

1 Theological Society and the Wesleyan Theological Society, though Lewis was neither an
2 evangelical nor a Wesleyan. In the book *Indelible Ink: 22 Prominent Christian Leaders*
3 *Discuss the Books That Shape Their Faith* (WaterBook Press, 2003), General Editor Scott
4 Larsen puts *Mere Christianity* as the top book and Lewis as the top Christian author with
5 Lewis mentioned more than three times more frequently than the next author Fyodor
6 Dostoyevsky.¹

7 In his numerous books, Lewis addresses a variety of topics in the philosophy of
8 religion and philosophical theology, including the argument from desire, a moral
9 argument for God's existence, an argument from reason for God's existence, the
10 problem of evil, the incarnation, the atonement, and the trinity. While Lewis makes
11 many interesting points about each of these topics, I wish to concentrate on his moral
12 argument, as presented in *Mere Christianity*. Although Lewis's version of the moral
13 argument for God's existence is far from the most sophisticated version available, it has
14 been and continues to be enormously popular, arguably the most popular of any of
15 Lewis's arguments for the existence of God.

16 Before we begin, it is worth highlighting a few issues on which we do agree. First,
17 I agree that if a nontheist asks, "Why should I believe that God exists?", it is not enough
18 to be told, "Because the Bible says so." In Lewis's words, "We are not taking anything
19 from the Bible or the Churches, we are trying to see what we can find out about this
20 Somebody on our own steam."² Second, I agree that a rational person bases his or her
21 beliefs on reason and evidence (138). Third, I agree that no one should "accept
22 Christianity if his best reasoning tells him that the weight of the evidence is against it"
23 (140). Fourth, I agree that morality does not seem to be a matter of taste or opinion (3-

¹ Joel D. Heck, "Mere Christianity: Uncommon Truth in Common Language" *C.S. Lewis: Life, Works, and Legacy* (ed. Bruce Edwards, Praeger Publishers, 2007), 51-73. Also available at [Joel Heck's C.S. Lewis Site](http://www.joelheck.com/resources/Uncommon%20Truth%20in%20Common%20Language.pdf) (2007), <http://www.joelheck.com/resources/Uncommon%20Truth%20in%20Common%20Language.pdf>.

² C.S. Lewis, *Mere Christianity* (1952, San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2001), p. 29. Further references to this book will be given in parentheses in the text.

1 8). Fifth, I agree that the existence or nonexistence of God does have consequences for
2 both ethics and metaethics.

3 Despite these areas of agreement, however, we obviously disagree on a variety
4 of philosophical issues. For example, although I believe that God's existence or
5 nonexistence has consequences for ethics and metaethics, my list of those
6 consequences is different from Lewis's. I maintain that an objective morality, by itself,
7 does not undermine materialism.

8 I can certainly understand why many people believe morality cannot be
9 objective without God. First, many famous atheists (e.g., Mackie, Sartre, Nietzsche) have
10 said so. Second, many atheists have said morality is not objective (e.g., Hume, Dawkins,
11 etc.).³ While these atheists give some independent reasons for this position—i.e.,
12 reasons not based on atheism—they are still atheists.⁴ Third, many people believe that
13 moral laws require a moral lawgiver. Understandably, many people have concluded that
14 if atheism is true, there is no moral lawgiver.

15 Nevertheless, it seems to me that Lewis's moral argument is hasty, and I think it
16 can be shown that he has failed to provide a sound or strong argument for God's
17 existence. I wish to emphasize, however, that none of my remarks are intended to be
18 critical of Lewis himself. On the contrary, I admire his commitment to reason and
19 especially his considerable literary talents. (I have fond memories of reading and re-
20 reading Lewis's *Chronicles of Narnia* as a child.) Nevertheless, as someone who is
21 interested in the truth, Lewis himself would want to know if any of his reasons for belief

³ Presumably, those atheists in the first group are also members of the second group, though it's possible to be in the second group but not the first since it's possible to think morality is not objective whether or not God exists.

⁴ To be precise, those atheists who deny objective morality give various reasons; some of those reasons are independent of atheism, whereas others aren't.

1 were fallacious or invalid. In a spirit of open-mindedness, then, let us consider Lewis's
2 argument.

