Collaborative science and the conception of violence

Emotional ground, allow, sharpen or diminish knowledge. What is evident mixes with secrets, through social relations of domination and victimization that cross the whole of society, although each social group and each person lives all this in their own way. Knowledge is embodied in people and pass / transform *in vivo*, with the help of information technologies. What collaborative science, what modes of collaboration (what methods), will be most effective for the study of the social sciences? The answer is to create mutual trust between those interested in developing knowledge, creating viable study objects (the human species) and penetrating as much in depth possible (the reversion of personal dissociation) into social life (as a particle accelerator can help penetrate the secrets of atoms).

Does the State really serve to protect people's lives? You ask me. (The first question I just dismiss because you did make a process of intention – you put in my mouth and mind something I think I did not think: it was easier to deny. It creates my defensive mood).  
A question like this can be done in an offensive way, denouncing a fundamental problem that is not stated but presupposed. It can also be done in a collaborative way: pointing to an opportunity to deepen and to complicate the analysis.  
The answer depends on the author's interpretation of the situation. This is come imbedded in the understanding of the question and the formulation of the answer.   
Being someone other than the author to present and defend the article and position can help collaborative science. Since the question comes as a challenge to the best representation of another person, the author. The self-respect changes strategic position: from the front it goes behind the discussion. The author should be given the opportunity to comment at the end or even after some time that can help reflexivity.   
In the case of your second question, my answer rather than just the discussion of the legality of the formulation of the functions of the state could have gone further and mentioned the ambiguity of existence between the upper triangle (shamed competition between the elites and their workers / slaves / collaborators / bodies administrative bodies / security corps) and the lower triangle (self-repressed fear of non-survival felt by all, as those living in peace can imagine to be the case of people living a state of war) I have mentioned in my presentation.  
A state of peace, like the one we live in, presumes the coexistence of good and bad collaborative awareness with the status quo; the state of peace means that the good-naive conscious prevails. A state of war presumes the coexistence of fear and hope in humanity. Bad conscious is much more present, then. That is why one can impose a state of peace imbedded in a state of war (Pax Romana or class struggle) with the active collaboration of the victims (who in the long run are also the ruling classes, as predicted - well – by the dialectics of history of Karl Marx): they prefer to think that they live in peace, even when war is undeniable. Because thoughts have practical effects on people's lives and their bodies, immediately, and war is just a violent environment.

Of course, it goes with dubious feelings and representations of what is society and what is the nature of human kind (tough Hobbes/Machiavel vs naïve Kant/Rousseau). Representations and communications are mutually dependent on states of mind, and therefore knowledge is constantly updated to exist. That is why it evolves, since it is created and imitated, transforming itself into something else, similar or opposite, until a maximum of use and popularity is found, always in danger of disappearing at any moment.  
The definition and understanding of what is a state of war, an environment of collaborative dialogue, the functions of the state, depend on and co-vary with the state of mind. With sufficient distance (in space-time, taking the singular experience of the human species as the object of study) and a strong intimacy with everyday life (and with social secrets, e.g. the conscious and explicit experience of repressions present in the social contexts studied), however, one can produce cumulative knowledge about the social with the same kind of stability as the knowledge currently produced for so-called natural objects.