

Published by the decision of the Scientific Council
of Khachatur Abovian
Armenian State Pedagogical University



Department of Philosophy and Logic
named after Academician Georg Brutian



W I S D O M

2(22), 2022



*WISDOM is covered in Clarivate Analytics' Emerging Sources
Citation Index service*

YEREVAN – 2022

TRANSFORMATION OF THE PHENOMENON OF FRIENDSHIP THROUGH THE PRISM OF NETWORK TECHNOLOGIES

Abstract

The article attempts to determine and clarify the concept of ‘friendship’. In particular, it focuses on the prime aspects of the concept and their transformations due to the usage of modern network technologies. The research is based on the semantic analysis of friendship’s biological, ontological-axiological, and social aspects. It argues that the integrative function of friendship, which determines its biological aspect, enhances the network contributing to more effective solutions to people’s problems. The ontological-axiological aspect reveals selectivity and fragmentation in manifesting the concept under analysis. The social aspect shows formal and superficial features of friendship in the network. It is stated that the network reduces the prime ontological status of friendship, resulting in changes in a person's biological, moral and social principles.

Keywords: friendship, communication, network, society, virtuality.

Introduction

The phenomenon of friendship has been discussed and analyzed in various spheres throughout centuries. However, at the turn of the 20-21 centuries, the development of network technologies and changes that modern man faces in ultra-fast flows of information requires additional attention. We believe that friendship is a particular form of human relations and determines personal development and ways of fulfilling one’s own potential through the embodiment of one’s existential functions. Nevertheless, in the modern world, friendship often refers to utilitarian-economic relations: when one person can be somehow beneficial to another; for instance, help avoid boredom or maintain one’s image. In addition, people face a sharp contrast between their expectations of friendship and its real-life manifestation. Philosophers of different eras claim that real friendship cannot be found and explain it by a crisis of communication between people,

a lack of intimacy and trust. Such reasoning does not indicate that, over time, friendship tends to become simpler and blurred; it rather outlines the problem that has always existed – finding a true friend and then retaining, developing and protecting the relationship has always been difficult (Svare, 2004). The spread of the Internet and network communication provided a new space for developing relationships establishing such a phenomenon as online friendship /‘friending’ – friendship, which is transformed through the involvement of network space and acquires new qualities and characteristics.

The concept “online friendship” refers to a form of a personal relationship between people, a type of private communication implemented in the social network that is a manifestation and satisfaction of specific existential, social, axiological, and biological needs of a person through dialogue. The COVID-19 pandemic has affected communication processes and various areas of our lives. It seems exciting and worthy to trace

the transformation of the concept of “friendship” under the influence of pandemic restrictions when most of our relationships continue online. Furthermore, the questions – should we consider a vast number of online friends in social networks as real friends, and should we define contacts in the network as friendship – require scientific reasoning. The investigation of the phenomenon of friendship (Aristotle, Seneca, Marcus Aurelius, Thomas Aquinas, M. Montaigne, I. Kant, A. Schopenhauer, S. Kierkegaard, K. Jaspers, M. Buber, etc.) proves that it is a polysemantic concept, a complex process of human interaction involving improvement of qualities and mutual development of the partakers. Since there is a variety of dimensions to characterize a person: spiritual and material, biological and social, good and evil, life and death, sustainability and changeability, etc., friendship, in the same way, acquires multidimensionality and manifests itself in various aspects: biological, ontological-axiological, social, etc. Therefore, *the purpose* of this article is: 1) to provide a semantic analysis of the concept of ‘friendship’, 2) to study biological, ontological-axiological and social aspects of manifestation and understanding of the concept of ‘friendship’, 3) to reveal the transformation of these aspects and the impact of network technologies on the manifestation of friendship.

