

---

Subject: Re: Anyone here smoke?

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sat, 22 Oct 2005 23:59:59 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

mrpirate wrote on Sat, 22 October 2005 18:17

This, perhaps, is where our favourite "crushed" argument applies. Speaking as someone who has spent some time as both a sober person, and a person on psychedelics, there is a world of difference between imagining the walls melting and moving in and out, and actually experiencing it.

Not necessarily true (at least in regards to the argument of whether not lack of experience negates knowledge).

You can comprehend something in its totality without experiencing it. Geometry is a pretty simple example of this. You never experience a circle (you experience the possibility of a circle), but you comprehend that a circle is because you know that shy of anything else, a circle is a polygon with an infinite number of sides. The point is, in many (and validly) cases, you might be fully knowledgeable of an action and its consequences (this is inconclusive, but the uncertainty is utterly negligible) prior to doing or not doing it. That is why we can say to you that doing drugs, or "illegal substances" (which isn't really accurate, but whatever) is stupid and be correct. The reasoning is flaunt thoughtout this thread, so I'm not going to say it again.

The bottom line is that having an experienced "frame of reference" is quite irrelevant, and that reason alone can determine that which is almost certain to be experienced. This means that the morality of the situation can also be reasoned, as well as the intelligability (or lack thereof).

---