e-ISSN **3041-248X**

Philosophy and Governance

https://www.eu-scientists.com/index.php/fag

Suicide: A Socio-Philosophical Dimension

Oleksandr Taradai [1]*

[1] *Dragomanov Ukrainian State University (Ukraine). PhD Student at the Department of Social Philosophy, Philosophy of Education and Educational Policy.*

* ***Corresponding Author,*** e-mail: o.l.taradai@npu.edu.ua

ARTICLE INFO

Research Article

DOI: 10.70651/3041-248X/2025.10.05

ABSTRACT

The article offers a socio-philosophical perspective on suicide, viewing it not merely as a personal tragedy but as a complex social phenomenon in which an individual's decision is inseparably intertwined with the deep social determinants that shape it. The theoretical foundation is grounded in Émile Durkheim's classical concept, whose pioneering approach defined suicide as a social fact and made it possible to examine its direct dependence on key parameters of social life – the level of social integration and regulation. A reinterpretation of these ideas in the twenty-first century shows that, despite the advancement of technology, mental health systems, and social institutions, suicide continues to serve as a marker of profound structural disruptions in social order, moral interaction, and the sense of belonging. The relevance of the issue increases amid the multiple crises of modernity – war, pandemics, economic vulnerability, loss of institutional trust, information overload, and the erosion of traditional norms. In such conditions, the individual often finds themselves at the intersection of high social expectations and a lack of resources to meet them, leading to inner exhaustion, frustration, and a feeling of social redundancy. Special attention is given to the study of suicide as a phenomenon shaped by complex social processes that create radically new circumstances for the individual. It involves a rethinking of human suffering, the limits of endurance, and the moral boundaries of social support and responsibility. The analysis shows that although the specific factors influencing suicide vary across historical periods, their roots remain invariably social. Combining classical theoretical approaches with contemporary research reveals new risk factors associated with changes in community structures, communication patterns, and the emergence of fundamentally new environments capable of both integrating and radically isolating the individual. Attention is also paid to suicide prevention, which demonstrates that effective measures are possible only through the strengthening of solidarity, increased access to psychosocial support, and the formation of cultural narratives that counteract the normalization of self-destruction. The scientific novelty of the research lies in its socio-philosophical interpretation of suicide as an indicator of transformations in the structure of collective existence, shedding light on the limits of social unity and testing the resilience of moral order. The practical significance of the study lies in its potential application for developing humanistic strategies to support individuals in crisis states and for strengthening society's collective responsibility for the life of every person.

KEYWORDS

suicide, social integration, social regulation, anomic states, suicide prevention, social solidarity, morality, social order, social realism, moral integration, digital risks.

e-ISSN **3041-248X**

Філософія та управління

https://www.eu-scientists.com/index.php/fag

Самогубство: соціально-філософський вимір

Олександр Л. Тарадай [1]*

[1] *Український державний університет імені Михайла Драгоманова (Україна). Аспірант кафедри соціальної філософії, філософії освіти та освітньої політики.*

* ***Автор-кореспондент,*** e-mail: o.l.taradai@npu.edu.ua

СТАТТЯ

Дослідницька

DOI: 10.70651/3041-248X/2025.10.05

АНОТАЦІЯ

Стаття пропонує соціально-філософський погляд на самогубство, розглядаючи його не просто як особисту трагедію, а як складний суспільний феномен, де особисте рішення людини нерозривно переплітається з глибинними соціальними детермінантами які визначили його. Вихідною теоретичною основою слугує класична концепція Еміля Дюркгайма. Саме його новаторський підхід, що визначив самогубство як соціальний факт, дозволяє нам дослідити його пряму залежність від ключових параметрів суспільного життя – рівня соціальної інтеграції та соціальної регуляції. Переосмислення цих ідей у XXI столітті демонструє: попри розвиток технологій, систем охорони психічного здоров'я та соціальних інститутів, самогубство й надалі постає маркером глибших структурних порушень у соціальному порядку, моральній взаємодії та відчутті життєвої належності. Актуальність проблеми зростає в умовах множинних криз сучасності – соціальних катаклізмів, пандемічних потрясінь, економічної вразливості, втрати довіри до інституцій, інформаційного перенавантаження та розмивання традиційних норм. У таких умовах індивід часто опиняється в точці зіткнення між високими соціальними очікуваннями і браком ресурсів для їх досягнення, що формує внутрішню виснаженість, фрустрацію та відчуття соціальної зайвості. Особливого значення набуває дослідження самогубства , складні соціальні процеси явища створюють радикально нові обставини для індивіда Відбувається осмислення його страждань, втрати його людської витривалості, а також постає питання про моральні рамки суспільної підтримки і відповідальності. Показано, що в різні історичні періоди на індивіда тиснуть різні чинники самогубств , але їхнє коріння незмінно залишається соціальним. Поєднання класичних теоретичних підходів із сучасними дослідженнями дозволяє виявити нові ризик-фактори, пов'язані зі змінами у структурі спільнот, характером комунікації, поширенням принципово нових середовищ, що здатні одночасно інтегрувати і радикально ізолювати особу. Увага приділена запобіганню самогубствам, які демонструють, що ефективна профілактика можлива лише за умов зміцнення солідарності, підвищення доступності психосоціальної допомоги та формування культурних наративів, які протистоять нормалізації самознищення. Наукова новизна полягає в соціально-філософському трактуванні самогубства як індикатора змін у структурі колективного буття, що висвітлює межі соціальної єдності й випробовує стійкість морального порядку. Практична цінність дослідження визначається можливістю використання його результатів у формуванні гуманістичних стратегій підтримки індивідів у кризових станах та посиленні суспільної відповідальності за життя кожної людини.

