



Climate change, COVID-19, and the co-production of injustices: a feminist reading of overlapping crises

Farhana Sultana

To cite this article: Farhana Sultana (2021): Climate change, COVID-19, and the co-production of injustices: a feminist reading of overlapping crises, Social & Cultural Geography, DOI: [10.1080/14649365.2021.1910994](https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2021.1910994)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2021.1910994>



Published online: 05 Apr 2021.



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



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Climate change, COVID-19, and the co-production of injustices: a feminist reading of overlapping crises

Farhana Sultana

Department of Geography and the Environment, Syracuse University, Syracuse, USA

ABSTRACT

The overlapping global socio-ecological crises of climate change and COVID-19 pandemic have simultaneously dominated discussions since 2020. The connections between them expose underbellies of structural inequities and systemic marginalizations across scales and sites. While ongoing climate change amplifies, compounds, and creates new forms of injustices and stresses, all of which are interlinked and interconnected, the emergence of COVID-19 pandemic has also co-created new challenges, vulnerabilities, and burdens, as well as reinforcing old ones. An intersectional analysis of these overlapping but uneven global crises demonstrates the importance of investigating and addressing them simultaneously through a feminist lens. This allows for a more nuanced understanding of the co-production of injustices structurally, materially, and discursively.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 9 December 2020
Accepted 16 February 2021

KEYWORDS

Climate change; covid-19; pandemic; intersectionality; injustice

Two overlapping global socio-ecological crises dominated discussions, imaginations, and lived realities from early 2020 onwards: climate breakdown and the COVID-19 pandemic. By early 2021, the World Health Organization reported over 105 million confirmed cases of COVID-19 cases with over 2 million deaths and counting.¹ These statistics are actually likely to be worse due to lack of accurate data collection, reporting, and monitoring of the virus' impacts in many countries. Similarly, the concurrent onslaught of climate change continued across the globe, making heat stress, wildfires, hurricanes/cyclones, droughts, sea level rise, and floods more severe and frequent. For instance, in 2020 alone, wildfires raged in USA, Australia, and the Amazon; a third of Bangladesh went under floodwaters; over a dozen above-average tropical hurricanes battered countries in the Atlantic, Pacific, and Indian Oceans; and Arctic ice sheets melted at record rates, thereby raising sea levels. As communities struggled to deal with variegated climate-related events, the arrival of the pandemic compounded crises, wreaking havoc, suffering, and deaths across countries and communities. The connections between climate breakdown and the COVID-19 pandemic expose underbellies of structural inequities and systemic marginalizations across scales and sites.

There are similarities and differences in processes and outcomes of climate change and the pandemic. Geographers and other scholars have written about how capitalism,

colonialism, global racism, and ongoing dispossessions have contributed to the worsening of historical climate breakdown, which has uneven and unequal impacts. Any attention to the differentiated climate injustices shows that there are systemic and structural inequities at play. Similarly, the COVID-19 pandemic rapidly spread in uneven and unequal ways across the globe. Both climate change and COVID-19 emerged from extractive ecological exploitation of capitalism, systemic discounting of human and more-than-human natures, and the creation of sacrifice zones where profit was prioritized over people and planetary wellbeing (Fernando, 2020; Kolinjivadi, 2020; Phillips et al., 2020). While ongoing climate change amplifies, compounds, and creates new forms of injustices and stresses, all of which are interlinked and interconnected, the emergences of the COVID-19 pandemic co-created new challenges, vulnerabilities, and burdens on top, while reinforcing old ones (Manzanedo & Manning, 2020; Salas et al., 2020). A Lancet editorial recently argued: 'Indeed, without considering the current and future impacts of climate change, efforts to prepare for future pandemics are likely to be undermined' (Watts et al., 2021, p. 3). While scholars and policy-makers are making comparisons between the climate crisis and the COVID-19 pandemic crisis (Cantellano, 2020; Fernando, 2020; Forster et al., 2020; Fuentes, 2020; Hulme et al., 2020; Searle & Turnbull, 2020), a feminist reading engaging intersectional analyses of both these overlapping crises together, instead of separately, brings into even sharper relief how people are impacted across social groups, identities, and locations. This fosters more nuanced understandings and explanations.

In this paper, I demonstrate the importance of bringing an intersectional lens to better analyze the overlapping but uneven crises of the pandemic and climate injustices. Similarities exist across both, such as gendered differences in increased unpaid care work, differential risks and exposures, disparate access to information and safety measures, increased gender-based violence, and exacerbations of insecurity of livelihoods and financial precarity; however, these manifest differently spatially, temporally, and intersectionally, exposing systemic fault lines and creating new ones, as elaborated below. My reflections and analyses are informed not only by scholarly and policy literatures, but also my situated knowledge and location as a scholar of and from the global South, where both climate breakdown and the pandemic have been profound.² For much of the industrialized world, climate change is something occurring now or in the future; however, in much of the post-colonial developing world, climate change has been occurring for decades already, whereby lived experiences and discourses of climate breakdown are not novel. The pandemic has only compounded those inequities across and between countries and regions.

