollout. Whilst the timeframes of this unprecedented global immunisation campaign are not fully determined yet, it is clear that countries have widely different abilities to secure a vaccine for their citizens. The wrangling over the waiver request by South Africa and India to the World Trade Organisation to suspend intellectual property rights related to COVID-19 serves as a sobering reminder of the stark South–North divide (Aryeetey et al. 2021; Usher 2020). The ramifications of inequalities in vaccine distribution are likely to be multiple and long-lasting.

### **Protecting the status quo?**

Before the COVID-19 outbreak, the dominant austerity narrative dismissed calls for more spending to address urgent environmental and inequality issues. We were repeatedly told that “there is no magic money tree”. However, with the COVID-19 outbreak, such a botanical species was suddenly (re)discovered and it was found to bear fruit quite vigorously.

The imposition of national lockdowns triggered a series of connected and mutually reinforcing supply and demand shocks, heavily disrupting production and transportation of commodities and causing a massive fall in private consumption and investment. This created an urgent need for government and central bank interventions, which led to unprecedented increases in public spending and expansion of central bank balance sheets in certain parts of the world. As of early September 2020, global pandemic-related fiscal measures are estimated by the IMF (2020) to be close to 12 per cent of global GDP. But while the magic money tree flourishes in countries of the Global North, producing a lot of money for financial markets and particular segments of society, it is a rare species in the Global South.

High-income countries have been in a position to conduct large fiscal expansionary programmes because they are at the top of the global currency hierarchy, their favourable credit ratings allow them to borrow money at low interest rates and their central banks can conduct massive purchases of government bonds. In middle-income countries, the capacity to spend has been much lower, given the low demand for short-term local currency debt and less favourable credit ratings internationally. In low-income countries, this capacity has been minimal. The IMF (2020, 8), for example, notes that some countries, like Sudan and Zambia, might in effect see a

reduction of their government deficits in 2020 compared to 2019, as a result of a decrease in their primary public expenditures. These differences in the capacity to conduct fiscal policy are a reflection of political and institutional processes, including financialisation, that have taken place over the last decades and have deepened the peripheral position of the Global South (see Bonizzi, Kaltenbrunner, and Powell 2019). They are also the result of the subordinate position of Global South countries in the global value chains and their subjugation to the modalities of transnational capital (see OECD 2020; UNCTAD 2020).

Measures seeking to attenuate this unevenness in fiscal space have been very limited. The grants that have been provided to some countries via the IMF's Catastrophe Containment and Relief Trust have been extremely small (Stubbs et al. 2021). The World Bank has provided support primarily through its private financial arm without changing its private finance-oriented approach that serves the interests of foreign investors and private financial institutions (Dimakou, Romero, and Van Waeyenberge 2020 this issue). Additionally, the pandemic puts strains on the financial systems in emerging market economies that rely significantly on dollar-denominated borrowing. In March 2020, the US Federal Reserve Bank (Fed) (which prior to the pandemic had standing swap arrangements with only 5 central banks) created new swap lines with 9 countries, but only 3 of them (Brazil, Mexico and Korea) were not high-income ones (Bahaj and Reis 2020). Finally, the G20's Debt Service Suspension Initiative only sought to provide *temporary* relief on debt service rather than alleviate structurally high debt burdens, failing to produce any substantial relaxation of the fiscal space necessary to support essential service provision (see Laskaridis *forthcoming* this issue). Crucially, fear of sovereigns losing market access (to commercial lenders) in case they participate in the scheme has limited the number of countries applying.<sup>6</sup> Overall, despite the unprecedented economic and social consequences of the pandemic, the status quo that is reflected in the global financial architecture, and puts the Global South in a subordinated position, has not been challenged (let alone changed).

Furthermore, the magic money tree, where it grows, has not been used by the governments to protect effectively the most vulnerable. Although "essential workers" were praised for their invaluable contribution to the tackling of the health crisis, this has not translated into wage increases or a substantial increase in spending on health and social care; in fact, essential work legislations have been used by governments across the world in politicised ways that escape universally intuitive understandings of "essentiality" and have often resulted in making essential workers more disposable (see Ghosh 2020; Stevano, Ali, and Jamieson 2020 this issue; The Lancet 2020). At the same time, many big corporations were bailed out without any environmental or social conditionalities. The reinforcement of uneven relations and inequalities within and across countries is estimated to push between 80 and 115 million people into extreme poverty, measured using the \$1.90/day international poverty line. The projections become even gloomier if indicators of moderate poverty are used (Sumner, Hoy, and Ortiz-Juarez 2020; The World Bank 2020). Although the positive narrative about income poverty falling since 1990 can be challenged (see Hickel 2016), the COVID-19 crisis is creating a consensus that poverty is set to increase substantially, regardless of the methodological approaches taken to measure it.