КЛЮЧОВІ СЛОВА

самогубство, соціальна інтеграція, соціальна регуляція, аномічні стани, профілактика самогубств, суспільна солідарність, мораль, соціальний порядок, соціальний реалізм, моральна інтеграція, цифрові ризики.

1. Introduction

The problem of suicide in the modern world is becoming acute again. At the intersection of the destruction of established norms, the blurring of value guidelines and the loss of social ties, suicide appears not only as an individual tragedy, but as a symptom of deep social transformations. It was this social nature of suicide that Emile Durkheim first systematically outlined, emphasizing: suicide is a "social fact" rooted in the relationship between the individual and society. In the twenty-first century, his ideas not only remain relevant but also need to be rethought in the context of global crises, information revolutions, and new forms of social vulnerability.

Durkheim's logic of integration and regulation allows us to see suicide as an indicator of a lack of supportive ties or excessive pressure of the social order. Modern researchers confirm: where a person experiences the loss of the meaning of community, the feeling of loneliness and uncontrollability of life circumstances increases, and the risks of suicidality increase rapidly [4]. Changes in the global economy, in particular the growth of inequality, are creating an environment of psychological burnout and distrust of social institutions. As a result, the individual is increasingly faced with crises that were previously divided collectively. The events of recent years – the COVID-19 pandemic, wars, including information wars – have complicated the already tense living conditions. Researchers record a paradox: formal interconnectedness in social networks does not guarantee real integration; on the contrary, it can increase stigmatization, comparison, and social exclusion [15]. Durkheim's analysis takes on a new meaning here: digital communities often do not support, but push the individual into a space of self-blame and social silence.

At the same time, modern international science demonstrates another dimension of the problem: suicide can be analyzed as a challenge to rethink the moral responsibility of society. Prevention strategies that emphasize the importance of solidarity, availability of support, and the formation of pro-life cultures demonstrate the possibility of change, from isolation to inclusion. Durkheim appears here not only as a diagnostician but as a thinker of social restoration.

Thus, turning to the socio-philosophical analysis of suicide actualizes the key question: what does it mean to "be connected" with society today? How is the normative order constructed that allows a person to survive and hope? And can modern civilization provide a balance of integration and individual autonomy? These questions include not only an explanation of the nature of suicide, but also directions for overcoming it. This is what determines the relevance of further philosophical analysis of the phenomenon of this complex social phenomenon in the conditions of the XXI century. The paper reconceptualizes the Durkheim model of integration and regulation in the context of global and digital crises of the XXI century.

2. Literature Review

The publication of Le Suicide (1897) [5] by E. Durkheim became not only the basis of a sociological approach to the study of suicide, but also a methodological breakthrough that turned an individual act of self-destruction into a social fact. His concept of anomie – as a state of disintegration of the normative system that weakens social integration – determined the trajectory of further research in the XX and XXI centuries. Halbwachs [9], Gibbs and Martin [7], to the microsocial and psychosocial models of Silva et al. [17] and Ozbilgin et al. [14], reflecting a new wave of rethinking his teachings. The first analytical attempts to continue the Durkheim line were made by M. Halbwachs in the work Les causes du suicide [9]. He developed the idea of the influence of social structures, specifically family and religious, arguing that suicide is due to the degree of integration of the individual into collective life. Halbwachs believed that even in a secularized society, the mechanisms of group affiliation remain decisive. In the 1950s and 1960s, sociological research attempted to quantify Durkheim's hypotheses. The work of Henry and Short [10] opened a new direction – the statistical interpretation of the relationship between economic stress, crime and suicide. A similar empirical line was continued by Gibbs and Martin [7], who, for the first time, put forward the concept of "integration status" as a social variable that directly correlates with the suicide rate. Sainsbury's study [19] was one of the first attempts to combine the Durkheim approach with urban sociology. The author found that the spatial distribution of suicides in London has a clear social geography – areas with low levels of social cohesion show an increased incidence of suicides. Later, this approach was deepened by Beckler [2], who drew attention to individual motivational types – "escapist" and "aggressive" suicides, seeing them as modernized forms of anomie.

At the end of the XX century, there were attempts to update the Durkheim model through social networks. Pescosolido and Georgianna [15] in Durkheim, Suicide, and Religion: Toward a Network Theory of Suicide interpreted integration not as an abstract social cohesion but as a real network of connections that determines the degree of support and inclusion. In this context, Bearman's work [3] was a turning point: he discovered that social ties not only prevent suicide, but can also contribute to it in conditions of structural tension – when excessive normativity gives rise to a "fanatical" form of integration, close to Durkheim's concept of "fatalistic suicide". The COVID-19 pandemic was the catalyst for a return to Durkheim's concept of anomie. Articles by Gunnell et al. [8] and Pirkis et al. [16]. The Lancet Psychiatry analyzes the dynamics of suicide in 21 countries, finding that social exclusion, loss of economic stability, and the destruction of social norms create "anomic zones" on a global scale. The authors emphasize that modern anomie is taking on a digital form – through the virtualization of social connections and the loss of "bodily presence" as a component of integration. As in classical environmental studies, the studies of Jacobsen et al. [11] in Social Science & Medicine demonstrate that the social context of neighborhoods—the levels of trust and participation in community initiatives – significantly influences suicide rates. In continuation of this line, Motillon-Toudic et al. [13] European Psychiatry summarized the literature on social isolation, concluding that suicide remains the result not only of individual depression but also of the destruction of social relationships – that is, structural anomie in Durkheim's sense. In 2024, Ozbilgin et al. [14] published a study in the journal Frontiers in Sociology Institutional Suicide as Anomie, where they made a direct return to the Durkheim concept of "institutional irresponsibility". They examined the suicide notes of employees who committed suicide due to work stress, showing that the lack of integration and indifference of institutions forms a new form of anomie – "professional and organizational". This is one of the most striking modern empirical confirmations of Durkheim's relevance. The modern psychosociological school, represented by the studies of Silva et al. [17] rethinks Durkheim's indicators of social integration through the individual sense of "belonging" and "burdensomeness". Although these concepts originate from the interpersonal theory of suicide (Joiner), they echo Durkheim's ideas about altruistic and selfish suicide. Thus, in the XXI century, there is a "micro-durkheimization" of psychological theories – the return of the social dimension to clinical psychology. An article by Arango et al. [1] in the Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry examines the association between social connectedness and suicide risk among adolescents. The authors prove that the level of integration into family and school networks directly reduces suicidal tendencies, which empirically confirms Durkheim's key thesis – "integration saves." Thus, his theory remains valid even in the context of contemporary psychosocial risks. If in the XX century Durkheim's doctrine was understood mainly through macrosocial structures (state, church, community), then in the XXI century the emphasis shifted to microsocial and emotional-relational aspects – a sense of connection, solidarity, trust. The classic works of Durkheim's successors in the 20th century demonstrated the importance of social order, while modern ones emphasize the deficit of social reciprocity in the face of institutional fragmentation.