While the pandemic is a fast-moving and an immediate public health crisis, involving expanding cases of mortality, morbidity, and mental health challenges, health impacts from climate change is a case of slow violence (Nelson, 2016). This slow violence has been occurring for decades, with increasing heat stress, poor indoor and outdoor air quality, poor drinking water quality, displacement trauma, and so on. These are context-driven but intersectionally experienced. Often the same communities are hardest hit by both climate breakdown and the pandemic, because they were already made sacrifice zones from global colonialism, imperialism, and injustices (Zografos & Robbins, 2020). The lived experiences of those in frontline communities should thus better inform global debates that are often occurring among powerful and privileged elites, often in masculine and

white spaces (Macgregor, 2020). Yet much of the global frontline communities, with regard to both the pandemic and climate breakdown, are communities of color. Similarly, disproportionate intersectional gendered imbalances in decision-making and leadership roles in addressing both the pandemic and climate justice exist. A feminist reading of these overlapping crises shows the starkness of this even more than before, or if each issue was analyzed separately instead of together. A trifecta of intersectional patriarchy, pandemic crises, and climate breakdown exacerbates differentiated vulnerabilities and multiplicities of systemic inequities at different temporal and spatial scales.

In broad terms, climate justice is about systems change and addressing structural inequities and power systems that uphold those inequities (Di Chiro, 2011; Forsyth, 2014; Gardiner, 2011; Gonzalez, 2021; Roberts & Parks, 2009; Robinson & Shine, 2018; Schlosberg & Collins, 2014). Critical approaches to climate justice look at issues of responsibility, exposure, vulnerability, and ethics. To have justice, it becomes imperative to first identify injustices that exist and then address underlying causes of them. Climate justice research and action, like pandemic research and action, thus necessitate deploying intersectional approaches for comprehensive accountability of various systemic injustices that overlap and compound. With climate breakdown, more serious epidemics and pandemics and concomitant public health crises will emerge, where the events of 2020 will no longer seem like an anomaly (Leach et al., 2021; UN Women & UNEP, 2020).

Scholars are increasingly beginning to heed insights from various strands of critical feminist scholarship, especially in climate scholarship (Acha, 2019; Bee et al., 2015; Djoudi et al., 2016; Kaijser & Kronsell, 2014; Sultana, 2014; Tschakert & Machado, 2012). Since social groups aren't homogenous, yet have largely been treated as such in a lot of policies and planning, insights such as intersectionality have gained traction to help nuance data and explain on-the-ground realities of overlapping axes of oppression and difference in more representative and accountable ways (Collins & Bilge, 2016; Crenshaw, 1991; Rodó-de-zárate & Baylina, 2018; Yuval-Davis, 2006). Some of the most common axes of intersectional differences or oppressions are gender, race/ethnicity, class, disability, age, sexuality, religion, caste, and livelihood and migrant status. The importance of intersectionality in research are many, but largely because it is (in policy language) a value-added that necessitates disaggregated data requirements but also gets behind such data, and therefore it can help formulate policies and projects that don't further marginalize people and reproduce socio-ecological inequities. This requires close understanding of local contexts and complexities, as well as engagement with insights from evolving bodies of scholarship and theories (such as feminist scholarship, critical race theories, postcolonialism, decolonial and Indigenous scholarship, and so on) (Sultana, 2021).

Geographers and feminist scholars from the Global South have demonstrated the importance of space in analyzing how different groups of men and women suffer differently spatially, whereby intersectional differences are co-constitutive also of histories of colonialism, imperialism, and modernization (McKittrick, 2006; Mohanty, 2003; Mollett & Faria, 2018; Patil, 2013; Radcliffe, 2018; Valentine, 2007). Attention to spatial intersectionality shows how the pandemic unfolded differentially in different places. For instance, the spike in anti-Asian sentiments and crimes in the US, rising anti-Muslim discrimination in the Americas and India, health disparities for people of color (esp in settler-colonial contexts such as the US, UK, Australia), and ageism and ableism globally. Precarious workers, often racial minorities or impoverished members of a community, such as

those in domestic service, migrant laborers, farmworkers, food preparers, were particularly hard hit when businesses shut down or they were pushed out of their jobs (Swan, 2020), or were forced to continue to work under risky circumstances (Teixeira, 2020). Many precarious labor force workers were unable to send remittances to their families overseas or were forced to leave their countries of employment; ethnic minorities and migrants have faced greater exposures from crowded living arrangements, lack of healthcare access, stigmatization and exclusion based on race, ethnicity, and migrant status (International Organisation on Migration (IOM), 2020). Urgent attention to the impact of COVID-19 on those with multiple intersectional burdens and the spatial inequities in deathscapes globally have thus been called for by geographers (Ho & Maddrell, 2021). Differential burdens, risks, exposures, and death rates exist between and within countries, especially among ethnic minorities, refugees, displaced peoples, and those facing contextual structural racisms and barriers. Racialized minorities and immigrants in the US faced greater exposure and risk, where Black communities reported higher morbidities and mortalities (Eaves & Al-Hindi, 2020). In contrast, wealthier people spread COVID-19 with travel across the globe and abilities to lockdown and escape (also through travel if necessary), heightening the disparities across class lines, where COVID-19 has been called the 'rich man's disease' (Bengali et al., 2020). Wealthier people generally fared better in the pandemic with abilities to get away on private jets, more secluded spacious homes, and better access to fiscal and health resources (BBC, 2020).