3 **2. Lewis's Argument**

4 Let us turn now to a presentation of Lewis's moral argument for God's existence.
5 In his book *Mere Christianity*, Lewis presents his case for the truth of "mere
6 Christianity," Lewis's term for the core set of beliefs shared by *all* orthodox Christians,
7 despite their doctrinal differences. He recognizes that a complete case for Christianity
8 must include a case for God's existence. For this reason, Lewis defends a moral
9 argument for God's existence which may be best characterized as some sort of inductive
10 argument.⁵ Despite several references to and discussions of this argument by
11 philosophers, however, no one seems to have analyzed its logical structure.⁶

12 Lewis's argument consists of two stages. Let us consider each of these two
13 stages in turn.

⁵ As noted by several commentators, e.g., David Baggett and Jerry L. Walls, *Good God: The Theistic Foundations of Morality* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 9-11; C. Stephen Evans and R. Zachary Manis, *Philosophy of Religion: Thinking About Faith* (2nd ed., Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press, 2009), 88-93; Erik J. Wielenberg, *God and the Reach of Reason: C.S. Lewis, David Hume, and Bertrand Russell* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 632-63, 77; and John Danaher, "C.S. Lewis and Mere Christianity: An Overview" *Philosophical Disquisitions* (January 7, 2010), <http://philosophicaldisquisitions.blogspot.com/2010/01/cs-lewis-and-mere-christianity-overview.html>. Thanks to Victor Reppert for making me aware of Evans' and Manis's book.

⁶ In addition to the references in note 4, cf. John Beversluis, *C.S. Lewis and the Search for Rational Religion* (2nd ed., Buffalo: Prometheus, 2007), 81-109; Richard Purtill, *C.S. Lewis' Case for the Christian Faith* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2004), 33-35; Raymond Martin and Christopher Bernard, *God Matters: Readings in the Philosophy of Religion* (New York: Longman, 2003), 135-139; Scott R. Burson and Jerry L. Walls, *C.S. Lewis & Francis Schaeffer: Lessons for a New Century from the Most Influential Apologists of Our Time* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1998), 172-176.

1 **2.1. First Stage: Lewis's Argument for the Moral Law**

2 **2.1.1. Lewis's Assessment of the Evidence for the Moral Law**

3 Let us turn to a summary of the facts that Lewis argues are evidence relevant to
4 the Moral Law. These facts may be summarized as follows.

- 5 1. Moral quarreling usually includes an appeal to "some kind of standard of
6 behaviour" (3).
- 7 2. People generally believe that "one set of moral ideas can be better than
8 another" (13).
- 9 3. As a practical matter, it is impossible to consistently deny the existence of the
10 Moral Law.

11 Let us examine each of these purported facts in detail in order to determine
12 whether they have high (> 0.5) epistemic probability and as such constitute evidence
13 that is relevant to the Moral Law. For reasons that should be clear later in this paper, it
14 will be convenient to consider this evidence in two groups: (1) evidence pertaining to
15 ordinary moral reasoning and discussion; and (2) evidence pertaining to the practical
16 inconsistency of denying the Moral Law.

17 **2.1.1.1. Ordinary Moral Reasoning and Discussion**

18 We will first consider the evidence pertaining to ordinary moral reasoning and
19 discussion. Lewis gives two examples. First, he observes that people will frequently
20 quarrel about whether a person's actions were morally wrong: the accuser will argue
21 the accused's actions violated the Moral Law, while the accused will defend himself by
22 arguing that his actions did not violate the Moral Law or, if they did, that he had some
23 special excuse (3). I shall call the former "moral condemnation" and the latter "moral
24 defense." As Lewis observes, both moral condemnation and defense would be pointless
25 unless "both parties had in mind some kind of Law or Rule of fair play or decent

1 behaviour or morality or whatever you like to call it, about which they really believed”
2 (4).

3 Lewis’s second example of how ordinary moral thinking includes moral
4 condemnation and defense is that people will frequently condemn or defend the moral
5 ideas of an entire society or culture. He observes that it is part of our ordinary moral
6 thinking that the moralities of some societies or cultures are better than others (13).
7 The commonsense notion that one set of moral ideas can be better justified than
8 another seems to imply there is some standard by which competing moral ideas can be
9 judged. Lewis argues that the truth of that standard is “independent of what people
10 think” (13). Similarly, he points out that we ordinarily believe that *moral progress* is
11 possible—that is, the moralities of societies or cultures can “grow morally better” over
12 time (13-14). Lewis concludes that the Moral Law is the standard which makes it
13 possible to evaluate human ideas about morality (14).

