

# Relative and Absolute Ages in Stellar Metamorphosis

Jeffrey J. Wolynski  
[Jeffrey.wolynski@yahoo.com](mailto:Jeffrey.wolynski@yahoo.com)

August 3, 2017  
Cape Canaveral, FL 32920

Abstract: Relative and absolute ages are mentioned in stellar metamorphosis.

In stellar metamorphosis the absolute ages of stars can be determined by radiometric dating. Unfortunately the data concerning the radiometric dating of the Sun is not available, nor is it available for Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus, Neptune, Venus, Mercury or Pluto. What happened is that scientists assume they are all the same ages, so meteorites (that are not evidenced to come from anywhere in the solar system) are radiometrically dated. Then they force all the solar system objects that are in different stages to their evolution and are vastly different in relative and absolute age to be the same age. They do this because in the paradigm, all the objects in the solar system are the same age because they all formed about the same time. Since they do not have radioisotope samples of the objects, they force the paradigm to be accurate. It is much easier for career scientists to skew data to fit the paradigm than to challenge it, because there is no reward for challenging it and all the reward is for keeping in line to move up the career ladder. What needs to happen now to give a correct radiometric age for all of the objects in the solar system, is to actually measure their radioisotopes. I think it should be a shock to the reader that they actually have no idea how old Mercury is in absolute terms, because there are no radiometric samples to determine that. As well, it should be noted that if there are any radiometric dating samples retrieved from these objects, be on the look out for them forcing the data to fit the paradigm. What this means is that independent analysis of all data needs to happen. If only one laboratory determines the age, then the results cannot be trusted. The results need to be independently verified by teams that are not financially or professionally connected. That's the problem with the LHC data, the workers at both detectors are financially connected so of course their data is going to match. (RIP Particle physics). Further, we can also use stellar metamorphosis to see if their results really hold up to scrutiny, as relative ages are provided via stellar metamorphosis.

Relatively speaking, Mars is not the same age as Earth. It does not have a strong magnetic field anymore. The heat flux is lower, so it has had much longer periods of time to cool down. There is no evidence of mountain building due to contraction of the crust caused by slow gravitational collapse, the majority of the water has evaporated. The crust is vastly thicker so it has had much more time to cool and solidify from earlier stages of evolution. The atmosphere is also much thinner and the iron/nickel core is larger than the Earth. It takes time, lots of time to form something that resembles Mars, much more time relatively speaking than Earth. So in terms of absolute age vs. relative age, if mainstream scientists place Mars as being the same age as Earth in absolute terms, they are skewing the data to fit the paradigm, 100% guaranteed, because in relative based on their physical properties they are NOT the same age. Mars is easily 25 billion years old, at the very least. Of course just saying any age beyond 13.7 billion years is blasphemy to the scientism cults that run universities, so it should be quite a shock. We should also expect Mercury to be in excess of 65 billion years old, as it doesn't even have an appreciable atmosphere, and many, many more craters are apparent due to its inability to heal the surface via interior fluid motion which signals youth (magma). The paradigm of stellar metamorphosis is much more advanced than the old, painfully outdated models that were taught in the 1950's.