https://doi.org/10.48336/IJROQK7410

Neo-Liberalism and Post-Crisis Recovery: A Review of Literature on 2008 Crisis and COVID-19 Pandemic Recovery Measures

Shila Avissa
York University

ABSTRACT

Discussions of the causes of the inequitable impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic strike a similar tone as the same discussion of the 2008 financial crisis. In this review of the literature on the post–2008-financial-crisis and the post-pandemic economic recoveries, neo-liberalism is identified as an influential force in both crises' inequitable impacts on communities experiencing marginalization. Calls for a radical, new, and more just health, social, and economic system can be found during the financial crisis and currently during the pandemic. However, the post-crisis recovery measures taken by governments across the Global North after 2008 rejected these calls, instead implementing policy measures that signalled a recommitment to the very same neo-liberal system that had created its inequitable impacts. This critical review of the literature discusses how the historical post-crisis recovery policies of the 2008 financial crisis might shed some light on what is to come during the recovery period of the COVID-19 pandemic in Canada, in addition to what possible alternatives to neo-liberal post-crisis economic recovery might look like.

Keywords: neo-liberalism, COVID-19, global financial crisis, economic recovery

---

Discussions of neo-liberal influence on the COVID-19 pandemic's economic recovery plans and its inequitable impacts strike a similar tone to the discussions of the 2008 global financial crisis. Literatures exploring the causes of the financial crisis and its severe social, economic, and health impacts point to the crisis's connection to neo-liberalism while also shining a light on various governments' moves to further implement neo-liberal policies as common-sense solutions to the crisis. Given that COVID-19 economic recovery is an emerging issue, I critically analyze literatures on both the 2008 financial crisis and recent proposals for post-pandemic recovery to understand the historical underpinnings of both crises and why certain economic-recovery policies are preferred by political actors across the Global North. I start by exploring neo-liberalism as a rationality and the historical context of both crises. Next, I explore the debates surrounding post-crisis recovery. After a discussion of the outlook for change, I end by examining what a radical alternative to neo-liberal recovery might look like.

Examining Neo-Liberalism

A deeper understanding of neo-liberalism and its implications for state policies and for everyday life and the citizen-subject–making process is crucial. Authors writing about the connection between neo-liberalism and economic-recovery policies after the 2008 financial

crisis and after COVID-19 pandemic identify policies such as welfare reforms, corporate deregulation, marketization and privatization of health and social sectors, and attack on labour rights as manifestations of neo-liberalism (Ferguson & Lavalette, 2013; Grover & Soldatic, 2012; Kecskes, 2020; Thomas & Tufts, 2015). There is also a common-found conception of laissez-faire attitudes—minimum government intervention—as entirely synonymous with neo-liberalism. However, Aalbers (2013) and Brown (2005) argued that in the neo-liberalism that actually exists today, the state is always an active actor striving to continuously reinforce its ideology. It continuously intervenes through its state apparatus such as laws, the political system, and the welfare system to further reinforce the ideology of neo-liberalism in all aspects of life, with the ultimate goal of benefiting capital—corporations, major investors, and employers.

Beyond being an economic ideology, neo-liberalism is a form of governmentality that discursively produces the citizen-subject through various technologies such as the political system, health-care system, economic policy, welfare reforms, and labour policy (Albers, 2013; Browning, 2005; Cahill, 2011; Grover & Soldatic, 2012; Macías, 2015). In her essay, Brown (2005) described neo-liberalism as a "political rationality" (p. 37) invested in the creation of *homo economicus*—the economic man. Neo-liberalism strives to construct the ideal neo-liberal citizen: a rational, self-interested, and entrepreneurial individual who continuously consumes. Individuals unable to fully participate in the economy, such as people with disabilities and the elderly, are considered to be insignificant, enabling seniors' care and long-term care to often be the first to receive major cuts and the welfare system to experience massive restructuring aimed at putting people with disabilities "back to work" (Grover & Soldatic, 2012; Primrose et al., 2020). Under the neo-liberal and capitalist system, "the only thing worse than being exploited economically is *not* [emphasis added] being exploited economically." (Ferguson & Lavalette, 2013, pp. 103–104). Furthermore, the ideal neo-liberal citizen also accepts widespread inequality as a normal part of neo-liberal capitalism; in fact, they recognize its necessity within the system (Brown, 2016).

