Stellar Metamorphosis: Reinterpreting Why Volatile Compounds are Mostly Missing From the Inner Planets

> Jeffrey J. Wolynski Jeffrey.wolynski@yahoo.com April 21, 2019 Rockledge, FL 32955

Abstract: It is claimed by researchers that when the solar nebula formed, it drove out large amounts of volatile compounds from the inner planets. Some corrections are made with direct quotes in light of the general theory. Quotes are taken from John M. Wallace, Peter V. Hobbs, in Atmospheric Science (Second Edition), 2006, 2.5.1 Formation and Evolution of the Earth System.

"The sun and the planets are believed to have formed 4.5 billion years ago from the gravitational collapse of a cold cloud of interstellar gas and dust."

The objects in the solar system are all different ages with all different isotopically stable, elemental, molecular and radioactive isotope abundances. This is to say all the major objects in the solar system have different cosmic fingerprints. This means they all are independent, and are all on their own transformation curves, as outlined in the general theory. They are not all 4.5 billion years old. The Sun is in fact the youngest member of the solar system, with the vast majority of its mass being composed of volatiles. Not only that, but 3 out of the most 4 volatile elements compose 99% of its mass, helium, hydrogen and oxygen.

As well, gravitational collapse requires that the star already be formed. You have to have a gravitational field present to begin with, cold gas in outer space does not possess a gravitational field! Cold gas in outer space dissipates!

"The absence of the noble gases neon, xenon, and krypton in the atmospheres of the Earth and the other planets, relative to their cosmic abundance, is evidence that the planets formed from the coalescence of the dust into chunks of solid materials called planetesimals that were drawn together by gravitation."

There are a few assumptions and misinterpretations to correct here. First, absence (or trace amounts) of noble gases neon, xenon and krypton in the atmospheres of the Earth and other planets can be explained easier. When the more evolved stars in the system (called planets) were younger, their percentages of noble gases was in fact, higher. This is observationally confirmed by studying the spectra of the youngest stars in the galaxy that have strong visible spectrums.

The percentage of neon in the Sun is much higher than on Earth, this is because as the stars evolve, they lose elements that do not combine either ionically or covalently with others. This is due in part to them being lighter (escaping the gravity), and being non-reactive. Elements that are non-reactive and lighter than heavier molecular compounds can and do escape. The Earth and the more evolved stars in the solar system are direct evidence that this is the path the Sun will take. It will lose the large majority of its noble gases and volatiles, unless they can combine into heavier molecules and/or get buried and mixed in with other compounds. A good example of this is the helium found mixed in with methane as natural gas.

As well, coalescence of dust and matter is done by younger stars, as they have the large gravitational fields, vast surface areas and heat to melt, ionize, vaporize and collect huge amounts of interstellar shrapnel. This is done internally, as the star gravitationally collapses and forms the planet internally, as the entire structure evolves and differentiates itself over hundreds of millions of years.

"Present within the condensing cloud were volatile compounds (i.e., water, methane, ammonia, and other substances with low boiling points), mainly in the form of ices."

Again, condensing clouds are the stars themselves, stars are the brilliant nebulas that cool and evolve into what are called "planets". The star forms the "planet" in its interior. They start off with light elements mostly, but contract, lose mass, and lose their light elements and volatiles as they evolve. This means the oldest, and even dead stars will be almost completely absent free volatiles on their surfaces. This is observationally confirmed by studying the Moon and Mercury.

"When the sun formed, the inner part of the cloud should have warmed, driving out most of the volatiles: hence the relatively low concentrations of these substances in the atmospheres of the inner planets." The Sun formed out of huge amounts of volatiles, which it is still composed of, signaling that it is a young nebula. Helium, hydrogen and oxygen (and neon) are the 4 most volatile elements, and are elements that the Sun is mostly composed of. The lower the concentrations of volatiles found on other solar system objects signals that they are much older. This being said, the youngest stars have the most volatiles, the oldest have volatiles that have combined into molecular substances or have dissipated back into space. Volatiles are lost as stars age, and are not related to any sort of disk theory which denies this fact.

The volatiles found on Earth, in the form of oxygen and water vapor, signal that the Earth is much younger than Mercury, regardless if the Earth itself is much older than the Sun. So not only did the Earth not form from the solar nebula (the Sun is its own independent object), but that Mercury which orbits even closer is even older than the Earth! We have three vastly different objects all with different volatile percentages as observed by telescopes. The Sun is mostly composed of them, Earth has water oceans and a thin atmosphere, and Mercury is a pitted, dead world vastly older than the Earth. The idea of these clearly completely independent objects forming out of a single gas cloud seems absurd when the facts are reinterpreted with the general theory.

This is the main problem that academics needs to address. The objects in our system are evolutionary in nature, and do not have the same ages, nor did they form out of the Sun's material, which is also observationally confirmed by the Genesis mission by NASA. By measuring the amounts of volatiles present in their atmospheres and surfaces, we can easily come to the conclusion that they are different and are evolutionary in nature. They are not related to the Sun, and they are not related to each other.

A graph on the next page shows a generalized outline of the path stars take when they gravitationally collapse into "planets", and subsequently disintegrate.