In this sense, Durkheim's anomie is transformed into "anemia of sociality": not only the rupture of norms, but also the loss of emotional connection between people becomes a risk factor. Psychological theories reveal only manifestations, while Durkheim's sociological logic explains the very structure of the environment that generates these manifestations.

Modern studies by Ozbilgin et al. [14] for the first time singled out the phenomenon of "institutional suicide" as a collective result of organizational indifference. This is a return to Durkheim's idea of social responsibility, adapted to the corporate culture of the XXI century. The works of Silva [17] and Arango et al. [1] prove that interpersonal feelings are a modern analogue of Durkheim integration. Scientific novelty lies in the merging of psychological and sociological dimensions into a single analytical model. Durkheim considered anomie a product of social transformations; today, Gunnell et al. [8] and Pirkis et al. [16] have shown that it has taken on a global scale as a result of economic crises, pandemics, and digital deprivation. This means the transition from "local" to "planetary" anomie. Despite the variety of methods (ethnography, statistics, neuropsychological surveys), all modern authors – from Motillon-Toudic et al. [13] to Jacobsen et al. [11]— rely on Durkheim's definition of suicide as a social fact. This confirms the continuity of the tradition for more than a century. The analysis of these sources demonstrates that the teachings of Emile Durkheim continue to determine the understanding of the phenomenon of suicide, from social statistics to modern psychosociology. If in the XX century attention was focused on structural integration, then in the XXI century the main issue is the subjective feeling of inclusion in society (Table 1).

Table 1. Evolution of research on the phenomenon of suicide based on the teachings of Émile Durkheim

Author(s), Year / Title of Work	Purpose of the study	Key findings	Connection with Durkheim's teachings
É. Durkheim (1897 / 1951). Le Suicide: Étude de sociologie / Suicide: A Study in Sociology [5]	Creation of a sociological theory of suicide as a social fact.	Suicides are divided into types (selfish, altruistic, anomic, fatalistic) according to the level of integration and regulation.	A fundamental work that laid the sociological approach to the study of suicide.
M. Halbwachs (1930). Les causes du suicide [9]	Expanding understanding of the social causes of suicide.	Religious, family and professional integration affect suicide rates.	Development of Durkheim's ideas about social solidarity.
A. F. Henry & J. F. Short, Jr. (1954). Suicide and Homicide: An Interpretation of Official Statistics [10]	Testing of the Durkheim hypothesis about the social causes of deviant behavior.	Socio-economic tension generates both outward aggression and auto-aggression.	Confirmation of the role of social tension as a form of anomie.
P. Sainsbury (1955). Suicide in London: An Ecological Study [19]	Investigation of the relationship between social structure, living conditions and suicide.	Social isolation and urban anonymity increase the risk of suicide.	Confirmation of the relevance of anomie in the urban environment.
J. P. Gibbs & W. T. Martin (1964). Status Integration and Suicide [7]	Operationalization of the concept of integration through social roles.	Low consistency of statuses increases the risk of suicide.	Empirical clarification of Durkheim's concept of integration.
J. Baechler (1979). Suicides [2]	Classification of suicides according to motivational models.	Social factors acquire a symbolic character in a cultural context.	Rethinking Durkheim's typology through cultural meanings.
B. A. Pescosolido & S. Georgianna (1989). Durkheim, Suicide, and Religion: Toward a Network Theory of Suicide [15]	Verification of Durkheim's conclusions about religion through social networks.	The power of social support is more important than nominal religiosity.	Updating the theory of integration through network sociology.
P. S. Bearman (1991). The Social Structure of Suicide [3]	Study of the influence of social structures on the prevalence of suicide.	Social connections can both reduce and increase the risk of suicide.	Development of the idea of the double effect of integration in structural contexts.
R. W. Maris & B. M. Lazerwitz (1981). Pathways to Suicide: A Survey of Self-Destructive Behaviors [12]	Identification of social pathways to suicide.	Social disintegration and loss of meaning lead to auto-aggression.	A combination of the sociological and psychological dimensions of Durkheim's theory.
S. Stack (2000). Suicide: A 15-Year Review of the Sociological Literature	Generalization of sociological studies of 1985–2000.	Integration remains the central explanatory mechanism of suicide.	Confirmation of the constancy of the Durkheim paradigm.
D. Gunnell et al. (2020). Suicide Risk and Prevention During the COVID-19 Pandemic [8]	Analyzing the risks of suicide during the COVID-19 pandemic.	Isolation and social upheaval create modern forms of anomie.	Actualization of Durkheim's logic in the context of the global crisis.
J. Pirkis et al. (2021). Suicide Trends in the Early Months of the COVID-19 Pandemic	Assessment of the impact of social turbulence on the dynamics of suicides.	Social support acts as an anti-anomic buffer.	Reaffirming the importance of social solidarity in times of crisis.
A. L. Jakobsen et al. (2022). Neighborhood Social Context and Suicide Mortality [11]	Study of the influence of the social context of areas on suicide mortality.	Social cohesion reduces the risks of suicide.	Quantitative confirmation of the principle of integration in the Durkheim tradition.
C. Motillon-Toudic et al. (2022). Social Isolation and Suicide Risk: Literature Review and Perspectives [13]	Integration of literature on social isolation and suicide.	Lack of social contact causes mental disorders and anomie.	A reflection of modern anomie through the psychosocial dimension.
C. Silva et al. (2023). Clinically Significant Scores for Thwarted Belonging and Perceived Burden [17]	Assessing the role of a sense of belonging and burden in suicide risk.	A high level of alienation is directly related to suicidality.	Microlevel confirmation of Durkheim's concept of integration.
M. F. Özbilgin et al. (2024). Institutional Suicide as Anomie [14]	Study of institutional working conditions as a factor of anomie.	The indifference of institutions contributes to professional anomie.	Development of the theory of anomie in the context of work ethics of the XXI century.
A. Arango et al. (2024). Social Connectedness and Adolescent Suicide Risk [1]	Study of social connectedness and suicide risk among adolescents.	Social connections reduce the risk of suicidal tendencies.	Confirmation of the relevance of Durkheim's idea of integration.

