

A Review of False Astrophysical Assumptions in Light of the General Theory of Stellar Metamorphosis

Jeffrey J. Wolynski
jeffrey.wolynski@yahoo.com
Dec. 20, 2015
Cocoa, FL 32922

Abstract: On December 3, 2015 a short online article was published on CarnegieScience.edu. The title was, "What Kind of Stars form Rocky Planets?". In light of 21st century science provided by the General Theory of Stellar Metamorphosis, it can be shown that a multitude of false assumptions are kept which place rational analysis of the wanted answer in jeopardy. Asking the wrong questions will not lead the right answers, you must ask the right questions to get the right answers. A short review of the article with the author's writing in purple is provided below.

Thursday, December 03, 2015

Washington, DC— As astronomers continue to find more and more planets around stars beyond our own Sun, they are trying to discover patterns and features that indicate what types of planets are likely to form around different kinds of stars.

They are looking for the incorrect types of patterns. Their mode of thinking goes as such, "planets and stars are mutually exclusive, so where is the pattern that shows how they got to be so?" The pattern they should be looking for would be provided if they had not used an incorrect assumption, which undoubtedly leads DIRECTLY to the answer they are seeking, "who decided that the objects we call planets/exoplanets were mutually exclusive of stars from an evolutionary standpoint?" That is the root of the problem, there were never any statements concerning that, it was considered self-evident that the stars were shiny, hot and big and the planets were not shiny, cool and small. There was never a scientist that proclaimed the two to be mutually exclusive, it was taken as fact WITHOUT EXAMINATION before further theory was drawn up! It should not be a surprise that if scientists fail to examine facts, they will work their way into dead end hypothesis and theories, this is why their mode of pattern searching and feature analysis will be of no use unless they first start with good assumptions. They have to examine their assumptions first, no amount of grants or telescope time can fix false assumptions!

This will hopefully inform and make more efficient the ongoing planet hunting process, and also help us better understand our own Solar System's formation.

Again, looking for patterns in light of false assumptions will not inform them of false assumptions! That is like claiming that wherever you touch your skin it hurts, not realizing that it is your finger that is broken! To inform someone of a false assumption, they must internally examine their own minds as well as their own groups ideals! Examining the external world will only reflect what you have taken to be true internally, you must first examine your internal assumptions before new understanding on great mysteries can be had! Claiming to KNOW how things work and then asking questions based on what you think you know will only lead back to what you think you know! It is a vicious cycle!

When a star is young, it is surrounded by a rotating disk of gas and dust, from which its planets form.

This is the main dogma. It is easy to see how it fails. Planets are spherical, not disk like. Unless they can provide an easy explanation as to WHY planets are spherical then the disk theory falls apart, because the disk theory has no method for angular momentum loss! It is quite easy to replace. The star in classical theory is just a nebular cloud that is collapsing on itself. Over many billions of years of collapse it cools, shrinks and dies, keeping its spherical shape and slowly solidifying in its interior, and the angular momentum (mass) is lost via solar wind, solar flaring, coronal mass ejections, impacts and even photoevaporation from orbiting hotter hosts in its past. See how easy that was? No disk required! The vast majority of large spherical objects are one in the same, only in different stages to their evolution. After a young star is born it retains its spherical shape indefinitely because of gravity keeping it round. It is a complete turn around in assumptions that is required. Either we keep planets being formed as byproducts of stellar birth and add a lot of mystery and other false assumptions/theories or we go with planets being formed as an end product of stellar evolution itself, which is the more reasonable conclusion.

As such, it's expected that chemical composition of the star should in some way affect the compositions of the planets orbiting it.

The chemical composition of an older astron (planet) orbiting a newer astron (star) is irrelevant. The two objects are mutually exclusive from an evolutionary standpoint, they are completely separate astrons on their own paths. The orbits are temporary constructs which fall apart and reassemble multiple times during their evolutionary timelines. Again, it is the disk assumption which prevents understanding nature, of course the disk assumption can also be explained. They are remains of astron impacts. That's it. Large shrapel fields are formed and continuously orbit the host astron if there is an impact, leaving disks. This means their assumption is actually backwards concerning the formation of disks, they think it signals creation, but it actually signals destruction. Again, assumptions getting in the way of understanding nature.

Indeed, previous research has demonstrated that gas giant planets preferentially form

around iron-rich stars.

Previous research will be rendered outdated as gas giant planets (intermediate aged astrons) orbit iron poor stars (young astrons) as well. There will be no statistical significance to this specific finding in light of the general theory of stellar metamorphosis. As well, no scientist has EVER seen a gas giant in formation. Claiming to watch dust clump to dust from light years out is a downright lie, they cannot even directly imagine a body the size of Earth at the distances they are finding them via the transit method! Getting some facts straight are not required I suppose, just make sure your readers are in awe of your superior expertise then shout them down when you question them. You can even make up things just as long as you have the authority to do so! Is this what has become of astronomy? Or maybe it has been like this for hundreds of years, and the way forward has always been hammered out in front of us, and I'm the naive one?

