

**SCTCMG 2021**  
**International Scientific Conference «Social and Cultural Transformations in the Context of**  
**Modern Globalism»**

**FEATURES OF THE CONCEPTS USED IN ANTI-SUICIDAL**  
**CONVERSATION**

Evgeni Yuryevich Sivertsev (a)\*

\*Corresponding author

(a) Federal State Budgetary Educational Institution of Higher Education "Saint-Petersburg State University" (Saint-Petersburg, Russian Federation), Universitetskaya nab., 7/9, 199034, Saint-Petersburg, Russia, emden1914@mail.ru

**Abstract**

The purpose of this work is to analyze the features of concepts used in a conversation conducted with a person whose suicidal intentions can be considered obvious. The effectiveness of the impact of concepts on a person who is in a pre-suicidal or post-suicidal state depends on many factors, but first of all – on the ability of concepts to relieve mental pain. This ability increases as concepts become more specific and verifiable. The material of the research is the logical and semantic structure of the language; the search is made for the features of concepts that best meet the goals of suicide prevention. Methodologically the research is based on some provisions of European existentialist philosophy. The use of the existentialist method allows us to show that the most convincing concepts for a person seem to meet two requirements. First: concepts release a person from personal responsibility – that is, they allow a minimum of opportunities for broad and free interpretation. Second: they help to raise the level of confidence that circumstances will change even with minimal effort on the part of the person. These requirements are met by three types of concepts: empirical concepts; logical-mathematical concepts; self-evident concepts. It is assumed that any concept can be divided into several narrower concepts, each of which will meet two requirements for credibility. Accordingly, a conversation with a person who is in suicidal danger can increase its effectiveness if the preference is given to empirical, logical-mathematical and self-evident concepts.

2357-1330 © 2021 Published by European Publisher.

*Keywords:* Suicide, concept, freedom, choice, empirium, existence



## 1. Introduction

One form of anti-suicidal work is a conversation with a person who has made a non-demonstrative attempt at suicide (fortunately, unsuccessful) or with a person whose suicidal intentions are obvious. According to Schneidman (2018), in such a "conversation, attention is focused on superficial content (specific events, certain dates, superficial details), the plot of the conversation, or ordinary, curious (or banal) details of life" (p. 346).

## 2. Problem Statement

Modern suicidology has a huge arsenal of tools that allow one to make recommendations for recognizing suicidal moods, neutralizing them and preventing suicide. All these tools have been developed within the framework of psychology and medicine (in particular, psychiatry). It seems that the arsenal of means of influencing a person who is in a pre-suicidal state – if this arsenal is limited only to psychological and medical developments-focuses exclusively on the content side of countering suicide. It does not take into account the specifics of the form in which the suicidal person is presented with information designed to bring him out of the life impasse. The form of information transmission is concepts. Depending on their specifics, concepts can be allies in anti – suicidal practice, or they can also hinder it. For the correct differentiation of concepts, it is necessary to expand the range of sciences, the results of which can be used by suicidology. In particular, we are talking about linguistics, logic and philosophy.

## 3. Research Questions

The article examines three phenomena. The first phenomenon is "suicidal". By suicidal, we will understand a more or less physically and practically mentally healthy person who has made a non-provocative suicide attempt that ended in failure, or a person who is clearly going to make such an attempt.

The second phenomenon is the "anti – suicidal conversation": it is simply one of the components of the work carried out with a suicidal person. "Anti-suicidal conversation" is an integral part of anti-crisis prevention, which "is carried out in the pre-suicidal and immediate post-suicidal periods of the suicidal process» the tasks are: 1. Prevention of the implementation of suicidal intentions ( ... ) in the pre-suicidal period.2. Stopping suicidal intentions in persons who have committed incomplete suicide in the immediate post-suicidal period" (Polojij & Panchenko, 2012, p. 9).

The third phenomenon is the logical and semantic component of anti- suicidal conversation. it refers to concepts used in anti-suicidal conversation and designed primarily for rational perception. The research method is the application of existentialist analysis of the features of human existence to identify the features of words and concepts necessary for use in anti-suicidal conversation.

