

# Introduction: A Global Dialogue on the Pandemic

*Breno Bringel and Geoffrey Pleyers*

The COVID-19 pandemic has put the world on hold during 2020 and 2021. Beyond all macrodimensions, it is a global event that has changed the daily routines and lives of every human being on the planet, with multiple impacts for the future. Billions of people have been confined at different stages. Others, however, can not afford this luxury and continue to work in the health sector, in production, food supply, social work, transport, cleaning and at various other tasks which, although defined as ‘essential services’ in our societies, are not sufficiently recognized and valued. In turn, workers in the informal economy, those living from day to day or those who lost their jobs, have become concerned not only about a virus but also about rapid impoverishment and deterioration of living conditions in a context full of uncertainties.

Faced with the threat of COVID-19, local and national governments turned to doctors, biologists, virologists and epidemiologists to try to contain the pandemic, design policy responses and search for a vaccine. Social sciences also mobilized in all parts of the world, although not always with the same weight. Would this have anything to do with the lesser legitimacy of social sciences as compared to the so-called life sciences? A prestigious physician accompanying a crisis committee sounds relevant, but would one say the same if this committee also included sociologists, psychologists or philosophers who provide other readings of the health crisis and could convey their proposals for governments and society as a whole? A curious division, by the way: on one side, life; on the other, the ‘social’ or ‘human’. Health, however, is one of those issues that does not understand disciplinary and knowledge boundaries. Although in practice the division may be reinforced by the political hierarchization of knowledge and ‘expertise’, much progress has been made, mainly in the Global South, towards a holistic, multidimensional and collective understanding of health as understood far beyond an individual physiological dimension.

Although the virus itself is a biological agent that can infect any of us, we have been deeply unequal in the face of the pandemic. Therefore, the emphasis on the ecosystemic and social nature of the pandemic is essential to remind us of the profound global asymmetries and inequalities of class, race and gender, as well as to link the health crisis to other previous crises – environmental, social and political – that are only deepening today. One of the main contributions of social sciences to the contemporary public debate is precisely a broadening of the vision of health and risk, something that is crucial in order to produce more accurate diagnoses about the origins of the pandemic, more effective policies for its containment and strategies aimed at providing a glimpse of the post-pandemic world.

The COVID-19 pandemic comes at a historic moment of natural resource depletion and climate and environmental emergency in which capitalism shows its most predatory face. It is a time of setbacks for democracy and human rights, and of mistrust and rejection of political systems. We also live in societies that have been torn apart by huge inequalities (both North/South and within national societies) and whose public services have been dismantled by decades of neoliberalism, which, beyond the economy, also strongly permeates individual and collective subjectivities. Meanwhile, the digitalization of society has enabled greater interaction between people and a greater flow of information about the pandemic, but this has been accompanied, before and beyond COVID-19, by a process of growing individualization, circulation of fake news and production of devices for surveillance and social control.

The pandemic also acts as a magnifying glass. It intensifies social and economic problems, as well as political failures, and makes them more visible. The critical analyses of the 46 authors from 27 countries that we bring together in this book make intelligible the local, national and global impacts and challenges generated by the pandemic, while also pointing to problems that the pandemic has amplified or revealed. Read together, these chapters written from all continents and different points of view create a truly global dialogue on the current crisis and the contemporary world, on the way in which inequalities are being exacerbated and forms of social control diversified, but also on how new solidarities and possibilities of other worlds are opening up.

## Thinking globally

The analytical perspective that led us to put these texts together articulates four convictions. Firstly, we understand the pandemic as a *critical global event* that marks a historical turning point. Although there have been previous pandemics, the global resonance of this one is unprecedented. The virus does not stop at borders, even when governments decide to close them. It

reveals how deeply connected and inter/ecodependent we have become. It generates impacts that will have global consequences. For this reason, it seems essential to articulate diverse scenarios and temporalities of analysis, imagining the short, medium and long term.

