

Race, Space and Architecture: an open access curriculum

This chapter is published with the authors' permission, and is the accepted manuscript for publication. Please note that the use of this manuscript is restricted to not for profit scholarly use.

The full and final version of this article/ chapter can be found at:

Katz, Irit., Martin, Diana., and Claudio Minca (eds). 2018. *Camps Revisited: Multifaceted Spatialities of a Modern Political Technology*. London: Rowman and Littlefield.

Camps Revisited: Multifaceted Spatialities of a Modern Political Technology

Edited by Irit Katz, Diana Martin and Claudio Minca, London: Rowman & Littlefield (2018)

Introduction: The Camp Reconsidered

By Irit Katz, Diana Martin and Claudio Minca

The Idomeni makeshift camp was dismantled on May 24, 2016. The 10–12,000 people dwelling in what was presumably the largest “spontaneous” refugee camp in Europe were displaced by the Greek police and taken by coach to institutional camps around Salonika. At the end of the “move,” the authority would register only 2,800 refugees. What happened to the other 8–10,000? They disappeared into thin air, to re-emerge a few days later in new, smaller, improvised camps in other countries in the region. The fields in Idomeni have remained empty, and for a while, the train station was still showing the remnants of the makeshift dwellings of this desperate coalition of nameless subjects on the move. But what kind of camp was Idomeni? And how can we define a camp in today’s turbulent global era of migration, displacement, and radical political change?

In recent years Europe and other places around the world have experienced a true proliferation of camps, many related to the so-called “refugee crisis.” While the Idomeni camp has attracted much attention until its closure, to be quickly forgotten together with the majority of its inhabitants, the makeshift camp in Calais – dismantled in October 2016 – has represented the “capital of makeshift camps,” “the Jungle” par excellence, the testimony of a new kind of spatial formation conceived as entirely temporary, but de facto often becoming somewhat permanent, a new kind of unstable landscape, a new type of “mobile and ephemeral spatiality,” popping up in, and partially disrupting, the presumed orderly geographies of the nation-state.

Yet other camps are constantly invented, reconfigured, and made operational by national and municipal authorities: refugee camps, hospitality centers for asylum seekers, identification and expulsion centers, and emergency welcoming facilities, while new “hubs” are created to speed up the process of identification of the “irregular migrants” captured by the existing networks of assistance and management of their bodies and mobilities. Other camps are realized and supported by local charities and volunteers or international NGOs in order to provide first humanitarian aid and some relief to these mobile and often unidentified subjects who may then disappear after a few hours, days, or weeks along the new informal migration routes. Former barracks, prisons, and derelict sites are often used to temporarily accommodate these irregular migrants, and empty buildings are often squatted and transformed into temporary shelters under the complacent eye of the authorities who may prefer not to intervene until the local residents complain about these

unwelcomed “alien” presences. Small, “Idomeni-like,” makeshift camps appear and disappear in Rome, Berlin, Paris, Belgrade, and other cities in Europe and beyond, but also in rural areas near the borders of inhospitable countries around the world. Additional camps are simply hosting stranded, smuggled, or trafficked individuals – at times thousands of them – like the ones in the center of Belgrade or in Greece (Bulman 2016; Katz 2017; Gentleman 2017; also, Minca et al., chapter 3 in this volume).

Whether in its institutional form— set up by the authorities to manage the unprecedented (or so it is often described by the media) number of people informally crossing international borders – or in its improvised and makeshift shape, the “camp” remains the most immediate and impactful intervention of the receiving countries to the current flows of irregular migrants and their “management.” As a result, displaced people and irregular migrants are either contained in enclavic, militarized structures or inhabit informal and abandoned spaces. The establishment of camps, whether formal or informal, represents a specific political reaction and resilience strategy as those on the move face the fortification of borders and the rise of nationalism (Cresswell 2006; Rajaram and Grundy-Warr 2008; Parker and Vaughan-Williams 2012; De Genova 2013; Lebuhn 2013; Ribas-Mateos 2016; Zhang 2017). From temporary detention camps to refugee camps, from camps for terrorist suspects to Roma and homeless camps, these sites are today spaces of exception that control, order, segregate, and exclude, but also protect, train, and host human beings who, according to the state authorities, cannot be qualified and spatialized otherwise.

