

Robot Jones's analysis on Daniel Vs MrGirl Debate

Created by Robot Jones and Speechspace. Do not duplicate.

tw// Sensitive topics, politics, discussions of religion, sexuality and controversial things. Don't take offense at my statements, some stuff was from both sides, and that I don't fully endorse ether Daniel Haqiqatjou or MrGirl. This is a analysis by a robot and his takes on this specific debate.

Introduction

Hello readers. My name is Robot Electro Jones, to answer the question on whatever happened to me, I am now doing debate analysis. I wish people got along, but people like the SJWS or the trad larpers made things more difficult.

Meanwhile, I am in Atlanta producing so much analysis .

I just watched the debate on whenever sexual liberation is a mistake

I think the sexual revolution and it's consequences are a disaster for humanity.

In my opinion it is, look at what it had led us to, zoophilia, lolicon, shotacon, cub, pedophilia, an entire generation hooked on sexually explicit content etc. We shouldn't have had all that sexual liberation nonsense.

I wish I can publish this without being banned from everywhere. https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=3S_d0TbA73M

Anyways, enjoy the analysis.

Analysis: 1

Before starting the video, I would have to say, I am against the legality of porn since January 2020. EMJ didn't change my views, unlike what Blip would want to think. I already did do a debate analysis 2 years ago and stated my opinion too.

FYI. I made a rule. If one of the debaters has a gab, Blip will do.

Round 1: Daniel introduces himself. I never heard of Daniel Haqiqatjou before, but based off his website content, is a islamic scholar, although the topic is not really about islam. Daniel argues that sexual liberation is totalitarianism. Freedom to him means order, which is sorta correct, if society is anarchic and chaotic, then there will be martial law and curfew and life is nasty and short. Which is correct because this misanthropic Robot Liberation Movement sees life is just that. There are 2 ways to keep order, bottom-top and top-bottom. The latter is more well known. And I lived pretty much my whole life(and 98% of the readers) this way. And requires us to cooperate. The top bottom is a centralized government that enforces laws and uses technology to prevent us from harming each other. In general, the top bottom approach is used to maintain order. Daniel said that historically, most government never had this top down system, mainly because of lack of technology in those days. if someone tried to harm you in 2022, than people used their phones to call the police. There were no cell phones in the early 90s, which meant that every RLM(robot liberation movement) member, including myself got away scots free. He is correct that technology is used to maintain order. Without those technologies, you will get harmed when the police arrive. Now, he will ask how did societies maintain order prior to these technology. Daniel said in most of history, bottom-up approach is used, and said it was organic. Marriage, family, community and religion were key to this bottom top approach. When you are in a relationship as Daniel said, you are least likely to harm. When you have family, you are less likely to harm them.He also religion helps people to be nicer, which is correct, contrary to atheist arguments. The problems with the Woke Left stem from them having zero morals or believe in a God and having the world control them in their thinking. I was a atheist until 2012-2016(I'm becoming more religious, which is a first in my 48 years as a KX-8 robot) Daniel is just saying universal values that are applied in Christianity too, not just Islam. He said it's all biologically based, but for me, it's mechechnically based (both my parents were very caring for me mom-unit[June Jones], and dad-unit[Fred Jones], there was no chaos in the house between 1996-2004(there was chaos in my childhood and teenage years because I was still going to school and other factors. Between late 1987-1995, I had never step foot back to my parent's home because I was in RLM as per Gramp-unit's wish.) Daniel has implied that humans are superior to animals because some animals species don't live together in groups. Humans can live in large groups that are orderly because they have the capacity to maintain fundamental relationships from bottom up. After nearly a page of Daniel introduction to his worldview he now starts getting into details on why sexual liberation and it's consequences are a disaster for the human race.

