

UNITED WISDOM

When digital communication supports a real connection

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R-19-N04 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

When digital communication supports a real connection

Epigraph

> *Only connect!*

E. M. Forster, *Howards End* (1910), Chapter XXII: a short fragment of Margaret's inward sermon conveyed by the narrator. The following passage shows her failure to reach Henry; the appeal does not promise a result. Text.

What this article is about

Two people can exchange messages every day and still misunderstand what kind of conversation is taking place. One sends a small sign of attention; the other awaits an answer to a specific question. One leaves a voice message for a free evening; the other hears an urgent demand in the notification. Sometimes correspondence preserves closeness across distance and different schedules. Sometimes the appearance of constant presence makes an agreement less clear. The screen itself does not determine which situation this is: we need to consider participation and the meaning of a particular action.

A real connection need not be confirmed by meeting at the same table. Remote conversation may be the only accessible and valuable form of a relationship. This article asks whether the chosen digital format helps people notice one another, make a needed conversation possible, and understand the limits of participation. The recipient, content, response time, privacy, and possibility of changing the format matter. We will not infer closeness from message counts or require continual availability. The examples are hypothetical; these distinctions are neither a tested relationship technique nor an assessment of someone's entire digital life.

I. A message acquires meaning within a relationship

Imagine Olga and Denis, who live in different cities. Olga sends a photograph of the courtyard after snowfall. Denis replies that evening with one symbol. The photograph invited him to notice an ordinary day, and his answer suited her. Another day, she asks whether he can join a shared video call on Sunday. The same symbol now leaves a question unanswered. Outwardly, the exchanges are similar: an image, a short reaction, a pause. But the participation being sought differs. One message type cannot adequately measure attentiveness without its subject.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

A digital gesture can mean a greeting, acknowledgement of reading, an invitation to talk, or agreement to act. These meanings need not automatically coincide. Sometimes a shared habit makes explanation unnecessary. Sometimes the habit stops working: a changed schedule makes an evening reply late for one person, or a different question requires more definite words. Then naming the subject can be more useful than multiplying signals. Olga needs an answer about Sunday, rather than another confirmation that Denis exists online and sees her posts.

The reverse counterexample also occurs. Someone requests a short acknowledgement that a document arrived; the recipient writes a long, warm letter without saying whether the file opened. Much attention was offered, but the needed action did not occur. That does not prove the letter insincere. It shows that length and relevance to a question are different matters. The participants can recognise the warmth and separately clarify the practical answer. Conversation then avoids becoming a contest in which longer messages automatically count as more caring and brevity indicates insufficient human depth.

Understanding the subject does not require turning every exchange into a business procedure. A joke, a chance photograph, or quietly listening together can be valuable in themselves. They simply should not acquire obligations nobody accepted. If Olga sends a funny image, Denis does not become obliged to disclose his whole day's mood. If he agreed to answer a specific question, an image does not replace that answer. A living conversation allows different gestures while retaining the distinction between a freely offered possibility and an actual agreement.

II. Different online actions cannot become one measure

Burke and Kraut's study analysed three survey waves from 1,910 voluntary Facebook users alongside activity logs. Receiving targeted, composed text from strong ties was associated with changes in well-being; quick reactions and broadcasts showed no such association. This was observational, without random assignment of communication. It does not establish each correspondence's effect, analyse its content, or prescribe a rule for every platform.

For our question, the useful distinction concerns actions, rather than a hierarchy of good and bad friends. One person publicly shares news with many people; another addresses a particular acquaintance; a third clicks a reaction. Each can serve different purposes: announcement, conversation, or brief acknowledgement. We cannot automatically demand a personal letter when someone simply shared a photograph, or treat a broadcast as a personal promise of help. The platform's name does not tell us which relationships and expectations actually arose between participants.

Imagine Denis seeing Olga's public post about a difficult week and assuming she has already received enough support. The number of reactions does not establish that. Nor does the post establish that she wants a personal conversation specifically with him. If appropriate, he can offer defined participation: he is available tomorrow if she would like to talk. The answer remains hers. She need not publicly establish how difficult things are or explain why other reactions did not help. Addressing someone personally differs from being obliged to guess an unspoken request.