14 **2.1.1.2. Practical Inconsistency of Moral Subjectivists**

15 Lewis’s second item of evidence is the practical inconsistency of those who
16 profess the belief that there is no Moral Law. If such people consistently believed there
17 was no Moral Law, he argues, we would expect that they would not appeal to the Moral
18 Law. They *do* implicitly appeal to the Moral Law, however, when others commit wrongs
19 against *them*. Lewis concludes the best explanation for this inconsistency is the
20 existence of the Moral Law (6).

21 **2.1.2. Lewis’s Assessment of Alternative Explanations of the Evidence Relevant** 22 **to the Moral Law**

23 In Chapter 2, “Some Objections,” Lewis considers various objections to his
24 argument. In the process of answering these objections, he considers two alternative

1 theories to the Moral Law. Let us now examine his assessment of these alternative
2 theories.

3 **2.1.2.1. Herd Instinct**

4 C.S. Lewis compares instincts regarding mother love, reproduction, and food. By
5 “instinct,” Lewis means “a strong want or desire to act in a certain way” (9). The Moral
6 Law cannot be reduced to herd instincts, however, since feeling a desire to do X is “quite
7 different from feeling that you ought to” do X “whether you want to or not” (9).
8 Furthermore, if we have competing instincts (such as the desire to run away vs. the
9 desire to help), the Moral Law can help us decide between them. When such conflicts
10 exist, the Moral Law usually supports the *weaker* of the two instincts. Indeed, the Moral
11 Law often tells us to make the weaker instinct stronger than it is. Finally, no single
12 instinct is always in agreement with the Moral Law (9-12).

13 **2.1.2.2. Social Convention (Relativism)**

14 The social convention theory consists of two claims. First, the Moral Law is
15 simply something that humans have made up for themselves. Second, our awareness of
16 the Moral Law is due to education by our parents, schools, etc (12).

17 Lewis argues that the social convention theory does not follow from the fact that
18 people usually learn the Moral Law through education. The multiplication table is
19 something we learn in school, but it doesn’t follow that the multiplication table is a
20 human invention (12).

21 Lewis gives two reasons for thinking that the Moral Law, like mathematics, is
22 discovered, not invented. First, the moral ideas of different times and countries are
23 largely in agreement. Disagreement about the moral status of an action can be due to
24 disagreement about moral facts, non-moral facts, or both; Lewis claims that much moral

1 disagreement is due to disagreement about the non-moral facts, *not* moral facts. If
2 morality were merely a social convention, however, we would expect much more
3 disagreement than what exists, since social conventions “may differ to any extent” (13).
4 Second, ordinary moral language and common-sense moral beliefs imply there has been
5 moral progress, which requires the Moral Law (13). For these two reasons, then, Lewis
6 concludes that the social convention theory must be rejected.

7 **2.2. Second Stage: Lewis’s Assessment of Moral Phenomena as Evidence for Theism**

8 **2.2.1. Lewis’s Assessment of the Evidence for the Moral Law**

9 Let us turn to a summary of the facts that Lewis argues are evidence relevant to
10 the religious view. These facts pertain to moral ontology, moral epistemology, and
11 moral psychology. They may be summarized, respectively, as follows.

- 12 1. Human beings have moral obligations which are grounded in the Moral Law.
- 13 2. Most human beings know at least the general principles of the Moral Law.
- 14 3. Most human beings experience moral emotions related to the Moral Law, such
15 as guilt and obligation.

16 **2.2.1.1. Moral Ontology**

17 We will first consider the evidence of the Moral Law. As we have seen, the first
18 stage concludes there is a Moral Law. Lewis argues that the Moral Law is evidence of the
19 religious view. As he puts it, the source of the Moral Law “is more like a mind than it is
20 like anything else we know because after all the only thing we know is matter and you
21 can hardly imagine a bit of matter giving instructions” (25). Accordingly, Lewis concludes
22 that the materialist view must be rejected.

1 **2.2.1.2. Moral Epistemology**

2 Let us now turn to Lewis's second item of evidence, moral epistemology. As I
3 read him, Lewis makes two points.

4 First, he observes that when people quarrel about whether an action was
5 morally wrong, they talk as if they "had some sort of agreement as to what Right and
6 Wrong are" (4). Second, "people knew it by nature and did not need to be taught it" (5).