Neo-Liberalism and Global Crises

In the three decades after the Second World War, governments across the Global North adopted an approach of *shared prosperity*, one which focused on some state control over the economy, the implementation of progressive taxation, and investments in the welfare system (Ferguson & Lavalette, 2013; Goldberg, 2012). In the United States, this approach resulted in the reduction of income inequality and the growth of public housing, albeit benefiting poor white Americans more than Black Americans (Goldberg, 2012).

However, from the 1970s to 2000s, state policies in the West took a sharp turn towards neo-liberalism. In the United Kingdom, this turn was evident from conservative Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's open embrace of austerity and neo-liberalism in the 1980s and Prime Minister Tony Blair's centre-left New Labour government's suspicion of welfare programs and the social work profession itself in the 1990s (Ferguson & Lavalette, 2013). A similar trajectory occurred in the United States in the 1980s, characterized by regressive taxation that mostly benefited capital (Goldberg, 2012). Austerity measures such as significant cuts to social programs, welfare restructuring, and increased privatization of public services were implemented by various governments in North America (Beder, 2009; Fernando & Earle, 2011; Goldberg, 2012). Goldberg (2012) identified the "unprecedented political mobilization" (p. 215) of big

corporations, financial institutions, conservative academics, and right-wing media starting in the early 1970s as the key reason for the change in policy direction in Washington. Their efforts proved to be successful in convincing policy-makers and the public to embrace austerity as a viable policy option. These austerity measures resulted in the emboldening of the corporate and financial sectors and a weakening of public-service sectors such as health, social services, and social housing. Workers, the poor, and those who were the most marginalized were significantly impacted by these state policies prior to and during the 2008 crisis, while capital enjoyed significant gains in wealth and political power (Primrose et al., 2020).

Literatures on the inequitable impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on marginalized communities similarly have placed the blame on policies of austerity and the ideology of neo-liberalism. Prior to 2020, governments across the Global North showed a pattern of cuts to health and social spending and a lack of investment in public programs, continuing the trend of the 1980s (Primrose et al., 2020). This situation was worsened by state policies that further reinforced corporate deregulation, privatization, and the marketization of social services, which have significant impacts on those bearing the worst effects of income, social, and health inequity, such as women, Indigenous Peoples, and racialized migrant workers (Kecskes, 2020; Michie, 2020; van Barneveld et. al., 2020).

In addition to resulting in a weakened public health-care system, neo-liberal policies are known to have dire impacts on health and key social determinants of health, including housing, food security, and income security (Labonté & Ruckert, 2015; van Barneveld et. al., 2020). These policies also resulted in deepening already-existing health inequities, therefore impacting marginalized communities the most (Labonté & Ruckert, 2015; van Barneveld et. al., 2020). Furthermore, Michie (2020) argued that fewer lives would have been lost to due to COVID-19 had governments invested more in health care and in social programs. It is clear that authors writing about the 2008 global financial crisis and the COVID-19 pandemic agree on neo-liberalism's influence on both crises' inequitable social, economic, and health impacts (Aalbers, 2013; Beder, 2009; Michie, 2020; van Barneveld et. al., 2020;).

Post-Crisis Economic Recovery

A majority of the articles on 2008 financial-crisis recovery and on COVID-19 recovery touch on the call for the building of a new and more equitable social, economic, and political system. Several post–global-financial-crisis economic-recovery policy solutions proposed by authors have included regulating the financial sector, reducing the influence of big money in politics, increasing social welfare, creating a living wage for all who want to work, and increasing investment in health care, housing, and child care (Clark, 2010; Goldberg, 2012). Goldberg (2012) asserted that progressive taxation and a decrease in military spending are two fiscal policy changes that could help states afford such recovery measures. In the aftermath of the 2008 financial crisis, authors also called for a rejection of the cult of individualism that is inherent in neo-liberal ideology (Ferguson & Lavalette, 2013).

