The Sun is a Planet

Jeffrey J. Wolynski
August 22, 2016
Jeffrey.wolynski@yahoo.com
Cocoa, FL 32922

Abstract: Masses, orbits and definitions of stars change as they evolve with us.

In the beginnings of astronomy, all the solar system objects orbited in concentric spheres called epicycles, and the Earth was the center of it all. The Sun was inside one of the spheres, and was a "wandering star" (planet) as were all of the others. Fortunately this idea was tossed in the trash can once we found out which objects are orbiting which. Once that was done, we began classifying stars by their mass according to Newton's laws, also unfortunately they took this method to its pseudoscientific limits as it is the only physical characteristic that is taken to have importance when differentiating planet from star. Instead of actually figuring out what is happening to the object internally, they are classified by how big they are, which leads to complete hypotheticals. Astronomers had no idea what so ever what actually happened to stars as they evolve, nor did they know what old stars look like! They could be standing on one and not know it (stellar metamorphosis theory). Yet, no astronomer will tell you they just made everything up, all according to ONE physical characteristic!

Nothing of their physical nature besides their mass can be determined by their orbits. Which leads us to the next point, astronomy is overly reliant on basing everything on mass, which is based on orbits! It is a closed loop! Figure out the mass, figure out the orbit, figure out the orbit, figure the mass. We got their orbits corrected, then their masses, then defined them based on their masses! They took one tiny slice of observation and founded EVERYTHING ON IT. They took a closed loop and went off the deep end with it, when there were no observations to back their hypotheticals. So asking the question, "what happens when objects lose mass in large amounts over billions of years?" is instantly ridiculed and ignored! They say, the orbits are stable, so the masses are stable, the stars don't lose mass so they don't lose orbits either. The next step in astronomy should have been, "well, we have their orbits down and now we have the masses calculated by their orbits…What happens to the orbits when they lose mass?" The reasoning for the next question should have come from the observation that the objects in our system are all DIFFERENT MASSES. Not only that, but the question also should have been arrived at in the 20th century, "what happens if the object loses enough mass to where it can't do what we think it does." This is of course in

reference to the hypothetical nuclear processes in heavy stars. If the star loses mass, then there can be no nuclear reactions, because it is not heavy enough… Then what happens? These questions are almost always ignored, yet are the next step in understanding the stars. Fortunately, the reader of this paper is probably well beyond that. It is the goal of this paper to address the fundamental position of accepted mainstream astronomy and how stuck they are.