3 Mobile population, 'pandemic citizenship'

*Nasreen Chowdhory and
Shamna Thacham Poyil*

Introduction

Constituting the lion's share of workforce in India's infrastructure, logistical and supply services, agricultural sector, and even engaging in menial jobs such as that of domestic helps or rickshaw pullers, the unskilled and semi-skilled migrant worker is the most indispensable yet the easily disposable entity in our economic structure. The synergy between 'informality' and 'mobility' has pushed the migrant worker to a vicious cycle of precarious labour, compounded by the 'uncertainty' of one's livelihood, 'insecurity' about one's entitlements and possessions, as well as the 'unsafety' of one's body and health (Bauman, 2000: 161). The usually precarious nature of the work done by migrant labourers elevates to a degree of 'hyper precarity' (Lewis et al., 2015) when subjected to the devastating impact of 'pandemic citizenship'.¹ Drawing on Agamben's construct of exception and constitution of bare life, the chapter conceptualises pandemic *citizens* as those citizens who in the 'state of exception' conjured by the pandemic have forfeited their rights and freedom of movement. The hardships faced by the migrant labour are not just a function of the pandemic but indicative of the compounded structural exclusion that has relegated them to the socio-political margins of the state and warranted their categorisation as '*citizen-migrant*'. While the assertion of their agency emerges with their mobility and livelihood paradox, the internal migrants of the country get drawn to the spatial aberration in claiming citizenship rights and entitlements. By subjecting *citizen-migrants* to the vagaries of *pandemic citizenship*, the state dispossesses them of the only modicum of agency that they could exert for the attainment of a dignified life.

Constituting the 'pandemic citizens' from 'citizen-migrants'

In the context of the pandemic, a 'pandemic citizen' has forfeited the indispensability of rights that is central to citizenship. The constitution of pandemic citizenship can be tethered to Foucault's (2003: 241) conceptualisation of 'non-disciplinary' bio politics of the state that is subjected on the 'living man' or 'man-as-having being'. This 'politics of life' comprises of the 'power to make live and let die' where the ambiguous equilibrium between right to life and right to death is perpetually balanced in favour of death over life (ibid.). This is contrasted by Foucault (2003: 273) with the conventional articulation of sovereign authority as classical biopower which 'take[s] life or let[s] live'. Extending Foucault's notion, Mbembe (2003) conceptualises necropolitics as the 'administration of death' which showcases the ongoing patterns of subduing life to accommodate the politics of death and thereby displays the 'generalized instrumentation of human existence and material destruction of human bodies and populations' (Vajpeyi, 2009: 301). Agamben, drawing from the same body of work, has furthered the understanding of 'bare life' of 'homosacer', where the inviolability of life is adjourned and reduced to the bare minimum of human existence. The pandemic response mechanism of the state constitutes a 'state of exception' where the discriminatory and discretionary powers of the state acquire a false legitimacy in the urgency to ensure public health. When the Indian state brought about a gamut of restrictions that curtailed the right to mobility of a citizen, it was given statutory validation through the enforcement of the Disaster Management Act of 2005. All citizens of the country were subjected to the new normal of restricted mobility, denying the right to freedom of movement ensured by Article 19(d) of the Constitution. Hence the suspension of laws and rights during the pandemic exemplifies the state of exceptionality as conceptualised by Agamben (1998: 170), where 'subjective right and juridical protection no longer make any sense'. When a *citizen-migrant* to whom mobile livelihood is crucial for sustenance is subjected to this restriction as compared to other citizens for whom the same restriction would only amount to an added inconvenience in terms of limitation of choices (and not a threat for survival), it unravels the disproportionate effect of the aforementioned category of pandemic citizenship. By reducing *citizen-migrants* to the status of *homo sacer*, who is excluded from living a politically proficient life, pandemic citizenship ensures that the ambit of state protection is reduced to a mere subsistence of their bare life. In the state of exceptionality that causes 'inclusive-exclusion' or 'exclusive-inclusion' (Agamben, 2008), pandemic citizens lose the capacity to claim their 'right to have rights' (Arendt, 1986). Faced with the lack of any alternative,