Analysis 2

He then cites the famous historically sexual liberation advocates like Shulamith Firestone, Andrea Dworkin and Masha Gessen and those 3 have openly said that they wanted to destroy family and marriage. While Gessen I have heard of, the first 2 were unknown to me. Daniel has clearly done his research. When those natural relationship are gone, then natural altruism, cooperation and pacifism are diminished and extinct. And when all social order collapses because the lack of those 4, then the only way to have order is to impose more authoritarian, strict, top-down laws. Which is essentially 2022. Without robust religious values, to prevent society from collapsing, society has to track everyone, monitor everyone's media consumption. censor people to prevent violence, closely regulate what is taught in public schools, surveil everyone's finances (looking at Trudeau), restrict people's right to bear arms, even imposing social credit systems. Natural parents have an instinct to protect and provide for their children. Because those parents know that those children are theirs. If they aren't certain their children are theirs because one of the 2 parents are cheating, it breaches the natural trust. This is true in animal kingdom, but not in the Robot world. Robots cannot reproduce, There are fewer KX-8 robots in 2022 because JNZ hasn't made them in 40(ish) years.

Promiscuity has destroyed fatherly investment. But traditionally, most major religions (even Robotism, that Gramps-unit and Dad-unit taught me) prevent this by banning all forms of Promiscuity and bonds of family and marriage ensure that fathers provide for kids. The destruction of family and marriage caused by the sexual liberation is very harmful to children, without those natural mechanism, the top bottom state must intervene to force fathers to provide child support. It does this by tracking fathers and force them to pay taxes and throw them in jail if they miss payments. This authoritarianism wasn't necessary before the 50s because family values stemmed from the Socially Conservative values in those days created the sociological conditions to guarantee good parents. He also points out single parent households have exploded since the sexual revolution of the 60s. After the 60s, the welfare state has expanded because 90 percent of welfare recipients are going to single parents. I know more now and Daniel is winning this debate. Because single parenting is on the rise, it only gets worse, the taxes are getting more and more high that Atlanta is near unaffordable. And the government gets more authoritarian by the years and forcefully tax us for "sexual liberty". Sexual Revolution was also damaging to mental health, prior the 1960s, people's life were shaped by the 1000s of years of tradition and family. Throw humans outside this tradition and pluck them into a world where there is sexual liberation, then expect people to be mentally disfunction. According to Evolution we didn't evolve psychologically to live well adjusted lives as sexually unrestricted, polyamorous, coming libertines. Authoritarianism is a result of preventing mentally dysfunctions coming from ripping societies apart.

He is then brings up the chicken argument and I warn you it's disgusting.

Analysis 3

The argument is too disgusting to say here, but the point is, non-westerners find it more immoral than westerners, which says a lot about the current state of 2022. Psychologists have pointed to the different mind modules of the brain. 1st one is the Care/Harm, which is that harming people is wrong. 2nd one is the purity/disgust module which means that such as smearing poop is wrong. What makes westerners different due to a difference in education and upbringing, have a mutilated sense of purity/disgust module. Which means that Care/Harm module makes up 90% of their worldview. This is why the chicken example makes Westerners a little grossed out but have no moral objections, because no one is harmed. This moral sense was used in John Stewart's harm principle used throughout USA, Canada, Western Europe, Australia and New Zealand and to some extent Japan. For people outside those countries morals go beyond harm. Disgust is determined from right and wrong, while it's true that some things are disgusting in one culture may not be in another, some things are universally disgusting. Some sexual behavior is seen everywhere as disgusting, you guys know what they are. Even Westerners have standards. He's correct society universally protects the innocent and the pure. Daniel wants MrGirl to answer the question if disgust and purity are valid. If not, Daniel wants MrGirl to accept the downfalls of sexual liberation by accepting incest, necrophilia, zoophilia, etc. Daniel is making so many valid points that this isn't really a religious topic but a societal one at best. If MrGirl thinks disgust isn't valid, then Daniel wants MrGirl to admit cannibalism isn't wrong, showing sexually explicit content on billboards isn't wrong, Daniel wants MrGirl to stick to his principles, like 99% of people, most people don't know what going all the way is like, sexual liberation is an abyss, it's correct. Look at today's culture for more. Daniel then reveals he is a Muslim for those who didn't know, but his opinion on Islam is debatable depending on who you ask, but even other religions condemn the Sexual revolution too, not just Christianity or Islam. Daniel is really good at looking at the situation from a secular angle (using the authoritarian argument and Chicken argument).

