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The Vibe
By Sarah P. Douglass

Back in 2009, a team of researchers at the Kinsey Institute for Research in Sex, Gender and Reproduction wanted to find out how prevalent vibrator use was in the US. The team, led by sex educator Debby Herbenick, foraged through clinical texts, poring over works with titles like A New Image for The Naughty Dildo, The Role of Masturbation and The New Sex Therapy.

They had questions, questions about who used vibrators, questions that were largely avoided by scientific inquiry. And so, they conducted a study titled Prevalence and Characteristics of Vibrator Use by Women in the United States. They found that vibrators, items categorized as an “unmentionable product” by the Journal of Product & Brand Management, are used by more than 50 percent of women.

“The vibrator industry is projected to be a $152 billion industry by 2020,” said Nina Šmigmator, communications manager at LELO, the world’s leading maker of high-end vibrators. “The goal is to offer women a whole new and different pleasure experience. It’s also to push the envelope of sex-tech a little bit further and to challenge ourselves.”

Last September, I took a walk through the 2017 Sex Expo in Brooklyn, New York. The strong demand for vibrators was made overwhelmingly obvious. There were thousands of vibrators on display, costing anywhere from $6 to $1,345. They weighed five ounces to 19 pounds. Some were coated in silicone, some in gold, some in stainless steel. Others were bejeweled or painted. They came mounted to saddles, strung onto necklaces and sewn into panties. But it was the technological bells and whistles that had the crowd buzzing.

A few of the vibrators that stole the show were those incorporating the latest technological advancements, like one synced to a playlist, pulsating to the music’s rhythm; one that mimicked directions drawn onto an iPhone screen; and one with a remote control that could reach overseas -- a big-ticket item ($900) for U.S. Marines looking for the perfect deployment gift for their wives and girlfriends.

Sexologists, neuroscientists and psychologists have conflicting opinions about sex-tech. Some, like Chris Donaghue, a sex therapist who appears regularly on radio and television talk shows, believe it’s a positive – elevating access and connection. Others, like clinical sexologist Patti Britton, believe it could be moving society in a direction of less relationally, less intimacy and less overall, real-time engagement.

As the bar for pleasure tech rises, so does the possibility of tech hacking the vagina and creating an orgasm intensity completely off the grid. Inspired by the thousands of new releases displayed at the expo, I wanted to know how far tech could take the female orgasm and meet those rigging the climax of the future.
In 1976, the hub for pleasure products broke ground. Doc Johnson, a sex toy company founded by Reuben Sturman and Ron Braverman, was the first of its kind. The business venture was a trail blazer for the sex toy industry – setting up shop out West and opening its doors to mainstream consumers, creating a threshold to the market of sexual pleasure.

Now Doc Johnson is a leading company in a global industry that grosses $15 billion annually. Doc Johnson produces 75,000 products weekly in its 250,000-square-foot compound in North Hollywood. The company’s famous product line includes some of the greats, like the iVibe Rabbit and the original Pocket Rocket: the best-selling vibrator in the history of the industry.

Today, tech plays an integral part in sex toy production. Braverman’s 35-year-old son, Chad, now serves as Doc Johnson’s COO and CCO, ensuring the family business stays at the forefront of tech-trends and keeps pace with today’s ever expanding list of futuristic possibilities. Tech has opened doors, inviting leaders in the industry to take pleasure to new heights, places once unimagined by sex-industry pioneers of the ’70s.

“If something is really exciting and feasible in the tech world, we’re going to see how we can bring that to market on an actual pleasure product,” Chad Braverman said. “We’re not an industry that is going to invent something, but we are definitely going to piggyback on inventions.”

Vibrator developers, like the younger Braverman, are eager to incorporate today’s technological advancements into stimulators. Vibrators now come with Bluetooth hookups, innovative power sourcing, temperature control and memory storage. But, as of now, there are limits for the booming industry.

“The adult industry has to adopt technologies that are already accepted by the mainstream consumer,” Braverman said. “No one would have the ability to turn on a Bluetooth item when it was just a sex toy driving that invention.”

A vibrator is a blank canvas, capable of being altered by almost any technological amenity released to market. However, once the flashy tech-dressing is stripped away, Braverman explains the vibrator itself is rather lackluster.

