

UNITED WISDOM

Long-Distance Relationships

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R-05-N04 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Long-Distance Relationships

Epigraph

“Ever-fixed mark.”

William Shakespeare, Sonnet 116, line 5, a fragment; RU translation by United Wisdom from the English MIT version. The poetic image of stability creates no duty to remain in every relationship.

What this article is about

In a hypothetical scene, one person finishes work and waits for a call while the other is already preparing for bed. They live in different places and said beforehand that they would call in the evening. For each, the word meant their own evening. The call did not happen; one felt forgotten, the other obliged to be available regardless of rest. This scene was invented for the article rather than taken from research. It shows a question distance makes visible: what precisely did two people accept as a shared plan, and which possibilities did each leave unconfirmed?

Long-distance relationships can have different causes, durations and desired futures. There will be no single message-frequency norm or promise that love overcomes every condition. We will consider availability, the content of communication, private life and meeting plans. A week-long communication study, a poetic image of constancy and religious ideas about attention remain separate. The article offers voluntary practice for clarifying one agreement. Its purpose is to make present answers more understandable while preserving each person's right to want closeness, have limits and revise the chosen relationship form.

I. Distance needs clarity about the agreement's subject

Living far apart describes conditions without explaining the whole couple. Some temporarily separate for study; others live separately by accepted choice; others do not know when they can meet. Identical communication needs or assessments of the future cannot be inferred in advance. First it helps to clarify what the current connection means to each. The relationship's meaning and practical contact arrangements are connected, yet an answer to one question does not replace an answer to the other.

In the opening scene, both could sincerely have wanted a call. Yet sincerity assigned no shared time. A day, times in both locations and an available period can be clarified if that precision suits. A detailed life calendar is unnecessary. Enough specificity is needed for the

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

accepted action. Promising to talk today differs from hoping to find an opportunity. This distinction helps avoid expecting a confirmed plan where someone has only expressed a wish, or treating every uncertainty as intentional deception.

Circumstances also deserve their own place in conversation. Working hours, rest, responsibilities and access to somewhere quiet can differ. A participant may state a limit without reporting every activity. The other may say that the availability offered is insufficient. Both answers matter. They do not automatically become compatible, but supply an actual subject for discussion: which format is possible and wanted now. The article does not decide who must abandon their routine to prove the seriousness of long-distance love.

Clarity does not demand an immediate decision about the entire future. Sometimes the next meeting is unknown while current contact is accepted. Sometimes precisely that uncertainty makes continuation difficult. The difference can be named directly. An exact date nobody can confirm should not be promised merely to calm the conversation. People can agree which new circumstance would allow them to return to the question. This remains a limited arrangement rather than a guaranteed meeting or a way to make one person wait indefinitely without a right to change their answer.

The first editorial step is to see the agreement's scope. What did both accept, what did one propose, and what remained an assumption? An answer helps even without a beautiful outcome. Different expectations do not yet establish absent love. But an important difference should not be hidden beneath a general promise to manage. It needs its own conversation. People may seek another contact format, retain the current one or recognise that no acceptable option currently exists; the next decision belongs to participants.

II. Availability does not mean presence around the clock

A phone permits contact, but possessing one does not mean continuous readiness to answer. Someone may work, sleep, talk to another person or simply want quiet. This does not assign an excuse as the cause of every silence. It distinguishes technical possibility from voluntary availability. If understanding response arrangements matters to a partner, those can be discussed. No universal waiting time should be imposed after which every message becomes evidence of neglect, infidelity or vanished feelings.

A hypothetical participant sees a read receipt and assumes they are deliberately ignored. The receipt supplies a limited interface fact rather than a complete reason for behaviour. The particular situation can be asked about if important. Yet the assumption should not become an established motive. The other may explain that they opened the message between tasks and intended to answer later. They may also decline a detailed account. The subsequent

conversation then concerns accepted communication arrangements and the need for them rather than the ability to guess a hidden thought.

A short message answerable later can be distinguished from an invitation to talk at a specified time. Each format has its own conditions. If every message carries immediate urgency, someone may find that the chosen connection demands more availability than they wish to give. This should be discussed in words. The article suggests neither a special code, compulsory daily check nor a love rating by notification count. The format is chosen for particular people rather than through a universal picture of the correct remote couple.

When an agreed conversation is postponed, the change can be communicated where possible and another option offered if actually available. Yet the suggestion should remain accurate. A new meeting should not be scheduled merely to stop dissatisfaction when its conditions are already unconfirmed. The other participant may consider frequent postponements significant. A general appeal to busyness cannot close that question; circumstances explain part of the situation, while each person independently assesses whether the current arrangement is acceptable.

