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Good Vibrations: Charting the Dominant and Emergent Discursive Regimes of Sex Toys

George Rossolatos
University of Kassel, Kassel, Germany

Sex toys promote a new consumptive ethos whose significance may be adequately outlined by attending to the institutional implications of this product category’s consumption. By drawing on Foucault’s theory of sexuality and the technologies of the self that materialize with the aid of discursive formations about sexuality, as well as on relevant sociological and ethnographic insights, I undertake a qualitative content analysis on a corpus of 100 sex toys’ product reviews from popular magazines and web sites in order to identify how the discourse about sex toys is articulated in terms of three dominant categories of sexual scripts (Simon & Gagnon, 2007), viz. cultural scenarios, interpersonal scripts and intrapsychic scripts. By opening up the discussion to broader cultural issues, I outline how the consumption experience of sex toys, as articulated in the reviews’ discursive formations, facilitates the emergence of new consumer trends, particularly with reference to orgasm-on-the-go and no-touch-orgasm, while redefining existent ones. Keywords: Foucault, Sexuality, Discourse Analysis, Qualitative Content Analysis, Consumer Culture

Introduction: 48 AD

Welcome to year 48 AD, that is Ano Dildo. In line with the endemic proclivity of the human imaginary to identify particularly valuable moments (evaluation points, according to Labov’s [1972] narratological model; cf. Ruiz Collantes & Oliva, 2015) in the deployment of meta-narratives as originary, and in the context of the legitimate trend of unearthing suppressed historicities as subaltern to “contingently universalist” discourses (e.g., theological) that was inaugurated with the advent of post-modernity, what appears on the surface as a cheap pun, rooted in the originary temporal point of the release of the seminal cult movie Barbarella (1968), in fact underlies a quite plausible argument for theorizing a subaltern historicity that has been deploying in a global cultural milieu, albeit not yet recognized as such. This suppressed historicity is incumbent broadly speaking on postmodern sexuality (Bauman, 1999) as discourse and as possibilities of be-coming, not just a Second Coming, but of multiple and ubiquitous ones. This suppressed historicity may be fathomed genealogically (Saukko, 2003) by attending, in the same vein as Nietszche and Foucault (Rabinow, 1984) have pursued indefatigably, to how orgasmic pleasure has assumed a telic dimension in the discursive articulations of sex toys’ magazine reviews. “In its postmodern rendition, sexual activity is focused narrowly on its orgasmic effect; for all practical intents and purposes, postmodern sex is about orgasm” (Bauman, 1999, p. 24). In this context, Dildano, the hero who saved Barbarella in the homonymous film, is not simply a movie character, but a prophetic anagram of an originary point that set in motion a historical period that is yet to be accounted for. Charting the entrails of Dildano’s machinery is the overarching task of this paper.

Sex toys as cultural artefacts favor and actively promote a wholly new consumptive ethos whose significance may be adequately outlined by attending more broadly to the
institutional implications that inhere in the consumption of this product category, as well as the consumptive ethos that is shaped in the discourse about sexuality whereby the promotion of sex toys is invested.

In order to chart this consumptive ethos, I am drawing on Foucault’s theory of sexuality and the technologies of the self that are enabled by the discursive formations about sexuality, as well as on relevant sociological and ethnographic insights. The theoretical exploratory informs the subsequent reading of 100 sex toys’ product reviews from popular magazines (e.g., Cosmopolitan, Glamour) and web sites (e.g., buzzfeed.com) which are coded alongside the three categories of sex scripts suggested by Simon & Gagnon (2007), viz. cultural scenarios, interpersonal scripts and intrapsychic scripts. By further conducting discourse analysis on the selected corpus of product reviews I point out how the new discourse about sex toys is articulated in terms of the salient consumptive dimensions of consumer benefits, consumptive occasions, places. Moreover, by opening up the discussion to broader cultural issues, I outline how the experience of sex toys consumption, as articulated in the concerned discursive formations, facilitates the emergence of new consumer trends, particularly with reference to orgasm-on-the-go and no-touch-orgasm, while buttressing dominant ones.

Sex Toys as Cultural Artefacts

Sex toys are products that aim at enhancing the stimulation of erogenous zones and have been around ever since antiquity. Sex toys are available predominantly in two forms, dildos and vibrators. The difference between these two (often conflated in common parlance) is that whereas dildos do not feature stimulating devices and are intended for vaginal penetration, vibrators are intended for clitoral stimulation only. Occasionally sex toys feature a stimulating device on the instrument, in which instance the toy is appropriate for both vaginal penetration and clitoral stimulation. Although initially targeted at members of the female gender, they progressively evolved into either unisex product propositions or into bespoke offerings for different genders.

Demand for sex toys by thrill-seeking consumers regardless of gender has been soaring over the past five years as manufacturers have been racing to accommodate ever more nuanced pleasure avenues under their spine-chilling, toe-curling product offerings. A nationally representative study on vibrator use in the US reported that half of the adult female population has used a vibrator at least once in their lives, while those who attend religious services more frequently (at least once per month) are less likely to be vibrator users (Herbenick et al., 2009). “As nearly 2/3 of women used vibrators in partnered sexual activities and masturbation, women described vibrators as contributing to intense orgasms and high levels of sexual satisfaction whether alone or with partners” (Fahs & Swank, 2013, p. 668). The three main erogenous zones they aim at stimulating are the clitoris (female), the vulva (female), the G spot (female, male). Sex toys, at least nominally, abide by the Freudian pleasure principle insofar as they aim at maximizing libidinal pleasure.

As innovation in the sex toys industry has been mounting, cultural consumer researchers have been progressively confronted not only with charting novel functional attributes and product aesthetics (Attwood, 2005), but, even more importantly, with what types of new meanings product innovation is infused (Smith, 2007) in this burgeoning industry. Subsequently, we are summoned to explore how these meanings are entangled in praxiological webs that feature consumptive occasions, benefits, places and significant others.