Similar calls for systems change can be found in articles discussing COVID-19 recovery. Van Barneveld et. al. (2020) contended that a radical change of direction away from a neo-liberal economic system is urgently needed in the post-pandemic recovery period. Instead of opting to further reinforce neo-liberal measures, the authors suggested the creation of a centralized global movement, led by the United Nations, to convene a forum on a just and

sustainable recovery. This suggestion was inspired by the memory of U.S. President Roosevelt's convening of a United Nations Conference to encourage widespread recognition of human rights at the end of the Second World War. The authors advocated for similar global leadership at crucial times such as now to avoid further catastrophe. Several policy proposals for an equitable recovery that can be discussed in such forums include enhancing universal health care, implementing reconciliation with Indigenous Peoples, furthering efforts to build clean energy, implementing progressive taxation, and strengthening the social safety net through expanding social housing programs (van Barneveld et. al., 2020). Despite these much-needed calls, however, the authors did not go further to call for a dismantling, or conduct a deeper examination at minimum, of the deeply interlocked systems of capitalism, colonialism, imperialism, and racism—among many other systems of oppression—that have subjugated many lives globally and arguably brought us to the current state of global crisis we are in today.

In a report published by the YWCA Canada national office, Sultana and Ravanera (2020) argued that a Canadian economic recovery plan post-pandemic must be guided by a Gender-Based Analysis-plus framework, rooted in feminist intersectional analysis. From this framework, the authors proposed eight guiding pillars for a feminist economic recovery in Canada, which included investing in good jobs, strengthening public infrastructure, ensuring the presence of diverse voices at decision-making tables, and supporting small businesses owned by women from equity-seeking groups. Specific policy demands outlined in this report included ensuring equitable access to jobs and training for Indigenous Peoples, investing in child care, increasing care-worker wages, investing in good jobs, and legislating job protection for people with disabilities (Sultana & Ravanera, 2020). Despite its claims of an intersectional analysis and a change in paradigm, the solutions proposed in this report still fall within the neo-liberal narrative of putting people back to work instead of calling for a bold path away from this ideology (Grover & Soldatic, 2012). Furthermore, this proposal appears to be based on the assumption that what women—including racialized, working-class, disabled, migrant, and poor women—need is to be included in neo-liberal–capitalist structures in order to solve the myriad issues they face today. Further, the authors missed the opportunity to support reformist, policy-change to strengthen the social safety net and health-care programs that have been eroding for decades, since the 1980s, in Canada (Clark, 2010; Platt et al., 2020), let alone more radical calls to completely dismantle the deeply interlocked systems of oppressions such as patriarchy, colonialism, racism, and imperialism that are embedded in the socio-economic and political systems today. Such advocacy would arguably benefit those who experience intersecting forms of marginalization and, therefore, have borne the heaviest brunt of the COVID-19 pandemic, in particular Indigenous, racialized, disabled, LGBTQ2S+, and poor women in the Global North and Global South.

Other authors on COVID-19 recovery have argued for the implementation of *universal basic income*, which entails a regular transfer of cash to individuals with neither means testing nor a requirement to work or find work (Prabhakar, 2020). In Canada, the idea of a universal basic income has increased in popularity ever since the creation of the Canada Emergency Response Benefit during the COVID-19 pandemic. This benefit was widely seen as a popular and life-saving bailout for the people, to the point that New Democratic Party Member of Parliament Leah Gazan proposed the continuation of this program as a guaranteed universal-basic-income program (Loreto, 2020). However, significant questions remain unanswered about whether universal basic income is an appropriate response to the projected economic

