3DS DS IOS PC PS3 PS4 PSP VITA WII U XBOX 360 XBOX ONE MORE SYSTEMS

LAWJ Inbox (2) My Games Logout

Game Title Search

ANSWERS BOARDS CONTRIBUTE GAMES USERS WHAT'S NEW

Wii » Action » Platformer » 3D

Super Mario Galaxy

Home FAQs Cheats Saves Reviews Images Videos Answers Board

Religious Roots?

LAWJ (20) Topic Archived « First Page 2 of 2

Boards » Super Mario Galaxy » Religious Roots?

Zorc_N_Pals 8 years ago #51

This topic owns. I should sell tickets.

Step right up, folks! See the match of a lifetime: religion VS. science on GAMEFAQS!!! Tickets are $10 each! Hurry, hurry, hurry - don't miss out on this epic event! :D

---
*Sports and most driving games SUCK ASS. If I wanted to spend $50 on sports every ****ing year, I'd buy a ticket to a game.* ~peteyboo

disco_inferno 8 years ago #52

Pays money for ticket Please listen to me! We will never advance as a species or have world peace if we can't learn to accept difference, but that doesn't mean we shouldn't have difference. Black and white is better than grey. We're never going to convince the entire race to believe in one thing, so let's not try. Lite Buddhists (my own form of Buddhism) respect the beliefs of ofters and don't ask them to change unless they affect some one negatively. So stop all the arguments, no one wins and if we don't it may cause another "religious" war

Now I'm thirsty for lemonade!

Playing for fun doesn't make you a loser, it makes you the winner no matter what.
Vice President of the PAL Gamers Organisation

DrScuttles 8 years ago #53

I really ought to join in in this whole shindig; I am an ordained minister of the ULC after all... I just don't know what I want to preach. Probably something ridiculous about old socks being sacred and containing the Old Gods every saturday.
It's like the Flying Spaghetti Monster debate; you can't prove or disprove it...

"A... shoe store."

AlexPenev 8 years ago #54

>*I would argue that there have been many plausible arguments offered for the existence of God.*
Don't they all basically boil down to "I don't know X. Hey, I have a great idea... I'm going to use one word to explain X, even though that word is itself much more complex and unexplainable. But I don't see that as a problem because it simplifies my explanations for lots of things. I just have to tread carefully and never have to explain that one word."?

>*Take the argument you brought up: if the universe began to exist, what brought it into being?*
Atheist response: "Hmm. Don't know. Don't need to know. Don't get me wrong, I'd really like to know. But I don't think I will ever know. Shame. So how about them Giants, eh?"
Theist response: "Hmm. Don't know. Hey, I have a great idea... I'm going to use one word...".
---
chown -R me ~you/base*

CS_Goodman_ 8 years ago #55

Not true.

You cannot contest this point. The concept of blind faith is biblically nonexistent. For instance, belief in the resurrected Jesus was treated as a concrete event for all to investigate, not something accepted on "faith" as it is (mis)understood today. What you're trying to argue is that, in fact, there is no rational basis for faith/trust, which is what is under dispute.

"Who stole the cookies from the cookie jar?
I don't know, so it must be God."

Must you demonstrate your painful non-cognizance of deductive logic--and this particular argument--further?

The argument in question goes as follows: whatever begins to exist has a cause; the universe began to exist; therefore the universe has a cause.

If the two premises are true, then the conclusion--that the universe has a cause--must be true. The question, then, is what (or who) brought the universe into being? This is scientifically unanswerable, since the beginning of the universe would mean the beginning of physical time and space. So whatever created the universe would have to be atemporal and nonphysical. From there, it could also be argued that the cause must have been a personal agent endowed with freedom of the will. For a further discussion of the nature of the cause, see section 3 of an old paper I

hosted under pseudonym here: http://www.tektonics.org/guest/kalamber.doc

In short, in an argument like this, God is not inferred based on what we don't know, but on what we do.

[Enemy of Philosophical Naturalism & Disciple of William Lane Craig, Ph.D Ph.D.]

Panzerscrap ▾ 8 years ago #56

For instance, belief in the resurrected Jesus was treated as a concrete event for all to investigate, not something accepted on "faith" as it is (mis)understood today.