In the opening scene, one may need a regular conversation and the other a free evening before sleep. They seek an overlap or see that little currently exists. Their decision need not be identical every day. A limited period can be accepted while remaining time is free from expectations of an immediate response. If that arrangement is unsuitable for one, this should also be heard. Availability does not become an infinite resource, and dissatisfaction does not vanish merely because a partner honestly states a limit.

III. What week-long diaries can tell us

In their 2013 primary paper, Jiang and Hancock studied communication through week-long diaries of dating couples, mostly students. In the selected analysis, distant participants reported greater closeness following individual contacts than nearby participants; the authors considered self-disclosure and idealization. This is an observational result from a particular sample. Selected methods, results and limitations were read rather than the entire paper.

This result does not permit distance to be declared the cause of better love. The practical choice of a format remains an independent question. Diaries also prescribe no compulsory volume of personal disclosures for a reader. The content of contact can be considered worthy of attention without a promised universal effect. Your couple's question remains its own: what is wanted in conversation, what is accepted voluntarily and what actually followed it. The answer needs present participants rather than one group comparison.

Closeness after conversation and a suitable shared future are different questions. People can enjoy communicating while differing about where to live. They can discuss a difficult topic

without immediate relief even though mutual understanding became more precise. These are editorial examples. They help preserve the rating's scope: an impression of contact does not describe a couple's whole life. The article establishes no experience that must follow every call for the connection to be considered real enough or deserving of continuation.

Content does not mean the depth of a compelled confession either. One person wants to share an important decision, another an ordinary event. Both formats can be welcome if participants accept them. Scientific interest in self-disclosure establishes no duty to open every private subject. Someone retains boundaries and their own readiness. A question can be offered and refusal heard. Conversation's actual subject thus stays with the living participant rather than being assigned by an outside scheme they must complete for a measurable feeling of closeness.

Our practice below therefore neither repeats the research diary nor counts as a tested intervention. It clarifies one contact agreement. Participants choose frequency and format; messages are not collected for assessment by a third party. A successful personal experience confirms no entire scientific article, and an unsuccessful one does not refute it. Empirical comparison remains a separate ground for reflection, the editorial question a way to identify particular expectations, and a continuing relationship needs its own voluntary answer.

IV. Private life remains during separation

Distance may leave participants with less immediate information about another's everyday life. Yet missing information creates no entitlement to any proof. Access to location, passwords or messages is not prescribed as a condition of love by this article. If someone voluntarily shares a plan, consent's scope should remain: mentioning a meeting does not permit checking all its participants. A relationship preserves adult independence, and an anxious assumption should not automatically become established guilt in a partner.

Chapter I of Mill addresses interference within a political and philosophical context. Here it provides a limited parallel with a person's right to a separate life. This is neither an empirical finding about long-distance trust nor a legal conclusion about digital data. The modern application belongs to the editors. Freedom also preserves accepted agreements. If changing a personal plan affects a promised meeting, it should be discussed within the shared subject's scope without turning that discussion into an account of all private life.

In a hypothetical scene, someone says they will spend the evening with friends. The other may feel there is too little shared time and request a separate conversation later. This differs from demanding proof of who was present every minute. An unmet need can be discussed without assigning guilt because physical access is absent. If participants want different levels of openness, the difference matters. Neither complete transparency nor complete closure is

declared compulsory here: the format needs agreement, while a boundary permits an independent answer.

Sharing the entire difficulty with an outside circle is unnecessary to gain a right to decide. People can choose whom to tell about the relationship and which details to keep private. Yet a shared conversation does not require concealing an important need from a partner. Privacy differs from silence about everything. The article leaves someone free to determine a safe and acceptable scope of communication. Platform rules, local laws and specific digital-protection measures are not researched here; no universal technical or legal promises are offered.

If proposed contact arrangements require continuous monitoring, that condition can be declined. Refusal establishes neither absent love nor a hidden relationship. The other may assess whether the accepted format is sufficient. Incompatible demands may remain real, but naming them is better than concealing them beneath every loving person's alleged duty to surrender passwords. Respect guarantees no matching of all wishes; it preserves each person's right to state a boundary and decide independently which relationship they are willing to continue.

V. Constancy in the sonnet remains a poetic image

Sonnet 116 speaks of love's stability before change and time. The selected fragment presents a mark that remains amid change. A reader can compare this image with the wish for a meaningful connection during separation. Yet the poem studies neither couples, time zones nor messaging methods. Its literary voice confirms no scientific hypothesis. It offers language for reflection about constancy; that word's particular relationship meaning should be sought from participants and their present answers.

