# Introduction: About Touch and About Society

In the third decade of the 21st century, everything appears “advanced” and “innovative.” There are no longer televisions that broadcast in black and white, and cinemas no longer show news dailies. At the same time, brick-and-mortar bookstores still exist, people still read print newspapers, albeit perhaps only on weekends, and graduates still attend ceremonies where they are awarded certificates printed on parchment. Vinyl records and Polaroid cameras – yes, those technologies that were “advanced” and “innovative” way back in the 1950s – are once again on trend and profitable. Everyone knows that all these “retro” analog technologies – books made of paper, print magazines and newspapers, vinyl records, vintage cameras, Polaroid photos – have digital replacements. You can read e-books on your iPad or Kindle, newspapers on your browser, snap photos with your smartphone, listen to music on Spotify or Apple Music, and receive your degree certificate via email in PDF format. So why do we insist on clinging to some of the technologies of yesteryear? Is it just a question of sweet nostalgia?

In this book, I discuss communication technologies that rely on touch. I talk about the essential characteristics of these technologies and their human and cultural interpretations. While I do not neglect the smartphone, whose ubiquitous touchscreen has become the symbol of a generation, I am concerned mainly with old, analog technologies that have managed to survive into the 21st century, interaction with which is based on touching the surface of each and every message. This feature is an expression of an intimate relationship with the message and a declaration of ownership. For a growing number of people, it is also an act of defiance against the increasing infiltration of the digital world into our everyday lives.

Ever since the invention of writing, people have used their hands to interact directly with the messages they read and write. They physically handled the paper on which they wrote, and touched the pages of the books and newspapers they read. They framed and hung photographs on the walls of their homes or carefully stuck them in leatherbound photo albums as keepsakes. In the 20th century, with the advent of radio and television, touch was gradually reduced to a minimum, as new technologies emerged that required people to press various buttons that activated “content boxes.” This principle continued into the age of the personal computer, with which people interacted using a mouse or a special type of electronic pencil.

At the beginning of the 21st century, two phenomena emerged. The first, and perhaps the most prominent, was the advent and rise to prominence of the smartphone. This communication device allows people to group a large amount of different data in a “content box” and control them by directly touching a screen. Therefore, the smartphone offers a tactile experience that, while more significant than that offered by buttons and computer mice, is still limited. For example, smartphones do not allow people to make direct contact with the surface of each message.

Thesecond phenomenon, which is the subject of this book, is the continued survival of paper media in our 21st century lives. This phenomenon arose out of a combination of two sub-processes: a much slower than expected transition to digital and a fresh return to paper and plastic-based media that allow people to interact directly with each message.The first process involves the preservation of the status of certain documents despite them having digital alternatives. There has also been a rise in the printing of various types of books (such as children’s books) and a concurrent failure of attempts to replace paper books and notebooks with tablets and smartphones in schools and colleges. The second process involves the reemergence of analog “retro-tech” like vinyl records and Polaroid cameras. Alongside the renewed craze for Polaroid cameras came a revived fashion for old-style, paper-based photo albums, which people could fill with printed digital photos – the same digital photos that had, ironically, partially replaced traditional photo albums. These technologies, which apparently became obsolete in the 20th century, are based on tactile experiences

The search for substantial and meaningful contact with each and every message is also expressed in the huge interest in developing virtual experiences that will allow such contact. The road to that is still long. People have already learned to translate sounds and sights into bits and bytes, but they still do not know how to translate the experience of touch into virtual reality.

The properties of a specific technology thus play an important, but not exclusive role in the experience of its users. Equally important is the human meaning and interpretation given to those properties. To explain the enduring appeal of tactile technologies like paper books, I rely on the *theory of technological affordances*. This theory attempts to distinguish between the potential of a particular technology to create a certain experience because of its properties and the meanings that people attribute to these properties. I show that technologies that allow people to directly touch each message evoke feelings of intimacy and ownership, as well as enable a deepening of knowledge. These meanings are shared by all who read paper books and print newspapers, store photos in paper photo albums, and play vinyl records on turntables. I also show how the persistence of these technologies can be interpreted as a criticism of the capitalist ideal of “efficiency” and our increasingly compressed world, which is based on a continuous receipt of information to the point of “the ends of sleep.”[[1]](#footnote-1)

Now, let us dive into this theory and uncover its secrets.