crisis post-pandemic: Is it adequate to tackle poverty and inequality? Are there better policies that could address these issues? (Prabhakar, 2020). Loreto (2020) argued that the $2,000 cash-transfer amount proposed in Gazan's motion was inadequate for many living in Canada's major cities and also failed to address the much-eroded health-care and social-service systems. Instead of implementing a form of universal basic income, authors have argued that better policies to solve systemic inequities would be stronger investments in universal public services such as housing, health care, universal pharmacare, and the creation of a national child-care program (Prabhakar, 2020; Loreto, 2020). Furthermore, it is apparent that universal basic income is still attached to neo-liberal capitalism's devotion to individualism and market-based solutions. Recipients of these regular cash transfers are seen as individuals in need of individual solutions to an individualized problem of poverty and inequality. The assumptions underlying universal basic income are that these cash transfers are enough to solve social problems and that the market can solve these issues, without any critical examination of the very systems that have fuelled the problems of inequality we have today.

Articles discussing proposals for a post-pandemic economic recovery failed to mention strategies to solve systemic inequities faced by communities experiencing interlocking forms of marginalization, such as Indigenous Peoples, disabled people, women, racialized people, poor and working-class people, and LGBTQ2S+ people—communities that have faced disproportionate impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic (Bachelet, 2020; Prokopenko & Kevins, 2020; Shakespeare et al., 2021). For example, migrant workers in Canada have experienced significant barriers to access to health care in addition to poor safety protection for workers and overcrowding in their housing (Migrant Rights Network, 2020). People who are undocumented and people with precarious immigration status have not only experienced similar challenges but are also unable to access health-care services and a basic social safety net due to a fear of deportation (Caulford & D'Andrade, 2012; Magalhaes et al., 2010). In addition, sex workers have often been forgotten in the conversation on post-pandemic recovery. Platt et al. (2020) advocated for the inclusion of sex workers in the worldwide response during and after the COVID-19 pandemic, especially given that many are homeless, are affected by substance-use stigma, and have precarious immigration status. Due to these factors, sex workers and migrant and undocumented workers, among many other groups, are highly vulnerable to the health, social, and economic impacts of COVID-19. Yet they have been missed in some calls for an equitable recovery, such as in Sultana and Ravanera's (2020) *Feminist Economy Recovery Plan* and in Gazan's proposal for a guaranteed basic income (Loreto, 2020). This risk of exclusion serves as another reason to advocate for a post-crisis recovery plan that upholds the provision of truly universal public programs, such as a welfare system that is available regardless of immigration status and the provision of emergency housing for those who are homeless or precariously housed (Platt et. al., 2020).

Other calls for a just post-pandemic recovery have provided a more comprehensive and inclusive set of policy recommendations. Just Recovery for All (2020), a Canada-wide movement supported by hundreds of organizations, demanded that federal, provincial, and municipal governments in Canada abide by six principles of a just recovery after COVID-19 pandemic, including putting all people's health and well-being first, strengthening the social safety net, prioritizing the needs of workers and communities, building resilience for future crises, and upholding Indigenous rights. Crucial policy solutions within their guiding principles include implementing redistributive policies, granting permanent-resident status for all, and

transitioning away from fossil fuels. The builders of this movement have strongly underlined the urgency of including everyone, especially those who are the most vulnerable in society, in a just recovery after the pandemic.

A recent report from the Chief Public Health Officer of Canada (Public Health Agency of Canada, 2020) provided an exhaustive and arguably more progressive list of policy recommendations that all levels of government can implement to ensure an equitable recovery after the COVID-19 pandemic. The agency advocated for, among other policy recommendations, better work-safety protections that include temporary foreign workers, investments in affordable and high-quality child care, the decriminalization of illicit drugs, the collection of disaggregated data in key health and social areas, and the implementation of a housing-for-all framework that includes investments in affordable housing, long-term care, and support for people who are incarcerated and those transitioning out of incarceration. The report also underlined the importance of implementing a *one health* approach to policymaking—one that considers the interrelation between the environment, humans, and animals in order to prevent further global pandemics caused by zoonotic diseases (Public Health Agency of Canada, 2020). If fully implemented by all levels of government, such post-pandemic economic recovery would arguably signal a radical shift away from the neo-liberal status quo, a system that has wreaked havoc on the health and well-being of the people and the planet.

