1: ideology

1. There is a contradiction between the way you treat Salvini (the single politician you mention) and what he represents and then others (politicians and what they may represent. Is not it an ideological bias from you, in this analysis? Where is the right and the wrong doing?
2. To you, it seems, Salvini is the cause of special problems that do not existed without him. What are these problems?

2: The downsizing of number of inmates in the US is a fact:

1. How and why is it relevant for any change in the prison functioning both inside and outside prisons?
2. Can we compare European 100 with US 600/inmate per 100 thousand rate?

3: shouldn´t we discuss what is prison subject of study?

1. Is it prison an walls limited institution?
2. Is it prison institution working alone from penal system?
3. Is it prison institution working alone from social control system?
4. Is it prison institution working alone from social support system?
5. Is it prison institution working alone from educational system?
6. Is it possible to study prisons and not to mention alternatives to imprisonment, deportation (repatriation), immigrant control, alleged lack of solidarity from EU regarding the countries with borders to the global south?

4: human rights institutional actions impact

1. Does it worth the all process of the ECHR imposing Italian government measures to comply with European legal minimum standards?
2. What were the consequences in hope and frustration on the Italian prison´s human rights activists, such as Mauro Palma?

Adds:

1. Important and clear review of thesis over prison status in western civilization, in the last decades.
2. Open prison analysis to political process and judicial practices.
3. Mention the existence of alternatives to prison (not focused enough in theory).
4. Note that preventive legal action regards scientific or technological achievements (and environmental risks) turns used to face immigrants’ activities and to deal with people as assets.
5. No proportions of deterrent functions of criminal penalties (out of criminal justice doctrine)
6. Incapacitation tool against those more precarious members of society (violation of fairness principle)
7. Repatriation as a renewal of 19th century deportation penalty on the reverse sense
8. Separation of legal analysis from procedural analysis (legal decision making and police-courts dynamics – rights of defence)
9. The use of lack of social integration (or ability to show family and friends) to impose imprisonment when alternatives could be available, with all the social-criminal consequences of incarceration. Plus deportation as alternative to imprisonment, which makes prison a necessary step to some of those who manage to stay in Italy/EU.
10. Exacerbation of feelings of suspicion is a very insightful comment on type situation by political speech of rage and contempt (p. 7)
11. Political critique of criminal justice (substituted by border control, deportation, refoulement of ships) as joining penal populism in political arena in lowing levels of violent crimes
12. Since the 90´s nationalism on crime politics become evident in prisons´ population p.11
13. The history of Torregiani case consequences: it seems to have had an effect in non-nationals imprisonment for 7 years and business as usual in the last 3 years (administrative dynamic resistance to human rights judicial politics) p.12
14. Alternatives to imprisonment used to manage political pressure to downsize number of inmates p.12
15. Two penitentiary regimes according to nationality

Problems:

1. Do not consider social control as a state function – that is why only by chance one gets any explanation about why more punitive politics develop a smaller number of prisoners
2. Do not consider EU responsibilities in border control under Schengen.
3. Reducing the analysis to a country, political conjuncture becomes over stated, over explaining the structural move for harsher punitive laws (in real world come behind what is being done in repressive institutions). See conclusion ambiguity p-16.
4. In this analysis, the angelical analyses of the western world (less racist propaganda? Less punishment? Less social control? More respect to the law?) confronts a more realistic recognition of reality in Italy, suggesting victimization of Italian people.
5. Preventive turn is “legal”? Or is it the process of jeopardizing liberal (individual) rule of law by communitarian and nationalist privileged hierarchization (the enemy criminal law)?
6. The explanation of the spontaneous fear of the unknown hides the very conscious policy to build walls (inside and outside national and EU borders) to avoid the accomplishment of the free circulation of people promised by neoliberal ideology, as part of the system of free circulation of finance, assets and goods.
7. Pg 4: terrorism and cybercrime THUS? Preventive approaches? AND law creates the illegality – INSTEAD OF USING A LESS RADICAL ARGUMENT, SUCH AS SEPARATING THINGS (AND CORPORATIONS) FROM PEOPLE AS OBJECTS OF CRIMINAL LAW – ARE IMMIGRANTS SLAVES?
8. Pg 7: is it true that “populism” built a mass media rhetoric or is it the reverse? Did human rights activist freedom of speech been protected by non-populist politicians? Do human rights´ freedom of speech being protected by non-populist parties?
9. Before and after Salvini, racism had no opportunity to express it self at police level and school level?
10. What means one of Torregiani consequence was to “reduce pressure on prison system”? p.12 is it better or is it worse? Why is it better? What kind of pressure are we talking about? Impunity of less obligation to produce harm?
11. Political dangerousness of statements against penal populism immediately denied by reality: 5-star politics (show off) against institutional everyday life on punitive institutions p. 16

Opportunities

1. The limits of deportation are an interesting study case to compare political will and economic interest