

UNITED WISDOM

Closeness and the number of contacts

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R-19-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Closeness and the number of contacts

Epigraph

...between mind and mind...

Agnes Repplier, Compromises, The Luxury of Conversation, web 103; a short fragment of the author's own reasoning. This image of conversation does not define measurable closeness.

What this article is about

Vera has many saved contacts: colleagues, former neighbours, activity participants, and old friends. Yet when she wants to discuss something important in the evening, the long list gives no immediate answer about whom she can approach. This is a fictional scene, not an account of a typical person. The number records entries; availability for conversation, trust, shared roles, and personal meaning require different information. The list does not become useless because it cannot satisfy every need. Its actual possibilities can be recognized without requiring every acquaintance to become a close friend.

This article considers an existing picture of connections. It appoints no correct number of friends, ranks nobody, and diagnoses no loneliness. Infrequent connection can be meaningful, frequent contact useful for an undertaking, and a friendly person presently unavailable. These distinctions matter. We consider existing connections rather than creating a circle, planning a meeting between already willing friends or selecting a device or communication channel. The following scenes and voluntary practice are editorial proposals rather than a tested social method.

I. A list of addresses and the possibility of approaching someone provide different information

Vera opens forty names, including people with whom numbers were exchanged once and others replying weekly. The number alone does not show which connections continue today. It can accurately describe an address book while inaccurately answering a question about available support. Retaining old addresses needs no accusation of self-deception. Establish the subject instead. Sending invitations benefits from one list; personal conversation needs other information. Someone can appear in both without that presence establishing an accepted proposal.

Contact has different meanings: the possibility of writing, an actual exchange, or a lengthy acquaintance. Comparing present relationships with someone else's follower count can

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

compare different subjects. This does not declare a public audience unreal or personal interaction necessarily better. Their tasks differ. Communicating news requires one form of access; confidential discussion may need another experience. Precision begins with naming the subject rather than searching for a universal ladder assigning every form of human presence the same positions.

A small actual question can clarify an entry. Have they interacted recently, is the channel available, and is the subject understood? Answers do not automatically produce an assessment of a person. A former neighbour may answer about the building without wanting a personal meeting. A friend may no longer use an old number. A colleague may discuss work rather than family. Those limits do not make a connection false: they show its area and prevent assigning an unknown role merely because a name appears in a long list.

Every unknown need not be immediately resolved. Vera can retain old contacts without checking everybody or restoring every correspondence. A specific need can prompt consideration of a suitable approach. Personal information need not become a reliability table. Here distinction supports choice rather than constant observation of acquaintances. Someone retains the right not to reply. Nonresponse affects this conversation without revealing all reasons. A long list leaves part of the picture unknown; this can be acknowledged without a general verdict on relationships.

II. Availability concerns a situation rather than an entire personality

Vera writes to an old friend who cannot speak tonight. A meaningful connection and an unavailable evening can coexist. One refusal does not establish complete lack of interest. Nor should available help be depicted where it is presently absent. If conversation is needed today, that limit matters regardless of good history. Respect for the friend can remain while another available option is sought. Acknowledging a present limit need not make all previous interaction a mistake.

Availability depends on the subject. An acquaintance may discuss a book without helping with a move. Another can perform a small task without hearing personal details. The article determines no compulsory alternative offer. Learn the actual proposal and decide whether it fits. A warm refusal of one role does not cancel all others; general friendliness does not mean agreement to any activity. Vera gains no complete access to someone's life through a pleasant answer. Past help gives the acquaintance no entitlement to her entire biography either.

Urgency changes timing's meaning. Speaking next month can matter to a relationship while proving insufficient today. This distinction does not judge feelings through reply speed: it names the actual limit of this support. Under danger, ordinary editorial practice stops and

protection concerns actual conditions. The article knows no local procedure and proposes no waiting until a close person finds a free evening. Conversation can be useful within its area without its name supplying an actual answer to a threat or another urgent subject.

