

Aunt Giggles Shows Us Why Most Feminists Are Future Ex-Wives

The Red Pill Room | 22 May, 2014 | by Ian Ironwood

Aunt Giggles (Susan Walsh - whom I respected and even lauded in my book, before she summarily dismissed me and the rest of the Manosphere to exile from her blog for the crime of being men who had opinions about stuff, so I will henceforth - despite my basic inclinations - reluctantly refer to her by her Manosphere nickname) had an interesting post up with the provocative title [This One Things Predicts Divorce With 94% Certainty](#).



I was curious - divorce is a big issue for the 'sphere - and I was gratified to see that it was indeed some helpful advice . . . just not the way she intended. Giggles wanted to take a shot at the well-known Game technique of using Dread in a relationship. Instead she accidentally pointed out why feminists in general are piss-poor candidates for marriage to a decent guy. That is, any guy who doesn't want a divorce.



[Dread](#), if you're just joining the show, is the act of using the threat of ending the relationship to gain control of the relationship. Dread can be a powerful tool in relationship Game - during the Basic or Single Game stage *fixing you*. it can be an effective tool to keep your girlfriend from, y'know, doing stuff you don't like. And that

usually happens when she's secure with your predictability. Predictability begets complacency, and complacency leads to both boredom and increased shit-tests. But Dread, used effectively early on in a relationship, can disable the feminine impulse to decide that she "has you figured out" . . . and can start

Based on the idea that men control commitment, Dread points out that whatever batshit crazy shenanigans a woman might decide to pull, the dude ultimately has control over whether or not the relationship will continue. Instilling Dread in a woman is the masculine equivalent of a woman using Drama to control the relationship.



Dread is an important and effective tool for a Red Pill man because it counters the Drama element many women seem all too happy to import into a relationship and then use to seize control of it. Simply put, once a woman feels confident that she's got a dude figured out, she often feels entitled to actively seize the wheel from his hands with *emotional Drama* or more subtly by *restricting sexual access*.

Aunt Giggles doesn't like Dread because it's designed to keep a woman from feeling stable in a relationship. Because when a woman doesn't feel stability in a relationship with a guy she likes, she does, y'know, *stuff he likes to keep him happy with her* and continue the relationship. That puts him in control, and that bugs Aunt Giggles and enrages feminists. Men *can't* be in control of a relationship under feminism. That's *Patriarchy*.

In Advanced or Married Game, Dread is usually reserved for important matters. No one wants to pull the plug on a relationship over stupid stuff, but if your wife of ten years has decided that "real grown ups don't need that much sex" and starts you on an IV drip of survival sex as a means of controlling the relationship, Dread becomes a valid and very potent tool to preserve it. Of course Aunt Giggles doesn't see it that way - Dread is *emotional blackmail, manipulation, or even coercion*. It means you don't love them, and you're a rat bastard who's just trying to use them for your own evil plans, or something like that. Never mind the propensity for feminine Drama - that's apparently okay - but a dude using Dread is EVIL. It inspires fear - fear that the man will withdraw and ultimately end the relationship, without the express permission of the female involved.



Spake she:

"An attractive and desirable person does not need to create drama to demonstrate their appeal, because others will naturally be drawn to that person. Only those who cannot sustain attraction or intimacy resort to negative reinforcement for personal gain."

I take issue with this because I've witnessed first-hand - repeatedly - how attractive and desirable men get into a relationship that seems rosy at first blush, but who incrementally become marginalized as the female asserts more and more control. Dread isn't the first tool in the box, but it certainly shouldn't be eschewed out of general principal by a man. And in some relationships where a dude is seriously trying to Break his Beta, Dread is often the only tool a woman entrenched in the belief that she alone has the power in a relationship based on her possession of the only fully-functional vagina will listen to.

Giggles attempts to discern between Threats and Warnings, explaining that the motivation of the person using Dread (usually the male - women usually use sex and drama) are what is important. If you are trying to instill fear, that's bad. If you are merely trying to warn someone of the consequences of their actions, that's . . . okay. Only there's damn little way for someone to ascertain what someone else's motivations really are. If a dude actually tells his woman that her behavior is a dealbreaker, that's a Threat. If he mentions her behavior is so poor that he is considering the fact that there are, indeed, other women out there who will not behave so, that's a Threat.