Despite, as noted in the extant literature, the scarcity of research concerning the benefits stemming from the employment of vibrators and dildos, the self-affirmative
emotional effects of female masturbation and the positive functional effects in terms of lubrication, orgasm, absence of sexual pain, and overall sexual functioning (Black, 2014; Fahs & Swank, 2013) have been repeatedly noted. However, the meaning of sex toys by far transcends their functional dimension, inasmuch as the cultural implications of the discourse of sexuality exceed sex as biological need and brute act, as noted repeatedly by Foucault (1978, 1988). “The sexual, like the photographic image, is often viewed as being just what it appears to be: a fact derived from life, the purest instance of naturalism. However, this is a deception: it is really a complex text that must be coded; a text selectively assembled to affirm, deny, and persuade; a text embroidered with metonymic “micro-dots” of meaning and history” (Simon, 1996, p. 28).

But even viewed from a strictly functional point of view, as brute fact and indulgent activity, sex has shifted orientation between modernity and post-modernity. According to Bauman (1999, p. 21), “the late modern or postmodern rendition of eroticism appears unprecedented, a genuine breakthrough and novelty. It enters alliance with neither sexual reproduction nor love, claiming independence from both neighbours and flatly refusing all responsibility for the impact it may make on their fate; it proudly and boldly proclaims itself to be its only, and sufficient, reason and purpose”. Subsequently, this paper neither adheres to certain feminist readings that identify sexuality with female sexuality (or male, in the same terms), nor subscribes to the subsumption of the cultural telos of the discourse of sexuality under the attainment of orgasm. Sex toys as cultural artefacts are intimately involved in webs of meaning and sign systems that cut across both everyday cultural practices, institutional forms (Maines, 1999) and regimes of value (Appadurai, 1986). “Toys are tools for producing orgasm and ‘symbolic goods,’ they are signifiers of cultural values” (Smith, 2007, p. 169). Concomitantly, the multilayered function and value of sex toys is approached in this analysis within a broader cultural analytic framework that is intent on charting the trend-setting and normative dimensions of the discourse about sex toys, rather than constrain their mission within the restrictive province of politicized readings, either of feminist or of any other persuasion.

The Discursive Articulation of Sex Toys: Emancipatory Tools or Disciplinary Media?

This study draws on sex toys’ product reviews published in major popular magazine titles (e.g., Cosmopolitan, Glamour) and web-sites (e.g., buzzfeed.com). The review narratives render sexuality manageable by furnishing a set of what Simon (1996) and Simon & Gagnon (2007) have called sexual scripts as the staging of desire. In this respect, sexual scripts are akin to Goffman’s (1986) frame theory and Van Dijk’s (2009) social scripts. Sexual scripts are distinguished into three categories, viz. cultural scenarios, inter-personal and intra-psychic scripts. Since these categories will inform the classification of the sex toys’ product reviews that will be exposed later on, it is prudent to outline them at this stage in our analytic.

From an institutional point of view, the discourse of and on sexuality as “structuring element of social activity” (Giddens, 1992, p. 28) furnishes both the occasions where sex toys may be used, as well as the ground of legitimacy for consuming sex toys (e.g., enhanced performance at work thanks to obtaining orgasms with the aid of a vibrator). “All institutions and institutionalized arrangements can be seen as systems of signs and symbols through which the requirements and the practice of specific roles are given. Cultural scenarios are the instructional guides that exist at the level of collective life” (Simon & Gagnon, 2007, p. 27). An example of a cultural scenario relevant to the study at hand is the consumptive occasion of a dinner at a restaurant where a sex toy may be used. The dinner at a restaurant has its own
syntax that imposes a disciplined behavior onto the subjects that partake of this occasion. The involved artefacts (e.g., cutlery, chairs, candle) are used according to the cultural mandates of a script bequeathed to the participating subjects through various forms of acculturation in different agencies, such as the family, peer-group, cinema, etc. The sex toy script as cultural scenario essentially embeds the toy in the syntax of the cultural practice, thus redefining the boundaries of the practice’s disciplinary status, as well as the acceptable scope of the artefact’s uses.

Interpersonal scripts concern a “process that transforms the social actor from being exclusively an actor to being a partial scriptwriter or adapter shaping the materials of relevant cultural scenarios into scripts for behaviour in particular contexts” (Simon & Gagnon, 2007, p. 29). Finally, intrapsychic scripting is the process whereby “individual desires are linked to social meanings” (Simon & Gagnon, 2007, p. 30). Desire, in this context, is used quite broadly to accommodate a wide roster of emotional and rational benefits.

Sex scripts essentially open up social spaces that may be called pleasure domains, as constellations of occasions, places, benefits. Of particular importance, as will be shown in greater detail later on, is the understanding with the aid of a segmentation analysis of how the suggested occasions for consuming sex toys, the places where they may be consumed, the benefits that stem from their consumption, and the significant others who participate concurrently in various capacities in their consumption are discursively mediated through narrative possibilities. Pleasure domains essentially constitute clusters of occasions, spaces, timings for immersing oneself in a libidinal economy (cf. Rossolatos, 2015), which proliferate in tandem with the propagation of a uniform consumption ethos.

Since the end of the sixteenth century, the "putting into discourse of sex," far from undergoing a process of restriction, on the contrary has been subjected to a mechanism of increasing incitement; that the techniques of power exercised over sex have not obeyed a principle of rigorous selection, but rather one of dissemination and implantation of polymorphous sexualities. (Foucault, 1978, p. 16)

However, it is questionable whether such a proliferation of pleasure domains in the context of an overarching libidinal economy abides by the pleasure principle or by a new form of panopticism. Viewed from the latter angle, subjects are compelled to multiply occasions and spaces for obtaining orgasms, in the same manner that, as shown by Foucault (Rabinow, 1984), penalization for not abiding by a given ethotic blueprint in pre-modern times was coupled with publicly conspicuous bodily torture. This compulsive docility of the body is enforced by an “ensemble of minute technical inventions that make it possible to increase the useful size of multiplicities” (Rabinow, 1984, p. 209), in the form of an ever more fine-grained, niche-catering roster of sex toys, coupled with a semiotic regime of cultural scripts as discursive configurations.