But more recent results have started to suggest that smaller planets do not require such high iron content in their stars to form.

See above. The reason why iron content in the host star is not statistically relevant is because they are on their own evolutionary paths, their own individual evolutionary progression. Forcing the objects to be related to each other is a direct result of false assumptions again.

New work from a team including Carnegie's Johanna Teske extended this idea by measuring a large suite of elements besides iron. They found that stars with Earth-sized rocky planets are overall chemically similar to those with Neptune-sized planets, and to stars with no planets, but not to stars with gas giant planets.

This is wishful thinking at best. There is actually no connection. Cherry picking data can yield the results you want so that you can make it appear that theory matches observations, but it will not yield genuine understanding of what's being observed. It also does not buy time either, if the theory uses false assumptions, no amount of time will fix it.

The team examined the abundance of 19 different elements found in seven stars that are orbited by at least one Earth-like rocky planet, all discovered by NASA's Kepler mission.

They only observed seven (7) stars? Kepler has in its sights many tens of thousands. This also points in the direction of them having cherry-picked data to conform to their pre-existing belief.

Their work shows that small rocky planets like Earth do not preferentially form around stars rich in metallic elements such as iron and silicon. The result is surprising because iron and silicon are among the most abundant elements in rocky planets.

This is also irrelevant. See above.

Their findings are published by The Astrophysical Journal.

The Astrophysical Journal only allows for the publication of ideas which conform to or do not threaten the existing status quo: Planets are formed in disks during stellar birth. Anything which threatens this will be rejected and the author will be black-listed. The Astrophysical Journal is a conformist journal. Do not expect new fundamental understanding to arise out of a publication that thrives off groupthink and plays on the strength of the herd mentality of human beings. You will never see an article published which challenges the status quo concerning stars, the only articles which will be made available which challenge the status quo are only available in alternative journals. It does not pay to be the odd (rational) man out! Who's going to fund the man/woman who says all the experts are fundamentally wrong? No-one!

“There has been much ongoing debate about the stellar conditions necessary for planet formation,” said lead author Simon Schuler of the University of Tampa. “Our results support the theory that the formation of small, rocky planets can occur around stars with diverse elemental compositions.”

All stars that evolve form small rocky planets as an end result of their evolutionary sequence. This means Earth is a many billion year old star (astron) at the very end of its evolutionary sequence and is still probably hot in its interior.

All stars have diverse elemental compositions and those elements combine to form molecules which comprise their rocky/metal remains over many billions of years of evolution. The stellar conditions for planet formation are internal, and can be reverse engineered by studying the Earth itself and all the objects in our solar system.

“This means that small, rocky planets may be even more commonplace than we previously thought,” Teske added.

Small rocky planets are highly evolved/dead stars. They outnumber the stars (young astrons) by many multiples inside of evolved galaxies such as the Milky Way and Andromeda. They are more than commonplace, they are like the oxygen molecules in

the air you breathe, so commonplace that you don't even notice them.

The planetary-formation from the gas-and-dust disk surrounding a new star as described above has also raised the question of whether the process itself depletes stars of the elements that are concentrated in the planets.

It is irrelevant. The gas dust disk is a result of the destruction of large bodies. If anything, the depletion of anything would go to the impact sending out shrapnel at velocities which would allow it to escape the system, to re-enter other star systems as small moons and asteroids/meteorites. If the gravitational field of another object is strong enough, it can capture these moons, of course they will all appear very different in composition, which is predicted, expected and evidenced by the many hundreds of moons in our solar system.

If so, this could be used to improve our planet-searching abilities, as looking specifically for stars that show signs of this kind of chemical depletion could narrow the hunt. However, none of the seven stars the team studied displayed this suggested depletion signature.

“Finding small planets can be challenging, so it’s a little disappointing that we don’t have a clear pointer for finding their host stars,” Teske said.

They do not have a clear pointer because the host star's chemical composition is not tied to whether it is hosting an Earth-like body. The fact being, any star (young astron) can host an Earth-like body, Earth-like bodies can even orbit Earth like bodies around star systems which have 4 Sun like stars! It is not hard to imagine if you work outside of the outdated disk theory! The ruling paradigm prevents our young minds from interpreting the stars in the way they can be interpreted, the real way, by not needing to use false assumptions just to get grant monies.

She works with Carnegie’s Paul Butler on one of the longest-running radial velocity planet searches, in which they are trying to find Earth-like planets. “However, at the same time our results are really exciting because they mean that small planets are very common and chemically diverse.”

Again, a small planet is an ancient star. So when you look at all the large hot objects in the sky, all the hundreds of thousands of them, what you are looking at are young hot Earths very early in their evolutionary sequence!

Teske is presenting today at the Extreme Solar Systems III meeting, co-organized by the American Astronomical Society and Northwestern University’s Center for Interdisciplinary Exploration and Research in Astronomy (CIERA).

<https://carnegiescience.edu/node/1944>