Secondly, the pandemic affects people and places in very different ways. In time of pandemic, it is more urgent than ever to *think globally*. This does not only imply a more comprehensive view but also the considering of phenomenon from different places, articulating scales and worldviews to compose a broad and diverse mosaic that takes into consideration the dynamics and conflicts that resonate in the world in a more transversal way, beyond parochial politics. It is crucial to capture the inequalities and diversity of situations and positions. It is essential to unveil issues, territories and experiences that remain barely visible in the mainstream media coverage of the pandemic and are not taken into account by public policies. Without denying the experience of the Western or Westernized middle and upper classes during the pandemic, it is fundamental to ‘provincialize’ them, integrating them into a global perspective with other experiences in different cultural, geographical and social environments. Learning from other realities opens new analytical and critical horizons with which to understand the world as a whole, as well as to rethink our own daily experience.

Thirdly, we suggest a dynamic perspective of the social and political reality. This perspective opposes teleological readings or deterministic perspectives, which see in the pandemic the confirmation of their previous analyses and are launched into hasty predictions about the structural impact of the crisis. The future is in dispute and possible scenarios are multiple. There is no *telos*, no inevitable logic or predetermined path that will lead us to a better world or, on the contrary, to the exacerbation of the authoritarian drifts and the collapse. The consequences of historical events are contingent and depend on disputes over the meaning of crises and the ability of various actors to impose political lines to address these multidimensional crises and their possible outcomes. This perspective places at the centre the actors and social movements as producers of society and—with this objective—also as producers of knowledge and know-how. *Thinking with the actors* requires incorporating diverse and disputed rationalities and subjectivities, something essential to getting a glimpse of the immediate reactions to the health crisis, but also the projections of the future.

Our fourth premise is a *committed and public sociology* that accompanies and contributes to the struggles for a fairer world. Such sociology should generate both academic knowledge and content accessible to a wide audience based on empirical research and critical analyses. Spaces of articulation between universities and social movements are crucial to the co-production of knowledge. As for its diffusion, this perspective has been materialized in our Open Movements editorial project, hosted by the leading international digital

platform Open Democracy. For the last six years, Open Movements has promoted the publication and circulation of short and direct texts by activists and researchers from all over the world. It is a way of trying to translate the results of collective experiences and research into diverse sectors of society, beyond academia and the movements themselves, reaching out to citizens, journalists and public policymakers. In times that are marked by attempts to delegitimize and criminalize critical thinking by various authoritarian governments, the way out cannot be to get defensive and turn inwards to the scientific community.

## From pandemic to social change

Since the outbreak of the global pandemic, thousands of articles, essays and books have been published about COVID-19 and the contemporary world. In the first stage of the pandemic, the intellectual and political debates ranged from a 'corona-optimism' to a 'corona-pessimism'. The first stance celebrates the renewed displays of solidarity, the umpteenth death of capitalism, the positive lessons that the experience of the pandemic could generate (such as living better with less or the more equitable distribution of care) and the rearticulation of local initiatives and collective actors. The second emphasizes the deleterious effects of the pandemic: selfishness and utilitarianism, greater social control, restrictions of freedom and deterioration in living conditions.

Two other features of the global debate are the *urgency of the present* and the *shortsightedness of the visible*. Rapid and peremptory interpretations of the extraordinary situation multiply. There seems to be no limit to the overinterpretation of the consequences of the rising pandemic in the virtual conversations and forums: 'Modernity is over', 'Nothing will be the same again', or, in a more exaggerated and ironic version, 'World history from now on will be divided between a new *Anno Domini*: BC and AC: before corona and after corona'.

On the other hand, following wider trends in the press and official stances, analyses have ended up focusing too much or almost exclusively on data, graphs and tables. Counting the number of new infections and deaths and comparing them with other cities, countries or regions has become an obsession. Many would summarize the policy to face the pandemic as the management of the health crisis and its effects. In that picture, social protests and resistance are limited to digital activism and *cacerolazos* on the balconies. In short, faced with an invisible virus, columnists and commentators have ended up being hijacked by the more 'visible' dimension of the pandemic associated with the control of the health crisis.

