

CURRENT SUICIDAL SITUATIONS WITHIN THE ROMANIAN AREA

DUMITRU STAN¹

Abstract

This article has been focussed on presentation of an older sociological issue – committing suicide /killing oneself – within new interpretative contexts specific to current Romanian society. The argumentation is therefore developed towards attracting three sustainable conclusions: a. right to property over one's own body should not metamorphose into individual's right to kill himself; b) no matter how many logical arguments we might have for committing suicide as a normal fact, it will naturally remain a pathological social fact; c. social actions against suiciding cannot otherwise be but *ante factum*. Consequently, social actors should be informed and get awareness on suicidal risk factors within the environment they are living in. This last aspect shall occupy the most part of the pages of this article. The conclusion of the whole approach is that no matter how many justifications, excuses and mitigating circumstances we may find, the suicidal act cannot be otherwise but traumatising and condemnable to society.

Keywords: suiciding, right to property over one's own body, suicidal risk, socio-cultural normality, normal fact, pathological fact.

Résumé

L'article est axé sur la présentation d'un ancien problème sociologique – le suicide – dans des nouveaux contextes interprétatives, spécifiques pour la société roumaine actuelle. L'argumentation est décrite d'une telle manière pour attirer trois conclusions soutenables: a. Le droit de propriété sur le propre corps ne doit pas se métamorphoser dans le droit de l'individu au suicide; b. peu importe le nombre d'arguments logiques selon lesquelles le suicide pourrait être un fait normal, il reste d'une manière foncière un fait social pathologique; c. les actions sociales d'opposition contre le suicide ne peuvent être que *ante factum*. Par conséquent, les acteurs sociaux doivent être informés et sensibilisés en ce qui concerne la présence des facteurs de risque suicidaires de l'environnement dans lequel ils vivent. Ce dernier aspect occupe la majeure partie de l'article. La conclusion de cette démarche est que en dépit de tous les justifications, excuses, circonstances atténuantes on retrouvait, l'acte suicidaire ne peut être que traumatique et condamnable pour la société.

¹ Professor, habil PhD, Department of Sociology and Social Work, “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University of Iasi, Romania, E-mail: dtrustan@yahoo.com

Mots clés: suicide, droit de propriété sur le corps, risque suicidaire, normalité socioculturelle, fait normal, fait pathologique.

Rezumat

Articolul este axat pe prezentarea unei vechi probleme sociologice – sinuciderea - în contexte interpretative noi, specifice societății românești actuale. Argumentația este înfățișată în așa fel încât să atragă trei conchideri sustenabile: a. dreptul de proprietate asupra trupului propriu nu trebuie să se metamorfozeze în dreptul individului la sinucidere; b. oricâte de multe ar fi argumentele logice conform cărora sinuciderea ar fi un fapt normal, ea rămâne în mod funciar un fapt social patologic; c. acțiunile sociale de împotrivire față de sinucidere nu pot fi decât *ante factum*. Prin urmare, actorii sociali trebuie informați și conștientizați în legătură cu prezența factorilor de risc suicidar din mediul în care trăiesc. Acest ultim aspect ocupă și cea mai mare parte din paginile articolului. Concluzia întregului demers este că oricât de multe justificări, scuze ori circumstanțe atenuante i-am găsi, actul suicidar nu poate fi decât unul traumatizant și condamnabil pentru societate.

Cuvinte cheie: sinucidere, drept de proprietate asupra trupului, risc suicidar, normalitate socioculturală, fapt normal, fapt patologic.

1. Introduction

Suiciding – a worrying phenomenon to any society, has an even more alarming impact nowadays. Its recrudescence within the Romanian space would compel us to re-explain it and re-interpret it. This is how we would be able to understand how far the individual right over his own body should activate how the autolytic act can be considered normal or pathological and what it would be the contexts whose social functioning would turn into conjunctions of suicidal risk.

2. Modernity and the Right to Property over One's Own Body

Longitudinal psychological perspective on change compels us to admit that modernity has revolutionised science, technology, production, commercial relations, politic, etc. more than any other preceding eras together. Paradoxically, among fields having occasionally undergone through radical changes of modernity, the field of mentalities seems to come in the first place. We are surprised by this hierarchic placement since it is known that over the history, changes in spiritual culture have been slower than changes in material culture. This is how we can explain why today, under postmodernity conditions, one can rather encounter reminiscences of pre-modernity gnosis than uses of material goods, specific to those time periods (Stan 2016, pp 40-44). Spiritual experience seems to be less receptive to renewal than material experience. This aspect is easily seen as long as, in too many situations, we are disappointed or compelled to conclude that material improvement of society become almost useless if they are not doubled by adjustment reactions of the same size on the plane of mentalities.

