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I am not a career scientist. I am a discoverer. After all these years, I have found the two titles and their worldviews are fundamentally different, though they can overlap in some places. The worldview of a discoverer is not tied to established norms and is concerned with saving face or getting along with the crowd. Playing nice and keeping under the radar are not valuable traits to a discoverer, as their moral ground is naturally much higher due to the nature of their purpose. A discoverer is not of the collectivist mentality of the group or consensus being held in higher esteem than the individual. They are not bound to norms of a society and this brings many challenges to the process of scientific development and of humanities' understanding of nature.
Career scientists are trained these days to keep their head down and do as they are told. If you are going to make a major discovery as a career scientist it is better to not say anything at all but to quietly write things down in a place that can be time stamped and not bother pushing the discovery upon your own community. It does not pay to stand out if you want to be a career scientist. This is the predicament we are in. We have commissioned the universities to pump out students who know so much about very little and expect them to make possible the future in astronomy and astrophysics based on a false worldview. Then, when that worldview is challenged (regardless if it is false or not), where does the student or future career scientist go? What would allow them to get the idea ‘out there' regardless if it goes against almost everything they are told is true? What future is there for a discoverer in a scientific society that censors dissent with the peer review system and is obsessed with saving face? How can they, given they are low on the totem pole of academia, place their idea to be seen in a system that values hierarchy over talent with permanent professorships and overly extravagant prizes that cheapen what it means to make discoveries?

The Discovery

To go back to what it felt like when the discovery was made is quite easy. It was not an accumulation of experiments that led me to the insight. It was not a course on astronomy. No physics professor told me this understanding. I did not uncover some lost library of some ancient civilization with facts handed down to us from some ancient aliens. In fact, even to this day, if I am to bring the discovery to an astronomer or a physics professor's attention I will not be given the time of day. I will get "oh,
so what is YOUR degree in?" haughtiness so inscribed in the minds of children, allowing them to feign actual understanding of the stars, at least in societies' perspective. Today's education of the stars is pseudo-education. In fact, George Bernard Shaw summed it up quite nicely,

"Beware of false knowledge; it is more dangerous than ignorance."

False knowledge is even worse in the hands of authorities. As it can lead many generations of people down a path of total ignorance. The Earth being flat, the Earth being the center of the solar system, the Earth having formed from dust in the vacuum of space without mechanism for angular momentum loss of that dust... they are all examples of false knowledge, the latter one still taught in universities even today.[1]

To really get across to you of the sheer shock of what it really means, what weight it really has in the grander scale, the discovery must be understood as essentially a three-fold, branched or can even be considered a multi-faceted process. First, it completely re-worked my view of nature on a personalized level. Who we are and where we came from and what all the stars in the sky really were/are had instant depth, unlike the pseudo-depth provided by religious organizations or cults/scientific communities. Secondly, it re-worked an offshoot of my worldview of what a scientific community is, which has had enormous consequences to my outlook concerning the whole process of getting an education and obtaining accreditation in the fields of astronomy/physics. Lastly, it imposed serious consequences to my own personal relationships with the people I loved, which in turn was even further consequential to my emotional well-being. I'll attack the discovery from the accreditation aspect first, as that tends to
be overlooked by large media organizations and smaller internet communities.

In a nutshell, the accreditation process is a pseudo-foundation to understanding the stars. It is what educated folk do to ensure that their positions in society as professors or researchers is maintained. It has nothing to do with actual foundations, meaning it does not matter if you understand the stars or not - you are the accredited person now. The accreditation means you can get a job surrounded by other people who share the same credits (college credits really). It has very, very little to do with actual understanding or "truth" as it could be worded. The whole accreditation process is to provide a shield against the riffraff of people who have different ideas, meaning it is a grinder that forces people to standardize their thoughts and adopt the same cultural mores and norms as their soon to be parent organization.

These shared beliefs then become the important issue so that you can streamline your replacement. That is the whole doctorate - advisor endgame. When it comes to actually replacing the worldview that your mind was standardized to accepting - well that is a whole new ball game. Someone who is training their replacement must endow them with ideas that are already accepted, so that their future success can be as close as guaranteed as possible, given they assume the current worldview will not change significantly. The endgame of master to learner is not to expand on current knowledge or to reject current knowledge; it is to protect current knowledge as it is passed down. That is what actually happens, so when those beliefs are rejected in huge swaths, what will become of the student? What path does a student have the grand picture if they never place the doctorate - advisor endgame? What power does the accreditation process really have when the new worldview is outright replacing the pseudo -
foundation offered by universities and colleges? Their power is in the marketing, of being able to reach wide audiences, and as their tentacles reach to the very ends of the Earth, it becomes more and more obvious that their goals are not to spread the truth but to spread their base, to gain more power and control over the minds and actions of the people who are being offered the accreditation. We will discuss that mess later; let’s just keep on track with the discovery.

When you do not need to bother with the accreditation process because your career is mutually exclusive of your understanding of nature, isolation will be high and funds very, very low. I have spent the majority of the last six years in almost complete isolation from the physics/astronomy community, learning as an outsider what it means to be a real, honest to God, discoverer. I no longer have the luxury of accepting what is taught in school with the idea that the Earth and the Sun are the same ages. I can no longer accept that the solar system is composed of related bodies and not completely 100% independent structures. I have realized that of all the time I have spent reading books, learning about the history of science, taking courses in college and high school in physics, chemistry, biology, anatomy/physiology and even geology- none of that really matters in social circles. All that really matters in this society and scientific communities is that you mesh well inside your prescribed group or else you get removed via forced resignation, excommunication or even being burned alive at the stake. The truth is not what scientific communities want - they want cooperation and compliance. They want people to value the accreditation process, or as I call, the ‘credibility game.’ This is another facet to the discovery that needs to be shared.

Do you know why universities and colleges play the accreditation game? They seek power and control. They
want your cash too. They will even lobby governments to convince banks to work with them to get as much money as they can, with as little social responsibility required. This is why they pander to young adults going to school. The bankers and financial institutions have the best of both worlds - they have financially irresponsible adults who can make major decisions with their money with very little idea of the consequences under the guise of caring for them and their education. Truth is, colleges do not care about your education or your future. They just want the money and they want to grow their organization as big as they can in order to get more. It is for marketing purposes that they want you to better yourself or have a bright future. You are the customer! There are many hundreds of news reports and documents that prove that college degrees are scams in multiple ways, but they are scams in ways that are not even seen! They are mindscams - huge organizations that crush individuality and a future researchers ability to think clearly. That is why they put so much stress to standardizing you and your worldview. They are not doing their jobs as professors if the student learns that planets and stars are actually the same objects, which means that the very job of a professor in any astronomy graduate course runs counter to the very act of discovery and scientific revolution. I feel sorry for those folks. Their knowledge is becoming obsolete and most do not even know it.

For individuals to have their worldviews re-worked on a personal level would undermine the community cohesion that the astronomical community desires. The product that colleges pump out (yes, you are a product and the universities are the factories) cannot have defects, and undermining the social cohesion from having knowledge that is not shared ruins it. Removing your programming, your standardization and conditioning in school essentially means waking up. The best way to wake
up from the university mentality, from what I have experienced is by making a grand discovery which conflicts with the shared worldview of the academic community. It is like taking LSD and realizing how bad the government has worked you over after exiting the Marines.

I learned very quickly that universities spend billions of dollars just to control you and your thoughts, yet you cannot control someone if their worldview is fundamentally different from the group. That is what a real discovery does, it ruins your ability to form group cohesion. If you cannot have the group cohesion, they will reject you as being a defective product. You will realize the whole group atmosphere taught in colleges is an illusion of agreement, you are all only there because you all paid to be there, and in turn when you get to your job doing astronomy/astrophysics, they will pay you to be there and you absolutely must mesh well. You must have the same beliefs of your peers, or else you will be in big trouble.

The whole university approach trains the students to become part of a scientific community more than teaching them to be honest to God rational researchers. A major discovery that conflicts with your ability to be a part of that community is a potentially chaotic scene. If you make a major scientific insight inside a scientific group, you had better find others in your group who also understand the discovery or else they will alienate you. They will classify you as "the other," "crank," "crackpot" or "pseudo scientist" etc. Regardless of your education or pedigree, you will get branded as quickly as the discovery is made because group cohesion is valued more than scientific truth. We are social creatures and our tribal mentality can many times ruin the sharpness and clarity of rational thought. Just like houses are "investments" is shared by millions of people, they are not actual investments -they are huge liabilities. Also, the classic, "I do not need a prenuptial
agreement, I love (him/her)." In either case, legally binding contracts and massive financial obligations are nothing to mess around with if you are completely unprepared and riding high on emotions.

I am blessed in that regard. It took me six years to form a small group of people who can share this insight with each other and discuss among their families and friends. I am now prepared to take on the establishment. That is why I continue to work on it, long, long after the initial discovery was made. If I had not found people to help me work on it, or had the initial go-ahead from my ex-girlfriend and Bill Gaede, I probably would not be where I am today in its development. Starting from the very beginning means to not only make a major discovery, but finding people who can understand the discovery as well. So, you have to make two discoveries, you have to figure out the scientific fact first, then you have to find others who realize that very same scientific fact. If you cannot do that, find others who can support you, then your label as defective goods will remain. So to put it plainly, a defective product that universities want to remove are people who are creative and can make major scientific discoveries. The accreditation process is there to safeguard people who might not really know what they are talking about, but that there are thousands of others who ALSO do not know what they are talking about. Basically it gives weight to people's ideas when there is actually very little knowledge that is correct. I guess this is the whole graduate school approach - the nail that sticks out gets hammered and to share as much as is known and place all the fake stuff on the credential pedestal, as if they actually had any real weight in a rational society. Alas, we do not live in a rational society, so the whole accreditation process is actually a sham, perpetuated by billion dollar corporations.
Sitting alone, on my ex-girlfriends couch, looking at my laptop screen is when it all began. If the reader really wants to know me, I'm one of those people who loves puzzles — the physical, hands-on puzzles. Puzzles that make me think and allows me to physically tinker with how to solve it interests me the most. I have the mind of a mechanical person, as do a hell of a lot of others as I am told. I guess the main difference though is that I became, for a short while, obsessed with trying to understand gravitation. The thrill of solving physical puzzles was tied together with a really physical mystery that nobody has solved yet, to date! I did everything I could to try to understand gravitation — I read books, I did my own demonstrations by dropping heavy objects at the airplane hangar (not airplanes) and I even played around with a small single stage vacuum pump. I was all about trying to solve the mystery of gravitation. A lot of people are probably reading that and saying to themselves, well, Einstein explained it. Nope. Not even close. He had a description of gravitation, not a mechanical explanation. So, naturally I "Googled" it. Who had a mechanical explanation because "Einstein is wrong". Then it happened. I saw Bill Gaede's website and YouTube videos. I must have watched each one like 20 times. He proposed a new theory of how things were held together by ropes, and that it was the tension of these ropes that gave the appearance of gravitation. Unfortunately, that did not make any sense after a time because I started to find inconsistencies. I watched the videos, took notes, wrote my own ideas out, and for a good six months I struggled with trying to understand how gravitation could really work. I dove into hundreds of online arguments with Bill Gaede and his band of rope enthusiasts. Unfortunately, that led me down the path of disregarding all discussions about such ropes and I instead dived straight into chemistry and biology. Relating chemistry and biology to star evolution is
the future of this theory and no astronomer realizes it, which is why I have decided to write this book. Sharing the events as they transpired from memory is incredibly important. I need to share what it is really, so that when it happens to someone else, they can be prepared.

The actual discovery was an accident really. A surprise. I had no clue what I was doing by looking at Wikipedia pages on the most gravitationally attracting objects. The stars were where the answer would be, I was sure of it. They were/are the most numerous and gravitationally attracting objects that are observed in the galaxy. There had to be a secret hidden in there. So, as I was on the couch, again, I continued to look at things on stars. Naturally I went to the stellar evolution page because I was sure that if I could find out how stars evolved and changed, I would have the secret to gravitation in my hands - unlike the fantasy SpacetimeTM Einstein invented. I clicked and scrolled down the page, looking at the ideas and just let my mind wander. I did not think too much while I was reading the stellar evolution article on Wikipedia - I just went wherever my mind went. You do that when you are being creative, you do not slam reality together as if your ego depended on it - you let it flow. (Which is the complete opposite of graduate school, fyi). Anyway, I kept on reading and scrolling down, and I saw this picture:
Now a short prelude to this picture... I had previously taken a geology course at the University of Maryland, University College in Okinawa, Japan in the summer of 2004. I was still only a Private First Class in the Marines, but was bound and determined to at least use some of the "free" tuition I would be receiving for school as an active duty Marine. I regularly caught stink from my sergeants for leaving early from work for the classes on Tuesdays and Thursdays, but I was going to use what I had
at my disposal to make something out of myself. I got an A in it if I can remember correctly, but in that class we learned about the Earth and many concepts that are still valuable to me today as the theory is being developed. However, what stuck out the most was that Earth has an iron/nickel core. As simple as it is, the most important object to Earth's physical stability is buried many hundreds of kilometers in the center of the Earth. Easy enough, right? Well, that was a full seven years before the discovery, which was September 3, 2011. The picture's caption read, "The onion like layers of a massive, evolved star just before core collapse (not to scale)." Well, of course it is not to scale, but the pattern is what stuck out. Earth with a massive iron/nickel core, the layers of an evolved star… It hits me like a freight train. Earth is an evolved star! I got up off the couch, and paced the living room for about three to five minutes. I kept on questioning myself, did I just make a discovery? This is really strange, but it makes crystal clear sense what is happening to me? Then, it really did start to set in. I needed to get some fresh air because I had been staring at a computer screen for the past couple of hours. My dopamine reward system went into full blast. I felt really good all over.

I had solved the mystery of planet formation. It is stellar evolution. Planets and stars are not different entities, they are the same things. Some are young, hot and big and most are old, cold and relatively small. The classification of Earth by the mainstream astronomers as essentially a pebble does it a great injustice. I guess this stems from Carl Sagan's "Pale Blue Dot" propaganda. Earth is not a dot, it is a far cry from being the pebble of the mainstream propaganda, it is six sextillion tons of iron, rocks, oil and water. The 1970s classification of it being a dot needs to go right out the window - it is a far cry from pebble territory. Just the very inner most core itself - the core I learned about in geology class, is about 1 billion cubic kilometers of solid
iron/nickel alloy. How the fuck did that thing get melted down? Where are the interstellar furnaces that can melt that much metal down? Carl Sagan never worked with large Earth moving machinery, he did not understand the scale of the material he was referring to. Just understanding how much force is required to life up a large boulder with a backhoe would be enough to reclassify Earth as more than a dot. In fact, this approach does all of astronomy a great injustice as entire galaxies appear as dots to the naked eye because we are far enough away to view them as such. Hopefully we can move away from 1970s propaganda. If not, it will become clear to the reader that the dot (the pale blue dot called Earth or 'planets' in their entirety) is a formation factory - (referring to the stars as individual objects) located exactly where the dots are observed in the telescopes. Well, they are in the night sky - you can see them if the clouds are gone and the Sun is shining on the other side of the Earth. The dots that beget dots are called "stars". We can also even see the youngest planet in our system if you have some welding glasses to don.

I did doubt the discovery, which is how I knew I wasn't going crazy. The haters tell me that I'm crazy, stupid or whatever because they possibly believe I did not doubt it. Well, I did. I did not think it was true. Someone who does not doubt a major insight or finding probably is not thinking clearly, but with emotional certainty, it was like a doubt pendulum. The initial energies of the discovery hit me and it made 100% crystal clear clarity - and then I went into full reverse mode for the next three days, trying to shoot it down and telling myself I was an idiot. We are our own worse critics at times. I let the doubt go full blast for a good 72 hours. After the first three days though, on a Wednesday, I started to write down all the ideas that would make sense if Earth really was an ancient star, while keeping the doubt at the dinner table. I needed to have
objects in middle masses between Earth and the Sun...that's easy. Jupiter, Saturn, Neptune, Uranus... I needed to have someone to tell it to - that was also easy. I would just go to the astronomy professor at Brevard Community College and tell him. Surely he would instantly get it. Turns out that was not the case. When that professor let me down, I told Bill Gaede, the guy I watched all the videos of debunking general relativity. Surely he would get it, and you know, he did! A former cold war spy to my rescue! Then, I needed to really dive back into my chemistry that I learned in high school and college as well as basic physics - I mean basic because the current string theory/dark matter/black hole/big bang/gravitational wave pseudo - science is heinous and a waste of time.

I was thrilled! I told Bill Gaede the discovery before I even had named it Stellar Metamorphosis and even well before any single star evolution principle was thought up. I originally called it "General Stellar Evolution and Planet Formation". Now that I see stellar metamorphosis or the General Theory of Stellar Metamorphosis everywhere, I just want to call it the general theory. Hell, I told my ex-girlfriend about it, and she told me to write it down. (She was an intelligent, sexy woman, let me tell you). Bill then made a short video for me calling it, "The Wolynski Theory of Planet Formation". Much has changed about the theory since then, but it is wonderful that he instantly understood. Between my ex's good vibes and support and Bill Gaede's acknowledgement, I then knew what I needed to do. I needed to pour everything I had into it. It was going to take all my mental energy to work this thing out. It really makes sense to me now why I was so absent - minded at work - I was working on a theory of star evolution, even when I was not writing anything down. It was my obsession. You forget work related things if your mind is pre-occupied, good thing my job is structured and not life/death, so forgetting
things can be fixed, albeit not ideally. It also destroyed my relationship with my girl because I knew I could no longer be there for her. I also knew she did not want to live like a caged bird, so I made the decision to break up. It was best for both of us. The pain inside me after that was so great that I eventually turned to both the theory and the bottle for the next five years, finding mistake after mistake of a hundred years of false astronomical and geological beliefs. I was reading books at an extreme rate, trying to re-new all the information of my past, as well as learning about where all the exoplanets fit in. It was even more delightful that they all fit into the theory.

This discovery really changed me. What is more pressing though is that I changed myself to allow my brain to accompany the understanding. I had to get rid of my perceived mental invincibility. I had to let go of my belief that scientists really knew what they were doing (they do not). I had to let go of my want to be acknowledged. I had to allow myself the time to heal from all the trolling and abuse I would be facing (have faced) in light of getting the theory out there. I most importantly had to learn how to tie together a fantastic worldview from scratch, without pressing it upon others in an arrogant tone - which is something I still struggle with. I am not arrogant, I am just so thrilled to know about who we are and where we came from - the Earth, that I just want to share it, no matter how much abuse I face from the experts who want to put me down. I also have to keep it under wraps because not everybody is willing to learn who they are and what the Earth is. Most people like to remain delightfully ignorant of the deepest life has to offer and that to me is sad - if not a waste of the many billions of years of star evolution that made you. We are essentially pieces of stars that have become self-aware. To me that is the most incredible realization I could ever want, even as a child.
It is wild. You would think that someone who makes a discovery of this magnitude would receive some big prize, or media acknowledgment. Boy, was I surprised. There has, to date, not have been a single dime or dollar awarded to me for the discovery, not a single news outlet has wanted to do an interview, and I have only received a dozen or so emails acknowledging the discovery, personally. Essentially I am not only in the shadows, but the new worldview is completely invisible on the main stage. Only the most inquisitive, clear thinking people know about this worldview. I would give a conservative estimate of the number of people who understand what I do and that's about 300. Given there are 7+ billion people on the Earth, that is way too low of a number. This worldview needs to be shared, as it is just as important, if not more important that Darwin's Theory of Natural Selection. This worldview is tying together the very stars themselves to life. It has never been done before in the history of the Earth, as I am aware of.

The Super - Genius Illusion Versus Discovery

In society today we perpetuate the illusion that some people are super geniuses and the idea that only the great geniuses of the time are the people who make the great discoveries. That is an illusory approach as it is a completely debunked worldview as evidenced by my own educational background. I am not a proper Ivy League educated mathematician or Professor Emeritus of some nationally ranked university. I do not have any science prizes under my belt or even a simple teaching position at a university or even a high school or middle school. Yet, I have designed a superior worldview of stellar evolution and planet
formation simultaneously, and guess what? I am not that smart. Many people would agree with me on that, especially the haters. I have average intelligence. I just think about different processes and ideas than most people, and stuff like rocks and melting metal would put people to sleep, it doesn't exactly fire people up and get them talking as much as a mass shooting or presidential election. I think about the Earth being round and constantly pulling at stuff, all the time. I obsess over the Earth and how nature works in a unique way, I get jazzed up about how elements behave even more than whom the president is, which is great because I can do the chemistry stuff all year every year. I think about what would fire look like in different pressures with different fuels, how it would sound and what it would smell like. I think about how people could possibly invent passive CO2 scrubbers that could function in extreme heat and pressure in say, the atmosphere of Venus or Mars. I do all this completely in an environment that allows me to be creative and I am not surrounded by overly-educated people who have closed minds. As it turns out, my lack of formalized education has been one of my greatest strengths. If I had received a formalized education in astronomy or astrophysics, I would have NEVER made the discovery that planet formation is stellar evolution. It would have been too late. If I had accepted the idea that planets and stars are different things, I would have formed my worldview around that, and everything I would learn from then on out would be adjusted to make that worldview work. Essentially I would play the avoidance of cognitive dissonance game, nothing I would learn or read about in passing that steps outside the bounds of the acceptance of the worldview would be considered.

The truth is that what allows people to make great discoveries is to position their minds in a place, both mentally and physically that allows them to be creative with
their thoughts. Forcing them to play the cognitive dissonance game inside large institutions robs people of their potential as problem solvers. As the type of problems that need to be solved and their solutions might just step way, way outside the bounds of the norms of that institution. The type of environment needed to make great discoveries is quite the opposite of allowing yourself to be conditioned into what everybody already believes is true, to a certain extent. The people you surround yourself with will make - or - break your creativity and clear thinking, thus making a great discovery a process that has nothing to do with intelligence. It has everything to do with positioning your mind in a place that allows it to explore possibilities coupled with specific information that is ignored because that is the collective human understanding of nature in its raw form. Do you not think there are physics and chemistry books that teach false information? There is false information in all of the sciences! All you have to do is study history, let that be your guide. We have a long, long road behind us of false ideas that were accepted theories. People are so quick to forget that. That being said, there is a sweet spot for making discoveries.

You cannot be surrounded by completely uneducated people, as the discussions will not tend towards asking really big questions like, where is the moon Titan, right now, in the sky? How does water form on glasses of cold water when it is humid outside, when there are no holes in the glass? As well, you cannot be surrounded by overly - educated people, as the discussions of how the Sun produces energy, will get the parrot approach. What's worse is that if you have a different idea concerning something they are supposedly trained to understand, they will become arrogant and angry that you dare challenge them! Even educated folk can be some of the most ignorant people on the Earth; this is because they never admit failure.
Instead of admitting failure, they venture into fantasy land. A good example of that is believing the Earth and all the objects in the solar system were the size of an atom, which exploded and created time, absent the time required for it to occur. You know what I'm referring to. The big bang creationism belief. How exactly does an event occur in zero time, and then create time? It is a glaring logical contradiction that cannot survive. The super-geniuses of the Earth have yet to answer that in a satisfactory fashion. It shows the inability of a large scale institution to change tune, in the face of glaring logical fallacies. Sure, the individual can reject big bang, but for a huge body of people who are pressured socially to conform? You can forget about it. They're going to be teaching big bang for the next hundred years. It is well past the bounds of science's ability to self-correct, it has become a cultural/socially accepted fact.

I have also learned that not discussing really wild ideas and fantastic thoughts is just as dangerous to the mind as thinking most things are already figured out. Uneducated people and overly educated people tend to rank high on the ignorance scale in that regard. They both take up the extreme right and the extreme left on the bell curve of a well-rounded understanding of nature. I have also noticed that neither extremely educated folk nor uneducated people want to change their beliefs or claimed knowledge, so don't bother trying to convince them of something new. Do not take my word for it; history is littered with people who got it all wrong, due to their expertise getting in the way of their learning. As well, no real mention in history is even made of people who did not think greatly, at all. So naturally, in order to make a great discovery, you have to be able to consider that the experts are wrong, while simultaneously thinking about the subjects that are out of the ordinary and giving yourself a
limited education. Walking into the unknown or unfamiliar, which is full of ridicule and scary ideas, challenging your own beliefs and the beliefs of others and limiting the education you receive so that you do not become a closed minded fool are the secrets to making grand discoveries. This of course leads back to my original approach to trying to understand gravitation.

If nobody can accept that Einstein was flat wrong, what happens if it turns out he was full of it? That's why I looked for the counter movement towards acceptance of general relativity. Finding counter movements has never been easier - just take a really famous person and write in the google search bar, "so and so is misguided" or "so and so is wrong." You will be amazed at how many dissidents are out there. You will be even more amazed at how long those dissidents have been around and that huge scientific communities completely ignore them. Even then, the mainstream's argument is that well since he has been "right" for over 100 years, then it is probably right today too. No. The length of time an idea is accepted is not evidence for its correct-ness, as if using that argument to show how the Earth/epicycle model for the solar system had any weight. The epicycle model was accepted for thousands of years! The reason that general relativity is still taught is that nobody has been able to replace it with something better, which is essentially the same as the epicycle model. Truthfully though, people that lived in the pre-industrial age all the way to the ancient Greeks for the most part just had survival on their minds, and it really didn't matter where Earth stood in the grand scheme. Just as long as the Earth remained here is all that really mattered. This is the same for Einstein's General Relativity. The truth is nobody understands what actually causes gravitation, and nobody has really figured it out because just as long as the gravitation is there, were good! Just describe it and that is
it! We're done! The whole debunking, of General Relativity is quite easy as well, but the approach taken does not consider that people do not really care. A good analogy for that would be stomping in a pothole in the ground to remove the water while it is raining. Sure, you can remove the water temporarily (that would be debunking GR, which I hear from Mr. Crothers is quite easy to do), but that is temporary. Unless you fill the pothole in the ground with concrete (replacing GR with a sound mechanical theory), then the rain will keep on filling up the hole. This means that to debunk a theory will essentially not do much. You have to replace the theory because the rain will fill the pothole back up again. If philosophers did not re- position the Sun as the central object, then rejecting the epicycle model would really have no effect either.

In the case concerning discovery, the wild fantastic idea is not to accept General Relativity but to consider that he was flat wrong and misguided about the very basics. That is the kind of thinking that will get you places. That is what led me to make the discovery that Earth is an ancient star, albeit indirectly because it woke me up. Once I realized general relativity is nonsense, just like the mathematically perfect epicycle model, I started to look at many other articles and I began consuming science books by the dozens to look for clues as to where and when he went wrong. Not only that, but I found out that it also was not all his fault. The whole cult of personality took over after a certain point, and his papers became those of a super-genius so no oversight was required for discussion and/or publication of his new theories. If anything, ‘super-genius’ or even ‘genius’ is societies’ code for unquestioned authority and it runs counter to the process of creative thinking because of the extreme rate at which the rain will keep on filling the pothole. How can you replace theory with something better and be creative if nobody questions it? That being said, I do
not want unquestioned submission to the general theory that I'm working on, like Einstein wanted with his general relativity. I want people to work on it with their own creative minds. I believe this is possible with the advent of nearly instantaneous publishing of scientific papers on Vixra.org, people sharing ideas freely on YouTube in discussions and an overall global approach that is not tied to the branding of any university. We can say what we want now, and that is incredibly powerful. Though, the repercussions are many, in the scientific community you do not really make a name for yourself unless you can rock the boat and these days, you cannot rock the boat unless you have no strings attached to your theory development. You can no longer be a part of a large scientific community and make discoveries; both are counter-intuitive to each other.

Introduction

This theory is also a new worldview that stars and planets are the same objects.\textsuperscript{[1]} Thus the mysteries of planet formation are all reliant on studying stars themselves, as they are all in different stages to their evolution. After stars are born they cool and combine their elements into molecular compounds, mixtures, colloids, solutions and suspensions. This is being observed in all parts of the galaxy and even on the Earth itself. The main point of this worldview (albeit ignored) is that it contradicts the false worldview of astrophysics which claims that stars and planets are entirely different entities. Unfortunately the only worldview that makes any sense is the one that stars and planets are not mutually exclusive, but are different
stages of the evolution of a single celestial body. Thus, this theory has its place in history as a fundamental scientific controversy. The reader will see that it is not only controversial for the claim of stars and planets not being mutually exclusive, but that the careers of the people who claim it are in jeopardy. Their worldviews and educational backgrounds are fundamentally misguided.[2] So, it is a quite painful realization to say the least.