Thus, Durkheim's anomie appears not only as a rupture of norms but as a loss of the "social fabric" that keeps the individual in the system of life. The modern scientific update of its concept consists in shifting the emphasis from the moral order to the institutional, cultural and psychological mechanisms that determine the ability of a person to feel his social belonging in the era of the crisis of collectivity.

The table reflects the evolution of scientific approaches to the study of suicide – from the classical sociology of Emile Durkheim to modern interdisciplinary concepts. In the works of researchers of the XX century, suicide is considered a consequence of the weakening of social integration, the destruction of collective norms and the loss of solidarity. Later works move on to the analysis of social networks, institutional structures and psychosocial states, showing that the risk of suicide increases where the feeling of reciprocity and support disappears. The generalization shows that the phenomenon of suicide is not only an individual tragedy, but a social indicator of the level of cohesion, moral responsibility and humanity of society, and Durkheim's logic of the interdependence of a person and a collective remains analytically relevant in the XXI century.

3. Problem Statement

The aim of the work is a socio-philosophical rethinking of the concept of suicide as a manifestation of anomie, i.e., a gap between the individual and society, in the context of modern forms of its interaction. The study seeks to show that suicide is not only an individual act of despair, but a mirror of the social order, which loses its ability to maintain semantic and moral reciprocity. Through this prism, we comprehend how the classical ideas of Emile Durkheim find a new sound in the age of digital communication, global crises and war experience.

The objectives of the study: 1) to analyze the classical concept of suicide by Emile Durkheim and its key categories – integration and regulation – as the basis of a socio-philosophical approach to the problem; 2) to determine the contribution of scientists who have studied the phenomenon of suicide after the death of Emile Durkheim, namely the expansion of the sociological interpretation of suicide, in particular in the context of cultural and phenomenological perspectives; 3) to explore modern approaches to suicidality in the context of global instability, pandemics, wars and digital disintegration; 4) to formulate an updated model of philosophical analysis of suicide as a phenomenon of moral vulnerability, combining structural, interpretive and risk logical dimensions; 5) to assess the possibilities of practical application of the results in the institutions of society and their 6) on the basis of research, to highlight the importance of preventive measures aimed at restoring social trust and solidarity.

4. Methods and Materials

The methodological approach to the analysis of the phenomenon of suicide has an integral and interdisciplinary character, since it rejects the reduction of this phenomenon to narrowly psychiatric or biological interpretations. Instead, suicide is understood as a socio-philosophical symptom of a deeper breakdown of human reciprocity, moral bond and spiritual solidarity between the individual and the community. In this context, the study relies on three interrelated levels of analysis – ontological, sociocultural, and moral-communicative, which allow us to reveal suicide not only as a fact of individual despair, but as an indicator of the crisis of collective existence and violation of the integrity of the social world. At the socio-structural level, we assess how institutional stability, social support, and economic conditions affect suicide risks, interpreting it as a reaction to a deficit of reciprocity and trust. The cultural-semantic level focuses on how society hides suffering and death, as well as whether human life is a moral value "by default", and whether there is a common vocabulary of meanings to overcome the crisis. Finally, the communication-media level analyzes the social new modern ways of interaction of individuals, which have become a new space of visibility of despair, functioning sometimes as a place of salvation and sometimes as an amplifier of vulnerability. The analytical base of the study combines fresh changes in society, focusing on the social conditions of suicidality, allowing for comparison of the global and local dimensions of risk, especially in the context of transformational shocks.

The philosophical direction of our work is in the ontological plane: we seek to understand why a person, deprived of social support, chooses death as the last response to the silence of society, thus touching on the essence of vulnerability, when a person is left alone with the chaos of freedoms without involvement.

This study is our bridge to Man, which stretches between strict sociology and deep philosophy. We don't just analyze soulless data; We strive to go from cold numbers to living human meanings, from stereotyped behavioral models to the core of value structures. Our goal is to turn dry statistical curves into real-life stories. At the heart of our work is a painful ontology of human vulnerability: we reveal the condition of a person who finds himself alone with the chaos of his own freedoms, when the world is silent and does not feel involved. It's about trying to understand what it really means to be human when social ties break down.