Not sure if this is entirely true. The documented account of the event in question was not written for approximately 40 years after it allegedly took place. A “concrete event for all to investigate” would be something like the existence of World War II. Even a cursory investigation at world history would verify the existence of such an event. Investigation into an event without any previous precedent (the dead rising) would lead the rational to conclude that such an extraordinary claim could realistically be dismissed without significant evidence. The “resurrected Jesus,” in the context of the 1st century, was proclaimed as an actual event by those who believed it happened, who expected future followers to believe it. Why would they believe it? Was there concrete evidence that it occurred? No, there wasn’t then, and there still isn’t now. Those who choose to accept it as truth have but one avenue: blind faith. You have thus far failed to differentiate why acceptance of unprecedented supernatural events is as rational as acceptance of scientific or concrete historical events.

Maze1125 ▾ 8 years ago #57

If the two premises are true,

This would be the key sentence in your post.

CS_Goodman_ ▾ 8 years ago #58

Not sure if this is entirely true. The documented account of the event in question was not written for approximately 40 years after it allegedly took place.

Before they were written down, accounts of the event were passed along via an oral tradition. This was widespread, and seeing as much of the populace was illiterate at the time, not to mention the difficulty of acquiring material for writing--highly effective.

Investigation into an event without any previous precedent (the dead rising) would lead the rational to conclude that such an extraordinary claim could realistically be dismissed without significant evidence.

The evidence must have been there, though, otherwise the new religion wouldn't have garnered so many followers, and the apostles wouldn't have continually told people to investigate their claims for themselves. Some pieces of evidence include, in order, Jesus' burial, the discovery of his empty tomb, claims to have seen Jesus alive, and the original disciples' conviction that Jesus rose from the dead, despite their having every predisposition to the contrary.

The “resurrected Jesus,” in the context of the 1st century, was proclaimed as an actual event by those who believed it happened,

And why did they believe it happened? There certainly wasn't much motivation to. Their leader was dead, and Jews had no conception of a Messiah who would be shamefully executed as a criminal. Further, Jewish belief precluded

anyone rising from the dead before the general resurrection at the end of the world. So what caused them to believe in the resurrection so strongly that they were willing to die for the truth of that belief?

Why would they believe it?

Indeed. Why?

Was there concrete evidence that it occurred? No, there wasn't then, and there still isn't now. Those who choose to accept it as truth have but one avenue: blind faith.

"Blind faith" is possibly one of the most outlandish hypothesises I've ever heard to explain belief in the resurrection. Not only is the 20th century Western concept of "blind faith" blatantly anachronistic, but unless there was some meat behind the resurrection, no sane person would have stood for the persecution and social ostracization that belief in it would bring them.

[Enemy of Philosophical Naturalism & Disciple of William Lane Craig, Ph.D Ph.D.]

disco_inferno 8 years ago #59

Minister or whatever religious official, is it true that only priest socks are black and every other "black sock" is really very, very dark blue? Why has everyone ignored me?

Playing for fun doesn't make you a loser, it makes you the winner no matter what.
Vice President of the PAL Gamers Organisation

CS_Goodman_ 8 years ago #60

This would be the key sentence in your post.

Key for the argument to go through, which wasn't the primary concern of my post. *That* was simply to demonstrate how the inference to God works.

All that said, feel free to dispute the premises.

[Enemy of Philosophical Naturalism & Disciple of William Lane Craig, Ph.D Ph.D.]

Panzerscrap 8 years ago #61

The evidence must have been there, though, otherwise the new religion wouldn't have garnered so many followers,

The same can be said, with exactly identical conviction, of *any* supernatural claim. Did Vishnu, as Varaha, really defeat Hiranyaksha to save the world from apparent oblivion? Many Hindus throughout history would say that He did. Rationally speaking, there are several explanations for such a tale: either it really occurred, or it is a cultural legend that gained momentum, bolstered by "authorities" who felt it best encapsulated themes of early Hindu philosophy. I would argue for the latter.

The resurrection of Jesus, likewise, has many possible explanations. I can quickly come up with two conflicting ideas. Either it really happened, making Jesus the only known human to survive absolute death. Or, it did not happen, but the optimism of Jewish followers of his ministry heard legends that it had occurred, spread by the same fervency that leads modern people to belief Mary appearing on a piece of burnt toast, accounts of angels guiding

troubled people to safety, or even astrological prediction. Other parties heard this resurrection myth and given the fact that such an event was so core to their historical belief system, they chose to accept it.