I wish to provide an accurate description and explanation of the processes involved in stellar evolution and planet formation, in light of planet formation being stellar evolution itself.[3][4] This means that stellar evolution, being planet formation itself, is dominated by chemical, electromechanical and kinetic processes at higher energies, not nuclear processes as observed in active galaxies and radio jets as hypothesized by Victor Ambartsumian.[5] The picture I will paint for the reader is vastly different than anything they have been taught in school, so it will be required that the reader approach with caution. When it comes to new ideas in physics and astronomy, there could be false ideas lurking. So as a disclaimer, since most of the ideas presented are the first of their kind, it is best to remain skeptical, but no so much that your thoughts turn to stone. Some readers might have the opinion that I am exposing Medusa's head, but to harm the astronomers is not the goal. The goal is to wake them up, and to see the light. The worldview they were raised with believing is bunk, and not only am I going to show you why, but I am going to replace those ideas with better ones. Ideas that make sense are going to be the name of this game. Without further ado, I present the only people that have publicly acknowledged this theory in written documents:

Eleven people endorsing stellar metamorphosis's tenents in order of historical appearance are:
Alexander Ivanovich Oparin[6] (1920's)
Jeffrey Wolynski[9][11](The author, 2011)
Bill Gaede (2011)[9]

These scientists and laymen can learn and critique any scientific knowledge because it is freely available on the internet. This sets the precedent for how human understanding is evolving, in that certain scientific societies can no longer withhold information from the public for their own career development and personal gain. These people have taken upon themselves the task of both understanding the very basics of astronomy and astrophysics as well as publicly admitting that they understand this new worldview. Those two steps are fundamental starting points to bringing humanity out of the big bang/dark matter age.

This worldview has actually been around for about 100 years now. People who criticize me and the people who are helping me do not realize this. An article written by the biology expert Alexander Oparin already argues that stars cool and become planets on page 17 of the article "Origins of Life", and there is no evidence that he went back to the nebular hypothesis. He stated, "The different heavenly bodies are now, therefore, at different stages of development...Finally, the stars which have cooled most and are already going out shine with a red light. A further
stages of cooling is represented by the planets which can no longer shine with their own light. Our Earth is one of these. Thus, a study of the different heavenly bodies gives us an idea of the different stages of cooling of our own planet (star)."[15] That documented statement is proof that the main tenants have been around for as long as Einstein's relativity theory. Unfortunately, the followers of General Relativity began making up wild claims that were never scrutinized and still exist today, such as big bang, dark matter and other non - entities. This is why we need this new worldview, as nothing of value has come from big bang or dark matter. With the new discoveries of "exoplanets" into the thousands, human beings need to get a firmer grip on reality. This is possible because stellar metamorphosis flatly denies that the Universe is expanding, or experienced any event even remotely close to the Big Bang. As well, it actually explains what happens to stars as they evolve, cool and die, which is a far cry from the rainy - day mathematical conjecture offered by Stephen Hawking, in his book, A Brief History of Time. I've read that book. It made me want to find actual answers to the questions I had as a child, because it did not provide any. Now as an adult, I have found one really big answer. How we came to be. We are quite literally formed from the energy and matter of an evolving star itself.

Chapter 1: Solving Problems and Examining Assumptions

1.1 Planet Formation and Evolution

A planet forms as it evolves from its much hotter, bigger state.[1][16] This means all the exoplanets identified by the Kepler Space Telescope and others are ancient, evolving
stars, only with the traditional name of "planet" blocking understanding.\cite{2,3} It also means that since stars are young planets, the Kepler data contains direct observation of 40,726,580+ exoplanets,\cite{17,17a} as those are the number of individual light curves being observed. The reason why scientists are having a difficult time classifying planets and exoplanets and actually finding them forming in outer space is not because the telescopes are not powerful enough, but because protoplanets (young planets) are actually very, very massive, bright and are given the name "star".\cite{18} Many issues related to planet formation and stellar evolution can be resolved instantly by realizing it is the same process.\cite{19}
1.1.1 Statistical significance of planet formation theories

The purpose of statistics is to find patterns in data and the more data you have, the higher likelihood a researcher can draw up meaningful patterns. Unfortunately, this is a huge issue in astronomy and astrophysics. Before the 1980s there was only one system to take any meaningful data out of, the solar system, yet there are in excess of an estimated 100 to 400 billion stars (potential systems) that could host planets in the galaxy.\textsuperscript{[20]} For the sake of argument, let us assume there are 200 billion. Therefore drawing up any type of prediction concerning planets when the sample size was 1 out of 200,000,000,000 was extremely likely to lead to false interpretation. The realization lies in the simple fact that just because something shows a pattern (all the planets close to the same axial plane around the Sun), does not mean it is significant especially
when the sample size is 1 out of 200,000,000,000+. A sample size of 1 out of 200 billion is essentially zero data.[21]

1.2 Brown dwarf classification

Mainstream astrophysics defines brown dwarfs as objects not quite large enough to sustain fusion of ordinary hydrogen (which would make them fully - fledged main sequence stars) but large enough to fuse the hydrogen isotope deuterium (unlike planets). However, brown dwarfs themselves are stars in intermediate stages of evolution and will eventually solidify from their gaseous state into solid structure internally, thus becoming a planet. They are considered to be the "missing link", by Anthony J. Abruzzo, connecting stellar evolution to planet formation.[22] So in essence establishment has it right, but does not realize that less massive "stars" were once all very heavy, as well as brown dwarfs, which are cooling indefinitely. Stars do not stop cooling since no additional heat is added externally. This thermodynamic relationship can be mathematically defined as $\Delta U = Q - W$, or the change in internal energy equals heat added to the system subtracting work done by the system.

1.2.1 The absence of lithium burning

The lithium test to distinguish a brown dwarf from a star is unnecessary. The test goes as follows, if the star has little to no lithium in its spectrum then it was used up for fusion processes. So if there is an object that has more lithium than expected then it can be classified as a brown dwarf, as the brown dwarf could have not had the mass to fuse matter in its central regions. The problem is that "ancient stars" such as Earth and brown dwarfs have lithium, so there is no possible way they could have been
fusion powered when they were like the Sun.[23] They are much older than stars that have strong visible spectra with very little lithium. Which leads the author to the hypothesis of being able to determine how large a star will become (given the extent of its crust/rocky surface), by determining the amount of lithium in early stellar evolution. For instance, if a star such as the Sun has a measured 6 billionths of a percent lithium, and we can assume that very little lithium is lost as it cools and transitions to red dwarf, then brown dwarf stages of evolution (because the lithium becomes more abundant to our measuring the spectroscopy of the star), and the lithium is mostly kept. Of course there will be some loss due to photoevaporation and disintegration to hotter hosts as shown by the existence of Hot Jupiters, but for the most part during those early transitions the lithium remains, due to some specific property as well as boron and beryllium while it is in its ionized state. With the lithium kept in about the same amount as when it was measured in the younger hotter star, that 6 billionths of a percent would translate to how much mass the star started out as. For instance, if the Sun is 330,000 times the mass of the Earth, then the total mass of lithium that will be found in the Sun when it becomes Earth-like will be 0.002% of the mass of the new object. That would be 0.00002% of lithium comprising the crust of the Earth, making the Sun as an Earth-like object as 100 times more massive than the Earth. This is assuming two things though which there is little information on, how much lithium would be lost during stellar evolution, and how much lithium the Earth possesses lower than the measurements than the crust can show. If the crust has only 1/50 of the presumed lithium available on the Earth, then it means the Sun will become about twice the mass of the Earth, and given some lithium is lost to photoevaporation and disintegration to hotter hosts, it will become the mass
of Earth. Of course this is all hypothetical, but it can be based on measurements and a reverse engineering of the Earth itself using the abundances of an element that persists throughout a star’s evolution, lithium.

1.2.2 The hydrogen paradox of planet formation

Hydrogen is hypothesized to have deposited in the interior of a brown dwarf as it combines with other elements forming vast arrangements of complex molecules. The direct observation of hydrogen on the Earth is evidence of Earth having been much larger, as its gravitational field currently is too weak to have held onto hydrogen during initial formation given its hypothesized size according to dogma. The escape velocity of Earth is lower than that of hydrogen gas at any temperature above 120 Kelvin. How could the Earth have huge deposits of hydrogen combined with other elements if the hydrogen during the Earth formation would have escaped? The hydrogen would not have formed into molecules, because it would not have been able to stay on the Earth.[24] If there is hydrogen observed in the rocks of any celestial body, it is direct evidence of that body having been either a part of a much larger body, was larger itself, or is the core remains of a star, which is the location that no hydrogen would have been able to collect. Fact is, the claims of Ceres being a protoplanet is misguided, as it could not have collected any amount of hydrogen gas to form the future compositions of a gas giant. If hydrogen is found in their compositions, then 100% they are pieces of much larger celestial bodies that had large enough gravitational fields to trap the hydrogen. Not only that, but since water vapor is observed to be coming out of Ceres, then we can guarantee that it is not material that clumped together to form a planet. It is the remains of an impact of two much larger objects that already had water.
1.2.3 Flare Star Transitioning

Flare stars signal the transition of red dwarfs to brown dwarfs. This means brown dwarfs are not “failed stars” as accepted by the dogma, they are actually the next stage of stellar evolution after red dwarf. Since brown dwarfs are evolved red dwarfs, they have the same evolutionary timeline. Since they have the same evolutionary timeline, their evolutionary paths can be inferred by their physical appearance. In this specific case, it can be inferred that since brown dwarfs are cooler and smaller than red dwarfs, then they were at one time actual red dwarfs, not failed stars. This means they are not only vastly older than what mainstream dogma accepts (sometimes as young as 23 million years old), but that their transition from their hotter star stages is even signaled by the stage known as “flare star”. This is the stage with which the main polar magnetic field of the star overpowers (overpowers) the fields of the surface activity. This in turn is caused by the iron/nickel core beginning to form and aligning the star’s main polar magnetic field internally. The electromagnetic turbulence of this process is what causes the flares. Since the flares are extremely powerful, the star loses mass more rapidly for a short time than previous stages of stellar evolution. If any scientist wants to figure out if the star is past flare stages or not, all they have to do is figure out if it has a strong polar magnetic field. If it does, then flare stages have past. If it has turbulent magnetic activity and is in the temperature range of red dwarfs, then it has not and the scientist will probably see flaring events if they pay attention to the star. The transition of red dwarf to brown dwarf in stellar evolution is signaled by flare star stage. This means brown dwarfs are not failed stars, they are evolved red dwarfs. Since red dwarfs are already many
hundreds of millions of years old, then all brown dwarfs are also many hundreds of millions of years old. If you should read an establishment dogma article that states brown dwarfs as being only a couple million years old, they are wrong. They are intermediate aged stars, not failed ones, and they took a very long time to form.[24a]

1.3 Protoplanet size

The Earth was once incredibly massive and plasmatic. This foundational understanding of the true size of protoplanets is rooted in multiple principles of stellar evolution[25]:

1. The energy/mass dissipation principle states has protoplanets starting out incredibly hot and massive and eventually cooling down to the lowest energy state as they lose the majority of their mass.

This means protoplanets are not rocky/metal objects that have only fractions of the masses of small moons, they are extremely energetic and large objects. The establishment calls Ceres, Pallas and Vesta "protoplanets" yet clearly they are at their lowest energy state, and are composed of rocks, minerals and metal, thus they cannot be protoplanets by definition, as there is very little mechanical or chemical/gravitational energy or pressure due to huge mass to do any real work. A real protoplanet would easily swallow one of those things without any problems, and does massive amounts of work on incoming objects to melt them down, ionize the material and sort it out internally (planet formation). Ceres, Pallas and Vesta are shrapnel remains of long dead stars. They have very, very little mass
and energy to dissipate relative to much hotter, younger stars, thus they cannot be the beginnings of planet formation. Establishment has it backwards, they are the very end of planetary evolution, they are the stellar shrapnel that will get reabsorbed and recycled into a new object in the interior of much larger, younger stars.

In addition to Ceres, Pallas and Vesta being considered as left over remains of the solar system's formation, who exactly has disproven they never came from outside of the solar system? That is for another time though, the reader will realize that establishment uses their white coats to justify their belief concerning that, regardless if there is not a giant Trump style wall surrounding the entire solar system. I guess we could call them ISSO's, or illegal solar system objects. They are undocumented!

2. The plasma to rock and metal principle states that protoplanets start out as plasmatic material (stars), then become cool, cold, dense, rocky/metal stars, which are called "planets".

This ties together the mass/energy dissipation principle. Cold rocks in the vacuum of outer space cannot do the chemical, gravitational, and mechanistic work required to form something as massive and differentiated as the Earth or Mercury. They may play a small part as they slam into the atmospheres of much larger objects, creating heat, but that in itself begets the rocky asteroid's cohesion and structure. The damn thing breaks apart if it does any real work, and this is evidenced by literally every single meteor that enters the Earth's atmosphere. The establishment has their physics in a big pseudoscientific knot!

3. Foundational structure principle states that any object that has a differentiated interior was a much larger object in its
past, and places the possibility that impact remains and many dwarf planets and planets can be classified by an internal physical understanding other than orbits or current size.

The foundational structure principle also deviates from the Newtonian approach, where stars' futures and features are determined only by their masses and orbits. For example, if you take two objects that have exactly the same mass, but one is more gaseous than the other, thus much more voluminous, there is no method to tell their actual stage of evolution in Newtonian mechanics. With the general theory, we can now put a much more elaborate and thought out approach to understanding the stars, as we have a theory that can explain what is actually happening inside the star and its future. The general theory offers a more evolutionary, chemical and thermodynamic approach to stars, three big ideas central to modern science which essentially were never completely thought out in Newton's time. In his time, caloric theory was still accepted, the periodic table did not exist, as well as there was no foundation for the evolution of species was even published. What this means is that Newton can hardly serve students as the epitome of knowledge concerning basic astronomy and astrophysics, he was living in a dark age compared to us.

Sure, orbits are important, but when there is mass and heat loss, motion of huge amounts of material due to both, chemistry happening on vast scales as well as life itself forming on stars as they cool and die, Newton's understanding doesn't provide what is needed. Not only that, but Newton did not have a mechanistic explanation for gravitation. Description is not explanation. To this day we still do not have a valid explanation of gravitation, my guess is that it will be rooted in combining all 4 laws of thermodynamics into one. That's just a hunch though, there
will be a brilliant girl or boy who will figure it out one day, as Einstein sure as hell did not. He was trapped (GR became popular before it was verified) into the belief that space and time were physical. Right. That would be like saying before you move furniture into your new house, that you must move the space out first so the furniture will fit. Sure, air will be displaced, but to move space out as if it was a physical object is absurd, and so is General Relativity in its entirety.

4. The accretion principle states that only objects with large surface areas and gravitational fields can accrete matter, this means protoplanets have to be really, really big.

1.4 The formation of life

As stars evolve, life evolves on them, and as they die the life dies as well,[26][27]

"The chemical reactions necessary for the formation of life from the formation of molecules from ionized plasma, to polymerization of the molecules, to prokaryotes, to eukaryotes and then to multicellular life, to sea plants then to animals and land plants all result in a series of stages of a single star's evolution."

1.4.1 The Taylor threshold
Location of the Taylor Threshold in yellow.

It was mentioned by Barrington Taylor that life could have existed on the Moon.[29] A threshold for the formation of life, given it has had enough time to evolve on any individual star is presented. In short, the star had to have evolved on long enough timescales to host life. If it evolves too fast then no life will form, regardless of the chemicals present. A temporary threshold is added to explain where stars would exist that have evolved too fast to host life. These would end up being the dead stars that are really small, and were formed in timeframes less than 5 billion years. Of course this is up to revision, the threshold is just a roundabout estimate. This means that if a star took only 410 million years to form, then no life will be on it, nor
did it host life. If a star such as Mars took ~14 billion years to form, then regardless if there is no life on it currently, it most certainly had life. The Taylor Threshold is the black line underneath the majority of the stars that take more than 5 billion years to form. The yellow shaded area would be stars that did not have enough time to form life. As an additional note, life can repeatedly spring up from early life, but the majority of the time required for life to form from simple molecules happens over 95% of the star’s evolution.

1.4.1.1 Miller-Urey Experiment
It is hypothesized that the Miller-Urey experiment showed how life begins inside the atmospheres of gas giants. Organic compounds can be created with simple molecules, so long as they have a medium for transportation, some type of electrical spark and/or heat providing for the reactions to take place.

1.4.2 Self - Sterilization vs. host - sterilization

A star can self - sterilize while keeping its atmosphere, or become sterilized by a host. This is in reference to life, as this theory is a life centered worldview, in that stars cool and evolve, forming life on them. Self - sterilization of life on a star happens in the beginning and ending stages of a star's evolution. Self - sterilization happens when the star is too hot when it is younger, and when the atmospheric composition becomes too toxic for life, or does not possess the feedback mechanisms to sustain it. We can see examples of this self - sterilization in various objects in our solar system. The Sun is clearly too hot, Jupiter is too toxic (but will change), Earth is just right, Venus is too hot and does not possess the feedback mechanisms such as a carbon or water cycle. Cycling atmospheres, low toxicity (or at least the organisms ability to handle the specific type of toxicity), stable temperatures that are lower than the boiling point of water, etc. are all essential to the star not self - sterilizing. It should be noted that self - sterilization is longer term as well, and in many cases of dead stars, completely permanent. Thus Mr. Musk wanting to visit Mars is a dead end endeavor, because it is completely self - sterilized. There is a window of opportunity for a star to host life, and inside of that window life can be partially sterilized by a hotter host. This is noted that even during a host - sterilization event (extinction)
event, not all the life is killed, it regains traction in a new form, and evolves to meet the changing characteristics of the star. Therefore it is actually expected to see lifeforms in the fossil record that are not only different for evolutionary reasons, but that their evolutionary pressures are present because of the environment being vastly different as well, for long periods of time (but not permanent). Host-sterilization would be similar to completely removing a couple different types of species, and seeing what happens as their ecosystem changes to adapt to the new conditions of predation, mobility, availability of resources, etc. Host sterilization therefore is not actually a real sterilization, but of a star dramatically changing atmospheric composition as it adapts to new orbital characteristics. As well, host sterilization is could not be permanent, as the atmospheric composition and feedback loops might go right back to how they were, similar to shaking up a snow globe and watching the flakes settle right back down to the bottom.[30]

1.4.3 Available evidence for evolution of life

The evidence for the evolution of early life will not be available on much older stars, as they have lost the majority of their atmospheres and material due to mass loss and atmospheric thinning when the earliest evolutionary processes were occurring.[31] Therefore, if scientists are going to find evidence for early evolution it will be found in stars in earlier stages of evolution such as the Sun, Jupiter, Saturn, Neptune, Uranus or out of the 3000+ exoplanets found to date. The young stars mix their ionized material in huge amounts. The feedback loops which allow for different chemicals to sort, combine and disintegrate during beginning - of - life evolution only appear again in the early - and middle - stages of star evolution. The vast majority of
any evolutionary record will not be apparent. Given rocks and minerals can contain information concerning what molecules were present, as they are solid material and can lock those molecules in place like organic safes similar to fossilized amber, they only formed long after the majority of the star transitioned to gaseous matter.

1.4.3.1 Oil and natural gas leftovers of early life formation

The beginnings of both life and the formation of oil and natural gas happen nearly simultaneously. In fact, one could argue the production of hydrocarbons themselves signals the beginning of life formation at its very earliest step. It would make more sense to have both happen at the same time, as early life itself would also have formed simple hydrocarbon chains, before being extended greatly into fats and the phospholipid bi-layers so common in organic cells. The dogma fully accepts the false notion of life somehow being independent of the natural world, unfortunately this leaves a very acute reasoning problem. How exactly does life form if nothing in the natural world played any part? It leaves a mysterious and disconnected gap. What was happening before natural gas and oil appeared, and life had already been flourishing, completely oblivious to the fact that life consists of huge amounts of long chain hydrocarbons? The reasoning the dogma gives is not convincing. They want people to believe the hydrocarbons formed naturally first to form life, and then the life decayed forming oil and natural gas. Did they forget that natural gas is just one carbon connected to 4 hydrogen atoms and is found in seemingly abiogenic atmospheres such as Jupiter, Saturn, Neptune and Uranus? It should be 100% clear to the reader that life and natural gas/oil formed side by side. This means oil and natural gas are more likely the leftovers of the
formation of the molecules required for life to form, they are not the end result of the decaying of organic matter.\[32\]

Worded differently, the oil and natural gas found today were mostly never alive to begin with, they are just the remaining molecular combinations that never came "alive". What this also means is that for any given amount of a star's ability to combine the available hydrogen with carbon, only a very small percentage of it will actually form structures that meet the conditions defined as "life". This hypothesis inside of the general theory both explains why there is so much oil/natural gas, as well why it is found deep in the interior crust. Given the complete amount of hydrocarbons that exist on the Earth now and in the past, it could be reasoned that only .01% of those would have composed anything resembling even the simplest cells. Finally so we are made clear 100%, coal is the decaying matter found from life. It is composed of mostly carbon and a various mix of previously organic matter, not mostly long hydrocarbon chains found in oil and natural gas. Coal can not be confused for oil or natural gas, they are not the same either in composition or formation mechanisms. Calling natural gas and oil, fossil fuel, does an injustice to its actual formation history. One is formed from compressed decaying organic material, the other is formed simultaneously as the beginnings of life itself, high in the atmosphere of an evolving late stage star, such as Uranus or Neptune. The evidence for this is direct as methane, the main component of natural gas is measured to be in abundance in Neptune's and Uranus's high atmospheres, completely absent evidence of life. As a further note to help spread awareness of the new principles of stellar evolution, the mobility principle of life formation can be included. For life to form on any object, the molecules for life formation need to be able to move on vast scales. This means life evolves on objects which have large gaseous atmospheres,
as that would provide the most motion, as opposed to solid or liquid objects. Life begins where large amounts of mixing can take place between molecules. It is much more probable that a star can form complex chemistry naturally when it can mix trillions of tons of matter in a giant blender like configuration, as opposed to thinking that there is very little mixing. This means that the process that formed the hydrocarbons deep in the Earth was environmentally different than their current state. They were gaseous compounds that could move freely and combine to form long chains, well before they ever became trapped in a thick crust many hundreds (sometimes thousands) of meters deep. It should be interesting to note for any future readers of this paper that biologists could experiment with the first lifeforms if they wanted, just find the bacteria that eat hydrocarbons/alkanes the best. One can wonder the scale of bacterial blooms that appear on evolved stars that are essentially pre-Earth/ocean world stages of evolution.

1.5 The formation of watery oceans

In order for water oceans to be formed many types of exothermic reactions, including plasma recombination, condensation and chemical synthesis reactions (including double-replacement and single replacement reactions, i.e. the mixing of acids and bases) must take place first. This means the hypothesis of comets seeding water oceans is unnecessary.\textsuperscript{[33][34][35][36]} It follows that since water forms on the star as it cools and dies, another principle can be attributed which follows as well under the astrochemical principle,

"Stars form their water oceans as a by-product of their evolution."
First off we can safely assume that the majority of the elements a star is comprised of were already made as a direct result of galaxy birth. Therefore we can discard stars as fusion reactors making either hydrogen or oxygen. Since the star has hydrogen and oxygen in its ionized state we can work from there.

1. First the ionized hydrogen combines with ionized hydrogen and ionized oxygen with ionized oxygen during plasma recombination forming hydrogen and oxygen gas, which are both diatomic molecules. This process releases heat as the elements lose a significant amount of enthalpy in young hot stars.

2. Hydrogen and oxygen gas then combine in much higher pressures to form water vapor. This process is also an exothermic reaction, meaning heat releasing. This happens in middle aged stars such as Jupiter and Saturn.

3. Water vapor then condenses into liquid water, which is called rain. This process also exothermic, and is a basic thermodynamic phase transition called condensation. This happens and is observed on water worlds and old stars such as the Earth. Therefore there are at least three layers of exothermic reactions that occur during star evolution as the star forms water. The ionized oxygen combines with oxygen in plasma recombination, the gases combine utilizing the gravitational potential energy of the collapsing cloud. Then the water condenses and helps further the cooling of the interior as the internal heat is continually absorbed. Essentially a small part of the star's evolutionary energy is stored as chemical bond energy during the synthesis of water and essentially all chemical compounds formed in every single star in the galaxy, and other galaxies.
This follows directly from the astrochemical principle of planet formation which is written in the beginning of Chapter 5.

1.5.1 Heat released from ocean formation

In this theory one of the steps that could form water oceans is when oxygen gas combines with hydrogen gas. This is a double replacement exothermic reaction, which releases 498kJ per Mole. Thus assuming the initial conditions of the hydrogen and oxygen were in a diatomic gaseous state before they combined leaves the whole of the Earth’s oceans having released at least 3.6×10^25 Joules of heat energy during its formation as it currently stands.[37] With thermochemistry, if there is a net loss of energy as is the loss of - 498 kJ mol⁻¹, then there is an exothermic reaction. This means that in order to create vast amounts of water, there needed to be vast amounts of energy loss. This energy loss will be calculated below.

1. Volume of Earth’s oceans is 1,335,000,000,000,000,000 liters or 1.34*10 18 liters.

2. 1.34*10 18 liters equals 1.34*10^21 cubic centimeters (each cc being 1/18 mol mass of water).

3. Heat given off per mol is 498,000 joules/mol (498 kJ/mol) divided by 18 = 27,000 joules/cc

4. 27 kJ/cc * 1.34*10^21 = 36,000 kJ/cc * 10^21 = 3.6 *10^25 joules of energy released synthesizing all hydrogen gas with oxygen gas to make the water of the Earth’s oceans as they currently stand.
This calculation does not include the phase transitioning of the plasma in the young hot star to gaseous diatomic molecules, simply because the thick atmosphere would probably still dominate with ionized hydrogen. The reasoning is probably rooted in the idea of explaining why Neptune has a giant storm on it, it probably signals exothermic reactions forming different types of molecules on large scales, including water, natural gas and oil. This also means that storms similar to what are observed on Neptune happened on the Earth at one point as well. This means that the Earth was vastly more violent, and was not anything like what we know it to be currently.