the pandemic citizens chose to defy the restriction when they decided to undertake a long walk home. Here biopolitics can be seen to transmute to a sort of thanatopolitics where a particular segment of the population is positioned outside the 'sphere of immunity' by the state (Esposito, 2008: 14). The death of migrant workers due to dehydration, exhaustion, hunger, and accidents in their perilous journey on foot effectively showcases the pandemic citizen as an embodiment of bare life who eventually become subjected to the thanatopolitical 'dispositif' (ibid) of the state. Thanatopolitics is then a corollary to biopolitics, where population management becomes politics of death brought about by letting some die, where death is 'elided and dismissed' as the 'necessary part of living', such that they are never 'caused' per se' rather the state merely 'allows' it to happen as a 'passive event' (Murray, 2008: 204). The lack of statistical records of the death of the migrants and the absence of any concerted attempt by the state to enumerate such deaths not just showcases the apathy towards the vulnerable but also signifies the thanatopolitical apparatus of the state that normalises the death of those excluded. It is necessary to analyse the construct of *citizen-migrant* to understand how their marginality conditions them to be expelled from the 'sphere of immunity' of the state, thereby exposing them to the viciously disproportionate impact of pandemic citizenship. The shaping of *citizen-migrant* can be zoepolitically seen as the starting point of his diminution from the politically qualified good life ('bios') to the bare and naked life (zoë) constituted by the pandemic.

The inclusive-exclusion that characterises Agamben's bare life is symptomatic of the condition of citizen-migrant where the mobility for livelihood excludes accessing rights based citizenship. Article 21 of the Indian Constitution guarantees the fundamental right to liberty, which is equivocally the right to a dignified life. Although every state is the benefactor of the right to life of its citizens both legally and politically, various patterns of exclusion relegate individuals to the margins of the body politic. This causes the right to life to be applied 'universally but not uniformly' among the citizens, triggering the state to develop 'differentiated governmental management of life' (Nasir, 2017: 76). Right to dignified life necessitates an individual's access to basic healthcare and education, and for those underprivileged languishing in peripheries of state, like the internal migrants, dignified life entails support for food rations and even livelihood assistance. Rather than conceiving citizenship as a legal status that facilitates their political and civic rights, it would be more pertinent to look at citizenship as a conduit that sanctions their social rights.

Building on T.H Marshall's conceptualisation of citizenship as a progression of civil, political, and social rights and entwining it with Arendt's notion of citizenship as the right to have rights, Somers (2008: 6) envisions

citizenship as the 'foundational right' that facilitates an individual's 'social inclusion in civil society as a moral equal' and how the rights of vulnerable categories of citizens within a nation-state get degraded under the influence of market fundamentalism. Being a citizen does not automatically enable the internal migrants of the country to access the rights and entitlements accrued through citizenship, which showcases the inevitable chasm inherent between 'status and the reality of citizenship' (Houtzager & Acharya, 2011: 4). Similarly, Solinger (1993) in his study of circular migrants in China suggests that despite having legal citizenship the 'floating populations' were prevented from accessing rights and welfare provisions. To Fraser (1996), the tenets of entitlement are based on the notion of necessity for assistance, requisite of employment, and a membership in the society in terms of citizenship.² Though with inherent variations, most of the advanced societies hyphenate entitlements with 'definition of citizenship' premised on a 'continuous stream of income above poverty level' or a stable employment (Bakker, 1994: 6). In countries like China, the system of entitlements was conditioned by acquisition of urban residence. Interestingly, the domain of social citizenship showcases the entwinement and mutuality of political and economic rights so much so that the deprivation of one would constitute the denial of other (Roy, 2010). Chhachhi (2004), in the context of an almost non-existent framework in India to ensure the provisioning of entitlements grounded on citizenship, considers it pertinent to ascertain the overt reliability of the migrant on exchanging their labour as the primary means for subsistence.