“The bare bones of a vibrator are not much more elaborate than a weight that’s placed off center of a motor [creating] what is technically known as a throw, which creates that sensation of vibration,” he said. “A lot of times vibrators aren’t necessarily different than what’s available, but they are presented differently. So they might come in different colors, or they might be in different packaging.”

Strolling past the expo’s thousands of vibrator options, this was made clear. Yes, the variety was undeniable – the vibrating, silicon tongue had obvious differences compared to the vibrating Eggplant Emojibator – but at these stimulator’s core, they were fundamentally the same. Surely this billion-dollar industry wasn’t planning to stall with the vibrator’s dated mechanism,
haphazardly covered in hijacked tech-additives and colorful designs. There had to be more. Science was becoming too advanced to settle on the conclusion that women just need a vibrating vegetable or pocket rocket to get off. Surely, within the complexity of the female anatomy, there were hidden hacks to orgasms stronger, better and more powerful than what is accepted today.

I wanted to know why in the hours of conversations I had discussing vibrator development, no expert or developer grazed past the surface of female anatomy. Industry leaders spend millions of dollars taking apart pleasure products and reconfiguring old parts into something new, but it seemed to me that they never consulted physiological findings, considering them a point of desired integration, or an area of potential influence.

If my interviews are any guide, never while rewiring vibrators do developers consider the intricate wiring of the female genitalia. Never while programing Bluetooth do developers consider the complex messaging system between pleasure-activating nerves and the brain. Never while configuring magic wands to twist and turn do developers consider focusing the shaft’s tilts to target areas neuroscientists consider orgasmic hot zones. At no time do they consider the overall rigging of the female brain and body, and how that could play into climax quality.

It seemed to me that vibrator developers had overlooked the opportunity of evaluating the female body as a device, a brilliantly-wired tool that can be manipulated to produce what they are after – optimal, orgasmic experiences of the future.

That is, until the new generation of sex toy development got wind of the untapped vortex of physiology.

“I want to know more,” Braverman said. “I’m very, very curious about this whole realm, this sort of next frontier.”

According to the 2017 United State(s) of Masturbation survey conducted by TENGa, pocket-sized stimulators make a big impact considering frequent masturbators are eight percent more likely to be employed than those who don’t engage in party-of-one sex.

There are nuances in orgasms resulting from sex with humans versus sex with tech. However, the starkest difference is the probability of orgasm itself during masturbation versus intercourse. According to a survey conducted by the University of Chicago, only 29 percent of women report always reaching orgasm during sex. That’s a small success rate compared with the 75 percent men who reach orgasm every time.

“The notion of sexual liberation, where men and women both had equal access to casual sex, assumed a comparable likelihood of that sex being pleasurable,” Kim Wallen, professor of behavioral neuroendocrinology at Emory University, told the New York Times. “But that part of the playing field isn’t level.”
Unlike the low percentage of female orgasm rate during intercourse, the probability of orgasm reached during masturbation spikes to a strong 96 percent.

“Many, many women do not have orgasms with intercourse,” said psychologist and sex therapist, Stephanie Buehler. “In those cases, some women are happy to get out a vibrator.”

Every week, 12 percent of women masturbate with a sex toy at least once. It’s time well spent considering what happens to the body during climax.

Barry Komisaruk, a neuroscientist at Rutgers University, sends women into fMRI machines with their vibrators so he can study the 80 regions of their brains while they climax.

Turns out, different parts of the female genitalia have different nerves. The pudendal nerve carries sensation from the clitoris to the brain. The pelvic nerve carries sensation from the deeper vaginal region to the brain. And the vagus nerve carries sensation from the cervix to the brain.

“It’s like a cable system,” Komisaruk said while explaining nerves pathways. “Like a string going from the genitals into the spinal cord [then] to the cortex.”

These different nerves enable women to have at least 11 different types of orgasm, the largest subtypes being clitoral and vaginal.

“These different parts of a woman’s sexual anatomy produce different experiences, different sensations, different kinds of pleasure [and] intensities because of the nerve pathways, how the body is structured and how the nerve is conducting sensation to the actual site of the body,” said Britton. “So, to replicate what a vibrator can do, there are very few humans that could do that.”

During stimulation of the vaginal nerves, hormones – including dopamine, serotonin and oxytocin – are released through a reflexive process. Oxytocin, the star orgasm hormone, is dumped into the blood stream which then distributes the love-drug throughout the entire body.