Features and Qualities of Friendship

The concept of friendship has been the focus of attention of numerous philosophers since the times of ancient Greece; it has evolved over the centuries and has undergone certain transformations. The interpretation of friendship based on moral principles of virtue, equality, and justice is credited to ancient Greek culture. Cicero (1974) stated that “we were born to unite with our fellow men and to join in community with the human race” (p. 36). Man appears as a social being whose existence is impossible outside the presence of the Other. We doubt that we will be aware of our existence unless the Other appears

in front of us. The latter will provoke not only a question about our relationship but also a question about ourselves: *Who are we?* In *The Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle (2002) argues that a friend is a ‘soul mate’, a reflection of ourselves. In other words, our friends reflect our advantages and disadvantages, which means that friendship involves more than just similar tastes and opinions. Under the influence of the ideas of Christianity, the idea of friendship was cultivated as Christian love and selfless service, and the chivalrous-secular ideal of friendship was created (“Church Fathers”, Augustine Aurelius, Anselm of Canterbury, Bernard of Clairvaux). Renaissance humanists (Dante Alighieri, Michel Montaigne) defined friendship as a natural sense built on the unity of spiritual interests, emotional wealth and accessible communication. In the Early Modern Period, in particular, the Enlightenment, the thinkers (Francis Bacon, Thomas Hobbes, Claude Helvetius, Christian Wolff, and Immanuel Kant) focused on the moral aspects of friendship. It associated it with the principles of developing a good relationship which involved personal interests, needs and benefits. Romanticism (Friedrich Schiller, August Schlegel) added intense feelings, intimacy and expressiveness to friendship relationships. In the 20th century, the influence of rapid social changes such as urbanization, market relations, and acceleration of social renewal growth caused several changes in human relations that acquired a superficial, business-like (instrumental) nature of relations. However, this does not indicate a lack of friendship but its transformation. Friendship is a process of interaction between two (or more) people that satisfies their spiritual needs and inquiries; it occurs when people feel the need to establish communication since they share common values and interests, without utilitarian reasons: “...to live in hope that, by giving myself, I will be given a hundredfold to myself again” (Jaspers, 2017, p. 112). Such friendship is a way of avoiding loneliness and learning about oneself. In the existential aspect, it is associated with high

moral qualities: care, openness, sacrifice, sincerity, tolerance, mercy, honesty, etc.

True friendship is quite a rare phenomenon and is impossible without an integral personality. Otherwise, it can be referred to as acquaintance, good fellowship, sociability, etc. – a relationship that does not provide a strong and stable connection with other people (for example, the kind of relationship that we find in Kierkegaard (1988), when he describes the aesthetic stage of existence.

Friendship is an ideal concept reflecting a constant desire of a person to go beyond the real. It is a necessary guideline and criterion for evaluating any relationship in which a person is involved, one's permanent desire to comply with certain ideal principles. That is why there have always been constant complaints that there is no real friendship: the mismatch between the ideal image of friendship and reality causes disappointment and mental crises. The latter reflects the crisis phenomena in not only the field of communication but also a failure of a person to assess adequately the processes in which he/she is involved. Friendship can be compared to the mirror we look into. By communicating with the Other, we can discover not only the previously unknown facets of the Other but our own facets as well (Cocking & Matthews, 2000).

Friendship is another form of human cognition and self-knowledge, identification and self-development, which reveals the facets of good and evil, true and false, ideal and real, bizarre and present. The aspirations of true friendship are caused by the desire to find someone with whom you can take off all masks and, stop playing roles, be yourself. Personal communication experience suggests that the level of communication is determined by the ability to conduct a dialogue, disagree with the Other, be a full-fledged interlocutor/rival, and give arguments and provide reasoning for one's own statements. Since a person can develop in different aspects (biological, spiritual, social, etc.), it is reasonable to analyse the phenomenon of friendship through

the prism of these aspects, in particular, the biological, ontological-axiological and social ones. Based on the fact that in the modern world, friendship is performed in the network, it is appropriate to investigate the transformation of these aspects in the context of the virtual network dimension.

Biological Aspect of Friendship

Considering the classical definitions and characteristics of the phenomenon “friendship” mentioned above, it seems that friendship has no biological roots. After all, friendship is related to forms of self-giving, self-sacrifice, and inner unity, which cannot be found within the limits of natural life. However, these are only superficial assumptions that are far from reality. From a biological point of view, man is a social animal; our social instincts prompt unity with other members of society, which contributes to better survival and effective social interaction. Charles Darwin (1877) stated in *The Descent of Man...* that “those communities which included the greatest number of the most sympathetic members, would flourish best, and rear the greatest number of offspring” (p. 107).