5. Results and Discussion

For Émile Durkheim, suicide was not only an act of individual despair, but above all a social fact – a manifestation of the structures that determine the connection between a person and society [5]. In his concept of suicide, two key dimensions are intertwined: the level of integration, which forms the strength of belonging to a community, and the level of regulation, which determines the boundaries and meaning of human aspirations. when the individual finds himself in a state of chronic uncertainty between independence and abandonment.

This is especially evident in the growth of the experience of loneliness in overloaded information environments and the gradual disappearance of trust in institutions that previously provided guidelines and a sense of common purpose. A normal society for Durkheim is a system that maintains a balance between "I" and "we". Today, this balance is increasingly shifting, either towards individualized isolation or towards fragile forms of group belonging that do not guarantee moral stability [5]. This is how a new form of selfish suicide arises: not as a lack of social contacts, but as their superficial fragmentation, where connection does not mean acceptance, and communication does not provide meaning.

Émile Durkheim rightly viewed suicide as a sensitive social barometer [5] that measures the health status of a community through its capacity for integration and regulation. This classic diagnosis takes on a new depth in the twenty-first century, when these structural foundations are undergoing a fundamental shift: traditional channels of social cohesion are weakening and new ones are not yet able to provide stability. Against the backdrop of weakening institutions, a digital space emerges that promises an infinite number of connections, but offers only fragile and multiple bindings. Modern empirical data [11] confirm that virtual solidarity turns out to be more of a network illusion than a source of real, effective support. Thus, human existence falls into a tragic existential paradox: the wider the network of our digital contacts, the more acute the inner experience of isolation and loneliness becomes.

At the same time, the factor of inequality, which Durkheim described as a factor of anomic suicide, increases: desires and practical possibilities live in different planes, generating a loss of meaning and hostility to the social order [5]. Modern economic and social crises – from global recessions to wars and pandemics – expose the instability of expectations, when society is no longer able to guarantee the predictability of the future. In the conditions of the "normative vacuum", life choices become an individual burden, and the blame for failures is transferred exclusively to the person, which aggravates the tendencies of self-blame and auto-aggression.

At the same time, another vector that Durkheim drew attention to is revealed: overregulation. In societies with authoritarian practices or rigid moral codes, fatalistic suicide can be intensified – not as an act of freedom, but as an escape from the complete loss of autonomy [5]. Modern strict requirements for success and unattainable standards put pressure on the individual and push him into extreme forms of protest or self-destruction. Thus, the renewal of Durkheim's theory requires taking into account the multi-layered nature of social reality: the simultaneous presence of disintegration, hyperregulation and anomic shifts. It is in this field of intersection that the modern image of suicide is born – not as a deviation, but as a symptom of a deep crisis of social connection and a disorder of the moral foundations that form human community.

In a society where success is measured by indicators and a mistake is perceived as a personal failure, a person is faced with an invisible wall of expectations. Where the community used to support the individual, he now feels himself on his own with the pressure to conform to ever-changing and increasingly stringent norms. Losing her sense of belonging and understanding of her own place, she looks for a way out, which often turns into an escape – up to self-destruction.

Suicide is not only a tragedy of the individual; it is a rupture in the fabric of sociality. It exposes what is usually hidden: the fragility of moral ties, the loss of trust, the fear of the future, and the inability

of institutions to be a supportive environment. Modern research confirms the opinion of Emile Durkheim: the suicide rate is an indicator of how much society can integrate a person, give him a sense of belonging and meaning [11]. Where the individual ceases to feel part of the greater, where his work and suffering lose their meaning, an inner loneliness appears, which destroys even the strong. And if social institutions show indifference, suicide becomes a cry that no one has heard. Studies show that the lack of sufficient support from the community, family and the state increase the risk of fatal decisions several times. Periods of social upheaval – economic crises, pandemics, wars – especially exacerbate the feeling of isolation. Systematic reviews prove that it is the instability of norms and the unpredictability of the rules of cohabitation that increase the suicidality of vulnerable groups.

When tomorrow does not guarantee minimal security, the sense of life perspective disappears, and with it the inner imperative to live. However, the social dimension of suicide is not only about the crisis. It also opens up the question of community responsibility to those who stand on the edge. Where a culture of support develops, where there are effective mechanisms of care, even the weakest person gets a chance to return to life. The social meaning of an outstretched hand is often stronger than any drug therapy. And this is no longer a private story of an individual – it is a story of mature or immature solidarity of society.

Suicide reveals another painful facet – the inequality of the right to help. Some people have access to quality support, others are left alone with a burden that they cannot bear. Social inequality in the field of mental health creates an invisible dividing line, where some lives get a chance and others get statistical status. In this dimension, suicide speaks of the moral deficit of society: the institutions that exist to protect do not always fulfill their mission [4].

When the system places the responsibility for salvation only on a person who is in the deepest crisis, this is the limit where humanity degrades. Durkheim emphasized that where social integration weakens, the number of lives that end on their own increases [5]. Modern research confirms that people often choose death when they cease to see the meaning for others in their own existence [11]. Wars, epidemics, and dynamic changes reinforce this logic – disorientation and mistrust punch cracks in the social structure through which lives flee. Therefore, the social response to suicide is not only a medical policy, but also a test of ethical maturity. Where a culture of compassion and responsibility is formed, even the shadow of suicide becomes less dense. A restrained life is always a consequence of the fact that someone nearby noticed a sign of decay in time and did not pass by. In the end, the social consequences of suicide bring us back to the main thing: society exists insofar as we create a space in which no one has to die alone.