The canvassing of this discursive regime constitutes an integral part of my ongoing research agenda on the emergence of new sociocultural practices, consumptive habits and their respective artefacts (online and offline) by leveraging multidisciplinary conceptual frameworks with the aid of qualitative and mixed methods research designs and methods (see, indicatively, Rossolatos, 2015, 2016). In the following sections, I turn to the empirical scrutiny of the discursive articulation of the emergent discursive regime of sex toys.
Methodology

I adopted a qualitative research design for the empirical prong of this study by drawing on a sample of N=100 product reviews (see Table 1). The sample was sourced from two top-ranking, in circulation terms, female magazine titles that are reputed for hosting reviews and cover stories about sex toys, viz. Cosmopolitan and Glamour, and from high-traffic web-sites that host product reviews (buzzfeed.com), targeted reviews about sex toys (bestvibratorsreviews.com) and reviews about products relating to eroticism and sexuality (lovehoney.co.uk). All reviews stemmed from the period 2013-2015, as a primary research objective was to discern not only dominant, but also emergent consumer cultural trends that necessitated the sourcing of as recently available information as possible.

Table 1: The sex toys sample used in this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>web link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>vibrators you can snag for less than $30 - cosmopolitan (10 different models)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cosmopolitan.com/sex-love/advice/g2040/cheap-vibrators/">http://www.cosmopolitan.com/sex-love/advice/g2040/cheap-vibrators/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-50</td>
<td>pure romance (39 different models)</td>
<td><a href="https://www.pureromance.com/shop/Adult-Sex-Toys/For-Women/Vibrators">https://www.pureromance.com/shop/Adult-Sex-Toys/For-Women/Vibrators</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-65</td>
<td>15 must-have sex toys (15 different models)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cosmopolitan.co.uk/love-sex/sex/tips/g2197/must-have-sex-toys/">http://www.cosmopolitan.co.uk/love-sex/sex/tips/g2197/must-have-sex-toys/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-76</td>
<td>top-ten-discreet-small-sex-toys/ (10 different models)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cosmopolitan.co.uk/love-sex/sex/tips/g1041/top-ten-discreet-small-sex-toys">http://www.cosmopolitan.co.uk/love-sex/sex/tips/g1041/top-ten-discreet-small-sex-toys</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77-87</td>
<td>top 10 sex toys for couples that work on both of you (10 different models)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cosmopolitan.co.uk/love-sex/sex/tips/g3099/best-sex-toys-for-couples/">http://www.cosmopolitan.co.uk/love-sex/sex/tips/g3099/best-sex-toys-for-couples/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>supersex remote control vibrator love egg</td>
<td><a href="http://www.lovehoney.co.uk/product.cfm?p=22202">http://www.lovehoney.co.uk/product.cfm?p=22202</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>bionic bullet rabbit vibrating cock ring</td>
<td><a href="http://www.lovehoney.com/product.cfm?p=22186">http://www.lovehoney.com/product.cfm?p=22186</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>the Jesus butt plug</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cosmopolitan.co.uk/love-sex/sex/tips/g3049/celebrity-sex-toys/?slide=4">http://www.cosmopolitan.co.uk/love-sex/sex/tips/g3049/celebrity-sex-toys/?slide=4</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94-100</td>
<td>dildo models</td>
<td><a href="http://www.lovehoney.co.uk/product.cfm?p=22814">http://www.lovehoney.co.uk/product.cfm?p=22814</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pursuant to saving the web pages in a designated location in my hard drive, a netnographic approach (Kozinets, 2010) was followed in terms of copying each product review onto a word document, while cleaning the text from any peripheral information (e.g., customer reviews and comments, links to relevant online content) prior to transferring the word documents to the employed qualitative content analytic software (atlas.ti). The word files were then saved as primary documents in the CAQDAS software atlas.ti under a single hermeneutic unit (cf. Friese, 2012; Rossolatos, 2014b) and an iterative coding procedure was followed. Initially the data were coded according to an a priori code-list (Miles & Huberman, 1994) that was produced based on the sex scripts typology offered by Simon & Gagnon (2007), as laid out earlier (cultural scenario, interpersonal script, intrapsychic script). Since the codes were not mutually exclusive and each product review sentence may have featured more than one script, the texts were coded accordingly. Prior to coding the data, the reviews were read several times in order to obtain a primary feel for the data, as well as to gauge whether they were fit for coding with the available list in terms of pertinence. Memos
featuring interpretive insights were regularly produced and annotated to the respective codes in an ongoing fashion (Figure 1).

Figure 1: Example of memos and codes used in this study (screenshot from atlas.tiworkspace)

As soon as the initial coding procedure was complete, consolidated reports were produced with the aid of atlas.ti. The consolidated reports feature information that contains only the codes and the text fragments to which they have been assigned, and hence allow for a vertical and focused reading of each sex script. Upon inspecting the reports in quest for more nuanced themes, a second coding round took place whereby the initial codes were further split into sub-codes, as per Table 2. This iterative coding procedure involved theoretical sampling not for the identification of broad categories, but for the determination of emergent sub-codes, that is “in order to saturate the properties of a category” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 104) insofar as the conceptually demarcated sex scripts had reached saturation in the first coding phase. Cultural scenarios were further split into occasions (e.g., a dinner, a night-out), places (e.g., home, restaurant, bathroom), and product attributes (e.g., light, wearable, easy to carry). The inter-personal scripts were further split to encompass the incidence in the discursive articulation of specific significant others (e.g., boyfriend, girlfriend) or the incidence of generic others (e.g., evocation of a sexy movie star). Finally, the intra-psychic scripts were split into benefits stemming from the use of the sex toy (e.g., maximum pleasure, simultaneous stimulation of clitoris and G-spot) and objectives for using the toy (e.g., involving a sexual partner).

Table 2: Code scheme of sex scripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Sub-codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cultural scenario</td>
<td>occasion (e.g., dinner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[culscen]</td>
<td>[culscen_occ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three classification criteria were taken into consideration in the process of further textual segmentation and sub-codes identification: First, they must have corresponded as widely as possible to the nuanced presentations of the driving themes across the entire sample. Second, while attending to the law of diminishing returns, new data and the identification of new sub-types would not add up significantly to the interpretive depth that was sought in this study against the background of the research questions; that is, the analysis stopped where saturation was deemed as having been achieved (Mautner, 2008). Third, and in continuation of the second criterion, the principle of parsimony was applied while adding dimensions to the sex scripts, as interpretively enriching “theoretical claims pertaining to scope. depth. power. and relevance” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 127), rather than “positivistic” variables.