As such, an intersectional lens allows for better understanding of the complex power structures and lived experiences of those who are coping with and having to adapt to both the pandemic and climate change. It helps explain some root causes of inequities, oppressions, and power structures that interplay to create variegated vulnerabilities, risks, and adaptive capacities in any context. It visibilizes the contours of climate injustices in places and across scales and illuminates the concurrent overlapping crises. Such attention also allows for better understandings of the embodied lived experiences of climate impacts, thereby humanizing climate change that is still largely approached in techno-managerialist and scientific ways. Similar analyses can be applied to how the pandemic travelled and continues to destroy lives and livelihoods of differentiated members of communities. Limits to abilities to cope and adapt at individual and household levels occur globally, but are made more difficult for marginalized and oppressed groups. Differences in decision-making opportunities and bargaining power within the household and community, access to knowledge and resources, and asset bases thus compound various vulnerabilities that are intersectionally experienced individually or communally, but are structurally and systemically produced and reinforced.

Lack of intersectionality analyses and resolution can result in more problematic outcomes and reductive conclusions to be made at this current conjuncture. With the rise of research on climate adaptation, resilience, and loss & damage internationally, it becomes more urgent for researchers to reclaim the possibilities of doing accountable and transformational research that is justice-oriented, with careful and thoughtful intersectional approaches. This is neither easy nor is there a consensus, but difficult conversations need to occur more rigorously, hopefully without reproducing neither victimizations nor damage narratives, or what is euphemistically called poverty porn (Tuck, 2009; Wilson, 2010). The same can be said of the pandemic scenario that continues to unravel and evolve.

But all intersectional research has to be locally grounded and account for local axes of oppression, exploitation, and marginalization. Thus, it has to be contextual. What makes sense in one context may not in another. Gender power relations and gender inequities have been a key entry points for undertaking intersectional research in international policy-making and academic scholarship for some time. However, gender is not static, it is relational and consists of various power relations that are contextual. Gender doesn't sit in isolation from other axes of power relations, but is co-constitutive of the relevant axes of privileges and oppression, such as class and race/ethnicity. This does not mean pursuing an endless set of variabilities of social categories, but of the main axes of oppression and social vulnerabilities and marginalizations that are relevant in each context, to address wider patriarchal power relations. As a result, considerable writing exists on the differential impacts of climate and the pandemic on women in different social and geographical locations.

However, the pandemic exposed and exaggerated fault lines between different groups of women, while showcasing instances of solidarity. There have been renewed privileges based on class and whiteness, and heightened marginalizations for others, whereby socially reproductive labor burdens on migrant women and working-class women allowed for greater 'success' for others based on whiteness and class (Gilbert et al., 2020; Staniscuaski et al., 2020). The pandemic thereby played out in relation to renewed privileging and contestations of particular forms of motherhood and parenting in lockdown. Nonetheless, there was reduced access to preventative and reproductive health-care for women across the board, amplifying gender-blindness in the pandemic response (Connor et al., 2020). There have been exacerbation of discrimination and gender-based violence against women who are ethnic minorities, domestic workers, migrants, sex worker, and members of the LGBTQ populations across the global South. Heightened vulnerabilities, a crisis of social reproduction, and disparities posed challenges to transnational feminist solidarities in the global South with the pandemic (Al-Ali, 2020). However, instances of solidarities, mutual aid, and caregiving activities have simultaneously been fostered by feminist organizations across and between countries to address these rising challenges: country-specific efforts such as 'Federation of Muslim Women's Associations' in Nigeria, 'Coordinadora Feminista 8 M' in Chile, 'She is a Revolution' in Iraq, as well as global efforts by existing feminist initiatives such as 'Association for Women in Development (AWID)' (Al-Ali, 2020).

In addition to gender, class is a key social marker that is co-constitutive of gender, which is why much of climate research expounds on differences of climate change impacts across rich and poor groups and the intersectionalities of gender and class in capitalist oppression; same approach exists with public health research on pandemics and disease burdens or health outcomes. In many contexts, race or ethnicity become important intersectional differences to heed, e.g., racialized and Indigenous communities are positioned marginally compared to settlers or dominant groups, but each community also has its own gender and class dynamics internally and in relation to other groups externally. Similarly, attention is drawn to issues of ability, sexuality, age, nationality, migrant status and other axes of difference and oppression that influence social power relations (Berkhout & Richardson, 2020).

Thus, household level, community level, and wider scalar analyses become important to explain wide-ranging challenges and power dynamics that exist locally. There are

overlaps and interplays that exist and need attention. Such attention needs to also be extended to historical and spatial analyses to understand not just various systemic barriers but geopolitical factors involved. This is because legacies of colonialism, imperialism, and ongoing colonialities reproduce various layers of oppression across space and scales, and these are important in intersectional research, especially when considering overlapping crises that involve uncertainties and multiple forms of vulnerabilities, such as that from climate change and the COVID-19 pandemic. Gendered inequities worsen differentiated vulnerabilities, which have only been exacerbated with the COVID-19 pandemic, creating uneven burdens in productive and reproductive labor responsibilities and roles. This is particularly so for the billions around the world who are marginalized and impoverished from histories of colonialism, capitalism, and development.

Paying attention to intersectionality fosters attention to differences in vulnerability, resilience, coping, and adaptation strategies and abilities in the context of simultaneous climate breakdown and the pandemic. However, just identifying points of difference and exclusions are just the starting point, *not* the end point. The goal is to expand local agency and voice so that marginalized people are heeded and heard in the corridors of power, for greater equity and justice on the ground, and for structural change. This includes working with local leaders, groups, organizations and institutions, while also paying attention to local power dynamics to see who is excluded or left out.