A Grim Outlook for the Possibility of Change: Learning from the 2008 Financial Crisis

Despite calls for a radical shift in the economic, social, and political systems after the 2008 financial crisis, economic-recovery measures chosen by governments across Global North countries serve as a cautionary tale of what could occur after the current global pandemic. Instead of utilizing the political window of opportunity to enact change after the global financial crisis, national and regional governments in Canada, the United States, and the United Kingdom opted to further reinforce neo-liberalism through their post-crisis response (Aalbers, 2013; Green & Lavery, 2015; Labonté & Ruckert, 2015; Thomas & Tufts, 2015). This reinforcement was marked by an unabashed recommitment to austerity measures and neo-liberal ideology, including severe cuts to the welfare system and health care, a weakening of labour protection, the implementation of open-door economic policies to stimulate foreign investments, and aggressive marketization of public services, such as the National Health Service in the United Kingdom (Cahill, 2011; Labonté & Ruckert, 2015; van Apeldoorn & de Graaff, 2017;). These moves were founded on the mantra often heard in political discourse: stimulating the economy (Beder, 2009). Today, a similar phrase heard more often during the pandemic is “saving the economy,” as during then-candidate Joe Biden’s U.S. presidential campaign in 2020 (Biden-Harris Democrats, 2020).

Political actors of all stripes, including those claiming to occupy the centre or centre-left political spectrum such as former president Barack Obama and former Ontario premier Dalton McGuinty, chose to deepen neo-liberalism during and after the recovery period from the 2008 financial crisis (Kuttner, 2019; Thomas & Tufts, 2015; van Apeldoorn & de Graaff, 2017). According to Ferguson and Lavalette (2013), the neo-liberal responses of governments after the 2008 crisis largely perpetuated ideologies of individualism, choice, and the attribution of social value to a person’s ability to participate in the economy through work. Governments opted to prioritize economic-recovery policies that restored the confidence of the markets and promoted economic competitiveness rather than enacting systemic change to help those who

had been harmed the most by the crisis (Thomas & Tufts, 2015; van Apeldoorn & de Graff, 2017).

A group's access to governmental power determines how policies are shaped and who can benefit from them (Giger et al., 2012; Kuttner, 2019). Van Apeldoorn and de Graff (2017) found that during the first Obama administration in the United States, architects of post–global-financial-crisis recovery policies had clear links to capital such as corporations, the finance sector, and conservative think tanks. The authors argued that the significant influence of people with links to capital resulted in economic-recovery policies that were more beneficial to and represented the interests of corporations and the wealthy while failing to represent those from marginalized communities. Moreover, studies on the correlation between American elected officials' policy responsiveness and the income levels of constituents have shown that policy preferences of affluent individuals and those living in higher-income areas are better represented in both the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives compared to those who are poor or are living in impoverished areas (Flavin & Franko, 2020; Gilens, 2005; Hayes, 2013). Rigby and Wright (2013) and Gilens (2005) further argued that the higher amount of campaign contributions coming from the wealthy and those living in affluent areas may play a significant part in elected officials' bias toward policies that are aligned with the interests of higher-income constituents.