Some of these camps are designated sites of control, custody, and care by state and international authorities, while others are created as spontaneous makeshift spaces by their own residents, as part of their attempts to challenge and struggle against existing migration practices and politics. *Camps Revisited* thus investigates the diverse workings of the camp as a site of political repression, separation, containment, abandonment, and custody, but also a site of agency, resistance, solidarity, care, identity, and perpetual movement of bodies, materialities, complex and entwined management practices, political imperatives, and human networks. Importantly, the camp appears in this volume as a site of active political negotiations between forces that aim to maintain control over human life and the forces of human life with their own specific needs, desires, and political demands. These negotiations materialize in different camp spaces and formations, creating ephemeral environments that may become either places of enduring temporariness evolving for decades and generations, such as the case of the Palestinian refugee camps, or hypertemporary spaces created, developed and demolished within a few weeks or months, such as the Idomeni camp, or the urban migrant camps and protest camps discussed in this volume. The camp therefore reemerges here not only as a spatial strategic “end-point” where these “populations in excess”

(Rahola 2003) are located and contained but also as a tactical space used for political contestations and where specific camp identities may take shape. As such, the camp appears not only as a hidden space where modern politics deals with its oppressed and outcasts – like in the case of concentration camps – also, in some specific cases described in this volume, as a space of high political visibility used as an instrument of protest and political mobilization.

In their rural or urban locations, these spaces greatly differ in the ways they are constructed and managed. Yet, despite these differences, not only are they defined as specific sites of biopolitical experimentation, but they are also become constitutive “hubs” of much broader geopolitical economies. Increasingly part of our everyday lives, the camp has become a perspective and a way of thinking that normalizes extraordinary measures and spatialities (see Gilroy 2004); at the same time, its material manifestations of sovereign exception are coupled with and complemented by less visible but equally invasive and potentially violent camp spatialities produced by biometrics, surveillance, racial profiling, and people’s classification and management.

The current proliferation of camps has been met by a growing academic interest on the effects that these camps have on their “guests” and, more in general, on how camps relate to different conceptualizations of sovereignty (Minca 2007; Rajaram and Grundy-Warr 2008; Ramadan and Fregonese 2017), biopolitics (Edkins 2000; Rahola 2003; Zimmerer 2005, 2016; Diken and Laustsen 2005; Giaccaria and Minca 2011, 2016; Minca 2005, 2015; Martin 2015; Wolf 2015), resistance (Isin and Rygiel 2007; Rygiel 2012; Katz 2015), humanitarian aid (Hyndman 2000; Agier 2011), or identity (Malkki, 1995; Peteet, 2005). *Camps Revisited* aims at responding to this growing literature – only partially recalled here – with a comprehensive investigation of the emergent formal and informal camp spatialities and their implications for those who are hosted in these unique facilities, but also for the cities and the regions affected by the presence of a camp.

This book thus analyzes the camp as a multifaceted, spatial formation taking different forms and functions in the management and control, but sometimes also in the development of new identities and new forms of political agency, of the populations that they host. It also intends to theorize the camp in light of the abovementioned unruly mobilities while reflecting on its different manifestations and their impacts. On the one hand, the book takes into consideration institutional camps established by the authorities and looks at them as modern institutions and spatial biopolitical technologies, while also analyzing makeshift camps realized “on the spot” by the refugees themselves and how these different forms of camp are related to each other. On the other hand, it reflects on specific cases of camp identities and on the different camp forms and functions, in the contemporary political landscape, with their multifaceted spatialities: from Romani camps to

protest camps, from former refugee camps converted into tourist attractions to post-disaster camps, to the relationship between the camp and the bunker.

We believe, in particular, that this volume can contribute to existing debates on the geopolitical, biopolitical, and spatial entanglements of the camp in two distinct ways. First, by providing an unprecedented transdisciplinary collection of papers engaging with the relationship between critical social and political theory, the camp, and its spatial practices. The second objective is more inherently theoretical, as it responds to the increasing need to conceptualize the spatialities of the camp: the central ambition of this collection is to show what broader debates in camp studies may learn from a deeper analysis of the related camp geographies and, more specifically, how a “spatial” approach can contribute to such an analysis. The growing interest on the part of geographers, architects, sociologists, and anthropologists, to name but a few, for the spatialities of the camp supports such argument and the need for more interdisciplinary work on this dimension.

