

Cluster Age, Star System Age and Stellar Age, K2-25b in Stellar Metamorphosis

Jeffrey J. Wolynski
Jeffrey.wolynski@yahoo.com
Rockledge, FL 32955
July 18, 2020

Abstract: A short explanation of the differences between a cluster's age, a star systems age and a star's age are provided. The three are not always the same. It is claimed by the dogmatists that K2-25b is ~600 million years old with reference to the Hyades Cluster, as well as K2-25 which is the host red dwarf, all because they are in the same cluster. They have clusters, young stars and intermediate aged stars as being the same age, but clearly they are not. Explanation is provided.

The Hyades Cluster is claimed to be ~600-800 million years old. The claim being made is that since a cluster has that assumed age, then no objects inside of that cluster can be vastly older or younger. They have made a misguided assumption sandwich. There are no walls surrounding the cluster to make sure it could not interact with other objects in outer space. In fact, we know the cluster has interacted with other objects because K2-25 is a ~200 million year old Red Dwarf, and K2-25b is a 1.4 billion year old post Neptune Ocean world. The 200 million years, which would have a William's number of ~110 million calculated here:

<https://vixra.org/pdf/1906.0146v3.pdf>. Neptune is about 1.15 billion calculated here:

<https://vixra.org/pdf/1905.0411v1.pdf> All we need to calculate its age is D/H ratios and total axial angular momentum (its William's number), which is predicted to be slightly higher with reference to D/H ratios, and slightly lower than Neptune with reference to total axial angular momentum.

So not only does the Hyades Cluster have objects 3 times younger than its proposed age, it has objects more than twice its age. In addition, those objects themselves orbit each other! What this means is that a cluster's age has no real data to share other than how old it is assumed to be as a whole in its current configuration. The only reason why they gave an entire cluster with hundreds of stars (probably tens of thousands of highly evolved/dead ones too) is because of tradition. There are objects vastly older and younger inside of it, which is common sense. Of course, common sense sometimes runs counter to tradition. The ages of people who attend a rock concert are not all assumed to be a few hours old, simply because they are all together are they? Nobody would ever assume something like that!

Stars cannot have their ages inferred by association to clusters. I have never had my age assumed based on location. What the astronomers are doing is saying since I am visiting my G-ma at the retirement home, I am automatically about the same age as the other older people there! As well, stars cannot have their ages inferred by orbital characteristics as is evidenced by our system. Saying all the solar system objects are all 4.5 billion years old is another assumption sandwich. There is no radiometric data from Mercury, Venus, Neptune, Uranus, Pluto, Ganymede, Io, Callisto, etc. to determine their ages! So it is an assumption sandwich. They are taking the assumed age of an entire cluster, saying that no objects can enter or exit, assuming everything in there is the same age, assuming objects that are in star systems are all the same age, and then assuming that those star systems formed in their current configuration at the same time the cluster is assumed to have formed. It is an assumption club sandwich with multiple layers!