After completing the second coding round and having decided that no further coding was required for the purposes of this study, the final consolidated reports were produced, based on which the discourse analytic procedure of charting the articulation of sex toys discourse was enacted. The merits of adopting a dual content/discourse analytic path in interpretive cultural research have been repeatedly highlighted in terms of the former yielding a tangible analytical grounding for the identification of discursive moves and strategies (Fairclough, 1995).

**Main Findings**

**The Formal Structure of Sex Toys’ Discourse: Mouthwatering Onomatology and Metaphors to Vibrate By**

The consumption of sex toys as articulated in popular female magazine titles is part and parcel of a wider nexus of social practices as sign systems (Barthes, 1970). Charting crucial facets of its underlying grammar, thus, paves the way to understanding how this nexus is articulated, and hence, how its experience will be ultimately fleshed out by the end consumers: “The ‘discovery’ of social relationships and cultural forms is thus paralleled by the personal narrative of exploration and survival” (Atkinson, 1990, p. 110). At the same time, the way the consumption of sex toys is narratively mediated in these articulations is suggestive of a form of life that is undergirded by a set of values. Hence, the preliminary formal analysis of the expressive articulation of the consumption of sex toys is amenable, at a
second stage, to a charting of the axiological nexus that animates the lifeworld wherein their consumption is embedded.

From the point of view of onomatology (that is product naming), we notice that despite the uber-technical descriptions and the path to enlightenment being assimilated to orgasm-by-the-book, vibrators are often assigned brand names that invest them with an aura of exoticism and mystique: magic wand, Eva; but also orgasm is occasionally invested with mythical proportions: “the mythical act of female ejaculation” (Comet Key II Wand), despite the demystification posture that permeates sex toys discourse. Furthermore, the discourse at hand is a metaphorical haven, laden with luscious and ultra-vivid metaphors that make up a homological canvass of analogical similarities with a colorful palette of cultural practices:

Opening the Lelo Pebble feels like unwrapping a luxury box of chocolates. This really is the Rolex of vibrators! (Lelo Pebble)

It's like the Swiss army knife of double-ended vibrators. (Picobong Transformer)

Additionally, the majority of prescribed and actively promoted cultural scenarios in the selected corpus not only prioritize solo over sex with partners, but occasionally employ vivid metaphors of inverted theological orientation for highlighting the benefits that may be reaped from employing the sex toys on offer:

The vibrating bunny ears are positioned in just the right place to send you straight to orgasmic heaven. (Cupids Club Mini Rabbit Vibrator)

It combines external vibrations for clitoral stimulation with a gently rotating shaft which massages the G-spot for blended orgasm heaven. (Lelo Tara)

The Technologization/Medicalization of the Orgasmic

In line with mid-period Foucauldian analysis of sexuality as a set of discourses for taking care of oneself (Foucault 1985, 1986), sex toys are occasionally tinged with the sterilized expressive inventory of medical discourse:

Avoid materials that may give you an allergic reaction (e.g., latex), and wash your toy with antibacterial soap and hot water before and after use and let it dry completely. (Cosmopolitan: How do I figure out what sex toy to buy?)

But what surfaces in this discourse most resolutely is the ultimate disciplining of the orgasmic through the absolute technological mediation of the singularity of the libido as one’s most private animus. What was described earlier as pleasure domains, that is as unique configurations of benefits, occasions and places within the broader terrain of possibilities for attaining an orgasm, within this discourse is pushed to the utmost extremes of micro-fulfillment. The following examples are quite striking attestations of how sexual pleasure has become technologically enabled in the same manner as one handles a computer software or any kitchen electrical appliance. What used to be offered in the 19th C. novel via a narrative that was inciteful to imaginative play, embellished with kinky metaphors, has now materialized into perfectly realisable possibilities. And what’s more: the settings can always be saved and the same multivariate configuration that spawned a specifically configured
orgasm may be replicated ad infinitum. In the post-human orgasmic calculus there is no room for error:

It copies the pressure and pattern of your squeezing, repeating it as long as you like. (Minna Ola)

Each of its two sides has its own motor, so you can position your clitoris in the middle and customize the sensation by adjusting the different settings. (yours + mine)

The rabbit has two slide controls on the base, one for thrusting and one for the vibrating bunny ears, with each having three levels of intensity. (Thruster Deluxe)

Not only is the Lelo one of the quietest vibrators on the market, it has the most incredible settings that go from sensual pulsing to mind blowing continuous vibrations which will guarantee earth shattering g-spot stimulation. (Lelo Isla)

**New Occasions, New Places: Orgasm-On-The-Go**

Interestingly, the majority of sex toys reviews analyzed in this study featured neither locative verbs nor expressions of location, apparently with view to highlighting the versatile nature of these products in terms of use places/occasions, but also in order to avoid deterring the readers’ imagination as they accommodate the offered narratives to their own, personal lifeworlds. Wherever the sex scripts undergirding cultural scenaria mentioned explicitly places, as per the code-scheme (Table 1), and apart from scarce references to in-home consumption, emphasis was laid on consumption in public places, on the suitability of toys for ubiquitous consumption and for consumption-on-the-go. However, obtaining pleasure from sex toys in public places was still communicated as an inconspicuous activity, albeit in public.

**Places**

Want to get off any time any place? Then you shouldn't even think about leaving the house without Cupids Club Mini Rabbit Vibrator. (Cupids Club Mini Rabbit Vibrator)

The Mia vibe is an excellent travel companion. (Mia Vibe)

And don't worry, there's still a plug-and-play option if you neglected to charge it but need an orgasm like now. (Magic Wand Rechargeable)

**Occasions**

One way to spice up dinner in a busy restaurant. (Supersex Remote Control Vibrator Love Egg)
Sex at a Distance

What initially appeared in the cult sci-fi erotic film Barbarella (1968) as a counter-factual scenario featuring Jane Fonda (Barbarella) engaging in no-touch intercourse with her rescuer Dildano, now constitutes a real consumptive script (Rossolatos, 2014a). The orgasmic potential of female partners may be controlled at a distance by their partners via remote controls.

You wear this whilst he controls the vibrations without anyone having a clue. One way to spice up dinner in a busy restaurant. (Supersex Remote Control Vibrator Love Egg)

It’s a wearable vibrator that hits your clitoris and your G-spot at the same time. Plus, it comes with an app that you or a partner can control from literally anywhere with Wi-Fi. (We Vibe 4 Plus)

Solo or Partnered Sex?

