

Questions of Ethics, Pandemic and the Migrant Worker

Module F: Ethics of care, public health, and the migrants and refugees

On March 24, 2020, the Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi announced a 21-day lockdown in the wake of the spread of the novel coronavirus SARS-CoV-2, better known by its acronym Covid-19. The announcement was both destabilising and unexpected. The country was totally unprepared for such a lockdown. The pandemic and the sudden lockdown were disastrous for most of the 400 million workers of India but proved particularly catastrophic for its 139 million migrant workers. Within days, migrant workers crowded bus stations to catch a bus to go back home or go someplace where they might live a life of dignity. News reached readers via the morning newspapers about how: “Carrying their children and bags, migrant workers, including women, were standing in a long queue of about 3 km ... in the hope to catch any bus to return to their distant villages located in UP’s different parts. Several migrants were also from states like Madhya Pradesh and Bihar.”¹ News proliferated about how the police were beating back desperate migrants trying to leave town by the end of March.² But the real desperation of migrants began when the first phase of lockdown ended and the next phase started. Very few people asked how ethical was it to begin a lockdown without any plans of sustaining the entire working class, let alone migrant workers, and driving them to desperate measures.

When the next phase of lockdown started the migrants were in such desperate conditions that they decided to brave all odds to go back home. Now it was not just a question of livelihood but of life itself. On April 14, desperate migrant workers started gathering in bus stations again. This time the flash point was Mumbai. Soon news started appearing about how: “Migrant workers in large numbers gathered at a bus stand in Mumbai on Tuesday afternoon demanding transport arrangements to go back to their native places, hours after Prime Minister Narendra Modi announced the nation-wide lockdown to contain the spread of coronavirus has been extended till May 3.”³ Failing to get any help from the government, the migrants started acquiring private vehicles and those who could not do so began the long trek home, thereby embracing death for life. One news feed reported: “After facing difficulties to meet basic ends without work, these migrants, in the absence of any means of transport, found no choice but to walk back home. Unfortunately, not all of them reached their respective destinations.”⁴

In May, news such as: “Three migrant workers who were on their way to Uttar Pradesh from Maharashtra, mostly walking, died in Barwani district of Madhya Pradesh on Saturday,” was

becoming commonplace.⁵In the peak of summer, migrant workers walking back home were dehydrated, fatigued and starving, and were dying on their trek towards their destination. No one asked why it was so important for migrants to get away. There were media agencies that started tabulating the deaths that happened en route. One media house reported that between March 24 and May 18, more than 159 migrant workers died in road accidents.⁶ When the date was extended up to May 30, the reported numbers of death rose to 198. One newspaper reported that: “There were at least 1,461 accidents over the course of the nationwide lockdown - from March 25 to May 31 - in which at least 750 people were killed, including 198 migrant workers. There were 1,390 who got injured, according to the data.”⁷ Amidst these events, the government began to confront uncomfortable questions from the media. A news channel asked: “While the economic disruption caused by the pandemic and the lockdown remained a cause of concern, the failure to provide authoritative solutions for the unprecedented migrant crisis, even after more than 50 days of the lockdown, has raised questions over the planning of the country’s Covid-19 response.”⁸ Faced with mounting criticisms of the sheer number of migrant deaths on the road to their destinations and then a direct order from the Supreme Court, the governments of both the centre and the states started running special buses and trains to take the migrants back to their homes. The trains were called Shramik Specials. It was reported that “within 15 days 4,277 Shramik Specials have been operated by railways to transport approximately 60 lakh people to their home states.”⁹ But even these trains did not protect the lives of the migrant workers. It was reported that there were more than “80 deaths on board the Shramik Special trains (for stranded migrant workers) between May 9 and May 27, according to data from the Railway Protection Force...”¹⁰.

By the time the migrants reached home, India had reoriented itself to the term “social distancing”. After all, that was exactly what the upper-class Hindus had done to their lower-caste “essential workers” for centuries. When the erstwhile socially distanced became the essential workers, those who went to the cities or migrants who were once considered essential for the rural economy for their ability to send remittances to their family and villages had now become the new socially distanced. The migrants rushing home against all odds discovered that they were no longer welcome and they were treated as if they “put everyone in the village in harms’ way”¹¹. The migrants said that upon returning, “they and their families have been singled out, sneered at, and harassed by villagers. In some villages, they face ostracisation even after completing the mandatory 14-day quarantine period.”¹² However, the more important question that the migrants faced was could they get the dignity that they were looking for in their perilous journey?

