

Slippery Slope Phenomenon

Perhaps you are familiar with the saying: *"Give a dog a bad name so that you can hang it"*. This refers to the tactic employed by the unscrupulous to bring someone down, by first discrediting them or damaging their reputation, even if unfairly or based on very weak evidence. This then makes it difficult if not impossible for the person thus attacked to repair or refute the negative name attached to them.

There is also a flip side to this tactic that many are perhaps not as aware. In this case, the effort is directed at presenting a person or a trait in such light as to make it appear benign, or desirable. Or to invoke public sympathy. Just as with giving a dog a bad name, the proponents offer very weak, or no logical supporting evidence for their claim. Instead, they try to gain public sympathy by appealing to sentiments or fears.

In our increasingly sympathetic world, this tactic, which we shall describe as *"Destigmatization"*, is now used to desensitize people to traits or behavior that were once considered reprehensible to society, and even unwholesome to the individual.

A very striking example is given in a 2021 New York Post report about a Virginia assistant professor who is advocating that the term *"Minor-attracted persons" (MAP)* should be

used, instead of "*Pedophile*", to describe adults who engage in sexual intercourse with under age persons, even minor children.

Her reason is that MAP would be a less offensive term for such sex offenders, suggesting that the proposed change in name would help society to better understand the challenges of such sexual offenders, because they should be seen as suffering from mental handicaps. She then concludes that with access to medical health resources, the offenders could be cured, and thereby reduce or stop child sexual abuse. But her presentation did not offer an iota of empirical evidence to support her prognosis or claims.

Therefore, it is not unreasonable to view this as simply a proposal to destigmatize what society views as a heinous crime. Unfortunately, in our increasingly sympathetic world, her proposal has not caused a loud uproar or grabbed as much news headline as one would have expected.

The response, if it ever emerges, will demonstrate how myopic intellectual thinking can be. In this case, the proposal will become bogged down in intellectual debates. This, even against the better judgement and common sense of the debaters, while society careens towards disaster.

More important, perhaps, is how a rational thinker, even if they consider themselves as very sympathetic, can see such a proposal working to reduce the danger to which children will

be exposed, as MAPs are treated less as criminals but as sick people in need of mental health assistance? Or, what would be the outlook when this inhibitive designation, that also serves as a deterrent for some, is no longer used?

Where will this lead eventually?

It is interesting that segments of the LGBTQ community, who are considered one of the most marginalized and in need of sympathy, are appalled and are dissociating themselves from this proposal. Perhaps they sense, quiet correctly, that its embrace will contaminate their legitimate struggle against discrimination. There is also the understandable fear that if they fall for this *sympathy trap*, an unscrupulous individual could use that to paint them as defending pedophilia, and use the tactic of *giving a dog a bad name* against them.

This example, hopefully, brings to mind other slippery slopes on which societies are standing today, in the name of the new desire to create a more humane and understanding world. Unfortunately, much of this is done under the guise of the scientific discipline of *Psycho-Sociology*.

Although many are confused by the promises of this new “scientific approach”, they feel that they dare not argue or object, despite their deep inner sensing of the potential dangers lurking beneath these promises. They are afraid or

unsure of exercising their own personal judgement in these matters.

Hopefully, as the consequences become more obvious, more people will develop the strength of their inner conviction to draw the line for themselves. Perhaps by then they will have learned to recognize when a proposal is truly against discrimination and oppression, versus opening the flood gates to other evils.

Also, through bitter personal experiences, society will recognize the fallacy in modern understanding of the concept of compassion, or the distorted concept of Christian or charitable way, and how it is now applied to address any and all social problems. Meanwhile, Christians, and all *good-intentioned* people, need to be reminded that Jesus Christ used the whip to chase money changers from the temple, because they were defiling its sanctity. So, perhaps we too should be asking ourselves: *How much defilement are we quietly accepting today?*

As is constantly stressed in all the writings on this site, the only way to recognize true right from wrong, danger from promises, or justice from injustice depends on the degree of one's spiritual awakening and awareness.

Hopefully the rapid acceleration of chaos and disintegration around the globe will lead more to question and reflect and come to their own recognitions. After which they will seek their necessary spiritual awakening.

But this awareness must be developed by each person for themselves! Relying on, and adopting the say-so, or recognitions of others, will be of no long-term benefit to the adopter, regardless of whether they experience immediate benefit or suffering from such reliance! Thus, each person must develop their own ability to recognize and perceive right from wrong, and dangers from promises. And the more this ability is present in society, the more stable the society will become, and the less subject to being hijacked by the numerous destigmatization strategy being promoted for various selfish reasons.

Unfortunately, it is still likely that many will prefer to go along with the flow, showing their indifference, or placing their hopes on the promises of *the experts*.

There are also many who will not question or object because they have become too blinded by their own struggles. Most vulnerable here are those who have suffered and are fighting against legitimate discrimination. Unfortunately, they believe that they must support any and all other “struggles”.

Then there those whose loved ones are involved, and thus prefer to see them as victims to be helped and protected,

without sanctions or accountability, regardless of the effect on society.

No doubt, the experts will continue to propagate their “scientific” theories and hypothesis to guide such thinking, until the inevitable happens. However, it is time for more people to wake up, to realize and recognize the unsuspected and unwholesome influences (i.e., the Darkness) behind the new trends and social science theories that are driving our so-called progressive society.

The famous line below, from the movie “The usual suspects”, is perhaps most apt here, as it literally and graphically portrays the state of the human condition in most societies today:.....

"The Greatest Trick The Devil Ever Pulled Was Convincing The World He Did Not Exist."