An example here lays bare the differences between policy advice and lived realities. Water stress and water insecurity compound gendered inequities where women and girls are responsible for household water provision daily in much of the developing world. This can occur during droughts (which are increasing with climate breakdown) but also during floods and storms (which are also worsening with climate breakdown); and this water insecurity occurs for a range of reasons, such as potable water sources becoming precarious, or few and far between, or expensive to access, or socially challenging to access for different reasons, or institutional barriers being in place (Sultana & Loftus, 2020). The pandemic crisis was compounded not only from the lack of ability to socially distance in small homes or the rising poverty due to inability to earn an income as economies struggle in a pandemic, but from another aspect, which is the need for water: instructions for frequent hand-washing and hygiene practice during COVID-19 meant greater burden of providing for water in the home and ensuring sanitation opportunities (Loftus & Sultana, 2020; Ray, 2020). When there is no household-level water connection or easy source of reliable water, which is the case in impoverished communities across the world, poorer women and girls spent considerable amounts of time and labor fetching water for their families during the pandemic, which was challenging with many publicly accessible sources not being viable, malfunctioning, shut down, or simply inaccessible because of the pandemic. However, it is not all women and girls, since this varies by class and race, but can also include men and boys who participate in domestic water provision. The inability to fulfill such gendered domestic responsibilities has led to greater incidences of gender-based and domestic violence, as well as entire households becoming unable to address the pandemic successfully, and thus reinforcing their vulnerabilities and also exacerbating public health crises. Thus, in the pandemic, we were actually not all in this together equally (Loftus & Sultana, 2020).

Emerging scholarship and statistics on the pandemic globally have shown how gendered caregiving roles and household responsibilities amplified with the onset of the

pandemic (Ryan & El Ayadi, 2020). Impacts were also felt in the workplace with loss of jobs and economic wellbeing of entire families and communities, as the pandemic lockdowns and shutdowns caused a global economic slowdown (Dang & Viet Nguyen, 2021). Disposability of precarious workforce, often occupied by women and gender minorities, meant increasing vulnerability to pandemic shocks and increasing household economic insecurity. Similarly, inability to pay back microfinance loans due to pandemic economy impacted vast numbers of women in the developing world, compounding poverty (Brickell et al., 2020). At the same time, gendered impacts of climate-fueled disasters and post-disaster recovery (or lack thereof) demonstrated increased job losses for men and women, but with increased distress sale of women's assets (such as jewelry), greater incidences of gender-based violence, and unequal gendered health-related burdens, food and water insecurity, and overall compounding impoverishment (UN Women & UNEP, 2020). The United Nations called this rise in gender-based violence and spike in sex trafficking of women and girls during the pandemic a 'shadow pandemic' (UN Women, 2020). COVID-19 is expected to have more enduring impacts on women compared to men into the future, since in general, women tend to hold fewer political positions of power or decision-making control over policies, processes, and finances that impact their lives (Azcona et al., 2020). The authors of this report argue 'by 2021 around 435 million women and girls will be living on less than 1.90 USD a day, including 47 million pushed into poverty as a result of COVID-19.' The national debt of many impoverished countries increased with economic downturn due to COVID-19, resulting in greater threats to gender justice due to austerity measures (which compounded livelihood precarity and abilities to exercise rights) (Fresnillo Sallan, 2020). This was worsened with the climate crises simultaneously occurring in these countries.

What all this demonstrates is that heeding intersectional gendered implications of climate change and the ongoing pandemic are particularly important as patriarchal norms, inequities, and inequalities often place women and men in differentiated positions in their abilities to respond to and cope with dramatic changes in socioecological relations and dispossessions, as well as foregrounds the complex ways in which social power relations operate in communal responses to any strategies deployed. For instance, as greater climate-exacerbated storms, hurricanes/cyclones, heat stress, wildfires, and flood continue to ravage large parts of the world, sufferings have been compounded with the pandemic due to uneven landscapes of assistance, support, relief, and rehabilitation (Dankelman & Naidu, 2020). Erratic heat waves, wildfires, irregular rainfall patterns, and frequent stronger storms are part and parcel of climate breakdown, which will worsen over time. With rising seas, greater tropical storms, sea surges, and salinity encroachments into aquifers and surface waters, more rural migrants are being driven to cities in the developing world, as well as more cross-border climate migrants and refugees. As economic recessions and lockdowns have ripple effects, greater stressors are placed on families. All these compound existing patriarchal, classed, and racialized violences and injustices.

At the same time, the overlapping crises demonstrated variegated coping strategies as well as alterations in how people perceive their roles in their democracies and enact their citizenship rights. State failures or inability to provide relief, sufficient social safety net protections, or adequate healthcare have further weakened societies across the global South (Ali et al., 2021; Jankó, 2020). Critical and nuanced analyses of these issues open up

opportunities to address barriers and thereby encourage equitable changes. While the COVID-19 pandemic shifted priorities for many institutions, governments, and decision-makers, existing realities of those facing the double whammy of climate breakdown and COVID-19 pandemic showcases how the contours of suffering are both reinforced and created anew. This should bring into greater question the underlying capitalist ideologies of endless growth and ecological exploitation on a finite planet.

What all these demonstrate is that close understanding of local dynamics and power structures is vital, as well as understanding the broader political economies and political ecologies of overlapping crises. Climate change has exacerbated unequal intersectional power relations of gender, class, and other axes significantly in the developing world, but also in the industrialized world (especially in racialized communities and Indigenous communities). Similarly, the pandemic intensified intersectional sufferings and burdens concomitantly. This is why international, interdisciplinary, and intersectional research enriches our overall understanding and abilities to act across sites and scales.

