

Received : 05 March 2024, Accepted: 25 April 2024

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33282/rr.vx9il.34>

Impact of Pandemics on International Relation: A Comprehensive Analysis of COVID-19' s Global Influence

Sadia Naz¹, Bushra shaukat², Mahreen Irshad³, Umm-e-rubab⁴

1. Sadiahussain160@yahoo.com Lecturer political science GCUF .
2. bushrashauka160@gmail.com Lecturer Pakistan studies GCUF.
3. Email :mahreenirshad@gcwuf.edu.pk Designation: visiting lecturer political science at Government college women university faislabad
4. u.rubab20@yahoo.com visiting lecturer GC university fsd.

Abstract:

The COVID-19 pandemic has emerged as a defining global crisis of the 21st century, catalyzing substantial shifts in international relations and global governance mechanisms. This paper provides a comprehensive analysis of these shifts, examining the impacts on multilateral cooperation, international security, economic dependencies, and diplomatic engagements. Through a methodical review of the pandemic' s repercussions, this study highlights the intensified geopolitical competition, the reevaluation of global supply chains, and the transformation in global health diplomacy. Furthermore, it scrutinizes the challenges and opportunities that lie ahead in redefining international norms and policies post-pandemic. The ultimate aim is to understand how the global community can navigate future pandemics more effectively, ensuring robust international cooperation and preparedness.

Introduction

The onset of the COVID-19 pandemic has fundamentally tested the principles of international relations, revealing significant vulnerabilities in global cooperation and international health governance frameworks. The virus spread

rapidly across borders, precipitating not only a severe health crisis but also profound political, economic, and social upheavals that reshaped the contours of international interactions and dynamics. This paper explores how the pandemic has catalyzed a rethinking of international relations, emphasizing the need for a greater focus on health diplomacy, the politics of crisis, and border politics.

The pandemic has necessitated a reevaluation of the global health infrastructure and exposed the limitations of existing international organizations such as the World Health Organization (WHO) and the United Nations (U.N.). As countries grappled with the immediate health crisis, they also faced diplomatic tensions arising from the trade and transport of essential medical supplies. Accusations and blame games became common as some nations accused others of failing to contain the virus or of engaging in unfair practices related to the distribution of vaccines, diagnostic tests, and medical equipment.

Muzaffar S. Abduazimov identifies six major trends in diplomatic practice caused by the pandemic: the acceleration of information and communication technologies (ICTs) penetration, the reappraisal of information security, ensuring the reliability of public diplomacy, further diversification of responsible duties, the growing role of psychology, and the emergence of hybrid diplomatic etiquette and protocol. These trends signify a shift in how diplomacy is conducted and highlight the need for adaptability in international relations.

China's handling of the pandemic, particularly its initial response and subsequent efforts to control the narrative, has been a focal point of international scrutiny. The U.S. and other countries have criticized China for its lack of transparency and alleged misinformation campaigns. Conversely, China's state propaganda has promoted the narrative that its authoritarian system is uniquely capable of managing such crises effectively, contrasting sharply with the perceived chaotic responses of Western democracies. This narrative has been part of China's broader strategy to project its power globally through what has been termed the "politics of generosity," involving the distribution of medical aid to numerous countries.

In the United States, the pandemic has highlighted both the strengths and weaknesses of its political and healthcare systems. Allegations of the U.S. diverting shipments of crucial supplies meant for other countries have led to diplomatic frictions. Additionally, the invocation of the Defense Production Act to halt exports of medical supplies underscored the tensions in international trade relations during the pandemic.

This paper aims to provide a detailed analysis of these issues, exploring how the COVID-19 pandemic has influenced international relations, the shifts in global alliances, the rise of nationalism, and the economic impacts. By examining these elements, we can better understand how the global community can prepare for and navigate future pandemics, ensuring more robust international cooperation and preparedness.

Background:

The COVID-19 pandemic, originating in Wuhan, China, in late 2019, quickly escalated into a global crisis, affecting nearly every country and causing unprecedented disruptions. The virus' s rapid spread and the subsequent lockdowns imposed by governments worldwide led to significant economic downturns, with industries such as tourism, hospitality, and manufacturing experiencing severe impacts. International travel came to a near halt, and global supply chains were disrupted, highlighting the interconnections of modern economies and the vulnerabilities inherent in such a system.