7 Lewis considers the objection based on moral disagreement, which says that
8 "different civilisations and different ages have had quite different moralities." Lewis
9 turns this objection on its head, however, by arguing that there is a high degree of
10 agreement between the fundamental moral ideas of different cultures and even of
11 different times (5-6). Lewis concludes, consequently, that the commonsense belief in
12 widespread awareness of the Moral Law is evidence of its existence.

13 **2.2.1.3. Moral Emotions**

14 Lewis's third item of evidence for the Religious view is that virtually all human
15 beings experience moral emotions, such as guilt and obligation (8, 20, 25). That Lewis
16 believed moral emotions are evidence for the religious view is suggested by the
17 following passage:

18 All I have got to is a Something which is directing the universe, and which appears in me
19 as a law urging me to do right and *making me feel responsible and uncomfortable when I*
20 *do wrong.* (25, my italics)

21 Lewis argues that if the Religious view is correct, things like moral emotions are
22 just what we would expect.

23 If there was a controlling power outside the universe, it could not show itself to us as
24 one of the facts inside the universe—no more than the architect of a house could
25 actually be a wall or staircase or fireplace in that house. The only way in which we could

1 expect it to show itself would be inside ourselves as an influence or a command trying to
2 get us to behave in a certain way. (24)

3 Lewis concludes that the Religious view is the best explanation for moral
4 emotions.

5 **2.2.2. Lewis’s Assessment of Alternative Explanations of the Evidence Relevant** 6 **to Moral Phenomena**

7 In Chapter 2, “Some Objections,” Lewis considers various objections to his
8 argument. In the process of answering these objections, he considers two alternative
9 theories to the Religious view. Let us now examine his assessment of these alternative
10 theories.

11 **2.2.1. The Materialist View**

12 As I read him, Lewis defines the “materialist view” as comprised of two claims.
13 First, the universe is both uncaused and eternal. Second, all living things, including
14 human beings, are the result of random chance. Perhaps just as important as what
15 Lewis includes in his definition of materialism is what he excludes. Lewis does not argue,
16 at least in *Mere Christianity*, that materialism entails that physical matter is all that
17 exists. Lewisian materialism, so defined, thus appears to be logically compatible with the
18 view that abstract entities exist.

19 Lewis observes that we find “inside ourselves ... [an] influence or a command
20 trying to get us to behave in a certain way.” He argues this is evidence favoring the
21 Religious view over the materialist view. If the Religious view is true, this is just what we
22 would expect, since the “only way” the “controlling power outside the universe” could
23 show itself to us would be “as an influence or a command trying to get us to behave in a
24 certain way” (24). If the materialist view is true, however, the evidence of the Moral Law
25 is very surprising. According to Lewis, the source of the Moral Law “is more like a mind

1 than it is like anything else we know because after all the only other thing we know is
2 matter and you can hardly imagine a bit of matter giving instructions” (25). Accordingly,
3 Lewis concludes that the materialist view must be rejected.

4 **2.2.2. The Life-Force View**

5 In a short note written after the original broadcast of “Mere Christianity” on the
6 radio, Lewis considers and rejects a third view (or pseudo view?), which he calls the
7 “Life-Force philosophy” (26). Lewis defines the Life-Force view as the view that the
8 evolution of life “were not due to chance but to the ‘striving’ or ‘purposiveness’ of a
9 Life-Force” (26). Lewis argues, however, that this view is ambiguous on whether the
10 Life-Force has a mind or not. If the striving or purposiveness of the Life-Force has a
11 mind, then the Life-Force view reduces to the Religious view. If, however, the Life-Force
12 does not have a mind, then it is inexplicable (if not incoherent) that “something without
13 a mind ‘strives’ or has ‘purposes’” (26).