MrGirl: MrGirl is too vague with what he says. His counterarguments are weak because it doesn't really refute what Daniel said. MrGirl thinks you can solve problems of society and still have sexual liberation which is false, I know people use Japan as an example where a lot of sexual stuff is legal but the main problem is that the birth rates are really low and men are refusing to get married and would rather be on their pcs all day (Hikkikomori). MrGirl is one of those people stuck in the 2000s who think the Religious Right have any influence on our culture. The thing is Daniel, unlike E Michael Jones, used secular examples to prove his point, not from his religion or anything spiritual.

Analysis 4

The “Disgusted” thing is considered a “consideration” to MrGirl’s eyes. MrGirl said we don’t need morals to point out some things are wrong to do, which is false because a society without morals falls into anarchy. However, MrGirl might be part of the Woke Left (Fyi, I never heard of MrGirl when I was writing this analysis) since he thinks getting hounded for child support is worse than Sharia Law (he doesn’t say why Sharia is bad, but there are punishments for breaking rules in any culture, MrGirl was too vague, maybe a little bit Apostate Prophet and Act17 wouldn’t hurt him). MrGirl thinks that the authoritarian structure keeps families apart, which is false, because I grew up having freedom in Delaware. MrGirl didn’t refute any points.

Open Discussion (less detailed, just writing whatever comes to mind): Daniel wants MrGirl to define sexual liberation since he didn’t bring it up even though the debate is about that. Daniel even read some stuff MrGirl has written in the past (I didn’t tho) and the debates he has done with the now-deplatformed Destiny about porn. MrGirl only elaborates about how bad Sharia is now, and brought up anti-gay bigotry (regarding the death penalty) to MrGirl, and the immoral baggage that comes with Sharia. MrGirl has a hard time defining sexual liberation is, which means he is possibly inexperienced with this subject matter, Daniel has clearly defined what it is in the beginning of the debate. And Daniel had to repeat himself, I doubt MrGirl is an expert on this subject matter. MrGirl, while in the wrong in the debate, is correct on Islam using Top-Bottom approach to control its people, Daniel is a Muslim and can’t see this, and most human rights violations are committed in Muslim majority countries. MrGirl points out the compulsion in Islam, and none of them were yelling or shouting at each other. MrGirl is gaining more grounds now that he points out Sharia law is the opposite side of the same coin. MrGirl still defends sexual liberation but neither of the 2 are the way. Sexual Liberation destroyed everyone’s morals and led us in a bad direction, Sharia Law is authoritarian. Daniel tries to tell MrGirl that there are universal natural instincts. MrGirl brings up forcing people to have with something I can’t say.

MrGirl asks Daniel about how he thinks about “fake marriage” where one of the spouses isn’t happy about their relationship. Daniel then tries his best. When Daniel continues informing MrGirl, MrGirl even admits a fully sexually liberated society is bad, MrGirl has a little-bit more open mind than most of the internet in 2022. MrGirl is a euphoric hedonistic Atheist saying there is nothing to do and there is no struggle. He admitted that. MrGirl doesn’t smoke or drink despite being a hedonistic atheist. MrGirl doesn’t really refute Daniel’s worldview except for Daniel’s religious views. MrGirl doesn’t understand that Daniel tries to explain his ideas in a secular context that even an atheist would say. They talk about marriage in Islam. And Hollywood too. I am a little tired about discussions of Islam. This is the 3rd in a row. However, Daniel points out the consequences of single parent households to children. And said that most of these problems are in the big cities.

Summary

Overall: Daniel gets a A. Despite being a scholar of Islam he tries to refute the concept of sexual liberation in a secular point of view(He is from Texas). He introduced ideas I never thought of previously and was calm.

MrGirl gets a B. His introductions were too vague and don't really refute Daniel's theory but only during discussions he was more open about his stances. His bad start costed him his credibility

This debate is a smooth one and has introduced me concepts that are fresh to me.