Regarding the climate crisis, the pandemic and its unprecedented impact on our societies and economies demonstrate once more that humanity is particularly exposed to nature-related events. This has increased the attention to the climate emergency, which has been reinforced by the awareness that “no vaccine exists for climate change”. International organisations have emphasised the need to design and implement economic policies that are conducive to a “green recovery” and “climate resilience” (e.g. IMF 2020). However, Dafermos, Gabor, and Michell (2021 this issue) point out how the growing attention to climate issues has been used as an opportunity to support the so-called Wall Street Consensus, which reflects the new hegemonic finance-dominated approach to international development (Gabor 2020). Since the COVID-19 outbreak, the World Bank’s promotion of climate public private partnerships (PPPs) in the Global South has been reinforced (see also Dimakou, Romero, and Van Waeyenberge 2020 this issue). Furthermore, while transformations and initiatives that try to protect the financial system from climate-related shocks have taken place, these fail to recognise (let alone address) the central role that the financial system has played in reinforcing the climate crisis (Dafermos et al. 2020; RAN 2020). Crucially, the climate-adjusted Wall Street Consensus has acted as a barrier to alternative solutions to the climate crisis that put public initiatives and climate justice at their core.

The COVID-19 crisis also highlights that political action can and must be used effectively in order to prevent a repetition of the series of policy failures that marked the decade following the 2007–09 Global Financial Crisis. Moving the global economy out of recession and towards a more sustainable path of recovery requires the reversal of the social, economic and environmental policy failures of the past decades. This can happen through an agenda centred around job creation, income redistribution, public services, clean energy and the provision of public funding for new technologies that can serve as foundations for a sustainable and inclusive development path (UNCTAD 2020).

## **Contributions to the Special Issue**

By anchoring interdisciplinarity in a political economy analysis that sees the pandemic as yet another prism through which the contradictory and violent tendencies of global capitalism are exposed, this Special Issue brings together contributions from radical political economists, political scientists, heterodox economists, development economists and public health specialists. The contributions are based on analyses developed in the first months of the pandemic, between March 2020 and December 2020, and make use of the available up-to-date data, including some fresh primary data. The Special Issue provides an early intervention in the fast-evolving understanding of the COVID-19 crisis, with a focus on the Global South.

The agro-ecological roots of the COVID-19 pandemic and its propagation through the world food system are addressed in two contributions. Akram-Lodhi reviews the evidence that shows how the growth of industrial agriculture has greatly amplified the possibility of zoonotic transmission. However, whilst the COVID-19 pandemic originates in the world capitalist food system, it has exposed its numerous contradictions, giving rise to a co-morbidity between COVID-19 and the capitalist world food system. Picchioni, Po and Forsythe concur that the COVID-19 crisis has revealed new tensions and

exacerbated old fragilities in global food systems. They focus on the importance of everyday resilience and resistance in food systems and call for the emerging agri-nutrition literature to draw on social reproduction perspectives and account for the geographies of care.

As COVID-19 is first and foremost a public health crisis, two contributions consider health inequalities and their root causes. Hawkes and Buse show that both the transmission of the virus and the risk of death from it reflect the underlying social and structural determinants of ill-health more broadly. In particular, the pandemic has revealed the gendered nature of these determinants but, while there has been some attention paid to gender issues, Hawkes and Buse argue that a more thorough gender lens needs to inform our understanding of the pandemic as well as the formulation of responses to it. Looking at the case of Peru, Gianella, Gideon and Romero interrogate the extremely severe impact of the pandemic in the country and outline how the fragmentation of the Peruvian health care system, not least through the increased recourse to PPPs, is central to the state's weak capacity to manage the pandemic.

Certainly, the vigorous state interventions observed in some countries have re-ignited the long-standing debates of the role of the state vis-a-vis the market. Osome documents how COVID-19 has propelled African governments into an interventionist role through cash transfers and food distribution; however, the neglect of the reality of gendered labour limits the efficacy of these responses to address the ongoing crisis of social reproduction. With a focus on the Latin American experience, and taking Brazil as an example, Lavinás discusses the role of social policy with an emphasis on cash transfer schemes and how they might help to respond to the economic and social implications of the pandemic. On the issue of state capacity, Lo and Shi assess the Chinese model in comparison to the US model in the response to the COVID-19 crisis, with a particular focus on governance structures. Their analysis challenges the divide between liberal democracy and authoritarianism.