For having destructured one ankylosed medieval order, infallible in its own way though, the new epoch, the modernity has compelled us to admit that elements depending on individual consciousness can be as consistent and authoritarian or even more powerful than those of material existence. Consequently, due to the new vision on the power of the spirit, people have begun to re-dimension their views on what it is allowed or forbidden to them, to re-assess boundaries between moral and justice, to resettle new foundations for the relationships between parents and children, between man and woman, between chief and subordinate, between the rich and the poor, between the old and the new, between secular and religious, between duty-related constraints and constraints given by personal choices, between material and spiritual determiners of life design, etc.

In the enormous sequence of reconsiderations having been operated by modernity, a new content has been registered: *the right to property*. Previously, this was only active for people with great powers in society, such as monarchs, high officials of the court and high-rank nobles. The new epoch has not only declared (economic) property to be „divine” but it has also expanded its legitimacy from material assets to *individual right to dispose of its own body*. With time, it has resulted in expressing this right in more picturesque forms: lend a body through prostitution, estrange body organs through selling, body modelling through aesthetic surgery body self-flagellation through asceticism and starvation, invoke the right to euthanasia, appeal to suicide/ autolysis, etc. In most of these situations, the individual demonstrates that “he is actually the owner of himself”, that he is able to dispose of himself, both as a body matter and spirit, that “he is free” to “fill” in his life as he wishes and that he can easily ignore both formal and informal interdictions.

The right to property over one’s own body can be regarded as any other right of economic property. This is transferable, according to modern view, and it would allow individual to operate though committing suicide and separate the body from the soul, since they are both technically his “ownership”. At the same time we should not omit the reality according to which both the body and the soul of the individual are not originally the results of his own merits. They could be possibly considered as personal constructions or acquisitions only after he has benefitted from physical parental conception and help of some socialising formative sources from family, school, church, and neighbourhood and so on. All these sources have invested economic and symbolic capitals in the individual and, as after any other investment, there are some expectations coming related to amortisation. The right to being becomes within this context a right conditioned by fulfilment of some natural duties to the “investors”. To claim the right to property over the body and to appeal to suicide by virtue of it represents an act of evasion, unbecomingness or at least of economic immorality. The individual practically refuses by autolysis to meet the goals for which he has been created, he declines his mission to give back the investors what he has received and therefore he generates a deficit or, even more than that, a crisis. According to

religious moral, unbecomingness of the suicider is even greater, he would choose not to praise life, respectively the priceless gift received from Divinity and he proceeds arrogantly, aggressively and discretionary while starting from the wrong premise that he is his own creator. If we would also consider the social impact having been triggered by the suicider (it would upset equilibrium of the family, disturb organisational chart where he has been included to, it would cause psychological shock to the people around him and it would attract stigmas on his community, etc.). then we could only reach the following conclusion: *it is unfair that an individual should make use for committing suicide of his (political) right to property over his own body regardless of the causes to justify his gesture.*

Unfortunately, at least in contemporary cases of suicide, as the moralist Gilles Lipovetsky would claim, social sanctions applied to suicidal have significantly diminished in compliance with the aforementioned right, “suicide has been mostly dissociated from the idea of guilt... the act of self-destruction would no longer arise the collective blame, self-conservation would no longer be seen as an absolute duty to himself... it would no longer mean resignation from a moral obligation, and it would give birth to questioning rather than to disapproval, to compassion rather than to banishment” (Lipovetsky, 1996, p. 100). Moreover, interpretations on autolytic acts have made so many concessions and have exaggerated so much on the culture of corporality that suiciders would sometimes acquire the image of genuine victims of their life multiple contexts. The dominant individualism in current societies would therefore require movement of responsibility from the person who has committed suicide to the persons around him, while the latter are found to be guilty of not having anticipated and hindering the gesture of self-destruction in time. What it would have once considered to be an act of cowardice or evasion from world for reasons of personal inability and non-fulfilment, nowadays it is not much to consider the suicider as a brave character, able to make radical decisions and put them into practice, some sort of a strange misunderstood hero

With such (post-moralist) interpretative view, there is far too little to argue to be able to surprisingly conclude that suicide would be legitimate, that euthanasia should become a rightful practice to all societies or that aggressions of the individual on his own body should not be condemned in any way if it is him who has selected and decided on it. Such conclusions on suicide would be obviously immoral since they would be speculative, it would encourage people who are not yet convinced by the appropriateness of the autolytic gesture to go further to the traumatising moment, it would deepen even more mistrust in social values, it would not even consider all types of suicide and all categories of causes or circumstances to result in suicidal effect.