At the outset, it is important to both locate and differentiate the precarious labour of the *citizen-migrant* within the predominant discourse of labour, in order to establish the necessity to introspect their vulnerability towards the citizenship rights of the state. Drawing on Marxian scholarship, Fraser (1996) considers disproportionate labour exchange to be a grave social injustice that involves tacit exploitation, where the benefit of one's labour is appropriated for the advantage of others, thereby constituting their economic deprivation and marginalisation. The current 'neo-liberal globalization, along with hypermobility of capital' has fortified the supply of such 'flexible labour' (Chhachhi, 2014) by feeding on the inequality emerging from such marginalisation. This must be seen in the context of erosion of the decommodification of labour in the post-Fordist era marked by the 'informalization, precariatization and fragmentation of labour' (Chhachhi, 2014: 901). The welfare capitalism that emerged during the Fordist mass production era saw the state's effort to promise a gamut of social citizenship rights that was in turn influenced by the strategies of trade union tactics and labour mobilisation. This was primarily dependent on the centrality of decommodification of labour that emboldened the worker, but also threatened the

ultimate power and supremacy enjoyed by employers (Esping-Andersen, 1990: 22). The hyphenation between wage labour and social citizenship that was asserted during this period of welfare state had considerably brought down the inherent systemic inequalities and caused for a 'social levelling' (Bremen & Linden, 2014; Chhachhi, 2014). The informality of the wage labour thereby challenged the hyphenation of employment with social citizenship (Barchiesi, 2008) such that it was the nature of the employment (formal/informal) which was coupled with the realisation of social citizenship. Chhachhi (2014: 903) opines that the bivalent narrative of labour that centres on the Marxian notion of 'exploitation' and Polanyian theorisation of 'commodification' can be contested by the Global South in the context of their uniqueness in terms of the development of working class under the influence of colonialism, relevance of various types of labour, entwinement of migration with labour, the function of post-colonial state, as well as the confrontation and struggle that workers underwent to attain both work-related and social rights. In alignment with postulations of other scholarship (Linden, 2008; Mezzadra, 2012; Chakrabarty, 2001), she opines that the labour question in post-colonial countries like India should recognise the categorisation of novel configurations of labour such as 'precariat, cybertariat, care workers, etc.', and the ways in which this reconfigures the class divide in the milieu of prevalent procedures and patterns of capital accumulation.

In spite of participating in the accretion of capital, the 'reserve army of labour' is structurally conditioned to be the perpetually deprived (Bremen, 2013) and characteristically compared to the 'precariat'. While reconceptualising the notion of 'labour' based on the distinctions of nature of work, labour power, and distinguishing the modes of income, Standing (2011) posits the emergence of a new labour class that he calls the 'precariat' characterised by the distinctive features of uncertainty and elasticity of occupation, overt dependability on the apprehensive and flexible wages coming from undertaking such employment and the negligible realisation of substantive citizenship rights. Unlike the proletariat, they cannot be located specifically in the hierarchy of Marxist class relations in the context of capitalist patterns of production. While the prognosis and diagnosis of the proletariat question is conditioned specifically by the need to attain a sustainable protection of labour within the place of employment that, in turn, can be affiliated or associated with (such as a factory), it cannot be the same for the precariat. The vulnerability of the circular migrant labour in India that qualifies them to be the precariat in terms of their mobile livelihood and diverse skill set also precludes them to develop long-term affiliation with a particular place or segment of employment. The solution for the precariat's uncertainty and vulnerability cannot be confined to their employment but

rather should be simultaneously sought outside those limits of the place of their employment. It is here that one can approach the exclusion of the precarious migrant labour by reconciling both their economic vulnerability and their political existence. By building on the Polanyian theorisation and by emphasising the inadequacy of 'industrial citizenship', Standing (2009) had put forth the necessity to re-problematise the dominant approach by supporting the de-hyphenation of employment with social citizenship and advocating 'occupational citizenship' that associates all occupations with equal rights, recognition, and identity. This can prevent the alienation of the labourer arising from mass commodification of the post-neoliberal world order. Arguably, the variations brought about in the nature of labour invoke categorisations like the precariat that warrant a realignment in introspection by combining the need to secure 'labour rights vis-à-vis capital' (Chhachhi, 2014: 903) that necessitates locating rights as the citizens of the state.