Stability can mean preserving an accepted meaning rather than an unchanging schedule. A call is postponed, a circumstance changes, someone states a new limit—none yet decides the connection's entire fate. Yet a repeated difficulty also does not disappear beneath a beautiful image. Poetry should not forbid discussing an insufficient current format. Someone can value constancy and need revision. This is an editorial application of the image rather than a proven authorial guide or a demand always to endure distance.

In the key quotation, time gains no final power over love within the sonnet. This is a literary statement that can support reflection on meaning. It does not require ignoring changing circumstances. Someone can recognise that a former arrangement no longer suits even if the feeling was sincere. Choosing another life does not automatically establish that no love existed before. The article does not judge past experience by whether the current connection could be preserved forever.

Participants can relate differently to the poem: its image matters to one but feels distant to another. This need not obstruct a practical conversation. A shared spiritual or literary interpretation cannot be required before discussing a meeting time. Meanings and actions can be separated. What matters to me to preserve? What can I actually accept now? Where is our plan confirmed? Poetic attention helps pose a question without gaining the right to answer for an adult living in particular conditions.

In the opening scene, the mark may be simple: both want to learn about each other's present lives and can choose an available time. Or one discovers that without a clear prospect of meeting, this format is unsuitable. Neither answer is prescribed by the sonnet. Keeping it accurate matters. Constancy becomes a living meaning where participants choose what to preserve; it stops helping conversation when it becomes a beautiful name for one person's duty to endure everything without revision.

VI. Attention can become specific

At a distance, care need not appear only as a long call. An accepted format can be asked about: a short message, conversation later or help with a clear task. Yet good intention does not determine the suitable method. One wants to be heard and receives advice; another expects practical action and hears general words. These hypothetical differences establish no cause of every difficulty. They suggest clarifying support's subject with its intended recipient while preserving the possibility of declining the option offered.

In James 1:19–27, listening, speech and action have a Christian moral foundation. The article's limited parallel is to hear content before presenting ready-made help. This is no universal digital-communication protocol. The passage studies no remote couples and validates no effect of our practice. Its religious foundation remains separate, while the editors formulate the modern question: which action is actually accepted and what response is needed now if the participant wishes to name it in their own words?

In Chapter 67 of Legge's translation, Daoist gentleness provides another normative framework. It can be compared with attention without insistence: a question permits a pause and independent answer. This comparison establishes no identical Christian and Daoist teaching. It concerns a limited way of treating an adult. Gentleness does not conceal one's own dissatisfaction, and listening does not mean agreeing to everything. Someone can state an important limit calmly or awkwardly without turning it into an order for another to surrender their voice.

A hypothetical participant sends a gift when their partner requested conversation. The gift may be pleasant without automatically answering the request. Attention can be recognised while the need for conversation remains named. Gratitude creates no duty to abandon the original

question or offer an intimate message in return. Any sexual content, including digital content, needs its own voluntary consent; the couple's closeness does not assign that consent in advance. The article offers neither special intimate-connection techniques nor required frequency.

Specific participation is not always possible at the desired scale. Someone can honestly state today's availability without presenting it as a complete solution. The other may want more and choose whether the current form is sufficient. Respectfully declining an unmanageable task and acknowledging dissatisfaction can coexist. The article does not promise to remove the difference through moral language. Attention means seeing the actual subject and limit rather than declaring any small contribution sufficient for everyone or every request compulsory to fulfil.

VII. A meeting needs separate conditions

A wish to meet can be shared while the practical plan remains unconfirmed. Time, cost, travel and accommodation need specific answers where the meeting depends on them. Every expense should not become proof of seriousness. One person may have other resources or responsibilities. Contributions and limits can be discussed without judging someone's worth by willingness to pay more. The article prescribes neither a financial product, legal relocation procedure nor universal division of expense; those decisions need their own checks of circumstances.

An invitation, accepted plan and completed action can be distinguished. A proposed trip does not yet mean agreement to buy a ticket. A ticket bought without agreement makes no meeting compulsory. If one invests money on their own assumption, the other becomes indebted neither in body, time nor further promises. A solution to the resulting difficulty can be sought separately. Respect for invested resources matters, yet preserves the need for a voluntary answer to the meeting itself and conditions not previously accepted.

Meeting may reveal expectations different from those in messages. One wants more time together; another wants to retain ordinary responsibilities and see friends. These differences should be clarified as planning subjects rather than settled through a rule that rare meetings justify every demand. Available days and a wish for personal time can be named. A shared trip establishes no continuous availability. Long-distance relationships retain boundaries when people come physically closer, and consent to visit is not consent to everything after arrival.