Announcements about COVID-19 economic-recovery plans in Canada have signalled a possible repeat of the post–2008-financial-crisis recovery. Kecskes (2020) argued that the Economic Recovery Act omnibus bill announced by Premier Doug Ford's Progressive Conservative government aims to further reinforce neo-liberal policies in post-pandemic Ontario. The author posited that policies proposed in this bill, such as further corporate deregulation and the creation of a new agency to attract investments to the province, would primarily benefit corporations and major investors instead of those experiencing the worst health, social, and economic impacts of the pandemic. In addition, Primrose, et al. (2020) cautioned that there is a strong likelihood of deepening neo-liberal responses after the pandemic. The authors argued that the overwhelming use of war metaphors in state and public health responses to this virus, positioning it as an "unprecedented threat" or a threat from an "external Other" with little mention of systemic failures have signalled the possibility of status quo responses after the pandemic ends. The most obvious example is French president Emmanuel Macron's address to that nation at the start of the pandemic: "I know that what I am asking of you is *unprecedented*. But the circumstances demand it. *We are at war* [emphasis added]. Certainly, in a healthcare war" (BBC News, 2020,).

Wartime and individualistic discourses may enable governments to further justify the use of neo-liberal solutions as an economic, social, and political response while ignoring growing calls to address the roots of the devastating and inequitable impacts of this pandemic (Primrose et al., 2020). In British Columbia, a close look of the list of names on the province's economic-recovery taskforce showed that a majority of its members represented trade, commerce, and labour, indicating the possibility of an economic-recovery plan that would benefit some groups more than others (Office of the Premier, 2020).

Possible Alternatives to Neo-Liberal Solutions

To implement a progressive alternative, authors have proposed that advocates follow the strategies that have been adopted by proponents of neo-liberalism to ensure a durable and

politically "sticky" ideology (Aalbers, 2013; Cahill, 2011). Despite various moments in history signalling its potential demise, the neo-liberal goal of economic growth at the expense of nature and human lives continues to serve as the foundation of what politicians and some economists claim to be common-sense policy solutions to global crises (Albers, 2013; Macías, 2015). Its success can be traced to its embeddedness within all aspects of life beyond state institutions, including academia, media, Wall Street, powerful think tanks, and the discursive process of subject-making (Kuttner, 2019; Macías, 2015). Arguably, a new system needs to follow in neo-liberalism's footsteps to ensure it becomes a viable, embedded, and long-lasting alternative.

An alternative to neo-liberalism demands a radical shift of priorities and values. Del Cerro Santamaria (2019) discussed creating an alternative, small-scale economy that can complement stronger state regulation of corporations and the market. Brown (2005) advocated that the political left present an alternative system that rejects neo-liberalism's fixation on the creation of homo economicus and the cult of individualism. This alternative, the author argued, must centre collective power and a collaborative form of government while building an equitable distribution of wealth and access to public institutions such as housing, health care, and education. Kuttner (2019) proposed that progressives create a practical form of politics and sets of policy that can prove that governments are better equipped than the free market to build a more equitable society. This approach to politics and policy-making would serve to dispel the myth of trickle-down economics. Furthermore, Cahill (2011) argued that proponents of a non–neo-liberal system must first organize and mobilize a powerful social movement demanding a radical change and presenting to the public its coherent ideology and merits. Then, proponents of a new system must ensure that it becomes not only embedded in social norms but also in institutional and state norms through policy measures such as progressive taxation and the provision of high-quality, universal social services (Cahill, 2011).

Conclusion

Neo-liberalism is seen by authors writing about the causes of the 2008 financial crisis and the COVID-19 pandemic as fuel to both crises' severe and inequitable social, economic, and health impacts. As an ideology, it not only influences state policies but also discursively creates its ideal citizen-subject, which renders neo-liberalism a durable hegemonic system of governance. To remedy the inequitable impacts of a global crisis, authors have overwhelmingly called for the implementation of a new economic and political system, one which benefits all people instead of only the wealthy. However, post-2008 economic-recovery policies showed that governments across the Global North only strengthened their commitments to further neo-liberal policies as common-sense solutions, even to a neo-liberal-made crisis. The outlook for radical systemic change and just economic recoveries post-pandemic is, therefore, grim. Nonetheless, change is still possible if the concerted mobilization of proponents calling for a radical shift that prioritizes the lives of those who have been hurt the most by this pandemic is paired with strategies that ensure its durability.