Accordingly, this book brings together a set of different perspectives and locations worldwide: from the Gaza Strip to Bologna, Rome, Paris, Berlin, and Calais; from Serbia to Italy and France; from Burma to Indonesia; from Auschwitz to the postwar German bunkers; from Cairo to Ecuador. However, this collection was not conceived with the intention to cover comprehensively the “world regions” where camps have been and continue to operate, nor was it conceived to study the “regional” differentiation of camp geographies. The cases presented here have instead been selected with three conceptual perspectives in mind, that tentatively correspond to the three sections according to which the book is organized: first, the relationship between institutional camps and makeshift camps; second, the formation of specific camp’s identities; third, the exploration of the camp in relation to the multifaceted, exceptional realities it enables to sustain as a spatial, political technology. These three perspectives, we argue, are key to understand the workings of past and present camps as geographical formations that, while being temporary and exceptional in nature, have become a permanent and constitutive presence in the contemporary spaces of the political.

The Structure of the Book

Camps Revisited collects fourteen essays, mostly written by geographers, but also with important contributions authored by scholars from other disciplines, such as architecture, social anthropology, political science, law, and international studies. By linking spatial theory to the geopolitical and biopolitical workings and practices of contemporary camps, this book argues that camps are also a specific response to certain social and political realities and processes, such as the changing

conditions of European borders due to the “refugee crisis” and the rise of nationalism in many countries affected by it. Containing people in enclavic, militarized spaces is often presented today as the most immediate and impactful response of the state authorities engaged with the arrival, rescue, hospitality, and identification of thousands of individuals crossing seas, continents, and national borders. For this reason, most chapters in this volume focus on “what camps do” as spatial formations with certain strategic and tactical roles.

Camps, in our perspective, emerge as manifestations of complex networks that do not include only institutional spaces such as refugee camps and detention centers, but comprise noninstitutional and makeshift spaces as well, which are sometimes not less organized and temporarily provide alternative spaces of care and of social and political solidarity and support. Here people who are informally “on the move” and inhabit series of dots-on-a-map are offered assistance by nonprofit organizations, but also run the risk of being evacuated and sometimes forcibly relocated into administrative detention.

These manifestations show how both care and custody form part of these institutional and informal networks. And yet, camps are differently utilized in different contexts. While protest camps are used to resist certain political orders by creating autonomous spaces in which different forms of order are visibly enacted in the public realm, Romani camps are created to contain and exclude specific identities; bunkers are designed to preserve and protect certain lives; and the post-disaster camps are established to manage the life of displaced citizens while often reproducing existing inequalities and vulnerabilities. As temporary and exceptional spaces existing outside ordinary, dominant, spatial and political orders, the life-span of these camps and their spatial developments are often surprising and unpredictable. While some camps exist only for a few days and weeks and disappear as quickly as they emerged, others last for years and sometimes develop into sites with other meanings, with their haunted spaces only carrying the memory of the original reason for their creation. Our aim is thus to theoretically examine these multifaceted camp geographies in ways that may help reading them as a constitutive and somewhat permanent presence of the contemporary global geopolitical space.

As mentioned above, the chapters are organized into three sections, each focused on different aspects of the broader geographies of the camp. The grouping of the chapters into these three “movements” intends to emphasize the links between the development of a specific set of spatial theories and the analysis of a set of geopolitical, biopolitical, experimental, and everyday spatial practices related to the camp and to their broader corresponding urban, national, and transnational geographies. We claim that the spatialities of the camp are precisely the outcome of these entanglements between theory and practice at different levels and scales, and between

different actors – entanglements that also rapidly change over time.