“During mating, during sexual intercourse that stimulation occurs and it releases oxytocin into the bloodstream and the oxytocin causes the contractions of the uterus during orgasm,” Komisaruk said.

These contractions are much like the contractions during labor – same hormone, same mechanism. Once the body hits its tension threshold, it releases into an orgasm. At this moment, the vagina, uterus and anus begin contracting at 0.8-second intervals. Small orgasms usually have just three to five contractions while larger orgasms have around 10 to 15.

“Orgasm itself is a physiological event that’s reflexive,” said Nicole Prause, sexual psychologist and neuroscientist specializing in the study of human sexual behavior. “It’s really a kind of on/off
in lots of ways, not that we can’t use things to enhance it or make it easier or more pleasurable, but basically once those contractions start, you can’t stop them.”

Neuroscientists believe it’s possible for technology to manipulate this intricately wired system, creating orgasm intensities unachievable through human contact alone.

“The vibrator could provide vibratory stimulation at a much higher rate and a much higher frequency than would be possible from manual stimulation or penile thrusting. It could also provide such stimulation to parts of the body that would not be accessible through sexual intercourse,” Komisaruk said. “Theoretically, you could apply that kind of stimulation, concurrent with technology, not only to just the cervix, vagina and the clitoris, but it could be done simultaneously or combinations of stimulations.”

Komisaruk believes with just a little trial and error, scientists could configure climaxes of the future.

“It’s not physiological, it’s not the natural way of stimulation but it could be done,” he said.

Because each woman requires different avenues to reaching orgasm, the vehicle to nirvana can’t always be designed the same. As Braverman explains, each woman has her own “sexual fingerprint.” Some women need a deep rumble from their vibrator, while others need a high pitched buzz; some need a strong vibration, while others need a feather-light touch; some need clitoris stimulation, while others need g-spot action.

“Sex varies tremendously, preferences vary tremendously so it’s going to depend a lot,” Prause said of women’s different vibrator needs.

The list of different needs and wants is extensive, but the basic makeup of a vibrator has stayed fundamentally the same. However, Companies like LELO are beginning to break away from the standard vibrator model. They consider the basic motor setup a jumping off point for stimulators.

This opinion materialized in October 2017, when LELO released a product with sonic waves. The $179 stimulator was designed by engineers to penetrate deep into the internal structure of the clitoris, convincing every woman she needs to add sonic weapons to her pleasure arsenal.

“If good sex is essentially a discourse,” Šmigmator said. “Then so too must be the development of a good sex toy.”

With Bluetooth hookups, focus on texture, innovative power sourcing, mind-blowing frequencies and now sonic waves, it’s possible this hand-held robot could be the best sex of every woman’s life.

“These products are developed specifically for pleasure delivering,” Braverman said. “There are
so many different reasons why a vibrator is going to be better or more consistent – or, whatever word you want to use – than your partner.”

Modern technological substitutes such as Amazon’s Alexa, Philips’s Sonicare Toothbrush and Roomba’s iRobot Vacuum are part of everyday activities. Sexologists and psychologists believe this surge of tech into daily life has made sex-tech not only mainstream, but more user friendly.

“I think we’re getting away from the power tool toward a compatible enhancement,” said Britton. “There’s a sense of compatibility with the human body.”

There is a growing dependency on technological amenities. More often than not, tech replacements surpass human ability, creating a world of ease, convenience and isolation. Now this phenomenon can be seen creeping into human sexuality. With vibrators becoming more convenient, dependable and effortless, sex-tech could become the female solution to men’s shortcomings. And, as sex-tech becomes increasingly advanced and perfected, men are losing ground to compete.

No longer are wives left sitting on washing machines, frustrated over husbands’ low stamina. No longer are single girls left waiting for a knight on a white charger to sweep her off her feet. No longer, because today that charger carries chargeable induced pleasure. Today—thanks to modern advancements—women have choices, opportunities, vast horizons, hacks to biological clocks and no-strings-attached orgasms.

Eventually, one could imagine, society will lose the need for human interaction completely. There will be no need for human-to-human contact. Even human intercourse will become outdated. Sure, it’ll have a fond association, but, much like the quaint horse and buggy, it will be shrouded in nostalgia, only enjoyed when one wishes to muse over the simpler of times.