If he merely says she hurt his feelings and he won't do something ("socialize with her", is Giggles' example) then that's just a Warning.

Used too harshly or too frequently, Threats can undermine a relationship. But how many Warnings must a man deliver to deaf ears before he resorts to Threats? Depends on the man, woman, relationship and situation. Usually when a man encounters unacceptable behavior in his woman, bringing it to her attention can fix the problem. But there are plenty of women who simply discount such warnings from their men, dismissing them as him being "mean" or "marginalizing" or other sins.

In my opinion, the Threat is often warranted and justified. Men don't like using them any more than women like hearing them, but if she's steamrolling over your valid objections, then [like my friend Darius](#), a Threat is decidedly in order.

Aunt Giggles cites marriage expert [Dr. John Gottman](#), who has been able to predict whether or not a union would endure with 94% accuracy, essentially based on the presence of one key factor:

Contempt.

That's important. *But not why she thinks it is.*



Giggles concludes that using threats is coercive, and that merely pointing out how a partner "hurt your feelings" should be enough to motivate change in an understanding and loving relationship. The problem is that most couples don't have a consistently understanding and loving relationship, and when a man admits to hurt feelings - and tries to use them to convince his woman to alter her behavior - all too often she dismisses his feelings as less important or completely unimportant. *Because as long as the relationship is intact, **she's winning**.* It could be a piss-poor, sexless, crappy relationship replete with fights and arguments, but for the purposes of boosting her in the FSM, it's all the relationship she needs until something better (and more Alpha, to her horror) comes along.

Giggles mentions the psychological term "intermittent reinforcement," an addictive reward pattern that is the motivator in gambling. You win just often enough to keep you playing. This is the female motivation in slowly reducing and restricting sex in a relationship as a control mechanism. The man wins when he's have good sex frequently. But the woman wins just if the relationship is intact and things are more or less muddling along. It doesn't matter how much suffering or anxiety she creates in her dude, as long as he hasn't left, she still wins. So she puts out just barely enough to keep him intact, and ignores his feelings the rest of the time in a Blue Pill relationship.

Which brings us to the subject of contempt. Giggles insists that contempt underlies most of the motivation behind employing Dread. That's positively ludicrous. For example, my friend Darius, when he employed Dread and Preselection, did so *without contempt* for his girlfriend. He didn't treat her poorly or try to actively undermine her self-esteem, he pointed out the obvious flaw in her emotional reasoning - that he would not stick around unconditionally and wait for her to make up her mind - and pointed out that she was by no means the only game in town. He did not fault her personal character or insult her, *he told her what*



the deal was with enough passion in his voice to invoke her emotional receptivity, and he got the job done. But he was *never* contemptful of her.

And that brings us to the title of the post. For while I fault Giggie's reasoning, I cannot fault the initial premise: **that Contempt in a partner is a strong indicator of whether or not divorce is on the horizon.**

What she doesn't quite understand is that the damaging contempt she rightfully fears need not be personal in nature - the mere presence of contempt in a partner is a strong indicator of divorce, by my observations. Someone who is contemptful of a whole class of human beings - to which you may belong - is a very poor risk for a long term relationship. If you are black, for instance, marrying someone who generally does not like black people but will make an exception for you because they love you is a very poor marriage risk.

So consider, then, the fact that for three generations feminism has been raising girls in an environment of pure contempt for masculinity and all things male. Since about 1975 the feminist party line has been to blame men for all the world's ills and demonize masculinity at every turn. Divorced moms who espouse general contempt for men have not only emasculated their sons at a basic level, they have instilled in their daughters a bitter perspective that leaks out into every aspect of their lives. While hormones may temporarily overwhelm this homegrown contempt for men, once the orgasmic buzz of infatuation leaves off and a feminist discovers that the swell dude she married is actually a real live man with his own masculinity, the blush of love usually cannot overcome the deep and abiding contempt that she has been raised to feel for men.



Men make more money. Men have all the power. Men want sex and control. Men are aggressive and dangerous. Men make stupid decisions. Regardless of the number of examples of contrary behavior, even within their own personal sphere, I would suggest that the majority of girls raised by self-identified feminists (and I include misguided "male feminists" like Schwyzer and Scalzi here) become not only entitled, but learn to actively feel contempt for all men . . . even the ones they are in a relationship with.