Ram Achal Prasad, a factory worker in Mumbai, returned to his village promising never to come back. Upon returning, he was confronted with a situation that was most unexpected. Quoting his own words: “I left for my village in April and braved many setbacks. We almost lost our lives while going home ... However, I could not find any work that suited my skill-set in Bahraich district, and I could not keep sitting at home waiting for things to get back to normal. I had no money left and had to decide to return to Mumbai. But with the news of COVID-19 cases rising every day, I decided to leave my wife and two daughters behind.”¹³ Meanwhile, the states were busy eroding whatever rights the migrant workers had by allowing businesses to hire and fire their workers without intervention either from the government’s labour inspectors or from trade unions. Some were arbitrarily trying to increase the working hours of workers so much so that the ILO expressed deep concerns.¹⁴ However, what concerns us in this module is that apparently, the dignity that the migrants were striving for proved ephemeral both in their return as well as re-turn. The pandemic and the long march of the migrant workers brought back with a vehemence like never before the question of ethics in migration studies.

To begin with, migration studies was largely policy-oriented towards and subsumed within the area of law. There were those who looked at migration from the standpoint of how it could be regulated. Other than that, anthropologists and sociologists tried to look at the dynamics and patterns of migration from a micro level. Those who worked on ethics were seldom interested in questions of migration. Ethical theorists did not take migration on as they were wary of the empirical complexity of the field and their general favour towards scholarship about more abstract matters of moral concern to humanity also deterred them for a while. However, with increasing popularity of critical forced migration studies, ethics became an essential prism of analysis.

Over the last two decades, scholars from Asia, Africa and Latin America entered the field of forced migration studies. Most of them understood that the major narrative of forced migration that was being popularised needed to be critiqued. Instead of obsessing over questions of relief and rehabilitation, these scholars started questioning the politics behind the emergence of forced migration as a discipline in the global North. With it came the understanding that many crucial questions were not being addressed such as what were the root causes for such large-scale displacements that countries of the global South were facing. While these new questions were being asked, new fields of study with different prisms were emerging, one of them being migration and forced migration studies through the lens of ethics. In the last decade, with advancement in technology, the plight of migrants became more and more visible and scholars

were discovering a clear connection and/or disconnect between ethics and migration. How did ethics segue into migration and forced migration studies? The novel coronavirus showed the clear relationship of one with the other.

Probably, the fault-line as far as ethics in migration studies is concerned lies between questions about an 'ethics of care' and an 'ethics of justice'.¹⁵ Carol Gilligan's concept of the ethics of care— although she herself was not intending to argue anything beyond the point that the moral domain must be extended to include care—has been transformed by a cultural phenomenon into the concept of a female morality.¹⁶ Drawing from Gilligan's statement that the focus on care as a part of ethics had characteristically been a female phenomenon in the populations that she had studied, as the interpretation and reception of the theory has had to be, the ethics of care is an essentially female morality. This places value on concepts and qualities like sympathy, compassion, concern for others and friendship. In 1984, Nel Noddings published *Caring*, in which she developed the idea of care as a feminine ethic. She believed that caring was intrinsic to human existence. In it there are two parties, one caring and the other receiving care. Distinct from the ethics of care is the ethics of justice, which is the cornerstone for most Western theories of justice for the last several centuries and is centred on issues of equity.

