

All judgments about the truth of a religion or religions must be a posteriori, not a priori. By this I mean, not that the arguments supporting the judgments must be only, or even primarily, empirical rather than metaphysical arguments, but rather that the judgments have to be supported somehow by logically appropriate arguments, empirical or metaphysical, instead of being made entirely without any supporting argument.

But to maintain thus, that all judgments about religious truth must be supported by appropriate arguments, is also to hold that there is a sense in which all religions are indeed to be treated equally—pending, namely, the inquiry by which their respective claims to truth can alone be validated and judgments about their truth supported by appropriate arguments.

4 November 1989; rev. 3 September 2003