Moreover, the scientist pointed out that such a feature of integration is a characteristic of humans and higher animals. Frans de Waal, a contemporary thinker and primatologist, in his book *The Bonobo and the Atheist...* pays significant attention to the phenomena of integration, empathy, and sympathy, which are inherent not only in humans but also in animals. He claims that the so-called social code exists due to internal and external factors. Internal factors are empathy and a desire to maintain good relationships, whereas external factors associate with the threat of physical punishment (de Waal, 2013). These opinions indicate the importance of integration processes within any community since they effectively contribute to survival and procreation. In this context, we can assume that online friendship allows faster and more efficient mobilisation

and coordination of interaction between people to achieve a specific goal (be it fundraising for treatment or solving the problems of local residents).

The biological roots of friendship can be found in neurophysiological research. In the book *Friendship: The Evolution, Biology, and Extraordinary Power of Life's Fundamental Bond*, Lydia Denworth speaks about the formation of the social brain and the genetic basis for friendship formation. In particular, she points out that we socialise from an early age, but the actions of our involvement in society have to be constantly taught and improved. Finding a friend and then becoming a friend is a challenge. From birth, a child receives a considerable amount of social infrastructure. Sight, hearing, smell, touch, and taste are the guides through which the child learns and reveals the details of the environment, transferring them to the brain programmed for social interaction. The brain is like a computer where specific software is installed, waiting for appropriate commands; face, voice, and touch customize the operation (Denworth, 2020).

There is also a specific connection between our physical health and social relations. Several studies show that group therapy and social support affect biological and clinical outcomes in cancer, and various psycho-social events can be beneficial in the treatment (Lamkin & Slavich, 2014). It is also claimed that the level of loneliness correlates with the state of our body: lack of sleep, high blood pressure, stress, depression, and increased mortality. In contrast, people with extensive social connections are less likely to suffer from cognitive impairment and dementia (L. Denworth).

Moreover, studies suggest that the genotypes of people who communicate closely are similar. People tend to choose friends of a similar genotype. For example, a person with average weight may decide to communicate only with those who are also of average weight; whereas people who lack the high-risk allele of the gene associated with obesity tend to befriend with the same

genotype; or a person is likely to stop relationship with another one whose weight became different (Fowler, Settler, & Christakisc, 2011). There is a certain logic here. Aristotle said that we choose our friends employing similarity. Recent research has proved that this affinity is spiritual and has biological roots.

Thus, our need for the Other has not only spiritual roots but also evolutionary ones - associate with the evolution of a man. We strive for communication; it gives us a sense of security, self-confidence and confidence in the future. It is easier to overcome obstacles, get over adversity and solve problems in the community. Friendship in the view of progress and evolution makes us stronger and encourages further development of society. Hence, one of the reasons why online friendships have become so widespread is that it provides us with the possibility to solve problems. However, biological aspects of friendship do not limit the scope of this phenomenon. Humankind has evolved so much that it has significantly moved away from the primary roots of friendship. Proof of this is that when we choose a friend, we count on more than biology or instincts. A friend is not just someone who contributes to our survival or is responsible for transferring genes. We see a friend not as a mean or tool but as a goal. He may not match us genetically, be slim or fat, nasty or nice, be ultimately imperfect, but still be our Mirror, our second 'Self'.

The biological aspect of friendly relations cannot fully manifest in the network since the Internet deprives us of direct face and body contact: a friend cannot comfort us at a distance nor hug and wipe away our tears. In the network, the potential of our senses (taste, smell and touch) is limited, depriving us of the physical perception of the Other.

Ontological-Axiological Aspect of Friendship

The ontological-axiological aspect of friend-

ship involves identifying the place and meaning of friendship in a person's life and society and the form of its embodiment in real-life situations. Cognition of human nature is impossible without understanding its sociality. Many people complain that despite the spread of various ways of communication, a person feels lonely in the network. Such statements are not entirely justified since a person often transfers his communication model from real life to the virtual one. In other words, if one is either lonely or sociable in real life, he/she tends to keep the tendency in the network; hence, communication is just a reflection of one's inner state.

We constantly interact with Others: cooperation, assistance, communication, and mutual development. Even when reflecting on the nature of our feelings, we must realise that they are social in nature and constantly refer us to Others. Jean-Paul Sartre (1992) stated that shame typically arises in front of someone (p. 301). In this way, Sartre clearly defines our sociality *per se*. Others become the condition of our own existence since our consciousness arises at the moment when it *faces* the Other, *sees* Him, and *gets in touch* with Him.

