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#### This year’s topic invites us to reflect on the meaning of presidential actions—who, what, where, when, why, but also HOW, through what WAYS OF THINKING did we allow for the authorities and powers of the presidency so unrestrained that we can only grasp their expression in fiction.

#### The war camp is not just an isolated act of war—it represents not only the mass executions by Germany in World War II or the parallel detention of thousands of Asian-American persons by the U.S. government, but stands for the entire governmental paradigm of modernity. The idea of isolating spaces as inside or outside the law, tying certain bodies to varying legal rights based on their spatial location, is a crucial component of the larger framework of disciplinary authority and exceptional violence which characterizes contemporary governmental practice.

Agamben 2000 (Giorgio Agamben, professor of philosophy at the College International de Philosophie in Paris, Means Without End: Notes on Politics, 2000, p. 40-41)

One ought to reflect on the paradoxical status of the camp as space of exception: the camp is a piece of terri­tory that is placed outside the normal juridical order; for all that, however, it is not simply an external space. Ac­cording to the etymological meaning of the term *excep­tion (ex-capere),* what is being excluded in the camp is captured outside, that is, it is included by virtue of its very exclusion. Thus, what is being captured under the rule of law is first of all the very state of exception. In other words, if sovereign power is founded on the ability to decide on the state of exception, the camp is the struc­ture in which the state of exception is permanently real­ized. Hannah Arendt observed once that what comes to light in the camps is the principle that supports totali­tarian domination and that common sense stubbornly refuses to admit to, namely, the principle according to which anything is possible. It is only because the camps constitute a space of exception—a space in which the law is completely suspended—that everything is truly possible in them. If one does not understand this par­ticular political-juridical structure of the camps, whose vocation is precisely to realize permanently the exception, the incredible events that took place in them remain en­tirely unintelligible. The people who entered the camp moved about in a zone of indistinction between the out­side and the inside, the exception and the rule, the licit and the illicit, in which every juridical protection had dis­appeared; moreover, if they were Jews, they had already been deprived of citizenship rights by the Nuremberg Laws and were later completely denationalized at the moment of the “final solution.” Inasmuch as its inhabitants have been stripped of every political status and reduced com­pletely to naked life, the camp is also the most absolute biopo­litical space that has ever been realized —a space in which power confronts nothing other than pure biological life with­out any mediation. The camp is the paradigm itself of po­litical space at the point in which politics becomes bio­politics and the homo sacer becomes indistinguishable from the citizen. The correct question regarding the hor­rors committed in the camps, therefore, is not the ques­tion that asks hypocritically how it could have been possible to commit such atrocious horrors against other human beings; it would be more honest, and above all more useful, to investigate carefully how—that is, thanks to what juridical procedures and political devices—hu­man beings could have been so completely deprived of their rights and prerogatives to the point that commit­ting any act toward them would no longer appear as a crime (at this point, in fact, truly anything had become possible).

#### The U.S. response to security threats is identical in form to the National Socialist reaction against otherness—the passage of the NDAA signifies a panicked response to a borderless and faceless enemy, internalizing security protocols as the very precondition for existence.

Kamalnath 2013 (Anthea, Law Graduate at University College London, “United States of Exeption,” <http://antheakamalnath.wordpress.com/tag/agamben/>, 30 April 2013)CJQ