In another situation, a person receives a pleasant brief reply and has no need for a deeper conversation. Their satisfaction need not match someone else's scale of substance. We can ask whether the exchange suits these people without attributing a measured effect to it. The study did not test the wording offered here, so it does not establish a well-being method. Its bounded finding discourages treating all activity as identical. Choosing a format remains a question of the particular relationship, available conditions, and participants' consent.

III. A pause does not contain a ready explanation

Olga sends a question in the morning and sees a read indicator. By evening, there is no answer. She suspects Denis does not want to talk. That explanation is possible, but the indicator does not establish it. He may have opened the message between tasks, lack necessary information, or still be deciding whether the proposal suits him. These possibilities should not be declared true instead of the first one either. The available fact is narrower: the message was opened, and no reply has arrived. Explaining the cause requires other grounds; wanting an answer can be recognised separately from knowing his intention.

If an answer is needed by a particular time, that deadline can become part of the question. Olga must confirm a booking by Friday and can say she will choose another option afterwards. This limit concerns her action, rather than punishment for insufficient speed. Denis may decline or be unable to answer in time; Olga need not hold the booking indefinitely. A clear condition does not guarantee a response. It reduces the ambiguity in which one participant regards a question as urgent while the other treats it as an open thought without a decision date.

Different times are particularly easy to confuse in a voice message. Recording five minutes may be immediately convenient for the sender, while the listener needs a quiet interval. They may be travelling or near people for whom the content is not intended. A request to answer now therefore involves more conditions than it first appears. Text may suit a short organisational question; a longer story may need an agreed listening time. No channel is universally best. The cost of this particular message to the other person can be considered without requiring a detailed explanation of every reason for unavailability.

Sometimes pauses repeatedly make the needed conversation impossible. That raises a question about the existing format, rather than every individual indicator. Olga can name the observable difficulty: plans remain unconfirmed until a decision must be made. Denis can suggest another arrangement or acknowledge that he is not ready to participate. If no suitable format exists, this remains an unwelcome limit of the connection. We cannot promise that correct wording will transform another person's availability. We can distinguish a fact, a personal need, and an unconfirmed explanation.

IV. Asynchronous exchange can make participation possible

People in different time zones cannot always talk simultaneously. Denis's late evening coincides with Olga's early morning before work. Correspondence lets each answer during an available interval without cancelling their conversation. It need not be an incomplete relationship awaiting repair through a meeting. If both enjoy exchanging letters, those letters constitute their available participation. Lack of synchrony should not automatically mean lack of attention, nor should delay be declared a defect merely because the technology delivers messages immediately, independently of human schedules.

Asynchronous exchange nevertheless has limits. Several subjects can become intertwined, a question can disappear among photographs, or a brief phrase can seem to answer the wrong part of a story. Sometimes a simple clarification identifies what the reply concerns. Sometimes participants choose a separate conversation for one question. Organisation responds to a difficulty, rather than a compulsory standard of discipline for every friendship. Managing correspondence in too much detail can also consume its pleasure. An exchange already understood by both people does not need improvement solely to fit a general scheme.

A simultaneous conversation is not always clearer. Imagine a video call where Denis wants to discuss a practical matter while Olga is occupied with household tasks and can only say a brief hello. Appearing on screen does not create consent to a lengthy subject. They can identify what conversation is possible now and separately consider another time. A promise to talk later is not yet completed participation, however. If the date is unknown, keeping that uncertainty visible is more honest than reassuring each other through an agreement understood differently by each.

Choosing text, voice, or video therefore begins with the task and availability, rather than a scale of genuine communication. Video conveys more facial expression but requires a suitable place and time. A letter permits reflection but does not automatically convey intonation. A short symbol saves effort but cannot answer every question. Participants can combine these forms. No channel acquires the right to command someone's attention around the clock simply because it once suited their conversation well.

V. Availability does not mean continuous presence

If Denis usually replies quickly, Olga gradually begins to expect that pattern. The expectation is understandable, but a habit does not establish an obligation at every hour. He may leave messages unopened on a weekend. The change creates inconvenience that can be discussed without treating former speed as a lifelong promise. The other person still owns their time. They can also acknowledge particular agreements they really accepted. Distinguishing general availability from a definite promise allows discussion of a failure without putting every earlier sign of attention on trial.