**Affordances theory: The person?** **The object? Maybe actually both**

# Over two thousand years ago, the ancient Greek philosopher Aristotle pondered whether it was possible to separate the organs of touch from the experience of touch. Can the properties of objects, as they are perceived by the human sensory system, be separated from the interpretative action of those sensations that take place in the organ of thinking – the brain?[[2]](#footnote-2) This analytical process is the basis of the theory of affordances. Originating in ecological psychology, this theory helped us understand how animals interact with the world. From there, its application expanded to studies of society, technology, and culture. Originally, it referred to every possible interaction that can occur between a living being and its environment. For example, the physical properties of rocks affect how they are used but do not determine how different organisms use them. “There is no doubt that rocks mean something different to humans and lizards”[[3]](#footnote-3) A specific property of rocks is that they are harder and more durable than, for example, grass or paper. Lizards see rocks as hiding places, and (unlike people) do not take advantage of their hardness – for example, on which to engrave important messages.

# The theory of technological affordances[[4]](#footnote-4) focuses on human-made technologies. It seeks to distinguish between the essential features of a specific technological artifact, and its personal and social meanings. There is a clear distinction between the material properties of an object or technology (which are fixed and whose existence does not depend on an external subject) and their perceived affordances.[[5]](#footnote-5) This concept refers to the human (or non-human) interpretations and implications of an object’s material properties. It also describes the conceptual context of the encounter that takes place when an object’s properties encounter the limitations of human perception and knowledge, as well as the various practical, normative, and cultural factors that influence an individual’s interest in a specific object.[[6]](#footnote-6) For example, I might show an interest in a certain book and hold it in my hand to declare, in a manner that is understood in human societies, my ownership of it. Moreover, in contrast to technological determinism, according to which technologies impose a certain mode of action and prevent others, technical affordances theory distinguishes between different measures of imposing. It is possible to distinguish between a “requirement” to perform a certain action and an “encouragement” or “lack of encouragement” to perform it. For example, the availability of paper books requires that people distinguish one copy from another. However, as we will see later, when people read a print book they remember more than they would if they read the same information on a screen (but the screen does not prevent people from remembering what they read).

# In summary, according to the theory of technological affordances, we should not underestimate the importance of the features of human-made objects or technologies. This is because (at least, to a certain extent) they impose a particular way of using them on us. However, how we use a particular object or technology is subject to two dimensions of human interpretation: the personal (the limitations of human perception and knowledge) and the social-ideological (the social norms that dictate the use of a particular technology).

# Before we discuss the tension between the specific characteristics of a particular technology and its meanings, we should first explore the meaning of touch.

**A touching experience**

Every day, we use our sensory systems to examine and explore ourselves and the world around us – this appears so natural that, usually, we do not notice we are doing so. We only pay attention when some aspect of our sensory system – our eyesight or hearing, for example – goes wrong and affects our ability to experience and understand the world. In such cases, we seek help from a medical professional, in the hope that they can heal us and restore our full function – or help us compensate for our sudden loss of ability. In light of this, what can be said about the importance of the human sensory system that does not require medical knowledge? It is easier to understand how using certain senses affects the way we experience the world, process information, and make emotional (not just intellectual) judgments about the people and objects around us.

In 1954, the German-Jewish philosopher Hans Jonas described how the essential properties of the senses, especially sight and touch, allow people to experience the world.[[7]](#footnote-7) The table below summarizes the three main differences between the modes of interaction with the world imposed on us by these two senses:



|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Touch | Sight |
| Method of reception | Sequential | Simultaneous |
| Distance | Requires proximity | Requires distance |
| Nature of interaction | Leaves a trace | Leaves no trace |

# Method of reception: sight is the sense that allows us to gather the largest amount of information in the fastest time. Unlike the other senses, which are slower (we gather information through them only gradually), sight allows the contemporaneous absorption of pieces of information that are scattered in space. Touch, like hearing and smell, requires a delay. To experience how touch works, we might close our eyes for a moment and reach for a nearby chair. An initial touch of the chair allows us to feel the properties of the material it is made from, such as its texture and thickness. However, we cannot conclude that what we are touching is indeed a chair, and we also lack information about the presence of other chairs in the same space. We will find this information only through further exploration.

