

Moral Problem of Suicide and its Relation to Human Freedom

Pavel Liliana Lăcrămioara

Danubius University, Faculty of Law, lilianapavel@univ-danubius.ro

Abstract: The thesis treats the problem of suicide by putting it in relation to the individual freedom of human. I will concentrate on just a few problems which target to attempt to offer an answer to the theme above mentioned. To achieve the purpose I use different opinions and theories regarding theme in question which demonstrates that the theme has been treated thoroughly and also by prominent authors like G. Minois, E. Cioran, A. Schopenhauer or Paul-Ludwig Landsberg. We were asking ourselves whether suicide is a moral problem. How about a solution to escape from the existential anguish? People have never understood completely the acts of suicide showing almost constantly contempt, fear, pity or indifference to these.

Keywords: suicide; morality; Christianity

1. Introduction

Throughout the centuries, suicidal acts have shocked either through the violence with which they have been committed or through their causes sometimes absurd that had determined them.

The problem that interests me in this case is whether the acts of suicidal committed because of different reasons are condemnable and why.

- If they are convicted, means that are not consistent with a morality that is not the moral. Intolerance they can sometimes have developed a purely rational justification (eg Kant), sometimes a religious justification or in other cases it is based on simple human feelings to react against such acts.
- If there are no acts of suicide censurable, means they are recognized as expressions of individual freedom to decide each for themselves and act according to their desires in what concerns you. If we accept that each individual is free to do what he wants as long as its actions do not directly affect others suicide should no longer be tried and condemned in any way the freedom of expression because it is concerned. (Mill, 2001, p. 17)

A number of existentialist thinkers such as E. Cioran saw the suicide act as only chance to escape the anguish of life more hated we are all caught and we can only issue the passage into nonexistence.

"Life is but a long series of disappointments and suffering and those who try to find a good side and do nothing but to continually lie"

Existentialists start from this premise in their attempt to justify "last resort".

For example Cioran wrote: "Signs of life: cruelty, fanaticism, intolerance, signs of decadence: kindness, understanding, indulgence...." (Cioran, 1992, p. 230)

Taking as a starting point such premises, it seems pretty obvious that those found in suicide only salvation will seek to justify the act of suicide as a necessary one, purely individual whose responsibility belongs to them fully.

After what was said above, you still try to show to what extent one can speak of suicide as a problem as in sustaining ethics the presentation. I will use the views of Paul-Ludwig Landsberg deems it very important for this problem.

2. Suicidal- a Moral Problem?

Landsberg says that suicide as moral facts exist and it is felt this quite strong. This is because suicide occurs as a matter of fact and everyday world.

Anywhere in print or spoken is often mentions suicide. In cases this phenomenon is clearly observed an argument against suicide; the argument comes mainly from the great majority of people.

They judge the act as one of cowardice in the face of difficulties of life. Objection of Landsberg is the "way of dying of a Cato, a Hannibal and Brutus and Seneca a Mitridate, hardly a Napoleon act we may consider as let. Certainly more people who kill themselves because they are not too let to do it than people who kill in cowardice. " (Landsberg, 1992, p. 94)

This does not mean that Landsberg consider suicid an act of heroism, or for a purpose that justifies suicide as a noble decision. He only show that suicide is not just act as an act of cowardice as labeled in most cases but may arise due to causes different. The moral implication of suicide put the discussion of human freedom and its understanding. Wrongly understood freedom, according to Landsberg, can give the illusion of omnipotence that a man believed to have it. In virtue of this freedom and the limits of measurement this one can commit suicide.

An example here is the character Kirilov Dostoyevsky who wants to end their days to prove absolute freedom of man. Considering this case master Kirilov is subject to its moral act.

If people are absolutely free, means that Christian morality comes out from discussion. No God can punish him for his act because it was an act of freedom! If means that God has allowed him freedom, He allowed his full right to his own life. (Dostoevski, 1962)

Generally speaking, even if he would fall under any particular morality, suicide would get an immoral character opposite to the common idea about life. There is the idea that the act of suicide is an act against human nature, man's nature is to fight for survival, to do, instinctively, everything possible to maintain life safety.

So we deal with an innate instinct of life. When the vast majority having this survival instinct acts a suicide, there is consistently a negative reaction to it. In these rarely cases when suicide is accepted by the society, we can speak of an innate morality in terms of suicide or moral judge spontaneously.

Following the apparent assertion that the act of suicide is subject to morality, whether it is a conventional or is simply an innate moral sense. Although suicide is acceptable in some cultures, it happens that the all considerations are supported by morality. In those cultures, suicide is committed in most cases for religious reasons, political reasons relating to a certain moral value (e.g. self-sacrifice go Word of God in the Muslim world).

3. Christian Ethics and the Banning of Suicide

Christianity, especially Catholic Church considers suicide as a mortal sin and do not accept any justification.

Nobody has the right to hold its own life for a divine authority prohibited. Faithful have to accept this command to permanently and also to obey. Suicide is defined by the Church as "action to suppress the release of one's own life tragedy that you have not the courage to bear." (Minois, 2002)

This act violates the divine commandment. Suicide is censurable because God gives us life he is only entitled to cut it. We do not have death right of our lives just like the divinity.

On moral act of suicide has appeared in a controversy over where the Church of Christ. Christian parents were faced with the fact to explain and accepting punishment if Jesus had committed suicide; the controversy became even more with how bright it is considered that Jesus was born in order to die for this situation to die. It was required to refine the moral distinctions and Christian dogma: the sacrifice differs from suicide. Thus, Christian morality accepts self-sacrifice as a divine purpose, or at least whose need is the divine nature.