14 **3. A Formal Analysis of Lewis’s Moral Argument**

15 **3.1. First Stage: A Formal Analysis of Lewis’s Argument for the Moral Law**

16 Let us now turn to a formal analysis of the argument for the moral law. Lewis
17 presents two types of evidence in that argument. First, certain items of evidence
18 function as *puzzling* facts that need to be explained. For example, Lewis appeals to the
19 objectivist presuppositions of ordinary moral reasoning and discussion as a fact that any
20 good explanation about the nature of morality must be able to explain. He rejects the
21 social convention theory in part because it is unable to explain that fact. Second, other
22 items of evidence are background evidence, which influence the *explanatory power* of
23 rival theories—that is, the probability of rival theories given the evidence to be
24 explained. For example, Lewis argues that moral quarrelling and moral progress assume

1 there is an objective standard by which moral behavior and ideas can be judged. Lewis
 2 does not claim that rival theories need to explain that assumption. Rather, he argues,
 3 that assumption makes it highly unlikely on the social convention theory that ordinary
 4 moral reasoning and discussion include moral quarrelling and the idea of moral
 5 progress. Let us divide the evidence for the Moral Law, then, between background
 6 evidence and the evidence to be explained.

7 We may now reorganize the evidence for the Moral Law into B, the relevant
 8 background evidence, and E, the evidence to be explained.

9 *B: The Relevant Background Evidence*

- 10 1. Moral condemnation, justification, and progress assume that there is an
 11 objective truth of the matter.
 12 2. Moral knowledge is a necessary condition for a person to be morally responsible
 13 for their behavior.

14 *E: The Evidence to be Explained*

- 15 1. Ordinary moral reasoning and discussion include moral condemnation and
 16 defense.
 17 2. As a practical matter, it is impossible to consistently deny the existence of an
 18 objective moral law.
 19

20 These two types of evidence have two probabilistic counterparts which are
 21 useful for evaluating explanatory hypotheses: (1) the *prior probability* and (2) the
 22 *explanatory power* of a hypothesis H. (1) is a measure of how likely H is to occur based
 23 on background information B *alone*, whether or not E is true. As I understand it, Lewis's
 24 explanatory argument for the Moral Law does not address the prior probability of either
 25 the Moral Law or competing hypotheses. As for (2), this measures the ability of a
 26 hypothesis (combined with background evidence B) to *predict* (i.e., make probable) an
 27 item of evidence. For example, Lewis appeals to B1 and the supposition that the social
 28 convention theory is true to show it is inexplicable that ordinary moral reasoning and

1 discussion include, rather than exclude, moral progress (13). In other words, Lewis
2 argues that the social convention theory has weak explanatory power.

3 We are now in a position to formally state Lewis's argument for the Moral Law:

4 (1.) The evidence relevant to the Moral Law theory is known to be true.

5 (2.) The herd instinct theory has weak explanatory power.

6 (3.) The social convention theory has weak explanatory power.

7 (4.) The Moral Law theory has strong explanatory power.

8 (5.) Therefore, it is epistemically probable that the Moral Law exists.

9

10 Now that the argument for the Moral Law has been formally stated, we may
11 analyze the argument using insights from probability theory. Let us proceed, then, to a
12 probabilistic analysis of the argument. We begin with some basic notation. Again, B is
13 our background evidence and E is the evidence to be explained. H represents an
14 explanatory hypothesis. A_i are the alternative explanatory hypotheses to H .

15 Let us begin by defining the following conditional probabilities.

16 $\Pr(H / B)$ = the *prior probability* of H with respect to B —a measure of how likely H is to
17 occur at all, whether or not E is true,

18 $\Pr(H / E \ \& \ B)$ = the *final probability* that H is true conditional upon the total evidence B
19 and E ,

20 $\Pr(E / H \ \& \ B)$ = the *explanatory power* of H —a measure of the degree to which the
21 hypothesis H predicts the data E given B .

22 $\Pr(E / A_i \ \& \ B)$ = the *explanatory power* of A_i —a measure of the degree to which A_i
23 predicts E given B .

1 Turning to Lewis’s argument for the Moral Law, let **ML** be the Moral Law theory;
 2 A_H be the herd instinct theory; and A_C be the social convention theory. We are now in a
 3 position to restate the explanatory argument for the Moral Law in probabilistic terms:

- 4 (1'.) $\Pr(E) \gg 0.5$.
 5 (2'.) $\Pr(E/B \ \& \ A_H) \ll 0.5$.
 6 (3'.) $\Pr(E/B \ \& \ A_C) \ll 0.5$.
 7 (4'.) $\Pr(E/B \ \& \ \mathbf{ML}) \gg 0.5$.

 8 (5'.) $\Pr(\mathbf{ML}) > 0.5$.