“One of the critical needs most of us in our profession in sexology are seeing among our clients are people who have become disembodied,” Britton said. “They live neck-up. They’re in their heads all of the time. Their lives are regulated to when the next beep or ding or ping gets their attention.”

Japan is an example of what the future could look like if people continue moving towards an overly tech-reliant, neck-up lifestyle.

Japan’s millennial generation appears to have almost no interest in romantic or sexual relations. Millions aren’t dating, which is making the already low birth rates sink further. Right now, the population is around 120 million and it’s expected to fall one-third by 2060. The country’s media calls this crisis the Celibacy Syndrome.

Sex-tech is one factor causing the national crisis. With things like virtual-reality porn, $10,000 sex dolls and increasingly satisfying tech, the young generation doesn’t feel the need for a human relationship. A small demographic has even become complete shuts-ins referred to as
“hikikomori.” Although sex-tech is just one of several reasons for the crisis, it still raises questions about tech-intimacy dependency.

Regardless of where sex with tech may lead, Donaghue sees the growing tech trend in the US as a positive.

“A lot of clients I work with are fat or a person of color or queer or disabled and they don’t feel desirable in the world,” he said. “And so technology is a source for them to connect to a community, see representation, see themselves eroticized, find sex partners and so for them it’s everything - it’s mental health, it’s confidence building, it’s access.”

It’s no surprise the industry is putting so much focus on these battery-operated playmates. The demand is high. The vibrator market rakes in over $2.9 billion annually. According to the Society for The Scientific Study of Sexuality, the most popular sex toys purchased online are vibrators, making up about 20 percent of all online sex-toy sales. Doc Johnson invests anywhere from $10,000 to $250,000 when creating a new vibrator model, while LELO spends more than three years developing a single stimulator.

“It’s the people who are pushing developers to do better,” Šmigmator said. “They’re vocal, informed and always pushing for newness and innovation.”

In 2012, neuroscientist Nicole Prause published one of the world’s first clinical studies on most-effective vibrator characteristics. She believed that scientifically quantifying vibrator stimulation would better help identify which vibrators are more effective for different clients and purposes.

“We’re the only lab in the world right now measuring the quality of orgasm physiologically,” Prause said. “[Vibrator companies] just like making these random things and I’m like Oh my god – there are mechanoreceptors in the vulva, you can characterize and tune these things, and they’re just not doing any of it. It’s crazy.”

Prause and her colleague set up shop in Albuquerque and began merging search engines to find the top 10 most commonly purchased vibrators. They then decided on the top three most important characteristics to focus on: frequency, acceleration and displacement.

“There are ways of characterizing those. They’re commonly used in construction sites or on roadways,” Prause said.

Prause needed to evaluate these mechanical characteristics, so she turned to a team of mechanical engineers for help.

“They of course thought this was hysterical and were very helpful in getting us set up,” she said.

The engineers used a piezoelectric device, a tool that measures pressure, acceleration, strain and force, to quantify Prause’s list of characteristics in question. They hooked the vibrators to
the device and quantified the hertz, frequency and power source of each tool, including the Hitachi Magic Wand and the Rabbit.

The vibratory frequencies ranged from 43 to 148 Hz, the displacement from 37 to 783 μm and the acceleration from 18 to 311 m/s².

“One of the main things that differentiated the vibrators more than anything else was the displacement,” Prause said. “It really seems like the most important thing that differentiates more and less powerful vibrators is how much displacement ends up occurring.”

I asked Prause if it was possible to program an optimal vibration frequency that could have universal, climax-reaching success (something vibrator developers told me was not considered possible).

“You could absolutely just change the research question a little bit and say I’m going to look at the brain and see at what frequency people increase in sexual motivation the most or what they report feels the most pleasurable,” she said. “It’s a very common test of limits and you can do that with a vibrator, no problem. It would be very simple to do. [I have] no idea why people haven’t done it.”

As the study progressed, Prause speculated over what would be most-effective in making a study sample orgasm. So, she organized a sample group of folks willing to put her scientifically programmed vibrator to the test.

With limited physiological data available, Prause configured a pattern of vibration intervals that climbed intensity as time progressed. The algorithm started three rounds of 10 seconds with the vibrator on, followed by five seconds with the vibrator off. From there, the rounds progressively increased in length of stimulation, decreasing the break time in between. The off/on pattern climbed up to 30 seconds on with 10 seconds off.