The problematic nature of human communication was actively discussed by philosophers-dialogists M. Buber, E. Levinas, F. Rosenzweig, and E. Rosenstock-Huessy. In particular, according to E. Levinas, my 'I' arises when the Other appears before me. This connection with another person is primary and hence has metaphysical nature. The Other appears totally different from us, someone beyond our control (Levinas, 1998, p. 85). The need for the Other is the demand of our conscience that strives for responsibility. The problem of responsibility is discussed in the works of E. Levinas and F. Dostoevsky. Both thinkers emphasize the idea of responsibility for oneself and everyone. We cannot avoid responsibility for the Other because the Other appears in his nakedness, insecurity and vulnerability. Our ignoring the Other only proves that we have still responded to His request. The need for the

Other deprives us of self-sufficiency and destroys our selfishness (Levinas, 2014, pp. 18-38). Friendship fixes the ontological unity of "I-Other", its inseparability and complementarity. Friendship is an act of accepting the Other and understanding oneself in the eyes of the Other.

Friendship is always the act of meeting *two* (Alberoni, 2009). This meeting belongs to the space-time continuum. We get engaged in dialogue, have a rest, help, sympathise, and support each other at a particular time and in a specific place under certain circumstances. Friendship time is a fluidity that unites the lives of two people, closely linking their past (memories), present (specificity) and future (expectations, hopes and dreams). The time of friendship provides us with emotional, intellectual and spiritual benefits; it implies a confident presence, openness, sincerity and honesty of the companions. Friendship, in other words, is a temporary project of experiencing intimacy and involvement with another person.

Furthermore, it is necessary to say that each of us lives in our own time, experiencing different subjective time moments of our presence, although we live in an expected coordinated time. This allows us to relate to Others, to tune in to others. Friendship is expressed in the fullness of presence, giving a person meaning and richness of life, freeing him or her from emptiness and indifference while acting as an immanent form of human involvement in an inevitable process, the course of which he or she can influence. It is a process of self-constitution. When you are in this process, it unfolds in you at the same time. Every friendship situation is unique. People can identify themselves through who they are friends with. Friendship is a powerful motivating, and influential factor in a person's living space.

With the development of information technology, a kind of 'explosion of communication' takes place, which has largely moved into cyberspace and undergone a transformation. "Digital communication technologies are contributing to new ideas and experiences of intimacy, friend-

ship and identity through new forms of social interaction and new techniques of public display, particularly on social network sites” (Chambers, 2013). Online friendship is convenient, allowing us to compensate for space-time constraints and hypothetically implies friendship 24/7. In addition, in today’s online environment, friendship is a new type of human identification that transforms behaviour patterns, blurs boundaries between people, and promotes the emergence of new social groups. The fluidity of communication processes and the plurality of values of the network society are supported by multiple information flows, which are extremely difficult to predict, as communicative forms of modern culture have aligned everyone in the communication process and are increasingly legitimising the multiplicity of meanings. The peculiarity of network identity is that it is open, flexible and complex, allowing a person to be fulfilled through network communication in different positions and paradigms. This is reflected in the peculiarities of friendly relations as well. When combined with mobile social connections and the absence of pressure from any particular ideology, this identity makes it possible to get easily released from lots of restrictions in relations with other people (for instance, traditional moral, ethical or religious). In this situation, we consider it appropriate to be guided by moral self-awareness and ethics of responsibility.

To sum up, several features of online friendship can be traced:

- The feeling of unity, intimacy, and integrity is lost, and the presence of the Other becomes technologically indirect and incomplete. There is no physical contact, the importance of which the authors have already mentioned in the previous section. The perception of the Other is limited to videos, messages, photographs and ‘stories’, which seem to split the whole person offering us only fragments. As a result, the interaction between people is often reduced to the level of masks, images and roles. The loss of uniqueness is facilitated by
- the replacement of personal integrity by split being, mass standards for establishing a ‘person without features’ with a networked consciousness due to the merging of everyday life with the virtual world. Digital friendship implies openness/infinity of media and limitation/isolation of a person (for example, communication in the network through the reduction of physicality makes the horizon of potential friends almost limitless (so the attitude to the content of messages is often indifferent, as well as to ‘friends’), and real communication, at the same time, is often locked into everyday life and a limited number of interlocutors);
- there is a distance between interlocutors in the process of communication. We can never achieve total understanding in communication because the signs that we operate with are ambiguous and intertwine with a variety of contexts;
 - there is a lack of silence as a sign of intimacy. In the immediate present, we can not only discuss things that are meaningful to us but also be silent about them; it testifies to spiritual unity and intuitively understanding the meaning. In silence, a person becomes Single, unique, and authentic; in other words, a uniqueness disappears when a speech starts. “The relief of speech is that it translates me into the universal” (Kierkegaard, 1994, pp. 100-101);
 - virtual friendship is vulnerable, unpredictable and unstable due to the incommensurability of the spiritual essence of man with his bodily and virtual dimensions. Virtual reality provides the individual with alternative ontologies in the form of different pictures of the world and value systems, leading to existential conflicts. For example, virtual friendship contributes to some extent to the assertion of existential passivity, which is expressed in indifference to the Other (let us say we are much easier to bypass an online help announcement than being asked for help face-to-

face);

- network communication transforms the feeling of space and time. M. Castells emphasised that the new communication system radically transforms space and time as the basic dimensions of human life. Time changes; the past, present and future can be programmed to interact with each other in the same message. Current space and timeless time become the material foundations of a new culture (Castells, 2010, p. 406). The topic of time on the Internet has attracted the attention of many researchers; some claim that there is no time but rather a sort of electronic immortality since time begins to break down into small interims. This is reflected in the peculiarities of communication, which becomes instantaneous and not tied to a specific place. Time as a way to determine distance no longer exists. Users perceive time as a phenomenon that can be modelled and capable of independent, parallel existence both in terms of real-time and the virtuals themselves: time lives come to life and get stuck. We cannot come across such a phenomenon of time, for instance, in classical correspondence.

However, the global network creates universal platforms, social networks, and forums where anyone can find the most comfortable conditions for communication. One can find people they have not talked to for a long time, make a purchase, leave a comment about an event, and make new friends. The network becomes 'a venue'. In the social media space, you can get a warning: "life without hundreds of online 'friends' is virtual death" (Rosen, 2007). Because online friendship is based on acts of reading and writing, online correspondence is characterised by an instant response to events, where time is concise: messages appear, are corrected, stored, and disappear. This gives the texts short-term relevance, which is a feature of time and allows us to enter a state of 'uptime' ("here and now") and more fully perceive the communicative function, which is deprived of experiences, assess-

ments, conclusions, distracts from real-world problems, relieves psychological stress, and helps to get rid of discontent.

The features of virtual space allow friends to be selective about the aspects of interaction: 'when', 'where' and 'how long' what differentiates it from the interaction in real life, they can (sometimes unintentionally) choose to communicate only in certain situations. The price to be paid is that friends miss out on potentially important, problematic, and complex aspects of friends' personalities, accepting only a part of their personality.

Social Aspect of Friendship

In previous sections, considerable emphasis has been made on a man's social nature and his inseparable existence with others. It should also be noted that friendship can be viewed as a marker that allows us to identify ourselves with other people and expand our own boundaries to determine our place in society. Modern man belongs to the mobile and changing communities (which were stable in previous epochs). He is often not attached to any of them (be it a religious community, or ethnic, or a family one), just as he often changes his job, place of residence (the phenomenon of nomadism) and, consequently, his communication with other people is hampered by the lack of common value imperatives, goals and objectives, due to the instability of self-identification. These changes also affect the establishment and development of friendly relations, and the very concept of 'friendship' is blurred and relativised. A person may not be alone but feel lonely.

It should be mentioned that social processes also influence the development of the friendship phenomenon. In particular, many people were quarantined because of the COVID-19 pandemic, and live communication became more difficult. Contacts, work, study and various activities have moved to the web.

Even those democratic processes that took

place in Ukraine greatly influenced the development of friendly relations between people. Euro Revolution in 2014 provoked powerful processes of uniting people. The desire to change the political system united people from different social strata and directed them to achieve a common goal. This situation has stimulated not only live communication but also the Internet-mediated one.