Chemical reactions play the central role to water formation even with different types of molecules. Acid + base = salt + water, neutralization reaction, double replacement reaction: HCl (hydrochloric acid, a queous solution) + NaOH (sodium hydroxide, aqueous solution) = NaCl (salt) + H2O (water), which could be salt water oceans. The whole idea that water had to be transported here is rooted in the false dogma of all comets being dirty snowballs, when it is well known that they are mostly dry rocks, minerals and metals. As well, there could be many hundreds of ways to form water oceans, some chemical
reactions producing more water than others. Even if water was preformed and brought here, it still does not answer the question how the water was formed to begin with. Asteroids have no appreciable atmospheres, so how exactly did vast amounts of the hydrogen combine with oxygen and not escape the gravitational field of the tiny comets? Establishment still has no answer to that very basic question.\[48\]

1.5.2 The source of ocean methane

According to mainstream science, 4% of the Earth's methane, which is one carbon atom connected to four hydrogen atoms (CH4), is formed by micro-organisms in the world's oceans.\[38\] What is disregarded is the fact that the vast majority of methane was already formed in later stages of stellar evolution when the carbon combined with the vast quantities of hydrogen in the high atmosphere during grey and blue dwarf stages. These are mostly exothermic combination reactions and are the basis for the formation of most naturally occurring molecular compounds including extremely complex molecules that compose life itself.\[39\] This atmospheric methane then combined with other hydrocarbons which then sank to the center of the star as the silicate crust was developing and became trapped. Over the next many millions of years this trapped methane and other hydrocarbons eventually started bubbling out of the crust underneath the water oceans and mixed in. The methane is still doing this to this very day. As well, it should be noted that some stars that have their outer atmospheres ripped away faster, before material can be built up enough to bury the methane and ethane, might just have exposed hydrocarbon lakes right on their surface, as is the case of Titan.\[39a\]
1.6 The formation of rocks and minerals

This theory covers all matter in gaseous and plasmatic phases, which is not covered by the rock cycle. This new theory assumes that before rocks/minerals were sedimentary, igneous and metamorphic rock, the material consisted of much simpler compounds such as molecular radicals both anions and cations and was also fully ionized at one point. This means that all the rocks/minerals on Earth were at one time completely different phases of matter earlier in the Earth's evolution, when it was a much hotter, bigger, younger star. This stands to reason that the rock cycle as interpreted by modern geologists only accounts for very late stages processes, when the star has already combined vast amounts of molecules in its thick atmosphere.[40][41]

1.7 The formation of planetesimals

Establishment believes that to form planetesimals two larger objects collide at normal asteroid velocities, which is about 25 kilometers per second. A bullet coming out of a high powered rifle is travelling about 1.2 kilometers per second. This is clearly absurd as that means they are travelling relative to each other many tens of thousands of kilometers an hour. It would be like taking two rail guns and aiming their projectiles to hit each other from opposite directions. Not only that but the average velocity of a rail gun projectile is around 2.5 kilometers per second. Now, scale up to two school bus sized asteroids travelling towards each other at 10 times the velocity of a rail gun projectile. Will those asteroids clump together? I don't think so. What is most likely is that their impacting each other will cause an explosion of nuclear bomb magnitude. It is 100% clear that astronomers do not understand the concept of
inertia, or maybe they got "C's" in college, or maybe they don't understand basic physics such as rocks that travel at extreme velocities being extremely hard to stop (much less clump together with other skyscraper sized rocks, travelling 10 times rail gun velocities), who knows. In order to correctly state what happens in nature, the exact reversal in philosophy is needed, and is only offered by the general theory.[42][43]

"A planetesimal is formed from a collision of objects which were much larger and broke into smaller pieces. It is easy to reason this is how they form, because it can be easily visualized how two objects would break apart if they smacked into each other in outer space. Two objects hitting each other at velocities of orbiting satellites would not clump together into a bigger mass, they would break apart into millions of pieces. Not only that, but they would bounce off each other even at low velocities because the gravitational field of something the size of a glass marble is not strong enough to keep them clumped together. Just like in a game of billiards, it doesn't matter how fast they hit each other, they will deflect and never coalesce."

1.8 Location of fusion reactions

The thermal energy of 20 million degrees equates to around 3.5 Kev, or 3500 electron - volts. The energies required for fusion/nuclear transformations is of the order of millions of electron - volts.[44] This means the interior of stars do not possess the required energies for fusion reactions to take place, even if their interiors possess great temperatures. The actual location for nuclear transformations exists in radio galaxy jets and other high -
energy phenomena such as quasars and pulsars where the energies of accelerated particles are well above the amounted required for nuclear reactions, according to the general theory. Astrophysicists born in the late 19th century, such as Eddington, Atkinson and Houtermans took their students on the wrong path of discovery concerning the location of nuclear transformations. The correction in observations is as follows.

"Stars are electrochemical, thermochemical reaction chambers and are actively engaged in vast chemical exothermic reactions. Nuclear physics is negligible. The existence of radio galaxies were not known in Eddington's time, nor were the relativistic jets that create all the matter necessary for star formation. Meanwhile, mainstream scientists believe quasars, pulsars and other types of high-energy objects rely on strange matter and exotic theoretical ideas which have no basis in reality. What is more appropriate is to place stars in the arena of chemists and those who study rocks and minerals, and redirect the processes of nuclear transformations where the energies and velocities are high enough for them to occur, in birthing and active galaxies (AGNs). If this is not done, then there will be a great waste of resources chasing the fusion process." [46]

1.8.1 Fusion outside a body

Only the most energetic particles will exit the areas of least resistance, along the poles, thus producing jets of material at velocities required for fusion to take place outside of the body. This also means that fusion is more than likely a thermodynamically open system, not a closed system accepted by establishment. The energies required for fusion are probably the result of a very powerful gravitational field, and the subsequent exit from that field,
not purely as a result of a powerful gravitational field alone, with self-damping feedback loops. In essence it is a two-stepped process. Squeeze the matter greatly, then let the material blast outwards at near luminal velocities as observed in radio jets in active galaxies.

Unfortunately, this method will not be adopted as the closed system mentality rules current fusion projects, as a result of group think and the lack of genuinely creative thinking. They all make the same mistake of closing the process off in giant containers, which self-damps the energy due to the critical ionization velocities of the material. They are doing the thermodynamic equivalent of heating a giant cup of hot coffee in a closed off cup. Heating the coffee to enormous temperatures is one thing, letting that material blast outwards at enormous velocity as a result of the heating is something else. It is also interesting to note that if material is moving away from an active jet, then the material will naturally be incredibly cold, due to thermodynamic expansion. This meaning that fusion processes are high velocity, extremely cold and are absent self-damping feedback loops invented in the 1950's, the exact opposite of modern experiments.

1.9 Excess radiation from Neptune

Neptune emits 2.61 times the radiation it receives from the Sun. The excess radiation falsifies any notion that this object formed simultaneously as any other solar system object. The star is combining oxygen and hydrogen with other elements which are forming molecules. Combination chemical reactions (exothermic) are known to release infrared radiation. These continuous and very long term combination chemical reactions create all naturally
occurring compounds, including life itself. This is in line with the fundamental from of heat production outlined in SM, which is the heat of a star is fueled by gravitational collapse into electrochemical, thermochemical and photochemical reactions on large scales. In turn the excess radiation of Neptune (and all evolving stars) is also supported by the principle of heat evolution which states that the heat production of the star is internalized. This gives its outside atmosphere not heated by an external star the opportunity to drop to extreme temperatures which do not reflect internal conditions. In short, high atmosphere temperatures or methods of heat loss do not necessarily reflect internal conditions during stellar evolution.

1.10 Examining basic assumptions

The origin of the rewriting of astrophysics provided in this book rests with examining of the basic assumptions that are accepted have not been critically examined in light of the discoveries of thousands of exoplanets.[48]

1.10.1 Geological assumptions

1.10.1.1 Solid and liquid Earth

Multiple textbooks and the literature assume that Earth always consists of solid and liquid materials.[49] This assumption flatly rejects the possibility that Earth could have been in a gaseous or plasmatic state in earlier stages of its evolution, as suggested by the observations of billions of objects in those states of matter. The main justification for the standard assumption above is rooted in the philosophy of uniformitarianism, and a sort of compartmentalization of the geologic sciences apart from astronomical observations, regardless if Earth itself is fundamentally an astronomical
object. As well, there is direct evidence that Earth's surface was around 800 Kelvin and at pressures between .2 and 1 Gigapascal, (2000 - 9,800 atmospheres) meaning it was at one point completely covered in very thick highly pressurized gas. This evidence is in the form of the existence of Kyanite, Sillimanite and Andalusite being found on the surface of the Earth.[50] These minerals require the existence of very high pressures and temperatures to form. This meaning the very surface people walk on is the interior surface of a gas giant, or star in intermediate stages of evolution.

1.10.1.2 Thin atmosphere

Another major assumption of geophysics is that Earth always had a very thin atmosphere as compared to Jupiter, Neptune or Uranus. To the contrary, Earth was exactly like Jupiter, Neptune or Uranus much earlier in its evolution, but gradually loses its atmosphere as it evolved according to the atmospheric thinning principle. According to the AT principle, younger stars are very large and have very thick atmospheres, as well do not yet possess cores. As they evolve their cores slowly deposit via physical vapor deposition in their central regions, and the atmosphere loses material to this core deposition,[51][52][53] as well to photoevaporation of a hotter host, atmospheric escape and if the star is really young like the Sun to CMEs, flaring and the like.

1.10.2 Astronomical assumptions

1.10.2.1 Visible spectrums

A main astronomical assumption is that all stars have visible spectrums. This assumption has lead to
scientists neglecting the vast majority of stars that do not have visible spectrums. Calling them planets/exoplanets does not resolve the issue. It is only until scientists realize that the majority of stars no longer shine will they understand how stellar evolution works.

1.10.2.2 Massive stars

It is assumed that all stars are massive like the Sun. This directly contradicts a fact of physics called the conservation of mass and energy. All stars lose mass and energy in great amounts as they evolve. They can start out big and hot like the Sun, but will eventually cool, and lose the majority of their mass to solar wind, CME's, solar flares, photoevaporation, impacts, etc. This also means that as it shrinks, it also loses the angular momentum (mass loss), which means its rotational velocity will remain constant.

1.10.2.2.1 Conservation of mass and stars in the general theory

The law of conservation of mass or principle of mass conservation states that for any system closed to all transfers of matter and energy, the mass of the system must remain constant over time, as system's mass cannot change, so quantity cannot be added nor removed. Hence, the quantity of mass is conserved over time.

This is taken directly from wikipedia's page on conservation of mass and is a shared definition for all
physicists, including the author. The reverse of the statement, and with equal meaning can be stated, "for any system not closed to all transfers of matter and energy, the mass of the system will not remain constant over time, as system's mass can change, so quantity can be added and removed. Hence, the quantity of mass is not conserved over time."

Simplified it means that if you have an object that can lose mass, then it will probably lose mass. If the object cannot lose mass, it is closed, then it will not lose mass. This brings up a very, very damaging realization that destroys all stellar evolution models, except for the general theory. Stated simply, if there are stars that are observed to lose mass, then they will become less massive. Not only that, but if there are stars that are becoming less massive, then they are not closed systems. Of course, this is a problem for one reason, and one reason alone. This is taken from the Wikipedia page for stellar evolution, "Depending on the mass of the star, its lifetime can range from a few million years for the most massive to trillions of years for the least massive".

To clarify reader. The above statement states, "depending on the mass of the star". You know what that means? They have stellar evolution models dependent on the mass of stars. Yet, clearly they are observed to be open, not closed, systems, as their masses are not conserved over time. How can they determine what happens to stars by how massive they are when mass is not conserved? It means they have no idea what they are talking about.

This problem can be stated extremely simply. If I take a bite out of an apple, it will become less massive. What the astrophysicists are telling the public is that if I take a bite out of an apple, it will retain its mass as I eat it. Their models for star evolution really are that wrong. Yes, shocking. They claim to understand what conservation of mass means yet
model stars as closed systems that do not lose mass as they evolve! They modeled stars as closed systems, regardless if they are clearly open systems. Not only that, but historically stars have been modeled as closed systems. Do not take my word for it, here's a snip directly from a book written in 1979, on O-type stars by Peter S. Conti and Camiel W. H. de Loore.

The reader should wonder. Why on Earth would they model stars as closed systems, when all the observations show that they are open systems? Well, because the rate of mass loss is too little to have any real significance to the mathematical modellers, as well it is easier to make up equations when you remove variables (mass loss, meaning ignore physical reality, as math does quite often), and that is exactly where they fumble the ball. They should have taken into account the fact that stars lose mass and are not closed systems. They are open systems. If they would have realized this early on, then their modelling would have led directly to the conclusion that stars as they evolve, become less massive. Thus, trying to determine what happens to a star on mass alone, when the mass is actually lost, has fubar all astrophysical understanding.

Now that we know this very valuable information, we can now model stars based on the fact that they are open systems and lose mass. Fortunately that is extremely easy too, they all fit on one graph. As it turns out, planets themselves are the stars that have lost basically 99.999% of their mass, so by appropriating the conservation of mass,
which is a simple physical law, we in turn have both solved the mystery of stellar evolution and planet formation itself. It is suggested that physicists not violate basic conservation laws to explain physical phenomenon.

As well, if a star loses mass too fast, before it can even create life, then the material deposited in the center will be much less than old stars that evolved slowly. The moon Io is a good example of this. Still active cores of stars that have had their atmospheres ripped away really fast (lost mass) can be quite small, the fact that astrophysicists still call them moons does not really help. It is an outdated term. Below is where Io sits, it fits directly under the Taylor Threshold, where it evolved much too fast to host life, yet is still active and hot.\[53a\]
1.10.2.2.2 The mass modelling principle of stellar evolution

In order to correctly model star's evolution into life hosting stars such as the Earth, or others, the variable of mass loss needs to be included. What this means is that any model of the internal structure of a star is not sufficient 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" in the solar system. In short, trying to determine what the future of a star's physical and chemical structure without significant mass loss as a variable will lead to wildly inaccurate assessments of the star's evolution at most stages of evolution. A star's current structure, elemental and molecular composition, radiance, phase of matter, etc. cannot be used to determine its history unless mass loss is taken into account. That also being said, this principle diminishes in importance as the star stabilizes and loses mass slower, thus older stars such as Mercury will not change considerably, so can be modelled much easier as the mass loss and rate of mass loss will be much less. Basically this means 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. This is why all planets will be different sizes and are observed to be different sizes.[53b]

This also means claims of Jupiter sized objects by the dogmatists of being composed of mostly metallic hydrogen in their centers is irrelevant to determine its future fate, as most of that hydrogen will eventually escape in time, due to the strength of the gravitational field diminishing. It will not be able to hold onto the hydrogen as it evolves, as its average kinetic energy will exceed the escape velocity of the star. This is why the oldest stars that are observed, most of the free hydrogen has escaped, and only the hydrogen that has combined with other elements remains. The hydrogen can only stay if it combines with other elements and becomes heavier, in the case of water, or rocks/minerals.

1.10.2.3 Sun reliance

It is assumed that the evolution of all the solar system objects relies on the fate of the Sun alone and that they are not independent objects. This directly contradicts the principle of multiple nebulas and the principle of stellar adoption. The solar system is an adopted family, with mini solar systems inside of it. It is much more reasonable to actually look at the objects and notice they are all different in size, look different and are in different random orbits, meaning the Sun plays a minor and temporary role in their evolutionary sequences, until it loses them and they wander the galaxy as rogue objects, taking up orbit around another bigger, less evolved star or group of stars.

The whole volume of a star evolves, therefore their evolution is mostly independent of the relatively small surface area impacted by a hotter host. This means they are definitely mostly independent of the Sun, except for their current orbits. Rocky/metal surfaces are not subject to
photoevaporation as are younger more gaseous stars, so they are even more independent of the Sun’s features except for their thin (if existent) atmospheres such as the Earth.

1.10.2.4 Mutual exclusiveness

The main astronomical assumption accepted which has prevented understanding is of assuming a star to be big, hot and bright and planet as small, cold and dim, which was rooted in appearances. It is pointed out that the appearances of there being two distinct classes of objects has always been a deception. The two are not mutually exclusive. The big, hot and bright star shrinks, cools and dims, becoming the planet. This assumption has allowed for entire models and theories to be designed to fit in stars as being similar in age to planets, regardless if the former is actually the younger by many magnitudes. It also applies to objects that are both classified as planets. Venus is roughly the same size as Earth, is composed of rocks like the Earth, and no longer has a magnetic field. How do two very similar objects form at the same time and one have volcanic activity and the other is a lifeless world without any crustal activity? Clearly Venus is vastly older than the Earth and has almost completely solidified and hid all evidence for having been composed of multiple plates in the lithosphere well in its past. Simply put, most of the magma lava has already solidified.

1.10.2.5 By-product reinterpretation

Another root assumption of astrophysics is that planets are by-products of star formation, which could be misleading. In this theory planets are by-products of stellar evolution, meaning the planet is not the remains of stellar
birth, but the remains of an evolving/evolved star itself. This reversing of assumption simplifies all astrophysical interpretations regarding stellar evolution and planet formation models. The majority of accepted models for both stellar evolution and planet formation could probably be using an assumption that does not work, according to Anthony J. Abruzzo.[55]

1. Establishment dogma: Planets are by-products of star formation

2. Stellar metamorphosis theory (expanded transformation hypothesis): Planets are by-products of star evolution.[55a]

1.10.2.6 Disk nebula

A reinterpretation of the apparent evidence of planets being formed in disks is provided.[56] It is stated,

"They (protoplanetary disks) are evidence for planet destruction and collision events. The disks radiate strongly in the infrared, meaning the material is liquid hot like magma. In essence they are shrapnel fields, and this shrapnel can re-enter the atmospheres of other stars as meteors and can be found on the ground as meteorites, and even leaves rings around other evolved stars and asteroid fields and in meteor showers.

The obsession over the idea of disks forming vast spherical objects stems from the many century old belief that the disk nebulas observed in the night sky were new solar systems. When Hubble and Humason found out that the disks were actually galaxies, composing hundreds of billions of individual stars, the belief that the disks were
forming/young solar systems that were close in, should have been abandoned. Unfortunately, even in the 21st century, the belief persists. Astronomers are still looking for a "smoking gun" in reference to proving their idea that somehow giant spherical objects form out of disks.\footnote{56a} As of 2017 they still have no evidence to back their claim that planets form out of disks. The system TYC 8241 2652 had an alleged protoplanetary disk. This disk glowed brightly in the infrared when discovered in 1983, but as of a few years ago has stopped glowing in the infrared. This system falsifies the idea that disks create Earth sized objects because the protoplanetary disk model absolutely requires that the disk be present for millions of years. The infrared glowing is simply the result of a series of giant collision events that create trillions of tons of star shrapnel known as asteroids, meteorites and small moon-like objects that are undifferentiated. Therefore TYC 8241 2652 is not evidence planet formation but planet destruction caused by objects clearing their path for more stable orbits.

In fact, all the evidence points to cultural acceptance of stars being mutually exclusive of planets conceptually as the cause for the mystery of planet formation. In fact, planet formation is no mystery if we can disregard our culture and think rationally. The young hot planets are called "stars".

1.20.2.6.1 Disk age interpretation

In the accepted sciences, the presence of a disk of material around a big hot star means the star is young. The determination of a star’s age based on the presence of disks can be ignored as unnecessary. It is simply an assumption based off the nebular hypothesis, which originally was beat out by the island universe hypothesis. The nebulas that were disk shaped spotted by early astronomers were not young solar systems forming planets inside of the Milky
Way, they were entire galaxies. Somehow this tidbit of scientific history has escaped the theorists.

“Disks cannot be used to determine the age of a star, they are independent structures.”

Disks do not signal youth nor do they signal planet formation, as planets are simply more evolved stars that orbit younger ones forming systems.

1.10.2.7 Solar system wall

It is assumed that nothing can enter the solar system from another star system entirely, yet it is very clear that there are no walls preventing objects from entering the solar system. The heliosphere is not a physical wall, it is a concept. If any galactic objects have enough mass and momentum they will enter freely. This means the Oort cloud is probably an unnecessary concept, as well means that objects found as meteorites probably came from outside the solar system entirely and have origins from some other place in the galaxy, or another galaxy entirely. With this realization it becomes obvious that our own system of objects was subject to capture by the Sun, including the Earth, Jupiter, Saturn, Neptune, Uranus and all their moons.

1.10.2.8 Fusion powered stars Versus Plasma Recombination

It is assumed that stars are fusion powered, they cannot be hot for any other reason. This ignores a fact of thermodynamics that plasma recombines into gas, releasing heat. This is known as plasma recombination and is a basic thermodynamic phase transition. Plasma recombination/re
- ionization fueled via gravitational collapse keeps young stars hot and luminous. As the gravitational field diminishes to mass loss, via the conservation of mass, the feedback loop becomes interrupted and the plasma recombines into superheated gaseous matter which then transforms into much more complex molecules to dissipate the left over heat for many more billions of years. This means stars are hot and can remain hot as they evolve with mechanisms completely absent the concept of fusion, and can almost ignore radioactive material heating any matter.

1.10.2.9 Chemistry assumption

It is assumed that chemistry is not important to explain the behavior of stellar events, yet stars are giant celestial chemistry demonstrations involving all naturally occurring chemical reactions. This is evidenced by the presence of all naturally occurring chemical compounds being found on the Earth, an evolved star.

1.10.2.10 Exotic structures

Cosmologists believe that the universe's exotic structures are composed of theoretical entities, such as dark matter, quark stars, and other structures and material never observed. Rocks, minerals and all of matter involved in the formation/evolution of life itself, the real physical matter of reality in their millions of combinations are unimportant and non-exotic. This assumption signals a mental disconnected-ness of cosmologists with nature, which is evidence that they have no concern for the central science, chemistry.
1.20.2.11 Stellar age location

In academic dogma, stars can have their ages determined by where they are located. This is completely false. That would be like saying I am 90 years old because I am in the nursing home visiting my grandmother. It is nonsense. The AA Tauri system is assumed to be 2.4 million years old by the dogmatists, yet probably possesses a brown dwarf which makes it at least 260+ million years old. Brown dwarfs are at least hundreds of millions of years old. There is no way in hell the AA Tauri system is 2.4 million years old. In astronomy they do this a lot, they assume two objects are the same age because they are in the same vicinity. How could all the objects in a system be 2.4 million years old and possess objects that are 100 times older? Just because I'm standing next to a giant sequoia tree does not mean that my presence makes it 33 years old!

This is why they think the Sun is old like the Earth, yet clearly it is a very young, hot star relative to Earth. I guess a better analogy would be puppies. How many of those can you hold in your arms at the same time? Does the proximity of the puppies to you determine their age? Then why do astronomers ASSUME Earth to be the same age as the Sun? Their ideas do not make any sense. The Earth is made of rocks and has mountains! Where are the mountains
and rocks on the Sun? There are none! It is too young! It is way too young to have formed those types of structures![56b]

1.11 Gravitational instability

To form any object in outer space the concept of gravitational instability is not required. Therefore, any type of gravitational wave or uncertainties related to gravitational forces can be ignored involving the birthing of stars, planets, asteroids or any celestial object. To birth a star you need huge electrical and magnetic forces to bind together and heat the gases of an interstellar cloud. Gravitation of said cloud simply does not exist yet because the cloud has not collapsed yet. To state that there is “gravitational instability” of the cloud causing it to collapse absent a gravitational field does not represent an accurate description of nature. How can there be an instability of a force which does not impact the surroundings yet? It is a contradiction in reasoning.[57]

1.12 Mental biases of astronomers

1.12.1 The Cornell Effect

The late and great HaltonArp:

“I gloomily came to the ironic conclusion that if you take a highly intelligent person and give them the best possible, elite education, then you will most likely wind up with an academic who is completely impervious to reality.”

The Dunning - Kruger Effect: Dunning and Kruger proposed that, for a given skill, incompetent people will:

1. fail to recognize their own lack of skill
2. fail to recognize the extent of their inadequacy

3. fail to accurately gauge skill in others

4. recognize and acknowledge their own lack of skill only after they are exposed to training for that skill

The Cornell Effect is very similar and explains Halton Arp’s observations.

Highly educated people after schooling will:

1. fail to recognize their own ignorance

2. fail to recognize the extent of their ignorance

3. fail to accurately gauge the ignorance of other highly educated people

4. fail to recognize and acknowledge their own ignorance even after they are exposed to more reasonable ideas and processes they consider to come from uneducated people or those outside their field of study

The Cornell effect does not apply to ignorance of those who do not have formal educations, it applies to people who are so far educated, that they become institutionalized, a pervasive all - encompassing ignorance that is invisible to the most expert of experts. The Cornell effect is a permanent ignorance, an ignorance that no education can fix. Lord Kelvin himself was subject to the Cornell effect when he denied that there was such thing as
“nuclear energy”. Stephen Hawking as well suffers from it, as there is no place in stellar evolution for singularities. It is proposed that there is an effective middle ground for education. Too much education breeds institutionalization and the Cornell effect, too little education breeds the Dunning - Kruger effect. The only downside is that the Dunning - Kruger effect can be fixed, the Cornell effect is a permanent ignorance, bulwarked by social status, ego, careerism and false knowledge. It is like that saying, it is harder unlearning something than learning it, or it is easy to fool someone, harder to convince them they have been fooled. As well, it ties into the idea that educated people ignore the uneducated because they believe that they would have nothing important to say, which ties in the Cornell effect to the Michelson fallacy. It is the belief that the fundamental principles of nature have already been discovered, and/or if there were something important to be known, the studying physicist who claims the former would be the first to know of it. It is not education that cures ignorance, it is the ability to recognize ignorance which cures ignorance.[57a]

1.12.2 Cosmologists and their problem with equivocation

Cosmologists use equivocation, which confuses the public and even themselves. They do this to make sure they can never be wrong in any situation, by never taking a stance one way or the other. Their intent is to deceive to protect their careers and to sell books that say nothing. It is essentially a political tactic that does not belong in science, and neither does cosmology (which is a quasi - religion) as a whole. In astrophysics, plasma recombination happens when an ionized particle combines with another ionized particle forming a neutral particle. This process releases
heat and is a simple thermodynamic phase transition in which a plasma (ionized gas) becomes a gas (neutral).

The next two lowering of the enthalpies of the gas can happen via deposition (gas directly deposits as solid material), or condensation (the gas transitions to a liquid). They have very clear transitions as defined in basic thermodynamics. The fallacy of equivocation happens when the Army of quasi-religious cosmologists apply a thermodynamic phase transition to the earliest stages of their big bang creationism idea. They hijacked the concept of hydrogen recombination and applied it to an entire epoch, after the initial explosion of the big bang creation event.

They equivocated the thermodynamics of an ionized to neutral gas (something that happens in stars) and applied it to a fantasy idea that has no basis in reality. They took an actual observation and forced it to apply to an event that was never observed. In fact, there is no observational evidence for a big bang creation. Plasma recombination happens in events that are observed, in stars and even in lightning and different types of light bulbs. Taking actual science and understandable explanation and equivocating it to an idea that is pure fantasy is a recipe for disaster.

Just so the reader is made aware, it is very dangerous to accept any cosmology related idea, because cosmologists tend to hijack words and equivocate them into nothingness. They abstract into oblivion. The people who study cosmology end up doing circles around themselves and others, a kind of pseudo-intellectualism that puts up the front of being actual science (it isn't). The previous example they are essentially inverting the meaning of recombination. They are saying that before the hydrogen is made, everything was all protons/electrons to a certain extent, but recombination is a re-combination. That word literally means the hydrogen was first a gas, then it was
ionized, then it was re-combined. If they really did not want to get called out on their hijacking of the term, they should have used the word "combination" or "combination epoch". Which is further evidence they hijacked the term to suit their fantasy. To expose the cosmologists for the giant big bang creation scam, all the reader needs to do is examine the words they use and play connect the dots. They abuse and equivocate language all over the place to suit their agenda.\[57b\]

They also equivocate elements that are not metals as metals. So to them, oxygen and neon are metals. Non-exacting language is how they got into this mess. Being sloppy with the words used has helped them to create a JabbaWocky, which is a nonsense monster that cannot be killed.

Most of the physical matter in the universe is in the form of hydrogen and helium, so astronomers use the word "metals" as a convenient short term for "all elements except hydrogen and helium".\[3\] This usage is distinct from the usual physical definition of a solid metal. For example, stars and nebulae with relatively high abundances of carbon, nitrogen, oxygen, and neon are called "metal-rich" in astrophysical terms, even though those elements are non-metals in chemistry.

It should be known that to understand star evolution, we have to refer to what is actually observed chemically speaking. Saying a gaseous object that has lots of oxygen and very little iron as "metal rich" is really bad. What about dead stars that are actually metal rich, such as Mercury which as a very large iron/nickel core? Their confusion and misuse of simple terms is not good.

Chapter 2: Stellar Birthing
It is referenced that to birth a star, the majority of the thermodynamic phase transitions be comprised of endothermic or heat absorbing reactions. These reactions include ionization, melting, vaporization and sublimation. The metamorphosis (evolution) of it be comprised of exothermic or heat releasing reactions, these are comprised of mostly recombination, solidification (crystallization (crystals and amorphous material)), condensation and deposition.[58]

This means that the star is not externally/internally powered but is a result of a much larger, earlier event which is having its energy dissipated via star formation. This earlier event is considered in this crank theory as galactic nucleosynthesis, which has the required velocities of material to fuse matter on the nuclear level, thus also contradicting the fusion model of stars.[59]

2.1 Stellar birthing

To birth a star the cloud has to have some sort of charge separation so that the material can be brought together to overcome the pressure and heat required for stellar birth. To have the charge separation, the cloud has to be plasma.[60]

"Stars are born in plasmatic environments, where large scale charge separation can occur."