We challenge these trends for three reasons. First, although there are solid arguments among both the corona-optimists and the corona-pessimists, we

have to assume the deeply contradictory nature of this historical moment. There are many threats, but also some opportunities. The pandemic may serve as an alarm, but the derivations of its signals will always depend on the actors and their ability to influence the course of the coming world. These actors develop contentious actions and different interpretation of the crisis, making its outcomes unpredictable. In this way, the ‘new normality’ is, in itself, a project of reconstruction of capitalism that builds on the wish of many people to recover sociability and employment.

Second, we tend to overestimate the capacity for systemic changes when we are immersed in events and critical junctures that shape new directions. While windows of opportunity are real, we tend to magnify them and believe that everything will change radically, for better or worse. This is not necessarily so. It is essential to be open to new horizons, but also to try to capture the continuities, adaptations, hybridizations and innovations. To leave behind the urgency of the present as a short-term view opens a path for broader interpretations of the actors and the process of social and political life. Our challenge is to distinguish the specific feature of the time of a pandemic from what may remain afterwards. Of course, some urgency cannot be denied. It is notably related to the need to save lives, to defend public health and to prioritize eco-social justice in a context that tends to accentuate inequalities or to incorporate, once again, the ‘green’ as a make-up without concern for equity and social and environmental justice. But the urgent cannot make us forget about long-lasting outcomes and challenges, nor can it tie us to a spiral that prevents us from building transitions and utopian horizons.

Finally, a third reason refers to tracking society’s tectonic plates, the dissatisfactions that emerge from diverse communities and collectivities but which barely make it into the mainstream news headlines. We have to go beyond the most visible part of the iceberg and integrate living experiences that have been ‘invisibilized’, or actively made invisible, in times of the pandemic. In our work, and in much of this book, we seek to reconstruct these from the agendas, dynamics and community protests, as well as from diverse forms of activism and social movements. This perspective allows us to point to emerging conflicts, but also to innovative solutions to get out of the crisis.

## **Challenges in the global pandemic**

### *COVID-19 governance, politics and the ambivalence of states*

The first part of the book brings together contributions that analyse the ways political regimes, states and governments have dealt with the virus outbreak and the health crisis, and how this reveals ambivalences, weaknesses and possibilities in the fight against COVID-19. Some global and regional

analyses are combined with some specific national cases, like those of China, Indonesia and the Philippines.

Nation states have imposed themselves as the main actors in dealing with the pandemic, calling for national unity and intervening daily on TV channels. At the beginning of the pandemic, even the defenders of neoliberalism called for massive state intervention. This increased interventionism was implemented in historic stimulus packages to support businesses and companies, urgent expansion in social and health policies and also increasing social control, with police and sometimes military controls in the streets, sometimes involving cases of people beaten to death for not respecting the restrictions. Curfew or lockdown measures are necessary to mitigate the spread of the virus, but in some circumstances they may also pave the way for increasing social control and authoritarian measures, even in democratic regimes.

Permanent surveillance (from the most classic forms to digital tracking and drones), the control and handling of big data, new facial recognition devices and other sophisticated forms of social control were not just strengthened to fight a virus. Power-concentration measures adopted to fight COVID-19 may even be necessary to enable public healthcare and the 'protection' of the population, however there is a very tenuous line between these and authoritarian practices. Over the last decade, we have witnessed the emergence and strengthening of populist leaders and authoritarian governments that have put hatred, nationalism, regressive agendas and the militarization of life at the centre of the world's political agenda. In the face of the pandemic, they have not taken a step back, but in most cases have become more radical. At the same time, they have also been challenged, since the virus cannot be reduced to a simple flu as Donald Trump or Jair Bolsonaro suggested, nor can it be encapsulated in fake news.