Active and intense communication with others stimulates the processes of self-identification, self-knowledge and socialisation. However, these processes are modified in a certain way in the network. People have the chance to make acquaintances on the Internet, and there are many communities in various directions, where even lonely people have the opportunity to meet and communicate with those similar to them in spirit and interests. Viber, Telegram, Facebook, Instagram, WhatsApp, Skype, Zoom, and Microsoft Teams are the links that can maintain social connections online. In the early 2000s, when Cocking and Matthews criticised virtual friendly communication, there was no such modern technology, and communication itself was limited to text messaging (Hongladarom, 2016, p. 130). Today we can communicate online using video and audio tools as well. This enriches our communication and allows us to obtain additional information about the Other. Internet communication allows two people to open up, express their views, and have a shared experience, even though it is reflective, rather programmed, and devoid of spontaneity.

However, there are significant disadvantages of such virtual communication and friendship on it. Firstly, it is necessary to note that not everyone whom we add to our friend list is our friend. Sometimes we even add people who cause us negative emotions. This may be due to a simple good upbringing or unwillingness to engage in a particular silent conflict (Boyd, 2006). In virtual space, we can never absolutely know what the relationship between 'friends' is. Secondly, the communication that takes place in the virtual

space is often superficial and informative ('objective communication', according to K. Jaspers).

With the spread of the ideas of postmodernism and the simularisation of reality, friendship itself has also turned into a simulacrum – an image that has nothing to do with reality. Being open to communication and longing for true friendship, we can never be 100% sure of the sincerity and frankness of the person on the screen's other side. Their hobbies and profiles can be fake. After all, everyone only provides information about himself or herself that they consider essential. In other words, our profiles reflect our quasi-reality, which is more desired than true. Cocking and Matthews point out that virtual communication blocks our attempts of spontaneous self-disclosure, as we quite rationally and consciously choose the information we present about ourselves, having time to think and give a more straightforward answer to the question, to artificially create our own image (Cocking & Matthews, 2000). Although such filtered information is important and revealing, it is still limited to only two senses – sight and hearing; other sense organs are not involved at all.

Moreover, we must admit that in today's online communication, the weight of figurative rather than textual information increases, forcing our brain to work with images and not with concepts, limiting our cognitive capabilities. This situation cannot affect online communication quality; one should not expect a deep level of disclosure in the virtual space. Thirdly, the communication format quite often implies not talking and reflecting but short messages oriented on grasping the meanings. This leads to misunderstandings and misinterpretations, conflicts and insults. Fourthly, the virtual space, breaking space-time boundaries, contributes to a specific shift in communication patterns. If everyday communication is full of various rituals (greetings, farewells, polite words, etc.), virtual communication often lacks them. We can start a conversation without a greeting and continue as long

as it interests us. Such deritualisation, not a negative point per se, causes more profound changes. In the virtual space, we can simply go offline during a conversation, showing ourselves as rude and tactless. We may neglect our spelling and punctuation, allowing errors in texting. Lack of direct physical contact often tempts us to be rude, tactless, and intolerant during the conversation, whereas in real life, the presence of the Other can restrain us from the negative manifestations. This is the reason why admins often close groups since they cannot withstand the haters creating a negative atmosphere in the group. Those who are carriers of this negativity feel their impunity and are unaware of the consequences of their actions because they can delete their account or just leave the network at any time. These difficulties of virtual communication cause not just the information-mechanistic nature of communication/friendship but also the violation of subject-subject relations and their transition to subject-object.

Conclusion

This article provided the analysis of biological, ontological-axiological and social aspects of friendship and identified its transformations during the time of development and spread of information technology. It focuses specifically on the problems of friendly communication on the Internet. Technological enhancement of new human communication capabilities, on the one hand, has created and is still creating additional ways of building and maintaining friendly relations. On the other hand, moments of intimacy, privacy, and a sense of direct bodily presence are lost in the network. Virtual space creates and provides powerful tools for establishing contact between people. We can meet new people, continue communicating with them offline and maintain existing connections. Just as correspondence once allowed two people to maintain contact, so virtual space nowadays opens up opportunities to know the Other. However, this

method of communication still has some limitations and peculiarities, as discussed in the article. It is advisable, therefore, to speak not about the fact that virtual friendship has to replace the real one but about their certain complementarity. Many features of our personality can be revealed only in the process of direct communication, activity and spending time together, and the network cannot replace such things. The emergence and development of friendship require common life situations and their resolution. If a person is ready to open up to the Other, the network platform can be a useful and effective tool for establishing connections, a way to reach the Other.