A different scope can be proposed: brief correspondence, one question, or later conversation if suitable to both. This is a possibility rather than a duty to reduce every need to others' convenient size. If the smaller format fails the subject, insufficiency can be acknowledged. Vera need not declare satisfaction to preserve a pleasant impression; her friend need not depict nonexistent capacity. Clarification preserves each answer and distinguishes a real small proposal from a large promise existing only in an assumed picture of the relationship.

III. Trust has a subject and a history

Vera trusts a colleague within a project: tasks are completed and delays reported. This is actual experience rather than automatic trust concerning personal information. Confidence can differ between areas without inconsistency. One episode makes nobody wholly reliable or unreliable. A broader conclusion needs other grounds. Secret testing is not proposed. Limited experience should not become knowledge of every future action, nor should incomplete openness prove that a connection has no meaning.

Disclosure alone also does not measure friendship. Vera can share something important without receiving wanted understanding, or retain part of her story while remaining close. Missing detail does not always mean deficient trust: it may have its own grounds. Uniform transparency or collected confessions need not confirm status. Actual handling of already shared information matters and can reveal a limit, without becoming a scientific scale or promising that a subsequent message will be received similarly.

If an acquaintance passes private information onward, the actual action deserves consideration rather than being concealed by years of good history. The article knows neither all circumstances nor a legal procedure. What happened can be clarified where available and safe, and later disclosure changed. One significant breach need not erase every area of connection, but previous help does not compel unchanged trust. Revision concerns present grounds rather than a person's good reputation or a duty to remain grateful for all past events.

History can support confidence while leaving uncertainty. Ten years of acquaintance do not reveal every present circumstance; a short duration does not automatically make a new connection dangerous. Such descriptions orient without supplying complete conclusions. Vera can recognize the grounds of today's approach and what remains unknown. This requires no suspicion of everybody. Experience, hope, and an untested assumption differ, allowing someone to avoid disclosing beyond their wishes to fit an attractive image of friendship or rejecting good contact because it lacks lengthy history.

IV. Conversation is not reduced to the number of interlocutors

In the selected opening of Agnes Repplier's The Luxury of Conversation, conversation is considered as a connection between people rather than merely a prominent speaker's performance. This historical literary judgement is no network study and supplies no size for a close circle. We also do not adopt conversation as compulsory duty: capacity and desire remain separate.

The comparison offers a limited question for Vera's scene. At a crowded gathering she hears an interesting presentation but barely participates. An event can be valuable without answering her desire for exchange. Recognizing the second need not deny the first. Elsewhere, a brief conversation with one person can provide a wanted response. This establishes no superiority of small gatherings. Participant numbers and opportunities for mutual approach are different properties. A large event may contain both; a small one may lack exchange. Examine the actual episode rather than assigning its result through size.

Mutual exchange does not require equal-length turns. Someone speaks more while another presently listens. Availability of one's own participation and a real response matter if wanted by both. There is no stopwatch or compulsory activity for a quiet person. Listening can be chosen and sufficient, or enforced by a conversation's arrangement. These cases need different information. Vera can recognize her wishes and available participation without first becoming a brighter speaker or assuming another's silence always accepts every direction of discussion.

Interesting speech does not replace every form of closeness. After an excellent conversation, availability for another subject may remain unknown. This does not cancel the episode: it has meaning without promising continuation on any terms. Another meeting can be wanted, proposed, and answered. Here, however, the article does not organise an old friendship's calendar. Its subject is distinguishing existing connections. One good conversation clarifies the picture without making someone a universal recipient obliged to hear every story, perform every request, and confirm every expectation.

V. A role's name and actual response need separate examination

Vera calls someone a friend, associating the word with history and personal meaning. What is possible now remains a specific question. One limitation does not empty the name, but the name does not answer every subject either. The word can remain while the actual format is clarified. Another person may understand the role differently without deception: meanings may never have been discussed. No complete assumed scope should be demanded to preserve a pleasant name, and significant mismatch need not hide behind a word both already used.