“It seemed to be really freakin’ effective,” Prause said. “It worked for just about everyone.”

Well, almost everyone. The breakthrough worked for all but one unfortunate subject, but, according to Prause, that was due to a condom malfunction.

“I’m actually suspicious that what we came across was not actually so much a perfect intensity or frequency, but a stimulation pattern,” Prause said.

This clinical algorithm has yet to be integrated in consumer vibrators. Prause believes this is just one of many opportunities the vibrator industry is missing out on.

“None of them collaborate with any sexual physiologist,” she said sounding exasperated. “It’s really annoying for a scientist...They’re [not] doing feedback. There’s enough development in
neuroscience so like tomorrow—if we wanted to—we could set up something to tell you how aroused your partner’s getting from your vibrator by looking at your brain.”

Prause has done dozens of studies on sex, covering topics like how brain stimulation alters sexual responsiveness, the neurophysiology of pornography addiction and women’s preferred penis/dildo size.

“I hope, and I’m not sure this will happen, but I wish what would happen would be some sensitivity to physiology. That [the vibrator industry] will actually try to study the body and understand like the greatest response and where the mechanoreceptors are tuned for clitoral stimulation,” Prause said. “That would be amazing.”

As far back as 51 B.C., women have been seeking outside help to enhance their sexual experience. It’s rumored Egyptian queen Cleopatra used a hollowed out gourd filled with bees as her stimulator. Historian Paul Chrystal, author of “In Bed with the Ancient Greeks”, says the ancient Greeks used “dildo-like breadsticks” to get the job done. Centuries before the invention of the silicone covered vibrators I spotted at the expo in Brooklyn, these Greeks got crafty by lubing up bread with olive oil. Archaeologists say dildos are the fourth oldest invention – following weapons, fire, clothing and jewelry. Although we’ve upgraded from insects to batteries, women’s needs have stayed fundamentally the same.

According to Herbenick’s prevalence-of-vibrators study, the use of vibrators has significantly increased over the past 50 years. Today’s 52 percent of vibrator-using women ages 18 to 60 is a hefty increase compared to the 1970s, when only one percent of women owned a vibrator, according to sex educator Shere Hite’s The Hite Report: A National Study of Female Sexuality.

Vibrators were once marketed as back massagers promising “pleasurable, pulsating relaxation.” By the 2000s, reviews on vibrators were splashed across magazine pages, listing explicit details about the orgasms each guarantee.

“The changing cultural norms in the late 1990’s characterized by shows as “Sex in the City” were mostly positive for the industry,” Susan Colvin, Founder and CEO of CalExotics, told Forbes. “Women emerged as a self-sufficient and in control of their lives, all the way into the bedroom. Women’s sexual empowerment became so pervasive that we even experienced an embrace from more mainstream media.”

Today, we’ve moved beyond an acceptance of vibrators into an embrace knowing that as technology improves, so can the female orgasm.

The vibrator has picked up momentum as waves of feminism roll through the decades. The first wave (1910s to 1950s) scratched “hysteria” from the American Psychiatric Association’s Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, leaving vibrators, once considered a medical solution, exposed of its true being – a female pleasure product. The second wave (1960s to 1980s) reimaged vibrators into phallic symbols, pushing vibrators onto sex shop shelves and into the hands of porn stars. The third wave (1990s to 2008) had the epitome class, Charlotte
York, wrapped in Chanel, obsessing over the Rabbit in the iconic, female-driven series “Sex in the City”. Today, during the fourth wave, women have become key players in the vibrator industry, configuring frequencies and amplitudes designed for optimal orgasm.

“The biggest driver is the market itself – the women using the products,” said Šmigmator. “They love it, and they are more knowledgeable and open to discussion than ever before.”

Since the 2000s, sex-tech has improved immensely. Today, the bar for the female orgasm has been raised significantly. But with the continued technological advancements, experts are beginning to speculate that perhaps robots won’t just be taking up jobs, but taking up lovers. Ian Pearson, PhD futurologist, believes by 2030 people will be having both emotional and casual sex with robots. Emotional dependency is what concerns clinical sexologists, like Britton. However, Britton feels certain no matter how good robot-on-human gets, it will never surpass human-on-human.

“The human connection is not replicable,” Britton said. “When two individuals are engaging in a sexual activity, particularly a sexually penetrative activity, there’s a lot more going on than the mechanics.”