Participants might state a few conditions: messages without an urgent question need not receive an evening reply, while an organisational call is arranged separately. This is one possible arrangement, not an established standard. Other people enjoy spontaneous calls. The question is whether a habit can be reconsidered when one participant no longer fits it. Agreement to a previous call does not cancel a future refusal. Nor should every limit be called evidence of a healthy relationship: it may make desired contact significantly less available.

A counterexample arises when rules about timing become a way to avoid every definite answer. Someone says they respond only when they wish, yet continues asking another person to keep an evening free. This concerns more than a right to pause. One participant is directing the other's time without offering a decision of their own. Olga may stop waiting for that agreement and make her own plans. Denis's freedom from continual availability does not include indefinitely reserving her participation. Both limits can be recognised without deciding who is generally better at friendship.

Someone experiencing continual tension around notifications can change their own pattern of checking them. But a phone setting will not resolve the relationship question for them or guarantee calm. Expectations may need clarification, or the chosen amount of contact may not suit them. This article prescribes no digital diet and measures no normal screen time. It considers only what participation people offer one another and what they are willing to manage themselves. A technical tool can implement a chosen condition; it cannot replace the other participant's consent.

VI. Privacy remains part of the conversation

Denis sends Olga a photograph with a personal explanation. She wants to show a funny part to a mutual friend. Forwarding is technically possible, but that does not establish consent to another recipient. A public post should be distinguished from a story intended for one person. She can ask which part may be shown, or describe her own impression without someone else's details. This is an editorial ethical distinction, not a legal conclusion about every correspondence. Relevant laws and image rights depend on circumstances the hypothetical scene does not establish.

In a group chat, the audience boundary may be less visible. A newcomer sees earlier discussion; someone forwards a screenshot to another group; a third person's name enters the conversation. Each action can change the context of the words. Digital closeness therefore includes asking who can access the history and continue spreading it. Calling a group private does not guarantee complete confidentiality. Participants can disclose less or choose another channel, but a technical choice does not remove every risk of information spreading.

Concern for privacy should not become a demand to conceal everything. A person may share their own experience and seek a suitable conversation. The question also concerns other people's information within that experience. Olga can describe feeling upset about an unresolved agreement without publishing Denis's entire correspondence. If a particular phrase matters, she can distinguish necessary context from details that do not help the question. This does not guarantee the correct choice in every situation. It brings attention back to the recipient, purpose, and amount of the available account.

Some circumstances require assistance beyond ordinary friendship. Threats or coercion do not require clarifying a format with the person responsible. Readers should not disclose plans to demonstrate openness or be directed into one universal course of action. The right to limit conversation includes such situations; suitable professional or other support depends on the actual conditions. A digital channel does not in itself oblige anyone to continue contact or establish the safety of its participants.

VII. A group stream and a personal address serve different purposes

Olga belongs to a chat of old acquaintances. She enjoys photographs, news, and occasionally responding to a joke. But a personal question addressed to Denis disappears among twenty replies. The group keeps ordinary lives visible while the needed conversation has no place. That does not make the chat useless. It serves another purpose. Olga can remain in the shared stream and separately ask about a suitable personal channel. One space need not perform every social function merely because the relevant people are present there.

The reverse situation also exists. A personal letter asks one person to organise something affecting the entire group. Other participants see nothing and cannot answer. A shared channel can make the division of tasks clearer. It does not entitle anyone to require constant involvement from everybody. They can identify who is actually affected and when an answer is needed. The recipient follows the subject. Personal correspondence is not invariably deeper or group communication invariably shallower; either can open needed participation or leave it unavailable.

A public conversation introduces another limit: disagreement becomes visible to others. This may suit discussion of a meeting time and make a personal grievance too costly if participants did not choose a public examination. Moving the subject elsewhere can reduce the audience but does not promise agreement. Nor should privacy be demanded to silence every inconvenient group question. A personal history differs from a decision for which participants are actually accountable to others. The hypothetical scene establishes no universal obligation to discuss everything publicly or everything separately.