A working role can include a clear obligation that a personal name does not create. A task accepted by a colleague has consequences concerning that promise; simple friendliness creates no duty to perform it. These can be distinguished without declaring friendship irresponsible or work devoid of human meaning. Accepted scope matters, separating promised action from a new proposal. An unknown agreement cannot be demanded through the word close, nor can an actual promise be cancelled because relationships acquired no higher title.

A formal role sometimes remains after response changes. Vera says old friend while knowing little about the present person. History and current distance can coexist without making the past unreal. Memory can remain while a new approach is considered or expectations change. Vera cannot appoint another's desire. Where continuation is absent, an attractive name supplies none. Yet missing present closeness need not make someone a useless address to delete for correct statistics. Relationships can have different times and meanings rather than one compulsory lifelong form.

Clarifying a role need not begin with a weighty status discussion. A concrete request with a real possible answer may suffice, while a wider subject needs separate consideration. This is no hidden test of love through a small action: the action reveals its own result. It should not be a trap making an unwanted reply proof of inferior personal quality. Vera can seek another way to meet a need while retaining a suitable connection. Precision lets people remain meaningful within their actual area without promising every conceivable kind of closeness.

VI. Connections can have different personal meanings

Someone helps Vera think about her profession, another is pleasant for walks, and a third retains shared history. Areas can overlap or remain separate. Nobody must fulfil every function simultaneously, and acquaintances should not be reduced to services. A participant has interests and answers rather than a position in somebody else's scheme. Someone can name a connection's meaning for themselves without describing another's entire personality. Such a map reveals availability if it does not distribute duties among people who never accepted the proposed roles.

Meaning can be substantial at low frequency. Vera rarely meets an old friend but recognizes an important part of her history in conversation. This is a possible fictional meaning rather than a rule favouring rare meetings. Frequency describes repetition; meaning needs its own description. Frequent work can matter differently. Comparison should not declare rare contact authentic and daily contact superficial. Each has circumstances. Several forms can be valued without a common hierarchy of worth or requiring a seemingly deep connection to replace everything else.

Not every wanted kind of connection is present. Vera has useful work exchanges but lacks available personal conversation. The absence deserves acknowledgment rather than claims that contact numbers already suffice. Work connections do not become bad because another need remains unmet. Another possibility can be sought where available; the article promises no creation of it or explanation through inadequate gratitude. One contact's meaning and the overall picture's insufficiency for a subject can coexist without a universal norm for friend numbers.

Personal descriptions can change. Vera previously wanted frequent shared leisure and now values a separate conversation more. Changing need does not make the old connection mistaken; it invites reconsideration of available proposals. New duties require others' answers. The old format can remain, another be offered, or mismatch recognized. Relationship meaning does not exist solely within one person, yet somebody else's normal-friendship label cannot cancel personal description either. Each can name a desire; two desires provide no ready joint solution and do not guarantee that an old form can accommodate both.

VII. Numbers explain neither motives nor personal worth

Seeing someone else's wide circle, Vera can feel left behind. Visible numbers do not reveal all conditions: availability, content, time, and costs remain unknown. Defending her relationships requires no invention of poor quality elsewhere. Incomplete comparison can simply be acknowledged. Another circle can be large and meaningful; hers can have another size and possibilities. A lack of specific interaction remains an actual subject without proving lesser worth for somebody with fewer names in an address book.

A small number also proves no special depth. Someone can have few contacts without a needed response, or many and find it. The article replaces no prestigious scale with another. A number answers a limited question while others remain open. This matters when reassuring somebody that they simply need two real friends. Such a formula appoints a number without grounds and may conceal present help's unavailability. Establish the wanted subject and existing possibilities rather than promising a correct life after achieving a selected figure.

Reasons for infrequent interaction may remain unknown: somebody is occupied, prefers another format, changed interests, or wants no continuation. Possibilities establish no fact. Vera may ask where appropriate without entitlement to an explanation of an entire life. Refusal of details limits understanding without permitting invented motives. Decisions with incomplete information can acknowledge the limit. This differs both from continuously seeking hidden rejection and compulsory reassurance that everything is certainly fine. No general account replaces an actual answer that may presently be absent.