The sex toys discourse is highly Cartesian: I masturbate therefore I am, where masturbation is promoted mostly as a solitary activity, without the involvement of significant others. Despite the fact that almost 30% of the reviews included in this corpus did mention the presence of others (mostly in the context of heterosexual activities, with only one explicit reference to gay sex), the bulk of product use descriptions exalted the merits of solitary orgasmic attainment. Moreover, in quite a few instances the discourse went so far as to highlight the competitive advantage of the machinic (sex toys) by engaging in direct comparisons with the ability of male sexual partners to perform at such post-human levels against salient performance indicators as speed, duration, depth and any possible combination thereof.

You might just find your man edging out of the door the moment he clocks eyes on the Big O. (The Big O!)

Plus, you can record a vibration pattern that was particularly amazing and play it again later. Real genitals just can’t be trusted to be that consistent. (OhMiBod Blue Motion)

Unisex Toys for Heterogeneous Couples

Redefining the boundaries of hetero- and homo-eroticism is an integral aspect of this discourse that “exculpates” the male use of vibrators in the context of “pleasure-sharing” with female partners. And we are not talking about mere insinuations, such as “why don’t you try this on and see if you can find your G-spot?”, but of overt promises of mutually enhanced orgasmic pleasure for both genders. This is a striking attestation of the malleability of socially construed sexual identities and the spatiotemporally contingent straight-jacketing of the drives.

A hands-free vibrator for you during sex, plus it gives him a little jolt too. (Vibrating cock ring)
Gives you extra pleasure for an increased chance of mutual climax. Everybody wins! (Bionic Bullet Rabbit Vibrating Cock Ring)

**Discussion of Findings**

The analysis of sex toys’ promotional discourses, an as yet unexplored area, attains, on the hand, to complement the focus of the bulk of relevant research which has been laid on a largely gender-studies oriented terrain. On the other hand, by situating this discursive regime within the turn towards post-modern sexuality as conceptualized in the extant literature, the offered analytic identifies emergent trends that have wider sociocultural implications, as will be discussed in this section. The overarching research question that was posed earlier concerned whether sex toys are emancipatory tools or disciplinary media (in the Foucauldian sense). Based on the main findings from the qualitative content analysis, I am rather inclined to answer this question in a mixed mode as both emancipatory tools and disciplinary media, depending on which referential plane is adopted for framing the answer.

From the point of view of a working female, of AB S/E class with scarce spare time “in her hands,” surely the auto-erotic solutions on offer constitute emancipatory tools, as they enhance independence from any other party that may be involved in attaining the desired objective, as well as maximize efficiency by virtue of being equipped with an entire “dashboard” whereby the desired objective may be technologically manipulated by playing around with salient variables. On the other hand, from a critical discourse analytic point of view (Fairclough, 1995), the new generation of sex toys may come across as disciplinary media, resting on the oft-made assumption that eroticism is subjugated to the same efficiency maximization rationale as a commodity production plant, as well as to a body policing ideology that seeks to discipline the drives according to a set of actions embedded in technological manuals. Although I find the ground whereupon criticisms from a neo-Marxian critical perspective may be launched against the technologization of the erotic frail and equally valid as any other possible point of argumentative departure, I think there is merit in pursuing a discussion alongside Foucauldian lines for the sake of unearthing latent cultural and institutional facets of the sex toys’ discourse.

By adopting a discourse analytic rationale (Barker & Galasinaski, 2001; Sitz, 2008), the argumentative thrust of the following discussion, along with its ramifications, prioritize the scrutiny of contextual aspects of sex toys’ discourse and particularly how, from a post-modern sexuality point of view, once clearly demarcated praxiological and moral divisions become blurred (as a complementary facet of postmodernity’s juxtaposition of opposites, according to Firat & Venkatesh, 1995; also see Holt, 1997). Discourse analysis is geared towards systematically elucidating how subjects become discursively constituted (either in conversational interaction or in publicly circulating texts), by attending both to the direct context of discourse and its linguistic features, as well as to the indirect context, that is underpinning institutional realities (Fairclough, 1992).

**Post-Human Eroticism**

Within the broader context of post-modern sexuality that is delineated by and prescribed in sex toys’ discourse, we are confronted with a pattern of reversal of the theological model that assumes sex as material ground for imposing a set of moral sanctions, in favour of an absolute exculpation of sex, that is liberation from any moral scaffolding, save for an abstract schema of hyper-libidinization. This schema assumes canonicity by virtue of being discursively articulated as a compulsion to attain as many orgasms as possible.
However, sex toys’ discourse that “professes to demystify sex in the name of its liberation, is subtly coercive in its classification of techniques of sexual behavior” (Hutton, 1988, p. 130).

This logic has also been identified by Baudrillard with obscenity (see Rossolatos 2016), not of the erotic act per se, but of the pornographic extreme close-up’s attempt to contain the libido in minute iconic inscriptions, and hence to foreground and codify any imaginary angle that might singularize what has been prescribed in publicly available artefacts. Likewise, in the case of sex toys, ever more detailed prescriptions as disciplinary practices (Rabinow, 1984) are offered in their discursive articulations, scripted in quasi-popular, quasi-medical/technical terms with regard to variables such as speed, noise levels, rotation, saving settings, and all sorts of operational guidelines based on multiple occasions and places of use, as shown earlier.

In this manner, sex toys are subsumed under a productive, calculative rationale that is geared towards the maximization of orgasmic efficiency, which, at the end of the day, has little in common with the erotic as a playful, random and time-consuming activity. Free-floating eroticism is therefore eminently suitable for the task of tending to the kind of identity which, like all other postmodern cultural products, is calculated for “maximal impact and instant obsolescence” (Bauman, 1999). Thus, sexual discourse of sex toys ultimately de-eroticizes sexuality, while reducing it to a telic, productive activity. The erotic as the imaginary of the sex toy becomes the double of a working day inasmuch as the attainment of the perfect orgasm is presented as being akin to a video game’s cockpit flight simulator. “Taking off” is a matter of following the “manual.” The perfect orgasm is thus fully prescribed and demystified. This demystification, at a discursive level, as a correlate of the orgasmic exiting the secret province of the boudoir, also confers a fatal blow on the theologically invested mystery of procreation.