The position of Global South countries at the lower end of global value chains has reinforced their dependence on income through commodity exports. In his analysis of who are the winners (and losers) of the combined effect of the oil price crash, the global economic recession, and the pandemic, Hanieh insists that interpretations of the pandemic as the beginning of the end for big oil ignore the realities of global capitalism's reliance on fossil fuels and the political economy of fossil capital. Franz finds that spatial fixes to previous crises, through which financial capital moved from the North into Latin America's commodity-producing countries, have increased the vulnerability of Latin American commodity-exporting economies during the COVID-19 crisis. He concludes that the territorialisation of capitalist crises manifested in the current COVID-19 crisis disproportionately affects Latin America's commodity-producing countries. Asante-Poku and van Huellen examine the impacts of COVID-19 on commodity-dependent countries, by looking at the cocoa sector in Ghana. They find that, together with the price slump and supply chain disruptions, a structurally vulnerable position in global commodity chains threatens the future supply of key inputs and the general sustainability of export-oriented economic growth models based on primary commodities.

Another set of contributions addresses the theme of work, which is central to the COVID-19 crisis in different ways. On the one hand, the COVID-19 crisis is

fundamentally a crisis of work, and, on the other hand, large segments of the workforce in the Global South are in a position of extreme vulnerability, having become the main absorbers of burdens created by the pandemic. Looking at India – where the plight of workers was so brutal that it received much international attention – Kesar, Abraham, Lahoti, Nath and Basole argue, on the basis of primary survey data collected during the first phase of the pandemic, that containment measures had severe negative impact on livelihoods and food security, particularly for the informally employed. Taking the implications of the pandemic and the state's response to it for the most vulnerable workers in India as the starting point, Miyamura explores the implications for work struggles in India. Noting the emergence of numerous mobilisations and protests by workers organised around workplaces but also beyond them during the pandemic, he argues that future work struggles have an opportunity to bridge production-reproduction divides. Stevano, Ali and Jamieson investigate how essential work classifications have been deployed. Using a global social reproduction lens with illustrations from Mozambique, they point to the need to overcome a Western, productive and nationalist bias intrinsic to current classifications in order to mobilise the transformative potential of the essential work concept to re-valorise undervalued forms of work.

Finally, the subordinate position of Global South countries in international financial structures is at the core of the contributions by Laskaridis, Dimakou et al. and Dafermos et al. Laskaridis analyses the debt relief responses of international creditors and argues that the initiatives dramatically fall short. Prioritising debt repayment over needed domestic expenditures constrains countries' ability to address the direct and indirect economic fallouts of the COVID-19 pandemic. Dimakou, Romero and Van Waeyenberge point to the persistence of the World Bank's prioritisation of private over public interests in its initial COVID-19 response to the detriment of an approach that would strengthen states' capacity to provide public services for all its citizens. Dafermos, Gabor and Michell explain how the pandemic has reinforced the dominance of the Wall Street Consensus, strengthening the powerful role of global institutional investors in international development. They also argue that the climate policy tools of the Wall Street Consensus – which have been promoted more actively since the COVID-19 outbreak – will increase financial vulnerability in the Global South while doing little to achieve climate-aligned development.

## **Old and new imperatives**

The multiple unfolding crises discussed in the contributions to this Special Issue pose serious challenges to how we – as researchers – understand and approach the study of development in a coronavirus-shaped world. The dramatic changes caused by the pandemic raise, or reinforce, important epistemological, methodological and ethical questions. In what follows we discuss some of these and outline how to approach them from a critical, heterodox and interdisciplinary perspective.

The pandemic has magnified the imperative for interdisciplinarity. It is now fully evident that the transmission of infectious diseases is shaped through the interactions between biomedical conditions, socio-economic relations, cultural norms and practices, and political decision-making (see Bontempi, Vergalli, and Squazzoni 2020; Hawkes and Buse 2020 this issue). For Horton (2020b) COVID-19 should be understood as a

syndemic, characterised by biological and social interactions, rather than a pandemic. To produce relevant research in this context, we – as social scientists – must foster interdisciplinary engagement. This will deliver the necessary analytical tools to make sense of the COVID-19 crisis and foster the capacity to formulate adequate responses to it. Interdisciplinarity is equally indispensable in the context of the climate crisis that has dramatic implications for the livelihoods of people in the Global South.

Furthermore, owing to the geographies of inequalities and the specific challenges faced by the Global South, the study of contemporary financialised capitalism necessitates a focus on the Global South. Indeed, examining the global economy through a lens focused on the Global South, including variations within it, provides a useful vantage point for at least two reasons. On the one hand, it allows us to overcome both methodological individualism and methodological nationalism in the analysis of the uneven relations of interdependence across people and countries in the world (Fine 2000; Franz 2019; Hanieh 2015; Pradella 2014). On the other, centring the analysis on the Global South contributes to decolonising processes of knowledge production. This allows us to challenge dominant frameworks (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2012), which are at the core of the responses to the pandemic and the climate crisis. The political economy of debt accumulation (Laskaridis [forthcoming](#) this issue), the role of the international financial institutions (Dafermos, Gabor, and Michell 2021 this issue; Dimakou, Romero, and Van Waeyenberge 2020 this issue) and the disposability and marginalisation of working people (Miyamura [forthcoming](#) this issue; Kesar et al. [forthcoming](#) this issue) ought to become primary lenses to understand processes of capitalist development on a global scale and to frame questions about the future of capitalism.

