Historians argue about when camps first appeared, like the ones in Cuba by the Spanish in 1896 or the English camps for Boers in the early 1900s. These camps were created during colonial wars, not normal times. The Nazi camps, like Dachau, weren't based on regular laws but on a special one called Schutzhaft, allowing the state to take people into custody without a specific crime, aiming to protect the state. Camps became a permanent part of Germany during the Nazi era.

The camp is a unique place. It's outside normal laws but not entirely external. It captures what's excluded, making it part of the exception. Camps show that anything is possible because they're spaces where the law is completely suspended. The people in camps, especially Jews, had no rights, and the camp became a place where pure biological life faced political power directly. The key question isn't how such terrible things happened, but how people were stripped of their rights and why it wasn't considered a crime.

If we understand that camps materialize the state of exception, creating a space for naked life, then anytime such a structure is created, it's like a camp. It doesn't matter what it's called or where it is. Examples include a soccer stadium in Bari, a cycle-racing track under Vichy authorities, a refugee camp near the Spanish border, or zones in French airports. Even places like the outskirts of postindustrial cities or gated communities in the United States can resemble camps in certain moments. In these places, normal laws are suspended, and whether atrocities happen depends on the behavior of those in charge.

The idea is that the appearance of camps in modern times marks a big change in how politics works. It happens when the usual way a country is run - based on territory, order, and birth (like citizenship) - goes through a crisis. The camp is a new way to manage life directly, especially when the usual rules about where people belong (like citizenship laws) don't work as they used to.

Camps showed up around the same time as new citizenship and denationalization laws. The state of exception, which used to be a temporary pause in the normal rules, becomes a permanent arrangement with the camp as a space outside the usual order. It's like a gap between birth and the nation-state. Instead of the political system neatly organizing life in a specific space, it now has this dislocating element (the camp) where almost anything can happen.

The reappearance of camps in the former Yugoslavia isn't just a reshaping of the old political system; it's a bigger change, with a rupture in the old ways and a new way of organizing people's lives. The camps in this context, like those involving ethnic violence, are crucial because they show a breakdown in the old idea of how life is ordered. The principle of birth is adrift, and we can expect not just new camps but also new and more confusing ways of deciding who belongs where in society. The camp has become a new way of organizing life on a global scale.

This passage discusses the concept of a "camp" in the context of historical events, particularly focusing on its political and juridical aspects. The author emphasizes that the events in camps go beyond legal definitions and argues that understanding the nature of a camp requires examining its political-juridical structure. The passage mentions historical instances of camps, such as those in Cuba and concentration camps in the early 20th century, linking them to states of exception and martial law rather than ordinary legal frameworks. The origin of the Nazi Lager is also discussed, highlighting the use of protective custody as a legal foundation, originating from Prussian laws related to the state of siege and the protection of personal freedom. The author suggests viewing camps not just as historical anomalies but as a hidden matrix influencing the political space in which we live.

This passage discusses the crucial connection between a state of exception and concentration camps. It explains that concentration camps, like Dachau in Nazi Germany, are spaces created outside normal legal rules during a state of emergency. The author highlights the paradox that although camps are outside regular legal order, they are not entirely external. The term "exception" implies that what is excluded (captured) is included by virtue of its exclusion.

The text emphasizes that concentration camps became a permanent reality in Germany, operating continuously even when the number of inmates varied. The author reflects on the unique status of the camp as a space where the state of exception is consistently realized. It's explained that in camps, everything becomes possible because the law is completely suspended, making the events within them difficult to understand without recognizing this political-juridical structure.

The passage also touches on the idea that people in camps existed in a zone between the inside and outside, lawful and unlawful, with no legal protections. For example, if they were Jews, they had lost citizenship rights and were completely denationalized. The author argues that the camp represents the most extreme form of biopolitical space, where political power directly faces biological life without any mediation.

In conclusion, the passage suggests that understanding the horrors of the camps requires exploring the political and legal processes that led to the complete deprivation of rights for individuals, rather than just questioning the possibility of committing such atrocities against fellow human beings.

This passage explores the idea that the essence of a camp lies in the materialization of a state of exception, creating a space for "naked life" – life without legal protection. The author argues that whenever a structure with this nature is created, it should be considered a camp, regardless of specific crimes or names. Examples include places where immigrants are temporarily held or certain zones in international airports.

The text suggests that even some areas in modern cities and gated communities resemble camps during specific moments of indeterminacy. The birth of the camp is seen as a crucial event in modern political space, marking a shift when the nation-state decides to directly manage the biological life of its population. This change occurs when traditional mechanisms regulating life inscription (birth into nation) no longer function, leading to the emergence of camps as new regulators or signs of the system's inability to operate without turning into a lethal machine.

The author notes that camps appeared alongside new laws on citizenship and denationalization, emphasizing that the state of exception, once a temporary suspension of order, now becomes a stable spatial arrangement inhabited by life that cannot be easily incorporated into the existing order. This widening gap between birth (naked life) and the nation-state defines the politics of our time, with the camp representing a dislocating localization that disrupts the traditional trinity of nation, state, and territory. In essence, the camp is described as the fourth element that has been added, breaking up the old trinity.

This passage discusses the reappearance of camps in the former Yugoslav territories and emphasizes that it's not just a reorganization of the old political system based on ethnic and territorial changes. Instead, there is a fundamental break from the old order and a dislocation of populations along entirely new lines. The author points to the significance of ethnic rape camps in this context.

The text draws a comparison with the Nazis' "final solution" and highlights that, unlike the Nazis, who did not consider impregnating Jewish women as part of their plan, the current situation indicates a breakdown in the principle of birth. This principle, previously ensuring life's inscription in the nation-state order, is now in disarray, making it difficult to function. The author suggests that this disruption may lead not only to new camps but also to increasingly chaotic and extreme normative definitions of how life is incorporated into the city.

In summary, the passage argues that the camp, firmly established in the current situation, represents a new biopolitical order for the planet, indicating a shift in how life is regulated within society.