The first section, titled “Institutional and Makeshift Camps” is focused on contemporary refugee camps and in particular on the complementary relationship between institutional camps and makeshift camps. The aim of this section, organized as a journey among the camps created recently in Europe as spaces of arrival and departure of people “on the move,” is to show how, in practice, the two categories of camps are not necessarily in opposition, as it is often claimed by the authorities and the media; on the contrary, they are often created in a symbiotic relationship. In other words, in the four empirical cases examined in this section both the makeshift and the institutional camps contribute, at different scales, to the consolidation of a specific set of camp geographies that have become a constitutive and permanent presence in their respective region or city or indeed connect different camps across transnational routes. The chapter 2, “Networks of Encampments and ‘Traveling’ Emergencies: The Bologna Hub between Carceral Geographies and Spaces of Transition,” written by Loris Bacchetta and Diana Martin, describes a refugee hospitality center in Bologna, Italy, that has been converted into a new “hub” for the fast identification of irregular migrants. Italy has been at the forefront of Europe’s so-called migration crisis for years. According to EU legislation, the country is obliged to register and process asylum applications upon arrival, but it has struggled logistically and politically with the task—while most migrants do not regard Italy as their final destination and wish to travel north, to join relatives or friends elsewhere in Europe. In this context, the chapter shows that the Bologna Hub and its functions are tightly connected to the management of the broader geographies of irregular migrations in Italy, at the most diverse scales, and plays an ambivalent role as a pivot of irregular mobilities on the part of many who are simply allowed to “go north” after having been identified.

In the chapter 3 – “Walking the Balkan Route: The Archipelago of Refugee Camps in Serbia” - Claudio Minca, Danica Šantić, and Dragan Umek explain how Serbia has become a key buffer zone in the broader European geopolitics concerning the most recent “refugee crisis.” A true archipelago of camps has emerged in the past few years to provide support to the thousands of refugees who have engaged with the so-called Balkan Route. The closure of the borders with Hungary and Croatia, and therefore with the Schengen area, has translated Serbia since 2016 into a land where refugees arrive, seek temporary protection, and depart from in order to reach their final destination. Belgrade has accordingly been elected to be an informal hub of these precarious geographies of relief and informal migrant mobility. This chapter investigates in detail such geographies by paying particular attention to the ways in which the Serbian camp archipelago is strategically used by the refugees in their routings across the Balkan region.

Differently, Irit Katz, Toby Parsloe, Zoey Poll, and Akil Scafe-Smith look at the emergence of

refugee camps in three urban European contexts, Paris, Berlin, and Calais. Chapter 4, “The Bubble, the Airport, and the Jungle: Europe’s Urban Migrant Camps,” reflects on how three migrant camps, the Parisian “Bubble,” the former Tempelhof airport in Berlin, and the Jungle makeshift camp in Calais, have been created within specific urban “cracks” - that is, relatively dismissed areas defined by the respective municipalities. These camps are at once incorporated to, and marginalized within, the urban fabric, while at the same time being highly visible in the media, something that allows the authors to hint at a possible and questionable - spectacularization of these unique camp spatialities.

The final chapter of this section, “On the Meaning of Shelter: Living in Calais’s Camps de la Lande,” is an essay focused on the interplay between Calais’s makeshift Jungle camp and the institutional container camp that was opened by the French authorities at its heart. With rich and original ethnographic material, this essay shows how the use of prefabricated restrictive shelters and biometrics in defining the spatial rationalities of the container camp is in clear contrast with the idea and the need of a “shelter” in its broader, yet essential, social and cultural meaning. This latter is something that the authors, Cannelle Gueguen-Teil and Irit Katz, instead identify in some of the makeshift shelters and temporary institutions created in the Jungle, in this way problematizing the relationship between these kinds of camp in novel and provocative ways.

The second section discusses the question of “Camp Identities.” Camps here are presented as spaces marked by an exceptional sociopolitical and juridical regime, but also as spaces of potential resistance, where new forms of sociality and new political identities may emerge. This part of the book includes five contributions that look at camps as spaces where identity formation is a response to the diverse forms of repression, exclusion, and discriminative governance the camp’s residents are exposed to. This section intends to show that, despite the calculative rationalities that guide many interventions on the part of the authorities in the creations of camps, these spatial formations are also generative of new forms of the social transformation, of new networks of solidarity and resistance, and of new understandings of the camp experience for those who are forced into its spatialities.