Finally, the ongoing crisis has placed at centre stage the question of reproduction of life, which, while a long-standing concern for feminists, has remained marginalised in dominant approaches to capitalism and development. We can no longer afford to consider processes of development solely as driven by capital accumulation, technological progress, state intervention and dependence relations without asking the more fundamental question regarding how human life is sustained and labour (re)produced. The latter is a foundational dimension of trajectories of capitalist development. Failure to consider social reproduction, that is the set of material and social practices that ensure the reproduction of life, society and labour (e.g. Bakker and Gill 2019; Katz 2001; Mezzadri 2019), leads to depletion and endangered survival (Bhattacharyya 2018; Rai, Hoskyns, and Thomas 2014). The COVID-19 crisis is fundamentally a crisis of work through both production and reproduction (Mezzadri 2020; Stevano et al. [forthcoming](#)). For example, Ossome (2020 this issue) argues that, by detaching from the agrarian nature of social reproduction and care economies, the African states' responses to the COVID-19 pandemic risk aggravating the crisis of care.

The disproportionate impact of the pandemic on women and people of colour, as well as the failure of the macro-level policy responses to attenuate this impact, illustrate the need to explore more deeply the gendered and racialised effects of crises and the policy responses to them. This becomes even more urgent in the context of the climate crisis. Climate-related events and climate policies (like carbon taxes) can reinforce gender and racial inequalities (Cottrell and Falcão 2018; Roy 2018; ). It is therefore important to develop analytical frameworks that bridge macro-micro divides and allow us to understand the impact of macro-level transformations on the micro-level

dynamics of everyday life. Such frameworks can help the design of macroeconomic, social and industrial policies that can improve the livelihood of young workers, women, migrants and racialised minorities.

Our call for (i) interdisciplinarity, (ii) a focus on the Global South, (iii) the foregrounding of feminist social reproduction approaches and (iv) holistic approaches that examine simultaneously macro- and micro-level dynamics, needs to be accompanied by an awareness of the practical and structural changes to the research process imposed by COVID-19. The pandemic has triggered the production of much research that seeks to document and explain the unfolding crisis almost in real time. This “just-in-time” research raises some broader questions on the organisation of academic work, which typically produces analyses that are slower than the pace of the phenomena they seek to evaluate. Whilst the quick adaptation of much of the research community has been remarkable, we also need to consider whether these emerging approaches to research require a rethinking of the institutional practices that regulate the work of researchers. In addition, in the context of development research, primary data collection is often an important component. The much-limited ability of researchers from the Global North to conduct fieldwork in the Global South poses important questions for power relations in partnerships with local researchers and organisations, including how research funding is structured and how to access the most vulnerable. Collaborations with local researchers and assistants have always been central although not necessarily acknowledged or made visible (Mwambari 2019; Turner 2010). The pandemic has made the work of local researchers and collaborators, however, critically visible. This reality reinforces the need to reframe the architecture of research funding in ways that redress the power imbalances between Global North and South partners (Stevano and Deane 2017).

While we remain hopeful that the pandemic will be managed through vaccines roll-out and virus suppression strategies, it is likely that the use of digital technologies to conduct research will not disappear after the acceleration prompted by the pandemic and in light of the increased recognition of the burden that frequent travel (including by academics) imposes on the planet. However, it is paramount to bear in mind that, if research practices become increasingly governed by digital access, the most vulnerable and marginalised are likely to be on the other side of the digital divide. This will deteriorate their invisibility. Primary research methods have been critical in giving voice to the marginalised and overturning narratives based on biased evidence (see Berik 1997; Mies 1982). It is therefore essential that we continue to ensure that those who cannot be interviewed via phone or computers do not disappear from our analyses and narratives. Meanwhile, our reliance on digital technologies and platforms heightens the risk of surveillance premised on the concentration of power in the hands of the digital corporations, which prosper at times of crisis (Whitehead 2020), with unknown implications for the possible uses of research data and exposure of research participants.

In conclusion, the COVID-19 pandemic has exposed many structural flaws of global capitalism. These are reproduced through the intensification of inequalities and reinforced through inadequate policy responses. These responses are characterised by complex geographies of inequality, with dynamics of class, race, gender and migration status deepening unequal impacts and suffering across the South and the North. At the same time, however, these inequalities are constitutive of global relations of

production, reproduction and finance that continue to perpetuate a North–South divide with no sign of change, if not for the worse, one year into the pandemic. The COVID-19 crisis has overall magnified inequalities and aggravated the vicious cycle that enables the transfer of risk and burden to the most vulnerable. Importantly, the COVID-19 pandemic has also shed light on the materiality of human life and its embeddedness in nature. This points to the importance of preventing crises that are linked to nature, as well as of developing economic and social systems that are resilient to such crises. In the age of the environmental crisis, this makes the need for fundamental changes even more urgent.