While climate change amplifies, exacerbates, and creates new forms of interconnected injustices and stresses, adaptation and planning processes to tackle climate breakdown in different locations can also exacerbate climate injustices if not undertaken carefully and critically (Eriksen et al., 2021; Sultana, 2018). Climate change is not a single-topic issue but is a stress multiplier. No community is homogeneous, no class group is homogeneous, since contextual intersectional differences are important to understand. Simultaneously, the COVID-19 pandemic only created more layers of burdens and additional individual and systemic vulnerabilities, thereby compounding sufferings spatially, temporally, and intergenerationally, foregrounding how marginalized groups are rendered more vulnerable, treated differently, and why a critical social justice lens is important. The contours of these burdens become more visible when critical intersectional analyses are undertaken.

At the current conjuncture of overlapping existential crises, undertaking intersectional research ethically becomes important, especially by human/social geographers and other critical social scientists. This can be informed by insights from feminist, Indigenous, decolonial, and critical race scholarships, among others. Feminist methodological insights of situated knowledge, positionality, critical self-reflexivity, inter-subjectivity, ethics of care, accountability, reciprocity, inclusivity, co-producing knowledge, relationality, and critical praxis are important in undertaking intersectional work that has the potential to be meaningful, ethical, and useful to people on the ground (Johnson et al., 2020; Mollett & Faria, 2018; Sultana, 2007; Swarr & Nagar, 2010). To work towards emancipatory changes, one must engage with various structures, institutions, and communities in ethical yet critical ways. This also means working interdisciplinarily and transdisciplinarily, recognizing that expertise exists beyond the ivory tower in the lived experiences and wisdom in frontline communities (however they are defined in context).

In conclusion, radical intersectionality approaches go beyond just analyses and explanation, but in exploring opportunities for building solidarities, agency, and collectivities against systemic inequities and oppression. It offers possibilities to explore strategies of resistances and emancipatory transformations. It also allows for better policy-making and project planning for reducing climate-related and pandemic-related vulnerabilities and crises, for encouraging long-term commitments to address structural, societal, and institutional barriers, and for enacting ways to reduce inequities while fostering relationships of mutuality, aid, solidarity, care, and respect. Research that is intersectional can thus

provide ways to begin to address institutional and structural challenges that compound impacts of climate change and the COVID-19 pandemic across scales and locations. Feminist politics that prioritizes intersectional inclusion, political leverage, and accountability can create more gender-responsive responses for COVID-19 and climate change (Dankelman & Naidu, 2020). These scholars argue that 'feminist responses to COVID-19 as well as to the global climate crisis call for fundamental system changes, with a need for feminist, just, and green approaches at the heart of all post-COVID developments' (Dankelman & Naidu, 2020: 450).

Critical and conceptual reassessment of intersectionality through gender-just approaches, and the processual, discursive, and material intersections of climate and COVID-19 pandemic, are thus necessary. There are no easy solutions or quick fixes, but an imperative to investigate, expose, and understand various interconnected injustices, especially in marginalized spaces, so that more equitable outcomes can be configured and pursued. There is increased rhetoric of 'building back better' or 'the great reset' for a post-pandemic era of climate change that are contextually being defined by different countries, yet questions remain exactly what this means, who is deciding, for whom is this for, in what ways, where, and why. Post-pandemic recovery may not account sufficiently for gender-sensitive or gender-just responses unless it is specifically made so. Many activists and scholars have called for moving away from fossil-fuel-based recovery not just to slow down climate breakdown, but for better post-pandemic fiscal recovery that includes climate financing that is gender-accountable (Hepburn et al., 2020). Some recent examples put forth by activists are the Feminist Green New Deal in the USA (Daniel & Dolan, 2020) and Feminist Fossil Free Future in the Asia-Pacific (Godden et al., 2020). Such endeavors would require multi-scalar, gender-disaggregated data collection, greater monitoring, accountability, adequate capacities, and budgetary resources allocated for intersectional analyses and thus responsiveness and redress where necessary. Such approaches allow for avoiding generalizations and homogenizations of communities, but focus on power relations in processes and across scales, whose voice counts and how, and systemic approaches that foster the importance of recognizing radical intersectionality in these overlapping crises. Addressing rapidly compounding injustices with gender-just planning for post-pandemic recovery that includes climate justice offers pathways forward that are more just and sustainable. Thus, greater feminist attention to the interactions of these co-produced but uneven processes of disposessions and crises remain critically necessary.

Notes

1. The WHO maintains a regular tracker of national COVID-19 statistics at <https://covid19.who.int/>
2. I draw insights from my own research and lived experience in South Asia to think through these connections as well as existing scholarship. My perspective is informed by my being both an academic researcher who works on nature-society dialectics intersectionally and internationally, as a feminist geographer, political ecologist, and development geographer, and as someone with lived experience and close family ties in the developing world where climate injustices and climate breakdown have been long-standing crises for many decades, and the pandemic rages unabatedly concomitantly. The pandemic will likely continue well into the future due vaccine apartheid, inadequate healthcare, and impoverishment, while

climate breakdown worsens over time.