The conclusion that emerges from a Christian moral is: unless the Church considers to be sacrifice and not suicide, suicide is a mortal sin and is vehemently denied. To commit suicide is to consider you as equal in law to God and also, you ignore the divine commandment. In this respect in the "Catechism" of Richelieu in 1626 is written "... absolutely no one is master of his being to dispose of it as it seems right, but only a depository to preserve required deposit."

4. Suicide the Only Way of Escaping the Anguish of Existence (Cioran)

Unlike the Christian morality he considered suicide a sin there are other moral concern suicide as the only chance of saving the soul.

These are not necessarily anti-Christian or non-Christian but we call them, kind of nonconformist moral. This morality was present in the opera of the French existentialist, such as JP A. Camus or Sartre.

These include also E. Cioran and his moral, whose thinks works in the same direction. In Cioran's theory we cannot say that he shows us a not too ethical system but rather a mindset that reflects a certain moral.

For Cioran, which causes repulsion feeling towards life is its absurd. In an absurd life who can fight for values? What is its meaning, if everything turns against you? "Suffering is always intolerable because it is mine", says Cioran. Moreover, he added that the fight for truth finding is a nonsense. The only certainty of life is death. With these as prerequisites Cioran develop almost an ethic of renunciation in Schopenhauerian style.

Unlike Schopenhauer within which one can speak of a much deeper tragedy because the will is present in everything, with both influence and in the phenomenal world intelligible, Cioran still hoped, however, that death is the only refuge. Hence leaving he said: "There are no reasons for living. That have reached the limit can walk with arguments, the causes, effects, etc.... moral considerations?"

Obviously not. He has no longer the only reasons to be alive. In peak undue despair, absurdity is the only passion that still sheds light demonic chaos." (Cioran, 1990, p. 14)

It becomes evident that under the absurd rule, life loses its meaning.

Suicide, in this case remains for an existentialist thinkers the only one choice. In this situation no longer falls under the issue of morality, even as Cioran says, here the question was beyond the conventions and regulations directly aimed at human condition. Seems strange that the death vision of Cioran (and beyond) is very different from that of the collective imaginary. For him the death cannot be understood unless life is felt that a long agony, when death is combined with life. Death is not something outside, ontologically different life, because death as an autonomous reality of life there. "

Note that we do in this case with that of adjacent to freedom. The Problem of freedom this time is to push to suicide. If you are absolutely free and means you are absolutely responsible. In this situation arise that are responsible for my life but also its absurdity. Freedom allows me to put an end to the absurd, because I am a person who knows or really just absurd.

No matter how we try to understand the suffering of others we cannot because, according to Cioran, there is no objective perception of suffering. Suffering is perceived only subjective and only suffering that matters is the mine freedom in this case will manifest as self-defense reaction in front of the absurd. At this point I say that freedom is understood differently than understood it as an example of Kirilov.

Cioran's case shows the difficulty of being a free prisoner although absurd paradox, accepting one of the premises as freedom and the other as being absurd, Cioran reach a point where the universe brings man in this situation "on the heights of despair.

However different from Sartre, but keeping the spirit, Cioran offers a world where the idea of suicide is a precious refuge. This theory does not mean that he would be a suicidal instigator. Suicidal and death, in his view, I believe that occurred more than mood.

During the daily anguish, a suicide is the only state in the spirit of providing a balance.

5. Conclusions

Following the above ideas, detached ideas and feedback can be born shared. For instance, to the question "should be blamed suicide?" we will meet. These responses both positive and negative depend on the position to respond.

As we have shown, there are several types of moral each starting from different premises and reaching different conclusions. Relation between freedom and suicide is itself conditioned by the type of morality that fits individuals. In a traditional Christian moral freedom is limited and sentenced suicide.

In other types of moral freedom is taken to the extreme sometimes be confused with suicide.

Another idea that emerges is that suicide is indeed a moral issue, as pointed Landsberg.

Whether it is accepted or not suicide will always be subject to morals. Feeling conventional or naturally it will not be released outside problem.

Even if you have a feeling for or against suicide it will focus on its moral problem: if they accept suicide in terms of existentialist when it acquires a moral value, if they condemn suicide is immoral to blame for everything but after a moral judgments was decided. Finally, we can conclude by saying that suicide in his report to freedom is a purely personal note with meaning only for one who commits it.

Going beyond that which is moral suicide eventually execute its freedom. The problem remains, unfortunately its moral act to be judged by others.

Bibliography

Cioran, E. (1990). *Pe culmile disperarii/On the heights of despair*. Bucharest: Humanitas.

Cioran, E. (1992). *Tratat de descompunere/Treaty on decomposition*. Bucharest: Humanitas.

Dostoievski, F. (1962). *Demonii/Demons*. Bucharest: Editura pentru literatura universala.

Landsberg, P. L. (1992). Problema morala a sinuciderii/The moral problem of suicide. In *Marile carti mici ale gandirii universale/The great small books of universal thinking*. Bucharest: Humanitas.

Mill, J. S. (2001). *Despre libertate/On freedom*. Second edition. Bucharest: Humanitas.

Minois, G. (2002). *Istoria sinuciderii-Societatea occidentala in fata mortii voluntare/ The history of suicide -The Western society facing the voluntary death*. Bucharest: Humanitas.