## Notes

1. The complex geographies around the handling of the health crisis have generated calls for a potential reconsideration of the use of the North-South divide and in favour of a global lens in development studies (see e.g. Oldekop et al. 2020).
2. For example, see various pieces in the *Monthly Review*, the special issue on Geographies of the COVID-19 pandemic in *Dialogues on Human Geography*, and the special issue in the *Australian Journal of Political Economy*, among others.
3. For more information, see <https://www.ghsindex.org/>.
4. See <https://covid19.who.int/>.
5. When global income inequality is weighted by population, the effect of China, no longer a poor country, leads to an increase in global income inequality.
6. See <https://www.spglobal.com/ratings/en/research/articles/201201-g20-sovereign-debt-suspension-to-apply-or-not-to-apply-11750938>.

## Acknowledgments

The authors are thankful to two anonymous reviewers whose suggestions have helped them strengthen the introductory piece to the Special Issue. The authors would also like to thank the editorial and admin team at the *Canadian Journal of Development Studies* for having managed the process of compiling the Special Issue in a timely and smooth manner and all the contributors for having enriched the collection and worked with them under tight timelines.

## Notes on contributors

**Sara Stevano** is a Lecturer in Economics at SOAS University of London. She is a development and feminist political economist specialising in the study of the political economy of work, well-being (food and nutrition), households and development policy. Her work focuses on Africa, with primary research experience in Mozambique and Ghana.

**Tobias Franz** is a Lecturer in Economics at SOAS, University of London. His work critically engages with issues relating to the political economy of institutional change, development economics, and economic geography. His area focus is on Latin America, with an emphasis on Colombia.

**Yannis Dafermos** is a Lecturer in Economics at SOAS, University of London. His research focuses on macroeconomics, finance, climate change and inequality.

**Elisa Van Waeyenberge** is a Senior Lecturer and Co-Head of the Department of Economics, SOAS University of London. She has a long-standing interest in the International Financial Institutions and the way in which these affect the policy space of countries in the Global South. She has authored numerous publications on this topic including a co-edited book entitled *The Political*

*Economy of Development. The World Bank, Neoliberalism and Development Research* (London: Pluto).

## ORCID

Elisa Van Waeyenberge  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6201-1010>

## References

- Adams-Prassl, A., T. Boneva, M. Golin, and C. Rauh. 2020. "Inequality in the Impact of the Coronavirus Shock: Evidence from Real Time Surveys." Cambridge-INET Working Paper Series No 2020.18/Cambridge Working Papers in Economics No 2032. University of Cambridge Faculty of Economics/Institute for New Economic Thinking. <https://www.inet.econ.cam.ac.uk/working-paper-pdfs/wp2018.pdf>.
- Akram-Lodhi, A. H. 2020. "Contemporary Pathogens and the Capitalist World Food System." *Canadian Journal of Development Studies / Revue canadienne d'études du développement*, doi:10.1080/02255189.2020.1834361.
- Alston, P. 2020. "The Parlous State of Poverty Eradication. Report of the Special Rapporteur on Extreme Poverty and Human Rights." Report no A/HRC/44/40. <http://chrgi.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/Alston-Poverty-Report-FINAL.pdf>.
- Anner, M. 2020. "The Impact of COVID-19 on Workers and Businesses at the Bottom of Global Garment Supply Chains." PennState Center for Global Workers Rights. <https://www.workersrights.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/Abandoned-Penn-State-WRC-Report-March-27-2020-1.pdf>.
- Aryeetey, E., E. Engebretsen, Å Gornitzka, P. Maassen, and S. Stølen. 2021. "A Step Backwards in the Fight Against Global Vaccine Inequities." *The Lancet* 397 (10268): 23–24.
- Asante-Poku, N. A., and S. van Huellen. 2021. "Commodity Exporter's Vulnerabilities in Times of COVID-19: The Case of Ghana." *Canadian Journal of Development Studies / Revue canadienne d'études du développement*, doi:10.1080/02255189.2020.1857225.
- Bahaj, S., and R. Reis. 2020. "Central Bank Swap Lines: Evidence on the Effects of the Lender of Last Resort." Working Paper. <https://personal.lse.ac.uk/reisr/papers/99-cbswaps.pdf>.
- Bakker, I., and S. Gill. 2019. "Rethinking Power, Production, and Social Reproduction: Toward Variegated Social Reproduction." *Capital & Class* 43 (4): 503–523. doi:10.1177/0309816819880783.
- Berik, G. 1997. "The Need for Crossing the Method Boundaries in Economics Research." *Feminist Economics* 3 (2): 121–125. doi:10.1080/135457097338735.
- Bhattacharyya, G. 2018. *Rethinking Racial Capitalism: Questions of Reproduction and Survival*. London: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Blattman, C. 2017. "Winners and Losers in the Commodity Lottery: The Impact of Terms of Trade Growth and Volatility in the Periphery 1870-1939." *Journal of Development Economics* 82 (1): 156–179. doi:10.1016/j.jdeveco.2005.09.003.
- Bonizzi, B., A. Kaltenbrunner, and J. Powell. 2019. "Subordinate Financialization in Emerging Capitalist Economies." Greenwich Papers in Political Economy 23044, University of Greenwich, Greenwich Political Economy Research Centre.
- Bontempi, E., S. Vergalli, and F. Squazzoni. 2020. "Understanding COVID-19 Diffusion Requires an Interdisciplinary, Multi-Dimensional Approach." *Environmental Research* 188: 109814. doi:10.1016/j.envres.2020.109814.
- Cottrell, J., and T. Falcão. 2018. "A Climate of Fairness: Environmental Taxation and Tax Justice in Developing Countries." Vienna Institute for International Dialogue and Cooperation.
- Dafermos, Y., D. Gabor, and J. Michell. 2021. "The Wall Street Consensus in Pandemic Times: What Does it Mean for Climate-Aligned Development?" *Canadian Journal of Development Studies / Revue canadienne d'études du développement*, doi:10.1080/02255189.2020.1865137.