An absence of contacts is no diagnosis here. It may complicate a particular need, which attractive claims about self-sufficiency cannot erase. Causes and responses require context rather than a universal command to expand at any cost or to desire absence. Available limits can be acknowledged, one possibility considered, and the broader question retained for separate work. Under danger or pronounced distress, ordinary practice appoints no local help. It stops where a small editorial consideration fails the actual subject and consequences of a situation.

VIII. A picture of connections should not become a ranking of people

Vera can note an unmet need and a connection answering part of it without assigning everyone a closeness score. Numbers can hide different subjects and turn personal approaches into competition. This practice concerns questions and availability rather than a person's value. One episode suffices, and nothing need be recorded. Permanent accounting of help, replies, and disclosures is not required. The purpose is clearer choice today rather than proof of the best participant throughout an entire life through invisible points.

Accepted responsibility deserves attention without making every kind act a debt. Helping an acquaintance creates no automatic entitlement to equal personal attention. A specific reciprocal promise has a separate subject. Both circumstances can be named. Gratitude should not cancel future freedom, nor freedom erase already accepted actions. An unagreed contribution cannot purchase closeness and make somebody indebted for absent feelings. Help's practical result and personal interest have different grounds even where they sometimes emerge together.

Available responses to one need can be compared: one person suits work discussion, another an ordinary walk. This choice establishes no overall superiority and can change next time. Vera need not announce everyone’s position in her internal map. Proposing an action does require retaining a real answer rather than depicting an assumed role as accepted. A useful map remains a draft of personal understanding: it reveals limits instead of appointing others' schedules, disclosure levels, and compulsory positions in a predetermined plan of closeness.

A connection unsuitable for one subject need not end completely. Shared interest can remain while approaches change. Significant harmful action needs separate consideration rather than concealment through usefulness. The article knows no locally safe step and commands no mandatory departure. It distinguishes limitation from harm, while decisions may need further facts. Unavailability should not automatically be called violence, and occasional help should not excuse humiliation. Both conclusions concern information that numbers alone cannot supply or replace through a general table of people's value.

IX. Expectations can change without erasing history

Vera notices she repeatedly seeks something a person does not offer. Expectations can change without first deciding the acquaintance is bad or the past unreal. Today's possibility matters. A continuing need requires a separate available response; reduced expectation need not depict complete satisfaction. Past value and another desire can coexist. This precision preserves actual meaning without making a good history and sufficient addresses proof that every need must already be met.

Another subject can be proposed: a conversation instead of a large request, or an activity instead of continuous availability. This is no compulsory concession. An unsuitable smaller format need not be accepted to produce an attractive outcome. An acquaintance may agree or decline. A new form needs an answer rather than unilateral renaming. This article designs neither a meeting calendar nor group departure. Changing understanding does not itself change another's capacity, though it may support a proposal free from hidden demands to perform a previously imagined role.

A connection can end without clear explanation. Absent continuation and limited knowledge of reasons can be recognized. Contact numbers may fall without automatically worsening an entire life. A loss can matter in itself rather than being reassured away through remaining numbers. Other connections also need not vanish from attention. The article appoints no period for experiencing loss and supplies no replacement person. Specific loss, uncertainty, and present participation can be distinguished without becoming one general score of relationship success.

Change can reveal a more precise question: which participation is missing and actually available, rather than how many people to add? An answer may be small and include no new closeness. Its scope can be acknowledged while the need remains separately considered. Correct contact examination promises no quick circle, nor becomes useless solely because it creates no conversational partner. Its possible result is clearer knowledge of an offer and limitation supporting a next choice where any such choice is available in actual conditions.