The only explanation for the sheer lack of discourse, let alone intelligent discourse, in relation to the topic of the Obama administration’s gross expansion of executive powers and its support of unconstitutional provisions of the National Defense Authorization Act 2012 (NDAA) is that we are in a “state of exception”, characterized by anomie at best and idiocy at worst. Cicero said, “There can be war without tumult, but no tumult without war.” President Obama signed the NDAA into law Dec 2011. The NDAA is not a simple extension of the Patriot Act. The NDAA allows for indefinite detention of any person suspected of terrorism or posing a threat to the executive, both American citizen and foreign national, without probable cause and with zero promise of due process. Although the NDAA secures the end of Guantanamo Bay as a detention center, it allows the executive to literally sign off on death warrants – shoot-to kill lists of suspected terrorists, some American, some under 18. In the 1920s, German legal theorist Carl Schmitt coined the term “state of exception”, a moment in government when there is a “suspesion of the entire existing judicial order”. Following the September 11th attacks, the subsequent Patriot Act of 2001 and Guantanamo Bay , Italian philosopher Giorgio Agamben elaborated on this historical phenomenon with his books “Homo Sacer” and “The State of Exception.” I read the latter in college and it changed the way I saw the world. For Agamben (and the tradition that produced him Carl Schmitt, Walter Benjamin, Jacques Derrida), a “state of exception” is neither internal nor external to the juridicial order, and the problem of defining it concerns a threshold, or a zone of indifference, where inside and outside do not exclude each other but rather blur with each other. It introduces a zone of anomie into the law in order to make the effective regulation of the real possible. Agamben argues that this “state of exception” was already codified in Roman law; the Roman iustitium, literally “the suspension of the law”, was an archetypal state of exception. “Iustititium” gave the Roman Senate expansive powers in the face of threats to the Republic. Iustitium was declared following the death of the sovereign, a legal manifestation of grief through suspension of the order: Durkheim’s anomie. Grief is arguably dehumanizing; a state of exception is the reversal of the human to the non-human, the fate of enemy combatants captured and detained in Guantanamo Bay with no legal identity and no legal rights. The National Defense Authorization Act is the final act of the “state of exception”: the no man’s land of Guantanamao Bay has been done away with, only to be brought home. The NDAA FY 2012 allowed the executive to kill an American citizen without due process, without charging him with a crime, and to hide behind the shield of executive powers. And he did. At any previous time in American history, a summary execution by the executive without due process would have been considered cold-blooded murder and an act of tyranny. Yet no one blinked an eye. This indifference is not a normal condition for society; it is a pathological psychological state, a social “state of exception”. I will never understand the vocal enthusiasm of those who claim they are proud of our President, the NDAA undoes every decent thing President Obama has achieved in office. The politcians will pontificate, the lawyers will legislate, but the people should always pay attention.

#### But the NDAA was not passed in isolation—for decades, FEMA has colluded with the US Armed Forces to plan and execute a massive national securitization of life. The Army and FEMA created the Civilian Inmate Labor Program to create the very prison camps which are the materialization of violent sovereignty—the entire nation is now a concentration camp.

Bourbaki 2013 (Nicole, blogger, “FEMA’s Mass Fatality Planning,” <http://financearmageddon.blogspot.com/2013/05/femas-mass-fatality-planning.html>)CJQ

Since the Reagan administration, REX-84 U.S. Civilian Inmate Labor program has been drawn up, implemented, and expanded in many ways. The military and police have been increasingly training together. The military has been running operations like "Urban Warrior" fully-armed in suburbia. 800+ FEMA detention centers (concentration camps) have already been built all over the United States and Halliburton's engineering subsidiary KBR is busy building more. These camps are complete with biometric scanners, barbed wire facing inwards, gas lines and furnaces, heli-pads, watchtowers, and security cameras. The few journalists who have filmed and reported on these have been observed by black helicopters and even approached and questioned by secret servicemen (see Google or you tube videos of "FEMA camps"). "The Civilian Inmate Labor Program was conducted in secret at US military bases from 1989 to 1996. This nightmare program was recently declassified. If Civilian Inmate Labor Programs are so wonderful, why did the Army keep them secret for over seven years? There are thousands of pages of documents on the Army's website detailing the massive scope of this program, much of which is still secret. Many of the documents are contradictory. For example, on the same page it will say that the Army is not allowed to house and use State inmate labor, and, in the next paragraph will say that they have been housing and using State inmate labor ...For years, we warned people about FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency). The federal documents have been around for decades and include round-up plans and concentration camps. People used to laugh at us when we said this in December of 1999. Then came Seattle. FEMA housed and protected government-placed 'anarchist' provocateurs, but put five hundred peaceful demonstrators in a FEMA camp on the outskirts of town. FEMA used the old Sand Point naval brig to detain hundreds of American citizens.

#### And, these camps aren’t far-away or on remote off-shore locations; they are in every state and every territory. In Washington alone there are at least four capable of holdings hundreds of thousands of prisoners and have been used in the past to illegally imprison activists during the Seattle 1999 WTO protests.

