

Robot Jones's analysis on the Carissa Avallone Vs Cider & Port Debate

Created by Robot Jones and Speechspace. Do not duplicate.

tw// Sensitive topics, politics, discussions of drugs and controversial things. Don't take offense at my statements, some stuff was from both sides, and that I don't fully endorse ether Carrisa Avallone or Cider and Port. 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 one of the most controversial debate with someone who isn't well informed . "Wats the point" is best description about this video.

I can't believe that people are complaining about the legality of cannabis. As you may know, Cannabis is still a crime in America federally, although some places you can get them recreationally or medically. <https://youtube.com/watch?v=W7UxOjgY65g>

Anyways, enjoy the analysis.

Analysis: 1

I started this video knowing that it's pointless in many places like Canada, Uruguay, Mexico, South Africa, and many parts of America (including California, New York, Michigan, Washington, Montana) to discuss it as it's already legal. However, in the state of Georgia, it's still a felony to own cannabis, so it's not even pointless for me to analyze the debate. For background information, cannabis users were targeted heavily by the DEA in the 80s on the war on drugs. In those days, I can recall those anti drug psas that were really common as the war on drugs raged on, there were also crazy fundies then who think the psychedelics were "gateways to the spiritual". I didn't pay attention to those idiots. But at the same time, I know to be a law abiding citizen. I am also a robot, so I obviously never did. Thankfully, the pro-weed side got the seat.

1st round: Cider gets the round. I'm glad that the side that wants it legal gets it first. Cider admits he always think Cannabis should be legal. Cider then gives out the medicinal benefits of weed to prove his point that it should be legal. This is important to consider, as anything to be legalized must have a positive benefits to be legalized. Since these benefits Cider mentioned are very lifesaving (fighting cancer, being one of them), Cider is winning. He also points out the economic benefits of it, which is crucial since America is a capitalist government. Cider also mentioned it can help treat addiction, which is a serious epidemic since the start of the pandemic lockdowns in early 2020. However, Cider has no clue where it has worked, he thinks it's the Swedish model of government, however, considering that Cider had no clue where weed legalization works, his point started to fell a little bit, you need to provide real life examples to win. Cider also has pointed out the hypocrisy of weed being illegal when legal stuff like tobacco causes lung cancer and alcohol causing liver damage, yet people usually don't realize this. Double standards are a big no-no for me. Which is why I am in favor of ending the war on drugs and I am wanting weed to be legal. It's not damaging at all. Cider hated the notion that weed leads to harder drugs, I also know that the "gateway drug" myth is full of b.s too. I and Morton have known potheads who never do harder stuff and stick to weed only. I congratulate Cider for thinking for himself. He said that weed leads to happiness, watching cartoons, enjoying the company of the elderly (which would have been a good thing) and a belief that we live in a matrix. He ended the opening.

Carissa prepared herself before debating, which is a smart thing to do, even though I don't agree with her stance. She said that weed being harmless is a myth. She correctly pointed out that news sources except for "far right pundits" don't usually freak out over cannabis anymore. Her use the term "Far Right pundit" is sorta correct since Nixon was the one who started the war on drugs. However, Democrats are also complicit in the war on drugs as well. I don't blame one political party for all the societal ills. She then pointed out the scientific studies on drugs as popular as cannabis that point out that they are dangerous. She then tried to generalize potheads as wells. She thinks potheads think that weed improves your lungs.

Analysis 2

Now I think it's her just using straw-mans and cherry picking dumb takes potheads have said. Carissa obviously is pro establishment as she tries to equate weed with heroin. She said that there are no proper scientific studies on weed. However, she opened the possibility the medical use of it. I think she may just be against recreational use. She tries to cite studies. Carissa isn't right that the more extreme your stance is, the less educated. Carrisa isn't pro full ban on weed. So, she cited what Portugal did, which is fair enough. Carrisa only wants it legal in the future. Carissa points out the side effects. And Carissa wants further research then, which should happen. Carrisa isn't pro weed ban.

Open Discussion: Cider admits that Carissa did have some points that aren't false. Cider is open-minded and did admit, that weed does have it's downsides, as in any drugs. And admits weed can be damaging to your lungs. Cider's point is correct, people have double standards being cigarettes being legal, while weed illegal. And that double standards made weed bans pointless. Carissa refuted by saying 10% of weed users are addicted to it. That is way too low for weed to be a crisis. However, Cider equates the cannabis addiction with alcohol addiction, and gambling addiction. Everything is to be done in moderation. Carissa barely proved Cider wrong. Carissa pointed out that weed causes cognitive decline. Cider said that is a very low percentage that people get serious side effects. Anyways. I don't want to get into the details of the discussions. it's time consuming and no one is doing a rebuttal here. Carrisa isn't anti weed, so the title of the video is misleading as both want weed legalized one way or another. Cider pointed out that so many people tried weed that there is proof it's not damaging long term, but Cider wants the types of weeds safer so that there isn't a side effects. Carrisa is pointing out scientific studies, so her viewpoints aren't from propaganda. This discussion was very rational and well spoken, with both sides citing sources and studies. Cider also used real life examples to prove his point. I don't think I should continue this more.

Summary

Overall: Avalone gets a B-. She does cite scientific studies, she overlooks benefits of it and did strawmans in many points of the discussions. She also misled the channel by making us believe she is against all legalization. However, she is calm and came well prepared so that help prevent her from getting a C or D.

Cider gets an A. Cider was able to cite all the benefits, and has the ability to disagree and find agreements and be on the rivals same page. This topic of Cannabis legalization is a touchy topic and the fact the 2 were calmly able to discuss tjos without any aruguments or shouting proves that we can make a conclusion.

What do i think:I do think there is some up and downs to it, but I think it should be legalized because there are benefitz as Cider mentioned, I didn't have my mindset changed, and Avalone didn't succeed. Overall, both wanted weed legalized in a way.