

Review of: "Integrating Afterlife Beliefs of Christianity, Hinduism, Buddhism, and Shintoism Through the Cyclic Universe Model: A Multidisciplinary Approach with Practical Implications for Mental Health and Caregiving Professions"

Jaco Beyers¹

1 Religion Studies, University of Pretoria, South Africa

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The authors must be congratulated on a well-structured and well-written article. Recent and relevant sources are used in order to build a coherent argument. The conclusion follows logically from the argumentation. There is a clear goal for the study, and the article maintains a strong focus on the problem at hand.

The conclusion and process of reaching the conclusion illustrate one of several possible ways in which the relation between science and religion can be viewed. There is the animosity position, where science and religion are perceived to destroy one another by proving the other as invalid. There is the indifference position, which allows for the autonomous and peaceful co-existence of science and religion. According to this position, science and religion have their own domains and should stick to them. Interference on the terrain of the other is perceived as playing one game according to the rule book of another game (like playing football on a tennis court). The implication is that science and religion should be kept apart, allowing each to function on their own distinct terrain. The third position is what we find evidence of in this article: the reconciling position. This position tries to argue the relativity of differences while emphasising the similarities between science and religion. The result may be an over-simplification of the relationship between science and religion based on superficial similarities.

Although a reader may be convinced about the validity of a different model of the relationship between science and religion than the one the authors of this article hold, one has to respect the attempt made in this article to reconcile science and religion. It does provide food for thought.

Qeios ID: 7GMF6A · https://doi.org/10.32388/7GMF6A