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

Michael French[1]

1 University of New Haven

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The author speaks about some NDEs as if they should not be respected before supporting them. It would be more effective to discuss the public discourse on NDEs at once instead of trying to bounce back and forth between questioning their validity and then supporting them.

The use and overuse of rhetorical questions allows for the opportunity to dismiss the question or disagree with the point the author wants to make. Stating the intended point would be much stronger than the many rhetorical questions used.

The analysis of the Williams (2019) quote refers to the quote as a hunch and without any basis, which is making a similar “esoteric jargon” to the author accuses Williams of using to “blind us,” which is also poor word choice. There is a repetition of calling language esoteric to appear erudite. The author uses that insult to diminish the work of others rather than addressing the issues found in the work.

On page 6, the author refers to “true knowledge” without developing what is meant by that.

Language in the paper is often metaphorical instead of purposeful.

The final part of the paper is focused on an ethical question rather than the epistemological one laid out at the beginning of the paper. It could be better to have the topics separated into two papers. The second half of the paper has little to do with the initial purpose or the relationship between NDEs and the question of immortality.