Citizenship is about accessing the resources apportioned to the citizens as much as it denotes their social membership in a community (Turner, 1990). Through making claims on the state for the resources and rights that they are entitled to, individuals are effectively 'practicing citizenship' (Kruks-Wisner, 2019: 8). According to scholarship like Lister (2000) and Molyneux (2000), the conception of 'citizenship in practice' requires a shift in the focus of citizenship as a 'process' rather than a 'status'. The question of exercising agency, whether at an individual level or at a collective level is instrumental while looking at citizenship as 'process' (Ong, 1991). The practice of citizenship ascertains an understanding on active citizenship as conceptualised by Houztager and Acharya (2011: 3), where citizens attempt to traverse the conditions for their access to public goods and provisions through exercising their agency 'in ways that are publicly sanctioned and protected'. Kruks-Wisner (2019) examines the notion of active citizenship by modifying the ways exerted by an individual to access the public goods and provisions, wherein a citizen could use both formal and informal, publicly sanctioned and even unsanctioned means to claim rights. This reclamation of rights substantively denotes the participatory notion of citizenship where an individual exerts his political agency (Lister, 1998:228). In the absence of an institutionalised state structure that proactively implements the constitutionally guaranteed rights and welfare provisions, despite being the bearer of those rights, the migrant worker faces impediments in exerting his agency and claiming those rights. Kruks-Wisner (2019: 9) opines that claim-making hyphenates two aspects of citizenship – citizenship as a status that bestows the civil, political, and social rights and the status of citizenship acquired by the individual through their participation in the political community. Going back to Somers (2008), one can see the amalgamation of these two aspects where she conceptualises the legality of citizenship rights

as emanating from the impact of social mobilisation in turn conditioned by the same rights. If citizenship can be conceived as a bundle of rights to be allocated and duties, passive citizens would comprise the base while active citizenship would constitute progressively higher echelons of the hierarchy. The precarity of migrant labour is that their compounded structural exclusion conjures a gap which is in turn constituted by both the spatial bias of our citizenship rights and the migrant's mobility.

Mobile populations constitute the 'imperceptible lot' to the political leadership of our country, working in towns and cities of their home states renders them incapable to cast votes in the villages where they are electorally registered. Notwithstanding the numbers, they lack a concerted political weight due to their inefficacy in comprising the 'vote bank'. For the same reason, the working conditions, health care and housing provisions of these labourers do not figure as a pressing concern for the politicians at the places to which they have migrated for employment. The 'political disenfranchisement of circular labour migrants' (Roy, 2016) is central to their political exclusion. The disparity in the enumeration of migrants as visible in census reports and National Sample Surveys is rather too trivial a matter for the state, considering the haphazard and ambiguous definitions used to even qualify someone as migrant within the country. The ill-informed policy-making of state on internal migrants not just overlooks but also deeply discounts the economic value of the labour they undertake, as a larger number of temporary/seasonal/circular migrants remain invisible.

The way in which their workplaces are spatially dispersed across various geographical locations (Ghosh & Bandyopadhyay, 2020), the nature of complicated subcontracting provisions, and even the sheer circumstantial variety of low skilled and unskilled occupations in the country make their static settlement in one location impossible, making the 'floating population' in the suburbs and urban locations of the country. The collective mobilisation of the migrant labour so as to assert their rights or negotiate their political demands is very difficult. One cannot attribute this lack of collective assertion among the migrant workers completely to the informal nature of their work; Agarwala (2013) opines that close to nine million informal workers participate in a union, even though they lack formal working conditions. A combination of both informal employment and mobile livelihood precipitate the structural vulnerability of migrant labour in India. In addition, their inherent socio-cultural diversity in terms of the identity markers such as language, religion, or caste renders their collective organisation as a homogenous group rather challenging. The faultlines of caste, class, and gender and the diversity of their inherent skill set have constituted hierarchies of labour. The migrant labour of the country comprises largely those who belong to the lowermost levels of this hierarchy (Shah & Lerche,

2020). The nature of contractual labour recruitment for low skilled and semi-skilled jobs adds on to this complex hierarchical structure, where the migrant labour is prevented from accruing any tangible capital or resources and is perpetually subjected to the exploitation by middlemen in selling their labour.