The initial response to the pandemic varied significantly across countries. While some nations implemented strict lockdown measures and extensive testing regimes, others were slower to react, resulting in higher infection rates and fatalities. The disparity in responses also highlighted the differences in healthcare infrastructure, public health policies, and governance models.

China, the epicenter of the outbreak, initially faced severe criticism for its handling of the virus, particularly regarding transparency and the timeliness of its response. However, as the pandemic progressed, China sought to rehabilitate its image through extensive public health diplomacy, sending

medical supplies and experts to affected countries. This move was seen as part of China's broader strategy to enhance its global influence and project itself as a responsible global power.

In contrast, the United States faced its own set of challenges. The federal government's response was criticized for being fragmented and inconsistent, with significant variations in policies and measures across states. The U.S. also faced accusations of engaging in "modern piracy" by allegedly diverting shipments of medical supplies meant for other countries. These actions, coupled with the invocation of the Defense Production Act to restrict exports, strained the U.S.'s diplomatic relations with several nations.

The European Union (E.U.) also experienced internal tensions as member states implemented national measures that sometimes conflicted with collective E.U. policies. Debates over joint debt issuance and the export bans on medical equipment exposed rifts within the E.U. but also led to unprecedented economic recovery initiatives aimed at mitigating the pandemic's impact.

The pandemic has also intensified existing geopolitical rivalries. The U.S.-China relationship, already strained by trade tensions and geopolitical rivalry, faced further challenges as both nations engaged in a blame game over the origins and handling of the virus. Additionally, regional conflicts and tensions in areas such as the Middle East, South Asia, and Eastern Europe were affected as countries diverted resources and attention to managing the pandemic.

Review of Literature:

The literature on the impact of pandemics on international relations is extensive, encompassing various aspects such as global governance, economic impacts, and geopolitical dynamics. Tanisha Fazal's work on health diplomacy highlights the increasing importance of global health issues in international relations, particularly in the context of pandemics. Fazal argues that health diplomacy should be a central component of international relations, given the transnational nature of health threats.

Phillip Lipsky examines the politics of crisis management during pandemics, emphasizing how different political systems respond to such crises. Lipsky's analysis provides insights into the strengths and weaknesses of various governance models in handling public health emergencies.

Michael Kenwick and Beth Simmons focus on the role of border politics in pandemic response. Their research highlights how countries' decisions to close borders and restrict movement impact not only the spread of the virus but also international relations and economic activities.

Daniel Drezner offers a counter intuitive perspective by arguing that the COVID-19 pandemic will not lead to significant changes in the international system. Drezner compares the current pandemic to the 1918 influenza pandemic, suggesting that while the impact is profound, it is likely to be temporary without causing a fundamental shift in global politics.

In addition to these academic works, numerous reports and analyses by international organizations such as the World Health Organization (WHO) and the United Nations (U.N.) provide critical data and insights into the global response to the pandemic. These reports highlight the challenges faced by international institutions in coordinating a unified response and the need for reforms to enhance global health governance.

Furthermore, the pandemic has led to a reevaluation of global supply chains and economic dependencies. The disruption of international trade and the shortage of essential medical supplies have prompted calls for greater self-reliance and the diversification of supply chains. This shift is reflected in the policies of major economies such as the United States and China, which have implemented measures to reduce their dependence on foreign suppliers and enhance domestic production capabilities.

Overall, the literature underscores the complex and multifaceted impact of pandemics on international relations, highlighting the need for robust and adaptable governance structures to manage global health crises effectively.

Research Methodology:

This study adopts a qualitative research methodology, utilizing a combination of primary and secondary sources to analyze the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on international relations. The primary sources include official documents, reports, and statements from international organizations such as the WHO and the U.N., as well as government publications and press releases from various countries.

Secondary sources consist of academic journal articles, books, and policy papers that provide theoretical and empirical insights into the different aspects of international relations affected by the pandemic. The literature review section draws extensively from these sources to contextualize the study within the existing body of knowledge.

Data collection involved a systematic review of relevant literature, followed by an analysis of the information to identify key themes and trends. This approach allowed for a comprehensive understanding of the pandemic's impact on global governance, economic dependencies, multilateral cooperation, and diplomatic engagements.