A meeting also need not immediately resolve living together. People can enjoy it while relocation remains open. They may learn that an earlier picture of household life differs from present wishes. This supplies information for a separate conversation rather than proof that all previous feelings were false. Physical proximity cannot be promised automatically to remove

confusion or difficulty. It changes contact conditions, yet participants still need to clarify actual answers, the scope of accepted actions and what each wants to choose next.

If a meeting is postponed, disappointment can matter. It need not be suppressed to preserve the image of a strong remote couple. The changed plan and remaining need can be acknowledged. Yet a new promise should rest on available conditions. Sometimes these are absent. An honest lack of a date is not necessarily pleasant, but is more accurate than invented certainty. The next choice—waiting, different contact, revision or another decision—is prescribed neither by the article nor automatically by the number of postponed journeys.

VIII. The future can be discussed without false certainty

A plan to come closer may matter to one while remaining uncertain for another. Shared hope does not make it a shared decision. What each wants, which conditions are known and what action is currently accepted can be clarified. A particular country or date need not be chosen without grounds. Yet a significant question should not disappear merely because it is difficult. Someone may say that an absent prospect affects willingness to continue this form without declaring another answer a moral failure.

A wish, possibility and promise can be distinguished. Someone wants to live nearby but does not know whether work can change. Another would like to wait only with a clear plan. Both answers can be sincere and remain incompatible. The article decides neither which wish matters more nor how to force circumstances to obey correct love. Conversation helps when it makes these grounds visible and preserves each person's right to choose consequences rather than treating any warm intention as a confirmed date.

Revision need not devalue the past. A present answer may differ from an earlier one. Communicating change where it concerns a shared plan matters. This differs from silently cancelling an accepted action on which the other depends. Someone can respect shared history and no longer want distance. They can choose continuation without an exact date for coming closer. Each option needs its own acceptance; waiting's duration grants neither automatic entitlement to the wanted outcome nor a duty to wait equally long again.

If conversation currently feels too large, one nearest question can be selected. What became confirmed? What remained open? Which action needs an answer before planning? This limit should not pretend to decide the entire life. A broader subject can remain named and be revisited when suitable. The article prescribes no obligatory interval and tests no one's consistency through one difficult conversation. A small result retains its scale, while significant uncertainty retains a right to be heard even when not yet removed.

When no acceptable shared plan appears, a beautiful promise need not replace it. A difference can be named and an independent decision made. Not every outcome is pleasant. Yet an

absent shared answer cannot count as shared consent, and refusing an unacceptable condition cannot mean insufficient ability to love. Respect preserves each person's independence amid uncertainty. It guarantees no continuing couple, but helps avoid adding to difficult circumstances a duty to perform certainty nobody can actually supply.

IX. Connection remains two people's choice

A remote couple has no single external sign of a real relationship. Call frequency, meeting count and message length alone provide no complete answer about its meaning for participants. How each experiences current arrangements and what they want to retain can be clarified. An identical vocabulary of feelings is unnecessary. Yet differences affecting accepted actions deserve conversation. Today's decision develops from people's answers and available conditions rather than compulsory conformity to an image of the couple that always overcomes distance.

In the opening scene, they may choose a mutually suitable time and limit the conversation. One receives attention; the other preserves rest. But another answer is possible: there is little overlap and the wanted amount is unavailable. This should be heard without a promised communication victory. Clarification creates no extra time itself. It only shows what is accepted, what is missing and what each can actually do. This is a small increase in clarity rather than guaranteed happiness or proof that all present conditions are sufficient.

After accepted contact, what helped can be learned: the time, topic or opportunity to speak without hurry. An unsuitable format can also be noticed. Different impressions require no immediate guilty party. They supply a subject for revision if participants want further discussion. Checking should not become compulsory rating of every message. Its purpose is one clear question rather than continuous relationship measurement in which every contact reports the whole couple's success to a partner or outside observer.

Continuation permits a changed form. Another channel, fewer conversations or a separate meeting plan can be accepted if both want it. A suitable form may currently be absent. Even sincere love assigns no duty to accept every condition. Someone may state a boundary and the other determine their own decision. The article leaves different futures open and judges no participant by whether they chose to wait, come closer, live separately or end the connection.