The socio-economic susceptibility of the migrant labour is characterised by the repetitive abnegation of their social rights where affordable housing, healthcare, basic education becomes inaccessible to them due to the invisible fissures in administrative design and institutional framework of distributing the welfare provisions of the state. Srivastava (2020) outlines four factors for continued precarity of migrant labour in India – first is their inability to establish a 'civic identity and civic citizenship' at the destination, second is the unfavourable terms of assimilation to the labour market when compared to the non-migrants, third being the weak social network pattern amongst the migrants, and finally the inherent complexity in ascertaining claims and entitlements such as shelter. The inability can be attributed primarily to the lack of prior experience in exercising their citizenship rights even at their place of origin. This precludes them from developing awareness on the prerequisite of necessary documentation that would make them eligible for the entitlements and sometimes they would not know the provisions or entitlements for which they are eligible in the first place. In a complex administrative and institutional arrangement of welfare system, though money for the scheme might be sanctioned by the central government, their pattern and implementation design can vary from state to state, making it difficult for the labourer to move from his state of origin to the state of his employment to claim his entitlements from the state. The primary impediment in accessing welfare provisions is establishing their legal identity at address of domicile as identification systems like UIDAI currently can link an individual with only one address, making it difficult for seasonal and circular migrants to access the entitlements through a single address. Even the admissibility to be included in the target population of schemes such as Ayushman Bharat, P.M Awas Yojana, and National Food Security Act are determined on the basis of Socio-Economic Caste Census (SECC) updated every ten years. Except for the possibility of some being included in the state of their origin, the chances for SECC being inclusive of short-term migrants at any place are significantly less, in turn causing them to be excluded from being a targeted beneficiary for such assistance. Statutory provisions include the Inter-State Migrant Workmen (Regulation of Employment and Conditions of Service) Act of 1979, which was brought about by acknowledging the inadequacy of existing legal framework in protecting the interests of migrant workers in the country. It recognised the necessity to protect the large section of unorganised and illiterate workers

from the vagaries of their informal work condition and exploitation at the hands of contracting middlemen (Varma, 2020). The structural vulnerability and socio-economic deprivation has rendered them frail to exert the agency required for claiming their constitutional rights. The awareness and adequate understanding on the implementation of a statutory law for alleviating their exploitation at work is in principle a long haul. The attempt to bridge the lacunae in existing labour laws led to the introduction of Occupational Safety, Health and Working Conditions Code of 2019 in Lok Sabha in 2019,³ which also failed to achieve its stated purpose.

The political exclusion, marginalisation in acquiring a valid legal identity, and inability to access their entitlements create a precarious existence amidst their material hardships and socio-economic vulnerability. Such deprivation of their substantive rights and entitlements along with ‘othering’ that they face in the host societies can be considered to be the materialisation of an ‘eclipsed citizenship’ (Mander et al., 2019). Beyond the normal dichotomy of insider/outsider to the construct of citizenship, they opine that differential practices of membership within the nation-state causes some to be privileged as being ‘interior’ and others as ‘exterior’. The plight of the migrant labour is not just that he is an outsider to the state to which he migrated but also that he is ‘exterior’ to the states from which he has migrated. The compounded structural exclusion has turned the migrant labour to a lesser citizen of the body politic even in the pre-pandemic normality, and curtailing the mobility of people has been central to the response measures adopted by means of complete or partial lockdown and border closures. It is at this juncture that the notion of ‘politics of mobility’ has resulted in ‘pandemic citizenship’. Dobusch and Kreissl (2020) have opined that the nature in which states handle the response measures for COVID-19 can be likened to the way in which the crisis management transmutes as ‘im-/mobility governance’. As a person’s mobility is what enables him to access his livelihood or sustaining his societal and personal relations, it is inextricably linked to the constitution and reconstitution of power relations within the society (Cresswell, 2010) and thereby emerges as the ‘most coveted stratifying factor’ (Bauman, 1998). The statutory and non-statutory provisions intended to enable or curtail the mobility and thereby the partaking of individuals across various aspects of life ensures the disproportionate endowment of mobility along the pre-existing faultlines of class, religion, ethnicity, or even gender. For a pandemic crisis where mobility-induced proximity of individuals is the primary causative factor, the curtailment of the very same mobility emerging as the principal response mechanism of the state was perceived to be fairly just. But the implementation of such response mechanisms exhibits the inequalities and asymmetric power relations that forfeit the rights of the individual. The state meted out a visibly