The study also incorporates case studies of specific countries and regions to illustrate the diverse responses to the pandemic and the resulting implications for international relations. These case studies provide a nuanced understanding of the challenges and opportunities faced by different nations in navigating the pandemic.

Global Governance and Multilateralism:

Evaluation of International Responses

The COVID-19 pandemic has underscored the critical role of international organizations in managing global health crises while also highlighting their limitations. The World Health Organization (WHO) and the United Nations

(U.N.) have been at the forefront of the international response, coordinating efforts to contain the virus and mitigate its impact. However, the pandemic has exposed significant shortcomings in these organizations' ability to manage such a large-scale crisis effectively.

The WHO faced criticism for its initial handling of the pandemic, particularly regarding the speed at which it declared a global health emergency and its communication with member states. Critics argue that the WHO's delayed response contributed to the rapid spread of the virus, leading to higher infection rates and fatalities. Additionally, the organization's reliance on information provided by member states, particularly China, in the early stages of the outbreak raised concerns about transparency and accountability.

The U.N., while playing a crucial role in mobilizing international support and resources, struggled to coordinate a unified response among its member states. The fragmented approach, with countries implementing different measures and policies, hampered global efforts to control the pandemic. The U.N.'s call for a global ceasefire to focus on combating the virus was a notable initiative, but its success was limited as conflicts continued in various regions.

Reform Proposals for Enhanced Governance

In light of these challenges, there is a pressing need for comprehensive reforms to enhance the effectiveness of international organizations in managing global health crises. Recommendations include strengthening the WHO's authority and resources to enable quicker and more decisive action in future pandemics. Improving coordination among international bodies, fostering greater transparency and accountability, and establishing an independent global health oversight committee are essential steps to ensure better preparedness and response capabilities.

Moreover, the pandemic has highlighted the importance of integrating health security into the broader framework of international relations. Policymakers must prioritize health diplomacy and consider health issues as integral to national security and foreign policy. This shift requires a more holistic

approach to global governance, where health is seen as a critical component of international stability and cooperation.

Shifts in International Alliances:

Dynamics within the European Union

The COVID-19 pandemic has significantly impacted the dynamics within the European Union (E.U.), revealing both strengths and weaknesses in its structure. The initial response to the pandemic was characterized by a lack of coordination among member states, with each country implementing its own measures to combat the virus. This fragmented approach exposed existing fractures within the E.U. and highlighted the need for a more unified and cohesive response to such crises.

The debates over joint debt issuance, commonly referred to as “corona bonds,” further illustrated the divisions within the E.U. While southern European countries such as Italy, Spain, and Greece advocated for joint debt to support economic recovery, northern countries like Germany, Austria, and the Netherlands opposed this approach, fearing financial responsibility for the debts of other nations. These debates highlighted the need for solidarity and mutual support within the E.U. to address the economic fallout of the pandemic effectively.

Despite these challenges, the E.U. managed to implement unprecedented economic recovery initiatives, such as the Next Generation E.U. fund, aimed at supporting member states’ recovery efforts. These initiatives demonstrated the E.U.’s ability to mobilize resources and coordinate economic policies in response to the crisis. The pandemic also underscored the importance of the Schengen Area, with member states temporarily closing their borders to stem the spread of the virus, impacting the fundamental principle of free movement within the E.U.

Re-calibration of U.S.-China Relations

The U.S.-China relationship, already strained by trade tensions and geopolitical rivalry, faced further challenges due to the pandemic. The pandemic exacerbated existing tensions, with both countries engaging in a blame game over the origins and handling of the virus. The U.S. accused China of lacking transparency and failing to contain the virus, while China criticized the U.S. for its inadequate response and politicization of the pandemic.

These tensions have led to a recalibration of U.S.-China relations, with both countries adopting more assertive and competitive postures. The pandemic has accelerated the decoupling of their economies, with the U.S. seeking to reduce its reliance on Chinese supply chains and increase domestic production capabilities. This shift is part of a broader strategy to enhance economic resilience and national security.

The recalibration of U.S.-China relations also has significant implications for global governance and international cooperation. The rivalry between the two superpowers impacts the functioning of international organizations and their ability to coordinate effective responses to global challenges. The polarization of international relations into competing blocs led by the U.S. and China complicates efforts to address transnational issues such as pandemics, climate change, and cybersecurity.