Gibson 2013 (Dave, blogger, “Find the FEMA Camp Nearest You,” <http://intellihub.com/2013/06/13/find-the-fema-camp-nearest-you/>)CJQ

WASHINGTON Seattle/Tacoma – SeaTac Airport: fully operational federal transfer center

Okanogan County – Borders Canada and is a site for a massive concentration camp capable of holding hundreds of thousands of people for slave labor. This is probably one of the locations that will be used to hold hard core patriots who will be held captive for the rest of their lives.

 Sand Point Naval Station – Seattle – FEMA detention center used actively during the 1999 WTO protests to classify prisoners.

Ft. Lewis / McChord AFB – near Tacoma – This is one of several sites that may be used to ship prisoners overseas for slave labor.

#### Biopolitics now collapses into the project of an unending genocide on deviant bodies in the name of survival. Not only the camp, but massive international wars become possible when sovereignty reacts to national emergencies by disposing of those bodies who refuse to conform—Nuclear extermination is the final expression of FEMA ideology.

Foucault 1978 (Michel Foucault, professor of philosophy at the college de france, The History Of Sexuality: An Introduction, Volume 1, 1978, pg. 136-137)

Since the classical age the West has undergone a very profound transformation of these mechanisms of power. “Deduction” has tended to be no longer the major form of power but merely one element among others, working to incite, reinforce, control, monitor, optimize, and organize the forces under it: a power bent on generating forces, mak­ing them grow, and ordering them, rather than one dedicated to impeding them, making them submit, or destroying them. There has been a parallel shift in the right of death, or at least a tendency to align itself with the exigencies of a life-adminis­tering power and to define itself accordingly. This death that was based on the right of the sovereign is now manifested as simply the reverse of the right of the social body to ensure, maintain, or develop its life. Yet wars were never as bloody as they have been since the nineteenth century, and all things being equal, never before did regimes visit such holocausts on their own populations. But this formidable power of death—and this is perhaps what accounts for part of its force and the cynicism with which it has so greatly expanded its limits—now presents itself as the counterpart of a power that exerts a positive influence on life, that endeavors to adminis­ter, optimize, and multiply it, subjecting it to precise controls and comprehensive regulations. Wars are no longer waged in the name of a sovereign who must be defended; they are waged on behalf of the existence of everyone; entire popula­tions are mobilized for the purpose of wholesale slaughter in the name of life necessity: massacres have become vital. It is as managers of life and survival, of bodies and the race, that so many regimes have been able to wage so many wars, causing so many men to be killed. And through a turn that closes the circle, as the technology of wars has caused them to tend increasingly toward all-out destruction, the decision that initiates them and the one that terminates them are in fact increasingly informed by the naked question of survival. The atomic situation is now at the end point of this process: the power to expose a whole population to death is the underside of the power to guarantee an individual’s con­tinued existence. The principle underlying the tactics of bat­tle—that one has to be capable of killing in order to go on living—has become the principle that defines the strategy of states. But the existence in question is no longer the juridical existence of sovereignty; at stake is the biological existence of a population. If genocide is indeed the dream of modern powers, this is not because of a recent return of the ancient right to kill; it is because power is situated and exercised at the level of life, the species, the race, and the large-scale phenomena of population.

#### THUS THE PLAN: The war powers of the President of the United States should be substantially restricted and Army Regulation 210-35 stricken from law.

#### The radical contestation of the plan matters. The plan forces the state to confront the question of FEMA camps existing which exposes the mechanism by which governmenttality fuses with biopolitical regimes to internalize hierarchies of control. This is based on the constant articulation of human subjectivities as stable, subordinated to the apolitical calculations of the state apparatus which remains unconcerned with the resistance it makes inevitable.

