

## Astronomical Pseudoscience via Linguistics and Culture

Jeffrey J. Wolynski  
Jeffrey.wolynski@yahoo.com  
August 19, 2017  
Rockledge, FL 32955

*Abstract: Since the mystery of planet formation is solved by the discovery that planets are older stars (stellar evolution is planet formation), the continued mystery of planet formation as accepted by establishment dogma is pseudoscientific. Thus a different type of pseudoscience is present, the ignoring of discoveries. The only problem now with getting the discovery recognized is a deep culturally rooted belief that they are mutually exclusive, regardless if the facts of nature are in direct contradiction of the culture.*

Young boys and girls are taught in early schooling that a star is something different than a planet. It has been culturally accepted for centuries, thus very few people questioned whether the two were the same. Even if they were to question it, most of those questioners did nothing about it, because it is a belief that is rooted in culture and persists even in the year 2017. Think about it. Young boys and girls long before they learn the scientific method are told, by their teachers who are most likely not scientists, that planets and stars are different. The Sun is a star and the Earth is a planet along with the other 8. It is an enormously unfortunate event in the life of a child. A very deep, and powerful history of the Earth and the stars can be presented to them from the very start, but they are first conditioned into a culturally accepted idea that is officially completely false. It is like teaching children the Earth is flat.

Even though I'm one of the principle discoverers of this understanding, because of the cultural conditioning I was subjected to in school from a very early age, it is still hard for me to accept mentally and emotionally. It also puts me in a separate group of people socially, I cannot discuss this new fact, not even with physics teachers! They just get upset! It is unlike anything I've ever understood before, as well, to understand it takes a mind that is actually, genuinely open to new ideas. Once children reach a certain age, say, young adulthood, their minds are mostly completely made up. Their worldview was presented and given to them, and was accepted by them long before they even got to college and began studying the stars. Thus, their culturally defined meaning of planet/star remains and they look through their telescopes absolutely sure of what they are seeing, long before they started questioning what they are looking at. The transcendence of astronomy was murdered, by a large overwhelming majority of people who do not possess the capacity to question themselves. An echo chamber of cultural proportions was thrust upon them long before they learned what an echo really is.

The confirmation bias that I as a discoverer am up against is deeply rooted in people's childhoods. The confirmation bias that astronomers/astrophysicists are up against internally is actually to this day unaddressed, as that is the essence of the fallacy. Only read stuff that already conforms to your belief, so the very instant that the possibility of stars being young planets is nearly instantaneously rejected. That immediate "wrongness" is deeply rooted in cultural beliefs, coupled with the pain of social stigma, mental hardship and an emotional turmoil that goes unmatched by any new discovery to date. Even discovering different Earths out there pales in comparison, as all of the hot young stars are possible new Earths, long into their futures. With them numbering into the hundreds of billions, it becomes crystal clear that accepting the non-existence of extraterrestrials is insane.

It is a very strange phenomenon to me, seeing scientists trying to scientifically define planet/star/exoplanet when they do not realize they are still keeping their cultural definition. They are trying to change their cultural definition of planet/star without actually changing it, by approaching the issue in scientific terms. This of course is going to fail them (and continues to fail them), because their definition only applies to the solar system bodies, as well needed to be voted on, as if voting was scientific! Which step in the scientific method does voting occur, or even finding consensus? There is not a step in the scientific method for that!

In short, the reason why we do not understand planet formation is because young planets are culturally defined as being something other than planet, via linguistics rooted in culture. All models/theories that were invented that separate planet formation from stellar evolution came after the objects were culturally defined. Planets were small, cold and dim, and stars were big, hot and bright, long before theories/models were drawn up to explain them. The actual idea is easy to digest, the real complications come from a deep seated cultural belief that the two objects are somehow different. Well, they are different, simply because they are in different stages to their evolution. It is wild how astronomers/astrophysicists have completely missed this. The worldview complications all began when they were children, they should have never accepted the false ideas to begin with. Teach children to use the 4.5 billion years of evolution on their shoulders. We come from a long line of great creatures that survived and evolved, don't let it go to waste believing the Earth is just a giant rock.