This leads me to ponder: which of these scenarios has historical, scientific, or logical precedent? Miraculous resurrection, divine parentage, and mystical powers precede Jesus' life in the form of various mythological systems only. Whereas the willingness to accept a legend that would fulfill the beliefs of an oppressed people has massive, easily confirmed historical precedent. Rational favors parsimony. If you want to believe that Jesus' case was the exception, that is called faith.

Maze1125 ▾ 8 years ago #62

All that said, feel free to dispute the premises.

Very well.
I dispute the premises.

Master_of_Light ▾ 8 years ago #63

People who diss people's religions, and people who try to force their beliefs unto others should really learn to keep it to themselves. We don't want any more holy wars.

Call me Light. It's short and simple.
Ligers? On *my* landship?

DrScuttles ▾ 8 years ago #64

Minister or whatever religious official, is it true that only priest socks are black and every other "black sock" is really very, very dark blue?

Speaking as a Minister of the ULC, I can indeed confirm this. My socks are indeed black as mindnight, wheras my neighbours are an 11pm blue.

"A... shoe store."

CS_Goodman_ ▾ 8 years ago #65

The resurrection of Jesus, likewise, has many possible explanations. I can quickly come up with two conflicting ideas. Either it really happened, making Jesus the only known human to survive absolute death. Or, it did not happen, but the optimism of Jewish followers of his ministry heard legends that it had occurred, spread by the same fervency that leads modern people to belief Mary appearing on a piece of burnt toast, accounts of angels guiding troubled people to safety, or even astrological prediction. Other parties heard this resurrection myth and given the fact that such an event was so core to their historical belief system, they chose to accept it.

Tis' a nice secular fantasy, but one that ignores decades of social science and anthropological research.

Additionally, it just doesn't make any sense: directly following Jesus' death, there were no ministries, there *certainly* wasn't any optimism (your leader was just executed in the most humiliating way possible), and the resurrection was a wholly unanticipated event that went against virtually every extant belief system of the time.

If you want to believe that Jesus' case was the exception,

What would Jesus' resurrection be the exception to?

[Enemy of Philosophical Naturalism & Disciple of William Lane Craig, Ph.D Ph.D.]

Maze1125 8 years ago #66

Seeing as you're ignoring me (or you don't understand the meaning of the word 'dispute' and so think I was trolling) I'm going to say it again.
I dispute these two premises, the second one in particular:
whatever begins to exist has a cause; the universe began to exist;

Please provide your proof of them.

Panzerscrap 8 years ago #67

... decades of social science and anthropological research.

Let's make sure we're on the same page here... the historicity of Jesus' very existence is sometimes called into question, though even I question the validity of such claims. Are you insinuating that mainstream non-Christian historians are certain that Jesus rose from the dead? The only people who can "confirm" the resurrection of Jesus are those who have faith that he did indeed, resurrect.

What would Jesus' resurrection be the exception to?

What would it be the exception to? That's simple: that "death" is the medical state a human is in when the brain ceases electrical activity. You are seemingly claiming, and correct me if I am wrong, that this man was fully "dead," that is, he experienced days of complete nervous system inactivity, but then was *not dead?* With the number of human beings that have died at about 100 billion, you do not see that claiming that one man came back from it can be considered an exception?

That's analogous to saying that I know of one cloud hovering above Nova Scotia that can be walked upon as though it were solid ground. Knowing what you know of water vapor, and the astronomical number clouds that have ever existed, you would likely have reason to doubt my claim.

Panzerscrap 8 years ago #68

Rereading my last post, I wish not to retract my rebuttal, but just to clarify what I perceive to be agression of tone. I did not mean to be cynical in any way. I am finding myself in great respect of you, CSGoodman, even though our views clash in this matter. You are well spoken with finely formed arguments, and your de facto "mentor," Dr. Craig, is a formidable philosopher.

Basically, what I am saying is, I hope no ill will or anger is present in my writing, since I enjoy a good debate, especially with a worthy opponent.

