



EXCERPTS PACKAGE

Reverse Engineering the Afterlife

Brendan D. Murphy

Five passages from the manuscript—selected to give you the clearest possible sense of the book's central arguments before your conversation with Brendan.

PASSAGES IN THIS PACKAGE

1. The Afterlife Is Not a Place—Chapter 5—Heaven and Hell: Your One Stop Astral Shop
2. The CTM as the Missing Framework—Introduction
3. The Core Error: Mistaking Perception for Ontology—Chapter 9—Soul Trap
4. Cross-Tradition Convergence Without Hand-Waving—Chapter 3—The NDE: Part IV
5. The Soul Trap Reframe—Chapter 9—Soul Trap

All excerpts reproduced verbatim from the working manuscript. Minor omissions indicated by [...]. For press and media use only.

Copyright Brendan D. Murphy.

brendandmurphy.com

team@brendandmurphy.com

EXCERPT 1 OF 5

The Afterlife Is Not a Place

From: Chapter 5—Heaven and Hell: Your One Stop Astral Shop

This passage reframes what "the afterlife" actually is—not a location you travel to, but a rendered experiential state generated by consciousness itself. It's where the book's central argument becomes tangible.

Since the afterlife is mind-dependent, we find ourselves in a "place" (state of consciousness) that corresponds with our deepest emotions, desires, intentions, and beliefs. Thus, since most people are not particularly "evil," malicious, or hate-filled, they experience death in a relatively positive way, a manner reflective of their beingness at the time. The truly diabolical soul may well be found in a very personalised state of self-created torment (or a dreamscape community of other malicious souls).

[...] The seer Swedenborg accurately explained that hell must be understood as a mental condition of confused and self-tormenting spirits. Later, Leadbeater correctly affirmed "hell" is "only a figment of the theological imagination; but a man who lives foolishly may make for himself a very unpleasant and long-enduring purgatory." [...] Even the authors of the Jesuit journal *Civilita Cattolica* could grasp "hell" is "not a place but a condition..."

As theosophical compiler Arthur Powell explained, gradually the coarse and dense outermost shell of the astral plasma body disintegrates, allowing responsiveness to the vibrations of the next higher astral sub-plane, and so on. The duration spent on each "sub-plane" (state of mind) depends on the amount and activity of one's astral matter (psychological content) belonging to that sub-plane.

In "rising" to the next sub-plane (state of mind) of the afterlife, the shift is psycho-spiritual and perceptual. New information comes into focus, so to speak, and the "scenery" changes. The individual's consciousness now "collapses" or coheres more enjoyable wave potentials into their experiential dreamscape, as if graduating from one level of a video game to the next.

[...] Experience in the imaginal realms of interiority is not merely subjective, it is intersubjective—that is, experience can be shared (and any shared experience can be defined as an objective or consensus reality, at least for the participants, as Tom Bearden noted). In a mind-based reality, there is no meaningful distinction between subjectivity and "reality"—the contents of consciousness are the reality.

EXCERPT 2 OF 5

The CTM as the Missing Framework

From: Introduction—Reverse Engineering the Afterlife

This is the book's opening declaration of intent—introducing the Consciousness Transition Model and the question it was built to answer: what would have to be true for all the existing accounts to be partially right, and partially wrong, in exactly the ways they are?

Do you dissolve into unity at death—or remain recognisably yourself? Is reincarnation inevitable, optional, or misinterpreted? Why do reports of heavenly reunion, ego-dissolution, and post-mortem communication all appear coherent—yet conflict?

These are not abstract puzzles. They concern what happens to you. Rather than defending a tradition or offering reassurance, this book identifies the underlying structure that makes these accounts compatible—and, to a surprising extent, predictable. Here you will find a functional explanation of how consciousness reorganises when the body falls away.

[...] My Consciousness Transition Model demonstrates that death appears to involve lawful transitions in attention, identity, and perceptual bandwidth. These transitions vary in texture but follow recognisable patterns.

[...] The governing concept of this volume is Consciousness Continuity: consciousness persists beyond biological death within a reciprocal system spanning two distinct—yet not separate—domains: physical and non-physical. What we call "death" appears not as termination, but as transition. Consciousness shifts bandwidth, reorganises identity, and oscillates between domains according to largely impersonal constraints.