Rocks, minerals, liquids and gaseous mixtures that are electrically neutral (not charged), or quasi - neutral, cannot facilitate stellar birth, there has to be large scale charge separation in a plasmatic environment.
Chapter 3: Energy Transformations

Since the processes are wide ranging and involve all forms of matter at very wide ranging temperatures, we can make a completely encompassing conclusion that all forms of energy transformation are present in a star as it evolves. This is including but not limited to gravitational potential energy being converted to thermal, mechanical, electrical, EM and sound energy, and a wide mix of the latter being converted to any combination of the former or latter. The purpose of this principle is to ensure that future generations are not blinded by the dogma of establishment, where only nuclear processes matter in stars. In fact, the only nuclear processes that matter in evolving stars are related to nuclear decay, and not element synthesis. The scales of power needed for nuclear element synthesis are only present in birthing galaxies. A picture of a birthing galaxy is provided below, it is Hercules A. [61a]
To explain the importance of energy transformations we can explain how much energy is there to get transformed. The gravitational potential energy of objects in highly evolved stars such as Earth is much lower than younger stars such as the Sun. For a 1kg object dropped on Earth, with an acceleration of 9.8m/s^2 at 1000 m, subtracting for loss due to the atmosphere causing friction, has a GPE of 9,800 J. For the same height, the GPE for 1kg object dropped on the Sun, (275m/s^2 acceleration of free fall) subtracting for loss due to the atmosphere causing friction and other factors, is 275,000 Joules. What this means is that the potential energy for objects that fall on younger stars that have a lot more mass and have much higher accelerations for free fall is much higher. This means their atmospheres are probably much more energetic from the heat of friction of particles constantly falling back into the star. It should be no wonder young stars are bright and hot, the particles that fall back into the star are accelerating extremely fast, at an astounding ~28 G’s.

To compare familiar objects, a 50kg (110lb) dumbbell dropped at 10,000 meters (6.2 miles) from the surface of the Sun would have about 137 million joules. That would be the same energy as a 60 ton aircraft at landing speed of 115 knots (132 MPH, 212 KPH) on the Earth. So it is clear for the reader, the GPE of objects inside or near stars diminishes at a smooth, continuous rate, given the change in height from the surface and mass of the dropped object do not change, and levels off as the star begins completely solidifying and has lost about 99% of its atmosphere. So to
rewrite the equation, would could add Delta (change in) in front of the g. So it would look like this:
\[ \Delta PE = m \times \Delta g \times h \]

When you can have that much energy from gravitational collapse available to do mechanical work on matter, then we should expect an enormous range of energy transformations as a result. Friction alone would cause an enormous amount of thermal energy, which then could be used to spur chemical events that need heat to occur. As well, thermal events due to enormous friction could also create huge amounts of electrical interactions, as charge between clouds would dwarf any Earth sized phenomenon. It should also be noted that to have a fully comprehensive understanding of the stars, astronomers should have kept the idea of slow gravitational collapse included in their solar evolution models while mass loss took place. Instead, they forced stars to gravitationally collapse without mass loss, which has led to a wide range of strange theories such as black holes, exploding stars, etc. From what I have read and studied over the years, astronomers engaged in a massive group think campaign, to which they were naïve victims due to over-education. They were educated long before they had the emotional and mental strength to challenge authoritarian regimes.

So that we can go back to where we took a wrong turn concerning star evolution we need to keep stars as experiencing all forms of energy transformation. The matter of a star is organized via basic chemical and physical principles, to form a life hosting star, of which we have grown very familiar with. Stellar evolution (planet formation) involves all types of energy transformation.[61]

3.1 Tying Gravitational work to energy transformations and other principles in the general theory
Gravitational work is defined as the star doing work on itself as it collapses into a "planet". This work translates to various energy transformations, due to gravitational potential energy being converted to kinetic energy and then to friction, heat and electrical energy and back to potential energy in different forms.\[61b\] Gravitational work as defined in the general theory is work done on a star due to it collapsing and crushing itself as it loses mass and energy, as gravitational collapse is a mass and energy loss phenomenon.

1. The star contracts and some material falls inwards faster than other material.

2. Inward falling of matter inside the star means the gravitational potential energy is being converted to kinetic energy (potential to kinetic energy).

3. The kinetic energy is converted to heat due to friction, and charge separation due to the clouds rubbing together transferring charge, and thus large amounts of electrical activity.

4. The electrical activity and heat fuel thermochemical and electrochemical reactions under various different pressures and temperatures.

5. Thus the collapsing star does work on itself, forming chemicals in increasing complexity as the star ages and evolves, due to energy transformations on very large scales.

6. The direct evidence of this occurring is in rocks, minerals, all the naturally occurring fluids and gases and even life found on the Earth in various complexity, from repeating crystalline structures to incredibly complex lifeforms.
7. The amount of energy provided by the star collapsing on itself will diminish.

8. The mass of the star will also decrease, thus leading to a lessening of the amount of gravitational work that can be done on itself, slowing the rate of energy transformations and internal new chemical production (new rocks and minerals being formed on a slower pace).

9. Any new rocks and minerals formed will mostly be sedimentary, due to the recycling of weathered rocks on the surface and re-compacted.

Chapter 4, Thermodynamics of Evolving Stars

4.1 Thermodynamic phase transitions

Physical thermodynamic phase transitions are much more important in the determination of stellar structure and evolution than are mathematical models. A young star will become a gaseous star, or a gas giant further along its evolution as it loses mass and the plasma recombines and neutralizes. This means the majority of the reactions are exothermic.\[62\]

A short description of the theory holds that gravitation is secondary to magnetic and electric interactions within fluids that are plasma, gas, liquids, supercritical fluids and solids. Phase transitions are stressed as well as the pneumatic and hydraulic properties of matter as stars cool and shrink.\[63\] As well it posits that stars obey the mass-energy equivalence and the conservation of mass in which stars that radiate and lose their mass to solar wind and flaring will do so because they are not
thermodynamically closed systems.\cite{28} In fact, all life itself is also composed of thermodynamically open systems, just like stars!

4.1.1 The Phase Transition Principle

“As stars cool and die, the matter they are comprised of will phase transition from plasma to gas to liquid and solid material.”

4.2 Type of system
Stars exchange matter and energy with their environment, which means they are thermodynamically open systems because they emit light, flare out trillions of tons of material and absorb the mass of incoming asteroids and comets if they should happen to get close enough. As they cool and shrink, they become less open as mass loss decreases as well as the rate at which it can absorb incoming objects decreases being that the gravitational field weakens and the surface area shrinks.

"Stars are thermodynamically open systems as they exchange matter and energy with their environment."

4.3 Heat production

It is stated that stars continually radiate over their lifetimes as the majority of their energy is produced via chemical combination reactions which are exothermic. This meaning stars are not fusion powered but are electrochemical, thermochemical and photochemical in nature. It is also stated that the activation energy required for the chemical combination reactions is provided by gravitational potential energy as the star collapses and cools. As well, any additional heat can be provided by orbiting another host, which would provide extra chemical interaction and mixing towards the surface of the companion star. This is in direct contrast to the standard solar model.

4.3.1 Internal work to heat efficiency principle

The efficiency of internal work to heat transfer increases as a star evolves. Planets and exoplanets are evolved stars that no longer shine with their younger intensities. Ancient stars produce much less heat than their
younger counterparts, so the majority of the work that is
done to the body is conserved more highly than when the
star is younger. The majority of the work done on young
stars escapes the star as heat, light and different forms of
electromagnetism, as well as physical excess exiting the star
as is the case of coronal mass ejections and flaring. The
energies for the material mechanical exit from the star and
large amounts of electromagnetic wave production are
provided by the star itself, which means it is not being
efficient at collapsing.\textsuperscript{[66]}

In this principle though the efficiency of collapse
increases as the star cools. It would be similar to Top Fuel
dragsters. The efficiency of combustion and amount of fuel
used is inversely proportional. The more fuel you use the
less goes to combustion because it is not burned up or used
efficiently. As well, the majority of the energy of the fuel and
the fuel itself is not even used to propel the car. It is shot out
of the exhaust and lost to heat production. Same goes with
stars when they are young. The majority of the gravitational
potential energy is lost due to mass ejections and EM
radiation.

The efficiency of the work done on the star increases
as it cools and dies, meaning the heat and mass loss per unit
volume will decrease significantly as well. Using the same
above example, a Top Fuel dragster’s engine scaled down
to the authors 1.5 liter engine, would be a huge increase in
efficiency, regardless if there is still losses to unburned fuel
and heat production in the smaller engine. In essence, the
star becoming smaller lengthens the lifetime of the star. Not
only that, but heat loss is prevented by the presence of
significant amounts of material that has a very high specific
heat capacity which builds up in the atmosphere such as
hydrogen gas (as opposed to hydrogen plasma). This means
that not only does the star become more efficient at
transferring the work of gravitational collapse to the
material (instead of losing it to CMEs, flaring and shining), its lifetime increases significantly because the heat being produced by the work has a difficult time escaping, either through radiative or convective effects. This leads the author to the conclusion that the majority of gas type stars claimed to be “ice giants” as is the case of Uranium and Neptune are not cold ice giants. They are very old stars, much older than Jupiter and Saturn, but younger than Earth, and they have hellish interiors. Uranium and Neptune’s efficiencies are on par with taking a 1.5 liter engine and utilizing the heat produced by the engine to power additional features, so that less heat goes to waste.

For the sake of argument, it could be mentioned that the efficiency of a young star doing work on itself and losing that heat and mass to interstellar space is around 1%. Young stars are very, very inefficient. As the star cools and collapses, the efficiency of the work done on the star increases, to about 30% during red dwarf stages. During brown dwarf stages the efficiency would be about 55%, and grey dwarf stages about 70%, blue dwarf about 90% and then ocean world at 95%. The efficiency of the work done to the mass of the star to transform it without losses increases past 99% when in mid-ocean world stages, until finally the star can no longer lose significant amounts of mass and energy by its own accord. It is reasoned that the life window is when the star prevents the majority of mass loss in any significant portion because of the gravity principle of life formation. The gravity is now strong enough to prevent most mass and energy loss, and the newly formed molecules cannot escape. The gravity principle also applies to asteroids, where the gravity is also not strong enough to prevent the escape of newly formed molecules which are the precursors to the formation of life.
Chapter 5, Chemistry of Evolving Stars

5.1 Astrochemical reactions

The astrochemical principle of planet formation/stellar evolution states that the majority of thermochemical, electrochemical and photochemical reactions take place in stars as they evolve into planets, not in the interstellar medium.[67]

"The majority of chemical reactions in the universe take place inside of stars as they cool and die, not in the interstellar medium."

5.1.1 Chemical complexity

Underneath the astrochemical principle is the idea of chemicals becoming more and more complex as the star evolves.[68]

"Chemicals increase in complexity on and near the surface of a star as it evolves."

This means the increasing chemical complexity does not happen inside the core of a star, nor does it happen in interstellar space, as the process of chemicals becoming more and more complex happens near and on the surface of a star, and remains there. Increasing complexity happens where the pressures and temperatures are just right. This means the true Goldilocks Zone is on and near the star’s surface as it cools and dies, and becomes the life hosting star.
5.1.1.1 Aqueous geochemistry principle

The stages of the evolution of a star include aqueous material, and this aqueous material facilitates the chemical reactions that occur as the star evolves, cools and dies becoming the remnant or “planet/exoplanet. In late stellar evolution where it is comprised heavily of aqueous solutions and mixtures, they change as it continues cooling and evolving, forming the “planet” in its interior, or “stellar remnant”. This being said, it should be no question why basalts and granites are comprised of water along side their less aqueous counterparts, they formed inside of aqueous watery solutions when Earth was a thick ocean world.[69] The water just stayed put inside the granite and basalt as they crystallized deep in the interior of the Earth as it was in late evolution. They are essentially precipitates as outlined in the Cementation Principle of Stellar Evolution noted below. To include only “watersheds” completely misses the point. The entire Earth was mostly liquid material, as are the vast majority of evolved stars towards the end of their lives.

"The observations of geological processes which occurred on the Earth and all evolved stars demands that the majority of the chemical reactions were once liquid (aqueous) solutions."

This principle explains that the less evolved stars than Earth will be comprised of liquid solutions, after gaseous stages of evolution, as is outlined in the reinterpreted Hertzsprung - Russell diagram. Before the star can completely solidify, it had to have been liquid material, as that is the intermediate phase between gaseous and solid material. Of course some material would skip that step inside of deposition (gas to solid) reactions (in the
iron/nickel core deposition processes), but the majority of it would not.

5.1.1.2 Cementation principle

Towards the very end of a stars life, it will morph into an ocean world after Neptune stages. At this stage the material deep in the interior of the star will interact with the water (albeit dissolved at higher temperatures and pressures) and precipitate out of the water forming what are called mountains, and vast arrays of different formations and structures.[70] Very large amounts of dissolved newly forming minerals are in a huge solution completely covering the young crust in an ocean of many hundreds of miles deep. As the outer escape velocity of the star falls below the average molecular velocity of water vapor, the oceans will then begin evaporating into interstellar space at a more rapid pace. As it does this, the minerals will being settling out into a thicker suspension, and eventually begin precipitating onto the thin, young, hot crust, forming things like mountains. Now, depending on how much mineral is in a specific area will determine how much precipitate will collect there, such is the case of mountain ranges. If the newly forming precipitate is given a back drop to prevent extra motion, it will collect in areas and build up, collecting more and more material, like a wind forming sand dunes. Therefore it is the action of deep ocean world convection and precipitate buildup which forms mountains, not mashing plates. As the ocean world evaporates away, the tops of the mountains will become exposed, and their weight will become much more pronounced as the buoyancy of the ocean is no longer present. Therefore if the mountains were very thin they will collapse, if they were robust and have had lots of precipitate to build up on, they will support each other in long chains, called mountain
ranges. If the precipitate was comprised of material that could not support large amounts of weight due to the crystalline forms not being strong like granite, then they will also collapse as the ocean evaporates.

"The majority of the cementation of rocks and minerals in the newly forming crust of a star occurs during the transition of early stage ocean worlds to worlds with newly exposed rocky surfaces caused by ocean evaporation, due to atmospheric escape."

This principle also explains why all rocks have water in them, even rocks that appear dry such as granite. One should wonder, how did water get inside the granite at the very top of Mt. Everest? The Earth was covered in deep oceans of water at one point, many millions of years in the past. Before the dinosaurs, all of Earth's life was aquatic only.

5.1.1.3 Formose Reaction

It is hypothesized that the first sugars for prebiotic life are formed during stellar evolution. They are created by formaldehyde being polymerized by iron/nickel meteors, which serve as catalysts, entering the atmospheres of middle aged stars such as Jupiter and Saturn. The vast majority of the chemical reactions that occur in the galaxy happen inside of stars as they cool and die, becoming “planets/exoplanets”. This is in line with the astrochemical principle. One of these reactions is the polymerization of formaldehyde to form simple sugars in the atmospheres of intermediate aged stars, as iron and nickel react with the atmosphere. The extreme heat of the iron/nickel, the fact that they break up into trillions of smaller bits to vastly increase their surface area for reactions as they smash into the atmosphere as well as their ease in acting as catalysts to
combine a multitude of chemicals together are all central to the process. In particular it has been unfortunately accepted in mainstream circles that asteroids can form prebiotic chemicals, absent the material and processes required for reactions to take place in outer space. For instance, if an asteroid is mostly iron/nickel, where does the hydrogen come from? The carbon? The oxygen? The formaldehyde? Solar wind impacting the surface of a tiny asteroid would not provide the vast amounts of organic precursors readily available in the atmospheres of intermediate aged stars such as Jupiter, which are in fact observed to contain the ingredients for life. As well, their average velocities as gases would readily exceed the escape velocity of even the largest asteroid, and these are outlined in basic principles of chemical reactions required for prebiotic life to form in the mobility, gravity, container and volume principles. We must realize that reactions of an entering asteroid to form prebiotic chemicals take place as the object enters the atmosphere. This means that mainstream claims which rely on life being brought here are simply misattributed to the reactions that took place on the asteroid as it entered Earth’s atmosphere when it was a large gas giant, and even during earlier stages when the Earth was radiant in the visible spectrum.

The hypothesis is as follows, prebiotic sugars are predicted to form in the atmospheres of intermediate aged stars, as iron/nickel asteroids impact them (which act as catalysts in large scales), given they contain considerable amounts of hydrogen, carbon, oxygen and the chemical comprising the specific combination of the three, formaldehyde. This is due to the formose reaction as discovered by the chemist, Alexander MikhaylovichButlerov. What happens is the formaldehyde that naturally occurs inside of the thick atmospheres is
heated and catalyzed by the entering iron/nickel asteroid/meteor, which then forms simple sugars.[70a]

5.1.1.4 PAH's in stellar metamorphosis

The vast majority of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH)’s are formed in intermediate stages of a star’s evolution. This is in line with the astrochemical principle of stellar metamorphosis. Stars in intermediate stages of evolution are outlined in a graph and are comprised of M, L, Y and T type brown dwarfs all the way to ocean world stages of stellar evolution.

PAH’s are mostly formed in Pop 2 stars. This means that PAH’s form inside of stars as they cool and die, becoming life hosting stars. PAH’s are very likely to help in the synthesis of organic molecules as they undergo various chemical combination and decomposition reactions on very large scales in the interior of the star. This means that not only are we dealing with a completely new worldview of life and the stars, we can start using infrared spectroscopy to its fullest extent to study the atmospheres of intermediate aged stars to find these chemical precursors to life being formed. We have a much more suitable method to form life rather than the, “it happens in molecular clouds in vacuum” stance of establishment dogma.

So in essence, we can use a reverse forensic analysis of the spectroscopic surveys of intermediate aged stars that are more evolved than others by referencing their stage of being able to form life, which adds another facet to determining their stage of evolution in addition to their masses, luminosities, etc. This being said, some PAH’s might be more abundant than others, but are predicted to exist in large quantities in intermediate aged stars, near the upper layers of the star. The PAH’s are formed mostly in Population 2 stars according to stellar metamorphosis
theory. The diagram below shows the location of population 2 stars as defined by GTSM.

The stars that form PAH's mostly are brown dwarfs through late Neptunes. This also means that as they lose mass, PAH's will be lost to interstellar space, so there should be clouds of PAH's found near these evolving stars, even if we cannot directly or indirectly detect them. [70b]

5.1.2 Physical mechanism

To explain the physical mechanism involved in powering the chemical reactions, it is presented the gravichemical principle which states:[71]

"The activation energy required for most chemical reactions on a star are fueled indirectly and directly by gravitational collapse."
5.2 Chemical equilibrium

Active stars are non-equilibrium dissipative structures. As well, they are not in chemical equilibrium either, as their pressures, temperatures and concentrations of their chemical components change greatly as they become life hosting stars, called “planets”. [72] This is restating differently Le Chatelier’s principle, in that, “if a system at equilibrium is disturbed by a change in temperature, pressure, or the concentration of one of the components, the system will shift its equilibrium position so as to counteract the effect of the disturbance.”

"Stars are in a perpetual state of chemical non-equilibrium as they evolve into life hosting worlds, per Le Chatelier’s Principle, as they lose heat, pressure and the concentrations of stellar chemistry change, per the general theory of stellar metamorphosis."

To remove the large hydrogen envelope of a young star is to both cause it to reduce the concentration of hydrogen, to reduce the internal pressures and also reduce the volume as the majority of young stars are supposedly comprised of hydrogen. So it would have a three-fold effect on all the internal interactions, not to mention to allow for any internal heat to escape in larger amounts due to the star no longer possessing a thick hydrogen upper layer to block internal heat loss. Also the amount of compounds that could be formed with hydrogen decreases considerably, leaving the interactions and molecule formation to the heavier elements such as oxygen, nitrogen and carbon.

5.2.1 Chemical equilibrium in dead stars
Stars with mostly dynamic equilibrium can host life, this is of course far into its evolutionary sequence. As well, all stars that are alive (chemically active) have either dynamic chemical equilibrium or can be in a long term non-equilibrium state as they evolve.[73] This means:

1. Dead stars are in static chemical equilibrium as all dynamic equilibrium events have ceased (this includes all biological events, such as life.)

2. All the chemically and physically reversible reactions have ceased to take place on the dead star.

3. Any chemically or physically reversible or irreversible reactions can only take place, due to outside influences such as impacts, the radiation or wind from another host, or internal heated due to gravitational effects, etc.

4. Internal radiation due to radioactive material can still occur, but is extremely limited in effects, as all matter is somewhat radioactive, due to the presence of unstable or partially stable isotopes. This means that for a star to be classified as dead, it is not required to have completely lost all radioactive components. The half-lives of extremely stable isotopes would reach far beyond the scope of defining a star as dead/alive, similar to a human being classified as “alive” regardless if he or she still has radioactive carbon - 14 long after they have died.

If a star has processes such as rain, wind or lava then it is not dead. Objects like Mercury and the Moon which do not have rain, wind or lava can be classified as dead. If they scoot closer to a hotter host and lava starts forming on the surface, then it can still be dead, as it is being heated by an outside body.
5.2.2 Hydrogenation

In chemistry, hydrogenation is a chemical reaction between molecular hydrogen H2 and another compound or element, usually in the presence of a catalyst such as nickel, palladium or platinum.\footnote{74} The process is commonly employed to reduce or saturate organic compounds. Hydrogenation typically constitutes the addition of pairs of hydrogen atoms to a molecule, often an alkene. Catalysts are required for the reaction to be usable; non-catalytic hydrogenation takes place only at very high temperatures. Hydrogenation reduces double and triple bonds in hydrocarbons.

The younger and intermediate aged stars have lots of gaseous hydrogen in their outer atmospheres. When an iron/nickel meteor slams into the atmosphere, a great amount of heat is produced allowing for the hydrogen in the atmosphere to recombine with all the different types of molecules in the atmosphere and in the meteor itself. Even if a large portion of the meteor does not burn up, the surface of it will act as a catalyst for hydrogenation of other types of molecules, as it can be comprised of nickel, palladium or even platinum which are heavy elements found in dense meteorites. Given many millions of years of this process, a wide range of molecular combinations can be formed alongside and with the hydrogen gas. As this occurs, and the gravitation of the star diminishes and it loses mass, there is less and less hydrogen available to create new molecules, so the meteors then continue to slam into the star, but do not form any significant amount of new molecules. They just remain on the surface to be picked up by whatever natural erosion processes are available.
According to the diminishing solar abundances principle, the star will increase its heavy element ratio as the hydrogen is lost, meaning the hydrogenation of incoming material will decay exponentially. The hydrogenation of incoming material could also explain why there is oil and natural gas (which are formed absent decaying organic material) underneath the crust of the Earth by many miles. The hydrogenation of carbonaceous chondrites led to increased production of long chain hydrocarbon molecules, which then rained down into the interior of the star, becoming trapped by in-falling oxygenated compounds (rocks and minerals). As well, if there happens to be evidence of large amounts of hydrocarbons on an object, then chances are it possessed a large hydrogen envelope at one point, thus also meaning its gravitation was a lot stronger, leading to the star having been much larger to prevent atmospheric escape of that hydrogen gas.

5.3 Heterolysis

It is now stated that stars undergo chemical heterolysis. It is explained that the process of chemical heterolysis is present in the Sun and all young stars. [75]

"During heterolysis a neutral particle is split into its component positive and negative parts with the introduction of electrical current. The strength of the electrical current to break apart the neutral particle is known as the decomposition voltage or decomposition potential. These negative and positive parts are then ejected from young hot stars, this is known as the solar wind. Therefore the solar wind is direct evidence of chemical compounds on the Sun, chemical reactions (decomposition and synthesis reactions) and electrical current. To deny this observational fact is to deny star science itself in favor of fusion pseudoscience. Heterolyticfissioning will continue indefinitely on the Sun until
the particles reach a more stable equilibrium, thus the solar wind will eventually die. This is predicted to happen when the majority of the plasmatic material phase transitions (recombines) to form mostly neutral gas which has higher breakdown voltages as opposed to plasma. This means the star will cool and become a gas giant and will cease production of "wind" as cations and anions."

5.4 Plasma as electrolytic substance

The theory states that plasma is comprised of ions and electrons and all Sun like stars are comprised of plasma. This means that stars like the Sun are much better suited for electrochemical and redox reactions as they are completely comprised of free ions and electrons. [76]

5.5 Homogeneous and heterogeneous reactions

It is also stressed that the creation of different chemicals inside of stars as they evolve also involves matter not in the same phase of matter. If two materials are both gaseous when they interact as caused by similar temperatures and pressures then the reaction would be homogeneous. If two material are different phases such as rocks being dissolved by an acidic solution, then you can form precipitates that do not appear similar, this would be heterogeneous.[77] As well, liquid lava dropping into water on a coast line in this case would be homogeneous, but of course would cause a phase transition of the water into water vapor, so then the water vapor can then interact with the lava in different ways.

5.6 Stars are dissipative systems

Stars are essentially the second largest dissipative systems in a galaxy. The properties of a dissipative system
match the evolution of a star as it cools and dies into what are called "planets". Firstly we should ask ourselves the question. Do stars fit the definition of dissipative systems?

A dissipative system is:

1. Thermodynamically open (exchanges matter and energy)
2. Operates far from thermodynamic equilibrium
3. has symmetry breaking
4. forms chaotic structures
5. Has interacting particles forming long range correlations

The Sun and all stars:

1. Are thermodynamically open systems (exchange matter and energy, no matter what stage of evolution they are in)

2. Operate far from thermodynamic equilibrium (outer space is ~2 kelvin, the Sun is ~5770 K at the surface)

3. symmetry breaking manifests as CME's, solar granules, weather and even form life well into their evolution given they do not evolve too fast, etc.

4. The stars are chaotic, the Sun's surface begin a wonderful example

5. solar wind
This dives into the most hideous mistake in solar astronomy, the assumption that the Sun is in thermodynamic equilibrium. It is not, it is a dissipative system far from thermodynamic equilibrium. The mistake is rooted in astronomers assuming there is a Sun inside the Sun, and they are solving for those equations, completely forgetting that the Sun is far from thermal equilibrium on the outside of it (it is in outer space where matter and energy are exchanged freely).

What should also be noted is that since stars are the second largest dissipative systems in a galaxy, they form smaller dissipative systems (hurricanes, thunderstorm convection, life) as they were created themselves from galaxy birthing itself (quasars as the largest dissipative system, as the example in this paper, there might be bigger ones.) Ilya Perigogine was awarded the Nobel Prize in Chemistry for work on dissipative systems, yet did not realize the Earth and life itself is a result of a single star's dissipative nature. Stars themselves are irreversible systems, so the arrow of time becomes apparent as all life and nature that we are aware of rest on the dissipative systems that created us and currently support life.

It should be noticed as well that dissipative systems are incompatible with Newtonian and quantum dynamic views as those are reversible. As a jump into trying to understand gravitation, to make Newtonian understanding irreversible, one should look at the largest dissipative structures which are incompatible with it, such as stars, and then draw conclusions from that. In other words, since dissipative systems are natural, observed and involve the some of the largest single structures with the longest range (gravitation), and Newtonian mechanics is reversible, then to give a mechanism for gravitation we must consider some aspect of Newtonian mechanics as being non-reversible, in
essence, that means gravitation itself as described by Newton is flawed.

1. Dissipative systems such as stars exhibit long range correlations (gravitation)

2. Dissipative systems are irreversible.

3. Newtonian theory is reversible

4. Newtonian theory does not accurately describe gravitation ... I think what is happening is that stars are so large, that they give the appearance of reversibility (you throw an object up, it comes back down), when in fact, the phenomenon of gravitation is not reversible. Some aspect of objects being attracted to each other is lost when they do work upon each other, and it is replenished, but not in a sense of it loses mass and then gains it back. What this means is that Newtonian mechanics when describing gravitation only works for large structures, when measured on small scales it should fall apart, some really small scale property of matter changes when it "falls". Finding out at what scale Newtonian mechanics falls apart is the key.