Care ethics suggests that there is a certain moral significance in the very fundamental elements which make up the building blocks of relationships, particularly insofar as they relate to dependencies that concern human life. An ethics of care seeks to normalise and, further, to embed within a network of social relations the well-being of givers of care and receivers of care. It's usually viewed more in the line of a practice or a virtue than a theory per se. Care here has the implication of maintaining the world of, as well as meeting the needs of, both our own self as well as of others. In its advocacy of caring and emotion, it seeks to build upon the very motivation to care for those who are dependent and those who are vulnerable. In Gilligan's own words: "Listening to women's voices clarified the ethic of care, not because care is essentially associated with women or part of women's nature, but because women for a combination of psychological and political reasons voiced relational realities that were otherwise unspoken or dismissed as inconsequential."¹⁷ The ethics of justice follows a familiar but different track. "The principle behind most Western theories of justice appears to be that of equity (a characteristic of Hofstede's masculinity dimension) which, in turn, is driven by merit, not by care or nurturance. The exception is the pure egalitarian theory which is driven by people's needs, usually economic needs. The pure egalitarian theory as well as the communitarian approach to justice, which stresses societal virtues, are more akin to an ethics of care than to a distributive ethics of

justice.”¹⁸Both these ethical queries are necessary for understanding migration and forced migration studies.

The Genre, its Traditional Subjects and Ethics

The genre of critical migration studies was already recognised as a vibrant theme for ethical analysis much before the pandemic and its impact on migrant workers. In this decade itself, ethics has reverberated through the study of refugees, especially in the context of Syrian refugees escaping to Europe and the Rohingyas perishing in boats, trying to escape to a safer life. The study of refugees more than any other phenomena raised ethical issues within the genre of critical migration studies. Speaking of the ethics of justice within the overarching context of migration studies itself, there are several ethical factors to be considered. It should not be too difficult to understand that ‘displacement’ as a very concept in the world surely has a spontaneous charge of questions about the ethical within it. To look specifically at an instance, it is not always clear what the border is between a migrant and a forced migrant. Individuals who may possess the privilege of being able to well afford to travel of their own free will and then further being able to well afford the context of settling down in the space that they have travelled to, perhaps because they liked the weather, are not forced migrants. But the lines of what precisely constitutes the persecution, which is a required factor before one can speak of a forced migrant, are not clear-cut. In the face of the fact that the 1951 United Nations Refugee Convention’s definition actually is at once indefinite, arbitrary and narrow, there is a problem. It is a question whether the norms imbibed by migration scholars from different origins and different points of view from different countries may not favour, perhaps, this or that particular kind of hard-luck narrative before they can conceive of a ‘forced migrant’. Again, if one considers, migration scholars use the term ‘forced migration’ to refer to individuals fleeing persecution from a certain country, but they do not consider the term applicable for someone suspected of being a criminal being forcibly extradited to face trial in another country or a non-citizen of a country who is being forcibly disgorged from it for failing immigration laws. Evidently, there is a moral judgment implicit and inherent in the very scholarship here, a moral judgement which is making an evaluation about the legitimacy of the concerned movement, the movement that is in question. This is certainly an ethical issue.

Perhaps simply the most fundamental question in migration studies with regard to ethics has been the question in scholarship of whether certain specific forced migrants have an implicit right to cross international borders in search of asylum or protection. The focus of this question most specifically has to do with which individuals should be able to make a claim of asylum and

what responsibilities a nation-state has to protect thereafter those figures whom they have recognized and admitted as refugees.

Probably, the very concern with asylum is a refinement of the broader question in migration studies of whether immigration controls are ethical. One side in migration studies holds the view that immigration controls are ethically unacceptable and argues that in the ideal world, all individuals irrespective of their particular status should be free to move from one region to another. The other side argues that immigration controls are acceptable, for example, because they are aids to the continuance of the way of life or the particular public culture of a specific community, but a question that immediately comes in is what is to happen to those individuals who are being forced to move. Those whose migration studies scholarship defends the line of immigration control nevertheless mostly broadly agree that nation-states have some kind of an ethical duty to provide some form of asylum, which limits the ethical right of the nation-state to choose who to permit and who to exclude. What is disagreed on in the ethics in the scholarship is the question of who is a refugee, and who should be granted protection.

Andrew Shacknove has argued in 1985-86 that refugees are “persons whose basic needs are unprotected by their country of origin, who have no remaining recourse other than to seek international restitution of their needs”.¹⁹ Shacknove’s scholarship is perhaps influential because it emphasizes the point that the figure of the refugee is the result of the breakage of a certain type of bond, what in classical politico-ethical liberal theory would be termed the social contract, between the person and the state; thus it is an ethical question in being a marker of a breakage of ethical rule. But here, what is left undefined are the reasons how, or rather, persecution on what specific grounds is having the effect that the basic needs of the individuals are being left unprotected by their country. It is up to the migration studies scholar’s own sense of ethics whether they consider life-threatening poverty a definite failure of the social contract or whether they insist that persecution must be of a direct nature by the state before they can conceive of the figure of a migrant as a ‘refugee’.