Distance makes some conditions more visible without supplying a ready answer about relationship quality. Poetry offers an image, research a bounded comparison and religious texts different moral foundations. A particular conversation remains living people's task. Here its purpose is to preserve clarity about accepted action and independence of response. Connection then needs no continuous proof of presence: it gains a clear subject, revision possibilities and room for each person's present life, which continues between meetings too.

What this means in practice

This is voluntary editorial practice about one agreement rather than Jiang and Hancock's research diary, therapy or fidelity test. It can be done privately in writing. A shared conversation is unnecessary where refusal triggers threat or pressure; suitable support is sought separately according to circumstances. The limited aim is to notice one contact or near-term plan and clarify which expectations both actually accepted. Practice requires neither passwords, private messages, intimate materials nor an external report.

Choose one situation: a missed call, waiting for a reply or discussing a meeting. Record the observed event separately from its assumed motive. Then name your own need: attention, a clear time, a particular plan or rest. You need not establish the cause of silence for your partner. If a specific crossed boundary is involved, name it separately. Clarifying contact replaces no decision about safety or whether the behaviour itself is acceptable.

If desired, ask how the other understands the situation today. Allow them to correct your description of their expectations. Silence does not count as agreement. A pause can be chosen, discussion currently declined or the question left open. If both want a contact agreement, clarify the day, times in both locations, available duration and how to communicate change. Discuss only information needed for the accepted subject; the entire private life does not become a compulsory schedule attachment.

Record the accepted decision's scope in ordinary words. What is confirmed, what only wanted and what unknown? Attach no promise of daily availability to one call or consent to relocation and intimacy to a meeting. Each subject needs its own answer. If a shared opportunity is absent, name the limit. Another option can be considered without accepting it merely to stop dissatisfaction or promising an unconfirmed date for a calm conversational ending.

After the chosen action, compare expectations and experience when suitable. Did the time suit, was the wanted topic heard, and did a significant difference remain? One pleasant conversation resolves no entire future; disappointment also establishes no absent love. Preserve what both want preserved and clarify the unsuitable separately. Do not turn observation into a correct-message counter. An absent shared answer permits honest acknowledgement rather than a compulsory positive exercise result.

Returning to the opening scene, two people may see that their evenings differed while the wish to meet was shared. They choose a suitable time or acknowledge current limited opportunities. Their next decision remains theirs. Long-distance relationships retain respect when each can state what they want and decline without proving love around the clock. Clear contact leaves space for closeness and separate life, while a mark cannot replace a living person's present voluntary answer.

Key quotation

> *“Not Time's fool.”*

William Shakespeare, Sonnet 116, line 9, a fragment about love; RU translation by United Wisdom from MIT. The poetic voice assigns no waiting deadline and requires no disregard for changing circumstances.

Connections between traditions

• Shakespeare: constancy before time ↔ a connection's meaning in separation. A poetic image remains separate from empirical results and a decision to stay.

• Mill: interference limits ↔ an adult's separate life. A bounded philosophical parallel rather than a legal regime for digital data.

• James: listening and action ↔ the accepted subject of support. A Christian framework becomes neither messaging research nor validated practice.

• Daoist gentleness, 67 ↔ a question permitting pause and refusal. Comparison of treatment rather than a claim of identical traditional doctrine.

• Jiang and Hancock: week-long diaries ↔ a question about contact's content. Observational comparison remains separate from universal advice and editorial practice.

Primary sources

• William Shakespeare. Sonnet CXVI. English MIT version; all 14 lines were read. The electronic page's printed basis was not established. United Wisdom translated fragments of lines 5 and 9.

• L. Crystal Jiang, Jeffrey T. Hancock. Absence Makes the Communication Grow Fonder: Geographic Separation, Interpersonal Media, and Intimacy in Dating Relationships. Journal of Communication, 2013, 63, 556–577, DOI10.1111/jcom.12029. Selected methods, results, discussion and limitations of the primary paper were read rather than all 22 pages. Its week-long observational design is not transferred to every couple.

• John Stuart Mill. On Liberty, I. Selected introductory-chapter arguments were read rather than the entire treatise; a political and philosophical comparison without new direct quotations.

• James 1:19–27, KJV. The specified passage was read in full; a religious moral framework rather than remote-relationship research.

• Laozi, traditional attribution. Tao Teh King, 67, James Legge translation. The selected chapter was read in full; the entire corpus and version's printed history were not researched.

Tags

long-distance relationships, couple, separation, closeness, communication, call, messages, availability, time, expectations, agreements, boundaries, privacy, independence, trust, consent, voluntariness, attention, support, meeting, journey, plans, future, constancy, revision, Shakespeare, Mill, James, Daoism, research

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a co-author of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.