AlexPenev 8 years ago #69

[This message was deleted at the request of the original poster]

AlexPenev 8 years ago #70

>*From there, it could also be argued that the cause must have been a personal agent endowed with freedom of the will.*
"If" the premises were true, it means the universe had a cause. That's all we can conclude. That this cause had free-will and put life on this planet (or is even around today) don't quite seem to follow.
The reason for Maze questioning the "if", I think, is because you can't demonstrate they're true, and the ensuing argument was based on them. We have to take it as an axiom that everything is caused, incl the universe. But then don't we instantly break that axiom by introducing an uncaused agent?

>*The evidence must have been there, though, otherwise the new religion wouldn't have garnered so many followers*.
Does this mean every big religion is based on evidence because they wouldn't have garnered followers otherwise? Which ones are right and which are wrong?

>*pieces of evidence include, in order, Jesus' burial, the discovery of his empty tomb, claims to have seen Jesus alive, and the original disciples' conviction that Jesus rose from the dead*
Fair enough, but I don't see what this proves about the universe. So far we have "a man died, his body went missing". Nothing special so far. Next we have "some claim to have seen him", which could be said for Elvis. Then we have "2000 years ago, some folks were really sure he rose again". We have to take their word on that last one, but isn't it still just circumstantial evidence? If it wasn't for the Bible linking the two, it wouldn't have even hit me that this is related to the creation of the universe.
---
chown -R me ~you/base*

CS_Goodman_ 8 years ago #71

MazeofaMind: *Seeing as you're ignoring me (or you don't understand the meaning of the word 'dispute' and so think I was trolling) I'm going to say it again.*
I dispute these two premises, the second one in particular:
whatever begins to exist has a cause; the universe began to exist;

Please provide your proof of them.

Don't assume I'm ignoring you. I'm a busy guy.

Evidence for the premises has already been provided in the link.

Panzerscrap: *Let's make sure we're on the same page here... the historicity of Jesus' very existence is sometimes called into question, though even I question the validity of such claims. Are you insinuating that mainstream non-Christian historians are certain that Jesus rose from the dead? The only people who can "confirm" the resurrection of Jesus are those who have faith that he did indeed, resurrect.*

Ah, I see we are not on the same page. There I was referring to the fallacy of assuming that society in the Ancient Near East was like our own, one I detected when you wrote ". . . spread by the same fervency that leads modern people to belief Mary appearing on a piece of burnt toast, accounts of angels guiding troubled people to safety, or even astrological prediction."

What would it be the exception to? That's simple: that "death" is the medical state a human is in when the brain ceases electrical activity. You are seemingly claiming, and correct me if I am wrong, that this man was fully "dead," that is, he experienced days of complete nervous system inactivity, but then was not dead? With the number of human beings that have died at about 100 billion, you do not see that claiming that one man came back from it can be considered an exception?

What if I said I agreed with all of the above post, yet still disagree that Jesus' resurrection can be considered an exception?

Rereading my last post, I wish not to retract my rebuttal, but just to clarify what I perceive to be agression of tone. I did not mean to be cynical in any way. I am finding myself in great respect of you, CSGoodman, even though our views clash in this matter. You are well spoken with finely formed arguments, and your de facto "mentor," Dr. Craig, is a formidable philosopher.

Likewise. You strike me as being a sincere and thoughtful person, and may I suggest you take my own acerbic tone/wit with a grain of salt.

If you enjoy a good debate, allow me to recommend theologyweb (temporarily down in honor of a member's recent death). Good for those occasional ... cravings.

[Enemy of Philosophical Naturalism & Disciple of William Lane Craig, Ph.D Ph.D.]

CaptainDumass ▾ 8 years ago #72

ok **** the religion BS argument, this was started about rosilina being a muslim, and some of us dont understand how that works and we want to be enlightened.

by the way, who cares if you belive in some guy who can do what ever and some dont! your the person trying to push a religion on someone and that makes you a fascist (thats a bad thing)
---
i like pi

CS_Goodman_ ▾ 8 years ago #73

AlexPenev: *"If" the premises were true, it means the universe had a cause. That's all we can conclude. That this cause had free-will and put life on this planet (or is even around today) don't quite seem to follow.*

It doesn't properly follow from the premises, true. Rather, it's an inference based on them: we've arrived at "the universe has a cause," so what was that cause like?