Cooper 10 [Brent, Alumnus of the London School of Economics, Sociology, Studies Political Science and International Relations at the University of British Columbia, Towards a Theory of Conspiracy: Analyzing Hidden Power in Globalization Process, Published in Knowledge and power in International Relations, June 1st 2010 AMB]

Investigating conspiracies within the higher levels of the state apparatus poses a unique challenge. In Sovereignty and the UFO, Alexander Wendt and Raymond Duvall make a compelling case for the threat certain taboos pose to governmentality – UFOs in this case. Governmentality, a concept from Michel Foucault, is the organized government practices (mentalities, rationalities, and techniques) directed at the management of populations and their territories.36 In the article, Wendt and Duvall argue that the investigation of UFOs threatens the anthropomorphic sovereignty of states, and is therefore ignored. I contend that this approach can be transposed onto questions of localized conspiracies pertaining to issues of national security. An example is the activation of the aforementioned state secrets privilege, but this is not so much a „taboo‟ as it is an explicit restriction by the state. An academic taboo, more specifically, is generally enforced by stigmatization and ostracism; examples of which include the study of covert operations and of state terror, both of which I discuss later. Wendt explains that science strives for an apolitical and objective account of reality, but is self-limited by its own methodology which produces an ever evolving, contestable body of knowledge, that precludes absolute “Truth.”37 On the other hand, the state seeks a regime of truth that its citizens will adhere to. In this case, Wendt argues, the state values stability and normalization as part of its standard of knowledge, over a scientific (albeit uncertain) criteria of truth.38 For the modern liberal state, power depends on legitimacy and knowledge rather than force to govern its populations, while the latter is a latent feature. However, when a regime of governmentality comes under threat, the sovereign authority reveals its truth power source: the capacity to suspend norms and laws if it sees fit - as Carl Schmitt put it, to "decide the exception."39 As Wendt says with UFOs, I argue with conspiracies that the authorities are not “hiding The Truth” about them, but rather “they cannot ask the question”; 40 the party in power, or more generally the state, is threatened by its own investigation.‡ And since we cannot know for sure, to reject the possibility is to possibly reject a true explanation; a Type II error in statistics.41 Wendt insists that the metaphysics of modern rule are so resilient that we should not underrate the challenges of resistance; those who challenge the status quo in this respect face career hurdles and put their reputation at risk.42 Therefore, the sensible position to take is to be agnostic about CT because atheism and belief are not epistemically justified.4

#### And, identically to how the camp imposes geo-spatial boundaries on human bodies who are placed outside of the law, liberal political theory places boundaries on thought which ensures that political agents arrive at certain predetermined conclusions. Conspiracizing about political discipline lays the basis for a thinking-otherwise which undoes stale political socialization.

Britach 2003 (Bratich, Jack Z., Jeremy Packer, and Cameron McCarthy. "Making Politics Reasonable: Conspiracism, Subjectification, and Governing through Styles of Thought." Foucault, Cultural Studies, and Governmentality. Albany: State University of New York, 2003. 67-101. Print. AMB)

Acknowledging the density and importance of thought does not situate it as the only or even primary mechanism of coordination in governmental cultural strategies. Nor is it to erase the crucial role of social, political, and economic determinations in shaping the forms of experience characteristic of this conjuncture (more on this later). And it is certainly not a call (as is so often the case of critical thinkers) for "more thought" as an antidote to the "unthinking" practices of everyday life. This quantification of thought ignores the way liberal governing has predicated itself on this activity. Rather, it is to argue that thought, because it has been made governmental under liberalism, is an important point of contestation. As we shall see, liberal arts of governing have persisted in large measure due to an ethos of self-critique, to the harnessing and deployment of thought as a political rationality and a strategic process of subjectification. The task, then, is to analyze the ways thought has been governmentalized, as a way of making this rationality contingent, thus opening up a thinking-otherwise (and a becoming-free-otherwise) . And, as I will argue later, this contingency is not just due to its historicity; it is located in the ambivalence of the very practice of governance that requires thought in order to persevere. With this in mind, I will first examine how Foucault defines thought as a methodological issue, in terms of its relation to practice, action, and ideas, in order to give thought its own specificity. Second, I will explore how, following the Enlightenment ethos of self-criticism, thought is taken up by liberal governance. In the third section, I take up Judith Butler's account of the power/subjectification dynamic as a "trope of the turn" in order to complicate the way thought can be turned on itsel£ Finally, I will use the recent problematizations of conspiracy theories in American political thought as an example of how, in advanced liberalism, thought is still required to be folded as a target of modification. Overall, the goal of this essay is to show the importance of thought in understanding how the present is governed specifically the liberal styles of thought that organizes consent and dissent. How are the contemporary problematizations of "conspiracism" attempts to secure consent (to a regime of truth) and modify dissent? How do neoliberal political rationalities attempt to organize styles of thought in the name of freedom? In the case of conspiracy theories (problematized as "the paranoid style," or "conspiracism") different styles of thought are marked, I argue, by the degree of skepticism that composes them. The very skepticism that defines liberal political rationality also marks its vulnerability when it comes to "paranoid" styles of thought. This continuing controversy over conspiracy theories foregrounds the implications of a "reasonable politics" in thought and action.

