Amidst COVID-19 crisis and further into aftermath of the hyper-connected and hyper-virualised current societies, nation-state borders seem to be at stake (Calzada, 2021). The social and economic effects of the pandemic are profound and pervasive for an emerging regime of citizenship: ‘pandemic citizenship’. ‘Pandemic citizenship’, therefore, could be described as follows (Calzada, 2020b): the post-COVID-19 era, on the one hand, has dramatically slowed down several mundane routines for citizens such as mobility patterns while, on the other hand, it has exponentially increased demanding new professional pressures, emotional fears, life uncertainties, algorithmic exposure, data privacy concerns, health-related direct risks, and socio-economic vulnerabilities depending eminently on the material and living conditions shared by a wide range of citizens regardless of their specific geolocalization worldwide (Bratton, 2017; Mathiason, 2008).

This current ‘pandemic citizenship’ emerging regime clearly contrasts with the ‘cosmopolitan globalized citizenship’ mainstream regime. As such, this ‘cosmopolitan globalized citizenship’ regime has been hegemonically spreading out over the last decades by leading to a new class of global citizens. Even before the COVID-19 outbreak in 2020, while the access to this global citizenship was still not spread evenly, many citizens had enjoyed the freedom to move, work, and travel with no limits (Barassi, 2017; Couldry & Mejias, 2019).

The cosmopolitan globalization rhetoric of a borderless world has been dramatically slowed down by COVID-19 by introducing a new level of uncertainty in global affairs and led many citizens to question whether citizens will be able to continue enjoying the freedom of movement once again. Ironically, this resonates with the popular quote made by the former UK primer minister Theresa May: ‘if you believe you are a citizen of the world, you are a citizen of nowhere’. Actually, amidst the post-COVID-19 in the UK (further exacerbated now by
post-Brexit current momentum), we must acknowledge that this quotation makes total sense at present (Keith & Calzada, 2018).

By contrast, lockdown radical measurements and the generalization of the disruption in borders by many nation-states’ governments, additionally to the complementary stressful feeling produced by the post-Brexit scenario particularly in the UK and in the rest of Europe, may well lead us to re-assert how nation-states’ borders will increasingly matter (Welsh, 2020). Yet, what is the significance of nation-states and citizenship in this rapidly shifting context? All sort of pandemic adjustments are having different consequences both for directly citizens (depending to which country they call home and their living conditions) and indirectly for nation-states. Therefore, the main hypothesis of this Academia Letters is that seemingly borders might be making a comeback affecting ‘pandemic citizens’ directly but not all equally. In addition to this and in the meantime, a subtle algorithmic revolution is happening around us with clear techno-political implications by making algorithms are increasingly shaping our lives (Janssen, Hartog, Matheus, Yi Ding, & Kuk, 2020). This Academia Letters argues that the current pandemic crisis is pervasively related to data governance issues which exposes ‘pandemic citizens’ vulnerability in a potential surveillance state. At this stage, the debate regarding urban liberties, digital rights, and cybercontrol has led ‘pandemic citizens’ to the consideration that actually the post-COVID-19 society incarnates a society of control, which in itself has flourished abundant critique from cybernetic and surveillance disease perspective (Calzada & Almirall, 2020; Isin & Ruppert, 2015). What is more, the giant technological flag ship Big Tech firms of surveillance capitalism, such as Google and Facebook, have already assumed many functions previously associated with the nation-state, from cartography to the surveillance of citizens, which has deterritorialized liquid citizenship. Consequently, nation-states are unable to provide further interpretation about the virialized/hyperconnected citizenship’s changing regimes and patterns, since often, within nation-states, urban and regional governments behave differently (Calzada, 2015; Calzada, 2018a, 2020a).

In conclusion, nation-states’ borders may still matter more than even before, which substantially differ from the cosmopolitan global citizenship rationale that has been the so-called mainstream interpretation by hyperglobalist scholars. These forecast the imminent demise of national state power, and consequently borders, because of the purportedly borderless, politically uncontrollable forces of global economic integration (Khanna, 2016; Ohmae, 1995). In contrast, a growing literature on state-rescaling provided a strong counterargument: namely, that national states are being qualitatively transformed- not eroded or dismantled- under contemporary capitalist conditions (Calzada, 2018a; (Brenner, 2004). What is more, the current post-COVID-19 crisis is increasingly showing that the more nation-states are reinforcing the more ‘pandemic citizens’ seem to be liquified. Which it means that their uncontrollable al-
algorithmic exposure being translated into a massive digital vulnerability is being combined by the lack of civilian liberties and by a constant limitation of their freedom of movement (Diumbrava, 2017).

Will COVID-19 reinforce nation-states’ borders and liquify citizens? Reintroducing new forms of nationalism is rather likely, although with different geopolitical orientation, not only protectionist and tribal ethnic nationalism but also civic and rather progressive civic one driven by internationalism (Calzada, 2018b). Alongside this, at some point in the near future, it is likely that the international community will have to delve on how far a surveillance state can go, and on what portion of their civil liberties, citizens are willing to relinquish, in an epidemiological emergency and beyond, rather likely given the global threats around climate change. This is a rather timely and topical issue (Kissinger, 2020).

Despite COVID-19 might be gone, ‘pandemic citizenship’ will remain as an emerging citizenship regime by both reinforcing the role of nation-states’ borders and further liquifying they daily life of ‘pandemic citizens’ worldwide (McCosker, Vivienne, & Johns, 2016).
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