Suicide in modern societies acquires a double meaning: it is not only an individual act of despair, but also a social symptom of the fact that the mechanisms of living together cease to work as expected [13]. Durkheim believed that suicide occurs where two key ties between a person and society are destroyed. If a person feels superfluous, individual life loses its meaning. If social demands become excessive or contradictory, the boundaries of what is desired and possible are destroyed. Today, we are witnessing the intensification of both crises at the same time. Excessive individualization, hyper competition, and constant demonstration of success in network spaces push a person to compare with unattainable standards. Social expectations grow faster than real opportunities, and as a result, moral exhaustion is formed, where freedom without support becomes a burden [5]. Losing togetherness, the individual seems to fall out of the collective body and begins to drown in his own silence. At the same time, regulation becomes fragile. Institutions do not always provide clear rules, and inequality blurs the idea of justice [9]. Under the pressure of crises, people do not feel that society is able to protect them or at least hear them. There is an experience of redundancy: if my life is not meaningful to anyone, why should I continue to fight? In such conditions, suicide can be perceived as a silent protest against the indifference of the world. Modern suicide trends cannot be explained only by clinical or individual factors – they are built into the logic of social order. When mutual support turns into competitive detachment, and the threshold of success dictates a feeling of constant insufficiency, life loses the common horizon of meaning. Social media creates a paradox: we see others, but we don't feel anyone around who is really able to support. The individual silently falls into the void – and often no one notices this in time.

When society ceases to perform the function of a protective shell, a person finds himself alone with suffering that has no one to tell. Durkheim warned: where the social bond weakens, "cold freedom" increases, which step by step brings the individual closer to the brink of self-destruction [5]. But today this boundary is not only personal – it is inscribed in the structure of social experience. In many cases,

suicide becomes the last form of expression – a tacit accusation of the world. Douglas showed in the last century that the choice of suicide cannot be reduced to psychopathology: it is a gesture that carries social meaning [4]

This is a way of saying: "I no longer see myself in your picture of the future" [5]. This is a desperate attempt to regain control where life has ceased to belong to man. Modern authors also pay attention to another dynamic: a change in the norms of self-preservation. Until recently, the preservation of life was an unconditional value. Now, the question arises more and more often: if life does not bring meaning, am I obliged to carry it further [4]? Thus, suicide begins to look like a tragedy of free choice, created by a culture of supra-individual responsibility for success. At the same time, forms of social exclusion are intensifying: migration, accelerated urbanization, and digital individualism create an environment where people feel like replaceable fragments of the system. The feeling of warmth of social support disappears – only instructions, pressure and loneliness remain. This is exactly what Gunnell describes as the accumulation of risks, when one event does not kill, but the collection of small cracks in the life system destroys its foundation [8]. Therefore, the analysis of suicide should go beyond medical statistics. Behind every intention, there is a cry for help, which society often hears too late. And if we want to reduce the number of suicides, then first of all, we need to restore the value of human presence, where invisibility reigns today.

Postmodern culture reinforces this crisis: every time life turns into a project that needs to be implemented successfully and flawlessly, and failure is interpreted as personal fault [6]. In such a world, suicide takes on an existential dimension: it is not only an escape from pain, but also a protest against the normative requirement to be happy. Douglas emphasized that human death carried out by one's own hand always has the semantics of the statement – it contains a message addressed to another [4]. However, today the addressee of this message is blurred: a person is talking to a world that does not exist nearby, which has dissolved in screens, algorithms and statistics. Suicide turns into a silent conversation without a listener. When moral guidelines cease to be the common property, the right to death merges with the right to final silence, in which there is no longer any recognition or trial. In this dimension, suicide becomes a tragedy not only of the loss of life, but also of the loss of semantic space for life. Modern man lives in a situation that can be described as an overload of choices. The right to self-determination has become absolute, and now every decision – including the decision to live – rests solely with the individual.

When social institutions demonstrate weakness, the feeling of their own uselessness can turn into the belief that suicide is the last form of self-control [1]. The value framework in which suffering makes sense, and the support of one's neighbor is a moral duty, is lost. They are being replaced by rationalized and even technologically advanced ideas about death: algorithms will tell you a good day to live – and just as indifferently allow you to leave. Researchers point out that today, suicide is a cry for recognition, addressed to a society that responds with silence [11]. In a world where communication is supposedly limitless, but rarely becomes a real meeting with the Other, a person experiencing his own invisibility often feels that his disappearance will not change anything. Hence, the logic of the tragedy – there is no point in living for those who don't care. A paradox arises: the louder society proclaims the significance of an individual, the lonelier a person can be who does not fit into the success scenarios.

In this sense, suicide becomes a philosophical gesture, an act of desperation that opens up a radical question: what does it mean to be human where there are no boundaries between what is possible and what is necessary? Thus, the philosophical dimension of suicide in the XXI century is not only about death, but about the fragility of being, the loss of common meanings and the search for reasons for living at a time when society no longer provides ready-made answers to this. Classical sociological studies of suicide for the first time gave death the status of a social fact rather than an individual tragedy. Émile Durkheim showed that the decision to take one's own life cannot be understood without analyzing integration and regulation – the fundamental ties between a person and society [5].

Suicide for him is an indicator of imbalance, when either society strangles the individual, depriving him of freedom, or lets him go too far, leaving him without any support. That is why Durkheim considered the increase in suicides as a symptom of a deeper moral illness of the social order, and not just the psychological drama of an individual. Maurice Halbwachs, continuing the Durkheim line, supplemented it with the idea that it is not only the nation or the state that influences the behavior of the individual, but also the microsocial structure: family, community, professional environments [9]. He argued that even at the most critical moments, it is living social memory that can keep a person from making a fatal choice. Therefore, in environments where ties break down, where people no longer feel

part of something bigger, the risks of suicide inevitably increase. Jack Douglas proposed a radical twist: he emphasized that suicide cannot be explained by statistical logic or external factors alone. For him, the key is the importance that the subject himself attaches to his own decision [4]. It is not just social disintegration that kills – it is the story that a person creates about himself. Suicide becomes an attempt to write the last meaning when all other stories have been invalidated. Modern interpretations combine these three approaches: Durkheim's quantitative logic, Halbwachs' social sensitivity, and Douglas' semantic perspective form a triune optics, without which it is impossible to understand suicide today [4]. After all, a person is at the same time a part of society, a carrier of connections and the author of his own life drama. Therefore, where institutions do not work, where communities do not support, and the personal narrative collapses, suicide arises as a logical, albeit tragic, outcome.