Shacknove’s definition is seen as set against the arbitrariness of the definition proposed by the United Nations Convention on Refugees. However, there are many scholars who hold that the requirement of persecution on certain definite grounds by the Convention before a person can be conceived of as a refugee is not arbitrary but rather a way of conceptualizing who are the most deserving among many deserving migrants. Yet, this ethical standpoint in itself leads to issues. It hardly seems practical in the case of individuals who are threatened and while not

persecuted are yet in grave imminent danger, such as those facing indiscriminate sporadic bombing.

Ethics in migration studies matters because on this depends the fine line between the duties that a scholar may advocate states have towards refugees in the real world or the legitimate expectations or rights of citizens of the states that states may feel exist, again citing the evidence of another set of scholars. If the definition of refugee is too broad, in the practical context in the actual world states would be deemed not to have any ethical right to control their borders, which again in our real, non-ideal world would mean an influx that would be an extraordinarily onerous set of responsibilities upon a state, overturning all previous resource calculations.

Scholars of migration studies, according to their ethical positions, could have two divergent viewpoints on how exactly duties towards refugees are incurred and what these might involve. Some might follow the fundamental ethical principle known as ‘non-refoulement’ which is a cornerstone forming a basis of international law in migration studies. According to such scholars, non-refoulement states that a state has a fundamental ethical duty to a refugee who has arrived at or in its territory.²⁰ As per Michael Walzer, states have this ethical duty because first, in a situation similar to the one with the person who is in possession of a property automatically having a certain advantage in law in a possession dispute, such individuals already have made their escape, and secondly, to send them back now would be inflicting cruel and unusual punishment on individuals who are desperate and helpless, which is ethically not acceptable. As can be seen, this ethical standpoint devolves entirely upon the question of location.²¹

Such an emphasis in an ethical standpoint towards location, in this issue, tends to have a couple of problems. First, it is a question whether it does not, in effect, privilege those who have the resources and the ability to move in search of asylum, like young men, and leave large numbers of people who simply don’t have the ability and the resources to move, trapped back home in their countries of origin and not recognized as legitimately worthy of need (Singer and Singer, 1988). These are the ‘internally displaced persons’. This is a group about whom there are increasingly ethical questions being raised in migration studies.

Moreover, depending upon the subject position of the particular migration studies scholar, some of them undoubtedly ought to recognize that applying the principle of location leads to unjust distributions in the burden of refugees across states. It should be recognized that countries in the global South tend to be the ones usually geographically near states emitting forth refugees, and consequently being easiest to access, these nation-states have extraordinarily large populations of

refugees. This inequitable distribution tends to rather render hollow the favourite claim of scholars operating from a Western position that to take in and care for refugees is a common responsibility of the entire international society of states. Scholars whose subject position is from the global South might well argue that a truly just conception of fair migration needs to be sensitive in its thought to the integrative abilities of specific states, taking into consideration such factors as their gross domestic product, size and political stability and factoring in what is a proper measure beyond which, in Yeats's words, things are bound to fall apart and the centre not hold.

There are grave ethical questions tied to this. To return to the ethics of care, to be shifting around the refugees in order to achieve an equitable balance as per law and justice between countries would be totally taking away the refugees' own rights and choices. Alternatively, it could be said that states could distribute resources instead of the refugees themselves. First World states could financially help out Third World states with a very high refugee burden. To an extent, though, that makes it possible for the First World states to buy their way out of the problem. But the ethics of justice too has serious fundamental questions about what particular responsibilities individual states might have towards refugees. One supposes it is generally pretty accepted that states have a duty towards refugees rendered so by wars or developmental crises initiated by war. In that sense, asylum could be conceived of as repayment given to refugees by states for crimes by third-party countries of military aggression against the refugees or the violation of their human rights. Ethically, in this sense, countries which have supplied arms to these nations owe a duty too.