The reason for Maze questioning the "if", I think, is because you can't demonstrate they're true, and the ensuing argument was based on them. We have to take it as an axiom that everything is caused, incl the universe. But then don't we instantly break that axiom by introducing an uncaused agent?

In a previous post I linked to where I discuss the argument in detail. Arguments for each of the premises are presented at length there. That said, the postulate of an uncaused agent doesn't violate the first premise, since it says everything that *begins to exist* has a cause, as opposed to "everything has a cause."

Does this mean every big religion is based on evidence because they wouldn't have garnered followers otherwise? Which ones are right and which are wrong?

No. Only religions that faced a similar predicament to that of Christianity in the 1st century. Christianity was in a position where, were it not based on something tangible, it simply wouldn't have flourished. If it puts things in any perspective, a friend of mine once wrote a piece on the beginning of Christianity (sub)titled "How *Not* to Start an Ancient Religion". If Christianity wanted to be successful, it made all the wrong moves.

Fair enough, but I don't see what this proves about the universe. So far we have "a man died, his body went missing". Nothing special so far. Next we have "some claim to have seen him", which could be said for Elvis. Then we have "2000 years ago, some folks were really sure he rose again". We have to take their word on that last one, but isn't it still just circumstantial evidence? If it wasn't for the Bible linking the two, it wouldn't have even hit me that this is related to the creation of the universe.

Oh. This isn't related; it's a separate argument.

[Enemy of Philosophical Naturalism & Disciple of William Lane Craig, Ph.D Ph.D.]

disco_inferno ▾ 8 years ago #74

What about Buddhism: It has no God but is still a religion (even though the founder described it as a prescription) is there a way to disprove it's ideology? I think not.

I think The Bible was misinterpreted and was really only mean to be a guide to live a good life using metaphor and not to spread the belief of a God
---
Playing for fun doesn't make you a loser, it makes you the winner no matter what.
Vice President of the PAL Gamers Organisation

Maze1125 ▾ 8 years ago #75

Okay I've seen the link now and I argue that neither of these are necessarily true:
1. An actual infinite cannot exist.
2. An infinite temporal regress of events is an actual infinite.

1. His entire argument is about saying that an actual infinite is absurd, but he never ever explains why. Yes he uses infinite set theory correctly, but I argue that the apparent absurdity of the results is merely an illusion caused by his lack of understanding of infinity, not his lack of understanding of infinite set theory, but a lack of understanding the actual concept of infinity. Which, to be fair, almost no-one understands, even the mathematicians that work with it. (And no I'm not saying that **I** understand it either.)

2. His arguments are based on this statement: "But the past is acquired and realized." Which is absolute rubbish that is based on a very naive understanding of time. Time is not a order of events. Time is a dimension. You can move either way through it, the fact that it seems we are only moving one way is irrelevant.
In fact I would argue that it's the *future* that is "acquired and realized" not the past.
Take John Conway' Game of Life: Take an arrangement from a game that has been running for an indeterminate number of turns, then the future of that game is certain, that same set-up will always lead to the same results, every time. **But** there are thousands of different ways that the set-up we had could have been produced. An example would be a 2x2 cube in the game, that will stay a cube forever, but the cube could have been produced by any of the three 'L' shapes you get by removing one of the cube's points, and that 'L' shape could have made the cube any number of turns ago.

The same is true of our world, even with Chaos Theory, there are infinitely more ways that the universe could have reached the state it is in now than there are ways that it can go in the future.

The future is far more determined than the past and as time is a dimension teh past can be just as much a 'potential' infinity as the future.

John Conway's Game of Life: http://www.bitstorm.org/gameoflife/

CS_Goodman_ 8 years ago #76

Maze: *1. His entire argument is about saying that an actual infinite is absurd,*

That's one of three arguments, actually.

but he never ever explains why.

Thought I spent a fair amount of space explaining why: the actual infinite, when transposed into the physical realm, results in absurdities, even contradictions. So in the absence of any good, independent reason to accept its existence in the real world, we ought to submit to metaphysical parsimony and reject it.