- Dafermos, Y., D. Gabor, M. Nikolaidi, A. Pawloff, and F. van Lerven. 2020. "Decarbonising is Easy: Beyond Market Neutrality in the ECB's Corporate QE." New Economics Foundation, October. <https://neweconomics.org/2020/10/decarbonising-is-easy>.
- Deaton, A. 2021. COVID-19 and Global Income Inequality, NBER Working Paper Series, Working Paper 28392 <http://www.nber.org/papers/w28392>.
- Dimakou, O. M., J. Romero, and E. Van Waeyenberge. 2020. "Never let a Pandemic go to Waste: Turbocharging the Private Sector for Development at the World Bank." *Canadian Journal of Development Studies / Revue canadienne d'études du développement*, doi:10.1080/02255189.2020.1839394.
- Elson, D. 1999. "Labor Markets as Gendered Institutions: Equality, Efficiency and Empowerment Issues." *World Development* 27 (3): 611–627. doi:10.1016/S0305-750X(98)00147-8.
- Elson, D., and R. Pearson. 1981. "Nimble Fingers Make Cheap Workers': An Analysis of Women's Employment in Third World Export Manufacturing." *Feminist Review* 7: 87–107. doi:10.1057/fr.1981.6.
- Federici, S. 2004. *Caliban and the Witch: Women, the Body and Primitive Accumulation*. New York: Autonomedia.
- Fine, B. 2000. "Economics Imperialism and Intellectual Progress: The Present as History of Economic Thought?" *History of Economics Review* 32 (1): 10–35. doi:10.1080/10370196.2000.11733338.
- Franz, T. 2019. "Why 'Good Governance' Fails: Lessons from Regional Economic Development in Colombia." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 43: 776–785. doi:10.1111/1468-2427.12742.
- Franz, T. 2020. "Spatial Fixes and Switching Crises in the Times of COVID-19: Implications for Commodity-Producing Economies in Latin America." *Canadian Journal of Development Studies/Revue Canadienne D'études du Développement*, doi:10.1080/02255189.2020.1832881.
- Gabor, D. 2020. "The Wall Street Consensus." *SocArXiv*. July 2, doi:10.31235/osf.io/wab8m.
- Ghosh, J. 2020. "A Critique of the Indian Government's Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic." *Journal of Industrial and Business Economics* 47 (3): 519–530. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s40812-020-00170-x>.
- Hanieh, A. 2015. "Overcoming Methodological Nationalism: Spatial Perspectives on Migration to the Gulf Arab States." In *Transit States: Labor, Migration and Citizenship in the Gulf*, edited by A. Khalaf, O. AlShehabi, and A. Hanieh, 57–76. London: Pluto Press.
- Hanieh, A. 2020. "COVID-19 and Global Oil Markets." *Canadian Journal of Development Studies / Revue Canadienne D'études du Développement*, doi:10.1080/02255189.2020.1821614.
- Hawkes, S., and K. Buse. 2020. "COVID-19 and the Gendered Markets of People and Products: Explaining Inequalities in Infections and Deaths." *Canadian Journal of Development Studies / Revue canadienne d'études du développement*, doi:10.1080/02255189.2020.1824894.
- Hickel, J. 2016. "The True Extent of Global Poverty and Hunger: Questioning the Good News Narrative of the Millennium Development Goals." *Third World Quarterly* 37 (5): 749–767. doi:10.1080/01436597.2015.1109439.
- Horton, R. 2020a. *The COVID-19 Catastrophe. What's Gone Wrong and How to Stop it Happening Again?* Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Horton, R. 2020b. "Offline: COVID-19 is not a Pandemic." *Lancet (London, England)* 396 (10255): 874. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)32000-6.
- ILO. 2020a. *ILO Monitor: COVID-19 and the World of Work*. 5th ed. [https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/—dgreports/—dcomm/documents/briefingnote/wcms\\_749399.pdf](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/—dgreports/—dcomm/documents/briefingnote/wcms_749399.pdf).
- ILO. 2020b. *Impact of Lockdown Measures on the Informal Economy*. [https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/—ed\\_protect/—protrav/—travail/documents/briefingnote/wcms\\_743523.pdf](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/—ed_protect/—protrav/—travail/documents/briefingnote/wcms_743523.pdf).
- ILO. 2020c. *Social Protection Responses to the COVID-19 Pandemic in Developing Countries: Strengthening Resilience by Building Universal Social Protection*. [https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/—ed\\_protect/—soc\\_sec/documents/publication/wcms\\_744612.pdf](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/—ed_protect/—soc_sec/documents/publication/wcms_744612.pdf).
- IMF. 2020. *Fiscal Monitor Report 2020*, October, Washington DC.
- Jackson, J. K., M. A. Weiss, A. B. Schwarzenberg, and R. M. Nelson. 2020. "Global Economic Effects of COVID-19." Congressional Research Service.