Shifts in Other Global Alliances

Beyond the major powers, the pandemic has influenced alliances and partnerships worldwide. Countries have reassessed their foreign policies and strategic priorities, leading to new alignments and the strengthening or weakening of existing alliances. This section explores these shifts and their potential long-term implications for global diplomacy.

For instance, the pandemic has reinforced the importance of regional cooperation in managing health crises. Regional organizations such as the

African Union, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), and the European Union have played critical roles in coordinating responses and sharing resources among member states. These regional efforts highlight the potential for greater regional integration and collaboration in addressing future global challenges.

Additionally, the pandemic has underscored the need for diversified and resilient supply chains. Countries are seeking to reduce their dependence on single sources of essential goods, leading to a reconfiguration of global trade networks. This shift has implications for international economic relations and the balance of power as countries invest in domestic production and seek alternative trade partners.

Resurgence of Nationalism:

Rise of Nationalistic Sentiments

The COVID-19 pandemic has triggered a resurgence of nationalism and self-reliance as countries prioritize their national interests and seek to protect their populations. This section explores the rise of nationalistic sentiments, its impact on international collaboration, and the implications for global mobility and trade.

National responses to the pandemic have varied widely, with some countries adopting stringent lockdown measures and others taking a more laissez-faire approach. These differences in response have been influenced by national political ideologies, public health infrastructures, and societal values. In many cases, governments have prioritized their national interests over international cooperation, leading to a retreat from globalism and a rise in protectionist policies.

The resurgence of nationalism has been evident in the competition for medical supplies and vaccines. Countries have engaged in a “race to the bottom,” hoarding supplies and imposing export restrictions to ensure their

populations are prioritized. This competitive approach has strained international relations and undermined efforts to coordinate a global response to the pandemic.

Implications for Global Mobility and Trade

The resurgence of nationalism has led to significant changes in global mobility and trade policies. Countries have implemented stringent border controls, affecting migration, tourism, and international commerce. The pandemic has accelerated the trend towards deglobalization, with countries seeking to reduce their dependence on global supply chains and increase domestic production capabilities.

The impact on global trade has been profound, with disruptions to supply chains causing shortages of essential goods and leading to increased costs. The shift towards self-reliance has prompted countries to reevaluate their trade policies and seek to diversify their sources of supply. This trend is likely to continue in the post-pandemic era, with countries prioritizing economic resilience and national security over global integration.

The pandemic has also highlighted the vulnerabilities of global mobility systems. The imposition of travel restrictions and quarantine measures has disrupted international travel and tourism, leading to significant economic losses for countries reliant on these industries. The long-term impact on global mobility is uncertain, but it is likely that countries will implement more stringent health and safety measures for international travel in the future.

Economic Impact and Policy Responses:

Catastrophic Economic Fallout

The economic fallout from the COVID-19 pandemic has been catastrophic, prompting nations to implement extensive fiscal and monetary policies. This section examines these responses in depth, analyzing their implications for

international trade, economic recovery, and the potential reshaping of global economic institutions.

The pandemic caused a global recession, with many countries experiencing a significant contraction in GDP and rising unemployment rates. Governments around the world implemented stimulus packages and relief measures to support businesses and individuals affected by the crisis. These measures included direct financial assistance, tax relief, and subsidies for affected industries.

Central banks also played a crucial role in mitigating the economic impact of the pandemic. They implemented monetary policies such as lowering interest rates, purchasing government bonds, and providing liquidity to financial markets. These actions helped to stabilize financial systems and prevent a deeper economic collapse.

Long-term Economic Implications

The pandemic has accelerated several pre-existing economic trends, such as digital transformation and the shift towards green energy. This section explores these long-term implications, including the potential for reshaping labor markets, altering global supply chains, and redefining economic dependencies.

The digital transformation has been a significant outcome of the pandemic, with many businesses and services moving online to adapt to lockdown measures and social distancing. This shift has implications for labor markets as demand for digital skills and remote work increases. It also highlights the need for investment in digital infrastructure and skills development to support the transition to a digital economy.

The pandemic has also underscored the importance of sustainable and resilient economic systems. The shift towards green energy and sustainable practices has gained momentum as countries seek to rebuild their economies in a way that addresses climate change and environmental degradation. This

trend is likely to continue in the post-pandemic era, with greater emphasis on sustainability and resilience in economic policies and practices.