Yes he uses infinite set theory correctly, but I argue that the apparent absurdity of the results is merely an illusion caused by his lack of understanding of infinity, not his lack of understanding of infinite set theory, but a lack of understanding the actual concept of infinity. Which, to be fair, almost no-one understands, even the mathematicians that work with it. (And no I'm not saying that I understand it either.)

Infinite set theory is a branch of mathematics that studies and refines the concept of infinity, and, being the foundation for much of modern mathematics, it should come as no surprise that it's a very well understood field. The reason we recognize the actual infinite to possess absurd properties is precisely because we do understand it.

2. His arguments are based on this statement: "But the past is acquired and realized." Which is absolute rubbish that is based on a very naive understanding of time. Time is not a order of events. Time is a dimension. You can move either way through it, the fact that it seems we are only moving one way is irrelevant.

Actually, that particular argument could go through even if the quoted statement were false--*particularly* if time is static, as you believe. However, because I reject the static/dimensionalist view of time, I tried to square it with my own--which is what that quote was about.

[Enemy of Philosophical Naturalism & Disciple of William Lane Craig, Ph.D Ph.D.]

Maze1125 8 years ago #77

Thought I spent a fair amount of space explaining why: the actual infinite, when transposed into the physical realm, results in absurdities, even contradictions. So in the absence of any good, independent reason to accept its existence in the real world, we ought to submit to metaphysical parsimony and reject it.

Appeal to ridicule is a logical fallacy and if you understand infinity, it produces no contradictions in the real world.

Infinite set theory is a branch of mathematics that studies and refines the concept of infinity, and, being the foundation for much of modern mathematics, it should come as no surprise that it's a very well understood field. The reason we recognize the actual infinite to possess absurd properties is precisely because we do understand it.

There is a difference between being able to manipulate infinity and actually understanding it.

And good job deleting the entire part of my post explaining how the past was more of a 'potential' infinie than the future.

coolblue16 8 years ago #78

"Are you sure you want to make that argument to a qualified philosopher of religion?"

Why? do you know one?

I hate it when people with no discernible talent become popular and famous.
glares at Hannah Montana

DSDUDE08 8 years ago #79

Someone please stop this topic
Mario Galaxy was NOT! created to cause these types of arguments
---
Metroid is Better than Halo, everyone knows it
Don't beleive me? Check out the reviews for super metroid, prime 1 and prime 3

starmetroid 8 years ago #80

Master_of_Light posted...
People who diss people's religions, and people who try to force their beliefs unto others should really learn to keep it to themselves. We don't want any more holy wars.

Call me Light. It's short and simple.
Ligers? On my landship?

silly boy, this is gamespot people don't listen to reason here

I agree with you though

Zorc_N_Pals 8 years ago #81

"Are you sure you want to make that argument to a qualified philosopher of religion?"

Why? do you know one?

LMFAO!!! No offense to the quotee, but, "OWNED!!!"

this is gamespot

Gamespot...

THIS. IS. GAMEFAQS!!!!!!!

(kicks starmetroid into a black hole)

---
*Sports and most driving games SUCK ASS. If I wanted to spend $50 on sports every ****ing year, I'd buy a ticket to a game.* ~peteyboo

Around the Web

This Impressive Dishonored Video Is Stylishly Violent

Amiibo Figures Reach New Shipment Milestone, Best-Selling Toys Revealed

If Square Enix Designed Batman as a Spartan Warrior, He Might Look Like This

Ultra Street Fighter IV Halloween Costume Packs Revealed

Explosive Cryptocurrency Overtaking the Dollar?
Wall Street Daily
Sponsored

Free Live, Interactive Webinar
Rich Dad Webinars
Sponsored

Learn more Powered by for you

More topics from this board...			
Worst Purple Coin Mission?	GuardianKirby64	24	11/16 12:41AM
Which Galaxy game was better in your opinion?	GuardianKirby64	23	11/15 6:33PM
Worst Comets(Spoilers)	awesomesause	5	11/15 8:05AM
The Official Super Mario Galaxy Guide	GameDesignerSage	288	7/27 8:47AM

facebook.com/GFAQs twitter.com/GameFAQs Help / Contact Us Change Colors

gamespot.com giantbomb.com metacritic.com gamerankings.com

© 2015 CBS Interactive Inc. All rights reserved. Sitemap Advertise Privacy Policy Ad Choice Terms of Use