The discourse of suicide in the social sciences begins from the moment when death ceases to be an exclusively private act and appears as a phenomenon that changes the structure of society. Émile Durkheim was one of the first to insist that the human ability to commit suicide is not only an individual choice or a psychological anomaly – it is a measure of the state of the social world [5]. He did not just classify the types of suicides, but identified the key nerve of the phenomenon: where the mutual recognition of people for each other weakens, life loses its meaning. Durkheim's framework showed that dying in this way can be an affirmation against society – or, conversely, a search for a way out of a connection that seems unbearable. This idea became a starting point for further discussions, where death ceases to be the result of a mental crisis and appears as a philosophical statement, a shift in emphasis in the ways of existence of a community. Maurice Halbwachs shifted the focus to closer ties: a person is saved not by the nation, but by those social circles where his word has weight, where the value of "being together" is confirmed by experience [9]. Invisible threads of daily interaction provide resilience. Therefore, Halbwachs' suicide is evidence of the fading of social memory, the disappearance of people who can bring you back to yourself.

In the end, Jack Douglas radicalizes the approach, trying to hear the very voice of the man who stands on the edge. He argues: each suicide has its own philosophy [4]. If Durkheim and Halbwachs explained conditions and environments, then Douglas asks: what meaning does a person put into his step?

He says that death becomes the last message, a text without a reader, an appeal that can only be understood through the biography of the subject.

In the classical concepts of suicide, one common belief is hidden: a person's life is always included in the structure of meanings that exceed it. That is why the act of self-destruction is a shock to the community – it destroys the tacit agreement that life has value regardless of the circumstances. Durkheim saw this as a threat to the moral foundations of society, Halbwachs saw it as a rupture of everyday ties, and Douglas saw it as a metaphysical protest of individual meaning against social silence. Social death precedes physical death: a person ceases to believe that his existence is inscribed in the general history. Then the world loses not only one life, it loses a view that could have changed others. That is why the classics emphasized that suicide prevention is not only a medical or psychological task, but a matter of preserving the human presence in the world. In modern conditions, the phenomenon is taking on new forms: digital communities are able to simultaneously support and destroy a person, creating spaces where recognition becomes a commodity or manipulation. What Durkheim called the "moral fabric" now exists on screen – it is fleeting, changeable, and at times ruthless. In this instability, the intuition of the classics is again manifested: suicide always speaks not only of the person, but also of a state of the world that he can no longer bear. Therefore, turning to classical works is not a gesture of respect for the history of science, but a way to see the threats of modernity: when culture ceases to be a space of care, but becomes a system of evaluations, when freedom exists without compassion, when human pain does not find a language that could keep it alive.

Suicide is a marginal act in which a person seems to remove himself from the common world. But that is why the question arises: is it possible to understand the motive of such a decision at all, when the action itself destroys the one who could explain it? Durkheim believed that the meaning of suicide is hidden not in a separate consciousness, but in the structure of social ties that either support a person or leave him alone with the world [A]. That is, the logic of self-destruction is socially determined, although it is lived internally. This position later began to be criticized as excessively "cold": it deprives the subject of a voice. Douglas, in contrast, suggested that every suicide should be seen as an attempt to say something to the world—protest, flight, revenge, or despair that seeks to be heard [C]. Understanding,

then, is not just a classification, but a co-creation of meaning that prolongs the silence of the deceased in our attempt to speak for him.

However, modern research shows an even more complex picture. The intention is often fuzzy, contradictory, fragmented – the desire to live and the desire to disappear can coexist in a person, and the act itself takes place at the moment when logic collapses and impulse dominates. Therefore, the interpretation cannot be definitive: each explanation is inevitably an attempt to give meaning where the meaning has been lost. Suicide prevention cannot be reduced to psychological support for individuals – it is, first of all, a test of the maturity of society [18]. After all, each suicide brings to the surface what the team preferred to keep silent about: alienation, mistrust, and confusion before life. Therefore, prevention is not about control, but about returning a person to his rightful place in the social whole. Two key areas can be traced in the world programs today.

First, strengthening social integration: supporting communities, developing horizontal connections, creating safe spaces for dialogue – all that gives a person a sense of inclusion. Studies have shown that where a person does not feel alone in their difficulties, the risks of suicide are sharply reduced [11]. In other words, the main defense is not an institution, but another person nearby. Secondly, the strengthening of regulatory mechanisms, which does not suppress freedom, but gives a sense of clear and fair rules. This includes accessible assistance, clear response protocols, responsible media communication, and prevention of romanticization of death [13]. A society that declares the value of human life must consistently confirm this with actions.

6. Conclusions

Suicide is an extreme form of tacit dialogue between a person and society, in which the connection of meaning is interrupted. It occurs where the individual ceases to feel his presence as important, where the community does not offer him support, and life seems to be a space without an addressee. In this sense, each act of suicide is not only a tragedy of the individual, but also a diagnosis of the social order: how capable he is of being human. The academic tradition started by Durkheim taught us to look at suicide as a social fact, revealing deficits in integration and regulation. However, the XXI century adds new dimensions: information overloads, transience of social ties, and crises of global instability. A person is no longer alone – he finds himself in a crowd, but without live contact, among endless "communities" that do not know him by name. Studies in recent years emphasize that where support mechanisms are destroyed, where trust in institutions falls, and success becomes the only moral criterion, the risks of self-destruction increase. This means that suicide prevention is not an auxiliary application of social policy, but its moral core. To prevent death means to give a person back the opportunity to be heard. Suicide reminds us that human existence cannot be reduced to biological survival. It needs recognition, responsibility, care, and meaning. And that is why the fight against suicide is a struggle for human dignity. For its right to live not only within the limits of statistics, but in a space where it matters to others.