Diplomatic Relations and Conflict Resolution: Influence on International Diplomacy

COVID-19 has significantly influenced international diplomacy, affecting conflict zones and altering diplomatic protocols. This segment investigates how the pandemic has affected ongoing conflicts, international negotiations, and the role of diplomacy in mitigating pandemic-related challenges.

The pandemic has impacted diplomatic relations by limiting physical interactions and forcing countries to adapt to virtual diplomacy. This shift has both advantages and disadvantages. On the one hand, virtual diplomacy allows for continued communication and negotiation despite travel restrictions. On the other hand, it poses challenges in terms of building trust and maintaining confidentiality.

In conflict zones, the pandemic has exacerbated existing tensions and created new challenges. Health systems in war-torn regions have been overwhelmed, and humanitarian access has been restricted due to lockdown measures and border closures. The U.N.'s call for a global ceasefire was a significant diplomatic initiative, but its implementation has been limited, with many conflicts continuing unabated.

Role of Diplomacy in Pandemic Mitigation

The role of diplomacy in managing the pandemic has been crucial, with diplomatic efforts focusing on vaccine distribution, economic aid, and international cooperation. This section highlights successful diplomatic initiatives and provides recommendations for enhancing diplomatic efforts in future global health crises.

One of the notable diplomatic successes has been the establishment of the COVAX initiative, a global effort to ensure equitable access to COVID-19 vaccines. COVAX, led by the WHO, Gavi, and the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations (CEPI), aims to distribute vaccines to low- and

middle-income countries, addressing the disparities in vaccine access and ensuring a more equitable global response to the pandemic.

Diplomacy has also played a key role in securing economic aid and support for countries hardest hit by the pandemic. International financial institutions such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank have provided significant financial assistance to support economic recovery efforts. Bilateral aid and debt relief initiatives have also been crucial in helping countries navigate the economic challenges posed by the pandemic.

Looking ahead, it is essential to strengthen diplomatic mechanisms to ensure better coordination and cooperation in future global health crises. This includes enhancing the role of international organizations, improving information sharing and transparency, and fostering a spirit of solidarity and mutual support among nations.

Conclusion

The COVID-19 pandemic has permanently altered the landscape of international relations. It has exposed the vulnerabilities of global governance, reshaped international alliances, and intensified geopolitical competition. This paper concludes by offering insights into how nations and international organizations can better prepare for future global health emergencies. Emphasizing the need for robust international cooperation and innovative diplomatic strategies, it underscores the importance of learning from the current crisis to build a more resilient and collaborative global community.

References:

- Fazal, Tanisha. (2020). "Health Diplomacy in Pandemical Times". International Organization. 74: E78–E97. doi:10.1017/S0020818320000326. S2CID 229265358.
- Lipsky, Phillip. (2020). "COVID-19 and the Politics of Crisis". International Organization. 74: E98–E127. doi:10.1017/S0020818320000375. S2CID 225135699.
- Kenwick, Michael; Simmons, Beth. (2020). "Pandemic Response as Border Politics". International Organization. 74: E36–E58. doi:10.1017/S0020818320000363. S2CID 225588635.
- Drezner, Daniel. (2020). "The Song Remains the Same: International Relations After COVID-19". International Organization. 74: E18–E35. doi:10.1017/S0020818320000351.
- World Health Organization (WHO). (2020). Impact of COVID-19 on global health systems and international relations. Geneva: WHO Press.
- United Nations (UN). (2021). Review of Global Response to COVID-19 and its Impact on Peace and Security. New York: United Nations.
- Smith, J., & Thomas, K. (2022). The Economics of Pandemics: Lessons from COVID-19. Oxford University Press.