differential and viciously disparate treatment to migrant labour within the country in comparison to the effort and enthusiasm invested in the implementation of the Vande Bharat mission conceived so as to bring home the emigrant community from Middle East who were literally crucial to the inward remittance received by the southern states of India, like Kerala. Instead, the improvisation of state-dictated norms of mobility using haphazard categorisations such as 'stranded migrants' failed to comprehend the diverse nature of the predicament of migrant labour, resulting in the reduction of individuals to graded bodies in which some citizens are more unequal than others. The pandemic reconstituted them as potential carriers of the virus, thus making the migrant labourer an 'outsider' or 'other' who can be thanatopolitically left to die than let to live.

When citizen-migrants are subjected to a *pandemic citizenship*, it conjures a 'contrast medium' that amplifies and reveals the 'ills that affect our society'.⁴ Their plight ought to be seen from the intersection of 'process, agency, and multidimensionality of exclusion', all of which create a situation of 'thwarted citizenship' (Roy, 2010: 176). The transition of migrant labour in India to a *citizen-migrant* to a *pandemic citizen* is marred with the masking, assertion, dispossession, and re-assertion of his agency. The economic marginalisation emanating from the informality of his labour and the compounded socio-political exclusion conditioned by his mobility had caused the state to precipitate structural conditions that masked him from exerting his agency required for the practice of citizenship. A *citizen-migrant* is already a lesser, unequal citizen who was included and later excluded at the same time. Baubock (2011: 3) in conceptualising 'partial citizens' describes temporary migrants as those who could not partake in the political sphere for making the same laws that they were being subjected to and whose membership status is jeopardised by the 'automatic acquisition or loss or as a result of mere change of residence' along with the absence of a robust spatial affiliation that prevents them from 'justifying fuller set of rights or motivating fuller participation'. The acquisition of livelihood is an exercise of their right to mobility, through which the migrant labour asserts limited agency. Overlooking of vulnerability and marginalisation by the state by means of imposition of a uniform blanket ban on mobility constitutes a *pandemic citizenship*, i.e., one that completely dispossessed the *citizen-migrant* of any agency to a dignified life. As opined by Roy (2010: 26–27), migrants who have been ousted from the 'elite domain of civil society' for their incapacity to manoeuvre the 'skills' required for citizenship are thereby perpetually condoned to the inferior realm of 'residual citizens'. The analogy of pandemic citizen to *homo sacer* signifies how being cast out to the peripheries of citizenship exposes one to the bare life, where abstract biological life is constituted by a state of exception. Had these vulnerable

people been able to access at least their basic food ration through the Public Distribution System at their areas of domicile, the migrant exodus and consequent cataclysm that we witness today could have been averted to a certain degree. When the *citizen-migrants* who are citizens deprived of substantive citizenship become *pandemic citizens*, they face a complete absence of choice, such that they are reduced to the naked life of the *homo sacer*. By defying the restrictions imposed by the state, when they set out on barefoot for a 'long march' back home, they reassert agency for a dignified life. This exposes them to the state's dichotomous choice of worthy citizens over the other insignificant citizens whose death are overtly or covertly instigated by the thanatopolitical practices of the state facilitated by the pandemic 'state of exception'. Their death both literally and metaphorically signifies the process of exclusion of the citizen-migrant culminating as the erasure of pandemic citizen.

Conclusion

To sum up, the compounded exclusion of migrants manifested by their mobile livelihood puts them into a flux between their state of origin and state of destination, which is juxtaposed against the spatial bias inherent both in our citizenship framework and the institutionalisation of our welfare provisions. These factors cause the migrant body to transmute to the *citizen-migrant* as lesser, unequal citizen unable to claim entitlements, disempowered to access rights. Agamben (2020) opines that response mechanism of the state during pandemic is the manifestation of the predisposition of the state to use a 'state of exception as the normal paradigm of the government'. The reduction of individuals to their bare life of mere biological existence devoid of any social and political dimension is normalised and accepted in fear of survival (ibid.). The state of exception and politics of mobility instituted by the state during pandemic creates the *pandemic citizen* who has forfeited his claim to the indispensable right of mobility. Yet the structural vulnerability that has constituted the citizen-migrants in the first place has made them most vulnerable to the adverse and disproportionate impact of this pandemic citizenship, reducing them to the disposition of *homo sacer* leading a 'bare life'. For the citizen-migrants, in the absence of an effective social security net and welfare provisions, their assertion of agency to be mobile is the only factor that enables them to earn the remuneration in return for the labour they engage in. While for any other citizen the constraints on mobility have only limited their choices and options in day-to-day life, the state has deprived the *citizen-migrant* of their only choice and means to a dignified life. The partaking of state in constituting their vulnerability as citizen-migrants and later as

