I always watch some of the older YouTube videos created by bassist Adam Neely every now and then. One of these videos come from before the pandemic, where he was at a gig, where one of his fellow musicians had given him a brownie that had some marijuana in it. The entire video essentially had the advice of “play sober, unless playing whilst intoxicated is intentional.” as he had a great difficulty playing bass at his 100% in that gig. I’m sure Mr. Neely has always known that playing intoxicated would be a detriment, but having the experience of having a hard time perform whilst intoxicated would really solidify that piece of knowledge. I think the relationship between knowledge and the knower here is that the knower can know something as perhaps they were told the information by someone else, but they wouldn’t listen to this knowledge as much in comparison to if they have a first hand account of the same knowledge. This suggests that we have a difference in the consideration of knowledge based on where we received them, which should not be the case since knowledge is knowledge.

If we consider the knowledge of jumping from a high place will hurt you, I’m sure there are some people that would take this claim of knowledge and challenge it; for example, some young children might be expected to climb a tree, jump, and hurt themselves. I do not think that they would do it again after that. I think this demonstrates a good working of thinking of a claim of knowledge on behalf of the child that has hurt their self by jumping from the tree, they have been told a claim of knowledge, but they are still unsure of supporting grounds for the claim; the knowledge that they got hurt would confirm their doubts about the claim that jumping from high places will hurt you.

But that is of a child, who probably doesn’t have much knowledge of the world yet. For us who are already very knowledgeable, assuming that for some reason we have not already known that jumping from a high place will hurt us, we would approach the claim that ‘jumping from a high place will hurt us’ using logic, rather than immediately physically challenging the claim. We could reason that our bones are not strong enough to take the impact, or correlate how objects break on impact; and then perhaps there is enough evidence there to support the claim, and we would not try it.

I do not think that I commonly do things against the word of others, but if I am given the opportunity to do so in the future, I think I’ll think about it hard before even considering whether I should or need to.