Ethics and Research on Migration

Questions of ethics become important even in the pedagogy on migration, particularly when one is looking at things like sex work being the fastest-growing employment sector for migrating women from the global South and where there really is a shocking crisis of care gap between the global North and the global South. If one is to deal effectively with questions of human security, an ethics of care is essential.²² As a researcher, one must understand their subjects as agential participating individuals, all carrying certain definite knowledge and their own interpretative perception with which they construct life-worlds. There may be instances where a researcher has to be conscious that in sourcing certain information, one has by virtue of that very fact transformed into a secret bearer, an individual who has information which could potentially be lethal for the respondent participants, and this can happen without the researcher being fully conscious of the process. As a result, the researcher must be self-reflexively aware at all times.

Another way in which they must be self-reflexively aware is to consider what is their own subject position and to what extent they bring to bear influences in their mind which might affect the narratives of the research subjects. Moreover, when speaking of information collected, they should also consider under what means the original source of the information was prevailed upon to part with it. If, for example, one is encountering government records where duress and intimidation was used to compel individuals to part with information, it might be a more ethical decision to not use the information. However, there may be a situation where the benefit of this information to the outside world would outstrip all costs. This assessment of benefits versus costs must be done by the researcher.

An ethics of care closely concerns itself with trust. It is imperative for a relation of trust to be built up between an interviewer and a narrator. When one has, for example, had to flee from a dangerous situation in the home state or migrated irregularly and is occupied in an employment sector like sex work, without trust, respondents will view an interviewer with suspicious eyes. This is the more so since they regularly have to deal with other people who often ask about the same sort of information, such as border officials or smugglers. It is therefore important to build personal contact with respondents on relations of friendship and sympathy. The researcher should ideally be going out of themselves and considering what it would be like to be in the place of the interviewee. Ideally, researchers should select spaces for interviews which are open, informal sites where residents feel comfortable and therefore can speak freely about their situations and circumstances and experiences. Researchers should not be urging interviewees to speak on any topic they do not want to talk about.

Public Health, Migration and Ethics

Few incidents bring into view questions of public health and ethics as a pandemic such as the novel coronavirus. The basic question here is in the words of John Krebs: “Whose responsibility is health? Is it purely a matter of individual choice or do governments have a role to play? What about others, such as businesses, employers and health professionals: do they also have responsibilities? Discussions of these issues in the media reveal a whole spectrum of views. These vary from considering any curbing of our freedom to do as we please as infringements by the pernicious ‘nanny state’ to crying ‘someone should do something’ to tackle public-health.”²³ Historically, public health became an issue of concern during epidemics. However, if one looks at the history of Black Death, medicine was an important albeit subordinate branch of the management of plague. As a medical response, the city councillors put certain administrative orders in place: “Physicians were forbidden to leave some cities and their hinterlands. They were

offered high fees and prizes to visit patients in the lazeretti or... plague hospitals. Many cities civic officials offered contracts to physicians to care for patients with plague. Most often, civic leaders tactfully delegated to local colleges of physicians the task of selecting members to serve in the hospitals.”²⁴ So health management was part of the larger management of urban centres.

In present times, by stressing the notion of individual choice, the states have often abrogated their responsibility as a result of which structural injustice happens when social processes, which is to say social norms, economic structures, institutional roles, incentive structures, sanctions, or decision-making processes, put large categories of persons under a sustained systematic threat of domination or deprivation of their means to develop and further exercise their capabilities, even as these same processes enable others to dominate or have a wide variety of opportunities for developing and exercising their capabilities. Structural injustices constrain and enable, working in a systematic manner to expand opportunities for the privileged while contracting opportunities for those who are less well off. Also, there are scholars who argue that by valourising individual choice states traditionally retreat from taking care of their marginalized populations. It has been argued that “entrenched focus on the individual in medical ethics is deeply implicated in the ongoing reproduction of poor health for marginalized minorities”²⁵. Therefore, states step in only when there is a crisis but only for their citizens.