The pandemic has therefore revealed not only the strengths but also the limitations of states and national political systems. The inefficiency of a national government or the repeated stances of state leaders mocking the pandemic and science have resulted in hundreds or thousands of additional deaths. Despite countless warnings, most governments failed to assess the size of the pandemic in time and to provide basic sanitary protections to public health workers and the overall population. In the face of the health crisis, each government has established its own necropolitics. They have provided fewer opportunities for some people to cope with the virus than others. Even in the cases of those who say that every life matters, we see people dying on the periphery, in their homes or in nursing homes, sometimes without even appearing in the national statistics.

State responses have been diverse. In some cases authoritarian state capitalism and repression prevailed. In others the pandemic has opened paths

to defend the social face of the welfare state and to propose to extend social protection, as our authors argue. Much of the analysis of states' management of the crisis seeks to highlight cases of 'success' and 'failure'. The main variable is the containment of cases of infection and deaths. Some strategies have been more successful than others in containing the spread of the virus. Denialism allied with incompetence (on these matters, it is difficult to beat Bolsonaro and Trump) has led to human disasters in both the Global North and Global South. We should not forget, however, that for dependent states on the global periphery or semi-periphery, confronting the pandemic is even more challenging. Public health systems are weak or practically non-existent, the right to water undermined, state capacity limited and housing in the urban peripheries precarious and overcrowded, as the second part of our book shows.

### *Crisis, inequalities and solidarities*

The virus can affect every human being. However, the pandemic affects us at very different levels, and the way the virus is treated is closely related to social factors. COVID-19 exacerbates inequalities between countries and within society, notably when it comes to class, race and gender. In the second part of this book, social scientists highlight these inequalities, the multiple impacts of COVID-19 in different realms of social life and also the emergence of solidarity networks in this difficult context.

On all continents, minorities and impoverished sectors have been much more affected by the virus. Many governments, along with the World Health Organization, have tried to differentiate between the existing data on infection and death by age, place and gender. The concentration of cases in peripheral places—strongly racialized and with a concentration of people with low revenues—unveils the social and particularly unfair reality of the pandemic. The older population is usually referred to as the most vulnerable, but it is rarely said that being Black in Brazil or African American in the United States means belonging to a 'population at risk'. In fact, in the United States, several studies have estimated that Latinos and Asians are 1.5 times more likely to be affected and to die from the virus than White people, while in the case of African Americans the chances are twice as high.

Therefore, an intersectional perspective is crucial to understanding how the crisis is experienced in places that remain largely invisible and forgotten in government policies to tackle the virus. Social systems of discrimination, oppression and domination have to be studied with both objective data of the pandemic and with subjective experiences of the multidimensional crisis. Authors in Part II provide accounts of life during the pandemic in the favelas of Rio, working-class neighbourhoods in Latin America and disadvantaged communities in India, as well as of minorities in the United

States and homeless people in Belgium. They show us that the pandemic is unfair and actually widens the gap of social inequalities, generating new forms of poverty (such as the ‘data poverty’, discussed in [Chapter 9](#) of this section), invisibility and segregation.

Targeting growing inequalities is crucial to unveiling the centrality of the social dimensions of the crisis and for setting policies that can minimize its impacts on those who struggle to cope with the rent or have fallen below the poverty line and whose concern is to get a daily meal. Proactive policies have also proliferated during the pandemic, such as solidarity-based taxation policies like taxes on inheritance, large fortunes and megaprojects, or social aid policies such as universal basic income to try to remedy extreme poverty and the adversities of the crisis. These and other proposals, such as those that seek to advance change in an absolutely unjust agro-food system and to foster food sovereignty, result from the combination of social movements and social science advocacy work.

### *Social movements, mutual aid and self-reliance during the pandemic*

Social movements build or strengthen solidarity, resilience and resistance in communities, popular neighbourhoods and cities. In many cases, this has been boosted by pre-existing groups and movements. Other social movements have underlined the centrality of environmental and climate justice in coping with the pandemic, as well as supporting and developing networks linked to the solidarity economy and agro-ecology, which insist on the need to radically change and relocate the economy and the food system. Feminist movements have also played a key role in placing care at the centre of life and putting it at the core of sociopolitical agendas after unveiling the unequal distribution of care tasks during the pandemic.