3. Is Suicide a Normal Social Fact?

One famous definition of suicide has been developed by the French sociologist E. Durkheim in 1897 when he published the results of an ample research on this phenomenon: “the term of suicide is applied to all cases of death

resulting directly or indirectly from a positive or negative act of the victim himself which he knows will produce this result” (Durkheim, 1993, p.12). In another work, the same famous author would offer the first sociological methodology and the first prominent distinction between normal and pathological social facts. He would therefore state that „a social fact is normal when it occurs in the average society” (Durkheim, 2002, p.101); if not, that fact enters the pathological category. Nevertheless, after having complied with the rules of the Durkheim methodology, suicide can be typologically both a normal and a pathological fact. Here there are some examples to demonstrate the truthfulness of this affirmation: since there is no society where the suicidal act be entirely eradicated, one can assert that it is an irremovable normal social presence or an objective component of the social body, when variations of the suicidal number remain insignificantly from one period to another and therefore the “average of cases” remains approximatively at the same level to similar time units, the autolytic act cannot be otherwise labelled but normal, if methods and causes which induce the traumatising moment would fall in types already known and practiced and the social environment is not entirely surprised by the event occurrence, then suicide would leave the impression that it is a regular or normal fact.

Judging by analogy and having as a starting point the dichotomic separation between normal and pathological, we can pronounce a difficult to contradict conclusion: all cases of suicide which would not qualify for the registry of normality represent the sub-normality or social pathology. Yet, suicide by its nature and specific feature, would rather define the pathological area than behavioural normality. As an actual fact, even if man destructively acts on himself, he is predisposed to preserve himself as a specie and he benefits from instinctive forces for it. That is why the statistic weigh of people committing suicide within social environment is absolutely lower than autolytic opponents’ rate. Natural (instinctive) anti-suicidal foundation is highly consolidated by their being informed on the existence of several normative, institutional and socio-cultural constructions to fight against options favourable to autolytic act: bans on funerals for suicides (Council of Orleans, year 533), adoption of penalty of excommunication for suicides and people who would attempt to commit suicide (Council of Toledo, year 693), decreed that suicide is a triple perpetration (crime, high treason and heresy) in 1670, definition of suicide as a psychological disease and of the person having committed suicide as a mentally disabled person (S. Freud, in 1917), establishment of centres to prevent suicide (the first appeared in Los Angeles, in 1958), etc. (Cosman, 2008, p.12). To all these measures intended to inhibit those who would find themselves attracted by the perspective of committing suicide, we would of course add depreciative reflections on autolysis having been accomplished by great men of culture with profound ethical and pedagogical effects on many people: “suicide is a solution to one single man and a problem to others” (G. Cesbron); “when you take your own life you might want to exasperate the others” (D. Diderot); “the man who commits suicide has not yet

discovered that he is a human. He has not succeeded in intuiting his existence” (P. Țuțea); “suicide is not a heroism, it is a cowardice. True heroes would endure life such as it is. They would not desert it” (Tr. Demetrescu); “suicide is not abominable because God prohibits it” (Im. Kant); “to commit suicide means to declare oneself incapable to incorrigible” (N. Iorga); “suicide is the greatest of all cowardliness. Moreover, it is a treason” (I. Hasdeu), etc. (Bujor, 2010, pp. 368-369).

If to all these ideas we would add information according to which some 800.000 and 1.000.000 people would commit suicide very year and that suicide is the tenth cause to contribute to the death rate (Varnik, 2012, p. 760) and that world suicide attempts would sum up 20 million people, then we would come to define suicide as an extremely dangerous epidemic disease which threatens social health and current stability of mankind (Stan, 2015, p. 10).