# Distance: even though hearing does not necessarily require us to be in particularly close proximity to an object to gather information, sight is the only sense where being too close to an object can actually be a disadvantage. To view a large object in its entirety, we must move away from it. Here, the gulf between sight and touch is enormous. We cannot physically touch something that is further away than the length of our arm. This limitation sometimes means that if we want to experience a particular object through touch, we need to get so close to it that we cannot see it properly. In so doing, we impede our ability to examine the relationships between that object and others in our world. This is essentially what Walter Benjamin argued in his essay *A Child’s View of Color* – that the basis of a child’s experience is tactile.[[8]](#footnote-8) Benjamin theorized that children experience color close to their bodies, and therefore, their drawings differ from reality experienced through the eyes. When they draw objects around them, children do not attempt to imitate the three-dimensional characteristics of reality, nor are they overly careful to match the colors they use with reality.[[9]](#footnote-9)

# The nature of the interaction: in his book *Visible and Invisible*, Maurice Merleau-Ponty used an image of two hands touching each other to demonstrate the concept that “what touches is touched at the same time.”[[10]](#footnote-10) The third feature of touch, which somewhat complements the previous two, is related to the traces that are left behind when we use our senses. If we fix our eyes on something and then close our eyes or turn our heads, the object we were looking at disappears from view. Using sight to gather information is perhaps the most extreme example of our resistance to being influenced by our environment (and to influencing it). In contrast, the information absorbed through hearing, smell, or taste penetrates into it and does not let go. Even if we close our ears or hold our noses, it is quite possible that information will nevertheless get through and penetrate us. However, even compared to hearing, smell, and taste, touch is unique. It is the only way of receiving information that forces us to *voluntarily* activate a set of mechanisms in our body. The result of this action changes not only us, but also the object being touched. Even the paper we touch has something of ourselves added to it – an almost invisible fingerprint.

# The human aspect: touch as a means of communication

# It is difficult to discuss the human implications of touch since we are not always aware of its particular importance. For the most part, we experience touch as part of our overall multi-sensory experience. Our five senses all work together. Yet physical touch has several unique implications related to our interactions with our environment. The 16th century English poet and lawyer John Davies described the properties of touch in his philosophical poem *Nosce Teipsum* (1599), connecting them with the way we perceive them:

By touch, the first pure qualities we learn,

Which quicken all things, hot, cold, moist and dry;

By touch, hard, soft, rough, smooth, we do discern;

By touch, sweet pleasure and sharp pain we try.[[11]](#footnote-12)

# Davies’ lines relate to two aspects of the experience of touch: the emotional and the rational. Let us discuss each of these in turn.

# Touch – thoughts and feelings

# One of the important implications of touch is the ability it gives us to express emotions (positive or negative), for example, by caressing or hitting someone or something. We use touch to express our feelings and interpret touch as an expression of emotion. Touch, it is claimed, is the best way to express our emotional relationships, at least compared to other senses.[[12]](#footnote-13) Although touch is usually associated with the physical, in many languages, it is also a metaphorical expression of a person’s interior life and feelings, at least as far as an emotional response is concerned.[[13]](#footnote-14) Ashley Montague defined touch as “an action that means feeling something with the hand.”[[14]](#footnote-15) So did the Elizabethan poet Michael Drayton, who described touch in his 29th sonnet, *To the Senses*, as “one who guards the fortress of the heart, one who awakens and blesses the other senses.”

# Many languages use touch as a metaphor for various emotions. In English, the verb “to feel” can mean both to think and to experience emotion. If your friend is easily upset or sensitive, you might describe him as “touchy,” and if you wanted to remain in contact with someone you met on holiday, you might ask her to “keep in touch” with you.[[15]](#footnote-16) Also, in many contexts, contact with a person, object or technology is linked to intimacy in relationships between people and between them and places and objects.

# Emotional communication through touch is first experienced at birth. Touch establishes what the French philosopher and psychoanalyst Luce Irigaray called the “prenatal moment,” when a newborn baby gropes without seeing.[[16]](#footnote-17) This brief time is of dramatic significance, as it encourages babies to explore the world with their hands [[17]](#footnote-18).The French psychoanalyst Didier Anzieu believed that this early experience leads to the development of the ego, as the skin acts as a “physical and mental interface between [the baby] and the world.”[[18]](#footnote-19) Julia Kristeva and Irigaray also claimed that this early experience is a sign of things to come: it is calibrated and embedded within the symbolic world through which each of us experiences the world throughout our lives.[[19]](#footnote-20)

The influence of formative touch-based experiences on later life is not limited to humans. In the 1940s, Harry and Margot Harlow conducted one of the most brutal and controversial experiments ever undertaken in developmental psychology.[[20]](#footnote-21) The experiment examined maternal bonding in primates, with the aim of understanding this process in humans. Baby rhesus monkeys were separated from their mothers and placed in a cage with two “surrogate mother” dolls, one made of wire and wood and the other of foam rubber and soft cloth. The baby monkeys were split into two groups: in the first, the wire “mother” had a milk bottle, and the cloth “mother” did not; in the second, the cloth “mother” had the food, while the wire “mother” did not. In both groups, the infants spent more time with the soft, cloth “mother” than the wire mother – and when the wire “mother” had the milk bottle, the hungry infants fed from it, but immediately returned to cuddle with the cloth “mother.” The absence of touch-based communication proved to be of extraordinary and horrifying significance. Monkeys raised without maternal physical contact suffered behavioral problems in adulthood, with females failing to function as mothers, probably because they were deprived of maternal touch as infants.