The Invisible Disciplining of Inconspicuous Public Sex

The oxymoronic predicament of “ultra-constraining liberation” as above described, one might say, is evinced most strikingly in the discourse about toy-enabled masturbation in public places. The more consumers are incited to engage in public masturbation with the aid of toys, the more prescriptions are offered for maintaining the inconspicuousness of the act (e.g., noise reduction: “all you need to remember to do is to disguise your screams of satisfaction!” Cosmosutra). Quite remarkably, sex toys’ discourse does not reprimand the event of conspicuous consumption, while classifying it under “turn-on” factors:

So make sure you have the place to yourself – or not... whatever turns you on!
(Thruster Deluxe)

Sex toys, thus, ultimately function not so much for maximizing and multiplying orgasmic pleasure as to enforce a regime of secrecy by inscribing the moral mandate for keeping secrets in the flesh. Masturbation is catapulted to a disciplinary practice par excellence, another instance of “administrative power” (Giddens, 1992, p. 31) that is “exercised through its invisibility” (Rabinow, 1984, p. 199). In this manner, the post-modern dislocation of the erotic from both inter-subjective relations and from its reproductive function, as noted by Bauman (1999), constitutes a continuation of sexuality as a fundamental facet of modernity’s regime of truth (Giddens, 1992, p. 21).

The more outlets for obtaining orgasms are opened up by the abundant roster of sex toys on offer, the more the demand for inconspicuousness is stressed. “Things may acquire value by having a high degree of public visibility or by being kept secret. An absence of something may be as crucial as its presence” (Tilley, 2007, p. 260). In this manner, the
augmentation of spatiality afforded by the pleasure domains is not correlated with an increase
in sociality, but of isolation. This ultra-solipsistic terrain constitutes a most fertile soil for
nurturing the “penal” consumptive pattern of vibrating on the go, a trend that is discursively
articulated as a form of obtaining borderless sexual satisfaction.

This reading of the cultural function of sex toys resonates with Foucault’s
genealogical analysis of the discourse of sexuality from praxiologically oriented towards
caring for oneself (souci pour soi; Foucault, 1985), as practiced in Ancient Greece, for
example, to the appropriation of sexuality as narrative substratum for edifying a theological
discourse that posits the body as the locus for culpability in the face of transgression from its

The difference between Foucault’s choice of discursive corpora and the discourse of
sex toys that surfaces in a postmodern mediascape is that the latter is not evinced as an
explicitly formulated system of bodily inscribed sanctions that is incumbent on sexuality as
source of transgression of moral maxims (the Christian approach), but on positing an utterly
liberated sexuality (uber-public but still inconspicuous) as the bodily inscription of an ethotic
pattern that favors borderlessness. This sort of borderlessness is not equivalent to the
liberation of sex from spatiality, but to the ultimate mastery of sexuality as the discursive
configuration of sex by a technological apparatus whose aim is to predict and control the
emergence of sexual desire at its inception anywhere, anytime. Subsequently, what is
ultimately achieved is the smooth reintegration of sexual desire into a production system,
coupled with its disclocation from the unproductive play of the boudoir.

We are confronted with a hyper-orgasmic predicament, where the libido may and
should be satisfied anytime, anywhere. The erotic act has exited the boudoir and has become
public property (although, not yet, public spectacle), that is a property of the public space
where it is now acceptable to consume sex toys.

Attaining satisfaction with the aid of a sex toy on-the-go entails both freeing up time
for more productive allocation to work-related matters, as well as greater independency from
others in attaining consummation. This argument becomes more palatable once viewed
through Foucault’s most pertinent distinction between the deployment of sexuality and the
deployment of alliance that was introduced in the first volume of the History of Sexuality
(1978).

I am speaking of the deployment of sexuality: like the deployment of alliance,
it connects up with the circuit of sexual partners, but in a completely different
way […] The deployment of alliance is built around a system of rules defining
the permitted and the forbidden, the licit and the illicit, whereas the
deployment of sexuality operates according to mobile, polymorphous, and
contingent techniques of power. The deployment of alliance has as one of its
chief objectives to reproduce the interplay of relations and maintain the law
that governs them; the deployment of sexuality, on the other hand, engenders a
continual extension of areas and forms of control. For the first, what is
pertinent is the link between partners and definite statutes; the second is
concerned with the sensations of the body, the quality of pleasures, and the
nature of impressions, however tenuous or imperceptible these may be […]
The deployment of sexuality has its reason for being, not in reproducing itself,
but in proliferating, innovating, annexing, creating, and penetrating bodies in
an increasingly detailed way, and in controlling populations in an increasingly
comprehensive way. (Foucault, 1978, pp. 106-107)
Based on the above distinction, the deritualization and demystification of sex in sex toys’ discourse constitutes an attenuation of the alliance dimension. This attenuation results in dislocating sex from a space of sociality to an anti-social activity. The more fine-grained pleasure domains are accommodated by the unique specifications of discrete sex toy offerings, the more the deployment of sexuality is confined into a space of non-sociality, as non-dependence on another for attaining orgasm. It doesn’t matter so much whether a consumer will actually try one or more of these offerings. What is more important is the transformation of the availability of such a variegated product roster into a cultural expectancy, and hence into background knowledge of the possibility of materialization of ubiquitously inconspicuous solitary public sex. “A most prominent mark of the postmodern erotic revolution is cutting the ties connecting eroticism on one side to sex (in its essential reproductive function) and on the other to love” (Bauman, 1999, p. 26).

We are confronted with an intertwinenment of primary narcissism and ultimate desublimation, the full-presencing of consumptive potential on the wreckage of a representational logic, where the place of libido’s fulfillment becomes overconflated with the social space that engenders narratively libido, an unprecedented overlap between cultural space/physical place and milieu of desire’s fulfillment that radically subverts the time-hallowed role of the boudoir as non-public space for the enactment of sexuality.

Get on the Scene, Like a Sex Machine

“The thin C-shaped toy “has two different vibrators: one that rests against the clitoris on the outside and another that stimulates the G-spot” (We Vibe). “It’s almost like a tiny little vulva, but with vibrations and horns. Human anatomy kinda can’t compete with that” (Screamin’ Demon).