What this means is that large scale experiments that neglect the true nature of gravitation (this should be upsetting to people), will not bring meaningful results, no matter how much propaganda there is to the contrary (LIGO, Gravity Probe B, black hole theory, spacetime warping, etc.) What this also means is that theories that try to explain/ describe gravitation as large scale phenomenon are neglecting a huge piece of the riddle, gravitation is small scale phenomenon. It only appears large scale because the effects are magnified. In short, gravitation has something todo with dissipative, non - equilibrium structures and systems in thermodynamics. I guess this would be similar
to the cannon - boring realization of Benjamin Thompson, where he proposed that there was heat produced from friction versus an actual substance exiting called "caloric".

There is a property of matter than changes when experiencing "gravitation", which also ties into the idea of inertia, or the increased resistance to movement with additional mass. Not only that, but radioactive decay also does not have a mechanism, so to do a bit of questioning concerning that dogma, we should do an experiment where we isolate radioactive material and measure the particles with given half-lives inside of human time scales and place them on objects which are more/less gravitationally attracting on the whole and see if there is a difference. We have to set up a Moon base to do more experiments. Aliens have figured it out, why can't we? [77a]

5.6.1 Tying together the gravity principles of life formation to dissipative systems concerning life formation

To set the stage for future statistical analysis of the probabilities involved we need simple generalizations. According to the general theory most stars evolve into life hosting planets, thus stellar evolution is planet formation. Some stars host life for longer periods of time with greater biological complexity than others and some never form life at all. The cutoff for such calculations will eventually be reviewed and worked out inside of the Taylor Threshold, in light of the mobility, gravity, container and time principles of life formation.

To begin, what we have is a previously not considered mix of ideas that set the stage for the beginning of life.
1. Life is formed from the energy of a single star’s evolution.

2. Life is extremely complex, many magnitudes greater than human imagination can really comprehend. (We cannot really comprehend our own stupendous complexity.)

3. Placing the probabilities of life forming from ionized, individual atoms all the way to extremely complex organisms such as a cat, tells us we are dealing with matter from a multi-faceted view. This means probability calculations will overlap on multiple avenues.

4. Pure randomness would never form life, there has to be a direction for all the chemicals to synthesize and replicate, meaning there has to be some over-reaching, stationary, extremely stable, long term force that can mix huge amounts of material together, constantly, for billions of years, which means ...

5. Gravitation removes randomness during the formation of life, only, it is directed by the large scale dissipation of a single star’s energy, meaning it is not pure randomness.

6. To form life requires there be a dissipative system greater than life itself, so that energy remains in boundless supply for billions of years.

7. Stars are the dissipative systems (open thermodynamic systems) that form life, but since life is quite complex, it is required that the dissipative system die down considerably on par with the amount of complexity that has arisen. In other words, the more energetic the system, the less complex the molecules will be found, and the more calm the system, the more complex molecules will be found.
Turbulence and violence suit early dissipative systems, but the very turbulence and violence that was useful for the beginning changes and becomes more calm and flowing. This simple understanding also can be somewhat applied to the differences between Uranus and Neptune. Neptune having the strong violent winds would pale in comparison to the molecular complexity that currently exists inside of Uranus, due to its calm nature. It should also be noted that scientists have referred to Uranus as “boring”[77b], in fact, NOT seeing huge bands and clouds rushing about the surface is a good thing if you are interested in what is stirring about in its interior. It is unfortunate scientists would rather waste billions of dollars on detecting non-existent dark matter and gravitational waves than spend money on satellites to study the very next star in our system that will become Earth-like.

To discuss what is meant by directed probabilities we could take a penny and flip it so that it lands heads or tails on the ground. We say that the penny is nearly 50%/50% each time to land on heads or tails. What is forgotten is that there is a person doing the flipping. So sure, there is a probability there for the coin to land on heads or tails, but it is a directed probability. Someone is doing the coin toss. The coin does not toss itself. The same argument is now being made for life formation on a single star. Sure, we could calculate probabilities for a star to combine elements into extremely complex molecules, but that is irrelevant. What needs to be taken into consideration is that the process is directed by a single force, which spawns a plethora of types of interactions and energy transformations, and that is gravitation. A star gravitationally collapsing fuels the energy required to form life, even in the most unlikely event that life could form, it
surely has, as we are here now. All the calculations for the beginning formation of life need to take this into account.[77c]

Chapter 6, Stellar Engineering

6.1 Metallurgy

Metallurgy is a domain of materials science and engineering that studies the physical and chemical behavior of metallic elements, their intermetallic compounds, and their mixtures, which are called alloys. Metallurgy is also the technology of metals: the way in which science is applied to the production of metals, and the engineering of metal components for usage in products for consumers and manufacturers. The production of metals involves the processing of ores to extract the metal they contain, and the mixture of metals, sometimes with other elements, to produce alloys. Metallurgy is distinguished from the craft of metalworking, although metalworking relies on metallurgy, as medicine relies on medical science, for technical advancement. The process of metal core formation is directly related to star evolution, as stars produce metal cores as they evolve.[78] The plasma transitions to gas, then solid and liquid structure. These metal cores are subsequently destroyed many billions of years after the star has died, leaving interstellar shrapnel to enter into the atmospheres of other evolving stars. This is outlined by the Krypton Hypothesis.

This being said, we can study the metallurgy of meteorites to determine the actual physical characteristics of stellar interiors. This of course means that we now have direct evidence of the conditions of stellar interiors. It is suggested that scientists can now reinterpret the data and empirical observations of metallic elements and their alloys of meteorites to determine the fate of stars as they evolve.
For example it is well known that the conditions required to make Widmanstatten patterns are only deep in the interior of an object that is cooling very, very slowly as well as under extremely high heat. These conditions cannot even be replicated in laboratories, as they are true conditions of evolved star interiors. By studying meteorites we can determine their previous locations inside of dead stars, meaning we can reverse engineer them to determine the causes for the star’s evolutionary sequences. Another example is that since stars form cores as they evolve, we can look at the iron/nickel in the atmosphere of hotter, younger stars and draw conclusions based on the rate at which that iron falls into the center of the star forming the core, to determine other properties. All the metallurgical information discovered about iron/nickel and other types of metal meteorites can be directly applied to understanding star interiors at any stage of evolution. The fact is that we have always had direct evidence of the internal conditions of an evolved star, and we have always had indirect observation of the conditions that are actually present inside of a young star.

It needs to be stressed that meteorites and their classifications now have their grounding in the evolutionary history of a single star. The solar system is composed of millions of independent objects all with their own unique history and age, and forcing everything to fit into the dogma which forces them to all be from the same cloud is now outdated. In a sense, if you are holding a mostly pure iron/nickel meteorite in your hands, you are holding a piece of an ancient star that did not have origins from any star in the solar system. The evolved stars in our system have their iron/nickel cores still very deep in their interior, there is no possible mechanism to remove pieces of those cores without having destroyed them. This is the main worldview change with regards to meteorites. When you
see books, magazine and journal articles speak of meteorites as primitive or early-type, you can know they are assuming the meteorite has a history that is reliant on a false worldview. The establishment accepts the origins of meteorites as being from some body in the solar system, and the worldview offered by this theory states that they most likely have interstellar or even intergalactic origins, especially the mostly pure iron/nickel alloy ones, which have origins deep in the interior of a long destroyed star.

Know that they are painting a picture in their minds without examining all the facts. Their worldview, their perspective, is already formed before they even take samples of the meteorites. In fact, all meteorites are pieces of ancient stars, so they are all primitive, as well, there is no such thing as an early-type, as opposed to late, as they are all very, very old shrapnel remains of dead stars. What is most important about a future meteorite classification scheme is that it must be made aware to scientists that all solar system objects came from some other part of the galaxy, and are old stars or pieces of them that have rich evolutionary backgrounds. What this does is add more mystery to meteorites, while simultaneously moving our race towards a more realistic, grounded understanding of nature. Fact is, we have come a long way from denying that rocks fall from the sky, now we know where those rocks actually came from. The rocks and iron that come from the sky do not have originations there, as clearly stated by a central figure to the 18th century chemical revolution, Antoine Lavoisier,

"Stones cannot fall from the sky, because there are no stones in the sky!"[78a]

Antoine Lavoisier was partly correct, there are no stones in the sky, but there are surely stones and metal in
outer space just as much as there are asteroids. They are pieces of destroyed stars that wander the galaxy, until they are completely vaporized and recycled by a younger host.

6.2 The addition of coefficients of thermal expansion and contraction

Another way to tell that establishment astrophysics is misguided is by examining the equations for stellar structure. They are absent coefficients of thermal contraction and expansion. This is one of the largest claimed discrepancies for standard models of star evolution. Of course, they do not apply these types of thermal properties to stellar evolution because they do not understand what stars do as they evolve. A thermal coefficient is simply a way to measure the change in size of an object due to a change in temperature, under constant pressure. So in other words, since stars change from 10,000 Kelvin on their surfaces all the way down to 25 Kelvin given they completely evolve and die, and the pressures are the same at given areas of the surface, their sizes must change. Of course this is a natural line of reasoning in the general theory, as stars are currently being observed directly at all temperatures between 10,000 Kelvin and 25 Kelvin, as an example. Some stars might be even hotter and some even colder, which further exacerbates the issue. When most matter is heated up under a constant pressure environment, it expands, and when it cools down it contracts. So to have standard solar equations not include this simple fact of physics, signals a very limited knowledge of what will happen to the Sun and all stars as they evolve. As well, since they phase transition alongside the thermal expansion properties of the material, those will change as well.

For example, cooling a balloon of water vapor will cause the balloon to contract significantly. But, given the
same volume of water in another balloon, cooling down the water will not cause it to contract at all, in fact it might have the reverse effect as water expands as it becomes ice! The same goes for gaseous objects in outer space. How much will gases contract/expand depends on their enthalpies, or internal heat content. The gases do condense into liquid at some stages of the star's evolution internally, but do re-expand when the star loses mass, allowing for different rates of mass loss. Since young stars are very, very hot, as well as even brown dwarfs all the way down to pre-ocean worlds, there is a hell of a lot of room for gas contraction and expansion processes. Not only that, but since the star is contracting overall as it evolves, it does work on the gases, keeping the star hot internally for extremely long periods of time. The only way the star really cools down is when it loses mass, and the gases can expand internally, puffing the star out. So essentially, a puffed out star in intermediate or late stages of evolution signals they are losing mass rapidly, or was orbiting its host or another one at extremely close distances.

As well, the thermal expansion properties of solid and liquid material during late stages of evolution need to be applied. All the older, evolved stars are composed of thick oceans of liquid at various enthalpies as well as millions of cubic kilometers of rocks and metal. The rocks and minerals that compose ancient evolving stars also contracts and expands due to various rates of heat loss, without a significant loss of pressure. We know this because that is how Earthquakes occur, and older stars that do not have starquakes (Earthquakes but clearly not Earth) can be reasoned to not be contracting anymore, thus they are probably dead.

6.3 The role of electrically insulating and conducting material
Plasma is comprised of free ions and electrons. Preventing the flow of both free ions/electrons as well as the flow of electricity via conduction is another central concept to stellar evolution. As the star evolves, changing levels of free ions and electrons internally allows for different types of feedback mechanisms which also facilitate the evolution of the star, and could possibly provide the mechanism for chemical and physical differentiation.\[80\]

When plasma recombines into gas it becomes electrically insulating. This plays a large role when red dwarf transitions to brown dwarf and stops shining strongly in the visible spectrum. It also means the electrical activity and light shows on the surface of the star will mostly die out, and they will internalize. Most of the heat dissipation becomes infrared as well, and the star's heat dissipation will be determined by properties such as how thermally conductive the material is. Plasma conducts electrical currents easily but has resistance, is neutral as a whole, but like gases which have a net velocity of zero they are still moving very rapidly. Plasma as a whole is electrically neutral, but is charged matter, so to say its neutral matter is false. We can also dive into the concept of superconducting material - what are the mechanisms behind pulsars and their alleged properties? Should we include superconducting electromagnetic storage mechanisms, and the mechanisms behind the Boomerang nebula, to explain the supposedly the coldest measured place in the galaxy? This might be pulsar birthing. It is accepted in the mainstream that pulsars are the possible end result of a star's evolutionary sequences, yet clearly, they are not. They are the beginning of something which is signaled by their huge energies. No dead star spins at extreme velocities and spews matter out like a giant fire hose.
6.4 Stellar meteorology

Weather on evolving stars signals their continuing evolution, meaning that if a star does not possess weather it is no longer evolving. This weather does not immediately cease simply because the star stops radiating in the visible spectrum, it continues indefinitely until all matter has reached the lowest possible enthalpy. It continues indefinitely until all matter has reached the lowest energy level and is compressed to the coulomb barrier and crystalizes. The plasma of a young hot star cools, recombines, synthesizes molecules as it becomes solid matter, meaning lava itself can be considered weather, as it is matter in motion, just at higher enthalpies than gaseous matter.

The intermediate steps of stellar differentiation involving weather overview the feedback loops of matter synthesis or decomposition, all ranges of phase transitioning and the pneumatic or hydraulic properties of the matter involved and are dependent on the strength of the gravitational field of the star to provide the energy for non-spontaneous chemical combination reactions. Absence of weather equals the absence of continuing differentiation. Absence of the process of differentiation is the absence of the star evolving, meaning that the star is dead. Meteorology can now be considered as condensation, deposition, sublimation, ionization, recombination, vaporization, melting, solidification, and it is stressed to think of stars as incredibly complex events comprising all phases of matter.

It should be noted to all geologists that they are studying an ancient star when they study rocks and minerals. Matter referred to in this case absentia matter which does not reflect or emit electromagnetism outlined in
the paper, "The Definition of Matter", is to provide an avoidance of the fake science labeled, "dark matter and dark energy".

Chapter 7, Magnetosphere Evolution

The theory includes the evolution of chaotic magnetic fields driven by surface MHD processes in young, hot, electrically active stars, when then lead to strong global fields as the star cools and begins differentiation. It is claimed that global field formation signals the beginning of core formation via convection of the entire body, which also leads to an increase in flaring and rapidity of mass loss during red dwarf stages of evolution. Alongside core formation are the properties of iron/nickel leading to an increase in magnetic flux density and a very large magnetic field.[82] This means that if a star does not possess a strong global magnetic field, then chances are there is no iron/nickel core, or mantle fluidity has ceased because of the star's extreme age as is the case of Venus/Mercury. It is also noted that if there are asteroids found with magnetic fields, then that serves as direct evidence of a previous dynamo being present, and that that asteroid was a part of a much larger body.[83]

7.1 Magnetization of rocks on Mars and the Moon

It is shown empirically that Mars and the Moon have been magnetized which is evidence of the past presence of a much larger magnetic field, regardless if they do not currently possess a significant one currently. The magnetized rocks on all black dwarfs including Mars and
the Moon could not have become magnetized externally by a host star as magnetic field strength drops at the inverse cube of distance $r^3$ from the central core, but internally from them having much stronger magnetic fields in earlier stages of metamorphosis. Mars is a much older black dwarf star that resembled Earth earlier in its history as is also evidenced by presence of water-like erosion on its surface and past volcanic activity, and a magnetic field would compliment those features.[84]

7.2 Magnetic Flux Amplification and Magnetosphere Evolution

An alternative type of magnetochronology as applied to stellar evolution is hypothesized. The presence of a core structure can be determined by whether the star has a strong global magnetic field, as well as other inferences. According to this theory Population 1 stars (plasmatic young stars) do not possess strong global magnetic fields, as their surfaces are dominated by spotty activity where material mixes called "sunspots" or "starspots". As the star cools and dies, the iron it has collected will move towards the center and collect, forming a large ball of iron/nickel. This is the beginning of planet formation.

The formation of a large ball of iron/nickel will increase the strength of the newly forming global magnetic field as the permability of iron/nickel are very high and increase the flux density of magnetic activity by large amounts. Eventually the iron/nickel ball will grow big enough so that the global field will completely dominate all surface activity, and the sunspots will disappear. We can know if a star has a core by looking at its surface, if we see sunspots, then there is no fully formed core. All young plasmatic/gaseous stars that have sunspot activity and almost no apparent global magnetic field do not have cores.
As they cool and age, the core begins forming, meaning they have no cores to begin with while they are young, it takes many billions of years to form a core structure (the beginning of planet formation). This is the main reason why the fusion model of stars is probably incorrect, the star forms a core as it cools and dies (the planet) so supposing a core is present before there is any strong global field to show that a core is magnifying a global field is at best inconsistent. The magnetochronology of stellar evolution rests on there being a strong global field. If there is no strong global field then it can mean one of two things, either it is too young to have formed a core structure, or it is very old and dead like Mercury (a black dwarf star, which do not exist according to establishment astronomers), and has no fluid interior to produce the moving charges around the iron/nickel core, producing the magnetic field.[84a][84b]

7.3 Magnetosphere evolution in (further explanation)

After stars form their global magnetic fields, they decrease in strength as the star evolves. The global magnetic field is not limitless energy, but is directly proportional to the amount of mechanical motion in the interior of the star. This means the bigger the global field, the more active and younger the star. The oldest stars have lost the majority of their visible light spectrums. Therefore to tell of how internally active the star is, we can look at how strong the global magnetic field is.

A big global magnetic field signals the star is less evolved than a star with a very small global magnetic field. This rule of thumb applies to stars’ evolutionary path as they lose energy as they evolve, so their internal motion will diminish due to mass loss, friction, gravitational potential energy being converted to heat, etc. With regards to white
dwarfs, their global fields are weakened significantly and outright lost as the star expands to its fullest blue giant size. After it expands to dissipate the heat of formation, it will then contract again, allowing for the reformation of a global magnetic field based on the newly formed different properties of the star. The white dwarfs magnetic fields do need to be further elaborated on.

To falsify this theory, we can look at brown dwarfs. It is predicted that all brown dwarfs have newly generated, extremely powerful global magnetic fields right after flare star stages (red dwarfs). If there are any brown dwarfs that do not have strong global magnetic fields, then the application of stellar metamorphosis to the evolution of stars is false. This being said, it is also predicted that brown dwarfs will have very large aurora due to their global magnetic fields sweeping in very large amounts of ionized material. This should also mean that they should be a strong source of radio waves.

This means the intensity of the radio waves being emitted from brown dwarfs can be used to determine the size of the magnetic field, thus their stage of evolution. Since it is understood now that planet formation is stellar evolution, it should become apparent that brown dwarves sit right in the middle, so we can now accurately predict the actual appearance and features of stars as they cool and die to brown dwarf stage, and we can predict what brown dwarfs will look like many billions of years into their future.

The young Population 1 stars are mostly plasma and stars in the visible light spectrum, the more advanced stages are Population 2 which is mostly gaseous matter and no longer have strong visible light spectrums, Population 3 which is solid and liquid material, and Population 4, which is a dead star. Concerning the magnetosphere evolution of stars it is only Pop 1 - Pop 3 stars that can have magnetic
energy permeating the interior and the surface, as dead stars have no large scale fluid motion to produce the fields.

This being said, we can tell if a star is dead by seeing if it has a magnetic field. No magnetic field equals a dead star. Of course this is very, very different than what establishment accepts as to them an extremely energetic star such as a white dwarf has a huge magnetic field, yet they are dead. Which should make the reader question their theories. How does a dead star have so much energy? At least 10% of white dwarfs found have surface magnetic field strengths of at least 1 million gauss, or 100 Tesla. This further supports the theory, as white dwarfs are placed firmly at the beginning of stellar evolution, not the end. With objects that energetic, there is no way they should be
considered “dead”. That would be like the author dying, and then turning into a sustained 1000 meter long lightning bolt. The reader should look up Dragon Ball Z, when Goku goes Supersaiyan.

Dead stars do not have really strong sustained global magnetic fields. The rule of thumb still works in this case, if the white dwarf has a relatively weak magnetic field, it is losing the global field because it is expanding outwards and becoming a blue giant. If the white dwarf has a very strong magnetic field, then it is new and young and very, very hot. This means that white dwarfs with strong magnetic fields should also be very hot, and white dwarfs with weak magnetic fields should be cooler and much larger. Establishment dogma has no predicted outcome of extremely energetic white dwarfs. To them they will remain perpetually energetic for trillions of years and their evolution rests on the fate of the entire universe, which is unscientific. They have taken an unfalsifiable assumption of the fate of the entire universe to predict the outcome of white dwarfs. That alone should be cause for concern for any scientist. They are new, young, extremely hot and energetic stars at the very beginning of their evolutionary track. White dwarfs belong in the beginning of a star's evolution. They are on the left hand side of the graph below.[84c]
Chapter 8, Encompassed Theories

8.1 Whole earth decompression dynamics

Some aspects of the WEDD model, proposed by the geophysicist J. Marvin Herndon, is encompassed by stellar metamorphosis.\[85\] The main understanding is that the crust was formed under very high pressures, and while the gas giant dissipated its thick atmosphere the crust then expanded outwards, and then contracted inwards again as it cooled off. The difference between WEDD and SM is that the Earth has a nuclear source keeping it hot, while in SM the Earth is just a really old star that is still cooling off. This meaning in WEDD the Earth keeps its internal heat by some type of fusion process and in SM the Earth is a giant dissipative structure (a dying star) and is not actively powered.
8.2 The great oxygenation event

The history of the Earth includes evidence that it underwent massive changes in atmospheric composition. The increase in oxygen can be observed in stars in earlier stages of evolution as per stellar metamorphosis theory with reference to the Earth's current stage. The great oxygenation event is a direct result of the massive loss of hydrogen in late stage stellar evolution.[86] These ancient stars are similar to Jupiter, Saturn, Neptune and Uranus, and even on newly forming ocean worlds found by the Kepler Space Telescope. These stars all fit a simple evolutionary timeline which includes an enriching of the atmosphere with oxygen, an explosion of increased mineral complexity during crust formation, and a thickening of the atmosphere with other heavier gases such as water vapor and nitrogen. The great oxygenation event is encompassed via the principle of diminishing solar abundances outlined inside of the general theory of SM.[87]

8.3 Mechanism for plate motion

Instead of placing tectonic plates as being constructs that move with sideways orientations absent mechanism, it is proposed that the source of motion is both slow and very powerful due to the entire Earth pulling the crust downwards. The readjusting of the crust as the Earth cools is explained by gravitational potential energy being transferred to downwards motion.[88] Essentially the Earth is crushing itself. The crust is falling inwards and simultaneously thickening and contracting, as per the ossification principle, due to gravitational collapse, the solidification of matter from its liquid state, and the thermodynamic contraction of matter when it phase transitions to a less energetic state. Moving an entire 10
cubic kilometers of mass 1 meter lower would produce enough seismic energy to obliterate any city, and can be calculated. Thus the mechanism for Earthquakes is caused by a different force in stellar metamorphosis.

"Earthquakes are caused by gravitational collapse not plate tectonics."

This phenomenon is understood and dealt with in the civil engineering of large concrete structures such as bridges, and even sidewalks. This thermodynamic phenomenon is why concrete and steel bridges are designed with gaps in them to allow for contraction and expansion without cracking. If there were no small gaps designed in bridges then the bridge would become structurally unsound and collapse due to the formation of uncontrolled cracking, some through the deck, overpass, piers or abutments. Similarly, as the Earth’s mantle contracts and cools the top portion (crust) adjusts and splits along fault lines because there are no gaps to allow for structural stress dissipation. The location of the cracks (fault lines) therefore will be a continual source of earthquakes. This explains the incredible power of earthquakes and the appearance of fault lines. Plate tectonics is unnecessary, the continents have not moved any appreciable distance in as much as a concrete sidewalk or giant concrete bridge moves. They could bend and make folds, but that is caused by the entire crust of the Earth contracting on itself as a whole.

8.4 Terraforming

Terraforming is reinterpreted by placing the process as natural, not human centered. It is mentioned that Earth -
like does not mean Earth exactly, as well, it is understood in this theory that forming life hosting worlds occurs inside of evolving stars as they cool and die. All stars are in some stage of terraforming, or disintegration from an Earth-like composition and atmosphere as well as losing their protective features such as a strong global magnetic field, their position relative to hotter host, and the internal/atmospheric feedback mechanisms such as water rain, to name a few.[90]

"Terraforming of a planet, moon, or other body is the process of a hot star moving through all stages of evolution, naturally changing in atmospheric composition, temperature, surface topography and ecology and strength of its global magnetic field to be similar to the environment and structure of Earth, but not completely Earth-like. The gravitational field would be stronger/weaker depending on how much mass was lost via the process of stellar evolution and how quickly relative to other stars it has evolved."

It should be noted that Mars is a dead world as it has no strong magnetic field to protect it. Sending people there for a trip to land on it, and then promptly get them back home is a great and worthwhile challenge, but establishing a human colony there is not the path for humanity. Even if we were to make the surface habitable, it would be for naught, because the magnetic field is not strong enough to protect the life that would be on the surface, and the effort that we would put into trying to establish a base would be better spent on a much closer object, the Moon. We cannot terraform entire dead stars, that belongs to mother nature for the moment.

8.5 Abiogenic oil and natural gas
It is stated that while the main hypothesis of Thomas Gold and the Soviet Russians during the 20th century were indeed unsubstantiated concerning the formation of oil and natural gas due to abiogenic processes, it was not known of the current types of reactions occurring in objects which are less evolved than Earth. This process is widely used in industry to form oil and natural gas from abiogenic processes and is currently occurring in pre-Earth objects, such as Jupiter, Saturn, Neptune and Uranus. The Fischer-Tropsch process only requires a few stepped reactions, carbon monoxide and hydrogen gas. The steps are stated,

1. Associative adsorption of CO
2. Splitting of the C/O - bond
3. Dissociative adsorption of 2H2
4. Transfer of 2H to the oxygen to yield H2O
5. Desorption of H2O
6. Transfer of 2H to the carbon to yield CH2

Some extra by-products of this process are various C-1 fragments including formyl (CHO), hydroxycarbene (HCOH), hydroxymethyl (CH2OH), methyl (CH3), methylene (CH2), methylidyne (CH), and hydroxymethylidyne (COH), all of which are probably in large quantities in the atmospheres of much more evolved stars (astrons) such as Jupiter, Saturn, Neptune and Uranus and in many of the 3,586 exoplanets found by modern telescopes.[91]

If Thomas Gold or the Soviets would have considered reverse engineering the Earth to account for earlier stages of evolution, they would have been pointed directly to objects right inside of our current system. It is stated clearly, Neptune, Uranus, Jupiter and Saturn have oil and natural gas rain, as do all late stage Population II stars.
8.6 Dinosaurs in 3-5 bar atmospheric pressure

It was reasoned by another scientist that Earth’s atmosphere was probably around 3-5 Bar in thickness during the dinosaur age. This is in line with the atmospheric thinning principle of stellar metamorphosis. The thickness of stars’ atmospheres diminishes as the star evolves, therefore the dinosaurs lived in any atmospheric density greater than what it is now. In Mr. Octave Levenspiel’s paper it is reasoned they probably lived in an atmosphere that was 3-5 times thicker than what it is now. As well, the further you go back in time to even before the dinosaurs, the atmosphere becomes thicker and thicker. This means that the atmosphere the dinosaurs lived in was thinned considerably from even earlier stages of stellar evolution, when Earth did not host life as we know it.

Life is the direct by-product of the chemical and physical changes involved when a star cools and evolves. As the star cools and evolves the atmosphere thins out, continuously, until it is so thin as to allow for life to live and continue evolving itself, on its surface, to the point of becoming self-aware. The atmosphere’s thickness at the surface of the Earth is about 1 atm, which is slightly above 1 bar. The scientist, Octave Levenspiel from Oregon State University is correct. The anomalies which puzzle scientists today concerning dinosaurs are solved if the atmosphere was thicker, to at least 3-5 bar. It is accepted as both correct and reasonable by the standards set forth by the General Theory of Stellar Metamorphosis and outlined in the principle of atmospheric thinning.[91a]

It is suggested for scientists who have rejected his paper to back track and re-examine their careers and belief systems, or else they will suffer greatly. The false narrative of Earth having always been in its current configuration, differentiation and atmospheric composition/thickness
was put forth by Hutton’s uniformitarianism and is false, as opposed to the concept of deep time. In other words, we can keep deep time as the Earth is billions of years old, but we must discard the notion that it was always this way.

