

Review of: "The Near-Death Experience and the Question of Immortality: A Philosophical Approach"

Hamidreza Ayatollahy

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The article is about an important topic that requires many philosophical and religious discussions.

Unfortunately, the article is very weak in terms of arguments and coherence of the content, and the answer to the main question of the article.

A small part of the article has tried to deal with a philosophical approach, while the rest of the content is a citation of various viewpoints and numerous examples of NDEs. Then the author has selected a special group who were of the same opinion as the author and brought their scattered views. In its philosophical section, the article is a retelling of different points of view, not a philosophical evaluation.

The following flaws are seen in the article:

1. The author is trying to examine the specific views of the near-death experience, which are very different, and these empiricists emphasize their differences in terms of the content of their statements. The main issue is not whether what they have seen as reality is exactly the same as real knowledge or not, but whether one can derive a reason for that specific case from the criteria of knowledge, i.e., true justified belief. The main issue is whether it can be concluded from the various types of these reports that life after death is a reality or not. Certain reports are subject to a variety of expressional, interpretative, and referential ambiguities that I have carefully explained in another article. But the main core of these types of reports refers to life after death for several reasons. The author should examine this issue and state if there is a problem with it from a philosophical point of view.
2. Unfortunately, the author brings up the issue of God in his words and fanatically considers it an illusion and a mental concept that cannot have any referent. He brings this subject to the discussion without any reason, which is an unnecessary induction of a subject through dictatorship, which is not acceptable.
3. The author has given every theological discussion that came to his mind inside this article. For example, it is not clear what the discussion of the relationship between God and time has to do with the discussion of near-death experiences and the immortality of the soul. Regardless of believing in God or not believing in God, is it not possible to discuss the position of the immortality of the soul? If the author has not been able to find an answer to other theological debates, there is no reason to overshadow another debate.
4. One of the problems of this discussion is that the immortality of the soul has been confused with the belief in the eternity of the soul or the belief in the resurrection or the belief in heaven and hell. Near-death experiences can only provide evidence for the immortality of the soul and cannot be used for other topics. And if someone has used such,

their argument is wrong and can be criticized. Therefore, instead of criticizing this view, the writer cannot deny the principle of immortality.

5. It is not clear what the lack of interest in eternal life has to do with the main problem of the article. Let's assume that eternal life is boring, but maybe there are reasons that this kind of life will be realized. What does this life have to do with the immortality of the soul?
6. The problem of many interpretations of life after death, as well as descriptions of life in the resurrection, depends on the Christian view of this issue and how it describes the resurrection. In Islamic and Quranic thinking, the characteristics of resurrection are different from the Christian point of view, and if the author had paid attention to them, he would have found a more reasonable description in this regard.
7. In any case, the article does not have the necessary standards from a scientific point of view, and its explanations are weak and unacceptable.