Whether it’s true or not, people like Jonathan McIntosh (writer and producer for Feminist Frequency) and his followers believe that all video games are primarily designed for straight males, which means that every asset and element of the game (plot, characters, gameplay, sound, etc.) is deliberately crafted to validate or sexually cater to the straight male demographic.

Of course it doesn’t mean that women, lesbians and gays cannot or won’t enjoy the game or its content, but if they do it’s purely incidental and it doesn’t challenge the idea that the game was constructed for another audience. Which is somehow at the very core of the problem.

Because every aspect of the game must appeal to straight males desires, these people consider that every characteristic of female characters (including but not limited to their role, achievements, psychology, clothing, and sexual orientation) are also constructed to fit the viewpoint of masculine heterosexuality or please them in some ways.

It comes to say that when a female character express her sexuality (even if she’s a lesbian), it’s only to gratify straight males, since she’s an element of a production designed for men.

Bayonetta didn’t chose to dress up the way she does: she doesn’t think, she doesn’t exist, she was created that way. Still following that premise, as the main protagonist of a video game, Bayonetta is a mere instrument whose only purpose is to titillate straight males (again and regardless of who designed her or who enjoys her style, she was designed for that very precise function).

The objection that “complaining over Bayonetta’s outfit is slut shaming” doesn’t work because according to their logic, "slut shaming" only happens if a woman is repressed for expressing her sexuality for herself and on her own. It doesn’t apply to video game characters since they are designed in a specific way for a specific reason.

This reasoning is also applied to real-life people: female sex-workers are primarily doing their job for straight males, not for their own enjoyment. This is why they stand against prostitutes, pole dancers and porn stars and why you can’t call them out for "slut shaming".

Like explained, they think that every element of the game is crafted to match an heterosexual fantasy. Male characters are no exception as they treat male NPCs and avatars in the
same scope: what can they bring to
the straight male demographic? Since
heterosexual men are not attracted
to other men, they simply dismiss
male sexualization. However, they
do consider the body, actions, roles
and achievements of male characters
as a way to put the audience on
a pedestal: if the hero is strong, a
womanizer, achieves great things and
has the entire world resolves around
him, it's solely for the straight male
to identify, relate and gain a higher
self-esteem.

They re-contextualize the entire
content by erasing all notion of
subjectivity, interpretation and
individuality so they can impose
their own judgment of value as the
objective truth. Their thinking process
dismiss entirely the opinion of whom
actually holds the controller and how
that person perceives the game.

The argument that a straight female
gamer may drool over a male
character and see him as an object
of desire and arousal will be denied
because this is "incidental" as the
game was designed for straight men,
therefore the character wasn't put
in the game for her own enjoyment
(in which case it would somehow
become acceptable).

They ignore your personal
position and bluntly dismiss your
interpretation of the content of the
game if they feel like you’re not part
of the audience as they perceive it. In
other words, "the content has to go
because it was designed for someone
else but you".

They think video games are a
manifesto reflecting political and
social messages, they are in no
way a mean to "be someone else"
or "temporary trade your life for a
fantasy". It has never been about
creating more content or diversity:
it's about destroying, censoring
and modifying content that was
presumably made to appeal to male
heterosexuality.

Don’t get me wrong. Creating new
content to appeal to a smaller or
different audience is never a bad
thing, but when you start to define
guidelines and police the content of
products designed for other groups,
you’re not being "inclusive", you’re
demonizing your audience.

As of now, two arguments are put
forward to support this cultural
reform: first, according to the ESA
report from 2014 the player ratio by
gender is currently 52% male and
48% female.

This number actually doesn’t
represent anything because the
paper mixes together triple-A games
(high-budget, mass-market products
for home consoles and computer)
and "time wasters" (casual, mobile
and freemium games such as social
network games, match-multiples,
dress up or hidden object flash
games, etc).

It makes no distinction between an
eight year old girls playing a dress up
game made in flash, a twenty year
old woman playing Call of Duty or
a grandma spending her money on Candy Crush Saga.

In comparison, the study is providing an overview of how many boys and how many girls are watching cartoons without making any distinction on the cartoon they actually watch. From there, you may use the numbers as an argument to support that cartoons shouldn’t cater to boys even if other cartoons appeal to girls.

The second argument is the negative impact video games have on society. They will tell you all medias have an impact, but somehow you never receive positive messages: only the negative ones are perceived, undiluted despite the pool of realities and opinions that lives within and around us. But if no proof or could ever make McIntosh change his mind, how could very specific elements of a media brute-force its way through my value system?

While they claim video games will eventually make people violent according to feminist-funded studies, they gladly ignore a collection of 45 years of real-life statistics showing a decrease of violence and sexual assaults while the gaming market is exploding.

In short, if these medias have a negative impact on society, this impact is negligible as it is unable to reverse that trend of decreasing violence.

These observations are not limited to video games and even though products and niche markets exist for different audiences, these people will systematically target markets with a mainly male heterosexual consumer base. It touches anything remotely artistic: novels, comics, movies, music...

This is why muscular men are "male-power fantasy" when they are depicted in comics, but are tolerated when displayed on the cover of romance novels published for a female audience. This is also why the pose of Spider Man is okay in a comic book, but it becomes an issue with Spider Woman.

On the other hand, the systematic shaming of men in movies and advertisement when they are competing against women shall never be addressed.

In conclusion, they are targeting a specific market under the scope of straight male sexuality and are attributing negative values to a content you may enjoy (even partially) so they can shame you for being straight and are currently teaching society that men are terrible for expressing and enjoying their heterosexuality.

While no one will allow you to call out a woman for expressing her sexuality openly, they will call out straight males for expressing theirs through the way they act, the things they create, the products they enjoy and consume.

When they say Bayonetta is dressed too sexily, she is not the victim of their "slut shaming", you are.