Further research should also reveal how global crises (wars, pandemics, economic shocks) restructure social mechanisms of behavior regulation. It is important to study how collective experiences of trauma can both increase vulnerability to suicide and develop new practices of solidarity that keep the individual within the social bond. Durkheim showed that suicide can be an indicator of how moral norms correspond to real-life conditions. Future work should explore how societies are shaping new criteria for an individual's academic performance, psychological resilience and social worth, and what implications this has for those who do not fit into these standards. A promising direction is the deepening of the connection between philosophy and empirical data. Combining the Durkheim tradition with modern statistical and clinical research will create more accurate models for predicting suicide risks. This approach opens up an opportunity for the formation of an effective social policy – from the development of crisis relief services to the support of local communities.

Thus, further research requires interdisciplinarity: philosophical analytics, sociology, psychology, information sciences and public policy must work together. Only then will the phenomenon of suicide cease to be society's "last silence" – and become a source of deeper understanding of what it means to be human among other people.

References

1. Arango, A., Brent, D., Grupp-Phelan, J., Barney, B. J., Spirito, A., Mroczkowski, M. M., ... & Pediatric Emergency Care Applied Research Network (PECARN). (2024). Social connectedness and adolescent suicide risk. *Journal of child psychology and psychiatry*, *65*(6), 785–797. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.13908
2. Baechler, J. (1979). *Suicides* (B. Cooper, Trans.). Oxford: Basil Blackwell. (Original work published 1975). https://archive.org/details/suicides0000baec
3. Bearman, P. S. (1991). The Social Structure of Suicide. *Sociological Forum, 6*(3), 501–524. http://www.jstor.org/stable/684516
4. Douglas, J. (2015). *Social Meanings of Suicide*. Princeton University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400868117
5. Durkheim, É. (1897). *Le suicide: Étude de sociologie*. Félix Alcan. Retrieved from https://monoskop.org/images/0/01/Durkheim_Émile_Le_suicide_1897.pdf
6. Durkheim, É. (1951). *Suicide: A study in sociology* (J. A. Spaulding & G. Simpson, Trans.). Free Press. (Original work published 1897). https://www.gacbe.ac.in/images/E%20books/Durkheim%20-%20Suicide%20-%20A%20study%20in%20sociology.pdf
7. Gibbs, J. P., & Martin, W. T. (1964). *Status integration and suicide: A sociological study*. University of Oregon Books. https://lnk.ua/y4zjv1w4j
8. Gunnell, D., Appleby, L., Arensman, E., Hawton, K., John, A., Kapur, N., ... & Yip, P. S. (2020). Suicide risk and prevention during the COVID-19 pandemic. *The Lancet Psychiatry*, *7*(6), 468–471. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m3871
9. Halbwachs, M. (1930). *Les causes du suicide*. Presses Universitaires.
10. Henry, A. F., & Short, J. F., Jr. (1954). *Suicide and Homicide: An Interpretation of Official Statistics*. Free Press. https://books.google.com.ua/books/about/Suicide_and_Homicide.html?id=oJEXAAAAIAAJ&redir_esc=y
11. Jakobsen, A. L., & Lund, R. L. (2022). Neighborhood social context and suicide mortality: a multilevel register-based 5-year follow-up study of 2.7 million individuals. *Social Science & Medicine*, (311), 115320. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2022.115320
12. Maris, R. W. (1981). *Pathways to Suicide: A Survey of Self-Destructive Behaviors*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
13. Motillon-Toudic, C., Walter, M., Séguin, M., Carrier, J. D., Berrouiguet, S., & Lemey, C. (2022). Social isolation and suicide risk: Literature review and perspectives. *European psychiatry, 65*(1), e65. https://doi.org/10.1192/j.eurpsy.2022.2320
14. Ozbilgin, M. F., Erbil, C., Demirbağ, O., Gündoğdu, N., & Şimşek Demirbağ, K. (2024). Institutional suicide as anomie: decedents speak out for work-related suicides through a Durkheimian exploration of suicide notes in a context without institutional responsibilization for suicide prevention. *Frontiers in Sociology*, (9), 1309119. https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2024.1309119
15. Pescosolido, B. A., & Georgianna, S. (1989). Durkheim, Suicide, and Religion: Toward a Network Theory of Suicide. *American Sociological Review*, *54*(1), 33–48. https://doi.org/10.2307/2095660
16. Pirkis, J., John, A., Shin, S., DelPozo-Banos, M., Arya, V., Analuisa-Aguilar, P., ... & Spittal, M. J. (2021). Suicide trends in the early months of the COVID-19 pandemic: an interrupted time-series analysis of preliminary data from 21 countries. *The Lancet Psychiatry, 8*(7), 579–588. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(21)00091-2
17. Silva, C., Smith, P. N., Rogers, M., Joiner, T. E., Foote, B., & Van Orden, K. A. (2023). Clinically significant scores for thwarted belonging and perceived burden from the Interpersonal Needs Questionnaire (INQ-15). *Crisis, 44*(5). https://doi.org/10.1027/0227-5910/a000898
18. Stack, S. (2000). Suicide: a 15-year review of the sociological literature part I: Cultural and economic factors. Suicide and Life-Threatening *Behavior, 30*(2), 145–162. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1943-278X.2000.tb01073.x
19. Sainsbury, P. (1955). *Suicide in London: An ecological study*. Chapman & Hall (for the Institute of Psychiatry). https://books.google.com.ua/books/about/Suicide_in_London.html?id=3Z5qAAAAMAAJ&redir_esc=y