On Fucking Girls

Appendix 1

Note on Command, Control, and Communication

Of course it is happening inside your head, Harry, but why on Earth should that mean it's not real? —Dumbledore

THERE is a definite command-and-control structure to the way you sometimes play with a girl, although calling it that makes something light and intimate sound much heavier than it actually feels. It has some of the formal structure associated with BDSM, but in practice it is closer to a private language the two of you already know. The instructions are usually small, concrete, familiar things. There is no elaborate ceremony announcing that the instruction mode has begun. The first instruction is itself the beginning. "Open your legs." "Keep your socks on." "Ask me before you go

to the toilet." "Next time you pee, tell me." Once you begin speaking that way, she understands that for the moment you're directing the sequence and that subsequent instructions belong to the same little game.

The ending is different because the absence of another instruction does not necessarily communicate that the instruction mode has ended. Silence could simply mean "wait." So you explicitly close it. Sometimes you give the whole sequence in advance: do this, then this, then this; afterward put your panties in the washing machine, or whatever the final mundane action happens to be; "and then you're done." In real time, the corresponding phrase is even simpler: "No more instructions now. You can do whatever you want." Those words function almost like "at ease." Until then she doesn't have to wonder whether another instruction is coming or whether she is supposed to remain attentive. Once you say them, the temporary structure disappears completely.

This matters even more when the game is asynchronous. Suppose you say, "Ask me next time before you go to the toilet." You don't want that instruction to turn into the absurd situation where she needs to pee and is staring at her phone indefinitely because you happen to be asleep, busy, or away from it. So the in-

struction contains its own timeout: ask you, but if you haven't replied within five minutes, just go. She can make the kind of video you normally like, improvise something she thinks you'll enjoy, or make no video at all. After the timeout there simply are no instructions. The important thing is that the state cannot accidentally persist forever.

The same principle applies when you give her something to do the following morning or at some other time when you won't necessarily be available to course-correct. The instruction needs a terminal condition she can reach by herself. If there are obvious contingencies, you can state them beforehand. If she's with a friend, if the situation is inconvenient, if something about the circumstances makes the instruction awkward, she can simply not do it and tell you later. The exit from the control is intentionally cheap.

Forgetting has an exit too. If you've said, "Next time you pee, remember to tell me," and she remembers only afterward, she hasn't created some unresolved debt. She can simply say that she forgot. That's the end of that instruction. You can give her another one some other time. What you specifically don't want is residual tension in which she thinks, "I missed the thing Daniel told me to do; now what am I supposed to do?" The

protocol answers that question in advance: tell you that you forgot, and you're done.

This is why your dance analogy is useful. Beginning doesn't necessarily require negotiation in words any more than every familiar dance requires somebody formally announcing, "I am now initiating a dance." A gesture can begin a shared pattern that both people recognize. But the dance still benefits from a closing gesture. There is a bow, a hug, a "thank you," the music ends, the hands separate—something says that this little structure no longer governs what happens next. Your "and then you're done" or "no more instructions" does exactly that.

There is also a strong asymmetry between ordinary improvisation and contradiction while the instruction mode is active. You don't expect a girl to become literally mechanical. She still has a body, preferences, judgment, and countless tiny movements that no instruction could or should specify. But the pleasure of the game comes partly from her taking the instruction seriously rather than deliberately doing its opposite. It resembles following in a dance: the follower is not an inert object, but there is nevertheless a meaningful distinction between following a lead and ignoring it.

And the roles aren't intrinsically attached to you. Usually you lead because you enjoy doing it and because this particular language of direction has become part of the way you play with girls. But occasionally a girl wants to direct you instead. Then the same principle becomes important from the other side. If she tells you what to do, you try very hard to do exactly what she meant—not to perversely literalize it, not to embellish it until it becomes your instruction instead of hers, but to make the most beautiful realization you can of the small gesture she gave you.

You find that exhilarating precisely because you know the other side so well. A girl can discover that a tiny instruction actually moves you. She says something simple and watches you take it seriously. If she says to wait, you wait. If she tells you to make a particular little video, you try to make the video she had in mind. The pleasure resembles tango again: a very small movement can have a large consequence because the other person is paying close enough attention to feel the lead.