#### The question of knowledge production is the most important political question to ask—the way that we THINK about THOUGHT directly constructs what thoughts it is possible to think. Without reflecting on the nature of our thoughts new political projects get swamped by existing institutions. It’s not the exact content of our political conspiracies which matters, but rather it’s a question of formulating a way of thinking that allows for thought to expand beyond the confines of existing power.

Britach 2003 (Bratich, Jack Z., Jeremy Packer, and Cameron McCarthy. "Making Politics Reasonable: Conspiracism, Subjectification, and Governing through Styles of Thought." Foucault, Cultural Studies, and Governmentality. Albany: State University of New York, 2003. 67-101. Print. AMB)

As evidenced in this epigraph, assessing how the present is governed entails more than a sociological description of various mechanisms, techniques, and institutions of governance, that is, more than the "actually existing" (Gordon, 1991 , p. 8). According to Nikolas Rose (1999), studies of governmentality "entail a work of thought on the present that is itself, inescapably, a work of thought" (p. 58). A scandalous statement for proponents of a kind of materialism that would relegate thought to the thin atmosphere of ideology and phenomenological consciousness, if not idealism. But in order to proceed on the effectivity of these kinds of studies, according to Rose, it is necessary to discard the last vestiges of those nineteenth-century philosophical disputes between materialism and idealism . . . they have done much to constrain our ways of understanding the materiality of ideas, and to recognize the embeddedness of thought in the most prosaic aspects of social and economic life." (1999, p. 58). That is, thought cannot merely be reduced to the diluted and auxiliary domain of ideological representation, or even to discourse. Foucault is delineating a different status for thought-practices, one that has a more productive and active force to it, not just the reactive force almost always accorded to"ideology" given the idealism/materialism binary. As Gilles Deleuze stated it when interviewed about Foucault's work, "thinking's a capacity, a capacity to set forces in play . . . [where forces mean] acting upon actions . . . . That's thought as strategy" ( 1 986, p. 95). Foucault often described his own work as an "ontology of the present" which includes the "different ways of thinking about who we are" (Dean, 1 996, p. 2 1 0). According to Mitchell Dean ( 1 996), an ontology of the present" seeks to define the conditions in which we are led to problematize what we are, what we can and should do, and the world in which we find ourselves"(p. 225). It asks, "how is reason exercised?" (Rabinow, 1 997, xxiv). In otherwords, an ontology of the present requires thought on thought. This conception of thought has very practical, concrete effects for political action, since "as soon as one can no longer think things as one formerly thought them, transformation becomes both very urgent, very difficult, and quite possible" (Foucault, 1988b, p. 155). Or, as Rose (1 999) puts it, "showing the role of thought in holding [contingent arrangements] together . . . also show[s] that thought has a part to play in contesting them" (p. 59). More than just being a condition for change, thought is also imperative to prevent a return or doubling of the institutions and practices targeted for transformation. Without "the work of thought upon itself . . . whatever the project of reform, we know that it will be swamped, digested by modes of behavior and institutions that will always be the same" (Foucault, 1988b, p. 156).1

#### Reflecting on conspiracies offers a chance to expose gaps in official discourses and demand a more rigorous epistemological framework. It’s not an irrational opposition to official truth narratives but is rather a highly informed skepticism which can be used strategically to contest violent power relations.