A woman who demonstrates contempt for all men in any way is to be avoided like a half-price hooker with the clap by a Red Pill man. I'm not talking about the ubiquitous and cathartic post break-up ice cream guzzling sleepovers designed to purge after heartbreak, here, I'm talking about those women who can calmly deconstruct, judge, abuse and vilify *all* men and masculinity itself, particularly while their husband or boyfriend is present. Women who are openly disrespectful of men, or who use misandrist terminology with gay abandon are indicating their class-based contempt.

Within the circles of Radical Feminism there's what they call the "Not Nigel" phenomenon, when a dominant feminist woman has condescended to a relationship with a weak Gamma male. The saying goes, "All men are sexist, chauvinistic sex fiends with no regard for the rights or sensibilities of women . . . except for Nigel. *You* aren't like that, are you, dear?" And Nigel slavishly assures her he isn't as he runs and fetches her another doughnut.



"Nigels" are viewed with open contempt among RadFems, and even among plain old ordinary Liberal *good* kind", they feel utterly justified in saying the

most horrendous things about men in general, secure in the knowledge that Nigel isn't going to protest - and will likely eagerly agree with her misandrist views just to stay in her good favor. And since the RadFems cannot stand a man who actually admits and apologizes for all males and their behavior, every agreement with them that falls out of his mouth merely validates their opinions and strengthens their contempt. Apparently being a lickspittle passive little Gamma bitch to your domineering wife doesn't dampen RadFem panties as much as the Gammas would like to think.

feminists. Male bashing and misandry are acceptable bloodsports for them, and as long as they add the half-assed disclaimer that their pet neutered male is "one of the

If Radical Feminists can recognize their own lurid contempt for the men who are bending over backwards to please them, then the existence of widespread general contempt for masculinity is going to doom a relationship to divorce regardless of her personal feelings for her pet penis. Because she will eventually either decide to chuck poor Nigel under the bus for being a man, or (far more rarely) Nigel might grow a set and start resisting her contemptuous behavior.



But beyond the RadFems, mainstream feminists often enjoy this kind of misandrous bloodsport, even as they qualify their opinions if anyone actually bothers to point out that, technically, not all men are rapists. Often they'll qualify further by attacking "the Patriarchy", a nameless, faceless boogeyman that symbolizes all men . . . while not supposedly offending any particular man. The Gammas go along with it, because they have firmly turned their backs on the masculine power of fatherhood, and they feel they can curry favor by joining the assault on "the Patriarchy".

What they don't understand is that by doing so, they not only paint targets on their own backs, they are actively participating in the first moves toward their eventual divorce. For even Liberal Feminists won't respect a man, subconsciously, who won't stand up for himself and his masculinity even as they enjoy the slavish devotion. Eventually they'll get a whiff of Alpha and their inherent hypergamy kicks in. Bye-bye Gammarabbit.




How do you test for this sort of thing in a woman? You listen . . . carefully. Perhaps even bring up a few controversial topics like porn, prostitution, and Blurred Lines. If she starts to rant about "male privilege" or "the Patriarchy" or "Rape Culture", then she's purely catch-and-release. Let her inflict her bile on some hapless Gamma or start collecting cats. Her contempt for men and masculinity might be popular in certain sections of the Female Social Matrix, but when it comes to how she will treat you within the relationship, she's shown her true colors.

And goddess help you if you hear her say ". . . *but I know you're not like other men . . . you're special!*" That's her hamster and her vagina speaking in chorus, because she devoutly wants to believe that YOU are not actually a **real man**, as men define the term. She wants to think that YOU are somehow immune to the persistent, constant drive of your sexual impulse and have the insight to realize what a special snowflake she is. No man wants to be "special", or "not like other men", and if you do . . . in *that* way . . . then you have larger identity issues that a relationship just ain't gonna fix.

But for the sake of all the gods, DO NOT PURSUE A LTR WITH HER. Her potential to be a good wife is almost nil, and her potential to be your future ex-wife is roughly . . . 94%. Contempt for all men will inevitably lead to contempt for you, to your detriment. And feminism is packed to the gunwales with that contempt.

You have been warned.



Archived from theredarchive.com