

Title: The Decline of Intelligence in the Face of Political Extremism.

Author: Alix Segovia Despignes

Blurb: “Let’s talk about the pitfalls of progressivism as a moral standard.” “When it suits them, they speak out. When it doesn’t, they stay silent.”

Does it drive you crazy to see how fans of the opposing team never admit their mistakes or excuse everything by saying, “the referee was bought.”? Well, that's exactly how the left is nowadays. It's called fanaticism. Defending something, right or wrong, without pausing to consider that the actions of our side might not be the most appropriate, is what it means to be a fanatic. And there is no greater intellectual misfortune than being a fanatic about an idea and never questioning oneself.

Let’s talk about the pitfalls of progressivism as a moral standard. Progressivism has become a trend that pushes people to always strive to appear morally correct. But today, our society tends toward polarization—here, toward the polarization of presenting oneself as a "good person" to everyone, even defending those who harm society. This can lead to discrimination and the invisibilization of certain victims and events depending on their cultural or religious background.

Take, for example, the total disregard for the [murder of Philippine](#) by certain university students (supposedly educated individuals) affiliated with anti-capitalist parties and student unions. These students [tore down posters](#) in her memory and [disrupted moments of silence with noise](#). All this outrage because Philippine, a student murdered by a Moroccan man who had already been convicted of rape and was under a deportation order (Order to Leave French Territory), doesn’t fit their narrative. What bothers them ? That her killer’s OLFT status and nationality were mentioned, despite the fact he wasn’t even apprehended in France, but in Switzerland.

How did we get to the point where murders against women are hushed up because they involve an OLFT ? The mere mention of nationality is deemed “racist.” This highlights a decay in judgment. Blinded by their political fanaticism, some are more concerned with condemning the far right than thinking about the actual victims, even dismissing the gravity of a femicide if the perpetrator is undocumented. Not even the murder of a student fazes them when it involves an OLFT.

How biased have so many people become, letting their judgment be clouded simply because a situation doesn’t suit the cause they’re defending ? And what cause is that, anyway ? Defending women ? Let’s hope they don’t dare claim to speak on women’s rights and femicides.

This is double standards at its finest. When it suits them, they speak out. When it doesn’t, they stay silent.

Another paradox of progressive feminism. In Spain, the “*solo sí es sí*” law, although designed to defend women's rights, has had completely opposite and harmful effects. The goal was to show a commitment to defending women's rights, but in creating a law aimed at punishing sexual offenses more harshly, an unexpected outcome emerged. Those who commit what was previously classified as “sexual abuse” now face harsher penalties, while those guilty of what was classified as “sexual

assault” see their sentences reduced because the two crimes have been equalized. The result ? By March 2024, between [1,000](#) and [1,400 sentences for sexual abuse had been reduced, and 121 people](#) were released from prison.

Did the minister who created this law—let's not forget, a staunch feminist who was meant to be more progressive than anyone else—apologize ? Did she have the honesty to resign for what she did ? No. Is she more feminist than conservatives ? Apparently, yes. She defends women's rights, but only when it suits her, as she has no shame in staying silent when former Argentine President Alberto Fernández was accused of sexually assaulting his wife, or when the co-founder of the far-left party “Podemos” was accused of sexual abuse—an accusation the entire party was aware of but chose to ignore. Hypocrisy and frivolity are the order of the day. Once again, it's a double standard: they denounce sexual abuse, but when it involves one of their own, no one speaks up. No one cares.

Adding to all of this are the paradoxes of progressive rhetoric and the social tensions that arise from them, as well as contradictions in political and social positions. Certain progressive narratives lack pragmatism and coherence, particularly when it comes to tolerating everything—or rather, the normalization of cultures that do not share the same egalitarian values.

It's no secret that, historically, the values of the most widely practiced religions (the Abrahamic religions, Buddhism, Hinduism) were very traditionalist and rigid. Over time, this rigidity has softened, but the influence of religion remains strong in our society. Traditionalist Catholics, Muslims, Jews, and others still uphold this rigidity in their values. Examples of such traditional values include the image of women as homemakers caring for children or the view of homosexuality as a sin.

These values clash with progressive ideals, which advocate for women's total freedom and autonomy—allowing them to choose whether they want to work or stay at home without being morally pressured to have or desire children, or being forced to choose between work and family—and the freedom to love whomever they want. In reality, many devout believers and practitioners of these religions do not share these ideals.

Yet, progressivism does not hesitate to defend and even embrace individuals who do not uphold these progressive values. A clear example of this contradiction is the case of Hamtramck, Michigan, in 2015. Many liberal residents celebrated the fact that their city had gained international attention for becoming the first in the U.S. to elect a Muslim-majority city council. They viewed this shift in power and diversity as a symbolic but meaningful response to the Islamophobic rhetoric that was a central theme in the presidential campaign of Republican candidate Donald Trump.

That is, until these same residents, dismayed, watched as this now entirely Muslim and socially conservative city council passed a [law banning the display of LGBT flags on city-owned properties.](#)

Once again, we need to think and reason carefully. If you defend the rights of LGBT people, then you cannot support a group of people who denigrate or even persecute LGBT individuals. You cannot expect everyone to share the same values and beliefs as you, nor assume they will be as welcoming and generous. Sometimes, we need to be realistic and honest with ourselves.

Progressivism has transformed into a social and moral standard that everyone must adhere to in order to be seen as a “good person.” As soon as someone opposes these ideas, they are immediately labeled as racist, xenophobic, homophobic, sexist, or even a "fascist." People reflexively insult those they disagree with. Labeling individuals and groups as “fascists” simply because they hold different opinions might actually indicate that the true extremists and fanatics are the ones doing the labeling.