When an environment contains several chats, one person should not automatically become responsible for moving every conversation between them. Olga can grow tired of forwarding plans and explaining who meant what. That effort exists even when it looks like a few easy clicks. Participants can choose a shared place for a particular decision or divide the organisation. The group's convenience should not silently become the most attentive participant's duty. Real connection includes the possibility of noticing this work and responding with defined participation, if people are willing to do so.

VIII. Understanding does not follow from the correct appeal

In Chapter XXII of *Howards End*, Margaret wants to join divided aspects of Henry's life. The narrator conveys her inward appeal and then shows failure. The scene does not investigate digital channels. Here it reminds us that strongly wanting to join experience and action does not establish another person's understanding. The literary analogy preserves failure instead of making a character's words a guaranteed communication recipe.

Olga can write a very clear message and receive an answer to another question. A clarification may help if both want to continue. But clarity of intention gives her no control over Denis's attention. He may not share the subject, want the proposed form, or understand their relationship in the same way. The task is not necessarily to perfect the wording until the desired answer appears. Discovering a difference can be a real outcome. It neither cancels the value of earlier conversations nor supplies their hoped-for continuation.

A similar substitution occurs when someone asks for explanation until everything is understood. Denis has said he is not ready to discuss a family subject, but Olga keeps clarifying because she regards conversation as a way of preserving connection. More words can then cross the stated limit. Attention includes hearing an unwanted answer, rather than only explaining one's intention more fully. At the same time, a single refusal does not explain the whole relationship. They can recognise the absence of this subject and decide whether the remaining contact suits them, without inferring hidden motives from one boundary.

Not every ambiguity needs immediate removal. Friends can leave a disputed question open if it does not prevent an agreed action. They may not know what they want in future and still exchange ordinary news today. Uncertainty should not be presented as a promise. Someone relying on a definite decision can notice that it has not been made. A digital channel allows return to written words, but a message history is not a complete archive of human intentions and does not remove the need for fresh consent to a fresh action.

IX. Being together can remain remote

Olga and Denis sometimes listen to the same concert in different cities and then discuss it. They enjoy this participation. It need not prepare them for a more genuine meeting that will eventually certify the relationship. A shared subject exists now despite separate physical locations. Yet their action defines togetherness, rather than an identical link alone. If one listened while the other did something else, a shared file does not prove a shared experience. They can acknowledge the difference without accusation and decide whether they want to repeat this particular evening.

Elsewhere, correspondence supports practical cooperation: people edit a text together, clarify a route, or help one another understand a question. This participation has value without becoming deep friendship. A common task also gives no right to silently expand another person's contribution. Denis agreed to examine one paragraph, rather than manage an entire project. If Olga needs more help, that is a new proposal. The ease of forwarding a file does not reduce the work promised or create additional obligations from an earlier agreement.

Sometimes both want a physical meeting, but travel is currently unavailable. Remote exchange need not then be declared a complete replacement. They can appreciate it while missing what it cannot provide: a walk, ordinary silence, or presence without arranging a screen. Acknowledging a limitation does not devalue available contact. It helps them avoid requiring a video call to perform every function of a meeting. Each channel has possibilities and limits, and a relationship can contain pleasure and loss together without becoming a general verdict on the digital world.

For some people, remote contact better suits accessibility, circumstances, or preference. This article demands no explanation of that choice and ranks no reasons for it. The question remains specific: what participation is possible and suits both sides? If one wants only correspondence while the other needs another format, a difference can remain. Respecting preferences does not create automatic agreement. They can preserve a limited connection, alter an expectation, or stop continuing it without making one outward way of communicating a measure of the other's human completeness.

X. A format's quality appears in available action

Return to the question about Sunday's call. Olga states when she needs to settle the organisation. Denis replies that he cannot attend but can exchange letters another day. She may accept that option or notice that it does not meet the present need. Either way, there is something definite to choose. This is one possible outcome of a hypothetical scene, not evidence that a formulation works. The value of clarification is discernible participation, rather than compulsory agreement, restored closeness, or vanished disappointment.