Correlating all information we have dealt with so far, it is no doubt that suicide is condemnable from many points of view (medical, demographic, psychological, moral, social, religious, etc.) and that it represents a deed which deviates from the values of normality and only within special contexts it is equivalent to a discretionary right of people committing suicide. Regarded effectively as an act of abusive life taking, suicide could be simply defined as an assassination, with the mention that the assassin does not succeed to his victim since he is the victim himself. Yet Jean Amery, a very subtle analyst of the autolytic act, claims that “the action to raise hand against my own person with a view to death has, within the phenomenal space of the self, another meaning than assassinate does” (Amery, 2012, pp. 122-123). Following this argumentative connection, gestures of self-aggression should be less seen as forms of self-flagellation/ self-sanction and rather as forms to oppose the outer world. Hostility of the latter should be somehow annihilated and if under some other circumstances the individual would appeal to sabotage, negation disregard, doctor’s visit, law suit, additional work, irony against the state of discomfort, etc., this time the solution chosen is suicide.

Radicalism of the choice derives not only from attracted limit consequence, which is from supplication of his own life, but also from the pressures of the causes having determined such a choice. Evaluation of the suicide from such an optic has made sociologists to believe that “it is not the individual who freely applies his, own death to himself, but it is the society in all its problems to expose a human who has been however inappropriately endowed to commit suicide without any opposition” (Amery, 2012, pp. 123-124). Consequently, a proper understanding of suicide from a sociological angle, requires less the identification of the level of physical, psychic, social and cultural of the suiciders, but it requires more a delimitation of causal complexes to have induced commitment of such a fact.

4. Suicidal Risk Contexts within Current Romanian Area

To a first analysis, to know the causes which have resulted in manifestation of some undesirable phenomena does not mean a too attractive gain for a

connoisseur since he does not so obtain some means to diminish or eliminate it does not even obtain the guarantee that launching of interventions to suppress causes could be finalised by stopping the presence of unwanted consequences. Nevertheless in the case of a phenomenon of the gravity of the autolysis, when the individual commits the most personal act possible, at the end of which he separates himself from life, to know the social determiners represents an enormous advantage. We should not forget that we do not refer to a deviant phenomenon of some sort, or to blameable act which could be possibly corrected immediately after it has been produced, but to an irreversible and dramatic act. In other words, he cannot be restarted and the actor cannot be recovered.

If there is something important and of curing impact for the suicide to be really done, than this cannot be located otherwise but *ante factum*. As a consequence, persons involved in fighting against suicide and suicide attempts, - psychologists, psychiatrists, sociologists, pedagogues, priests, social workers a.s.o. - as well as concerned institutions empowered to take steps towards it (Hospital, Church, Police, School, etc.) should act preventively. For this it is required much information on suicide, especially on the causes and circumstances announcing it, its longitudinal tendencies, the peculiarities it gets depending on social status, health, religion, residence age and gender of the persons open to suicidal behaviours. According to the size of their cognitive capital, institutions and their specialists should try to counteract suicidal risk factors, should more effectively intervene in the most vulnerable „places” and implicitly diminish the suicide rates.

Based on scientific research and empirical findings, it is known that men would suicide more than women, old people appeal to suicide more than younger people, the suicide rate is higher in cities than in villages, to single people and to couples without children than to marry couples with children, higher to disadvantaged groups than to individuals belonging to elites, higher to warm season than to cold season, higher to those with deficiencies of social integration than to those profoundly and correctly socialised, etc. All situations to create higher index of suicidal finality can be firstly defined as suicidal risk factors and afterwards assumed as determining generic sources. At the same time, we should admit that in the case of social determiners of suicide would also intervene *peculiarities which depend strictly on current characteristics of the manifestations of the social body*. Here there are hereinafter some peculiarities having been drawn from the specific functionality of the current Romanian society.

a. *Anomic inversion of distribution of the material force between men and women*. Traditionally this force represents the sum of elements having been mobilised by man to produce material goods for his living. Both on the level of the family and the society, men were those who owned the material force in time. On their economic performances would depend the quality of life of their children and women. At present many men are unemployed, they are kept by women, they are less preferred by some sectors of the labour market, they bring less assets and income to the domestic area than their wives. Because they have

been mentally pre-programmed by the entire history of the gender to own precedence, that is to have a deciding position in using material force for family functioning, some men would not accept to lose in their relation of power with women and they would appeal to suicide. This could explain why for the last two decades men commit suicide four times more than women do. As for statue of the females, they are aware both of their ascend in owing material force and the social recognition of this ascend. Consequently even if women have come to have major material contributions to family group support, the most of decision-making and control roles, both on the level of this group and on the level of the society are still owned by men. This discrepancy in validation of merits justifies the increase of numbers of suicide attempts by women as a form of warning on unequitable socially practiced androcracy.