The explanatory framework developed here is the Consciousness Transition Model (CTM). Unlike descriptive approaches that simply catalogue altered states, CTM asks what structural dynamics must be in place for those states to occur as they do. It is rooted in phenomenology but extends beyond description into explanation—and, in certain respects, prediction.

CTM is not a theology and not a traditional cosmology. It is a functional map: an account of what consciousness appears to do when biological filters loosen, how self-structure reorganises, how perception stratifies, and why independent reports across cultures and centuries converge on recurring architectural patterns.

It does not ask "Which field is right?" It asks "What would have to be true for all of them to be partially right—and partially wrong—in exactly the ways they are?" That's why it sometimes feels both unsettling—and enlightening.

[...] The framework developed here does not merely catalogue anomalies; it resolves tensions that have quietly destabilised serious inquiry for decades. Some of those resolutions may unsettle you—but only because they replace explanations that were too small.

If you are seeking comfort or ideological reinforcement, this is not your book. If you are willing to think carefully, tolerate ambiguity, and allow your assumptions about mind, death, and identity to be stress-tested, you may discover that what emerges is not confusion, but coherence—a structural clarity that reframes what it means to be conscious at all.

You will not see death—or yourself—the same way again.

EXCERPT 3 OF 5

The Core Error: Mistaking Perception for Ontology

From: Chapter 9—Soul Trap

This passage introduces a structural mechanism that hasn't been identified before—one that explains how formless post-mortem states get converted, after the fact, into narrative memories. It's the book's account of where misinterpretation enters the picture.

Disclaimer: I come in peace! This critical part of our investigation asks you to consider that, while the experience or ostensible memory reported by Soul Trap advocates may be "real" enough, perceptually, the story about it may not be. We are about to unpack a game-changing translation error mechanism operating between different states of consciousness which has not been identified until now (to my knowledge). It clarifies how we got to where we are at today and how we can move forward with less baggage and illusion.

Consider: Reincarnation-trap narratives consistently mistake the potent felt "authority" (absoluteness) of Buddhist coherence for Absolute ontological authority, while treating subjective Manasic memory constructs and/or visions as direct metaphysical evidence.

[...] I venture this hypothesis: when people report such disturbing experiences it is the result of a translation process between different domains/types of consciousness. This group of people are vaguely retaining a post-mortem (between-lives) "submerged memory" of close contact or even direct immersion in the perfection of the Buddhist consciousness, or Home as it has been referred to by some. To clarify, what we really mean by "submerged memory" is a non-representational residue or affective trace, not a memory-object from realms of duality [...].

Lower Manas retroactively interprets the vague between-lives imprint of differentiation—being expelled—from blissful Buddhist consciousness by using anthropomorphic symbols and post hoc causal narratives. These effectively seek to concretise and rationalise the dimly recalled imprint and experience of being sent away (read: emanated) from a realm no one—at the level of Manas/human mind—would ever voluntarily leave. At the non-agentive Buddhist level, "you" actually have no choice. The result is unconsciously confabulated manasic "memories" of being tricked or forced by beings of light or bearded old man figures—all done effortlessly and subconsciously by Lower Manas after the fact. It is retrofitted causality aimed at explaining the loss of peace and unity—and the dimly sensed loss of agency (which cannot exist at the Buddhist level) that spontaneously led you out of heaven and into the lower worlds as a temporary personality application. Essentially, we are all just homesick.

[...] This is not deception or malevolent control, it is structurally intrinsic translation failure between different aspects or "levels" of self. Such translation limits are non-pathological, universal, and unavoidable; invariant symptoms of the existing consciousness architecture. In other words, it's all simply part of the meta-system we're involved in.

EXCERPT 4 OF 5

Cross-Tradition Convergence Without Hand-Waving

From: Chapter 3—The NDE: Part IV—Key Elements & Archetypes

This passage answers the question every sceptic raises: if NDEs are real, why does every tradition describe them differently? The answer here—they're not describing different things, they're describing the same structural process through different symbolic vocabularies—is the book's cross-tradition argument made explicit.

Key differences noted by Pasricha included: the subject being "taken to other realms by messengers or some one" and then being "passed on to the man with a book" containing a list of deeds or mistakes. (The man reads a book/document outlining good and bad deeds, "just as is done by the god Chitragupta in Hindu mythology.")