Within the contours of this new regime of signs, sex toys constitute an instance of hyper-mediation of the libidinal, as enablers of attainment of consummation anytime, anywhere. Whereas, as attested by Foucault, the theological paradigm that has been managing the discourse of sexuality until now as the groundwork whereupon moral sanctions should be imposed, dwelt on correlating certain sexual acts as signs with particular moral mandates as their signifieds, the new regime of signs only seeks the maximization of pleasure, regardless of any interference by the notion of responsibility to and for another. Whereas the theological subsumption of sexuality involved inter-subjective relations at its very core, the new regime of signs promotes responsibility only to oneself and one’s own pleasure. This new regime is part and parcel of what Bauman (1999, p. 26) described as postmodern eroticism:

Postmodern eroticism is free-floating; it can enter chemical reaction with virtually any other substance, feed and draw juices from any other human emotion or activity. It has become an unattached signifier capable of being wedded semiotically to virtually unlimited numbers of signifieds, but also a signified ready to be represented by any of the available signifiers.

As argued by Foucault (1978), the ultimate aim of theological morality’s work on the libidinal was the attainment of “knowledge of oneself,” as expressed through the frivolously vague Socratic maxim “know thyself.” Of course, in either case, “selfhood” resonates the irreducibly contingent tenets of a moral order which assume canonicity through indoctrination tactics, as meticulously deconstructed ever since Foucault’s master (that is Nietszche). The invitation to know oneself is an insidious interrogation of the extent to which questionable percepts have been effectively internalized. This “policing process signifies the
production of linguistic and institutional forms through which human beings define their relationships” (Hutton, 1988, p. 127). This knowledge involves an inter-subjective dimension which, ultimately, folds back into the “ipsus.”

The same ipseity conditional is encountered in the new regime of signs that is instituted in the discursive formations of sex toys, with the sole and critical difference that instead of epistemic, the finality of these artefacts’ use rests with unbound pleasure. The question that emerges at this juncture concerns whether this newly instituted pleasure-seeking mandate is irreducible to any ideologeme (e.g., theological moralizing second-order discourse) or it is still reducible, albeit to another, different set of moral mandates, such as the frantic proliferation of orgasms or the boundless prolongation of masturbation (as prescribed, for example, in the Comet Key II Wand vibrator’s narrative). Again, this brand promise of hyper-sexualization as the outcome of the erotic’s hyper-mediation may be read as a correlate of the broader disciplining regime that is propagated by the sex toys’ discourse.

Methodological Limitations and Reflections on the Analysis

The adoption of a dual and iterative coding scheme (a priori vs. open; Strauss & Corbin, 1990) in two successive stages, rather than in tandem, turned out to be a fulfilling undertaking, as it contributed indispensably in identifying at the same time to what extent relevant theoretical insights in circulation in the extant literature were in fact operative in this discursive regime, as well as how emergent insights from the open coding attained to enrich the existing theory by attending to bespoke nuances whereby this discursive regime is articulated. Thus, in a sense, this dual sequential coding scheme aided in confirming and extending theory building at the same time. Note that this is not the same as the constant comparative method which is premised on a grounded theoretic paradigm altogether, but a hybrid of confirmatory and grounded methods. Furthermore, despite the fact that this is not the first time I drew on grounded theory and atlas.ti in a research project, I continue to find the embedded memo function in atlas.ti indispensable groundwork for open codes generation, as it allows through the production of consolidated reports to look for patterns in the comments annotated to memos, while reading vertically memos across textual segments. This aids considerably in the coherent formulation of codes and sub-codes, prior to saving them in the pre-coded list and assigning them in the respective segments during successive iterative readings.

As regards the limitations of this study, it merits noticing that ever since the concept of self-reflexivity was catapulted to qualitative methodological criterion of reliability, in terms of a researcher’s becoming increasingly conscious of one’s radical situatedness in parsing and synthesizing fragments of informants’ lived realities or of artefacts’ sign systems, various ways of reporting on bias minimization in an interpretative process have developed (see Gentles et al., 2014). In this context, by distinguishing clearly between the reporting on the findings of this study from their discussion attains to draw a clear line between where description ends and where interpretation begins, without implying that the initial coding is the only possible one. However, this distinction affords to orient readers’ attention towards how driving themes emerge from specifically representative textual fragments and how these themes were leveraged at a second stage for extrapolating insights against the addressed cultural and institutional dimensions. Thus, during the coding phase I took particular care in anchoring codes as narrowly as possible to the semantics of the promotional discourses, while at the interpretative stage I referred explicitly to which themes, initially identified at the coding stage, buttress the offered interpretations, against the background of the evoked theories. I don’t think that this process enhances the “objectivity” of the offered interpretation, but that it aids considerably in terms of facilitating scientific discussions on
objectively grounded arguments: “grounded theory seeks to literally ground the research in the data in a way that any theory produced is readily verifiable” (Rich, 2012, p. 2). Furthermore, given that the delineation of emergent consumptive habits in the product category at hand constituted a key objective in this study, unless their identification took place through a proportionate contextualization in the selected corpus, as pursued in this study, the risk of over-interpretation would inevitably seethe into the broader thematization. This called for the imposition of constant controls against either over or under-thematizing an emergent code against the available data which was part and parcel of the self-reflexivity procedure I adopted in this study.

Finally, while addressing a review query concerning whether I consider the findings from this study to be generalizable, from a strict point of view concerning generalizability, that is as a criterion of a sample’s representativeness of the population from which it has been drawn, as customarily posited in quantitative research, certainly not. Strauss and Corbin (1990) were also quite averse to the idea of generalizability of qualitative findings, although they did recognize their usefulness in similar research settings. As is well-known, the majority of samples in qualitative research are purposive (convenience or non-random sampling), while there are occasionally hurdles in defining a “population,” especially in instances such as this study where we are not concerned with consumers who may be defined according to universally agreed demographic, psychographic and lifestyle variables, and whose distribution in the entire population is known through census studies, but with discursive universes, that is adhocratically demarcated populations that we posit as ideational totalities with a view to determining the attributes of a sample. In the context of discourse analytic studies (regardless of mode), we rarely encounter direct comparisons of a sample size with the size of the population from which it has been drawn, for the sheer reason that it is if not impossible, at least very difficult to identify in most occasions what is the size of the population we are talking about. Hence, we normally encounter formulations such as “we can fairly assume…” or tautologies (in the absence of actual benchmarks) of the sort “the corpus evidence largely supports my position, suggesting at least that the corpus is a good sample of the kind of English that seems natural to me” (Sinclair, 2004, p. 183). “In most cases it is not possible to achieve complete representation, and in these cases corpus size is determined by capturing enough of the language for accurate representation” (Reppen, 2010, p. 32). This is further compounded in discourse analytic studies by the fact that we are concerned with corpora (defined on any possibly imaginable minimal analytical units, from newreels in media studies to clubbing venues in cultural studies) and not with samples consisting of human subjects who may be hypothesized by virtue of a uniform distribution of more encompassing traits to display analogically similar behavior (which is anyway questionable).