pandemic citizens becomes thanatopolitical in the way it facilitated life for the equal citizens and death to the unequal citizen-migrant. The blatant disregard for their structural predicament will cause the normality of the post-pandemic society to be built on the edifice of the very same unequal pandemic citizenship.

Notes

- 1 The term *pandemic citizen* has been adapted from the article 'The biopolitics of pandemic citizenship' by Adil Hossain (2020) but conceptualized differently from the original version.
- 2 Cross cited from Chhachhi (2004).
- 3 <https://www.prsindia.org/billtrack/occupational-safety-health-and-working-conditions-code-2>.
- 4 Cross cited from Dobusch and Kreissl (2020).

References

- Agamben, Giorgio, 1998. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Translated by Daniel Heller-Roazen. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Agamben, G., 2008. *The Kingdom and the Glory*. Homo Sacer II. Buenos Aires: Adriana Hidalgo.
- Agamben, Giorgio, 2020. 'The Invention of an Epidemic', <https://www.journal-psychoanalysis.eu/coronavirus-and-philosophers/>; originally published in Italian on Quodlibet.
- Agarwala, Rina, 2013. *Informal Labour, Formal Politics and Dignified Discontent in India*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Arendt, Hannah, 1986. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. London: Andre Deutsch.
- Bakker, Isabella, 1994. *The Strategic Silence: Gender and Economic Policy*. London: Zed Book Company/The North-South Institute.
- Barchiesi, Franco, 2008. 'Hybrid Social Citizenship and the Normative Centrality of Wage Labor in Post-Apartheid South Africa', *Mediations*, 24(1): 52–67.
- Bauböck, Rainer, 2011. 'Temporary migrants, partial citizenship and hypermigration', *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 14(5): 665–693.
- Bauman, Zygmunt, 1998. *Globalization: The Human Consequences*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Bauman, Zygmunt, 2000. *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Breman, Jan, 2013. *At Work in the Informal Economy of India: A Perspective from Bottom Up*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Breman, Jan and Van der Linden, Marcel, 2014. 'Informalizing the economy: the return of the social question at a global level', *Development and Change*, 45: 920–940.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh, 2001. *Provincializing Europe*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Chhachhi, Amrita, 2004. *Eroding Citizenship: Gender and Labour in Contemporary India*. PHD Thesis, Amsterdam Institute for Social Science Research, University of Amsterdam.
- Chhachhi, Amrita, 2014. 'Introduction: the 'Labour Question' in Contemporary Capitalism', *Development and Change*, 45: 895–919.
- Cresswell, Tim, 2010. 'Towards a politics of mobility', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 28(1), 17–31.
- Dobusch, Laura and Kreissl, Katharina, 2020. 'Privilege and burden of im/mobility governance: on the reinforcement of inequalities during a pandemic lockdown', *Gender Work & Organizations*, 27(5): 709–716.
- Esping-Andersen, Gosta, 1990. *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Esposito, Roberto, 2008. *Bíos: Biopolitics and Philosophy*. Translated by Timothy Campbell. London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Foucault, Michel, 2003. 'Society Must Be Defended', *Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975–76*. Trans. David Macey, Ed. Arnold I. Davidson. New York: Picador.
- Fraser, Nancy, 1996. *Social Justice in the Age of Identity Politics: Redistribution, Recognition, and Participation*. The Tanner Lectures on Human Values, Stanford University April 30–May 2.
- Ghosh, Shreya and Bandyopadhyay, Ritajyoti, 2020. 'Postal Ballot voting rights: the only way migrant workers can make their presence felt', *Wire*, 21 May. Retrieved from <https://thewire.in/rights/postal-ballot-votes-migrant-workers>. Accessed on 16 October 2020.
- Hossain, Adil, 2020. 'The biopolitics of pandemic citizenship', *Discover Society*, 11 May. <https://discoversociety.org/2020/05/11/the-biopolitics-of-pandemic-citizenship/>. Accessed on 11 January 2021.
- Houtzager Peter, P. and Acharya, Arnab, 2011. 'Associations, Active Citizenship and Quality of Democracy in Brazil and Mexico', *Theory and Society*, 40(1): 4–5.
- Kruks-Wisner, Gabrielle, 2019. *Claiming the State: Active Citizenship and Social Welfare in Rural India*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lister, Ruth, 1998. 'Citizen in action: citizenship and community development in a Northern Ireland context', *Community Development Journal*, 33(3): 226–235.
- Lister, R., 2000. 'Strategies for social inclusion: promoting social cohesion or social justice?' *Social Inclusion, Possibilities and Tensions*. Eds. Askonas, P. and Stewart, A. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 37–58.
- Mander, Harsh, Roy, I. Priyanka Jain, Ravi Raman, Rashmi Guha Ray, Anirban Bhattacharya and Usman Jawed Siddiqi, 2019. 'Stolen citizenship, stolen freedoms Locating the rights of India's circular labour migrants', *Slaveries & Post-Slaveries, Open Edition Journals*. Retrieved from <http://journals.openedition.org/slaveries/602>. Accessed on 16 October 2020.
- Mbembe, Achille, 2003. 'Necropolitics', *Public Culture*, 15(1): 11–40.
- Mezzadra, Sandro, 2012. 'How many histories of labor? Towards a theory of postcolonial capitalism', *Post Colonial Studies*, 14(2): 151–170.