Therefore, it can be said with some certainty that public health becomes an issue in times of crisis and crisis is the modus operandi for states to become active. When it comes to migrants, the situation gets worse especially if that migrant happens to be a non-citizen. The ambiguity that is inherent in migrants’ existence makes their situation even worse. As a result, their entitlements to public health care provisions are severely affected, and as they lack entitlement to legal protection or recourse too, they cannot try to protect the former entitlement. This can lead to extended periods of total destitution for multiple families. The national asylum support policy of a country, difficult working relations with border agencies, higher thresholds for eligibility, or the budgets of local care authorities getting slashed might all take effect as factors acting as barriers to the health support needs of forced migrants who are sick or disabled as well as their family care givers.²⁶ There is a moral judgment implicit and inherent which is making an evaluation about the legitimacy of the movement that has been made by the migrant. Nations often exploit this vagueness and ambiguity in their status as a loophole.

When the pandemic happened, states such as India resorted to the historically known ways of dealing with it through lockdowns and closing of borders. Since internal borders were closed, migrant labour came to be treated as refugees as they had arrived from across the state borders

and they became nowhere people. The states did not feel the responsibility to take care of their health or any other issues. They became the bare bodies. The pandemic therefore once again brought to the forefront that where migrants are concerned, both ethics of care and ethics of justice are suspended. Only biopolitics remains the modus operandi.

¹ “Migrant workers crowd Anand Vihar bus terminus to return to their villages.” The Economic Times, 28 March 2020, <https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/politics-and-nation/migrant-workers-crowd-anand-vihar-bus-terminus-to-return-to-their-villages/articleshow/74863940.cms?from=mdr> accessed on 7 July 2020.

² “They are beating people who try to move further. I am here with my wife and 11-year-old son and we can’t afford to be beaten up by police. Now we have only one option — go back to our home in Shahdara’s Vishwas Nagar area,” reported Joginder Singh, a fruit merchant from Moradabad living in Delhi, to a reporter from The Hindu. “Coronavirus | Exodus of migrant workers out of Delhi unabated but police block their entry into Anand Vihar ISBT,” The Hindu, 29 March 2020, <https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/coronavirus-exodus-of-migrant-workers-out-of-delhi-unabated-but-police-block-their-entry-into-anand-vihar-isbt/article31198725.ece> accessed on 7 July 2020.

³ “Thousands of Migrant Workers Protest at Mumbai Bus Stand Amid Lockdown, Lathicharged by Cops,” News 18 India, 14 April 2020, <https://www.news18.com/news/india/migrant-workers-gather-at-mumbais-bandra-bus-stand-demand-arrangement-of-transport-to-return-home-2577497.html> accessed on 8 July 2020.

⁴ Fazil Khan, “Mapping Accidents That Killed Over 100 Migrant Workers on Their Way to Home During Lockdown,” News 18 India, 20 May 2020, <https://www.news18.com/news/india/mapping-accidents-that-killed-over-100-migrant-workers-on-their-way-to-home-during-nationwide-lockdown-2627947.html> accessed on 8 August 2020.

⁵ “Coronavirus lockdown | Three migrant workers on way to Uttar Pradesh die on Maharashtra-Madhya Pradesh border,” The Hindu, 10 May 2020, <https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/other-states/three-migrant-workers-on-way-to-up-die-on-maha-mp-border/article31547365.ece> accessed on 8 July 2020

⁶ Fazil Khan, “Mapping Accidents That Killed Over 100 Migrant Workers on Their Way to Home During Lockdown,” News 18 India, 20 May 2020, <https://www.news18.com/news/india/mapping-accidents-that-killed-over-100-migrant-workers-on-their-way-to-home-during-nationwide-lockdown-2627947.html> accessed on 8 August 2020.

⁷ Anisha Datta. “198 migrant workers killed in road accidents during lockdown: Report,” Hindustan Times, 2 June 2020, <https://www.hindustantimes.com/india-news/198-migrant-workers-killed-in-road-accidents-during-lockdown-report/story-hTWzAWMYn0kyycKw1dyKqL.html> accessed on 8 August 2020.

⁸ Fazil Khan, “Mapping Accidents That Killed Over 100 Migrant Workers on Their Way to Home During Lockdown,” News 18 India, 20 May 2020, <https://www.news18.com/news/india/mapping-accidents-that-killed-over-100-migrant-workers-on-their-way-to-home-during-nationwide-lockdown-2627947.html> accessed on 8 August 2020.