b. *Exaggerated distance between the amplexness of purposes and value of means of the individuals.* After the political events which took place in Romania in 1989, many barriers were lost which used to hinder Romanians to accomplish horizontal or vertical social and cultural assets. Under the new circumstances, the registry of individual aspirations would often acquire exalted contents being suspected by lack of realism and sometimes materialised in (non-specific) facts of social capillarity and other times in painful failures having been provoked by despair, anxiety and depression. Many persons misunderstood the nature and purpose of foreign socio-cultural relations, intentions of foreign partners, capitalism traps, types of capitals necessary to their entrepreneurial success, insufficiency of the means of action given that all formulated purposes are totally justified. Against the background of the non-concordance between desire and possibility, that is of the significant difference between the height of purposes and the height of means, behavioural disequilibriums have been triggered including under the form of suicide. Surprisingly autolytic gestures have increased and not only to poor social categories but also to individuals within higher social layers of the hierarchy but who have come so social and economic bankruptcy, or to children and young people who have been cultivated by the idea of social alpinism without they were also given concerned material, explanatory and moral support to it. Only started from these realities we can correctly explain to ourselves continuous increase of suicide rates to Romanian young people since they are the consumerism, new technologies and Western values based generation and yet without being consistently supported from a material point of view.

c. *Crisis of values and diminish of mechanic solidarity.* Suicide rate has increased since 1990 onwards, even if many positive spectacular events have happened in between. At the same time, cases of domestic violence, divorce, school abandon, individualism, tax evasion, abuse on children, people trafficking, discrimination, economic impasse have increased. Et the same time, family is about to lose its quality as a bastion of affectivity and solidarity, while working no longer represents the way to success and the size of the educational capital no

longer assures the entrance to the elite area, non-observance of the laws has become a regular practice, and the pecuniary emulation or ostentatious consumption have become extremely attractive motivations to many categories of individuals. All these crisis situations and especially the decay of the functioning of the family community (implicitly a decrease of automatic mutual assistance, affectivity, integration and security among consanguinity) represent alarming determiners of the current increase of the number of suiciders. The higher the number of mutual elements to be the basis of the group functioning, the more powerful the community spirit is, and the more integrated the individuals feel to be. They will try to complete facts which will not provide a personal benefit in as much but rather a collective one. The most important gain deriving from this state of facts is nevertheless the comfort of never being alone or of automatically be connected and responsible to the problems of the entire group of similarity. Unfortunately, mechanic solidarity continuously attenuates and instead of the reactive mechanic binder, organic, rational and interest-oriented solidarity develops and the individual is exposed to some risks of pathological vulnerability. When the passage from mechanic to organic solidarity occurs abruptly as an effect of unexpected crisis situations without giving a minimum of rational explanations, individuals who have never lived such an experience are in a suicidal risk.

d. *Progressive secularisation of the society and intellectualisation of the religious messages.* More and more voices would claim total purification of the religion from its secular structures and transform it into a parallel instance of a strictly personal option. This request reflects a processual tendency of secularization, which means to abstract divinity from its current social functioning as if its presence would be no longer required. About secularization it is known that it has been very aggressively during the communist regime and that it is continued nowadays by society elite segments. The latter aspire in the last instance to surpass religious modality to assess human acts as being or not being „sins” and to use to this purpose some scientific criteria and procedures. Concomitantly to it there has been an increase of the holders of higher education degrees and high cultural capitals and theological discourse has been adapted itself to their scienced claims. Moreover, the representatives of the religious denominations would quite often appeal to arguments offered by sciences both to cope with positivist needs of the individuals and to prove that a compatibility between the secular and the religious discourse is possible. On the whole, separation of the institution of the church and the institution of the state means a diminish of the importance of the formal religious education, a more reduced contribution of religion to the accomplishment of socialization, a lower involvement of the church representatives to conflict resolution, a dilution of the moral weigh in the adjustment of the individual relationships, favouring of building up an accentuated religious pluralism and arriving inclusively to exotic variants of customized religious “bricolage”, etc. Through secularization society would gradually lose a peerless social binder, religion, and exposes itself to many