#### **4. Purpose of the Study**

Conversations with a person who attempted suicide do not always end with a positive result, i.e. refusal of the interlocutor from intentions to commit the irreparable (for illustration, you can see the statistics of repeated suicides). There are many reasons for this, they are sanctified in detail in the literature (Efremov, 2004; Yurieva, 2006), however, it seems, there is one topic, developed in somewhat less detail than necessary. We are talking about the features of words and concepts used in a conversation. It is these features that are investigated in the proposed article.

#### **5. Research Methods**

The method of research is the application of logical and philosophical analysis of the features of human existence to identify the features of words and concepts necessary for use in anti-suicidal communication. Logic is used here in its classical form (formal logic), the main philosophical paradigm is the philosophy of existentialism.

#### **6. Findings**

When and in connection with what suicidal moods arise? The causes a huge number, all of them are quite thoroughly investigated (Starchenbaum, 2005). To sum up, we can make the following assumption: suicidal ideations arise when the suicide it appears that the adverse circumstances in which he is a) very difficult; b) not insurmountable by any personal efforts; C) will not in the foreseeable future; d) the main reason for the severity, irresistibility and infinite duration of circumstances - the suicidal person's own actions, committed by free choice, committed in this way, and not otherwise.

Anti-suicidal conversation should include a component designed to form in the mind of the suicidal person the opinion that in the event of negative circumstances, his guilt is minimal, and the prospects for overcoming them are quite obvious, while he will interfere in the course of events to a minimum extent. If its intervention is minimal, it means that it will not be able to worsen the situation by its actions, and it will also give the objective world the opportunity to normalize this situation independently.

The formation of such an opinion is achieved primarily by the content of the conversation - but this is a matter of a specific situation and we do not touch it now. In addition to taking into account the specific situation, the choice of words is very important. Words with the highest degree of persuasiveness should be used.

Traditionally, two types of words are considered to have the highest degree of persuasiveness. The first type is words that have an empirically obvious referent (i.e., the object called in the word appears to exist in the objective world). The second type is logical and mathematical categories. A person assumes that the relations of real objects, defined by logical categories, are just as objective as these objects themselves.

It is easy to guess that no productive conversation can be built only on empirical and logical concepts. It should also include other kinds of concepts. What concepts can we talk about? To find out,

let's first try to understand the essential nature of empirical and logical concepts — that is, to understand why they are perceived as the most convincing.

The empirical-positivist tradition in philosophy, which, in fact, considers empirical and logical concepts to be the Foundation of any knowledge of the world, has not come to an unambiguous justification of the dominant place of these concepts — it is simply accepted as obvious: "... in the scheme of building knowledge ... the role of observation suggestions is primarily that they stand in time at the beginning of the entire process, stimulating it and promoting it" (Schlick, 1993, p. 37).

Let's pay attention to one of the properties of these concepts: they are always finite and visible. In this regard, we will ask two questions. First: finiteness and visibility are qualities that the objective world itself possesses and that are reflected in the human mentality? Or, in other words: "The end may be the knowledge or existence?" (Pisarev, 2018, p. 141). Second: is the correlation with reality a self-evident way of believing that a finite and observable concept present in our consciousness corresponds to a real object?

Let's start with the limb. According to traditional beliefs, finiteness is what the object itself possesses, i.e. finiteness is an ontological category. The objective finiteness of a thing is primary in relation to the reflection of this finiteness in thought. Thought fixes initially finite things in finite signs: "the Sign ... fixes the world with names that can be counted" (Starikova, 2018, p. 124). However, the mechanism of transition of ontological finiteness to mental finiteness — as well as the mechanism of transition of objective reality to subjective reality, and the latter-to speech and actions, has not yet been clarified (it is enough to turn to this problem, which has become one of the Central ones in the modern philosophy of consciousness).

Let's try to approach the problem of persuasiveness of concepts from a different perspective. As a methodological principle, we use the existentialist paradigm.

Existentialism believes that man is a being thrown against his will into an alien, hostile world. A person lives in a world devoid of any meaning, everything that a person does is doomed to disappear without a trace in a soulless and all-consuming Nothing. The man himself will also inevitably disappear into this Nothingness. According to Tillich (1995), nothing is "... a finiteness experienced by a person as his own finiteness" (p. 118).