On the other hand, conservative and reactionary movements have also been very active during the lockdown and beyond, as some of the chapters of this section argue. Racism has increased in all regions of the world since the beginning of the pandemic, targeting migrant workers in India and China and African Americans and Asian Americans in the United States, and throughout the world refugees, minorities and poor people have been accused of spreading the pandemic by not maintaining physical isolation. Conspiracy theories have spread through social media, resulting in an unprecedented ‘infodemic’. Far-right activists attack migrant workers or slum dwellers for allegedly spreading the virus. Counter-movements have protested in various parts of the world against physical isolation policies, even when the pandemic was at its peak. In the United States, there were demonstrations, supported by Trump, against the closure of businesses in most state capitals. In Brazil, President Bolsonaro not only encouraged, but also participated in protests against health measures imposed by state governors.

In Germany, the group of protesters included anti-vaccine, anti-Semitic and ultra-liberal activists who framed the lockdown as the first step in an alleged 'coup' instigated by Angela Merkel.

Finally, the health crisis and restrictions on mobility have accentuated the digitization of many aspects of our daily lives, from friendship to work and forms of protest. While digital activism had already become an increasingly important component of social movements in the last two decades, the pandemic has increased the digitization of social movements and protests. It has played an important role in fostering collective actions and organizing. The mass diffusion of smartphones has made social media a crucial tool for neighbourhood solidarity. Although digital networks are impregnated with fake news, they also offer a space for disseminating alternative analyses and counter-information on practices that are deeply territorialized. In this way, even in times of pandemic, it is important to consider *online* activism in its interweaving with the experiences of activists, constructed sociabilities and the *offline* dimensions of mutual aid projects.

In sum, the authors of this book's third section examine the reconfiguration of the social movement landscape, the transformative possibilities and limits of social movements in the face of the multidimensional crisis and the contemporary fragmented social life. A wide range of cases are discussed, ranging from neighbourhoods and communities in the Global North and in the Global South, from Canada to India, from the COVID-19 mutual aid networks in British neighbourhoods to new alliances among grassroots movements and NGOs in South Africa and the resilience and resistance practices in New York City.

*'COVID-19 will not kill the revolution': Protest movements in the pandemic*

The COVID-19 outbreak has interrupted a historic worldwide wave of citizen mobilizations. Since the beginning of 2019, weekly protests had invaded the streets of towns and capital cities around the world, as was the case with the *Hirak* movement in Algeria and the yellow vests in France, and pro-democracy demonstrations in Hong Kong reached global news headlines. Iraqi youth also occupied squares and streets every week to demand work opportunities and more democracy, and brave people from Sudan put an end to a fierce dictatorship. Lebanese protestors demanded the end of a corrupt confessional political system. In Latin America and the Caribbean, massive popular protests took place in Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Haiti, Peru, Puerto Rico, Nicaragua and, mainly, in Chile against neoliberalism and inequality.

The pandemic and measures of physical distancing and confinement put a halt to these weekly protests. However, as the authors of the fourth part

of the book show, protests and grassroots activism in a broad sense have continued in Lebanon, France, Chile and many other countries. In most cases, and particularly in Hong Kong, the Philippines and France, these mobilizations faced the increasing repression of the state. In the Philippines and in Colombia, it has had deadly consequences, with a rising number of extrajudicial killings that notably target activists. In Hong Kong and in the Arab world, the repression and state social control has managed to crush the revolt of broad popular movements.

Even under authoritarian reprisals by governments, many popular movements and activists have reached the conclusion that ‘sexism and racism kill more than the virus’. Protest and revolt have spread through some catalytic events, even at unlikely times such as during a pandemic. This was the case with the brutal murder of an African American man, George Floyd, by a White policeman in Minneapolis, on 25 May 2020. This triggered a cycle of anti-racist protests in the United States unprecedented since the civil rights struggles, impacting the entire world.