References

Aalbers, M. B. (2013). Debate on neo-liberalism in and after the neo-liberal crisis. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 37*(3), 1053–1057. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468–2427.12061

Bachelet, M. (2020). *Addressing the disproportionate impact of COVID-19 on minority ethnic communities.* United Nations Human Rights, Office of the High Commissioner. https://www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=26541&LangID=E

BBC News. (2020, March 16). *Coronavirus: 'We are at war.' – Macron*. https://www.bbc.com/news/av/51917380

Beder, S. (2009). Neo-liberalism and the global financial crisis. *Social Alternatives, 28*(1), 17–21.

Biden-Harris Democrats. (2020). *The Biden emergency action plan to save the economy*. https://joebiden.com/the-biden-emergency-action-plan-to-save-the-economy/

Brown, W. (2005). *Edgework: Critical essays on knowledge and politics*. Princeton University Press.

Brown, W. (2016). Sacrificial citizenship: Neo-liberalism, human capital, and austerity politics. *Constellations, 23*(1), 3–14. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8675.12166

Cahill, D. (2011). Beyond neo-liberalism? Crisis and the prospects for progressive alternatives. *New Political Science, 33*(4), 479–492. https://doi.org/10.1080/07393148.2011.619820

Caulford, P., & D'Andrade, J. (2012). Health care for Canada's medically uninsured immigrants and refugees: Whose problem is it? *Canadian Family Physician–Le Médecin de famille canadien, 58*, 725–727.

del Cerro Santamaria, G. (2019). The ongoing aftermath to the financial crisis and the Great Recession. *International Sociology, 34*(5), 560–570. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0268580919870461

Clark, J. (2010). What would a real socialist president do? *Dissent, 57*(3), 33–37. https://doi.org/10.1353/dss.0.0170

Ferguson, I., & Lavalette, M. (2013). Crisis, austerity and the future(s) of social work in the UK. *Critical and Radical Social Work; 1*(1), 95–110. http://dx.doi.org/10.1332/204986013X665992

Fernando, S., & Earle, B. (2011). Linking poverty reduction and economic recovery: Supporting community responses to austerity in Ontario. *Canadian Review of Social Policy, 65*, 31-44.

Flavin, P., & Franko, W. W. (2020). Economic segregation and unequal policy responsiveness. *Political Behavior; New York, 42*(3), 845–864. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-018-09522-9

Giger, N., Rosset, J., & Bernauer, J. (2012). The poor political representation of the poor in a comparative perspective. *Representation, 48*(1), 47–61. https://doi.org/10.1080/00344893.2012.653238

Gilens, M. (2005). Inequality and democratic responsiveness. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 69*(5), 778–796. https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfi058

Goldberg, G. S. (2012). Economic inequality and economic crisis: A challenge for social workers. *Social Work, 57*(3), 211–224. https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/sws005

Green, J., & Lavery, S. (2015). The regressive recovery: Distribution, inequality and state power in Britain's post-crisis political economy. *New Political Economy*, *20*(6), 894–923. https://doi.org/10.1080/13563467.2015.1041478

Hayes, T. J. (2013). Responsiveness in an era of inequality: The case of the U.S. Senate. *Political Research Quarterly, 66*(3), 585–599. https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912912459567

Just Recovery for All. (2020). *Just recovery for all*. https://justrecoveryforall.ca/

Kecskes, B. (2020, July 17). An economic recovery for whom? *The Bullet*. https://socialistproject.ca /2020/07/economic-recovery-for-whom/

Kuttner, R. (2019, June 25). *Neo-liberalism: Political success, economic failure.* The American Prospect. https://prospect.org/api/content/a3fdb883-29e3-5102-b2a7-2699b3e18cd4/

Labonté, R., & Ruckert, A. (2015). Austerity lite: Social determinants of health under Canada's neo-liberal capture. In S. McBride, R. Mahon, & G. W. Boychuk (Eds.), *After '08—Social Policy and the Global Financial Crisis* (272–291). UBC Press.