In addition, it is hardly fair to blame the virtual space for the impossibility of establishing adequate communication. Socio-cultural changes, the rapid pace of society and the internal unwillingness to self-disclosure of man are the reasons for the lack of sincere and intense communication. It is important to emphasize that if a person is not disposed to develop certain friendly relations, this can manifest both in real and virtual life. Wherever a person goes, he or she always faces himself or herself. Therefore, we can show our loneliness and inner activity on the Internet.

References

- Alberoni, F. (2009). *Innamoramento e amore* (Love and affection, in Italian). BUR Biblioteca Univ. Rizzoli.
- Aristotle (2002). *Nikomakhova etyka* (The Nicomachean Ethics, in Ukrainian). Kyiv: Aquilon-Plus.
- Boyd, D. (2006, December 4). Friends, friendsters, and top 8: Writing community into being on social network sites. *First Monday*, 11(12). Retrieved from <https://firstmonday.org/article/view/1418/1336>
- Castells, M. (2010). *The information age: Economy, society and culture. Volume 1: The rise of the network society* (2nd ed). Ox-

- ford: Wiley Blackwell.
- Chambers, D. (2013). *Social Media and personal relationships. Online intimacies and networked friendship*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. Retrieved from <https://media.oipdf.com/pdf/5ba3cc95-4c7a-430b-bef1-af9e69e5faa9.pdf>
- Cicero. (1974). *O starosti. O družbe. Ob obyazannostyah* (About old age. About friendship. About responsibilities, in Russian). Moscow: Science.
- Cocking D., & Matthews, S. (2000). Unreal Friends. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 2, 223-231. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1011414704851>
- Darwin, Ch. (1877). *The descent of man, and selection in relation to sex* (2nd ed., rev. and augmented). Retrieved from http://darwin-online.org.uk/converted/pdf/1-877_Descent_F948.pdf
- De Waal, F. B. M. (2013). *The Bonobo and the Atheist: In search of humanism among the primates*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Denworth, L. (2020). *Friendship: The Evolution, biology, and extraordinary power of life's fundamental bond*. New York: W. W. Norton&Company.
- Fowlera, J. H., Settleb, J. E., & Christakisc, N. A. (2011). Correlated genotypes in friendship networks. *PNAS*, 108(5), 1993-1997. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1011687108>
- Hongladarom, S. (2016). *The online self: Externalism, friendship and games*. Cham: Springer International Publishing: Imprint: Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-39075-8>
- Jaspers, K. (2017). *Vvedenie v filosofiyu. Filosofskaya avtobiografiya* (Introduction to philosophy. Philosophical autobiography, in Russian). Minsk: Propylaea.
- Kierkegaard, S. (1988). *Stages on life's way: Studies by various persons*. (H. V. Hong, & E. H. Hong, Eds.). Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Kierkegaard, S. (1994). *Fear and trembling. The book on Adler*. New York: Random House.
- Lamkin, D. M., & Slavich, G. M. (2014). Psychosocial factors and cancer. In H. L. Miller (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of theory in psychology*. Retrieved from http://www.uclastresslab.org/pubs/Lamkin_Slavich_TheoryInPsych_2014.pdf
- Levinas, E. (1998). *Vremya i drugoy. Gumanizm drugogo cheloveka* (Time and other. Humanism of another person, in Russian). St. Petersburg: Higher Religious and Philosophical School.
- Levinas, E. (2014). *Zametki o smysle* (Notes on the meaning, in Russian). In A. V. Yampolskaya, & S. A. Sholokhova (Eds), *(Post)fenomenologiya: Novaya fenomenologiya vo Frantsii i za ee predelami*. ((Post) phenomenology. New phenomenology in France and beyond, in Russian) (pp. 18-38). Moscow: Academic Project, Gaudeamus.
- Rosen, Ch. (2007). Virtual friendship and the new narcissism. *The New Atlantis*, 17, 15-31. Retrieved from <https://www.thenewatlantis.com/publications/virtual-friendship-and-the-new-narcissism>
- Sartre, J.P. (1992). *Being and nothingness. A phenomenological essay on ontology*. New York: Washington Square Press.
- Svare, H. (2004). *Vennskap* (Friendship, in Norwegian). Oslo: Pax Forlag.