The observational facts provided by Kepler and other space/ground telescopes falsify this notion in its entirety, as we can observe stars in multiple stages of evolution not existent in our own solar system. Earth was vastly thicker, hotter and more massive in its past, and had to evolve to this point, per the principle of planet evolution. The thickness of the atmosphere during the age of the dinosaurs was considerably higher, as the dinosaurs existed well into the past, by hundreds of millions of years, when the Earth was physically and chemically different. The planet forms as it evolves.

It is my wish for Mr. Octave Levenspiel to know that he is correct in his analysis. Quetzalcoatlus flew in an atmosphere much thicker than Earth’s current one, at least to 3 to 5 bar. The apatosaur could pump blood up to his brain without needing additional hearts, and Earth was an alien world to us, not just in species, but in atmospheric composition and density. It is also my wish for Mr. Levenspiel to know that stellar evolution is in fact, planet formation, and that the object he is in discussion about is quite incredible. Thus, it will appear to be speculative, but is not really. It is only speculative to keep ideas which are no longer fully functional or reliable, like taking a chance on a car that constantly breaks down to drive to work.

I will also steal a quote he uses.

“Highly speculative investigations, especially by an unknown author, are best brought before the world through some other channel than a scientific society which naturally hesitates to admit into its printed records matter of uncertain value.” —Lord Rayleigh, Proc. Royal Soc., A183 1 (1892).
Speculation and being unknown are irrelevant to science if you have a better explanation of the facts. Mr. Octave Levenspiel’s paper is the best explanation of the facts, without additional conjecture. The atmosphere was simply thicker, as is predicted by stellar metamorphosis, and outlined in this book in basic principles.

Chapter 9, Theories with Partial Similarities

9.1 Liquid metallic hydrogen solar model

The Liquid Metallic Hydrogen Solar Model as outlined has very few partial similarities,[92] but still suffers the same issue as establishment dogma, as this model has stars as mutually exclusive of planets. At 33:14, “Unlike nuclear reactions which are unknown to us, we can observe the light emitted by the stars.”[93] This statement shows that he does not understand that most stars in the galaxy no longer shine, as they are gaseous, liquid and solid material, not plasma.

White dwarfs in the general theory are very young stars. Something about their radiative characteristics changes as they are definitely not Earth sized as mentioned by Robitaille. In line with the lattice idea presented by Robitaille, the actual lattice changes because the star does expand outwards greatly. This causes significant cooling all the way up to giant phases, and the condensed matter of the white dwarf expands creating a shell completely encapsulating the star’s interior (which is not nuclear but probably a homogeneous gas/plasmatic material). Of
course this is up to further refinement. It also should be noted that any lattice type configuration of material is lost eventually, as stars’ lose their ability to shine due to heat being internalized greatly due to infalling matter creating the new core (the planet) in its interior. Regardless of Robitaille’s opinion on this matter, we should be able to reverse engineer older gaseous stars to draw up more accurate representations of stars in intermediate stages of evolution between Jupiter and the Sun. It should be clear that Jupiter is not a failed star, but an intermediate aged one, as well the Sun is not an ancient star like Earth, but a really young one that has properties of youth, such as incredible mass and outward oriented heat production due to slow gravitational collapse. It also should be apparent that stars do gravitationally collapse, this energy fuels a variety of electrochemical, thermochemical and photochemical reactions inside the star forming things like life and rocks/minerals (land), oceans, etc.

9.2 Contracted/Expanding/Contraction Earth

In Earth’s earlier history when it had an extremely thick atmosphere, on par with atmospheres thicker than Jupiter’s, the central core was very, very pressurized and essentially liquid. This means it was extremely comparatively smooth to Earth as it currently is with mountains and ocean trenches. A short explanation for how the transition to its varying surface from being at an initial smooth state is provided. Smoothness is defined by how little the surface changes in topography. The surface topography of Earth while having a very thick, highly pressurized atmosphere crushing it from all sides evenly (it is spherical) therefore would be extremely smooth. An estimate of the smoothness of the topography I would guess to be about at a max 1000 feet. So 500 feet for the highest
mountain, and 500 feet for the lowest trench. This is not including the differences between pole circumference and equator circumference of the core. As the thick atmosphere, and all the water evaporates away over many tens of millions of years, the core begins pushing outwards due to thermal expansion, it is still very, very hot. It still remains smooth as this process is occurring and the crust begins cooling and forming rocks/minerals in accordance to what elements are present at those locations. As the rocks and minerals form underneath the thick ocean world, they form the beginning crust. As the crust is in formation the whole newly forming lithosphere begins contracting again, as a large portion of the heat was allowed to escape. The body will then begin contracting and the lithosphere will begin thickening considerably. This is where the smoothness of the interior core (where the solid surface is located) will begin to become more rough. Since the whole body of the lithosphere is contracting, and the locations of all the elements that have been forming into minerals and rocks varies, then mountain ranges and ocean trenches should form probably near each other. Think about what happens when you bend a piece of paper. The high bends will accompany the lower bends. This would only happen where the conditions are favorable. In some places the bending just goes on and on without an appearance of ocean trench formation simply because all of the bending happens on land, due to a large portion of specific minerals having formed in one spot. This is what happened to the Himalayas. The entire Earth is therefore rough, because it is contracting again from an initial expansion phase due to the thick atmosphere being lifted in earlier stages (Grey dwarf/ocean world stages) of star evolution. This could possibly satisfy the claims made by expanding Earth proponents as well as keep in line with the conservation of mass.[94]
Chapter 10, Rejected Theories

10.1 Stellar mass black holes

The concept of black holes is flatly rejected based on the mass loss principle, and the spherical celestial object principle. If a star gravitationally collapses it will lose mass and energy due to solar wind and solar flares releasing matter in large amounts as well as plasma recombination and exothermic reactions releasing heat. In black hole theory, the star gravitationally collapses without any mass loss or energy loss, yet all stars lose mass and energy as they evolve. This means stellar mass black holes violate the mass loss (ML) principle of stellar evolution to form, and can be rejected. It is also noted that black holes are zero dimensional, and stars are mostly spherical. This means since stars remain mostly spherical as they form and evolve, possessing 3 dimensions, they cannot become singularities according to the spherical celestial object principle. Since the main energy source for a star as it dissipates is gravitational collapse and exothermic chemical reactions and not fusion reactions, the lowest state of energy the material of a star can reach is when the material reaches the coulomb barrier, in which the electrostatic interaction prevents further collapse. This material is observed as crystalline structure, also known as rocks and minerals. These fully collapsed stars can be observed, such as Mercury, Mars, Venus and Earth. The stars as they evolve also have escape velocities. With black holes, their escape velocity is faster than light, and since nothing is faster than light, black holes have no escape velocity, meaning they cannot be stars nor could they have formed from a star-like state.[95][96]

10.2 Disk gravitational instability model
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The disk gravitational instability model for planet formation is falsified by the majority of the angular momentum of the solar system being present in Jupiter and not the Sun. If the solar system formed from a spinning disk, then the Sun should have the majority of the angular momentum.

10.3 Core accretion model

The core accretion model in astrophysics is the idea that the cores of planets are formed first, and then the outer material is accreted onto the developed core. So they build the core first, then layer the material onto the core. It sounds reasonable, but only three problems:

1. They build the core without a gravitational field. (There is no gravitating body bringing the material together.)

2. They build the core absent heat and material to block the heat from being lost to interstellar space. (There is nothing heating the iron/nickel, as well if there were something to heat the iron, there is nothing to block the heat loss, as per the refractory principle of planet formation.)

3. They build the core absent the ability to differentiate the material. (There is no mechanism that can differentiate the material, if matter was brought together as solid material, it would not be able to sort, as the rocks would be pre-formed.)

The solution to their problems are easily solved. The gravitational field required to form a large core only exists where there is a gravitating object large enough to clump the material together, heat and ionize it so that it can
differentiate into pure iron/nickel and block the heat loss. That means the beginning development of a "core" happens inside of stars themselves.

The difference is as follows between establishment core accretion model and this theory:

1. *Establishment* has core accretion happening outside of gravitating bodies.
2. *Stellar Metamorphosis* has core accretion happens inside of gravitating bodies.

**10.4 Destroying fusion model of Sun with ockham's razor**

We can destroy the fusion model of stars (which is pseudoscience) by using Ockham’s Razor.

1. The Sun radiates in the interior and exterior according to the dogma. The yellow is the radiative areas, outer space and inside the star. The red is the surfaces. So not only are there radiative areas, there are two radiative surfaces. So the Sun has two surfaces. This is extremely unlikely.
According to Ockham’s Razor the unnecessary presuppositions can be done away with. The Sun is radiating from its exterior exactly where it is observed. This means there is no radiating core.

2. The Sun radiates on its exterior.
This means that the energy production of a star is in full view, plasma recombination fueled by gravitational collapse. It also means all fusion models of stars are probably false. It is best to ignore theories that force the Sun being as old as the Earth. In fact, it is vastly younger than the Earth. Any theory that forces it to be as old, or older than the Earth can be ignored as false.[97a]

10.5. Stars do not end as internal explosions/implosions

It is important to use common sense when making observations. In the case of observations concerning the bright events labeled supernova/nova, we need to really examine what is going on. It is hypothesized that a star never ends as an internal implosion/ explosion event, but slowly cools and dies. There are a couple reasons why the author disagrees with the hypothesis of a star needing to explode/implode internally to end its life.

1. A star is a stable object, an object which sustains its stability for billions of years. Why would an extremely stable object implode/explode? It is the unstable structures in nature which can have violent endings, TNT, weapons grade plutonium, etc. The stable structures have slow endings, such as iron rusting, trees decaying, etc. Stability begets stability as a rule of thumb, it would be like saying we can harness lightning to power homes. Sure, lightning produces a lot of energy and electricity, but it is too unstable and unpredictable to have any practical use. So not only is the stability argument much stronger for stars not exploding all of a sudden, but that it is more practical. It just feels as if the bright events in the sky were attributed to only stars exploding as they die as the answer, before all the options were considered. It is suggested to look at outer space as being highly electrical, which was not really done when the
fusion model of stars and the supernova/nova theories were drawn up.

2. No supernova has ever been observed in modern times (for over 400 years) in our galaxy. Yet there are hundreds of billions of stars in the Milky Way Galaxy. That is like saying out of the 7 billion people on Earth, the last person to have been witnessed to die was in the year 1604. This brings into question the actual nature of an event which was bright in the night sky.

3. An expanding cloud of plasma can be easily explained as a collision event between two objects. If two very large objects collide at very high rates of velocity in outer space, there is nothing to prevent the material blasted outwards to slow down. As well, if the material is travelling fast enough it will ionize, depending on the critical ionization velocity of the material against the surrounding stellar environment. This is similar to why a meteor is bright, the friction ionizes the material. So what a supernova could really be is just an impact between two objects. Just think of the incredible amount of energy that would be released from two moon sized objects slamming into each other at tens of thousands of miles an hour, with each composed of enough radioactive material to make hundreds of thousands of nuclear warheads. That's a big bada boom.

4. A star contains plasma and is highly energetic when it is young, which dissipates its energy into the interstellar environment, via solar winds, solar flaring, coronal mass ejections and radiation over billions of years. To state that it releases all of its energy throughout its life, and then explodes after all the energy has dissipated is to contradict what it means to have an energetic object.
5. *Stars cool and die becoming gaseous/liquid and solid structure.* These stars are called “exoplanets/planets” by establishment dogma. As it is known that the process of stellar evolution is planet formation itself. By presenting these basic reasons for why stars do not end as internal explosion/implosions, we can reason that the very concept of “supernova/nova” needs to be reexamined and/or replaced.[97c]

### 10.6 Nice Model

According to the Nice Model gas giant planets were formed closer to the Sun and migrated outwards. This differs from stellar metamorphosis considerably. In SM, rocky objects are the final stages to a star’s (astron) evolutionary path. This means if any gas type, middle aged astron gets close enough to a much hotter host, it will have its outer layers ripped away, exposing the rocky differentiated core. Gas type objects do not form close to their host astrons, as well, they are mutually exclusive of other stars in general as they have their own evolutionary paths. This means the very basics of stellar evolution (astron evolution/planet formation) are not understood inside of the Nice Model. As well, the Nice Model has no explanation for the angular momentum loss problem of the classical (outdated) nebular hypothesis. The solution is that a star (astron) loses its angular momentum via mass loss to solar wind, flaring, coronal mass ejections and photoevaporation to hotter hosts. All the objects’ formations are mutually exclusive, they are not related. To summarize, the Nice Model assumes as does the nebular hypothesis that all the objects in our solar system are related and all formed at the same time when the Sun formed, when in stellar
metamorphosis they are actually an adopted family, all the objects are in different stages to their evolution, in which case the Sun has adopted all of them. How evolved they are is apparent in their physical characteristics, and has nothing what so ever to do with their current orbital configuration. Neptune sized objects could be in front of Earth sized objects without any problem, but forming there and then moving to the outer reaches is unnecessary. \[97d\] They are constantly trying to rearrange the objects via migration without addressing the underlying issues. All migration theories that force the stars in our system to all be a part of the same formation mechanism is just a haphazard way of trying to save the nebular disk paradigm. \[97e\]

Chapter 11, Superceded Theories and Classifications

11.1 Astrophysical

11.1.1 Reinterpreting false positive "exoplanets"

The bottom diagram shows four windows. One is “true” and not a false positive. The other three are “false positives”. According to the dogma, three of the windows do not count as discoveries of exoplanets, yet they actually do.
In the dogma’s diagram, “a” is the only true discovery. The others are false positives. The only thing false about the other three is the dogma’s understanding of what they are actually looking at. All false positives are stars in various stages to their evolution, as well as the one that is not a false positive. All four, a, b, c, and d all show stars in various stages to their evolution. There is nothing false about them. By observing the bottom diagram, we can see that stars exist in all stages of evolution, and that is what all observations are showing us, regardless if the dogma refuses to accept reality.
Brown dwarves, red dwarves, orange dwarves, “planets”, “exoplanets”, "moons" (depending on differentiation) they are all the same objects. They are all evolutionary in nature, they become each other over time as they evolve. This being said, all false positive data are actual confirmations of real exoplanets that are still young, hot and big after they first formed. We can now begin to replace the false knowledge taught by university professors and large research organizations that have no idea what they are talking about. To any young reader, do not listen to your professors concerning star evolution and/or planet formation, they are teaching you false theory that is outdated.[97f]

11.2 Pebble accretion

In pebble accretion, 1 cm sized pebbles clump together in outer space to make larger objects. Unfortunately there is no direct or indirect observation of
this occurring in outer space, nor any experimental results which show how 1 cm sized pebbles can clump into city sized rocks in the vacuum of outer space. As well, it is well known that stars are the only objects in outer space that can collect any pebbles in outer space, and offer a substantial gravitational field to clump them together. In pebble accretion the establishment uses the concept of aerodynamic drag to form larger objects from pebbles clumping together, which means astronomers clearly do not understand outer space as there is no aerodynamics, because there is no air. It would be akin to Star Wars explosions in outer space being large fireballs, or hearing the explosions (there is no air or oxygen, so there wouldn't be large orange fireballs or sound).

11.2.1 The absence of rock self-assembly

Falsifying the idea of rock self-assembly which is accepted by mainstream astronomy and astrophysics can be done anywhere there is a pool table and billiard balls. There is simply no way to clump material together, when adding material and the momentum of that material causes the larger mass to disintegrate. You cannot decrease entropy by adding entropy. They are essentially saying you can subtract things, by adding things. The system has to prevent the momentum from being lost for this method to work, and given the felt does not provide adequate friction to prevent the momentum from the cue ball being lost, they scatter when hit. Not only that, but the pool table is a world class mechanism to increase the likelihood of rock self-assembly in outer space. It has walls for the balls to bounce off, redirecting them towards the center, and it has felt to cause even a small amount of friction to slow them down and trap the momentum transfer of the cue ball. It even has gravitation of the Earth to keep all of the balls on the table!
In outer space, there is no felt to trap any momentum energy transfer, the gravitational field strength of the billiard balls is essentially zero as compared to any additional momentum added, and the kicker, there are no walls in outer space! This means that if these billiard balls were floating in a triangle configuration in outer space (beginning the process of planet formation as accepted by establishment), then literally anything that even gives a slight tap on any angle of the triangle will disintegrate.

11.2.2 Reinterpreting chondrites

The following is a word for word excerpt from the book, Meteorites and their Parent Planets, by Harry Y. McSween, Jr. on page 35:

"Imagine a witness at the birth of the solar system, painstakingly observing and recording each event as it unfolds. What would such a recording be worth to science now? The origin and early evolution of the Sun and planets are still, to a degree, shrouded in mystery, because there are no surviving witnesses or records - - none, that is, but chondrites. The name of this important meteorite group derives from the ancient Greek word chondros, meaning "grain" or "seed," a reference to the appearance produced by numerous small, round inclusions called chondrules...In this chapter we shall attempt to lift the shroud a bit and peek into the dark recesses of earliest solar system history. We shall do this by examining the record imprinted in chondrites. One might think that such chunks of rock would be mute witnesses, but nothing could be further from the truth."

ONCE UPON A TIME

"If chondrites contain records of early solar system processes, they must be very old. But how old are
they, and how does their age compare with that of the solar system?

The Earth is our most accessible source of solar system material, and its formation age should be the same as that for the whole system. This, of course, presumes that there was no significant gap in time between the formation of the Sun and the planets, and we have no theoretical reason or evidence to suggest such a hiatus."

Following from the above it should be explained clearly that there are assumptions as well as admitted assumptions that were forced based on extremely limited data. As well, the data was ignored that was actual evidence to suggest a very different worldview, there simply just was not a theory that could explain it. Now that we are in the Age of Astrons (evolving stars mislabeled exoplanets), and a theory that can explain them, we can go back to good science instead of piling massive amounts of assumptions together in an ad hoc fashion.

Above, McSween states that a person, in order to possibly understand the birthing of a solar system, should imagine what the solar system would look like, given we could be around to record each event as it unfolded. This is quite clearly a misdirection based on an enormous bias, which is the bias that the bodies in the solar system formed all at the same time. In this case bias and assumption can be used interchangeably. If we were to have a space ship orbit right above the Earth, and time travel to 4.5 billion or so years ago, we would get to observe the Sun, Jupiter, Saturn, Neptune, Venus, Mercury, Ceres, etc. just beginning to form. This should lead the reader to the very obvious mistake. What if Earth is vastly older than the Sun, Jupiter, Saturn, Neptune and Uranus? What would that look like? Would they even be orbiting anything that we are familiar with? What would the Earth itself look like? Would the Sun
even be there? What if Earth was orbiting some other star entirely? None of that is taken into account. The extreme simplifying assumption is that the Solar System essentially formed "as is", as a singular construct. That is the problem reader. McSween and huge amounts of academics all assume the Solar System to be a single body. Yet, when it is observed in telescopes, it appears to be thousands of disconnected bodies separated by, at times, billions of kilometers of hard vacuum. This is a huge problem. So to say, we can observe the solar system forming automatically assumes all the bodies in the solar system, regardless of how vastly disconnected they truly are, are the same age and formed where they are observed, and have not changed or evolved to their current state from incredibly violent pasts, well beyond their current configurations and levels of differentiation and compositions. It is clear imagination can lead us enormously astray from reality given we assume things to be true which are not.

McSween also states that the Solar System formation is shrouded in mystery, yet clearly there is no mystery. If anything it is confirmation bias rooted in false knowledge, not a mystery, which confounds us and prevents understanding the stars. The astronomers that observe the Solar System are looking at the objects as being "one object". Just to make clear with an analogy, just imagine you are standing in the middle of a large crowd of people, at they are all walking around in large looping circles around you. Since they are all walking around in large looping circles around you, does that mean they all formed from the left overs of your birthing? That would be extremely difficult to accept. Yet that is exactly what astronomers accept when they look at the solar system, they all assume the people who are walking around you are left overs from your birthing, and are not independent entities with their own histories and lives. Sure, people in mosh pits can all have
the same musical interests, but to assume they were formed from you being born? No way. The Sun, Neptune, Earth, Jupiter, etc., they all are independent entities. They are evolutionary structures each with their own vast histories, mutually exclusive of each other. The fact that they orbit the Sun now, does NOT mean that is their original configuration and to assume such is myopic based on outdated theory and group think.

McSween also states that chondrites are the only objects that can tell us of the past formation events which the solar system formed from. Again, if the solar system bodies are all mutually exclusive, and the "solar system" as it is understood is actually composed of a multitude of evolving objects independent of each other, then clearly chondrites tell us of something completely different. They actually tell us of the interiors of highly evolved stars. They show us what the interiors of Mars, Venus, Mercury and Earth are composed of, which is ironic as the very book itself is titled: Meteorites and their Parent Planets. Why would a researcher write up a book on chondrites being formed from the early "solar system" (essentially does not exist as a singular construct), when the book title lays down the very truth? A meteorite is a piece of a destroyed planet (evolved/dead star). A chondrite is a piece of a long since destroyed world. As well, given that world evolved at a specific rate to allow life to form, could have also been a world that hosted it on the scale that Earth hosts human beings and forests, as outlined in the Krypton Hypothesis.

It is mentioned that observing a chondrite tells us about the early solar system, which is untrue. A chondrite tells us about the mid - stages of the evolution of a single star's interior, between Gliese - 229b (brown dwarf star) and Pre - Earths such as Kepler - 10b or Corot - 7b, as examples. http://vixra.org/pdf/1712.0460v1.pdf Of course these types of objects were not known about when McSween
wrote this book on chondrites, so we have to be fair in the analysis of the writing. He simply adopted a paradigm that was accepted in light of extremely limited information. Fact is, chondrites are the scattered guts and remains of billions of dead stars. Chondrites are all over the galaxy and they enter the atmosphere of the Earth freely from essentially any location in the universe. They are not remains of the solar system forming, as there essentially is no "solar system", there are only evolving stars in various stages to their evolution and disintegration which are giving the appearance of being in a system because many of them orbit the Sun. Unfortunately upon closer inspection, the majority of the large objects in the solar system do not even orbit the Sun. They orbit Jupiter, Saturn, Neptune, Earth and Uranus. Still though, in 2017, a full 30 years after this book was written it is still accepted by mainstream that the Solar System is a singular object.

This paper isn't talking bad about the scientific importance of chondrites, it simply addresses their actual origins, and in fact is the most necessary part of the scientific process. If we are to accept chondrites as left overs of a single process (based on a 300 year old assumption) that formed in outer space, absent the heat and pressure to form them, then we have made a dogma that obliterates all free thought, and makes it impossible to make scientific progress in light of much more viable and reasonable alternatives.

It is lastly mentioned, "[T]he Earth is our most accessible source of solar system material, and its formation age should be the same as that for the whole system. This, of course, presumes that there was no significant gap in time between the formation of the Sun and the planets, and we have no theoretical reason or evidence to suggest such a hiatus." In actuality there is an enormous gap in time between the formation of the Sun and the planets, and even gaps in between the smaller
planets themselves, and all the evidence found by exoplanet data rolling in and a new theory that can explain it demands the hiatus, leaving chondrites as interpreted as much more magnificent material than even 1980's scientists could interpret them with. They are pieces of long since destroyed worlds that have histories vastly richer than even scientists in the 21st century can accept. They are the interior smashed up remains of long dead stars older than the Earth.[97b]

11.3 Geological

11.3.1 Evolutionary Earth vs. uniformitarianism

In the accepted geology and geophysics departments it is taught that the Earth formed mostly as is, and the processes involved in the formation of Earth happened very slowly. With those two assumptions in place, the former being less rational, the idea that Earth could not have possibly been much larger or even comprised of matter in much higher energy states which is observed in outer space is overlooked. [99] Conversely, if we observe outer space we shall see that there are a vast amount of very bright objects, consisting of plasmatic and gaseous matter. It is much more reasonable to assume that Earth was one of those objects at one point, as they are actually observed, as opposed to assuming giant rocky, differentiated bodies just clump together absent heat, pressure and refractory material to melt down iron/nickel in the vast amounts hypothesized to exist in the core. As well, the heat of the Earth can also simply be explained as being the left over heat of the Earth's evolutionary timeline,
Venus being much older, and not longer evolving. It is much more reasonable to assume Earth is the end result of very long stretches of time, which involves thousands of different types of chemical combination reactions, thermochemistry, electrochemistry, biological and even reactions such as grain growth and nucleation of matter before any type of rock cycle can even take place. It is therefore made clear that uniformitarianism does not work as a main geological principle or worldview. Taking an evolutionary stance of Earth inside of the theory which includes it as an end result of star evolution is much more reasonable and is based on unmistakably sound observation that continues to pile up via the discovery of thousands of exoplanets all in varying stages of their evolutionary sequence.

11.3.2 The rock cycle

All phases of matter exist in stars as they cool and evolve. This means the rock cycle has a closed loop between solid/liquid material and does not give the complete picture of stellar evolution (planet formation), nor does it explain the structures found on the Earth such as a giant iron nickel/core, which comprises a much larger portion of the Earth than just a thin lithosphere. The core of the Earth does not cycle, it is stationary and was formed as the beginning object to give all evolving stars their initial structure. As well, it is a spherical object as it cools and solidifies, meaning that hydrostatic equilibrium due to gravitation will be irrelevant to determine the differentiation process in stellar cores that have been completely exposed, far after the star has died. This has implications in the determination of the structures of dead stars.[100]
11.3.3 Iron catastrophe

1. There is no mechanism for the heating of the first rocks that supposedly made Earth. The rocks are assumed to be hot based off the idea of pre-existing heat from gravitational pressure in outer space. This is contradictory to evidence that outer space is extremely cold (2.7 Kelvin),[101][102] being close to a perfect vacuum and the fact that gravity cannot pressurize material without a pre-existing celestial body causing the gravity. For their model of gravitational heating to work, gravity has to be present without a large celestial object like Mars being in place. This is a glaring logical contradiction.

2. There is silver in the crust in nugget form which is heavier than iron and has a much lower melting point.[103] If the iron catastrophe were correct then there should be no silver in the crust, because all the heavier elements that have a much lower melting point and are heavier than iron should have sunk to the center as well. There simply has to be another property of iron that causes it to clump together in the center.

3. There is no mechanism for 1 centimeter sized pebbles to clump into 1 kilometer sized rocks (so called planetesimals) to form planets in outer space.[104]

4. Callisto is undifferentiated while the Moon is. Both objects are roughly the same size but one is differentiated and the other is not. This contradicts the hypothesis that objects can differentiate themselves via the iron catastrophe.

5. No mechanism is provided to sort the material, also if the material was sorted by weight alone then hydrogen would
never be found in the deep crust. It would have already evaporated away into interstellar space during the Earth's birthing. Put bluntly, the escape velocity of Earth's gravitational field is lower than the average velocity of hydrogen gas. This fact is reviewed in Chapter 1, which overviews the hydrogen paradox.

6. The iron catastrophe is not applied to explain the iron cores of the other older stars in our system such as Venus, Mars, Mercury, etc. If there is to be an actual explanation for why iron is in the center of older stars we must be able to use it interchangeably with the other older stars. If iron catastrophe can only be applied to the Earth and not the other celestial bodies then it is not even a hypothesis because the other stars have iron cores as well.

7. Catastrophe implies that whatever event caused the iron to move towards the center of the Earth that it happened very quickly, as opposed to uniformitarianism (or a very slow change), which would be a more appropriate reasoning because the Earth is billions of years old. Thus meaning that whatever mechanism caused the iron to be in the center the process must have taken a very long time, thereby making “catastrophe” an inappropriate word for the process. This would be akin to saying Redwood trees regardless of the fact that they are thousands of years old grow overnight, literally catastrophically. Saying Redwood trees just burst out of the ground as explosive events is as inane as stating that the iron in the Earth’s core just sunk there in a few days.