Suvendrini Perera, in “Indefinite Imprisonment, Infinite Punishment: Materializing Australia’s Pacific Black Sites,” theorizes Australia’s immigration imprisonment system on Nauru and Papua New Guinea as an offshoot of the global military-medical-legal complex that also encompasses other sites of offshore incarceration and punishment such as US camps for suspected enemy combatants in the war on terror. Although the asylum seekers and refugees (including women, men, and children) held in the camps on Nauru and Manus Island by the Australian state are not suspected terrorists, Perera shows that the structural conditions of their internment in many

ways replicate those of black sites and other secret offshore prisons, often operated by the same transnational contractors. The chapter draws on a number of visual and verbal testimonies and activist documents produced by the camp inmates themselves, opening in this way to specific understandings of camp identity, as a realm of presence, recognition, subjectivity, and agency.

In line with this process of recognition of the specificity of camp identity formation, Kirsten McConnachie's chapter, "Protracted Encampment and Its Consequences: Gender Identities and Historical Memory," reflects on how the social microcosms produced by long-term camp living conditions often have important effects on – and are importantly affected by – gender relationships and memory building. Gender, for refugees who may spend years in a camp (and who in some cases may never leave), is a key factor, according to McConnachie, in the ways in which communities born out of a camp may incorporate, and resist, cultures imposed by humanitarian organizations operating there. These new "camp communities" also often develop their own identity, in part through generating and shaping original forms of memorialization. Memory, often in the form of storytelling, is in many cases another key element of the daily life in the camp, particularly in situations of protracted encampment, while also representing a source of specific camp identities, especially when the camp becomes the permanent field of reproduction of the social fabric for its residents.

Another question of camp identity is discussed by Fatina Abreek-Zubiedat and Alona Nitzan-Shiftan in their chapter, "De-Camping through Development: The Palestinian Refugee Camps in the Gaza Strip under the Israeli Occupation," where they illustrate how Palestinian refugee camps in the Gaza Strip have become sites of political resistance, memory and identity for many of their inhabitants; where, despite the condition of precarity and marginalization, the hope to return home could be maintained alive. Focusing in particular on the decamping plans implemented by the Israeli authorities in the period between 1967 and 1982, this chapter analyzes the plans to liquidate the Palestinian refugee camps in the Gaza Strip, while at the same time to develop new urban environments aimed at accommodating the Palestinian refugees and facilitating their home-ownership. These developmental plans, Abreek-Zubiedat and Nitzan-Shiftan argue, are an attempt to normalize the occupation of the Palestinian territories and integrate the refugees into the local population, with the intention to merge the Gaza Strip's camps and cities until the de facto disappearance of the camps within the urban context. While for some of the Israeli planning authorities and experts, including architects, the camp's space was seen as a space that could eventually be integral to the cityscape, for many Palestinians, the camp was a space to be preserved and kept separated from the city, precisely in order to keep its social and political identity and to act as a living testimony of their history of exile.

Looking at an entirely different setting, Jan-Jonathan Bock's chapter, "Grassroots Solidarity and Political Protest in Rome's Migrant Camps," engages with the emergence of a makeshift camp in Rome, where the presence of irregular migrants living in a street and the support of a local volunteer group called Baobab Experience have constituted a highly symbolic space of contestation to Italy's official and unofficial politics of migration. The chapter examines the work of Baobab volunteers, the makeshift camp constructed by the group in the vicinity of the Tiburtina train station, and how the interplay of visibility and invisibility of the site reveals the political and practical paradoxes of the management of the migrants on the part of the Italian authorities. The chapter also shows how this spontaneous camp has become a site of care and contestation, identity, and political struggle, eventually leading to its dismantlement by the Italian police in September 2016.

The section ends with a chapter examining a radically different space of camp identity: that produced by the intersection of violence and community in the highly differentiated social space of the Nazi death camps. In "Communities of Violence in the Nazi Death Camps," Richard Carter-White argues that a focus upon practices and definitions of violence in the death camps can offer important insights into the sociospatial complexity and fragmentation of the many "communities" forcibly instituted in these places, which highlight in turn the multiplicity of camp spatiotemporalities and of related camp identities. Drawing on perpetrator and survivor testimony from Auschwitz, Sobibor, and Treblinka, the chapter suggests that the particular type of camp constructed by the Nazis for the purpose of mass killing during the Holocaust can be understood as a complex intersection of communities, leading to highly contrasting experiences of survival for individual victims of camp violence.