It is still too early to assess the nature of a new global protest cycle after the pandemic. At this stage, it’s important to understand the connection between movements unleashed before the health crisis and their continuities, discontinuities and innovations with the protest and solidarity dynamic that has emerged in the pandemic. While the pandemic has deactivated in some places and countries the most visible forms of protest, it has not extinguished the claims and the will that moved these demonstrations and which begin to be combined with new agendas and social forces.

### *Critical thinking and emerging theoretical challenges*

The need to rethink the meaning and the paths of emancipation in the 21st century, as well as how we understand the main risks and threats, our vulnerabilities and resilience capacity, represents a crucial challenge for social sciences and critical thinking. In other words, the pandemic has unveiled a fertile ground for crucial issues that need to be addressed, and deepens the ongoing renewal of theoretical debates that has taken place in the last decades.

On one side, the intellectual ‘confinement’ of provincial perspectives helps little. It reproduces exogenous and often colonial and Eurocentric visions. For example, the pandemic has unleashed a broad debate around the notion and experience of ‘risk’. However, what is often presented as a ‘global risk’ in the intellectual debate is the construction (as global and universal) of a particular conception of risk in Western societies, impregnated with local imaginaries of ‘normality’. Moreover, the ‘normality’ of some has always implied the crisis of others. The security of some is often acquired at the expenses of the insecurity of others. In other words, risk in the Western

world has been constructed under an elitist and restricted illusion that protects some while excluding others.

On the other side, beyond diagnosis and denunciation, the critical voices that allow us to understand the multidimensional crisis need to place themselves in a permanent dialogue with emancipatory movements and actors, accompanying actively and permanently the actors of resistance. On this basis, it is the challenge and responsibility of contemporary critical thinking to advance in this field, but also to seek multiple articulations of theoretical-political constellations and new forms of a *collective praxis*, of the relationship between theory and practice. Critical thinking has often remained tied to specific political conceptions, closing itself sometimes in a dogmatic way. It is crucial to maintain its independence, as well as its permanent connection with the concrete problems faced by people and popular movements.

The fifth part of the book gathers contributions from a wide range of critical perspectives, from sociological theory to political philosophy. The reader will have access in this section of the book to several theoretical and often abstract proposals, that where not disconnected from some of the main contemporary societal challenges. In some chapters, the main focus is on the tensions between the individual and collectivity and on the intersections between scales. In others, the emancipation horizon is discussed together with social regulation as a form of domination. In any case, we make no definitive statements but rather put forward theoretical proposals that seek to reformulate questions and consolidate assumptions by accepting uncertainty honestly, but also courageously.

The paradigm of the gift, for example, has found new resonance as a counterweight to a world that praises competition and short-term profits. Feminist activists and intellectuals have provided key concepts and tools with which to analyse the current crisis and alternative futures by placing care and intersectionality at the core of critical thinking, worldviews and concrete alternatives. The battle for a better, greener and less unequal world, capable of combining redistributive justice with environmental, ethnic and gender justice, is a long shot. The pandemic has opened new paths for critical perspectives, and strengthened existing ones. The following section of the book deepens this discussion by examining some of the disputed scenarios that emerge with the pandemic.

### *Post-pandemic transitions and futures in contention*

As a global crisis of unexpected consequence and dimension, the COVID-19 pandemic has opened up new horizons of possibility. It has been seized upon as an opportunity to reshape the world in a different way. Claims and imaginaries that had little space before the pandemic have gained visibility.

Activists and public intellectuals have emphasized the need for a fairer world that is attentive to human rights, care and community, as well as stronger public health systems. This is the backdrop for the sixth and final part of the book, which focuses on disputes over the future.

