After three months of the Covid-19 pandemic, it seems that we have gotten used to being visible, but untouchable. It seems that corona has swallowed most of our third dimension and most of the time we, interpersonally, are texts and voices with/without two dimensional pictures.

I do not want to deliver apocalyptic verses for wandering minds or blow into Israfil’s horn for lost bodies. I am merely trying to shed light on postcoronal bodies.

The process of reducing bodies to images was established mostly in the 20th century by the fashion and advertisement industries, and cinema and TV and was sustained by the ever-spreading social media. With the current pandemic state and its social and psychological consequences, the digitalization of the body has jumped to a higher level.

However, internet dependency induces some degrees of locus of control externalization, objectification of individuals, and alienation. Systematic mind control and the instability of social identity are the main processes that facilitate these internet-induced adverse effects.

on the other hand, we must admit that this unprecedented rate of body transportation and huge amount of energy consumption were becoming overwhelming for the earth. Corona, obviously, reduced these burdens and gave the earth’s lungs some fresh air.

It is not surprising that the earth may tolerate these digitalized bodies more than those fast track bodies. Furthermore, physical presence and tactile contact are not necessary for intimate relationship, functional communication, or even the experience of presence.

Others’ bodies, and of course, our own bodies for others have become a threat as carriers of Corona virus. There is a paradoxical orientation against others’ bodies and towards others’ souls; a dilemma between death and desire. It makes the body an
object; a complex phenomenon which is made of an object of death, an object of love, and a subject of care.

What HIV did with the sexual body, Corona virus is now doing with the social body; wandering bodies between love, death, and care. Our bodies have to withstand greater degrees of loneliness, fear, and rejection in local contacts while getting caressed more by nonlocal contacts.

Our bodies are gaining many benefits from this distance and it may change our preferences and even the expansion of our proxemics. We feel more secure and intimate through distance than proximity. By this distancing power of quarantine, does being close still mean being secure and intimate? Yes, I think. Because our relationships, even before the visualization era of media and especially after childhood, have always been more nonlocal than local. We feel others in our hearts (read embodied minds) and imagine them in our heads (read symbolic minds). Relatedness and rootedness are more nonlocal feelings and beliefs. Evidently, they are symbolized forms of early childhood sensory-motor patterns and they are empowered by physical presence and contact, but they are developed imaginarily and symbolically. Our words, intonation, mimic, and gesture transfer the warmth of our bodies, and more or less, our bodies reflect each other even without the magic of touch. I prefer to be welcoming of digital bodies and nonlocal communication as real intercorporeal experiences, but allow me to be enthusiastic about enjoying the familiar fragrance of my friends and drinking coffee with them while I feel the vibration of their bodies—of course as soon and safe as possible. I can simulate all of them in my mind, but they are not timely and marvelous.

On the one hand, having a body in communication can stabilize our social identity, make our presence more contingent and deep, and provide a warmer intercorporeal field to heal loneliness. On the other hand, internet-based communication provides a collective and accessible mind in which we can share our ideas and emotions and have a ready in hand being-with experience.
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