Macías, T. (2015). "Between a rock and a hard place": Negotiating the neo-liberal regulation of social work practice and education. *Alternative Routes, 26*, 251–276.

Magalhaes, L., Carrasco, C., & Gastaldo, D. (2010). Undocumented migrants in Canada: A scope literature review on health, access to services, and working conditions. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health, 12*(1), 132–151. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10903-009-9280-5

Michie, J. (2020). The covid-19 crisis – and the future of the economy and economics. *International Review of Applied Economics; New York, 34*(3), 301–303. https://doi.org/10.1080/02692171.2020.1756040

Migrant Rights Network. (2020). *Open letter: Full immigration status for all*. Migrant Rights Network. Retrieved on September 26, 2021, from https://migrantrights.ca/status-for-all/

Office of the Premier. British Columbia. (2020, April 2). *Premier's task force to support B.C. economy during, after COVID-19*. https://news.gov.bc.ca/releases/2020PREM0046-000618

Platt, L., Elmes, J., Stevenson, L., Holt, V., Rolles, S., & Stuart, R. (2020). Sex workers must not be forgotten in the COVID-19 response. *Lancet, 396*(10243), 9–11. https://doi.org/10.1016 /S0140-6736(20)31033-3

Prabhakar, R. (2020). Universal basic income and Covid-19. *IPPR Progressive Review: PPR, 27*(1), 105–113. https://doi.org/10.1111/newe.12198

Prokopenko, E., & Kevins, C. (2020). *Vulnerabilities related to COVID-19 among LGBTQ2+ Canadians.* https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/45-28-0001/2020001/article /00075-eng.htm

Public Health Agency of Canada. (2020). *From risk to resilience: An equity approach to COVID-19: The chief public health officer of Canada's report on the state of public health in Canada 2020.* https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/corporate/publications/chief-public-health-officer-reports-state-public-health-canada/from-risk-resilience-equity-approach-covid-19.html

Rigby, E., & Wright, G. C. (2013). Political parties and representation of the poor in the American states. *American Journal of Political Science*, *57*(3), 552–565. https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12007

Ruckert, A., & Labonté, R. (2014). The global financial crisis and health equity: Early experiences from Canada. *Globalization and Health*, *10*(1), 2. https://doi.org/10.1186 /1744–8603–10–2

Shakespeare, T., Ndagire, F., & Seketi, Q. E. (2021). Triple jeopardy: Disabled people and the COVID-19 pandemic. *Lancet*, *397*(10282), 1331–1333. https://doi.org/10.1016 /S0140-6736(21)00625-5

Sultana, A., & Ravanera, C. (2020). *A feminist recovery plan for Canada: Making the economy work for everyone*. Institute for Gender and the Economy (GATE); YWCA Canada. https://www.feministrecovery.ca/the-plan

Thomas, M. P., & Tufts, S. (2015). Austerity, right populism, and the crisis of labour in Canada. *Antipode*, *48*(1), 212–230. https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12162

van Apeldoorn, B., & de Graaff, N. (2017). Obama's economic recovery strategy open markets and elite power: Business as usual? *International Politics*, *54*(3), 356–372. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41311-017-0030-3

van Barneveld, K., Quinlan, M., Kriesler, P., Junor, A., Baum, F., Chowdhury, A., Junankar, P. N. (Raja), Clibborn, S., Flanagan, F., Wright, C. F., Friel, S., Halevi, J., & Rainnie, A. (2020). The COVID-19 pandemic: Lessons on building more equal and sustainable societies. *The Economic and Labour Relations Review*, *31*(2), 133–157. https://doi.org/10.1177/1035304620927107

Author Note

The author is grateful for the financial support provided by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada's Canada Graduate Scholarship - Master's Award. The author is also thankful for the support and guidance of Dr. Teresa Macías and Anna Brisco, in addition to the invaluable feedback of the anonymous reviewers.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Shila Avissa. Email: savissa@yorku.ca