This deeply shocking experiment had a benefit that improved the lives of many. It taught that initial bonding through touch plays an important role in the development of communication and intimacy in humans. A relationship was found between experiencing sufficient physical contact at a young age and avoiding feelings of depression or the ability to experience romantic relationships.

Touch is not used only for deep, intimate communication. Even a lighter touch can express and create a certain intimacy between interaction partners. Interpersonal touch may affect our altruistic behavior. This is called the Midas touch effect, after the Greek mythological figure who turned everything he touched into gold. Even a very brief human touch on the hand, arm, or neck that lasts less than a second (sometimes without the “toucher” even noticing it) affects the toucher’s attitude towards the touch recipient, the feelings of the touch recipient, and the attitude of both the toucher and the touch recipient to the whole situation. This stems from an unconscious feeling of a person being touched because they like or trust them.[[21]](#footnote-22) Studies have suggested that the Midas touch effect is reflected in the effect of hand contact on the desire to return lost money, on the size of tips given in restaurants, and on the degree of willingness to order from the menu.

Another everyday expression of intimacy through touch is the handshake. This action has the power to affect the quality of subsequent interactions and to create or preserve relationships.[[22]](#footnote-23) The handshake is not only used for an intimate-emotional expression on an interpersonal level. It also plays a significant role in representing the credibility of relations between commercial and state bodies. Handshakes are often an integral part of the conclusion of international contracts, peace agreements, and commercial transactions.

The emotional dimension of touch is also reflected in the human concept of property and ownership. People tend to distinguish between what is “theirs” and what is “not theirs” and even give the things they own added value. In contrast to the sense of intimacy created through touch, the need for ownership and ways of realizing it are acquired through learning and are part of the social contract. According to Thorstein Veblen, an economist, in the first stages of the development of human culture, ownership did not exist in any form, neither personal nor collective. The concept of ownership only emerged when we began to transition to the “predatory phase.” From that time on, people began to express power and status through durable objects, such as weapons and jewelry. Only when the era of printing began did people begin to distinguish between *tangible* assets, which involve physical contact, and *intangible* assets (such as copyright), which do not involve physical contact. It is no coincidence that the initial concept of ownership was related to touch. The French philosopher and theorist Jean Le Ron d’Alembert defined touch as something that “allows us to distinguish between that which is ours and that which surrounds us.”[[23]](#footnote-24)

The same sense of differentiation of the in-between of the above develops when a person constantly interacts with the object being touched and feels a sense of control over it.

Historian Elizabeth Harvey points to extensive examples in art where touch is depicted as a means of indicating ownership, including of another human being: a slaveowner touching a slave’s naked body to declare his ownership of that person, a man’s touch of a female body under his control, or a landowner touching his land.[[24]](#footnote-25) Even today, people buy valuable items so that they can touch them. Wealthy people might choose to buy valuable pictures to hang in their homes, where they can touch them whenever they choose. This is despite the fact that they can see any number of paintings in a museum for free or at a small cost (or view any famous painting in the world instantly via their smartphone).

Beyond an emotional expression of intimacy and ownership, the human implications of touch are also related to scholarly research aimed at discovering scientific truths.

**Thinking rationally – what is the most “correct” way to investigate reality?**

# The contribution of the senses to a rational observation of the world has been a much-debated theme in philosophical thought throughout the ages. Although a recurring argument is that the senses should be treated as a whole, there were nevertheless many who believed that some senses were “better” or more worthy than others, mainly giving precedence to sight. Throughout history, great thinkers, from Aristotle and Plato to Descartes, saw sight as the basis for the “human right”: it is claimed that only sight encourages and nurtures abstract rational thought, since this requires observing things from a distance and without interaction. Descartes, who is considered the “founding father of the visual paradigm of modern philosophy,”[[25]](#footnote-26) argued that the ability to see several things at once is what caused human intuition to advance. The ability to immediately grasp a general idea is the first step toward being able to solve mathematical and mechanical problems. According to Descartes, new ideas are born in a single look and not through patient and methodical discovery, such as characterizes how we experience the world through our other senses.