Nothing, non-existence is extremely important in human existence, without them a person could not understand either the world or himself, but we do not touch on this topic now — it is important to us that one of the properties of Nothing is the ability to produce a negative impact on a person, to cause a sense of fear. You can't protect yourself from Nothing in any way (it's like trying to protect yourself from the physiological processes that make the human body function). But you can create the illusion of protection from the intimidating effects of Nothing. There is only one way to create the illusion of protection from Nothingness: to use the essential property of human existence — constant presence in a state of choice. Man-from the point of view of existentialism-is a being of choice, endowed with the need to constantly choose and endowed with complete freedom of this choice. In more traditional terms, a person understands that they can perform absolutely any mental and physical actions. But freedom of choice also has a negative side: a person is responsible for the choice. This responsibility is not analogous to responsibility to parents, managers, or the law: if you violate something, you will be punished.

Responsibility is determined by the fact that the choice is always not only the choice of something, but also the mandatory rejection. If we choose the option of thought or action №1, we leave out the options №2, №3, №4, and so on either to a certain limit, or to infinity. The area of the unselected creates a sense of guilt in a person. Guilt not to someone outside, but only to yourself. Guilt for not effectively neutralizing the feeling of Nothingness in its existence.

Instinctively, a person seeks to reduce the discomfort caused by guilt. The most effective way to reduce discomfort is to restrict the freedom of choice. In itself, the theme of voluntary rejection of freedom of choice in favor of a certain external

the power to take on decision-making and responsibility for results is completely inexhaustible and has been discussed since Plato. But we are now interested in its aspect, which concerns the scope and content of concepts. Less freedom leaves the concept in the maximum extent possible is formalized, i.e. not already subject to actual human choice (leaves minimal scope for choice), and subject to only objective, person-independent laws of logic and mathematics. Operations with it are also carried out not by human free choice, but by objective laws. Of the images formed in thought, those that are minimally dependent on the imagination guided by free choice are preferable. Minimally dependent on freedom and maximally dependent on objective physiological processes is the image of the object presented to the senses. Information given by visual, auditory, olfactory, etc. receptors appears to be minimally subordinate to the freedom of one's own choice.

We return to the question of finiteness and to the question of reality. Is it possible to assume that finiteness and visibility are inherent in the object itself, and the human mentality only reflects them? Our brief excursion into existential philosophy has shown that the desire to put a limit to everything (to define) is inherent in the very essence of human existence. This aspiration selects from the set of concepts those that best meet this requirement. not an empirically clearly fixed thing puts itself in the center of human attention, pushing abstractions and metaphysics to the periphery, but on the contrary: a certain way of attuned attention highlights in the variety of external information those phenomena whose content can be extremely narrowed, and the manipulation of which can be entrusted to laws that are considered objective.

This is also the case with reference to reality: we cannot assume that reference to reality is a self-evident way of persuading that a finite and observable concept present in our consciousness corresponds to a real object. We can't talk about any self-evidence. Here is the "escape from freedom" mentioned above: to relate something to reality and fix the characteristics of this correlated thing is to give up your free choice and entrust it to the senses, whose action is considered completely independent of the human will. And if the action is independent of the will, then the responsibility is removed, and the guilt is smoothed out. By the way, we note that the idea of objectivity as a correspondence to material objects is formed just then,

when the secularization of European thinking occurs and the first concepts appear that treat thinking as primarily cognition and guided by objective laws (XVI – XVIII centuries).

We return to the problem of anti-suicidal conversation. Our search, conducted using the existentialist paradigm, showed that the main requirement for concepts used in anti-suicidal conversation

is the maximum degree of exclusion of the possibility of free interpretation, as well as the highest degree of evidence of subordination of concepts to the objective laws of logic and mathematics.

Obviously, this requirement is met by the concepts that were discussed from the very beginning — empirical and logical concepts. But they are not the only ones who can narrow the circle of freedom. It seems that there is another type of concept that is quite suitable for the requirement of "exclusion of freedom". This type includes concepts that do not have an empirical equivalent and do not allow any explanation using other concepts — and it is the explanation using other concepts that gives the explained concept a certain degree of freedom. The concepts in question cannot be explained in any way, but they are intuitively obvious, and they are also considered to be understood in exactly the same way by all normal people without exception. In General, there are not many such concepts. All of them are rooted in a person's experience of himself. Experience yourself as your own existence, an existence different from anything else. Turning to the already mentioned existential tradition, we can name the following concepts: "I" (any normal person knows what "I" am sure that all other people have the same knowledge, but to disclose the contents "I" using other concepts is not possible); "Oblivion" (can't explain what it means the non-existence of a thing, event, process, etc.); "Freedom" ("freedom" is usually explained as unlimited choice, but "unlimited" in this context is a synonym for freedom — so this explanation is a typical *circulus vitiosus* — and the concept of "freedom" turns out to be basically inexplicable).