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to the American Association of Geographers for the 2019 Glenda Laws Award, which recognizes “outstanding contributions to geographic research on social issues” and this paper is written to honor scholars like Glenda Laws. I thank David Bissell and anonymous peer reviewers of *Social and Cultural Geography* for constructive and generous feedback that helped in revising the paper. An earlier version of the paper was presented as an invited keynote lecture at the New Zealand Geographical Society’s annual conference in November 2020. All errors remain mine.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

References

- Acha, M. R. (2019). Climate justice must be anti-patriarchal, or it will not be systemic. In -K.-K. Bhavnani (Ed.), *Climate futures: Re-imagining global climate justice* (pp. 246–252). Zed Books.
- Al-Ali, N. (2020). Covid-19 and feminism in the global south: Challenges, initiatives and dilemmas. *European Journal of Women’s Studies*, 27(4), 333–347. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350506820943617>
- Ali, T. O., Hassan, M., & Hossain, N. (2021). The moral and political economy of the pandemic in Bangladesh: Weak states and strong societies during Covid-19. *World Development*, 137, 105216. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2020.105216>
- Azcona, G., Bhatt, A., Encarnacion, J., Plazaola-Castaño, J., Seck, P., Staab, S., & Turquet, L. (2020). *From Insights to Action: Gender Equality in the Wake of COVID-19*. United Nations Women. <https://doi.org/10.18356/f837e09b-en>
- BBC. (2020, September 10). Coronavirus: BBC poll suggests stark divide between rich and poor countries. *BBC News*. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-54106474>
- Bee, B. A., Rice, J., & Trauger, A. (2015). a feminist approach to climate change governance: Everyday and intimate politics. *Geography Compass*, 9(6), 339–350. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gec3.12218>
- Bengali, S., Linthicum, K., & Kim, V. (2020). How the coronavirus began as a disease of the rich. *Los Angeles Times*. <https://www.latimes.com/world-nation/story/2020-05-08/how-the-coronavirus-began-as-a-disease-of-the-rich>
- Berkhout, S. G., & Richardson, L. (2020). Identity, politics, and the pandemic: Why is COVID-19 a disaster for feminism(s)? *History and Philosophy of the Life Sciences*, 42(4), 49. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40656-020-00346-7>
- Brickell, K., Picchioni, F., Natarajan, N., Guermond, V., Parsons, L., Zanello, G., & Bateman, M. (2020). Compounding crises of social reproduction: Microfinance, over-indebtedness and the COVID-19 pandemic. *World Development*, 136, 105087. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2020.105087>
- Cantellano, P. E. (2020). COVID-19 and the Climate Agenda. *UN Chronicle*. <https://www.un.org/en/un-chronicle/2020-covid-19-and-climate-agenda>
- Collins, P. H., & Bilge, S. (2016). *What is intersectionality?* Polity Press.
- Connor, J., Madhavan, S., Mokashi, M., Amanuel, H., Johnson, N. R., Pace, L. E., & Bartz, D. (2020). Health risks and outcomes that disproportionately affect women during the Covid-19 pandemic: A review. *Social Science & Medicine*, 266, 113364. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113364>
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241–1299. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039>
- Dang, H. A. H., & Viet Nguyen, C. (2021). Gender inequality during the COVID-19 pandemic: Income, expenditure, savings, and job loss. *World Development*, 140, 105296. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2020.105296>

- Daniel, T., & Dolan, M. (2020). Intersectionality and collective action: Visioning a feminist green new deal in the US. *Gender and Development*, 28(3), 515–533. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13552074.2020.1843829>
- Dankelman, I., & Naidu, K. (2020). Introduction: Gender, development, and the climate crisis. *Gender and Development*, 28(3), 447–457. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13552074.2020.1843830>
- Di Chiro, G. (2011). Acting globally: Cultivating a thousand community solutions for climate justice. *Development*, 54(2), 232–236. <https://doi.org/10.1057/dev.2011.5>
- Djoudi, H., Locatelli, B., Vaast, C., Asher, K., Brockhaus, M., & Basnett Sijapati, B. (2016). Beyond dichotomies: Gender and intersecting inequalities in climate change studies. *Ambio*, 45(S3), 248–262. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-016-0825-2>
- Eaves, L. T., & Al-Hindi, K. F. (2020). Intersectional geographies and COVID-19. *Dialogues in Human Geography*, 10(2), 132–136. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2043820620935247>
- Eriksen, S., Schipper, E. L. F., Scoville-Simonds, M., Vincent, K., Adam, H. N., Brooks, N., Harding, B., Khatri, D., Lenaerts, L., Liverman, D., Mills-Novoa, M., Mosberg, M., Movik, S., Muok, B., Nightingale, A., Ojha, H., Sygna, L., Taylor, M., Vogel, C., & West, J. J. (2021). Adaptation interventions and their effect on vulnerability in developing countries: Help, hindrance or irrelevance? *World Development*, 141, 105383. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2020.105383>
- Fernando, J. L. (2020). From the Virocene to the Lovecene epoch: Multispecies justice as critical praxis for Virocene disruptions and vulnerabilities. *Journal of Political Ecology*, 27(1), 685–731. <https://doi.org/10.2458/v27i1.23816>
- Forster, P. M., Forster, H. I., Evans, M. J., Gidden, M. J., Jones, C. D., Keller, C. A., Lamboll, R. D., Quére, C. L., Rogelj, J., Rosen, D., Schleussner, C.-F., Richardson, T. B., Smith, C. J., & Turnock, S. T. (2020). Current and future global climate impacts resulting from COVID-19. *Nature Climate Change*, 10(10), 913–919. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-020-0883-0>
- Forsyth, T. (2014). Climate justice is not just ice. *Geoforum*, 54, 230–232. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2012.12.008>
- Fresnillo Sallan, I. (2020). Debt and climate: Entangled emergencies derailing women's rights and gender justice. *Gender and Development*, 28(3), 499–513. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13552074.2020.1838168>
- Fuentes, A. (2020). A (Bio)anthropological view of the COVID-19 Era midstream: Beyond the infection. *Anthropology Now*, 12(1), 24–32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19428200.2020.1760635>
- Gardiner, S. M. (2011). Climate justice. In John S. Dryzek, Richard B. Norgaard, and David Schlosberg (Eds.), *In The Oxford Handbook of climate change and society*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199566600.003.0021>
- Gilbert, L. K., Strine, T. W., Szucs, L. E., Crawford, T. N., Parks, S. E., Barradas, D. T., Njai, R., & Ko, J. Y. (2020). Racial and ethnic differences in parental attitudes and concerns about school reopening during the COVID-19 pandemic – United States, July 2020. *MMWR*, 69(49), 1848–1852. <https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6949a2>
- Godden, N. J., Macnish, P., Chakma, T., & Naidu, K. (2020). Feminist participatory action research as a tool for climate justice. *Gender and Development*, 28(3), 593–615. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13552074.2020.1842040>
- Gonzalez, C. (2021). Racial capitalism, climate justice, and climate displacement. *Oñati Socio-Legal Series*, 11(1), 108–147. <https://doi.org/10.35295/osls.iisl/0000-0000-0000-1137>
- Hepburn, C., O'Callaghan, B., Stern, N., Stiglitz, J., & Zenghelis, D. (2020). Will COVID-19 fiscal recovery packages accelerate or retard progress on climate change? *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 36 (Suppl_1), S359–S381. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxrep/graa015>
- Ho, E. L. E., & Maddrell, A. (2021). Intolerable intersectional burdens: A COVID-19 research agenda for social and cultural geographies. *Social and Cultural Geography*, 22(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2020.1837215>
- Hulme, M., Lidskog, R., White, J. M., & Standring, A. (2020). Social scientific knowledge in times of crisis: What climate change can learn from coronavirus (and vice versa). *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews. Climate Change*, 11(4), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.656>
- International Organisation on Migration (IOM). (2020). Migration factsheet no. 6 – The impact of COVID-19 on migrants. www.iom.int/migration-research