threats against which individual reactions are too little effective. As a consequence to it, a supporter of secularization would have to no entirely give up his religious faith. In other words, he would accept a pragmatic duplicity, which it would actually become vulnerable both in relation to religion and his consciousness. While noticing this deadlock, the religious officials, enhance their interpretative subtleties in such a way that their messages would require high intellectual qualities to be understood. Concomitantly with this refinement of communication, parables with much paremiological substance. Religious beneficiaries who would remain captive to highly intellectualized message come sometimes to depressive pathological states and they are more exposed to suicidal act as compared to persons who would like simple messages or correlate the contents of the two types of communication. It is regrettable but increased secularization, inadequate communication and abundance of speculations (even if theological) on religious acts, correlated to other diseases of the social body seem to estrange population more and more from religion, to nourish helplessness and mistrust of the individuals and to contribute the increase of suicidal tendencies.

e. Family dissolution while parents leave abroad for work and semi-abandon of their children. Sociological research has proved that family cohesion has suffered the most from spouses/ parents' migration or seasonal departure to another country to compensate the lack of material income. Situations of infidelity, adultery, domestic violence triggered by jealousy, divorce, lying, separation of spouses, family abandon, children neglect, juvenile crime, school failure of the children not surveyed by their parents, triggering of some very tough conflicts between the families of origin of the separated or divorced couples, etc. have multiplied very much just because of these departures. From the registry of these pathological manifestations, suicides do not lack: children who have committed the fact of suicide because they considered themselves to be totally or semi-abandoned by their parents who had left abroad, suicidal children who have come to the conclusion that they are not aa part of their parents' plans and projects, children who have resorted to theatre-like suicide to determine their parents to come back to the country, suicidal spouse in the country for having been left by the conjugal party abroad, spouses having been back from abroad kill their unfaithful marital party in the country and then kill themselves, etc. Essentially the suicidal risk is very high when it is found a significant difference between what individuals intended before leaving and what they have obtained given that they have created all necessary premises and achieved all required investment to reach success. For example, departure abroad of one or both parents have been made with unanimous agreement of all those involve and the purposes of departure have been assumed by parents, their children and extended family etc., yet the result obtained has been disappointing: loneliness, disease, cultural, divorce, loss of financial resources, loss of affection of the family members, etc. Those who are not able to manage these critical situations and cannot diminish the gap between purpose and result would slip into deviance area. Reality has proven that not a few times they have chosen the way to suicide.

Furthermore, suiciders motivated by such causes would appreciate that act they have committed to be a rational one in relation to one or several values they are not willing to make any concession.

f. *Numerous and compassionate accounts in the press.* In their search for sensational, news media make of the suicide cases some sources to increase their rating and implicitly their financial reward. Presentation of the suiciders is usually biased, spectacular, and it generates compassion, it exonerates culpa from its concrete facts and accuses circumstances and persons who have pushed him towards the traumatizing gesture. Out of the press, many of those being in the psychiatric stage of suicide have learnt about the most effective ways to commit suicide, the time to appeal to the autolytic gesture, how the moment should be glorified and how to maximize the negative effect on those who have caused the fact, etc. Some sources of the press come to exercise such a pressure on them that it would effectively determine the individuals who are little fortified for the surprises of the life to adopt the way to suicide; they are speculated incriminated episodes or happenings of their personal life, and this are presented to the general public as proofs of an immense scandal and therefore their image is highly compromised. Since they cannot protect themselves and rapidly find their equilibrium, individuals are not able to bear the fact of having brought such a big prejudice to the family group, they would not accept the social sanction especially when it is not sustained, they would strike out and appeal to autolysis. Nevertheless, the suicidal risk should normally decrease and by no means to increase after the individuals have received information from the press. As long as suicide is condemned from socio-cultural, religious and moral point of view, and the press correctly presents this tendencies of attitude, it can be considered a great force of anti-suicidal education. If not, the same press should be critically considered and treated as any other source of suicidal risk.