X. Sufficient precision needs no correct number of friends

Return to Vera. She distinguishes old addresses, work exchange, personal history, and current availability. This is a possible scene outcome rather than a proven effect. Her long list answers neither every question nor nothing. Useful connection and missing conversation can coexist. She knows slightly more about today's subject while not knowing others' entire lives. That limit is no failure. Choice need not demand maximum closeness from every acquaintance or final judgement of an entire circle through one figure.

A contact can have several areas without being permanently assigned to them. Different possibilities exist today and later as history and conditions change. Understanding can be revised while actual promises remain. An old role name gives no entitlement to eternal availability; claiming changed relationships also erases no accepted responsibility. Precision retains the subject. People can offer an actual part and hear replies without appointing complete mutual servicing or first proving identical thoughts, interests, and needs.

This article establishes no universal measure of closeness. Number, access, trust, role, and personal meaning are distinguished; they can support each other or diverge. The historical essay remains literary comparison and scenes an original editorial argument. No statistical norm or clinical explanation of absent links follows. The question concerns knowledge of an existing picture rather than when willing friends meet. Creating a new environment remains a separate subject. The boundary retains one subject without repeating the whole structure of friendship and autonomy.

Simply increasing numbers does not supply closeness, but numbers need not be rejected as useless. They answer their own question. Another subject can prompt examination of availability and response where appropriate. There is no required ranking, hidden test, or correct universal figure. Danger ends the ordinary format. Elsewhere a sufficient result can be a distinction: this contact matters, this help is unavailable, this need remains. Someone can seek a better form without devaluing an existing circle or requiring anybody immediately to become everything needed in their life.

What this means in practice

If you want, choose one present need and a suitable connection. Name known information: an available channel, previous experience, accepted role, or simply hope. Rank nobody and appoint no correct friend count. Consideration can remain mental without a saved personal table.

Where appropriate and safe, offer a clear subject with a real possible answer. Distinguish an actual action, its limit, and unknown reasons. One refusal explains no complete history; one agreement creates no universal future roles. Previous contribution purchases no compulsory interest. A specific accepted promise matters separately.

Afterward acknowledge available participation and remaining need separately. A suitable connection can remain, expectations change, or another possibility be sought where available. This voluntary editorial practice does not guarantee response, new closeness, or safety. Threat ends it. A slightly clearer present picture can suffice without proving you already have the right number of people and that an absent connection must now cease to matter.

Key quotation

> *...our most rational pleasure...*

Agnes Repplier, Compromises, The Luxury of Conversation, web 103; a short fragment of the author's judgement on conversation. That judgement creates no compulsory participation or promise that every conversation will be wanted.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Shared question	Difference and limit
Repplier ↔ editorial scene	What does conversation offer?	Historical literary judgement is no study of network size or compulsory interaction standard.
Number ↔ availability	Who can be approached today?	An entry establishes neither an accepted role nor reasons for nonresponse.
History ↔ trust	What grounds the approach?	Experience has scope; duration does not guarantee every future action.
Name ↔ response	What is possible in this connection?	Role and actual proposal differ without erasing history.
Meaning ↔ ranking	What matters personally?	Personal meaning appoints no person's value or universal hierarchy of closeness.

The map distinguishes a source and editorial questions rather than establishing one system for measuring relationships.

Sources

1. Agnes Repplier. Compromises. Boston and New York, Houghton, Mifflin and Company, printed title 1905; copyright 1904, Published September 1904. Gutenberg 73041, released 26 February 2024. Metadata/title web 0–76 and selected opening of The Luxury of Conversation web 95–109 were read, not the entire essay or collection. Both roles quote the author's own prose web 103, without nested quotations web 98/104. Literary judgement supplies no empirical study; conversation as duty and social hierarchy are not adopted. Rights UNKNOWN.

Tags

closeness, contacts, number, circle, friendship, acquaintance, recipient, availability, conversation, trust, history, role, response, personal meaning, proposal, answer, refusal, agreement, promise, help, limit, uncertainty, expectation, comparison, ranking, participation, respect, safety, Repplier, literary essay, United Wisdom

About the authors

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

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