# Many of the early proponents of sight as a superior sense also despised touch as basic and animalistic. Aristotle wrote that “all animals whatsoever are observed to have the sense of touch,” which means that it is the most basic sense of any living creature,[[26]](#footnote-27) or any living creature. He continued with his statement referring to all creatures and stated that touch is the place where the human and the animal meet each other sharing this basic sense that is the guardian of life. [[27]](#footnote-28)

# In the early modern period, when discussions concerning the relationship between the senses and rationality proliferated, Neoplatonic thinkers argued that touch, smell, and taste were inferior to sight. This was because humans share it with animals, and due to the proximity of objects that are touched to the body. This disgust regarding the “animal” and the “bodily” was expressed in a variety of areas. According to Norbert Elias, the process of “civilization” in which “warrior societies” turned into settled societies involved the institutionalization of actions that expressed control over “animal interests” or an excessive physical proximity to the world of objects. The aversion to direct touch was implied by institutionalizing actions such as wiping one’s nose with a handkerchief and eating with a knife and fork. Elizabeth Harvey, quoting Elias, sees the avoidance of physical intimacy as sharpening the connection of “humanity” with distance, restraint, control, and internalization of emotions.[[28]](#footnote-29)

# Among the intellectuals who admired sight was Robert Boyle, the Anglo-Irish chemist, who stated that it is the weakest of the five senses since the thoughts evoked by touch are instinctive.[[29]](#footnote-30) To such an extent, the preference for sight was prevalent among thinkers, and the 20th century Russian philosopher Mikhail Bakhtin equated the distinction between sight and touch to that between high and low culture. The words of Bakhtin, written in the 20th century, correspond with those of Renaissance philosopher Marsilio T. Ficino, who associated touch with extreme emotions such as passion or madness.[[30]](#footnote-31) During Ficino’s time, an article titled “The Sense of Touch” was published in a medical information book, arguing that touch is rough and imperfect because humans use it to carry heavy loads, which damages their hands.[[31]](#footnote-32)

# The scientific revolution that took place at that time also contributed to the rise of the status of vision in rational thinking. The invention of optical technologies such as the microscope and telescope contributed to the decline of the status of touch in a world that was thrilled by the breakthrough into a new visual world. Historian Martin Jay states that “it can be said with some certainty that the vision aided by the new technologies has become the dominant sense in the modern world.”[[32]](#footnote-33)

# The institutional organization of the European medical world, which did not change at the time, also contributed to the superior status of sight. Two people took part in medical surgery: the surgeon and one of the members of the book guild - the surgeons: people with no formal education in medicine who excelled with a steady hand. These were entrusted for years with performing a variety of treatments: haircutting, tooth extraction, bloodletting, and even full surgeries. Their steady and skilled hand was seen as nothing more than the “executive contractor” of the physician’s eye.[[33]](#footnote-34) The physicians themselves, who preferred to teach at the academy or treat members of the aristocracy, tried to avoid direct contact with patients and contented themselves with merely advising those who performed the actual work.

However, in ancient times, there were many who claimed that touch was not only a tool but also played a key role in helping people acquire deep insights. The famous Roman writer Pliny claimed that when it comes to smell, taste, or sight, animals perform better than humans. When it comes to touch, however, humans have an advantage, because they can mobilize it for diverse needs. Aristotle also argued that we know the world around us through touch, which allows the mind to perceive the shape of things, and we can mobilize it to be precise and distinguish.[[34]](#footnote-35)

These ideas resonated in early medicine. The Greek surgeon and philosopher Galen (Claudius Galenus), who is considered one of the fathers of modern anatomy, claimed that in order to reach the truth in medical diagnosis, a combination of vision and touch is required, mainly through the fingertips.[[35]](#footnote-36)

In the 16th century, while Descartes and his followers believed in the supremacy of sight, other thinkers pointed to the value of empirical observation based on touch. William Harvey, the influential English physician, wrote of the “powerful authority” of sensory integration, which he said was the “master of anatomy.” Harvey believed that the diagnostic experience, which combines sight and touch, was the right way to know the “truth.” Touch was an important and powerful source of authority that cannot be replaced by the abstract laws of probability.[[36]](#footnote-37) This position was supported by the 18th century French philosopher Denis Diderot, who asked his readers to ponder “how much the eyes can deceive, if the interpretation of reality based on them is not accompanied by touch.”[[37]](#footnote-38) Diderot backed up his claim by quoting the blind English scientist Nicholas Saunderson, who is credited with saying that if a person wants to believe in God (or know with more certainty that God does exist), he must touch him.[[38]](#footnote-39)
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