g. *Rapid and radical change of the framework to evaluate socio-cultural normality.* Any group space with its own identity is, due to the number of individuals it comprises and mobilizes to relate, a social environment. Since it has specific (action-related, cognitive, value-related, etc.) characteristics which it reproduces for a large period of time, this space can be defined as a cultural sphere. From the association of these two dimensions we would obtain, on the one hand, delimitation of the types of social spaces (community, people, social class, caste, social protection floor, nation, club, etc.) and, on the other hand, identification of cultural contents related to these spaces. Moreover we would discover as natural as it could be the existence of some reality of synthesis, of a functional totality which we name it as a *socio-cultural space*. Society is an immense enclosure of socio-cultures and each and every of it has its own formula for structuring, destructuring and restructuring. No matter how great influences and transfers between socio-cultures would be, they have the tendency to reproduce their elements of specificity. Practically they preserve their identity as long as they keep their inner scheme of life unaltered significantly. Components

of this scheme (relations, institutions, processes, attitudes, behaviours, etc.) are collective habitudes or natural modes of being. Between certain limits they cannot threaten the comfortability of existence and neither can they claim functional repositioning since they represent socio-cultural normality. Even deviant phenomena are evaluated to belong to normality, if they do not overpass a socially accepted intensity and density threshold. When criteria to establish this threshold would be modified too often and tend to get accustomed to contingent subjective pressures, the individual as an actor of the socio-culture does no longer benefit from the framework which would orientate him towards normality. As a result, he will not know how to properly select contents of the scheme of life. It is not excluded that he should substitute contents of the collective scheme of life to principles and references of the personal scheme, and should not be able to adjust himself to radical changes allowed by the society and not to keep the rhythm it has imposed. Under these anomic circumstances, especially in the case of non-anomic individuals willing to achieve socio-cultural integration but rejected for not having complied with normality framework, a state of profound shock is being installed. If it does not intervene as many collateral elements as possible shortly after it to re-equilibrate it, this state turns into a suicidal risk.

We have made an inventory and synthesis of several current situations within the Romanian area which could be consider to favour production of the phenomenon of suicidal risk. They could be also named as causes generating suicide but the designation would not be exactly correct since each and every type of risk corresponds not only a single cause but a complex of causes. Surely there are many other relevant situations on this theme which worth being analysed: fracture of the social corpus through amplification of the distance between its structure, artificial construction of conditions of social segregation, insufficiency of possibilities of pulse discharge through diminish of relation capacities, excess of social control under pandemic conditions, isolation and loneliness from a sociological perspective, etc. From all these, the following fundamental conclusion would be drawn: the fact of suicide is no longer nowadays a sporadic gesture, and the knowledge of its circumstances becomes a condition of the *ante factum* management approach on its proliferation. Therefore, all individuals in the proximity of suicidal risk factors should be repeated the idea that not even the reasons originated by the most profound unselfishness do not justify appeal to suicide. No matter how many mitigating circumstances we might find it and no matter how little it would affect us, the act of suicide is condemnable because, as Tomas Aquinas would state, it represents a triple violation: of the „natural law according to which everything is being kept naturally in life; of the moral law, since it is an insult to the community where the one who kills himself come from; of the divine law who would subject man to the power of God and who leaves God the right to take his life (Bloch & Chodoff, 2000, p. 264).

References

Amery, J. (2012). *Despre sinucidere. Discurs asupra morții liber alese*. Editura Art.

- Bloch, S., Chodoff, P. (2000). *Etică psihiatrică*. Editura Asociația psihiatrilor liberi din România.
- Bujor, A. (2010). *Maxime și cugetări. Gânduri care vrăjesc*. Vol. I. Editura Epigraf.
- Cosman, D. (2008). *Compendiu de suicidologie*. Editura Casa Cărții de Știință.
- Durkheim, E. (1993). *Despre sinucidere*. Editura Institutul European.
- Durkheim, E. (2002). *Regulile metodei sociologice*. Editura Polirom.
- Lipovetsky, G. (1996). *Amurgul datoriei*. Editura Babel.
- Stan, D. (2016). Cauze prevalente în producerea actuală a actului suicidal. In Țirdea, T. (Ed.). *Strategia supraviețuirii din perspectiva bioeticii, filosofiei și medicinei. Culegere de articole științifice cu participare internațională*. Editura CEP Medicina.
- Stan, D. (2015). *Maladii ale socialului. Teorii explicative, cercetări și remedii posibile*. Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași.
- Varnik, P. (2012). Suicide in the world. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 9(3), 760-77. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph9030760>