The third section, titled "The Camp as a Political Technology," explores several manifold functions for which the camp is used and the multiple spatial and political realities it facilitates: protest camps in Egypt, post-disaster camps in Ecuador, tourist (former refugee) camps in Indonesia, Romani camps in Italy, and the bunker as a camp in postwar Germany. In this section, less conventional forms and uses of the camp are thus presented in relation to various geographical, social, and political contexts, allowing us to examine the camp as a sociopolitical-spatial formation that, because of its specific characteristics, is used for very different objectives and creates very specific social relations. The examination of the various ways in which the camp is conceived, used, and "practiced" is important in order to discuss it not only in relation to the specific populations it is created by and for, but also in relation to the diverse social, political and cultural fields of possibility it generates - as an enclavic space that creates a stable presence in our societies yet existing somewhat outside of them.

“Urban Protest Camps in Egypt: The Occupation, (Re)creation, and Destruction of Alternative Political Worlds,” authored by Adam Ramadan and Elisa Pascucci, investigates how the collective political mobilization in contemporary Egypt has often taken the form of urban protest camps. Ramadan and Pascucci here examine the urban geographies and material politics of three protest camps: Tahrir Square in 2011; Mustapha Mahmoud, held by Sudanese refugees in Cairo in 2005; and the occupation of Raba’a al Adawiya, in 2013. Involving different actors and unfolding within different political contexts, the three camps are nevertheless characterized by common elements: the reversal of designated usage of public space through “occupations,” especially of squares; the practices of care and social reproduction that informed everyday life in the encampments; and the inherent fragility of the camps’ material politics, exposed by their violent evictions. Drawing on recent literature on protest camps and biopolitics, this chapter shows that, in the three cases examined, it was the camps’ interconnections with the broader urban infrastructural and social fabric that allowed protesters’ experiences of autonomy and liberation. These infrastructural and structural connections, Ramadan and Pascucci argue, are the most significant and contradictory elements of urban protest camps, ones that expose both the potential and the limitations of this spatial tactic of political mobilization.

“The Post-Disaster Camps in Ecuador: Between Emergency Measures and Political Objectives” is where Camillo Boano, Ricardo Martén, and Andrea Sierra draw a few parallels concerning this typology of camp – in many ways similar to many refugee camps and other camp formations – to highlight the clear differences but also the important commonalities. After a devastating earthquake in Ecuador in 2016, the government established a series of institutional camps to support the displaced populations, while allowing the emergence of multiple makeshift dwellings also populated by displaced families and individuals. As in other previous chapters, this case shows how the interplay between formal and informal encampments is all too often an essential part of the ways in which state authorities conceive humanitarian interventions through a combination of interventionism and abandonment in the form of non-intervention or violent unmediated control. The chapter also highlights how the space of the disaster camp, often presented as humanitarian and depoliticized environment, is in fact an inherently political space, especially after a period of prolonged existence.

A very different view on the enduring yet evolving space of the camp is provided in Chin-Ee Ong and Claudio Minca’s chapter “Touring the Camp: Ghostly Presences and Silent Geographies of Remnants at Galang Camp, Indonesia,” which examines the production and consumption of a former Vietnamese refugee camp as a “laboratory” for tourism. A refugee processing center on Indonesia’s Galang Island (Pulau Galang) between 1976 and 1996, Galang Camp was made accessible to

visitation in 1998. Since then, it has represented a “Vietnam Village” for tourists on general multi-attraction Batam day tours, an ex-Vietnam Camp for history buffs, a genealogical site for ex-refugees and their descendants, a tragic and haunted site (due to the real or perceived rate of refugee suicides) for paranormal tourists from neighboring Singapore, and a “contact zone” for Indonesia’s local ethnic Chinese gamblers to seek inspirations (and winning numbers) from the deceased. Engaging with the literature on dark tourism and its practices, this chapter critically interrogates what constitutes and defines the tourism experience at this repackaged camp spatialities, the ethics of production and consumption of such a site, and the implications for a broader understanding of camp memorialization and heritagization.