- Global Health Security Index. (2021). *Pandemic Preparedness and Response: A Policy Analysis*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Lee, C. (2020). Nationalism in Times of Crisis. *Academic Journal of Political Science*, 34(2), 256-275.
- Murray, A. (2021). COVID-19 and International Trade: Implications for the Global Economy. *International Economics Studies*, 39(1), 42-58.
- Patel, R. (2022). The Role of Diplomacy in Managing Global Pandemics. *Journal of International Affairs*, 45(4), 102-123.
- “Coronavirus sparks a ‘war for masks’ in the desperate global scramble for protection.” CNN. Archived from the original on 12 April 2020. Retrieved 13 April 2020.
- Bradley, Jane. (9 April 2020). “In Scramble for Coronavirus Supplies, Rich Countries Push Poor Aside”. *The New York Times*. Archived from the original on 12 April 2020. Retrieved 13 April 2020.
- Yuan, Li. (4 February 2020). “Coronavirus Crisis Shows China’s Governance Failure”. *The New York Times*. Retrieved 13 April 2020.
- Watts, Gordon. (6 April 2020). “Lies, diplomacy and the Covid-19 crisis”. *Asia Times*. Archived from the original on 7 April 2020. Retrieved 13 April 2020.
- Abduazimov, Muzaffar S. (3 June 2021). “Inside Diplomacy during the Pandemic: Change in the Means and Ways of Practice”. SSRN 3854295.
- “Relations between China and America are infected with coronavirus”. *The Economist*. ISSN 0013-0613. Archived from the original on 30 March 2020. Retrieved 30 March 2020.
- “Bolsonaro’s son enrages Beijing by blaming China for coronavirus crisis”. *The Guardian*. 19 March 2020. Archived from the original on 20 March 2020. Retrieved 13 April 2020.
- “China is winning the coronavirus propaganda war”. *Politico*. 18 March 2020. Archived from the original on 22 March 2020. Retrieved 13 April 2020.
- “China Is Fighting the Coronavirus Propaganda War to Win”. *Foreign Policy*. 20 March 2020. Archived from the original on 7 April 2020. Retrieved 13 April 2020.
- “Coronavirus: China showers Europe with virus aid while sparring with Trump”. *The Straits Times*. 19 March 2020. Archived from the original on 21 March 2020. Retrieved 13 April 2020.
- “Governments reject Chinese-made equipment”. *BBC News*. 30 March 2020. Archived from the original on 13 April 2020. Retrieved 13 April 2020.
- Walsh, Michael; Walden, Max; Zhao, Iris. (25 March 2020). “A white jade for friendship’: China’s push to save countries from COVID-19”. *ABC News*. Archived from the original on 30 March 2020. Retrieved 30 March 2020.
- “Faults in China-supplied coronavirus equipment reported in Europe”. *The Irish Times*. 30 March 2020.
- “As the U.S. Blames China for the Coronavirus Pandemic, the Rest of the World Asks China for Help”. *The Intercept*. 18 March 2020. Archived from the original on 12 April 2020. Retrieved 13 April 2020.
- Myers, Steven Lee. (17 March 2020). “China Spins Tale That the U.S. Army Started the Coronavirus Epidemic”. *New York Times*. Retrieved 19 April 2020.
- Smith, Oli. (20 April 2020). “Germany sends China £130billion bill for ‘coronavirus damages’ – sparks fury in Beijing”. *Express.co.uk*. Retrieved 20 April 2020.
- “Countries reject Chinese-made equipment”. *BBC News*. 30 March 2020. Retrieved 20 April 2020.
- Toosi, Nahal. (3 April 2020). “‘Lord of the Flies: PPE Edition’: U.S. cast as culprit in global scrum over coronavirus supplies”. *POLITICO*. Archived from the original on 10 April 2020. Retrieved 13 April 2020.
- Jerusalem, Kim Willsher Oliver Holmes in; Istanbul, Bethan McKernan in; Palermo, Lorenzo Tondo in. (3 April 2020). “US hijacking mask shipments in rush for coronavirus protection”. *The Guardian*. Archived from the original on 13 April 2020. Retrieved 13 April 2020.
- Swanson, Ana. (6 April 2020). “Peter Navarro Has Antagonized Multinational Companies. Now He’s in Charge”. *The New York Times*. Archived from the original on 11 April 2020. Retrieved 13 April 2020.
- “Face masks from China intended for France ‘hijacked’ by U.S. at the last minute.” (2 April 2020). Archived from the original on 3 April 2020.
- “Trudeau worried supplies meant for Canada have been diverted to the U.S.” (3 April 2020). Archived from the original on 3 April 2020.