- Jankó, F. (2020). Fear regimes: Comparing climate change and the Covid-19 pandemic. *Geoforum*, 117, 308–310. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2020.09.023>
- Johnson, A., Zalik, A., Mollett, S., Sultana, F., Havice, E., Osborne, T., Valdivia, G., Lu, F., & Billo, E. (2020). Extraction, entanglements, and (im)materialities: Reflections on the methods and methodologies of natural resource industries fieldwork. *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space*, 251484862090747. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2514848620907470>
- Kaijser, A., & Kronsell, A. (2014). Climate change through the lens of intersectionality. *Environmental Politics*, 23(3), 417–433. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2013.835203>
- Kolinjivadi, V. (2020). This pandemic IS ecological breakdown: Different tempo, same song. *Uneven Earth*. <http://unevenearth.org/2020/04/this-pandemic-is-ecological-breakdown-different-tempo-same-song/>
- Leach, M., MacGregor, H., Scoones, I., & Wilkinson, A. (2021). Post-pandemic transformations: How and why COVID-19 requires us to rethink development. *World Development*, 138, 105233. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2020.105233>
- Loftus, A., & Sultana, F. (2020). Are we all in this together? COVID-19 and the human rights to water and sanitation. In D. McDonald, S. Spronk, & D. Chavez (Eds.), *Public water and COVID-19: Dark clouds and silver linings* (pp. 49–60). The Transnational Institute (TNI) & Municipal Services Project (MSP).
- Macgregor, S. (2020). Zooming in, calling out: (M)Anthropogenic climate change through the lens of gender. In K. K. Bhavnani (Ed.), *Climate futures: Re-imagining global climate justice* (pp. 57–63). Zed Books.
- Manzanedo, R. D., & Manning, P. (2020). COVID-19: Lessons for the climate change emergency. *Science of the Total Environment*, 742, 140563. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.140563>
- Mckittrick, K. (2006). *Demonic grounds: Black women and the cartographies of struggle*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Mohanty, C. T. (2003). Cartographies of struggle. In *Feminism without borders*. (pp. 43–84). Duke University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822384649-003>
- Mollett, S., & Faria, C. (2018). The spatialities of intersectional thinking: Fashioning feminist geographic futures. *Gender, Place and Culture*, 25(4), 565–577. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2018.1454404>
- Nelson, S. H. (2016). The slow violence of climate change. *Jacobin*. <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2016/02/cop-21-united-nations-paris-climate-change/>
- Patil, V. (2013). From patriarchy to intersectionality: A transnational feminist assessment of how far we've really come. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 38(4), 847–867. <https://doi.org/10.1086/669560>
- Phillips, C. A., Caldas, A., Cleetus, R., Dahl, K. A., Declet-Barreto, J., Licker, R., Merner, L. D., Ortiz-Partida, J. P., Phelan, A. L., Spanger-Siegfried, E., Talati, S., Trisos, C. H., & Carlson, C. J. (2020). Compound climate risks in the COVID-19 pandemic. *Nature Climate Change*, 10(7), 586–588. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-020-0804-2>
- Radcliffe, S. A. (2018). Geography and indigeneity II: Critical geographies of indigenous bodily politics. *Progress in Human Geography*, 42(3), 436–445. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132517691631>
- Ray, I. (2020). Viewpoint – Handwashing and COVID-19: Simple, right there ...? *World Development*, 135, 105086. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2020.105086>
- Roberts, J. T., & Parks, B. C. (2009). Ecologically unequal exchange, ecological debt, and climate justice. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 50(3–4), 385–409. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020715209105147>
- Robinson, M., & Shine, T. (2018). Achieving a climate justice pathway to 1.5°C. *Nature Climate Change*, 8(7), 564–569. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-018-0189-7>
- Rodó-de-zárate, M., & Baylina, M. (2018). Intersectionality in feminist geographies. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 25(4), 547–553. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2018.1453489>
- Ryan, N. E., & El Ayadi, A. M. (2020). A call for a gender-responsive, intersectional approach to address COVID-19. *Global Public Health*, 15(9), 1404–1412. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17441692.2020.1791214>