8. The iron catastrophe is irreconcilable to general relativity. General relativity is supposed to be a theory of large scale structure but is not included in the explanation as to why there is a giant iron/nickel ball the size of Texas in the center
of the Earth. This meaning that via Ockham’s Razor either both the iron catastrophe and general relativity go hand in hand in explaining large scale structure, or neither are correct.

11.4 Biological

11.4.1 Goldilocks zone and/or External and Internal Habitable Zones

Stars do not need the external heat from another star to host life, or to maintain liquid oceans. They can do this absent being in orbit around a hotter host. The Goldilocks zone hypothesis is superseded by the biostellar evolution principle, as all organic material is synthesized on the star as it cools and dies becoming a life hosting world many billions of years into its evolution. Regardless, if life is found on one of the smallest stars in our solar system, Europa, then it will be evident that the Goldilocks zone/habitable zone hypothesis as taught by 20th century scientists is false, as Europa orbits too far from the Sun. Highly evolved stars can probably host life outside of an external habitable zone.

It would be much better to replace the outdated version of the habitable zone with the conclusions brought about by stellar metamorphosis. The habitable zone of a star is the area where liquid water exists or can exist. Since stars cool down and become water worlds as they evolve, combining their hydrogen with the leftover oxygen in large amounts, it is easy to see what happens. The star is too hot in the beginning to form water, or sustain it, but it can heat up other much colder stars allowing them to pool water on their surfaces from a distance. As the star cools and evolves,
the distance it can do this diminishes considerably and its habitable zone shrinks.

Blue giants have the largest habitable zones, but they quickly contract because they are so young and are evolving rapidly to cooler, less massive states. What this means is that the time variable for the habitable zones of these objects is quite small. The activity of more evolved stars around blue giants should be short-lived, but interesting to say the least. White stars have smaller habitable zones but are still very large. Orange dwarfs have even smaller habitable zones, as well show a noticeable thinning of the zone as opposed to earlier stages. Red dwarfs have very small external habitable zones and the smallest external habitable zone belongs to only the smallest brown dwarfs, which still have a small amount of heat to radiate the surface of another more evolved star. Three external habitable zones are shown below. Notice how the zone both shrinks in diameter and thickness.

Source: NASA

After brown dwarf stages of stellar evolution, the internal temperatures are low enough to allow water to begin forming, meaning the habitable zone of the star
internalizes. The heat from earlier stages of evolution (metamorphosis) keeps the water liquid. This means it does not need the heat from another star to keep its habitable zone. As the brown dwarf cools, the habitable zone moves more towards the center of the gas giant, and the top atmosphere cools significantly, to where water would just be ice crystals. This means the habitable zone becomes fully internalized, where the internal heat can keep water liquid, and the top atmosphere is too cold. Over time, the thick atmosphere diminishes and the star continues to lose mass, and internal heat energy, and the habitable zone moves further towards the center of the star.
Eventually the star reaches ocean world stages. The water available on the surface can be heated in large amounts both externally and internally, as the thick
atmosphere no longer prevents surface heating from being in an external habitable zone of another star. This is the interesting part. The habitable zone can be both in the star itself, and the star can be orbiting inside the external habitable zone of a completely different star. It can have a double habitable zone. Over time though, the heat from the internal regions of the highly evolved star begins diminishing and its ability to keep ocean water liquid slows down, due to internal crust formation. It will begin relying on orbiting inside the external habitable zones of hotter stars, to maintain its water. Though the double habitable zone can exist for extreme periods of time as has the Earth, it all depends on how evolved the star is. Venus for example, placed in Earth’s orbit would only have one habitable zone, because there is no mechanism to sustain internal heat. The crust has solidified very deeply, preventing internal heating. Since the concept of having a double habitable zone is very new, it is suggested to look into stars having them, as those are the most likely to host life, of course given other variables are met as well, such as having the right pressures, and the star has evolved long enough, above the Taylor Threshold.[105a]

As well, a new concept of bioclines can be introduced in which life arises in specific internal layers of the star as it evolves and changes internally, allowing for events such as endosymbiosis to occur. This is when different types of organisms absorb each other to become parts to a whole, such as cells absorbing bacteria which becomes chloroplasts and mitochondria.[105b]

Chapter 12, Spectroscopy
12.1 The absence of spectrums in older stars

In this theory of star evolution, older stars cool to the point of not having a light spectrum to measure them with. This means that all of the oldest stars will no longer have light spectrums, but will start emitting mostly in the infrared, and will be classified as "planets" by the establishment. Spectroscopy can still be accomplished to determine the atmospheric components, but the most evolved stars will not have continuous visible light spectrums. Spectroscopy can still be accomplished to determine the atmospheric components, but the most evolved stars will not have continuous visible light spectrums. NASA heavily relies on spectroscopy of stars,[106] so it should not be too difficult to realize the old ones no longer radiate strongly with their own light.[107]

12.2 Ionization energies

It is also relevant to discuss the role of singly, doubly or multiple levels of ionization energies when taking stellar spectrums, as they might cause miscalculated measurements of the atmospheres of evolved stars, especially in relation to gas pressures.[108]

12.3 Marklund convection

It is also stressed the importance of a plasmatic young star being able to sort out chemically the ions depending on their ionization energies, this is known as Marklund convection. The lower potential ions tend to move towards the cooler, central regions of the plasma such
as iron and nickel, and the higher potential ions move towards the outer regions, such as hydrogen and helium. This means that they do not sort by weight during early evolution, but by the electrical properties of the material when ionized, and very, very hot. As well, this could mean the process of gravitational collapse could be countered, as electromagnetic forcing would dominate the interiors of young stars as this process is underway.[109]

Chapter 13, "Five Laws of Hot Jupiters"

1st law: Hot Jupiters are intermediate aged stars, and are much older than stars that have strong visible spectrums.

2nd law: Hot Jupiters are not related to their host star by any sort of singular formation construct such as a protoplanetary disk and any of its variants which strive to force them to be related by formation processes.

3rd law: Hot Jupiters do not form in situ or even in orbit around their current hosts, they were adopted by their hosts from another part of the galaxy or another galaxy entirely.

4th law: Hot Jupiters have their thick atmospheres ripped away by their hosts, exposing more and more of their interiors.

5th law: Hot Jupiters can migrate towards or away from their host stars, to speed up or slow down (respectively) their evolutionary timeline, after they have been captured.[110]
Chapter 14, Determining the Ages of Stars

In this framework older stars are mostly solid. Middle-aged stars are gaseous and radiate in the infrared while young stars are very hot, big and bright.\[111\] Thus the relative age of the star can be determined by its physical appearance. This is in direct contradiction to the Big Bang theory which states the ages of stars can be determined by their metallicity, or their ratio of the amount iron to those of lighter elements, as measured against an event which happened 13.7 billion years in the past. There are stars in the Milky Way that are older than 13.7 billion years.\[112\] For this reason, the standard classification of stars via Population I, II and III must be redefined as opposed to Baade's original interpretation. The original interpretation was invented in 1944, which was a half-century before reliable data started coming in concerning more evolved stars in other star systems.\[112a\] Population I stars are plasmatic, population II stars gaseous, population III solid/liquid, and population IV dead worlds with no strong magnetic fields. This reduces the need for hypothetical stellar groupings which have never been observed, such as Pop III stars in the standard definition.
14.1 Time principle

It takes billions of years for a star to lose the vast majority of its heat and mass. This is in the framework of not orbiting too close to a younger hotter host speeding up its evolutionary timeline by ripping it apart before it can fully differentiate and form the core material. The stars that have lost the majority of their heat and mass absent the latter hypothesis (as statistical outliers) are similar in size, composition, differentiation and mass to the Earth, Venus, Mars and Mercury. Since they are labeled as “planets” by the establishment, it can be stated that planets take billions of years to form. This principle means that we will never witness planet formation as a complete process, but we can view planets in different stages to their evolution. An analogy to this would be to view trees in the forest. You can walk around in a forest and you will not actually see the trees growing, but you can infer their growth from smaller
trees in the vicinity. The same goes with stars. We can infer their evolution by looking at the ones that no longer shine. Only it is backwards during the main evolutionary sequence. Once the star reaches blue giant stages, it begins shrinking and losing mass. This means it will become smaller, colder and less massive as it evolves. With trees, they become bigger as they grow and age. The oldest trees are the biggest because they continually add mass to them as they grow, but since stars loose mass as they evolve, as per the mass loss (ML) principle, the oldest stars will be the smallest ones (as well as coldest). In academia any claims of seeing planets being formed are therefore false under this principle. The planet formation process happens internally, inside the evolving star, so “seeing” planet formation will never occur either even if we could speed up time. We can only infer the processes by studying the ground or high atmospheres of old or younger stars. This is in essence playing detective by looking at the direct clues on the Earth itself, we can discover what happened to it in the light that it is the leftover core of a long evolved star.\footnote{113}

"Since stellar evolution takes billions of years, and planet formation is stellar evolution in the general theory of stellar metamorphosis, it takes billions of years for a planet to form."
By Baz Taylor
14.1.1 The Pressure and Time Principle of Rock and Mineral Formation in Outer Space

Forming rocks and minerals in the quantities required to form planets in outer space requires large pressures over a sustained period of time to hold the material together. The principle is as follows:

“Large pressures over a sustained period of time are needed to form rocks and minerals in outer space.”
With this principle, it becomes apparent that rocks and minerals in the amounts found on Pluto, Io, Mars or Earth were formed when those surfaces had much greater pressures present. This means they had very, very thick atmospheres for extended periods of time while the rocks and minerals were growing and depositing from gaseous/supercritical and extremely pressurized fluid states. Essentially they are the inner cores of long dissipated gas giants. As well the gas giants are long cooled off stars which have lost the majority of their mass, it is a continuum. Any theory, model or hypothesis that has rocks and minerals forming in vacuum and in very little time violates the pressure /time (PT) principle of rock/mineral formation. The times required to form objects as large as Io, Mars, Pluto or Earth far exceed 100 million years. The pressures required to form the rocks and minerals on them far exceed 100’s of gigapascals on the surface. Large pebbles self - assembling from smaller pebbles and dust in outer space where there is essentially zero pressure is physically impossible. What astronomers do is say, "look, the Earth is here, therefore it had to happen." No. You absolutely need pressure and lots of time to form rocks and minerals. It is a basic geological fact. That is unless you can get a geologists to admit that large crystals such as amethyst, you know, something that you can find in antique stores, formed over - night, in the vacuum of outer space.

What this boils down to is that astronomers do not know the basics of geology, and have no business saying something the size and complexity of Earth could have formed in vacuum, in very little time. The only objects that are observed that can form something the size of Earth, with billions of cubic kilometers of rocks and minerals is a star.\[113a\]
We can even see the cores of the new Earths. Planet formation clearly happens inside of stars as they evolve. The time and pressure needed are provided by the evolving star, this is much different than establishment's take in which they say planet formation happens outside of celestial bodies, in the vacuum of outer space.

### 14.1.2 Phase curves

Phase curves are presented to make more sense of the Wolynski-Taylor Diagram. They are curves on the graph which show the stage of evolution an object is in, as compared to a younger/older star. Phase curves on the WT diagram show that stars in similar stages of evolution can be younger, older or even similar in age, it just depends on how fast they evolved.[113b]
In this diagram are some raw notes. I have highlighted the locations of the phase curves with a pink highlighter. You will notice the phase curves are quite pronounced towards the middle regions of a star's evolution and grow significantly larger towards Neptune stages of evolution, and then begin flattening out when the stars completely die and become solid worlds that have no atmospheres, internally produced magnetic fields or life. There are many reasons why phase curves need to be introduced. Some of these reasons are outlined below.

1. The ocean world labeled A., and the ocean world labeled B. have a ~4.5 billion age difference, regardless if they can be both considered as stars in similar stages of evolution. This is because they both fit on the same phase curve.

2. Ocean world A. is very small as compared to B., regardless if they are in similar stages of evolution.
3. Ocean world A. will never form advanced life as will B., as it sits far below the Taylor Threshold for advanced life formation.

4. Ocean world A. will have a much shorter ocean world stage, as it will last maybe ~100 million years, given the conditions do not change significantly. This is opposed to B., which will remain in ocean stages for ~4 billion years, given conditions also do not change significantly.

5. The intersecting line at A. shows a continued trend downward, as this signals a much more rapid rate of mass loss due to atmospheric escape. B.'s will evolve a bit slower as they have stronger gravitation to hold onto the atmosphere. The only real way A. could hold onto its oceans is if it froze over and the water could not evaporate back into interstellar space. This being said, the Goldilocks Zone hypothesis fails to address this issue. Sure, the object could orbit were liquid water would pool on the surface, but it would also escape much more rapidly if the object's gravitational field is too weak. The Goldilocks Zone hypothesis does not account for the gravitational field of the evolving star itself.

6. The phase curve for Dead Moon A. is also the same for Dead Moon B. This tells us a lot as well. They are both about the same age, and in the same stage of evolution. This is different than the ocean worlds, as those were different ages.

7. Dead Moon A. is a lot smaller than B.

8. Since the phase curve flattens out, this means the stage is indefinite, (the star is dead and will break up in intergalactic space to be recycled back into the universe).
9. Phase curves have the most impact on the prediction of the star's physical and chemical properties after red dwarf stages of evolution, where their rate of evolution can be slowed down/sped up by orbiting a hotter host or becoming solitary.

10. Most interesting though, is that water worlds could be out there without life on them. Though their window for hosting life, given it is pooled on the surface is much smaller than water worlds that sit above the Taylor Threshold, as outlined in #4.

11. The rate at which the smallest water worlds evolve given they orbit in the Goldilocks Zone is up for revision, as it might be much, much faster than 100 million years. This means that even if we do find water in the atmospheres of these objects and they are in the Gold zone, the water is probably evaporating away quickly and it does not host life.

12. Again, the stars move to the right and down on the diagram after blue giant stages, due to conservation of mass, which is the law that states that when mass is removed, the object becomes less massive. The stars do not move down or up a phase curve.

13. Lastly the older a star gets, the more it can be pushed around by hotter, younger stars, but the phase curves themselves don't change, the stars that evolve on the diagram do.

14. I kept PDS 70 and PDS 70b for this diagram to show that establishment dogma has found two younger stars, not a birthing "solar system". Solar systems are not something to be born, they are groups of independent objects that orbit.
each other, and are not related to each other by formation. Star systems are polymorphic, meaning many forms of stars in the same system, but all stars. Like carbon can be both diamond and graphite, but those forms are very different regardless if they are both carbon.

15. Always watch out for claims of disks making objects. The nebular hypothesis is 20th century stuff that can be ignored.

Here is a clean phase curve diagram for printing for future theory development. The main idea is quite apparent.
14.2 Stellar cooling

A star of ~6000 degrees Kelvin on its surface is much younger than a star which has a surface temperature of ~4000 degrees Kelvin. Subsequently a star that has a surface temperature of ~3000 degrees Kelvin is younger than one with a temperature of ~2000 Kelvin. Just so there is no confusion, this surface temperature only applies to the star itself, not if it is being heated by an outside body. A hot Jupiter could have a surface temperature of ~1000 Kelvin, only if it is being heated by an outside body. This principle only stands for stars in isolated areas not impacted significantly by hotter hosts. As well, it can be inferred that if the star is hotter when it is younger, then blue stars no matter the size can be aged appropriately according to how hot they are. White dwarfs as well are reinterpreted to account for this principle, placing them at the very beginning of stellar evolution as young, violent, dense stars, not towards the end when they cease radiating.[114]

“The surface temperatures not impacted by outside bodies will drop as the star evolves.”

14.2.1 The Relation of Surface Temperature and Populations of Stars in Evolving Galaxies

A simple relation of stellar surface temperature and population counts of stars in evolving galaxies is provided. They are inversely proportional. The hotter the star the lower their numbers will be. The cooler the star the higher their numbers will be in evolving galaxies.[115] This means that in the Milky Way, for every hot blue star observed, there will be many more white stars. For all the white stars
observed there will be more Sun-like stars. For all the Sun-like stars observed there will be more orange dwarfs. For all the orange dwarfs observed there will be more red dwarfs. For all the red dwarfs viewed there will be more brown dwarfs. For all the brown dwarfs observed there will be more Jupiter type objects. For all the Jupiter type objects observed there will be more grey dwarfs. This continues indefinitely all the way to dead stars. This means that the populations of dead stars (Population 4 stars) in evolved galaxies should wildly outnumber Sun-like stars (population 1 stars). This pattern is even observed in our own solar system. There is only one Sun, there are two Jupiter type objects (population 2 stars), two blue dwarfs, one Earth/late ocean world (population 3), and many dead stars (population 4 stars) such as Mars, Mercury, the Moon, Venus, etc.
The younger stars such as the Sun, or Pollux are much hotter than evolved stars such as Earth, or GJ1214b. Not only that, but they populate the Milky Way in vastly less numbers than much older stars. It is predicted that the number of evolved stars found that are rocky and have much cooler surface temperatures are going to be vastly greater than young stars that still shine. Stated differently, the hotter the star is, the less there are, or the cooler the star is, the more there are. This means the surface temperature of a star is inversely proportional to the number that populate evolved galaxies. This means that if we find a hotter star, there will be many rocky objects orbiting it, and a few intermediate aged objects. This also means the Kepler data has not been examined to its full potential. It is expected that all young stars (shining stars) contain multiple rocky, Earth-sized objects, not just one or two, as well as gas giants. It is also predicted that in evolved galaxies, there will be much greater numbers of Earth-like objects with civilizations on them.

In galaxies that are young, the time for the stars to cool down to Earth-like, or ocean world state has not been available. In young galaxies this inverse rule applies on a limited basis, and in highly evolved galaxies this inverse rule applies in an extreme manner, as the majority of the stars have cooled well beyond their ability to shine and even sustain life. It is also noted that since evolved galaxies no longer contain the large numbers of strong gravitationally attractive stars, they will fall apart, and seed the universe with an excess of dead stars. Therefore the probability of dead stars taking up orbit around much younger, hotter stars in evolving galaxies is quite high, as the universe is infinite in age. The Moon and Mercury are noted examples of objects which quite possibly have origins in galaxies that have since grown, evolved, and dissipated back into the universe.
One should wonder, if the Moon really was from another galaxy, then it stands to reason human beings were once standing on an object that was once separated by millions of light years. What was once far, far away, is currently right in our rocket accessible backyard. Pieces of this dead star, from another galaxy entirely are even being kept in the Smithsonian Museum of Natural History.\[115a\]
14.2.2 Star system prediction concerning cooler stars

Instead of ignoring data that does not fit into a pre-subscribed worldview, it is posed as a prediction in favor of
this theory. Given hundreds of thousands of light curves being analyzed by Kepler, and outputting about 3,000+ star systems, given a temperature range of roughly 1,600 Kelvin, between 4,600 Kelvin through 6,200 Kelvin, there should be at the very least 3,000 plus additional systems that fall right inside of the 540 Kelvin 2100 Kelvin gap ignored by Kepler scientists and others. This prediction is predicated on the fact that stars do not skip stages of their evolution, but that they are on a continuous spectrum of cooler temperatures as they evolve and die. Including stars that host solar systems between temperatures 2100 Kelvin and 540 Kelvin, safe to say, is on the to do list. The 1,600 Kelvin gap is referenced.[116]

14.2.3 Bolometric luminosity measurements

As stars exhibit exponential decay, a mathematical relationship was developed with a constant to determine how old a star is based on its bolometric luminosity. For this example we will begin with the Sun being 65 million years old and having the bolometric luminosity of “1”. Epsilon Eridani has ~1/3 the luminosity of the Sun, and is 98 million years old. Therefore, for every 33 million years, a star’s bolometric luminosity drops off by 1/3. This means that a star which a bolometric luminosity of 1/729 the Sun, it will be about 263 million years old. Therefore, all the stars in the sky that have strong bolometric spectrums all the way into the visible light spectrum are probably younger than 263 million years. This means all the stars a person sees in the night sky are very young, not older than 263 million years. A star with the luminosity of 1/729 the Sun would have 1/60 the luminosity of a red dwarf star, thus meaning near the brown dwarf stages of stellar evolution. Brown dwarfs do not have strong visible spectrums, so they can be considered at least 263 million years in age, meaning there
is no such thing as a “very young brown dwarf”. All brown
dwarfs have evolved considerably and have ceased shining
strongly in the visible spectrum.[117]

14.3 Determining the age of iron cores

It is also theorized that the ages of iron cores can be
determined by measuring their size, given the rate at which
the material deposits and crystalizes on the interior of the
star remains mostly stable. Stars form their iron/nickel
cores first and then the other material deposits on it,
meaning the crust is the youngest portion of a star which as
mostly solidified. The most stable stratum available on
Earth which was not subject to fluid flow or weathering is
claimed to be this iron/nickel core, made up of taenite and
kamacite. It is also claimed that we can determine the
relative positions of other ancient cores by the purity of the
composite, with respect to ratios of magnesium, oxygen,
nitrogen, olivine, etc.[118][119] The core being deposited first is
in line with the law of superposition in geology. In its
plainest form, it states that in undeformed stratigraphic
sequences, the oldest strata will be at the bottom of the
sequence.[119a] This is important to stratigraphic dating,
which assumes that the law of superposition holds true and
that an object cannot be older than the materials of which it
is composed. The law was first proposed in the 17th century
by the Danish scientist Nicolas Steno.

14.3.1 Iron core deposition rate

It is hypothesized that the iron/nickel core
deposition rate is the same for all stars. An equation
showing the variables is given to determine how long an
iron core took to form. A star’s evolutionary sequence
includes it forming an iron/nickel core. The rate at which
the iron deposits is given one variable. The age of the Earth and the radius of the iron/nickel core are the known quantities and for this example will be 10 billion years and 1,220 kilometers, respectively. Since the Earth is 10 billion years old and has an iron/nickel core of 1,220 kilometers we can divide 10 billion years by 1,220 kilometers. This brings ~8,200 years per 1 meter of iron/nickel deposition inside the core of the star. We can now therefore determine a lower limit for the age of a star by the size of its iron/nickel core given iron/nickel deposits into the interior at the rate of 1 meter thickness per 8,200 years. We can also determine the lower limit for the ages of moons (dead stars, not dead star shrapnel) by measuring the radius of their iron cores. With the moon, the inner iron/nickel core is about 160 kilometers, or 160,000 meters. So all we have to do is multiply that by 8,200 years and we have a lower limit for the age of the Moon as about 1.3 billion years old. What this also could mean is that given all the time required to form iron/nickel cores, it means that core formation ended after 1.3 billion years of its evolutionary sequence. So this means that the Moon could be way, way older than Earth, but the Moon as is, took a lower limit of 1.3 billion years to form. This also applies to objects that are undifferentiated like Callisto. Since it has no iron/nickel core via differentiation processes, then the object formed really fast. It was probably formed as a result of two different bodies colliding with each other. Establishment dogma states that iron just sinks to the centers of stars in their "iron catastrophe", but that is shown to be implausible. It takes billions of years to form iron/nickel cores. Essentially the longer the star can remain big, the more iron it can collect and deposit, the bigger the core can get, which in turn sets a lower limit to how old objects really are. With Mars, the diameter of its iron/nickel core is ~1,800 kilometers. So given the deposition rate is also the same, of 8,200 years per meter, leaves its lower limit in
age to be 14.76 billion years. This is all interesting, because it means that we are not only looking at Mars as an object that took 14.67 billion years to form its iron/nickel core, but that it has been wandering the universe since then and is most likely vastly older than 14.67 billion years. As well it should be noted that the outer core shrinks to loss from growth of the inner, so that needs to be accounted for as well.

It took that long just to form the core of the object alone. This of course is blasphemy to the big bang dogma, as nothing in the universe is older than 13.7 billion years. What we are dealing with is a complete 180 degree turn around from non-observation offered by Big Bang, to the ability to measure the seismological characteristics of dead stars, to figure out how old they are. For a future paper it should be referenced that the lower age limit has a direct relation to the star’s ability to form life. If it does not evolve slow enough (signaled by a huge iron/nickel core, which is a correlational observation), then no life will form. I am guessing we can use Earth as initial requirement for determining how old an object has to have been so that life had the time to form, per the time principle of life formation. The lower limit would be 5 - 10 billion years. This means Ganymede, Titan, the Moon, Europa and Pluto probably never had life on them. In the opposite respect, it means Mars, Mercury and Venus most definitely had life on them, but now they are dead worlds that cannot host it.\[120\]
The lower age limit provided above is a simple calculation given the deposition rate of the iron/nickel core is a constant. The constant could be higher or lower, depending on the stars' outer layers as it evolves. As well, this allows us to make note of other very interesting facts, such as Venus being at least ~1.5 billion years older than the Earth. Since it is at least that much older, we could then extrapolate how fast the crust/mantle boundary, or the "moho" moves downwards. All we need to do is measure its crustal thickness as it is now, which for arguments sake about 1,000 kilometers, and the Earth's which average is about ~20 km thick and divide. So you have 1000km/20km to get 50 times as thick. So take 1.5 billion years and divide by 50. So it thickens and solidifies by a kilometer every 30 million years. So that being said, the thin parts of the oceanic crust at ~5 kilometers would be about 150 million years old, and the thick parts of the continental crust at 50 kilometers would be 1.5 billion years old. What this all means reader is that Earth did not have a solid crust >1.5 billion years ago. Interesting.

This all means that the crust does not push outwards at the mid-Atlantic ridges and such, but that those are the last portions of the crust that solidified, as opposed to the continental crust. Which makes more sense than the plate
tectonic version that does not provide mechanism for sideways motion, nor mechanism for true subduction of plates thus necessitating the need for expanding oceanic plates. Of course this is also blasphemy to the geologists, regardless if their explanation seems to make sense, it is not required.

14.3.2 Core growth termination during stellar evolution in the general theory

Stars grow iron/nickel cores via vapor deposition and condensation during intermediate stages of evolution. It is proposed that these iron/nickel cores stop growing for a few reasons provided.

All stars are young planets, meaning the two are actually the same objects, some just give the appearance of being mutually exclusive based on mass, brightness, density, elemental composition and other factors which are explained by the theory. Since they are the same objects, and the process of core formation happens as they evolve because Earth and Mercury and other highly evolved stars have iron/nickel cores, we must give reasons why the core should stop growing, or vapor depositing in the central regions of the star. This can allow us to set a lower age limit on the star as well explain how much material was probably present in the dense atmosphere of the star as it was forming the core.

1. The young homogeneous star s can run out of iron/nickel to collect as it travels in interstellar space.

2. The homogeneous star starts off with a specific amount of iron when it is born, or maybe no iron at all as it all is collected as it travels through intergalactic space. In either
case, it collects a set amount of iron/nickel with which it forms the core. This means,

3. It absolutely has to collect the iron when the iron is vapor, or else, no iron can move to the center of the object, as well since it entered the star as a solid object, it more than likely was obliterated into vapor as well as ionized. An iron asteroid the size of a battleship slamming into the Sun at velocities approaching Mach 500 would remove all solidarity of the asteroid. The star breaks up the material to accrete material in a pure manner.

4. Since it has to be iron/nickel vapor to form the core it likely slowly deposits into a thick liquid which then is pressurized, cools very slowly and is transformed into solid iron/nickel alloy as observed in meteorites. (Meteorites and their subsequent Widmanstatten structures cannot be reproduced in the laboratory, it is too difficult, they can only be formed in the slowly cooling interior region of stars).

5. This means we have to assume that if the star is not mostly gaseous, then core formation has completed, because the conditions for core material transport and vapor deposition, solidification and condensation of the iron/nickel vapor are no longer present.

6. It is predicted that the very central iron/nickel core formation has completed when the magnetic field can be completely offset from the parent bodies’ axis of rotation, this signals the core is one complete structure, which provides a singular magnetic field as it rotates as a complete body in the internal regions of the star. A good example of this is in the magnetic field orientation of Uranus and Neptune.
7. This being said, if a star has a magnetic field offset from its axis of rotation, then it has a completely formed core, just like Uranus and Neptune. If it does not, and the global magnetic field is completely centered on the axis of rotation, then the very centralized iron/nickel core is not done forming.