⁹ Shreya Nandi, “Indian Railways receive request for 63 Shramik Special trains,” Livemint, 12 June 2020, <https://www.livemint.com/> accessed on 3 July 2020.

¹⁰ Anisha Datta, “Railway Protection Force reports 80 deaths on Shramik trains” The Hindustan Times, 30 May 2020, <https://www.hindustantimes.com/india-news/railway-protection-force-reports-80-deaths-on-shramik-trains/story-psJl3EenY4B0uUYMRvkChL.html> accessed on 6 June 2020.

¹¹ Atikh Rashid, “Migrant workers return home against all odds — only to be seen as carriers of the virus,” The Indian Express, 20 May 2020 <https://indianexpress.com/article/india/lockdown-migrant-workers-coronavirus-pune-uttar-pradesh-bihar-6419506/> accessed on 7 July 2020.

¹² Chandan Kumar and Debabrata Mohanty, “Migrant workers battle stigma, bias back home,” Hindustan Times, 11 May 2020, <https://www.hindustantimes.com/india-news/migrant-workers-battle-stigma-bias-back-home/story-0uuRSEZfoickVOrPU2agGL.html> accessed on 11 July 2020.

¹³ Abdul Alim Jafri, “UP: With Starvation Threatening Households, Migrant Workers Return to Mumbai,” News Click, 8 July 2020, <https://www.newsclick.in/Uttar-Pradesh-Starvation-Threatening-Households-Migrant-Workers-Return-Mumbai> accessed 8 August 2020.

¹⁴ “ILO expresses deep concerns over labour law suspension, tweaking to PM Modi,” Indian Express, 25 May 2020, <https://www.newindianexpress.com/business/2020/may/25/ilo-expresses-deep-concerns-over-labour-law-suspension-tweaking-to-pm-modi-2147853.html> accessed on 8 July 2020.

¹⁵ W. French., and A. Weis, “An Ethics of Care or an Ethics of Justice.” *Journal of Business Ethics*, 27(1/2), 2000, pp. 125-136.

¹⁶ Joan C. Tronto, “Beyond Gender Difference to a Theory of Care.” *Signs*, 12(4), 1987, p. 644-663.

-
- ¹⁷ Carol Gilligan, "Hearing the Difference: Theorizing Connections," *Hypatia*, Vol. 10, No. 2, p. 123
- ¹⁸ Warren French and Alexander Weis. "An Ethics of Care or an Ethics of Justice," *Journal of Business Ethics*, Sep., 2000, Vol. 27, No. 1/2, p. 126.
- ¹⁹ A.E. Shacknove, "Who is a Refugee?" *Ethics* 95(2), 1985: pp. 274–84.
- ²⁰ M.J. Gibney, "Asylum and the Principle of Proximity". *Ethics, Place & Environment*, 3(3), 2000: pp. 313–17.
- ²¹ M. Walzer, *Spheres of Justice*. (New York: Basic Books, 1983).
- ²² F. Robnison, *The Ethics of Care: A Feminist Approach to Human Security*, (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2011).
- ²³ John Krebs, "The Importance of Public–Health Ethics," *Bulletin of the World Health Organisation*, Vol. 86, No. 8. 2008, <https://www.who.int/bulletin/volumes/86/8/08-052431/en/> accessed on 30 August 2020.
- ²⁴ Daniel M, Fox, "The Politics of Physicians' Responsibility in Epidemics: A Note on History," *The Hastings Center Report*, Vol. 18, No. 2 (Apr. - May, 1988), p. 6
- ²⁵ Peter H. Stephenson, "Expanding Notions of Culture and Ethics in Health and Medicine to Include Marginalized Groups: A Critical Perspective," *Anthropologica*, 2001, Vol. 43, No. 1 (2001), p. 3.
- ²⁶ Ottosdottir, G., and Evans, R. (2014) 'Ethics of Care in Supporting Disabled Forced Migrants: Interactions with Professionals and Ethical Dilemmas in Health and Social Care in the South-East of England.' *The British Journal of Social Work*, 44(1): 153-169.