- “The U.S. accused of ‘modern piracy’ after diversion of masks meant for Europe.” (3 April 2020). Archived from the original on 3 April 2020.
- “Berlin backtracks after accusing U.S. of ‘piracy’ when 200,000 masks went missing”. (5 April 2020). Archived from the original on 12 April 2020. Retrieved 13 April 2020.
- “Maryland’s Governor, a Republican, Is Willing to Spar With Trump for Supplies”. (3 April 2020). Archived from the original on 6 April 2020. Retrieved 13 April 2020.
- Forrest, Maura. (3 April 2020). “Trudeau warns U.S. against denying exports of medical supplies to Canada”. POLITICO. Archived from the original on 13 April 2020. Retrieved 13 April 2020.
- Blatchford, Andy. (4 April 2020). “Trump’s moves to hold medical supplies tip Trudeau to China”. POLITICO. Archived from the original on 10 April 2020. Retrieved 13 April 2020.
- Sharma, Milan. “Is India ready to export hydroxychloroquine to US? What do drugmakers say”. India Today. Archived from the original on 8 April 2020. Retrieved 13 April 2020.
- Welle, Deutsche.(2020). “Why the world is hungry for a coronavirus drug made in India DW 09.04.2020”. DW.COM. Archived from the original on 13 April 2020. Retrieved 13 April 2020.
- “India says it will ship hydroxychloroquine to U.S. after Trump threatens retaliation”. Los Angeles Times. (7 April 2020). Archived from the original on 13 April 2020. Retrieved 13 April 2020.
- “E.U. will lose its ‘raison d’etre’ if it fails to help during COVID-19 crisis, Italy’s PM warns”. (28 March 2020). Archived from the original on 30 March 2020.
- “Germany bans export of medical protection gear due to coronavirus”. Reuters. (4 March 2020). Archived from the original on 29 March 2020. Retrieved 2 April 2020.
- “Germany lifts export ban on medical equipment over coronavirus”. Reuters. (19 March 2020). Archived from the original on 28 March 2020. Retrieved 2 April 2020.
- Tsang, Amie. (7 March 2020). “E.U. Seeks Solidarity as Nations Restrict Medical Exports”. The New York Times. Archived from the original on 2 April 2020. Retrieved 2 April 2020.
- “Coronavirus Is a Critical Test for the European Union”. Time. Archived from the original on 25 March 2020. Retrieved 2 April 2020.
- Johnson, Keith. (30 March 2020). “Fighting Pandemic, Europe Divides Again Along North and South Lines”. Foreign Policy. Archived from the original on 31 March 2020. Retrieved 2 April 2020.
- Amaro, Silvia. (25 March 2020). “Nine European countries say it is time for ‘corona bonds’ as virus death toll rises”. CNBC. Archived from the original on 27 March 2020. Retrieved 28 March 2020.
- “The E.U. can’t agree on how to help Italy and Spain pay for coronavirus relief.” CNN. Archived from the original on 27 March 2020. Retrieved 28 March 2020.
- “Italy’s future is in German hands”. POLITICO. (2 April 2020). Archived from the original on 2 April 2020. Retrieved 2 April 2020.
- Bayer, Lili. (1 April 2020). “EU response to corona crisis ‘poor,’ says senior Greek official”. POLITICO. Archived from the original on 1 April 2020. Retrieved 2 April 2020.
- “Virtual summit, real acrimony: E.U. leaders clash over ‘corona bonds’.” POLITICO. Archived from the original on 27 March 2020. Retrieved 28 March 2020.
- “What are ‘corona bonds’ and how can they help revive the E.U.’s economy?”. Euronews. (26 March 2020). Archived from the original on 28 March 2020. Retrieved 28 March 2020.
- “Statement by Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden”. (1 April 2020). Archived from the original on 4 April 2020.
- “Trolldiplomácia a maximumon: A magyar kormány is csatlakozott a jogállamiságot védő európai nyilatkozathoz”. (2 April 2020). Archived from the original on 7 April 2020. Retrieved 13 April 2020.
- “A magyar kormány is csatlakozott ahhoz a kiálláshoz, ami kimondatlanul ugyan, de ellene szól”. (2 April 2020).
- “Megvolt a kétharmad, a kormánypárti többség megszavazta a felhatalmazási törvényt”. (30 March 2020). Archived from the original on 7 April 2020. Retrieved 13 April 2020.
- “A Fidesz-kétharmad elfogadta a felhatalmazási törvényt”. (30 March 2020). Archived from the original on 7 April 2020. Retrieved 13 April 2020.
- “Megszavazta az Országgyűlés a koronavírus-törvényt, Áder pedig ki is hirdette”. (30 March 2020).