The man with the book from Indian NDEs would appear to represent a variation on the life review (self-examination directed by conscience) theme, as perceived through a different cultural lens. We see the same process in Christian belief of judgement at the "gates of heaven" by St Peter, and the more ancient Weighing of the Heart and Judgment of Osiris in Ancient Egypt—all perhaps derived from an as yet unidentified and much more ancient process/program running in the collective unconscious. All are externalised metaphorical representations of self-evaluation with conscience.*

[Footnote: In Zoroastrian afterlife teachings, the conscience becomes externally personified as the daena... After death, on the dawn of the third night the departed soul appears at the Chinvat Bridge... Meher the Judge weighs the actions of the soul... and if the good deeds outweigh the evil ones then the soul is allowed to cross the bridge and [be] rewarded with Vahista-ahu, the best life or heaven.]

[...] Murphy concludes that, like other cultures, Thai NDEs are pre-programmed via expectation, specifically stemming from Thailand's highly homogenous religious matrix, which informs virtually all beliefs and expectations about death and the afterlife.

[...] Hashemi's team's 2023 review of the NDE literature "shows that the supernatural and metaphysical experiences of the participants have similar roots for every race and religion, with differences in the expression of details."

In other words, as Nick Sambrook suggests, it is the "same virtual computer RPG 'god' game template and operating system but with different looking avatars, words... story, and scenery."

The Soul Trap Reframe

From: Chapter 9—Soul Trap

This is the book's direct engagement with the soul trap narrative—not through dismissal, but through a four-step structural argument showing how a non-agentive spiritual state gets misread as evidence of external coercive control. The final line is worth reading twice.

How Soul Trap Narratives Mistake Higher-Order (Buddhic) Unity for Illusory Authority

In reincarnation-trap discourse, the core error is not necessarily suspicion of post-mortem structures. Rather, it has to do with where authority or "control" is assigned.

Step 1: A Buddhic-level encounter or imprint is mistaken for an ontological absolute. Trap proponents sometimes describe encounters involving overwhelming unity or "oneness"; a sense of all knowledge or "nothing can be questioned" (immediacy of meaning); no more capacity for manasic doubt (lower mind is transcended); instructions from an "authority" framed as obvious, inevitable, or for your own good. In truth, questioning itself (a mental function) dissolves at the Buddhic level—and hence, could be misinterpreted downstream by the manasic/lower mind that there is "total, unquestionable control from above orchestrated by nefarious beings." This is post-hoc narrative construction by Manas, dimly perceiving the affective residue of subtle Buddhic imprints.

Step 2: Deep coherence is accidentally mistaken for imposed rulership by trap handlers/wardens.

Some trap narratives make an implicit leap: "If [x] state contained total unity, love, and knowledge, then whatever operated there must possess ultimate authority, or be an imposter authority handling the trap." [...] Buddhic unity states produce a subtle sense of "consensus" (all "souls" exist here in the same blissful, non-dual state). This sublime consensus could be misinterpreted downstream by the symbolic lower-manasic mind as some kind of dictatorially-imposed uniformity or conformity.

Step 3: Manasic translational artifacts are reified as trap controllers. When the NDEr returns, Lower Manas tries to narrate what happened—this is where trap narratives crystallise: "Councils" become Archontic rulers; "Guides" become wardens; the "Life review" becomes imposed surveillance and guilt-tripping; what could be called "karmic necessity" becomes enforced legal obligation from trap overlords above; "Return agreements" become binding contracts. But all of these are post-Buddhic interpretations of a level where agency was no longer personal but diffused and administered by an automated system process; all forms of hierarchy were utterly absent and structurally impossible; coercion, resistance, or rebellion are structurally impossible (because separation and duality are absent).

Step 4: The Monad is ignored, bypassed, or forgotten entirely. In our model, absolute "authority" can only reside at the Tier 1 Monadic level, where no beings of any form exist; narratives (of the manasic mind) cease to operate; no obligations can be imposed since there is no subject-object dynamic... They confuse the subjective feeling of ultimacy for ontological ultimacy. Fortunately feelings aren't facts. Our framework shows why that inference—an ontological reification fallacy—fails. Reifying perceived or felt ultimacy into ontological governing authority is a category error.

None of this denies the possibility of lower-tier (astral-manasic) manipulation, but it does relocate where manipulation—or more specifically, misinterpretation leading to belief in manipulation—could potentially occur.