There is a kind of generosity ledger underneath this for you too, although not a literal ledger. When a girl repeatedly lets you play with her in this elaborate way, follows your strange little instructions, remembers the vocabulary you've developed together, and takes seri-

ously something she knows matters enormously to you, you feel grateful. So on the comparatively rare occasions when she wants to reverse the game, you feel that she has accumulated an enormous amount of credit. She can spend some of it. If she wants to direct you sexually, wonderful. If she wants something involving pee, photographs, or a silly video, fine. It doesn't even necessarily have to be sexual: she can tell you to go make some ridiculous joke to a bartender and film it. Within ordinary personal limits, you enjoy giving her the experience of discovering that she can move you too.

That reciprocity is important because otherwise "control" describes the surface while missing the relationship underneath it. The underlying economy is mutual generosity. She knows this particular kind of play matters to you and treats that fact with care; you know that her comfort and enjoyment matter and treat those facts with equal care. Neither person's generosity becomes an unlimited claim on the other. The accumulated "credit" is an affectionate metaphor for gratitude, not a debt instrument.

Communication while you're physically together is even simpler. You have no interest in a code word that replaces ordinary language. "Stop" means stop. "End" means end. "Help" means help. "No" means no. Ordi-

nary words retain their ordinary meanings. You don't want somebody, at an uncomfortable moment, having to retrieve an arbitrary password from memory.

More importantly, communication isn't confined to words. If a girl clearly recoils, pushes you away, moves your hand away, freezes, or otherwise physically communicates that she doesn't want something, you treat the body language as communication rather than waiting for a magic syllable. A small ambiguous movement may simply make you back off and check what happens rather than instantly constructing a story about it; repeated avoidance makes the meaning increasingly obvious. A definite push away needs no repetition at all. Once her body is clearly saying stop, the interesting part of the sexual interaction has disappeared for you anyway. Continuing against that would defeat the entire point of the attention you've been describing.

This connects to another feature of your instruction mode: sometimes one of your instructions is simply to be quiet. You may want only one person directing the sequence because simultaneous direction ruins the particular concentration you're after. If you're directing, you want to be able to attend to her body closely enough that the body itself supplies much of the feedback. If she takes the lead, you can reverse the arrangement. For

example, if she wants to suck your cock entirely in her own way, you can stay still and let her determine what happens instead of putting your hands on her head and turning her act into yours.

When you've specifically asked her to remain quiet, speech itself consequently becomes salient. If she suddenly speaks because something is wrong, the fact that she broke the silence is already information. You stop attending to the imagined choreography and attend to what she's actually communicating. There is no need for "blueberry pancakes" or another arbitrary password because ordinary communication has priority over the game.

That doesn't mean you want a girl to suppress the involuntary sounds her body makes. Quite the opposite. A little whimper that escapes because something suddenly feels wonderful is especially cute to you precisely because it wasn't produced as a performance. You want to feel that you're communicating with her body and getting something genuine back from it. Breathing, movement, tension, relaxation, the way she presses toward or away from something, and spontaneous noises can tell you far more than a rehearsed stream of sexual dialogue.

Orgasm is a deliberate exception to the quietness. When you finally tell her she can come, she can make whatever noises come naturally. The temporary restraint disappears with the restraint on orgasm itself. If she wants to cry out, laugh, whimper, or make whatever ridiculous involuntary noises orgasm produces, wonderful. That's part of the release. Earlier you were listening carefully for small signals from her body; now she can let the whole thing happen without containing it.

So the command structure has a remarkably simple topology. It begins implicitly with the first recognizable instruction. While it is active, you lead and she generally follows, with ordinary communication and body language always capable of interrupting the game. Asynchronous instructions contain timeouts, contingencies, and fallback endings so that nobody becomes trapped waiting for the next command. Forgotten instructions expire rather than becoming debts. The whole structure ends explicitly: "and then you're done," or "no more instructions now." After that, there is no residual state. She is simply free to do whatever she wants.

And occasionally the arrows reverse. She gives the first instruction, you recognize what has begun, and

now you're the one paying almost absurdly close attention to the smallest lead she gives you. That's perhaps the nicest evidence that the underlying pleasure isn't merely "being in control." There is also pleasure in the protocol itself—in two people knowing that for a little while one of them gets to make tiny gestures and the other will take those gestures seriously.

※

Addendum: A special exception may occasionally be granted to certain distinguished girls permitting limited communication in the dialect known as "meow language," whose vocabulary consists entirely of differently inflected instances of the word "meow." This privilege should nevertheless be exercised sparingly. She is, after all, a girl and not a cat.

Example:

Vocalization: "*Meow-meow-MEOOOW!!! >>:3*"

Translation: "i can haz chiken pineapel pitza!!? corona ber?!! pliiiiss!! u order??!... cat :33 meow :3"

[approx.—meow language can be context-dependent]

※