Our research shows that the list of concepts suitable for use in anti-suicide conversation can consist of three classes. The first class - empirical concepts, the second class-logical and mathematical concepts, the third class-self-evident concepts that are not verified empirically and are not explained logically. The understanding of these concepts is the same for all people, and it is constituted by human existence.

How are these concepts used? Of course, each specific situation dictates its own requirements, but you can offer a General scheme. Schneidman (2001) sets it in one sentence: "the Basic rule to keep in mind is that you can reduce lethality by reducing suffering and confusion" (p. 116).

The work begins by clarifying the specific empirical circumstances that led a person to decide to end their life. Here it is extremely important to emphasize and highlight the empirical nature of the circumstances — that is, their verifiability and finiteness (visibility). At this stage, empirical concepts are most relevant. Next, possible ways of developing the situation are drawn — here the concepts of logic and mathematics are updated. The final stage is the time of preferential use of self-evident concepts. How do they work? First of all, it is subject to reflection (in this case, it is explained to the suicidal person) that the situation that caused suicidal intentions seems tragic because the suicidal person sees it as freely chosen by his own "I" (although he makes a lot of effort to think of it as caused by objective circumstances). When this understanding is reached, when the suicidal person agrees that much is created by the free action of his "I", the application of the category "non-Existence" must follow. Non-existence is something that must pass "redirection". non-existence from the category of what awaits a person should pass into the category of what awaits negative circumstances.

We found out what concepts should be used in anti-suicidal conversation — these are empirical concepts, logical-mathematical concepts, and self-evident concepts. We can also specify which concepts to avoid. Avoid first of all those concepts that provide greater freedom of interpretation and-

consequently-increase the degree of responsibility experienced by a person, as well as sharpen the sense of unpredictability. Such concepts include, for example, "meaning" (life, creativity), "love"(for oneself, for another), "satisfaction" (life, activity), and much more.

This statement does not mean that we should not discuss the topics introduced by these terms. Just a theme it is translated into a more specific language and discussed using extremely specific concepts. The content of General concepts is divided into components expressed by acceptable types of concepts. "Meaning of life", for example, can be divided into separate specific episodes of life with specific tasks and specific results, " love "is replaced by specific actions of the object of love and their logical analysis, and an empirically verifiable scale can be created for" satisfaction".

## 7. Conclusion

What concepts should an anti-suicidal conversation use? Concepts that limit the freedom of interpretation to the utmost extent. Concepts that allow for broad interpretation should be abandoned. But the topic itself, introduced by such terms, is discussed with the help of concepts that have extremely narrow content and extremely obvious empirical base.

## References

- Efremov, V. S. (2004). *Suicidology Fundamentals*. «Dialekt» (Russian Federation).
- Pisarev, A. A. (2018). Under the sign of finiteness: social philosophy as an empirical philosophy. *Philosophical science*, 6, 139 – 143.
- Polojij, B. S., & Panchenko, E. A. (2012). Differentiated prevention of suicidal behavior. *Suicidology*, 1, 8 - 12
- Schlick, M. (1993). *About the Foundation of knowledge. Analytical philosophy. Selected texts*. MGU.
- Shneidman, E. (2001). *The soul of a suicide*. Smysl.
- Shneidman, E. (2018). *Psychotherapy of suicidal patients. Anthology of suicidology*. Kogito-Zentr.
- Starchenbaum, G. V. (2005). *Suicidology and crisis psychotherapy*. Kogito-Zentr.
- Starikova, I. V. (2018). Sign: concept, philosophical essence, content aspects. *Economic and socio-humanitarian research*, 1(17), 122 – 127.
- Tillich, P. (1995). *Selected works. Theology of culture*. Jurist.
- Yurieva, L. N. (2006). *Clinical suicidology*. Porogy.