- Salas, R. N., Shultz, J. M., & Solomon, C. G. (2020). The climate crisis and Covid-19 – A major threat to the pandemic response. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 383(11), e70. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp2022011>
- Schlosberg, D., & Collins, L. B. (2014). From environmental to climate justice: Climate change and the discourse of environmental justice. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews. Climate Change*, 5(3), 359–374. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.275>
- Searle, A., & Turnbull, J. (2020). Resurgent natures? More-than-human perspectives on COVID-19. *Dialogues in Human Geography*, 10(2), 291–295. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2043820620933859>
- Stanisquaski, F., Kmetzsch, L., Zandonà, E., Reichert, F., Soletti, R., Ludwig, Z., Lima, E., Neumann, A., Schwartz, I., Mello-Carpes, P., Tamajusuku, A., Werneck, F., Ricachenevsky, F., Infanger, C., Seixas, A., Staats, C., & De Oliveira, L. (2020). Gender, race and parenthood impact academic productivity during the COVID-19 pandemic: From survey to action. *BioRxiv*, (2020(7), 04.187583. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.04.187583>
- Sultana, F. (2007). Reflexivity, positionality and participatory ethics: Negotiating fieldwork dilemmas in international research. *ACME*, 6(3), 374–385. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jedudev.2008.02.004>
- Sultana, F. (2014). Gendering climate change: Geographical insights. *The Professional Geographer*, 66(3), 372–381. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00330124.2013.821730>
- Sultana, F. (2018). Gender and water in a changing climate: Challenges and opportunities. In C. Fröhlich, G. Gioli, R. Cremades, & H. Myrntinen (Eds.), *Water security across the gender divide* (pp. 17–33). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-64046-4_2
- Sultana, F. (2021). Political ecology 1: From margins to center. *Progress in Human Geography*, 44(1), 99–118. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132520936751>
- Sultana, F., & Loftus, A. (2020). *Water politics: Governance, justice and the right to water*. Routledge.
- Swan, E. (2020). COVID-19 foodwork, race, gender, class and food justice: An intersectional feminist analysis. *Gender in Management*, 35(7–8), 693–703. <https://doi.org/10.1108/GM-08-2020-0257>
- Swarr, A. L., & Nagar, R. (2010). Introduction: Theorizing transnational feminist praxis. In A. L. Swarr & R. Nagar (Eds.), *Critical transnational feminist praxis* (pp. 1–20). SUNY Press.
- Teixeira, J. C. (2020). Brazilian housemaids and COVID-19: How can they isolate if domestic work stems from racism? *Gender, Work, and Organization* 28(S1): 250–259. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12536>
- Tschakert, P., & Machado, M. (2012). Gender justice and rights in climate change adaptation: Opportunities and pitfalls. *Ethics and Social Welfare*, 6(3), 275–289. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17496535.2012.704929>
- Tuck, E. (2009). Suspending damages. *Harvard Educational Review*, 79(3), 409–428. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.79.3.n0016675661t3n15>
- UN Women. (2020). The shadow pandemic: Violence against women during COVID-19. <https://www.unwomen.org/en/news/in-focus/in-focus-gender-equality-in-covid-19-response/violence-against-women-during-covid-19>
- UN Women, & UNEP. (2020). Gender and climate change in the context of COVID-19. <https://asiapacific.unwomen.org/en/digital-library/publications/2020/05/gender-and-climate-change-in-the-context-of-covid-19>
- Valentine, G. (2007). Theorizing and researching intersectionality: A challenge for feminist geography. *Professional Geographer*, 59(1), 10–21. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9272.2007.00587.x>
- Watts, N., Amann, M., Arnell, N., Ayeb-Karlsson, S., Beagley, J., Belesova, K., Boykoff, M., Byass, P., Cai, W., Campbell-Lendrum, D., Capstick, S., Chambers, J., Coleman, S., Dalin, C., Daly, M., Dasandi, N., Dasgupta, S., Davies, M., Di Napoli, C., & Costello, A. (2021). The 2020 report of the lancet countdown on health and climate change: Responding to converging crises. *The Lancet*, 397(10269), 129–170. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)32290-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)32290-X)

- Wilson, B. (2010). What is 'Poverty Porn' and are we guilty of indulging in it? *Trespass Magazine*. <http://www.trespassmag.com/what-is-'poverty-porn'-and-are-we-guilty-of-indulging-in-it/>
- Yuval-Davis, N. (2006). Intersectionality and feminist politics. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 13(3), 193–209. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350506806065752>
- Zografos, C., & Robbins, P. (2020). Green sacrifice zones, or why a green new deal cannot ignore the cost shifts of just transitions. *One Earth*, 3(5), 543–546. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2020.10.012>