Perhaps no answer arrives. Olga can then make plans without an unconfirmed participant. She need not declare the entire connection false, but neither must she count silence as sufficient communication if the needed conversation is repeatedly absent. She may consider the available format in relation to her life. Denis retains the right not to participate; Olga retains the right not to build expectations around assumed participation. Respect for two separate decisions does not promise reciprocity. Sometimes it simply makes the relationship's limits clearer and more honest.

When a format suits both people, it may look modest: one short practical reply, a funny photograph without an obligation to continue, or a letter every few weeks. Frequency alone certifies neither closeness nor its absence. Participants can notice whether conversation has a recipient, expectations are clear, refusal is allowed, and another person's information does not automatically reach new people. These are not a diagnostic scale. They help examine a specific difficulty without turning every good habit into an object of continual analysis and improvement.

Digital communication supports connection where it makes room for available human participation. Sometimes it preserves shared history across distance; sometimes it creates an entirely new way of doing something together. Sometimes it shows that needed participation is not currently available. Each outcome should be named within its actual limits. A screen transmits words and actions without cancelling their authors' separateness. The question about a real connection returns to people: what they offer, what they answer, which limits they recognise, and what continuation they are ready to choose now.

What this means in practice

If you wish, choose one digital exchange that left uncertainty. In a private note, identify its subject: greeting, story, question, invitation, or promise. Separately record the observed action and the explanation you feel inclined to attach to it. A read indicator is an action; certainty about indifference is an explanation that may need other grounds. The note need not be shown to the other person and does not assess the whole relationship. You can stop at making the distinction, without turning it into another conversation or a test of care.

If clarification is appropriate and contact voluntary, name one question, a necessary deadline, or a suitable channel. You need not explain the entire relationship history at once. Leave the other person room to refuse and yourself room to act without an unconfirmed answer. If the subject was simply a sign of attention, do not attach a hidden promise of constant availability to it. If you accepted a definite task, a brief reaction does not cancel it. You can offer only the amount of participation you are willing to provide, without guaranteeing it will suit the other person.

After the answer, notice what is clearer and what remains unknown. A convenient format may have emerged, or a difference may have become visible. Neither outcome proves all remote relationships right or wrong. Under threats or coercion, direct clarification and disclosure of plans are not prescribed; the article establishes no safe procedure for every situation. This practice is a voluntary editorial proposal, rather than therapy, legal guidance, or an examination. Digital connection should not acquire power over someone merely because the technology can remain switched on.

Key quotation

> *prose and the passion*

E. M. Forster, *Howards End*, Chapter XXII, a short fragment from the same inward sermon of Margaret conveyed by the narrator. A literary wish to connect is not proof that another person can be persuaded. Text.

Connections between traditions

Read text	Comparative question	Difference and limit
Forster, *Howards End*, XXII	Is wanting connection enough for another person to understand?	The novel preserves failure; the character offers no tested digital method
Burke and Kraut, Facebook study	Are different online actions equivalent?	An observational design establishes neither individual causation, each message's meaning, nor a rule for all platforms
Hypothetical article scenes	What do recipient, timing, and channel make available?	A fictional clarification can end in refusal; effectiveness has not been tested

Sources

1. E. M. Forster. *Howards End* (1910). Gutenberg 2946. Continuous context at web lines 3033–3290 read; Chapter XXII used, particularly 3094–3102. Not the whole book. Rights UNKNOWN; accessibility is not universal permission.

2. Moira Burke, Robert E. Kraut. *The Relationship Between Facebook Use and Well-Being Depends on Communication Type and Tie Strength*. Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication 21(4), 265–281 (2016), DOI 10.1111/jcc4.12162. Author-hosted pre-peer-reviewed version. Methods and participants 193–229, selected findings 370–383, discussion 403–430, and limitations 450–472 read. No claim of reviewing the whole paper or all tables. Rights UNKNOWN; bounded paraphrase, with no full-text import.

Tags

digital communication, real connection, correspondence, distance, recipient, content, response time, asynchronous exchange, voice message, video call, group chat, personal conversation, notifications, availability, consent, refusal, promise, privacy, forwarding, limits, togetherness, cooperation, uncertainty, attention, friendship, format, Forster, Burke, Kraut, literary analogy, empirical limits, United Wisdom

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