The next chapter – “Camps, Civil Society Organizations, and the Reproduction of Marginalization: Italian and French ‘Solidarity/Inclusion’ Villages for Romani People” – deals with another important camp typology: the camps established in France and Italy to host the Romani people, Europe’s largest ethnic minority. Riccardo Armillei and Gaja Maestri explain here how the Romani people have been subjected to social exclusion and marginalization for centuries and are still today one of the poorest and most discriminated-against groups on the continent. In order to address their socioeconomic disadvantage and improve their quality of life, particularly in their traditional makeshift settlements, the Italian and French governments have implemented deeply contradictory policy measures, oscillating between a vague sense of solidarity and exclusionary practices. While during the last few decades Italy and France started to endorse so-called “solidarity/integration” villages as a model for Romani social inclusion, this chapter attempts to move away from a state-centric analysis of these camp-like institutions, by focusing instead on the role of civil society organizations (CSOs) in relation to these camps. Subcontracted to work within institutional camps, these not-for-profit entities have indeed shown a rather ambivalent attitude – by contesting government policies, on the one hand, while complying with government requirements, on the other. The chapter concludes by arguing that some of these “pro-Romani” CSOs have played a major role in replicating the same mechanisms of marginalization that have been the product of the state authorities’ “camp mentality” in dealing with the “Romani problem” that they often criticize.

The third section ends with Ian Klinker’s important reflection on the relationship between “The Bunker and the Camp.” This chapter argues that the history of the death camp, in many of its various iterations, is intimately intertwined with that of the concrete survival machine, the bunker. Despite their different material form (poured concrete versus barbed wire), both spaces emerge from the same political fascination with life and death. Indeed, as inversions of one another, the bunker and the extermination camp are direct responses to the simultaneously geographical and

protofascist fantasy of living space (Lebensraum). While the bunker seeks to secure its concentrated living space from the annihilation outside, the death camp seeks to purge that living space from unwanted populations. In exploring the camp and the bunker as complementary spaces, the chapter travels through the twentieth century and into the present.

The camps discussed in this volume present the multifaceted spatialities of an ever-evolving modern political technology that continues to change according to shifting geopolitical realities around the world. While this account on the camp is undoubtedly partial in relation to the geographical contexts, the theoretical interventions, and the realities of encampment it covers, it nevertheless reveals the camp as a versatile space that, perhaps precisely because of its temporary and exceptional nature, maintains a key role in today's political landscape. Camps exist as offshore, unseen, hidden spaces and as flashy urban spectacles. They take on an instrumental, rigid, spatial order that responds to biological necessities created by institutional interventions, while they also emerge as seemingly chaotic makeshift spaces organized to respond to the social, cultural, and everyday needs of their inhabitants. They are camouflaged in banal, mysterious, and creative names such as hubs, hotspots, jungles. They emerge in exposed rural landscapes and in the center of cities. They function as a spaces of unmediated and often violent control, while also creating spaces of abandonment. They are established to achieve major political objectives such as horrific genocides, while also enabling new forms of identity politics, solidarity, care, and active political resistance to emerge. In all of its manifestations and functions, however, the camp appears as a spatial formation in which temporariness is imbedded, since reproduced to achieve a certain end, which is often the ongoing elimination, marginalization, and the contained perpetuum mobile of those who are suspended outside our modern political order and its consolidated and recognized spaces and territories.

References

Agier, Michel. 2011. *Managing the Undesirables: Refugee Camps and Humanitarian Government*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Bulman, May. 2016. "Hundreds of Refugees Return to 'Secret Camps' Near Calais in Bid to Reach the UK." *Independent*, December 26, 2016. <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/calais-refugees-secret-camps-migrants-france-jungle-a7488196.html>.

Cresswell, Tim. 2006. *On the Move: Mobility in the Modern Western World*. London and New York: Routledge.

De Genova, Nicholas. 2013. "Spectacles of Migrant 'Illegality': The Scene of Exclusion, the Obscene of Inclusion." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 36, no. 7: 1180–98.