Sapountzls & Condor 2013 (Sapountzls, Antonis, and Susan Condor. "Conspiracy Accounts as Intergroup Theories: Challenging Dominant Understandings of Social Power and Political Legitimacy."Political Psychology 2013th ser. XX.XX (2013): n. pag. Print. AMB)

Social identity theory’s concern for the reality of social groups and for collective action as a¶ mechanism of social change has led theorists generally to question assumptions about the irrationality¶ of group-based social cognition and action (see Spears, 2010) or the necessarily pathological¶ nature of social conflict (e.g., Oakes, 2001). In particular, social identity theorists have taken issue¶ with conventional assumptions concerning the irrationality of social stereotyping, arguing that¶ categorical social perception can both reflect social reality (Oakes, Haslam, & Turner, 1994) and be¶ strategically used as a rational means by which to promote social and political change (Haslam,¶ Turner, Oakes, Reynolds, & Doosje, 2002; Oakes, Reynolds, Haslam, & Turner, 1999; Reicher,¶ Hopkins, & Condor, 1997b; Reynolds, Oakes, Haslam, Nolan, & Dolnik, 2000).¶ We suggest that a similar line of argument could be applied to conspiracy theorizing. In fact,¶ many of the properties that academic commentators often regard as typical features of conspiracy¶ accounting correspond with assumptions about the social world adopted in formal social identity¶ theoretical perspectives on intergroup relations.1 For example, conspiracy theorizing tends to involve¶ dualistic, categorical accounts of political structures and processes. Similarly, as Subašic´, Reynolds,¶ and Turner (2008) have noted, social identity theorists often represent intergroup relations “in¶ dualistic terms: in-group versus out-group, dominant versus subordinate, powerful versus powerless,¶ disadvantaged versus privileged” (p. 330). Conspiracy narratives generally involve teleological¶ reasoning, presenting political and events as the outcome of direct design on the part of a powerful¶ antagonist. Again, this same kind of perspective can often be found in social identity theoretical¶ accounts of intergroup conflict (Condor, 1996a).

#### By exposing and deconstructing the collusion of FEMA and the military to transform the political space of the United States into a massive death camp, we position ourselves as external to the knowledge production of the sovereign orchestrators of FEMA—we can expose the gap at the heart of disciplinary power.

Dykes 10 [Dykes, Aaron. "Bombshell: FEMA Camps Confirmed." Infowars Bombshell FEMA Camps Confirmed Comments. Infowars, 10 Nov. 2010. Web. 28 Aug. 2013. <http://www.infowars.com/bombshell-fema-camps-confirmed/>.]