References

- Arendt, H. (1986) *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. London: Andre Deutsch.
- Banerjee, Paula, Sabyasachi Basu Ray Chaudhury & Samir Kumar Das eds. (2004) *Internal Displacement in South Asia: Relevance of UN's Guiding Principles*. New Delhi: Sage.
- Bauböck, R. (2005) 'Expansive Citizenship—Voting beyond Territory and Membership'. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 38(4): 683–7.
- Bauböck, R. (2008) *Stakeholder Citizenship: An Idea Whose Time Has Come?* Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.
- Black, R. (2001) 'Fifty Years of Refugee Studies: From Theory to Policy'. *International Migration Review* 35(1): 57–78.
- Carens, J. (1992) 'Migration and Morality: A Liberal Egalitarian Perspective'. Pp. 25–47 in B. Barry and R. Goodin (eds.), *Free Movement*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Carens, J. (2005) 'On Belonging'. *The Boston Review* (Summer).
- Cornelius, W. (1982) Interviewing undocumented migrants: Methodological reflections based on fieldwork in Mexico and the US. *International Migration Review Special Issue: Theory and Methods in Migration and Ethnic Research*, 16(2), 378–411.
- Crepeau, Francois (2010) 'Dealing with Migration: A Test for Democracies' in *Refugee Watch: A South Asian Journal on Forced Migration*, 35, June.
- French, W., and Weis, A. (2000) 'An Ethics of Care or an Ethics of Justice.' *Journal of Business Ethics*, 27(1/2), 125-136.
- Gibney, M. J. (2000) 'Asylum and the Principle of Proximity'. *Ethics, Place & Environment*, 3(3): 313–17.
- Gibney, M.J. (2014) 'Political Theory, Ethics, and Forced Migration.' Pp. 1-9 in E. Fiddian-Qasmiyeh et al. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Refugee and Forced Migration Studies*.
- Knapik, M. (2002, July 5–17) Ethics in qualitative research: Searching for practice guidelines. Paper presented at the symposium 'Linking Research to Educational Practice II', University of Calgary, Calgary.
- Ottosdottir, G., and Evans, R. (2014) 'Ethics of Care in Supporting Disabled Forced Migrants: Interactions with Professionals and Ethical Dilemmas in Health and Social Care in the South-East of England.' *The British Journal of Social Work*, 44(1): 153-169.
- Penz, P. (1997) 'The Ethics of Development-Induced Displacement'. *Refuge*, 16(3): 38–41.
- Penz, P., Drydyk, J., and Bose, P. S. (2011) *Displacement by Development: Ethics, Rights and Responsibilities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Robinson, F. (2011) *The Ethics of Care: A Feminist Approach to Human Security*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Samaddar, Ranabir (2002): 'Caring for the refugees: Issues of power, fear and ethics' in *Three Essays on Law, Responsibility and Justice*, SAFHR Paper 12. Kathmandu: South Asia Forum for Human Rights.
- Samaddar, Ranabir (2003): 'In life, in death: Power and rights' (mimeo.).
- Samaddar, Ranabir ed. (2020) *Borders of an Epidemic: Covid-19 and Migrant Workers*. Kolkata: Calcutta Research Group.
- Samaddar, Ranabir ed. (2020) *Burdens of an Epidemic: A Policy Perspective on Covid-19 and Migrant Labour*. Kolkata: Calcutta Research Group.
- Shacknove, A. E. (1985) 'Who is a Refugee?' *Ethics* 95(2): 274–84.

-
- Singer, P., and Singer R. (1988) 'The Ethics of Refugee Policy'. Pp. 111–30 in M. Gibney (ed.), *Open Borders, Closed Societies*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Tronto, J.C. (1987) 'Beyond Gender Difference to a Theory of Care.' *Signs*, 12(4): 644-663.
- van Liempt I., Bilger V. (2018) Methodological and Ethical Dilemmas in Research Among Smuggled Migrants. In: Zapata-Barrero R., Yalaz E. (eds) *Qualitative Research in European Migration Studies*. IMISCOE Research Series. Springer, Cham.
- Walzer, M. (1983) *Spheres of Justice*. New York: Basic Books.