9

10 **3.2. Second Stage: A Formal Analysis of Lewis’s Argument to the Religious View**

11 Let us now turn to a formal analysis of the argument for the moral law. As was
 12 the case in the first stage, Lewis presents two types of evidence in that argument: items
 13 of background evidence and items of evidence which function as *puzzling* facts that
 14 need to be explained. Let us divide the evidence for the Religious View, then, into these
 15 two categories.

16 ***B: The Relevant Background Information***

- 17 1. The materialist view entails that there is no Mind “behind” the universe (i.e.,
 18 there is no Creator). The universe itself, as well as all the creatures inside it
 19 (including humans), are not the effect of a supernatural First Cause or intelligent
 20 Designer. (21-22)
 21 2. The Religious view entails that there is a Mind “behind” the universe (i.e., there
 22 is a Creator who is conscious, has purposes, and preferences). This Mind created
 23 and designed the universe partly to produce creatures that, like It, have minds.
 24 (22)
 25 3. A Mind “behind” the universe could reveal Its existence to us by trying to get us
 26 to behave in a certain way. (24)

27 ***E: The Evidence to be Explained***

- 1 1. Human beings have moral obligations which are grounded in the Moral Law.
 2 [conclusion of argument's First Stage]
 3 2. Most human beings know at least the general principles of the Moral Law. (4-5)
 4 3. Most human beings experience moral emotions related to the Moral Law, such
 5 as guilt and obligation. (8, 20, 25)
 6

7 We are now in a position to formally state Lewis's argument for the Religious
 8 view:

- 9 (1) The evidence relevant to the Religious view is known to be true.
 10 (2) The materialist view has weak explanatory power.
 11 (3) The Religious view has strong explanatory power.
 12 (4) The materialist view and the Religious view are the only two explanations.
 13 (5) So, the Religious view is the best explanation of the relevant evidence.
 14

 (6) Therefore, it is epistemically probable that the religious view is true.

15 Let **R** be the Religious view and A_M be the materialist view. We are now in a
 16 position to restate the explanatory argument for the Religious view in probabilistic
 17 terms:

- 18 (1') $\Pr(B \ \& \ E)$ is close to 1.
 19 (2') $\Pr(E \mid B \ \& \ A_M) \ll 0.5$.
 20 (3') $\Pr(E \mid B \ \& \ \mathbf{R}) \gg 0.5$.
 21 (4') $\Pr(E \mid B \ \& \ A_M) + \Pr(E \mid B \ \& \ \mathbf{R}) = 1$.
 22 (5') $\Pr(\mathbf{R} \mid B \ \& \ E) > 0.5$.
 23

 (6') $\Pr(\mathbf{R}) > 0.5$.

1 3.3. Objections to These Formulations

2 Finally, I wish to end this section with a response to two objections noted by
3 reviewers of an earlier version of this paper.

4 First, one reviewer wondered whether Lewis intended his moral argument to be
5 a stand-alone argument, as the above formulation suggests, or as part of a cumulative
6 case argument. While someone could formulate a cumulative case for theism by
7 combining Lewis's moral argument with his other theistic arguments found in other
8 works, Lewis's presentation of his argument in *Mere Christianity* gives every appearance
9 of the argument as being a stand-alone argument. It is therefore entirely appropriate to
10 evaluate it as such.

11 Second, a reviewer correctly noted that it is controversial to assume that an
12 explanatory argument, such as Lewis's, can or should be represented as a Bayesian
13 argument, as opposed to an inference to the best explanation (IBE). I acknowledge the
14 point; a full defense of the restatement of Lewis's argument in Bayesian terms is beyond
15 the scope of the paper. In response, I would note the following points, defended in
16 detail by Robert Greg Cavin elsewhere, but paraphrased here. (i) Bayes' Theorem is the
17 immediate consequence of four fundamental principles governing rational belief that
18 are as innocuous as anyone could ever hope to find, *viz.*, the four axioms of the
19 probability calculus...⁷ (ii) The result of denying these axioms—and, in particular, Bayes'
20 Theorem—would be disastrous.⁸ (iii) Although Bayes' Theorem is useful because it
21 clearly displays the structural defects lying at the heart of Lewis's moral argument, it is
22 ultimately dispensable.⁹

⁷ Cf. Cavin <insert reference here>.

⁸ Cf. Cavin <insert reference here>.

⁹ Cf. Cavin <insert reference here>.

1 *(to be continued....)*