Interpreting the current critical moment as a step in a broader civilizational crisis opens the way to a very different perspective from the repeated discourses that invite us to come back to 'normality'. The pandemic questions our relation to nature and acts as a reminder of the urgency to change our economic, social and political systems if we want to put a halt to the destruction of nature. An increasing number of communities, movements and intellectuals put a global ecological perspective at the core of their worldview and of their understanding of this multidimensional crisis. The deep connection between the political and ecological crises requires us to understand the world in a different, more integrated way in order to respond to different individual and collective priorities.

As much as we highlight critical voices, the way the pandemic has been handled so far has privileged competition over solidarity both in society and among nations. The richest are even richer and stronger for the crisis. Instead of greater solidarity at national and international levels, the pandemic may lead individuals and states to prioritize the protection of their own community over the common good. Beyond opening new horizons and trying to challenge the dominant meanings of the crisis, mobilizations, advocacy and global political articulation are required. Unveiling the interests behind the political-economic project of the 'new normal' is the first challenge of social movements and committed intellectuals.

Grasping the tensions and disputes, the glimpses of the possible scenarios and blind spots, is a crucial mission. We maintain that the attention paid to concrete actors and local emancipatory projects should not be incompatible with a global perspective. Hence, this last part of the volume, and the book as a whole, is an invitation to an open intercultural dialogue and to revisit different intellectual and political traditions in the light of the multi-dimensional crisis generated by the pandemic.

## **Acknowledgements and platforms for a global dialogue**

The seeds of this book emerged with the Open Movements editorial project that started in 2015 as a collaboration between the International Sociological Association Research Committee on Social Classes and Social Movements (ISA RC-47) and Open Democracy. We have published more than 250 articles by authors from all regions of the world, animated by a will to 'open' the debate on social movements in five different directions: towards societal changes; towards dialogue with the South; towards the combination of scales

and levels of analysis in forging a global sociology; towards learning and acting with and from movements; and towards public sociology.

Initial versions of some articles included in this book were previously published by Open Movements. Most have been updated and developed for this book. Other chapters have been written specifically for it. All the authors were asked for short and direct analyses, written in a language accessible to a wide audience, in which they could synthesize their arguments and research. Their contributions are based on qualitative research and rooted in concrete realities and experience on different continents. They provide us with tools to understand the crisis and the challenges it raises.

We are very grateful to our extraordinary and committed editor in the Open Movements project, Rosemary Bechler, for all her support, as well as to Francesc Badia for his kindness and permanent collaboration with Democracia Abierta. Margot Achard was decisive in the logistical support of this complex editorial project, which involved so many authors in three languages. In this regard, Adriana Santos, as always, contributed with her insightful and lively translation of some pieces. This book also resulted from an increasing collaboration dynamic between the International Sociological Association (ISA), the Latin American Sociological Association (ALAS) and the Latin American Council of Social Sciences (CLACSO), which made possible the publication, in September 2020, of a previous and slightly different version of the book in Spanish under the title *Alerta Global*. We thank Sari Hanafi, Jaime Ríos Burga and Karina Batthyány, the highest authorities of these institutions, for their support, and Nicolás Arata, Pablo Vommoro and María Fernanda Pampín for their crucial role in bringing this project to a successful conclusion.

Last but not least, we would like to thank Shannon Kneis, Bahar Celik Muller, Rich Kemp, Dawn Preston and the team at Bristol University Press (BUP) for their support and enthusiasm for this book. The editors and many authors of this book have also suffered and been affected, in different ways, by the pandemic. This unfortunately slowed down the book production process. Even in the face of so many adversities, the BUP team was always very understanding and sensitive to us. We really appreciate that attitude.

The path towards a fairer way to manage the pandemic and the multidimensional crisis it has triggered requires fostering global dialogues among scholars, intellectuals, political actors, activists and citizens. Building this global perspective is not only a matter of adding a few countries in the list of authors and readings. We need to actively promote the circulation of knowledge and debate of ideas and proposals and build in experience and analyses rooted in different regions of the world. If this book may contribute to this global dialogue, the credit goes mainly to the colleagues who so kindly provided their articles and analyses.