- Katz, C. 2001. "Vagabond Capitalism and the Necessity of Social Reproduction." *Antipode* 33 (4): 709–728. doi:10.1111/1467-8330.00207.
- Kesar, S., R. Abraham, P. Nath, and A. Basole. forthcoming. "Pandemic, Informality and Vulnerability: Impact of COVID-19 on Livelihoods in India." *Canadian Journal of Development Studies/Revue Canadienne D'études Du Développement*. doi:10.1080/02255189.2021.1890003.
- Laskaridis, C. forthcoming. "When Push Came to Shove: COVID-19 and Debt Crises in Low Income Countries." *Canadian Journal of Development Studies/Revue Canadienne D'études Du Développement*. doi:10.1080/02255189.2021.1894102.
- Mezzadri, A. 2016. *The Sweatshop Regime*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mezzadri, A. 2019. "On the Value of Social Reproduction: Informal Labour, the Majority World and the Need for Inclusive Theories and Politics." *Radical Philosophy* 2 (4): 33–41.
- Mezzadri, A. 2020. "A Crisis Like no Other: Social Reproduction and the Regeneration of Capitalist Life During the COVID-19 Pandemic." *Developing Economics*. Accessed 29 June 2020. <https://developingeconomics.org/2020/04/20/a-crisis-like-no-other-social-reproduction-and-the-regeneration-of-capitalist-life-during-the-COVID-19-pandemic/>.
- Mies, M. 1982. *The Lace Makers of Narsapur: Indian Housewives Produce for the World Market*. London: Zed Books.
- Miyamura, S. forthcoming. "Turbulence Ahead: Labour and Struggles in Times of the COVID-19 Pandemic in India." *Canadian Journal of Development Studies/Revue Canadienne D'études Du Développement*. doi:10.1080/02255189.2021.1894415.
- Mwambari, D. 2019. "Local Positionality in the Production of Knowledge in Northern Uganda." *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 18: 1609406919864845. doi:10.1177/1609406919864845.
- Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. 2012. "Coloniality of Power in Development Studies and the Impact of Global Imperial Designs on Africa." *The Australasian Review of African Studies* 33 (2): 48–73.
- Nissanke, M., and E. Thorbecke. 2007. Channels and Policy Debate in the Globalization-Inequality-Poverty Nexus." *World Development* 34 (8): 1338–1360.
- OECD. 2020. COVID-19 and the Food and Agriculture Sector: Issues and Policy Responses, 29 April 2020, <http://www.oecd.org/coronavirus/policy-responses/covid-19-and-the-food-and-agriculture-sector-issues-and-policy-responses-a23f764b/>.
- Oldekop, J. A., R. Horner, D. Hulme, R. Adhikari, B. Agarwal, M. Alford, Oliver Bakewell, et al. 2020. "COVID-19 and the Case for Global Development." *World Development* 134: 105044. doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2020.105044.
- Ossome, L. 2020. "The Care Economy and the State in Africa's Covid-19 Responses." *Canadian Journal of Development Studies / Revue canadienne d'études du développement*, doi:10.1080/02255189.2020.1831448.
- Picchioni, F., J. Y. T. Po, and L. Forsythe. 2021. "Strengthening Resilience in Response to COVID-19: A Call to Integrate Social Reproduction in Sustainable Food Systems." *Canadian Journal of Development Studies/Revue canadienne d'études du développement*, doi:10.1080/02255189.2020.1858761.
- Pradella, L. 2014. "New Developmentalism and the Origins of Methodological Nationalism." *Competition & Change* 18 (2): 180–193. doi:10.1179/1024529414Z.00000000055.
- Rai, S. M., C. Hoskyns, and D. Thomas. 2014. "Depletion: The Cost of Social Reproduction." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 16 (1): 86–105. doi:10.1080/14616742.2013.789641.
- Rainforest Action Network (RAN). 2020. *Banking on Climate Change. Fossil Fuel Finance Report* 2020, March. <https://www.ran.org/bankingonclimatechange2020/>.
- Reeves, R., and J. Rothwell. 2020. Class and COVID: How the Less Affluent Face Double Risks." Retrieved March 30, 2020, available at: <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/up-front/2020/03/27/class-and-covid-how-the-less-affluent-face-double-risks/>.
- Roy, S. S. 2018. *Linking Gender to Climate Change Impacts in the Global South*. Cham: Springer.
- Stevano, S., R. Ali, and M. Jamieson. 2020. "Essential for What? A Global Social Reproduction View on the re-Organisation of Work During the COVID-19 Pandemic." *Canadian Journal*

