

The Principle of Equatorial Planes in Planet Formation (Stellar Evolution) in Stellar Metamorphosis

Jeffrey J. Wolynski
Jeffrey.wolynski@yahoo.com
 July 18, 2017
 Cape Canaveral, FL 32920

Abstract: It is proposed a principle of equatorial planes to accurately predict the orbits of evolving stars around their hosts. The new star systems found will have companion stars orbiting their hosts at all inclination angles. The Sun and its orbiting evolving/dead stars are used as an example.

All inclinations of companion stars to their hosts will be found at multiple angles compared to the host's axis and to each other.

Inclination				
	Name	Inclination to ecliptic	Inclination to Sun's equator	Inclination to invariable plane ^[3]
Terrestrials	Mercury	7.01°	3.38°	6.34°
	Venus	3.39°	3.86°	2.19°
	Earth	0°	7.155°	1.57°
	Mars	1.85°	5.65°	1.67°
Gas giants	Jupiter	1.31°	6.09°	0.32°
	Saturn	2.49°	5.51°	0.93°
	Uranus	0.77°	6.48°	1.02°
	Neptune	1.77°	6.43°	0.72°

As we can see on the graph, all the orbital inclinations are different. None of their angles match each other, and none match the inclination of the Sun's equator. What this means is that the objects, though they appear to be in a disk orientation, are not actually in a disk orientation once they are measured. If they formed in a disk their orbital inclinations would all match for one, secondly they would all match the inclination to the Sun's equator. Not only that, but Earth is a whole 7.155 degrees off! Compound the small angle difference by 93 million miles of distance and what you have are objects that are nowhere NEAR the same orbital plane. Neptune is ~2.8 billion miles from the Sun and with an orbital inclination of 6.43 degrees from the Sun's equator, it is so far removed from the proposed location of a "disk" that it is absurd to believe it came from one! Given my math is anywhere near correct, a 6 degree difference would make Neptune off the plane of the Sun's equatorial inclination of 280 million miles. That would be like saying my food is on the plate, and the food actually being on the roof of the house. How the heck do you form planets in a disk when they lay clearly outside of any proposed disk plane by hundreds of millions of miles? I'm not going to even mention Pluto. That object is so far off it might as well not be considered a solar system body, which then leads to the question that astronomers should have asked from the beginning: Is this really a "system" or are we looking at objects that are mutually exclusive?

What astronomers and astrophysicists need to learn is that they did not form in a singular disk, because they, in truth, do not even orbit in the same plane! Accounting for their distances, none of them are anywhere near the same orbital plane. So to correct the mistaken astronomers, in this principle it is stated, for example that there will be star systems found with objects orbiting their hosts with variable orbital inclinations. It would be safe to say that none of them will match up.

It is almost chaos in the Milky Way Galaxy. The solar system is FAR from being representative of the orbital inclinations that will be found. What this means is that scientists need to take off their rose colored glasses and realize systems such as the Trappist-1 system probably have objects orbiting in prograde and retrograde orbits (inclinations that are completely opposite of one another). Dips in the light curves could come from 180 degrees, 90 degrees or 0 degrees, they would make the light dim from the host at any angle. Not only that, but the whole dogma of these objects orbiting in the same plane according to their orbital inclinations is clearly false, once their distances are considered and the fact that none of them match up and none of them orbit the same inclination of the Sun's axis. What happened is that astronomers took appearances, turned those appearances into assumptions, which then turned into dogma. Hopefully all the new data that is being collected will correct them, and hopefully they will realize the "solar system" is not even a system at all, but a collection of mutually exclusive objects all on their own evolutionary paths. This is the whole point of stellar metamorphosis, we are looking at stars all in different stages of their evolution, the whole separation of planet/star was never needed.