Former Gov. Jesse Ventura and his [crew at Conspiracy Theory](http://www.trutv.com/shows/conspiracy_theory/index.html) have blown the FEMA camp issue wide open in a truly groundbreaking episode from the program’s second season on TruTV. The “Police State” episode proves once and for all that the feds have trained to take on American citizens, planned for riots and disasters and made preparations to maintain order at any cost. Tune in this Friday, Nov. 12 at 10 PM Eastern/ 9 PM Central and leave the denial at the door.¶ This powerful episode is the largest and most in-depth investigation into FEMA camps to date– and it is scheduled to air on television. Radio host and filmmaker Alex Jones returns to the series yet again, as the team takes you to confirmed on-the-ground facilities, confronts the legislators who authorized FEMA camps and breaks down the full-scale technologically-integrated police state that includes Fusion Centers, FEMA, the Department of Homeland Security and more.¶ At one of many real and verified FEMA locations, Jesse Ventura and Alex Jones approach a “Residential Center” run by Homeland Security in central Texas where they find locked doors, double-fences and escape warnings around the entire perimeter. Further inside the facility, they witness a playground complex, swings and slides for children. The crew walks up to the front door and attempts to get some answers. But the officials refuse to either confirm or deny the facility’s purpose, including whether or not American citizens are being held inside. However, [our past investigations into this facility](http://www.infowars.com/articles/ps/concentration_camps_tx_prison_camp_future_american_gulag.htm) reveal that it has confined both [children and adults](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TxYxTly-yo8), including immigrants, refugee seekers and American citizens.¶ Despite hundreds of government documents identifying emergency and contingency plans, including plans to deal with [mass fatalities](http://www.homelandsecurity.ms.gov/calendar.html), [insurrection](http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&cd=2&ved=0CBsQFjAB&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.infowars.com%2Fus-troops-in-homeland-%25E2%2580%259Ccrowd-control%25E2%2580%259D-patrols-from-october-1st%2F&rct=j&q=site%3Ainfowars.com%20insurrection&ei=EVrbTMSnFsOAlAfD4YGNCQ&usg=AFQjCNFuF2Xqggayi-vNYlF_vGpalcc-vg&sig2=yCrpU8RxwNEMlb3kiN50dQ&cad=rja), [internment](http://www.infowars.com/h-r-645-and-the-fema-concentration-camps/) and [quarantines](http://www.infowars.com/planning-the-h1n1-flu-pandemic-body-bags-mass-graves-quarantine-orders/), Ventura and his team repeatedly encounter outrageous denial and avoidance by officials at every level. The mainstream media have avoided and downplayed these on-the-record plans for FEMA Camps and Homeland Security Emergency Facilities for years. Clearly, it is not meant to be a public relations talking point, and it is no surprise that members of Congress, including those who wrote the bill to create FEMA camps in America, are reluctant to discuss the matter.¶ So, Jesse Ventura, former Mayor and Governor, descends upon Washington to confront two important figures behind [H.R. 645, the National Emergency Centers Establishment Act](http://www.govtrack.us/congress/billtext.xpd?bill=h111-645). Despite going through official channels, Ventura finds that [Jim Gerlach (P-Pennsylvania)](http://gerlach.house.gov/) repeatedly “ducks” TV cameras and refuses to answer questions about [H.R. 645](http://www.govtrack.us/congress/billtext.xpd?bill=h111-645).¶ Another Congressman who co-sponsored the bill starkly adm

#### But this doesn’t mean the question of spillover or solvency is relevant. The sovereign will always attempt to neutralize and internalize the production of any knowledge—we can’t ever claim to solve beyond the space of this round. We merely ask to abandon sovereignty in the face of its excessive violence.

Kent 6/25 [Kent, Clark. "Proof FEMA Camps Are Real." Hang the Bankers. Hang the Bankers, 25 June 2013. Web. 28 Aug. 2013. <http://www.hangthebankers.com/proof-fema-camps-are-real/>.]

Prior to the introduction of the bill, [U.S. troops returning from Iraq were assigned to conduct “homeland patrols”](http://www.infowars.com/us-troops-in-homeland-%E2%80%9Ccrowd-control%E2%80%9D-patrols-from-october-1st/) and part of that assignment was to deal with “civil unrest and crowd control.”¶ In the years leading up to FEMA concentration camp legislation, the government prepared for the eventuality of civil and political unrest. Rex 84, Operation Garden Plot, Operation Cable Splicer, and a flurry of executive orders issued over the years have established the framework for concentration camps.¶ Add to this the Pentagon’s [Civilian Inmate Labor Program](http://www.army.mil/usapa/epubs/pdf/r210_35.pdf), provided by Army Regulation 210-35, that establishes labor programs and prison camps on Army installations. It was issued in 2005, well before the current legislation of its predecessor. Signaling that the effort was not sidelined or mothballed, in January 2006, Kellogg, Brown and Root reported that they had received a contract from the Department of Homeland Security to expand these internment camps.¶ The government is determined to keep information about its FEMA concentration camps as secret as possible. This was demonstrated in December, 2010, when TruTV inexplicably [pulled an episode](http://www.infowars.com/police-state-episode-of-hit-ventura-show-covering-concentration-camps-pulled-from-air/) of Jesse Ventura’s [Conspiracy Theory](http://www.trutv.com/shows/conspiracy_theory/index.html) dealing with FEMA camps and fusion centers.¶ It is not certain H.R.390 will make it out of committee and become law. But its reintroduction earlier this year reveals a sincere desire on the part of the establishment to put a martial law detention infrastructure in place, especially now as the economy continues is danse macabre and the prospect of revolution grows within the United States.