In this case, as noted by Bednarek (2006, pp. 8-9) in the context of corpus-based discourse analytic research on evaluation language in the press “there are no existing large-scale corpora that are suitable for the analysis of the object of investigation. Corpora such as LOB/FLOB (www.helmer.aksis.uib.no/icame.html) contain only a mixed category (A) called press: reportage which does not distinguish between daily and Sunday newspapers, between regional and national newspapers or between the categories of political news, sports news, society news, spot news, fiategori news and cultural news (www.khnt.hit.uib.no/icame/manuals/flob/kata.htm). This is a problem because these categories differ so much from each other.” And even where large-scale corpora are available, it is debatable whether they may be posited as a “population” as against narrower corpora (McEneery, 2006).

Then, the latent assumption of generalizability prevalent in quantitative studies based on some sort of phantasmatic behavioral uniformity by virtue of sampling points partaking in equally differentiating measure of universal determinants is not reflected in principle in
discourse studies, where these determinants consist of dimensions, rather than strictly speaking variables. This does not imply that the non-random criteria whereupon a qualitative sample’s selection rest are arbitrary. For example, in this study the discursive sample was drawn from magazines that have high penetration in the concerned population and web-sites that are likewise characterized by high-traffic levels, but also based on more qualitative criteria such as the level of involvement with each medium and (if known from syndicated media research) the % of readership which is usually a multiple of the actual purchasers base. Additional information that may contribute to the optimization of sample selection criteria from an online point of view concerns the ranking of each web site by average time spent, but also on individual thematic pages of each web site (where portals or e-magazines are concerned), as well as surfing patterns, involving whether the targeted thematic pages constitute destination (entry) points, as well as whether they constitute a mainstay within an overall online navigation journey. To these criteria one might add information about the average click-through rate where direct purchase links are involved. So there are various criteria for safeguarding the robustness of a non-random sample based on the objectives of each research piece. Notwithstanding that even in quantitative research the notion of generalizability and whether replication studies actually make sense have been undergoing severe criticism; in qualitative research making a-contextual claims about generalizability is even more precarious. Moreover, in quantitative research, we usually encounter in the context of literature reviews and as integral parts of new hypotheses formulations, antecedents where sampling was far from random, and more often than not consisting of “student,” rather than “real” samples, which, yet, are considered as being transferable across a positivistically permeating “wall of research,” regardless of whether generalizability had been satisfied in the first place. The above do not entail, however, that the findings from qualitative research that has been undertaken on purposive samples are not transferable (also see Morse, 1999 and Goodman, 2008 as being further corroborative of this point), rather than generalizable, across research designs that are situated within a broadly encompassing territory. In this instance, the emergent coding scheme, for example, would indubitably be of exploratory value in a design that addressed research questions pertaining to a contiguous discursive universe within the broader problematic of the discursive articulation of sexuality in postmodernity or in the formulation of hypotheses in the context of confirmatory research that sought to identify through quantitative content analysis the relative incidence of variables in a discursive corpus that emerged from a grounded theoretical exploratory in previous research, as well as the quantitative exploration of differences between sub-samples (t-tests, chi-squares, factorial designs, etc.). In a nutshell, although findings may not be generalizable in the strict sense, they are transferable for both exploratory and confirmatory purposes provided that a research piece has been succinctly framed spatiotemporally and thematically.

Conclusions

The increasing penetration and popularity of sex toys is bound to attract greater scholarly attention, insofar as the implications of their discursive articulations spread throughout a variegated roster of embedded mores, exiting cultural practices and axiological frameworks. Sex toys discourse was found to actively promote a new consumptive ethos that, one the one hand, radically disrupts inter-subjective relations, while, on the other hand, challenging deeply rooted institutional realities, such as perhaps sedimented religious tenets.

By drawing on Foucault’s theory of sexuality and key sociological thinkers and ethnographers who have offered deep insights on post-modern sexuality and its implications for a wider cultural terrain, the way crucial facets of selfhood are re-articulated through sex toys discourse emerged to the limelight. Most notably, sex toys discourse was found to
promote a form of post-human eroticism, the utter technological mediation/manipulation and solitary confinement of sex, and to redefine the boundaries of sexual identities. Moreover, emergent consumptive trends with significant ramifications for adjacent cultural practices, such as orgasm-on-the-go and sex-at-a-distance/no-touch-sex were shown to be most potent in effecting a reorientation in consumer axiology. The implications of this re-orientation were addressed both at the level of consumptive ethotic patterns, as well as at the level of significant cultural institutions, such as work. In the case of the former, the seeming capacity of sex toys to accommodate ubiquitously and omnitemporally sexual desire was shown to be coupled with a disciplinary regime of secrecy and unattainable hyper-stimulation that functions ideationally, rather than materially. In the case of cultural institutions, it was argued that sex toys ultimately subjugate pleasure to the finality of a production rationale, by positing efficiency as key requirement in the attainment of orgasms, as well as by reducing sexuality to a flight simulation game.

Going forward, there are significant opportunities for furthering research on sex toys’ discursive regime on various grounds, such as adopting a gendered conceptual orientation and concomitantly a respective coding scheme. Moreover, it would be particularly interesting to complement this etic-driven analysis with the emic perspective on behalf of end consumers, with view to gauging the persuasiveness of these discursive articulations, but also to identifying how they have in fact materialized in consumers’ lived sociocultural milieus.
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