- of Development Studies / Revue canadienne d'études du développement*, doi:10.1080/02255189.2020.1834362.
- Stevano, S., and K. Deane. 2017. "The Role of Research Assistants in Qualitative and Cross-Cultural Social Sciences Research." In *Handbook of Research Methods in Health Social Sciences*, edited by P. Liamputtong, 1–16. Singapore: Springer Singapore.
- Stevano, S., A. Mezzadri, L. Lombardozi, and H. Bargawi. *forthcoming*. "Hidden abodes in plain sight: The social reproduction of households and labour in the COVID-19 pandemic." *Feminist Economics*, In-Press.
- Stubbs, T., W. Kring, C. Laskaridis, A. Kentikelenis, and K. Gallagher. 2021. "Whatever it Takes? The Global Financial Safety Net, COVID-19, and Developing Countries." *World Development* 137: 105171. doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2020.105171.
- Sumner, A., C. Hoy, and E. Ortiz-Juarez. 2020. "Estimates of the Impact of COVID-19 on Global Poverty." WIDER Working Paper 2020/43. <https://www.wider.unu.edu/sites/default/files/Publications/Working-paper/PDF/wp2020-43.pdf>.
- Suwandi, I. 2019. *Value Chains: The New Economic Imperialism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Sylla, N. S. 2014. "From a Marginalised to an Emerging Africa? A Critical Analysis." *Review of African Political Economy* 41 (sup1): S7–S25. doi:10.1080/03056244.2014.996323.
- Tai, D. B. G., C. Shah, C. A. Doubeni, I. G. Sia, and M. L. Wieland. 2020. "The Disproportionate Impact of COVID-19 on Racial and Ethnic Minorities in the United States." *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, ciaa815. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa815.
- The Lancet. 2020. "The Plight of Essential Workers During the COVID-19 Pandemic." *Lancet (London, England)* 395 (10237): 1587.
- The World Bank. 2020. *Poverty and Shared Prosperity 2020. Reversal of Fortunes*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Turner, S. 2010. "Research Note: The Silenced Assistant. Reflections of Invisible Interpreters and Research Assistants." *Asia Pacific Viewpoint* 51 (2): 206–219.
- UNCTAD. 2020. *From Global Pandemic to Prosperity for All*. Trade and Development Report 2020, United Nations, Geneva.
- Usher, A. D. 2020. "South Africa and India Push for COVID-19 Patents Ban." *The Lancet* 396 (10265): 1790–1791. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)32581-2.
- Wallace, R., A. Liebman, L. F. Chaves, and R. Wallace. 2020. "COVID-19 and Circuits of Capital." *Monthly Review* 72 (1): 1–15.
- Wenham, C., J. Smith, and R. Morgan. 2020. "COVID-19: The Gendered Impacts of the Outbreak." *The Lancet* 395 (10227): 846–848. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30526-2.
- Whitehead, M. 2020. Surveillance Capitalism in the Time of COVID-19, Independent Social Research Foundation, 11 May 2020. Accessed 2 December 2020. <https://www.isrf.org/2020/05/11/surveillance-capitalism-in-the-time-of-COVID-19-the-possible-costs-of-technological-liberation-from-lockdown/>.