Enya, 2018

Thank you for reading Collins (great author) and for using a momentous subject to reflect on.

My comments:

I think you read “surroundings” in a wrong way, in Collins.

What I read in Collins is that violence should be reduced to “objective” violence: physical violence that produces harm. That is why he claim that violence is so rare and short. Most of the time people are not involved in violence. Violence action, in percentage, will expend less that ¼ of one percent of human action – or less. I think he is right. If we decide to use his definition of “objective” violence.

The problem is to understand what is the surroundings when it comes to schools that are chosen as theatre for mass and arbitrary shootings for people with suicide instincts. You say, maybe there is some problems with social institutions that oppress people and do not let them any choice except revenge on anyone, before stopping the lives of the shooters. Most of the time the surroundings are frighten teachers and students. Are they violent or oppressive? In what way?

Lacking evidence on that, you follow Trump lead on video games. You have raisons to raise doubts about the reliance of this problem. Since it is used by the president to avoid facing the guns availability problem.

In my view, Collins understands that violence is due to individual violent action. He only classifies violent action when the action is accurate, produce harm. It is rare, he rightly writes. Many people in violent surroundings, as at war, fail to be violent. Some are accurate enough to be violent.

So, the problem become to know what is the difference between a war and a peaceful situation. Are schools at war? Are they violence spread surroundings? If so, tell me what is a peaceful surrounding. Prisons?

If you consider, as I would much appreciate, violence as a reduction to the body, you will understand that violence is everywhere where life is. Any form of life does expand and do contract. So, violence – in a scientific manner, for those social scientists that accept the game – is the contracting part of living.

Trauma or harm are not always consequences of violence. The reverse is true: trauma and harm and elderly reduce those who suffer to their bodies, to defend themselves from death or from illness or from other risks.

In this sense, schools are not enough anti-violence and education is not enough sensitive to violence to avoid big and spectacular physical and undeniable violence.

Schools, as any other institution, is very violent. To learn ask for a lot of efforts. Pupils and teachers reduce to their bodies frequently in many ways. Studying, stressing for exams, confronting each other, and so on. One of the biggest violence is to dissimulate violence as if it was not. As if schools were less hard than work. As if giving notes to pupils were an objective exercise and it did not involve a lot of sympathy and disgust about pupils versus teachers and vice versa.

Many students leave school in bad shape, since they feel it is their fault to be not able to produce better marks. They feel unworthy of sharing society with other people. So, they can develop hate society.

Another question that come to my mind is this: is there any problem with the idea of society diffused by social sciences that turn out to become favourable, instead of preventive, to violence at schools?

Looking forward to continuing this discussion with you further.