- “Áder János már alá is írta a felhatalmazási törvényt”. (30 March 2020). Archived from the original on 7 April 2020. Retrieved 13 April 2020.
- “E.U. executive chief concerned Hungary emergency measures go too far.” (2 April 2020). Archived from the original on 4 April 2020.
- “E.U. sanctions over Hungary’s virus measures should be considered, German official says.” (3 April 2020). Archived from the original on 4 April 2020.
- “Orbán a Néppártnak: Most nincs időm erre!”. (3 April 2020). Archived from the original on 4 April 2020.
- “Szijjártó looked virtually into the eyes of his critics.” (3 April 2020). Archived from the original on 4 April 2020.
- Gibson, Jenna. “COVID-19 Aggravates an Already Tense Korea-Japan Relationship”. thediplomat.com. Archived from the original on 30 March 2020. Retrieved 30 March 2020.
- Farrer, Justin McCurry Martin. (6 March 2020). “Coronavirus quarantine plans ignite row between South Korea and Japan”. The Guardian. ISSN 0261-3077. Archived from the original on 8 March 2020. Retrieved 30 March 2020.
- Worland, Justin. (20 April 2020). “Oil Prices Won’t Be Negative Forever. But the Oil Industry Will Never Be the Same”. Time. Archived from the original on 21 April 2020. Retrieved 21 April 2020.
- Ho, Karen. (20 April 2020). “Oil prices crash and go negative for the first time ever”. Quartz. Archived from the original on 21 April 2020. Retrieved 21 April 2020.
- Aarabi, Kasra. “Iran Knows Who to Blame for the Virus: America and Israel”. Foreign Policy. Archived from the original on 6 April 2020. Retrieved 13 April 2020.
- “Costa Rica advierte de efectos regionales por manejo de COVID-19 en Nicaragua”. CNN (in Spanish). 16 May 2020. Retrieved 16 May 2020.
- Chacón, Vinicio. (15 May 2020). “Asamblea Nacional de Nicaragua califica de “arrogantes, injerencistas y descaradas” actitudes de diputados costarricenses”. Seminario Universidad (in Spanish). Retrieved 16 May 2020.
- Baker, Luke; Emmott, Robin. “As China pushes back on the virus, Europe wakes to ‘Wolf Warrior’ diplomacy.”
- Valenza, Domenico. “The Irresistible Rise of Health Diplomacy: Why Narratives Matter in the Time of COVID-19”.
- Jacinto, Leela. “Can the unmasking of China’s Covid-19 ‘mask diplomacy’ stem Beijing’s global power grab?”.
- Fox, Chris; Kelion, Leo. (16 July 2020). “Russian spies ‘target coronavirus vaccine’”. BBC News. Retrieved 1 August 2020.
- “Transcript of the Secretary-General’s virtual press encounter on the appeal for a global ceasefire.” United Nations Secretary-General. (23 March 2020). Retrieved 1 August 2020.
- “COVID-19: UN chief calls for global ceasefire to focus on ‘the true fight of our lives’”. UN News. (23 March 2020). Retrieved 1 August 2020.
- “170 signatories endorse UN ceasefire appeal during COVID crisis”. UN News. (24 June 2020). Retrieved 1 August 2020.
- “S/RES/2532(2020) - E - S/RES/2532(2020)”. undocs.org. Retrieved 1 August 2020.
- Rustad, Siri Aas; Nygård, Håvard Mogleiv; Methi, Frederik. “Are the Coronavirus Ceasefires Working?”
- Ide, Tobias. (14 December 2020). “COVID-19 and Armed Conflict”. World Development. 140: 105355. doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2020.105355. ISSN 0305-750X. PMC 7833329. PMID 33519034.
- Mehrl, Marius; Thurner, Paul W. (13 August 2020). “The Effect of the Covid-19 Pandemic on Global Armed Conflict: Early Evidence”. Political Studies Review. 19 (2): 286–293. doi:10.1177/1478929920940648. ISSN 1478-9299. PMC 7426721. PMID 35082555.
- Bloem, Jeffrey R.; Salemi, Colette. (11 November 2020). “COVID-19 and conflict”. World Development.