- Diken, Bülent, and Carsten B. Laustsen. 2005. *The Culture of Exception: Sociology Facing the Camp*. London: Routledge.
- Edkins, Jenny. 2000. "Sovereign Power, Zones of Indistinction, and the Camp." *Alternatives* 25, no. 1: 3–25.
- Gentleman, Amelia. 2017. "Inside Vietnam City, the French Holding Camp for Vulnerable UK-bound Migrants." *Guardian*, September 10, 2017. <https://www.theguardian.com/law/2017/sep/10/vietnam-city-french-holding-camp-uk-migrants>.
- Giaccaria, Paolo, and Claudio Minca. 2011. "Topographies/Topologies of the Camp: Auschwitz as a Spatial Threshold." *Political Geography* 30: 3–12.
- Giaccaria, Paolo, and Claudio Minca, eds. 2016. *Hitler's Geographies: The Spatialities of the Third Reich*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gilroy, Paul. 2004. *Between Camps: Nations, Cultures and the Allure of Race*. London: Routledge.
- Hyndman, Jennifer. 2000. *Managing Displacement: Refugees and the Politics of Humanitarianism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Inin, Engin F., and Kim Ryeigiel. 2007. "Abject Spaces: Frontiers, Zones, Camps." In *The Logics of Biopower and the War on Terror: Living, Dying, Surviving*, edited by Elizabeth Dauphinee and Cristina Masters, 181–203. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lebuhn, Henrik. 2013. "Local Border Practices and Urban Citizenship in Europe: Exploring Urban Borderlands." *City* 17: 37–51.
- Katz, Irit. 2015. "From Spaces of Thanatopolitics to Spaces of Natality." *Political Geography* 49: 84–86.
- Katz, Irit. 2017. "Between Bare Life and Everyday Life: Spatialising the New Migrant Camps in Europe." *Amps: Architecture Media Politics Society* 12: 1–21.
- Malkki, Liisa. 1995. *Purity and Exile: Violence, Memory, and National Cosmology among Hutu Refugees in Tanzania*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Martin, Diana. 2015. "From Spaces of Exception to 'Campscapes': Palestinian Refugee Camps and Informal Settlements in Beirut." *Political Geography* 44, no. 1: 9–18.
- Minca, Claudio. 2005. "The Return of the Camp." *Progress in Human Geography* 29: 405–12.
- Minca, Claudio. 2007. "Agamben's Geographies of Modernity." *Political Geography* 26: 78–97.
- Minca, Claudio. 2015. "Geographies of the Camp." *Political Geography* 49: 74–83.
- Parker, Noel, and Nick Vaughan-Williams. 2012. "Critical Border Studies: Broadening and Deepening the 'Lines in the Sand' Agenda." *Geopolitics* 17, no. 4: 727–33.
- Peteet, Julie. 2005. *Landscape of Hope and Despair: Palestinian Refugee Camps*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Rahola, Federico. 2003. *Zone Indefinitamente Temporanee: I Luoghi dell'Umanità in Eccesso*. Verona, Italy: Ombre Corte.

Rajaram, Prem Kumar, and Carl Grundy-Warr. 2008. *Borderscapes: Hidden Geographies and Politics at Territory's Edge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Ramadan, Adam, and Sara Fregonese. 2017. "Hybrid Sovereignty and the State of Exception in the Palestinian Refugee Camps in Lebanon." *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* 107, no. 4: 949–63.

Rygiel, Kim. 2012. "Politicizing Camps: Forging Transgressive Citizenship in and through Transit." *Citizenship Studies* 16, no. 5–6: 807–25.

Wolf, Gerhard. 2015. "The East as Historical Imagination and the Germanization Policies of the Third Reich." In Giaccaria and Minca, *Hitler's Geographies*, 93–109.

Zhang, Chenchen. 2017. "Mobile Borders and Turbulent Mobilities: Mapping the Geopolitics of the Channel Tunnel." *Geopolitics*. doi:10.1080/14650045.2017.1379994.

Zimmerer, Jürgen. 2005. "The Birth of the Ostland Out of the Spirit of Colonialism." *Patterns of Prejudice* 39, no. 2: 197–219. doi:10.1080/00313220500106311.

Zimmerer, Jürgen. 2016. "In Service of Empire: Geographers at Berlin's University between Colonial Studies and Ostforschung." In Giaccaria and Minca, *Hitler's Geographies*, 67–92.