Even with continued advancements, sexologist and psychologists believe human intercourse is impossible to duplicate, or surpass. They believe sex is the whole experience – human connection, matching energies, pheromones and so on.

“Don’t feel that it is a replacement, look at it as an enhancer,” Britton said. “A pleasure product can be an additive to a relationship.”

Clinical psychologist Stuart Brody studied orgasms resulting from intercourse versus orgasms resulting from masturbation. In one study, he found that orgasms from sex rather than masturbation released 400 times prolactin, a hormone released in the blood that boosts relaxation.

“A wide range of better psychological and physiological health indices are associated specifically with penile-vaginal intercourse,” Brody wrote.

Brody concluded that other sexual activities, such as masturbation, have “weaker, no or inverse associations with health indices.”

Although Brody’s findings suggest vibrators can’t completely replicate orgasms reached through human contact, Komisaruk fMRI scans show tech-induced orgasms still provide substantial health and mood altering benefits.

During genital stimulation – regardless if by way of human contact or a mechanical gadget – a surge of blood is released into the pelvic region via erectile, cavernous tissue. This tissue is full of caverns made up of smooth-muscle walls lined with cells supplied by arterioles. During
stimulation of the pelvic nerve, nitric oxide is released, causing fingerlike-muscles around the arterioles to loosen, allowing blood from the vaginal artery to fill the caverns. This surge of blood delivers nutrients and improves circulation to organs in the pelvic cavity. Reaching climax gives an overall lymphatic massage, improves the body’s detoxification process, protects against heart disease and osteoporosis, helps prevent cancer, improves digestion, alters moods and increases infection-fighting cells, like those causing the flu.

One positive aspect of tech-induced orgasm is response time. According to Brown University, the average time it takes for females to reach orgasm during sex is 10 to 20 minutes, while orgasms reached during masturbation and/or sex-tech takes under four minutes.

Although stimulators provide orgasmic benefits in record time, the vibrator industry still only goes skin deep. Neuroscientists believe the vibrator industry hasn’t reached full potential because it has yet to incorporated physiological research into production. Like Praise, Komisaruk claims there is an enormous amount of untouched, unstudied corners of pleasure.

Both Praise and Komisaruk acknowledge that this deficiency in vibrator development isn’t entirely the fault of the vibrator industry. They say it trickles down from a much broader issue: lack of federal funding for sex research in the US.

“The funding agencies are extremely reluctant to fund anything on sexuality. It’s not easy to get grants for it,” Komisaruk explains. “It’s terrible. It is terrible. In this environment, in the current cultural environment, there’s infinite interest and zero willingness to support it.”

Neuroscientists claim one of the only ways to get funding for sex research is through a student or faculty funded project (how Praise got her funding), leaving “sex” out of the title or by phrasing the research question as a negative, for example: the study of women with spinal cord injury (how Komisaruk got his funding), investigating the effects of alcohol, HIV or rape.

“You have to package it in terms of a negative,” Praise said. “You have to be silent about what you’re doing.”

Only five grants for sex research have been brought before congress in the History of National Institutes of Health, and one was defunded.

“To just study human sexuality, they don’t fund it,” Komisaruk said of the National Institute of Health’s program officers. “They’re afraid of getting scrutinized by congress thinking it’s a waste of money.”

An argument could be made that keeping the mystery of, and around sex – no matter how scientifically irresponsible – is actually what’s keeping tech from surpassing human contact.

Overall, when it comes to modern technological advancements, many agree the vibrator industry is keeping up. However, in terms of physiological science, experts believe it is slacking
and remains only surface level. Once sex-tech becomes a topic of science inquiry, perhaps then we won’t be so far from the days of looking at human touch as an old-school way of achieving orgasm.

“Who knows,” answered Šmigmator when asked if it’s possible for sex-tech to surpass human intercourse. “But the Turing Test might become a whole [lot] more interesting.”

After learning about Prause’s work, I thought of Braverman and his quest for the industry’s “new frontier.”

It now seemed possible – with the help of Prause – for him to rig the climax of the future. By marrying cutting edge technology with world-class physiological and neurological findings, they could finally create an orgasm intensity completely off the grid.

I called Braverman. Before I could finish my line about mechanoreceptors in the vulva, he cut in.

“YES,” he said. “Hook me up with your guy!”