The Mass Modelling Principle of Stellar Metamorphosis

Jeffrey J. Wolynski
Jeffrey.wolynski@yahoo.com
Rockledge, FL 32955
September 12, 2020

Abstract: In stellar metamorphosis stars lose mass as they evolve, therefore a simple principle can be drawn up regarding their mass loss and modeling for future scientists.

To correctly model stars' evolution into life hosting stars such as the Earth, or others, the variable of mass loss needs to be included. Any model of the internal structure of a star not including mass loss is insufficient to determine its future, as mass loss will change all the other variables over time. This is observed in the different structures and compositions of stars in various stages of evolution found by Kepler and even the classical planets (evolving/dead stars) in the solar system, and explained by the General Theory of Stellar Metamorphosis.[1] The change in scale for old stars against young ones is significant, because it expands the timeframes, the pressures involved, the strength of the stars' evolutionary histories, and a host of other variables that are completely ignored by the mainstream's astronomers.

Determining the future of a star's physical and chemical structure without significant mass loss as a variable will (and has) lead to wildly inaccurate assessments of the star's evolution at all stages of evolution, and wildly inaccurate assessments of the star's final and intermediate stages of evolution. A star's current structure, elemental/molecular composition, radiance, phase of matter, etc. cannot be used to determine its past or future unless mass loss is accounted for. Mainstream astronomers make the assumption that the stars' life cycle is determined by its mass,[2] and it is known that if incorrect assumptions are accepted, then measurements will be meaningless and the conclusions they draw from those measurements will be misleading.[3] Mainstream astronomers continually assume that stellar evolution is determined by how massive they are, therefore all of their stellar evolution models are misguided.

This principle diminishes in importance as the star phase transitions into lower enthalpies of matter and loses mass slower, thus dead stars such as Mercury will not change considerably, so can be modelled much easier as the mass loss and rate of mass loss will diminish. The more massive the star, the more possibilities for its structure to change in different ways. For instance, you could have two Sun like stars, and both lose mass at about the same rate, but then they could have their orbits interrupted and one orbit a hotter host losing mass faster, thus not allowing for more material to be deposited in the interior (forming the planet). So, two stars that started with the same properties mostly, but one losing mass faster due to evaporation caused by a hotter host will lead to two different sized "planets" far into their evolutionary timelines.

All planets (evolving/dead stars/astrons) will be different sizes and are observed to be different sizes, as they are evolutionary structures that lose mass for various reasons at different rates. A short overview of the process of determining a star's evolutionary history and potential future is covered by the concept of transformation curves.[4]

Young stars are magnitudes more massive than old and dead stars as observed in nature and predicted/explained by the General Theory. Astronomers say, because stars are really massive, then they cannot become "planets" because of how massive they are. This is not a good or even half-way decent argument against stellar metamorphosis though, as the reverse is most certainly true. Human beings are vastly more massive (and morphologically different) in our adult forms versus our embryonic stages, that does not mean one can not possibly become the other. The same goes for acorns growing on an oak tree. To say an acorn cannot grow (and change) into a hundred ton oak tree would be absurd to argue. The scales of stars' masses changes alongside their morphology as they evolve, which is central to the general theory. It is clear, the morphology (the form) of stars changes alongside their masses. They go hand in hand. You cannot change the form of the star without changing its mass, and vice versa. You cannot change the mass of the star without changing its form. This isn't to say its physical shape becomes a cube or such other shape, it will retain its spheroid shape, but its internal physical structure changes, as well as its elemental composition, axial angular momentum, elemental abundances, etc.

Below is taken from a textbook on military and political counter-deception by Barton Whaley, on page 139 of breakdown through change of scale:

> The engineer Smeaton wrote, "the proportion of the effects of some members vary as the squares and others as the cubes and many in compound ratios of the linear dimensions." He was soon followed by James Watt, the instrument maker to the University of Glasgow, who in 1764 realised that the reason why the University's lecture-room model of a Newcomen engine would not function was due to the increasingly unfavorable ratio of the cylinder wall area to the cylinder volume as the scale was reduced; and he went on to invent the condensing steam engine.
>
> Similar effects of change of scale on the outcome of military conflict were noted both by Napoleon and by Wellington. They independently made the point that the French cavalryman was usually inferior to his enemy in horsemanship and could thus be beaten in small numbers by equal numbers of the enemy; but in large scale actions between equal numbers the French cavalry would win because of their superior discipline and organization.

When a star loses its mass, the strength of its gravitational field diminishes. This means that incoming material will not be accelerated as violently into its atmosphere, as its mass is lost. This goes for material that undergoes plasma recombination into gas, and is re-ionized back into plasma again via the acceleration. In other words, as the star loses its mass (its scale changes), material that is combined into gas will not be accelerated fast enough to get re-ionized. This means if there is no newly ionized material to undergo plasma recombination (exothermic reaction producing light), the star will begin dimming. So young stars that have been losing mass will have dimmed considerably. Thus, the aging process in stars involves mass loss, and reduction in bolometric luminosity (loss of radiance in all frequencies), and loss of its strong gravitational field. This is why as stars age, they lose their ability to shine. This is why red dwarf stars are less massive and are dimmer than Sun-like stars, the same is true for brown dwarfs. Mass and luminosity go hand in hand and are directly related.

The scale changes of stars. If you have an archaic dead star like Mercury, which is estimated to be about 350,000 times older than its host,[5] it will no longer possess the strong gravitational field to re-ionize its own atmosphere. It simply does not have enough mass to produce a gravitational field that can accelerate particles back into its atmosphere. Not only that, but its gravitational field is so weak, that it also barely has an atmosphere at all! Stellar evolution as explained by the General Theory is predicated on mass loss being prime for a multitude of processes.

References

[1] https://vixra.org/pdf/1711.0206v5.pdf The General Theory of Stellar Metamorphosis
[2] Archived here: https://archive.is/Ytox9 Main website in case it is taken down: https://imagine.gsfc.nasa.gov/educators/lessons/xray_spectra/background-lifecycles.html
[3] Lavenda, R. H., & Schultz, E. A. (2013). *Anthropology: what does it mean to be human?*. Oxford University Press. Pg. 23
[4] Stellar Metamorphosis: Transformation Curves on the Wolynski-Taylor Diagram, https://vixra.org/pdf/1905.0509v1.pdf
[5] https://vixra.org/pdf/1907.0544v1.pdf Accretion and Ablation During Stellar Evolution: How Old Is Mercury?