- Molyneux, Maxine, 2000. *Women's Movements in International Perspective*, Ed. Molyneux. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Murray, Stuart J., 2008. 'Thanatopolitics: reading in agamben a rejoinder to biopolitical life', *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, 5(2): 203–207.
- Nasir, Muhammed Ali, 2017. 'Biopolitics, Thanatopolitics and the Right to Life', *Theory, Culture & Society*, 34(1): 75–95.
- Ong, Aihwa, 1991. 'The Gender and Labor Politics of Postmodernity', *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 20: 279–309.
- Roy, Anupama, 2010. *Mapping Citizenship in India*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Roy, Indrajit, 2016. 'Enhancing mobility: political and social rights for circular labour migrants', *Policy Brief, No. 34112*, 1–6.
- Shah, Alpa and Lerche, Jens, 2020. 'Migration and the invisible economies of care: production, social reproduction and seasonal migrant labour in India', *Transactions of the Institute of Geographers*, 2020: 1– 16. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12401>.
- Solinger, Dorothy J., 1993. 'China's transients and the state: a form of civil society?', *Politics & Society*, 21(1): 91–122.
- Somers, M.R., 2008. *Genealogies of Citizenship: Markets, Statelessness and the Right to Have Rights*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Srivastava, Ravi, 2020. 'Vulnerable Internal Migrants in India and Portability of Social Security and Entitlements', *Centre for Employment Studies Working Paper Series WP02/2020*, Institute for Human Development, Delhi.
- Standing, Guy, 2009. *Work After Globalization: Building Occupational Citizenship*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Standing, Guy, 2011. *The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Turner, Bryan, 1990. 'Outline of a theory of citizenship', *Sociology*, 24(2): 189–217.
- Vajpeyi, Ananya, 2009. 'A history of caste in South Asia: from pre-colonial polity to bio-political state', in Islamoglu, Huri and Perdue, Peter C. eds. *Shared Histories of Modernity: China, India and the Ottoman Empire*. New Delhi: Routledge, 298–320.
- Van der Linden, Marcel, 2008. *Workers of the World: Essays Toward a Global Labour History*. Leiden: Brill.
- Varma, Satvik, 2020. 'Why India's Legal and Labour System needs to be Reconfigured to really help Migrant Workers', *Wire*, 19 May. Retrieved from <https://thewire.in/labour/india-labour-legal-system-migrant-workers>. Accessed on 16 October.