8. This means that we can also make another prediction, since red dwarf stars do not have fully formed cores, as they are just beginning stages of forming their global magnetic fields, their global magnetic fields should start forming in line with their axis of rotation, which then can become offset during orbit changes, as proposed by Inertial Core Theory http://vixra.org/pdf/1209.0080v2.pdf

9. If we find a red dwarf star with a strong global magnetic field completely offset from the axis of rotation, then this prediction needs to be further refined to account for the new observation. It means that the red dwarf recently exchanged orbits with a hotter host.\cite{120a}

14.3.2.1 The Beginnings of homogeneous Nucleation of Iron/Nickel Cores in Homogeneous Young Star

To begin the process of forming homogeneous iron/nickel cores it is required that the young, hot stars be
homogeneous in their interiors. To form an iron/nickel core as the star evolves, no nuclear core can be present. It would be too hot for the iron/nickel vapor to clump together and it would get in the way of the differentiation process. In stellar metamorphosis stars are young hot planets. By observing the old planets like Earth and Venus, we can know that they have large iron/nickel cores. This means that young stars form iron/nickel cores as they cool and die. Since they form iron/nickel cores in a homogeneous method, their interiors must also be isodense, or homogeneous. The star becomes heterogeneous at it evolves, forms the core and begins the differentiation process per the foundational structure principle and CBC principle.

It is clear the self-assembly of a planet occurs inside the star, as they are the same things conceptually, one just becomes the other. Like butterflies and moths from caterpillars. The Sun as it is now, has a very similar density throughout, which is evidenced by global Doppler oscillations of 160.01 minutes. Since the observations of these oscillations are in phase from different locations on the Earth, they cannot possibly be manifestations of a diurnal origin, meaning caused by an artifact of the Earth’s spin on measurements.

The reason why the dogmatists have rejected these long period oscillations of the Sun is because they had no model or theory that could explain why it would be necessary for the star to be homogeneous. Now that we have a theory, we can rightfully place the observations in the correct context, and remove stars as “nuclear furnaces” in all literature. What this should accomplish has a three-fold effect. We now understand that stars cannot be fusion reactors, as cores would both get the way of the differentiation process, and they are vastly cooler than what models predict them to be because matter would be too
energetic to clump together via physical deposition. We understand that stars are actually young planets, and we understand that fusion has to occur somewhere else in the galaxy with different processes involved. These types of papers I hope open the flood gates. We are dealing with a completely different universe than originally anticipated, which is history repeating itself. Homogeneous iron/nickel cores of small, old stars started as homogeneous vapor and plasma interiors of young, big stars.\textsuperscript{120c}

14.3.3 Creating Different Sized Earths in Stellar Metamorphosis

The rate at which the star's atmosphere is ripped away will determine how much material is deposited into the interior, thus determining how large the rocky/metal ball can be in the interior. If a companion is too close to a host, it will not have enough time to form a large interior. If a companion is far away, it will be able to form a really large core.
Core Sizes

1-3 Earth Masses

Size of New Earth

The core can grow the biggest the furthest it is away from the hotter hosts.

0.1-1 Earth Masses

Host Stars

Mid-range hosts will evaporate the star at intermediate rates leaving the object mid-sized.

0.01-1 Earth Masses

Initial thickness of evolving star’s atmosphere, given many previous stages of evolution have already passed.

Fast evaporative rates will create tiny moon like objects which still have differentiation.

How large of a new Earth can be formed is dependent on how fast the atmosphere is lost due to a variety of factors, including distance to hotter hosts during the companion’s late evolutionary sequences.

By Baz Taylor

Looking at the top diagram we can see that if the adoptive location for the companion is very close to another host, then core deposition will not allow for a lot of material to be deposited. The largest rocky objects that form had very
long periods of time spent away from hotter hosts, so that they could form giant interiors. This is why many rocky objects are larger than others, as well is why some evolving and evolved stars have iron/nickel cores different sizes. The nebular hypothesis and all the dogmatic accretion theories have no mechanism to explain this phenomenon. Yet it is very simple when the researcher realizes the two objects are mutually exclusive. \cite{120b}

### 14.4 Diminishing solar abundances

It is outlined in a principle of diminishing solar abundances that stars lose the lighter materials in large amounts, and leave the heavier material in the central regions.\cite{121} This includes iron/nickel, gold, titanium, and lighter elements which have combined to form much heavier molecules. The principle is outlined as follows:

"As stars evolve into rocky differentiated worlds, the ratio of lighter elements and molecules to heavy elements and molecules diminishes considerably."

### 14.4.1 Changing isotopic abundances

Stars in different stages to their evolution are present in the solar system. They are all mutually exclusive objects not related to the Sun, therefore should all have different isotopic abundances of essentially all elements.\cite{122} Unfortunately this is not accepted in the paradigm. The dogma forces all the objects in the solar system to be the same age. Below is a screenshot from a 2009 paper regarding the chemical composition of the Sun.
The proto-solar deuterium abundance can be estimated from observations of Jupiter. Using ISO spectra of the Jovian atmosphere and taking into account an expected 5–10% enrichment during the planet’s formation, [Lellouch et al., 2001]

As the reader can see, the solar abundances are tied to the abundances of Jupiter. They are assumed to be the same age! Their abundances should be different, as Jupiter is both unrelated to the Sun, did not form in the same vicinity, as well is a much more evolved star. This means the elemental abundances will be different. It would be best to take measurements of the different objects and list their own individual abundances, rather than assuming they are all the same. A good analogy for why taking Jupiter's abundances and forcing it to represent the Sun is a bad idea is like carbon dating a mammoth and expecting the abundances of C-12 and N-14 to match me simply because I'm standing next to the remains! Clearly a mammoth, which has long been extinct and is likely tens of thousands of years old, is not a 33 year old man, and vice versa. The same with Jupiter. It is vastly older! The Earth is also even older than that! It is even more evolved!

They are taking two objects, Jupiter (the mammoth), and measuring the isotopic abundances, and then saying those are the abundances that should match the Sun (me). What has happened reader is that scientists have been forcing all objects in the solar system to be the same age. Yet, Jupiter is many hundreds of millions of years older than the Sun! This is all because of the nebular hypothesis, they think the objects in our solar system all forming from a giant disk of dust, which is completely wrong. It is a polymorphic star system. It has stars that are all different ages and stages of evolution orbiting each other. A good way to see if the dogma is ignoring this discovery is to look at their isotopic abundances of all the
elements, not just oxygen as outlined below. Silicon, helium, hydrogen, nitrogen, sulfur plus about 100 more elements should have different stable isotope abundances. If Jupiter and the Sun match, then they don’t have an accurate picture. If the Earth and the Sun match, then they are way, way off.

Since oxygen has three isotopes that are stable, O\textsuperscript{-16}, O\textsuperscript{-17} and O\textsuperscript{-18} then we can use their ratios to determine how old a star is, based off simple processes that occur in stellar evolution. Oxygen that is lighter would escape the star as the atmosphere thins. This means that the older the star, the more heavy oxygen would be left over in the samples. Since oxygen is stable, none should radioactively decay, so long as the samples are complete we can determine how old the star is by how much relative O\textsuperscript{-16} it has as compared to O\textsuperscript{-17} and O\textsuperscript{-18}. The baseline for determining the ages of the stars would start with the Sun and end with the Earth. If the Sun has an isotopic abundance of O\textsuperscript{-16} of 99.92\% as compared to O\textsuperscript{-17} of .04\% and O\textsuperscript{-18} of .04\% then it is younger.

Since the Earth’s abundances are 99.757\% of O\textsuperscript{-16} then it means the heavier O\textsuperscript{-17} and O\textsuperscript{-18} were sinking into the star as it was cooling and dying, forming the planet (evolving stellar core) in its interior. This means it is older. All this means we can predict the O\textsuperscript{-16} isotopic abundances of Jupiter using this theory. The O\textsuperscript{-16} abundances should fall in between Earth and the Sun. So if the Sun’s was 99.92\% and the Earth’s was 99.757\%, then Jupiter’s should be 99.757\% < Jupiter < 99.92\%. It should fall right in the middle. Not only that, but it should be skewed to the Sun’s measurements because it is closer in age to the Sun than the Earth. The JUNO spacecraft that is taking measurements of Jupiter should discover this.
14.5 Diminishing gravitational fields

It is outlined in the principle of diminishing gravitation that stars lose mass as they evolve, therefore their gravitational fields weaken considerably.\[123\]

"As stars (astrons) evolve, the strength of their gravitational field diminishes."

14.6 Diminishing radiation

It is outlined in the radiation principle of stellar evolution that the oldest stars radiate almost no heat or light, and the youngest stars radiate in large amounts as a rule of thumb.\[124\][\[125\][\[126\]

"As stars evolve they radiate less, eventually they only reflect and absorb light from other objects."

No star can trap light or heat radiation unless there is physical material to prevent escape similar to radiative heat from magma being trapped by the huge crust of the Earth. It places importance on vacuums ability to absorb radiative heat in the largest amount as none is reflected back into the star. It also gives the star the ability to remain constant temperature for longer periods of time as there is no material as thermodynamically stable as vacuum. Depending on what density of cloud a star also moves through can cause the star to act strangely, as some clouds are heat baths/thermal reservoirs that can suck the heat from the star much more quickly. This means that if a star
moves though a cloud heat loss due to convection of the outer atmosphere will happen much quicker, which can cause the star to dim considerably, and have a domino effect on the future of its evolutionary sequence.

14.6.1 Black body radiation of stars as rate of plasma recombination

It is also hypothesized that young stars are mostly plasma, and since they will become gaseous, then plasma recombination occurs. The rate at which the plasma recombination occurs is a direct cause for black body radiation, the higher the plasma recombination the brighter the star. The lower rate of plasma recombination, the dimmer the star. Eventually as all the plasma recombines into gaseous matter, the star will stop shining.

There will be very, very little plasma recombination releasing light and heat, which is represented by the $h\nu$ in the diagram, when the star becomes mostly gaseous. The "h" stands for Planck's constant, and "\nu" is the frequency of light. So it is Planck's constant multiplied by the frequency.
of the light which determines the energy of the "photon". The photon of course is a mathematical representation of light energy and does not exist independently of matter. The youngest stars will have the highest energy photons, this includes white dwarfs and blue giants and it is because the rate at which plasma is trying to recombine into gas is very high. This is why white dwarfs expand into blue giants and lose their immense heat, the condensed plasma is recombining into gas and the gas pushes outwards. As it does this as well it cools down, this is why blue giants are cooler than white dwarfs. Once the star begins losing its gas though, it will collapse and shrink.\[126a]\n
14.7 Atmospheric thinning

Evolved stars will have greatly thinned atmospheres. The younger, hotter stars will have very, very thick atmospheres and the oldest stars will have very thin atmospheres, therefore as stars evolve their atmospheres thin.\[127]\n
"Atmospheres thin and eventually disappear as stars evolve."

14.7.1 Chthonian planets

Chthonian planets as previous gas giants are observed all over the galaxy, regardless if their evidence for existence is hypothetical inside of the dogma. They are not hypothetical objects, because they are observed and can be directly experimented on. A Chthonian planet is a class of hypothetical celestial objects resulting from the stripping away of a gas giant's hydrogen and helium atmosphere and outer layers, which is called hydrodynamic escape. Such
atmospheric stripping is a likely result of proximity to a star. The remaining rocky or metallic core would resemble a terrestrial planet in many respects.

All rocky “planets” are Chthonian planets. They all lose their atmospheres according to the Principle of Atmospheric Thinning. They are not hypothetical. The reason why they are hypothetical in the dogma is because they all have to be close to a hotter host and they can’t know if a rocky planet that orbits close had a large hydrogen atmosphere. They also assume that only the current host could have ripped away the atmosphere. This is false. A Chthonian planet could have had a variety of objects ripping away at it, at much different orbital distances, in different arrangements, such as two hosts or even three. If anything, the Chthonian would have its atmosphere ripped away faster by being closer, but that does not mean it will always orbit that host, nor does it mean it has always orbited that one and only host. It also does not mean it formed next to it, nor does it mean it formed even in orbit around the host. All of those assumptions are false. All Chthonians are evolved stars, they had evolutionary paths much greater than their hosts. We can even determine their history by studying their current compositions and evaporation histories by looking at their sizes and the sizes of their iron/nickel cores. This is impossible to do in the dogma because they believe all objects formed in disks, while violating the law of the conservation of angular momentum. Not only that, but the entire class of Chthonian can be disregarded, as it proposes that there is a separate “class” of objects. The question remains, if all rocky planets are Chthonians, and it is the path of stellar evolution, then no such class of object distinct from the others even really exists. Therefore the class “Chthonian” is not even needed. They are just referring to highly evolved stars.
14.7.2 Diminishing internal pressure

As the star loses its thick, heavy atmosphere according to the principle of atmospheric thinning, the internal pressure is lessened. This means that the internal pressures of stars will diminish as they evolve, so the most evolved stars will have very low atmospheric pressures. \[\text{[129]}\] As stars evolve their internal pressures decrease, this can also apply to stars in early stages of evolution such as white dwarfs, which have extremely high internal pressures as opposed to their Sun-like counterparts. In fact, the internal pressure of the new born star is what makes it expand outwards as it reaches blue giant stages. Once it reaches blue giant stages and the atmosphere reaches its fullest extent, the star’s atmosphere will start thinning due to mass loss per the mass loss principle, and the internal pressure will begin falling. Throughout the star’s evolution, the atmospheric and internal pressure will diminish until the star has completely lost all of its atmosphere, which means there will be no pressure at all near the surface. This is observed to be vacuum on dead stars such as Mercury and the Moon. As well, this simple principle has major consequences to the dogma of Jupiter sized objects having deep liquid metallic hydrogen mantles. They could possibly possess such mantles, but determining their characteristics to form evolutionary models is not required, due to the principle of diminishing internal pressure. The pressures that can form such metallic hydrogen will lessen as the star evolves internally, meaning a part of the evidence for the star having had such internal pressure will be how small the rocky material of the Earth could have compressed to. This has consequences to the expanding Earth paradigm, for if the Earth had expanded in its later stages, it was most likely caused by the internal pressure lessening to the point where
the trapped heat from the star’s evolution could allow for the star’s rocky interior to expand, due to the effects thermal expansion being greater. So keeping in line with the conservation of mass, the Earth’s rocky and metal interior was probably compressed and the actual physical diameter was lower by at least 1,000 kilometers. As the heat is lost and the star's crust begins contracting again due to gravitational collapse, there will be earthquakes on the surface from the crust falling inwards rubbing against itself. The star will then shrink very, very slowly and almost completely solidify and eventually die and resemble the dead surface of Venus, with a thick layer of CO2 due to the crust not having any material to collect it such as oceans and plants.

14.8 Mass loss

As stars cool and die they lose mass.\textsuperscript{[130]} The principle of mass loss states,

"As stars evolve, cool and die, they lose mass."

All observations point to stars losing mass as they are all different masses. There is no method or prediction provided by the dogma's theories that explains why stars and planets are different masses. The only explanation is that the mass of the star is lost as it evolves. It is also predicted that all the stars measured will be different masses. Stellar masses on a continuum signals that there are no actual stepped stages to stellar evolution, it is a smooth transition from heavy to light.

14.8.1 Mass continuum principle
The stages of evolution of a star cannot be solely determined by mass on a stepped scale, as is claimed by establishment, with brown dwarfs being defined as anything between 13 and 65 Jupiter masses. Since stars are not the location for any significant fusion processes, the previous brown dwarf classification is meaningless and does not add to our scientific knowledge. In short, the theoretical mass window is arbitrary and was invented before it was understood that brown dwarfs are not failed stars, but stars that are at least 263 million years old, meaning they are stars in intermediate stages of evolution. It would be more appropriate to consider that all stars at one point are much heavier than 65 Jupiter masses, pass through the fictional barrier, all the way to many times less than 13 Jupiter masses.\[131\\]

"A star’s mass loss is continuous and therefore stars cannot be classified by mass alone."

14.8.2 Ockham's razor

Since the star loses mass to become the planet, then it follows that planet formation itself is a mass loss phenomenon,\[132\\] as the planet started out much more massive in its past. Therefore, the concept of “planet growth” during planet formation is unnecessary. There is accretion in the central regions, but the overall growing of a planet from much smaller structures is unnecessary.

1. Establishment: Planets gaining mass to form, and stars’ evolutionary paths neither gain or lose mass in significant amounts (remain static).

A. Static and mass gaining structures. (2 mutually exclusive processes regarding mass)
2. Stellar metamorphosis: Stars losing mass to become planets, so both lose mass.

A. Just mass loss structures. (1 process regarding mass)[133]

14.8.3 Gyrochronology

The entire field of gyrochronology faces issues as well. Determining the ages of stars based on their rotation rate will be flawed, as their mass is lost per the ML (mass loss) principle, and the angular momentum of the star as it cools and gravitationally collapses will remain stable, because the mass being lost will carry away the additional angular momentum needed to speed up its rotation.[134] This means its rotation rate can remain constant as it cools and shrinks, and very old stars such as Earth can be slower than younger stars such as Jupiter, or much faster than younger stars such as the Sun. It is worthy of note for any future researcher to consider how fast an object lost its mass by determining how fast it is rotating, but interpreting the rotation will have issues not considered by establishment. The current accepted ideas of gyrochronology of Sydney A. Barnes do not take into account angular momentum loss due to mass loss of the star, nor the complete evolutionary track of stars outside of spectroscopic surveys. [135]

14.9 Heat evolution

Heat evolution of stars is explained.[136]

"In stellar metamorphosis the heat production and loss of young stars occurs on and above the surface, meaning the interior
regions are cooler. As the star evolve the heat moves inwards due to gravitational collapse as well as heated, heavy material falling inwards. The star stops shining in the visible spectrum around brown dwarf stages of evolution when an increased percentage of the heat is internalized. This internalized heat allows for the star to remain hot for exponentially longer periods of time due to the thick atmosphere providing the heat loss prevention. This is why the Earth still has magma and is many billions of years old, it had a thick brown dwarf type atmosphere preventing heat loss. Over time the thick atmosphere will be ripped away due to natural causes, leaving the heaviest material over in the central regions."

The principle of heat evolution is outlined as well,

"As a star evolves, it internalizes its heat production as its loss is slowed down."

14.10 Relative and absolute ages

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 as the meteorites.

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 according to the outdated and wrong
nebular hypothesis. Since they do not have radioisotope samples of the objects, they force the paradigm to be accurate, by using false theory. 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 lookout 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, which is actually near impossible to do these days, as all the main laboratories know each other.

This is 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). It does not matter if the data appearance is independent, the funds for both groups are tied into one bank account. Further, we can also use SM to see if their results really hold up to scrutiny, as relative ages are provided. 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 as does the Earth with the Andes, 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 it is clear that the relative ages based on their physical properties shows they are not the same ages. It is like astronomers are looking at a very large oak tree and saying it is the same age as a sapling, when clearly they are physically different. What is worse is that they are picking up grass and leaves off the ground and forcing the large, old oak to be the same as the sapling and the grass and dead leaves. It does not make any sense.

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 does not 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). We have to look at these objects and use our minds, not force them to conform to outdated theories.[136a]

Chapter 15, Additional Principles

15.1 Main principle of astrophysics

The astrophysical principle states that:[137]
"We can infer the future of stars by studying evolved, evolving and dead stars, which are called exoplanets/planets."

This principle firmly places objects which have been classified as mutually exclusive as not only similar, but of the same class of astrophysical phenomenon. Stated differently, planet formation is star evolution.

15.2 Coherency

The ejected remains of a star during its birthing and evolution do not form coherent objects 1 cm and bigger. The remains are ejected so violently that any coherency of the particles is mostly non-existent. The particles can be small molecules, ions and electrons, but nothing of significant size.[138]

"When a star is born its remains are incoherent particles that cannot form anything of significant size, as stellar birthing is too violent to allow for the classical mode of planet formation in a protoplanetary disk."

15.2.1 Mass independence

A birthing star does not leave significant remains after it is born according to the coherency principle. This means the mass of the companion is not determined by the mass of the host in any fashion and cannot be explained with any mechanism which tries to connect the two.[139] Therefore the mass independence principle of stellar formation can be stated quite clearly,

"The masses of stars are independent of each other when they are first formed/born."
15.2.2 Direct observational support for mass independence and coherency principles: NGTS-1b

The discovery of NGTS - 1b strongly supports the principles of mass independence and coherency of stellar evolution and formation according to the general theory.\cite{139a} Explanation is provided along with link to original discovery paper showing the issues. The Principle of Mass Independence stems directly from the Coherency Principle:

“When a star is born its remains are incoherent particles that cannot form anything of significant size, as stellar birthing is too violent to allow for the classical mode of planet formation in a protoplanetary disk.”

Since stellar birth does not leave anything left over, then assuming objects which orbiting stars were formed as a cause of the host being born is misguided. The principle of mass independence is thus:

“The masses of stars are independent of each other when they are first formed/born.”

The object that orbits NGTS - 1 is very, very large in comparison to the host, as well orbits at extreme velocity and closeness to the host.\cite{139b} It is clear that the general theory is supported by this discovery. NGTS - 1 and NGTS - 1b are not related to by formation, this meaning that they are actually two mutually exclusive stars in different stages to their evolution. One of the stars simply captured the other via a third object which allowed transfer of angular momentum. This means another prediction can be made, in that the object which transferred its angular momentum to
allow capture is either orbiting further out from the red dwarf, or was completely ejected from the system. This is why rogue objects exist that are Jupiter sized.

15.2.3 Mass dependence

The only time that the masses of stars will become even partially dependent on their hosts, is if they are orbiting at a somewhat close distance, and their atmospheres and material are being ripped away by the hotter hosts. [140] This means the mass - dependence principle can be written as,

"The mass of a star is partially dependent on its host during its evolution if the orbital parameters can cause mass loss of the companion."

15.3 Stability

Since planets form inside of stars (the planet is the remains of the evolved star), we can reason they form in very stable conditions that do not change dramatically over short periods of time. A short period of time in this case would be < 100 million years. The interior of stars only change slowly in scales of tens of millions of years as they cool and die, not only that, but they shield the planetary embryo forming in its center from gravitational instabilities and surface impacts. [141] This means that any planet formation model that relies on gravitational instabilities and/or direct impacts to form it, is misguided. This includes both the accepted leading scenarios, the disk gravitational instability model (a few hundred years) and the core accretion model (a few million years). Planet formation is an extremely gravitationally stable process.
The planet embryo is also protected almost entirely as the atmosphere of the star is too thick for smaller objects to interrupt the process in an unstable manner. Therefore, there are two main reasons why the stability principle supports this theory. The gravitation of the star remains very, very stable as it evolves and the thick atmosphere protects the internal planetary embryo from significant impacts which might interrupt the process of planetary differentiation and physical deposition. It would be expected that if there was not a very thick atmosphere to protect the internal planetary embryo, then there would not be an almost perfectly formed sphere of iron/nickel composite at the centers of highly evolved/dead stars. As well, it would be expected that if planet formation relied on instabilities of gravitation in a disk, then nothing would form at all, as the instabilities would prevent anything stable from forming to begin with, and without physical mechanism for angular momentum loss the disk instability model is dead on arrival.

15.4 Orbit principles

15.4.1 Inclinations

All inclinations of companion stars to their hosts will be found at multiple angles compared to the host’s axis and to each other. As well, contrary to established science the orbital inclinations of all solar system bodies 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 the math is 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 hell do you form planets in a disk when they lay clearly outside of any proposed disk plane by hundreds of millions of miles? Pluto is way worse! It is off by billions of miles. 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 this theory, we are looking at stars all in different stages of their evolution, the whole separation of planet/star was never needed.

15.4.2 Multiple orbiting objects

The more massive the star the more the objects that can orbit it or have orbited it. This means at one point all stars have or had many other objects orbiting them. In the dogma, Earth has had, and continues to have only one major satellite. This is myopic thinking and is rooted in the assumption that the Earth was not many magnitudes more massive in its past. Earth was vastly more massive, and can be deduced by utilizing the principle of mass loss in reverse. This means that going backwards in Earth’s history will lead directly to the Earth being more and more massive and energetic. Since we observe the most massive objects as being the ones that have the most objects orbiting them, and Earth was more massive, a simple principle of orbits can be deduced.[143]
"The more massive the star, the more objects will orbit it."

This means that the Earth more than likely had hundreds of objects orbiting it when it was a hot, young, massive star in its past, and even much older Earths that have their own "Moon" and even people on them. This is similar to the Krypton Hypothesis in which pieces of destroyed worlds can be found on the Earth as meteorites. The Moon is easily one of the remaining bodies that stuck around, or was even captured by other objects which were orbiting the Earth. Also, it means that in the Kepler data which has objects that orbit hot young stars, there should be tens of thousands of objects that are not in the data, which they would be if Kepler kept on working for a much greater period of time. To think, Neptune orbits the Sun every 165 years, and Jupiter about once every 12 years, Saturn every 29 years, Uranus in 84 years. The data collection by Kepler only lasted 4 years. This means if an alien civilization was using exactly the same method we used to find exoplanets (evolved stars) then the extent of the solar system would be missing from the data. Four years would have only found Earth, Mercury, Mars and Venus, given Mercury and Mars would have even made any noticeable change in the light curve. This means that even with the huge amount of exoplanets (evolved stars) found around hotter hosts, it does not even scratch the surface of potential worlds that are orbiting even stars that are confirmed to already possess evolved stars (exoplanets). The more massive the star, the more objects will orbit it. As the star loses mass, the objects will be lost to interstellar space, as they are independent entities and not related to their hosts by any formation mechanisms, in accordance to the mass independence principle of stellar formation. This basic principle should add more structure to the general theory, as the solar system is solidly a multiple star system, star system. Jupiter has
more mass so it has more objects orbiting it than Neptune. Neptune has more mass than Earth, so it has more objects orbiting it. The Sun has even more mass, so it can even have other evolved stars that are middle stages of evolution orbiting it even. The principle is a general rule of thumb for all observations. The only exception to this principle is that birthing stars can be very massive and not have many objects orbiting it, simply because it is still being formed and has not had enough time to collect and capture objects in the galaxy with its huge gravitational field. This essentially means that only the youngest objects will not have orbiting companions. Since the youngest objects will not have orbiting companions, we can also determine how old a star is by determining if anything is orbiting it. This goes for red giants which are probably very new, young stars.

15.5 Multiple nebulas

As star systems are comprised of multiple stars, a principle of their evolution is presented to place them in the context of solar system evolution,[144]

"A star system/solar system is comprised of multiple evolving nebulas, some more evolved than others."

15.5.1 Solar system principle

According to the above principle, it is further noted that the solar system itself is a multiple star system.[145]
"The Solar System is a multiple star system, as well as any star that has at least one evolved star (exoplanet) orbiting it."

15.5.2 Star system polymorphism

All star systems are polymorphic/polymorphous. This means they contain stars in various stages to their own metamorphosis. Stars of all kinds orbit each other. Since they are all in different stages to their own metamorphosis, they are poly (many) morphous/morphic (changes). The Solar system that we are familiar with is highly polymorphic, as it contains a very young, hot star we call the Sun, as well as two late stage brown dwarfs (Saturn/Jupiter), two pre-water worlds (Neptune/Uranus), a life hosting, very highly evolved star (Earth) and a multitude of dead stars (Mercury, Mars, Venus, etc.). It even contains stellar remnants that evolved too fast so that they could never host life, as well as impact remains of dead stars such as asteroids/comets and small moons.

Just so we are clear, astronomers still teach their students that the Solar System is one system, even one object, “the solar system”, which places importance on the Sun and the Sun alone, not the star's individual histories that are in the system. Students are taught that the various stars in our system that are in various stages of their own evolution all came from the Sun’s leftover materials, which is impossible, since they are actually many millions of years (in some cases many tens of billions of years) older than the Sun. There is direct evidence of the polymorphism of the stars in the Solar System. Here is a small list that overviews their many differences, which is direct evidence that they are in different stages of evolution, and have different histories as evidenced by their physical appearances, magnetic field orientations, mass, densities, etc.
They all have different:

1. Diameters
2. Masses
3. Level of core and mantle/crust formation
4. Elemental ratio on the whole
5. Types of atmospheres
6. Sizes of iron cores (some aren't completely formed yet or even begun forming)
7. Stages of life formation (some are sterile, and some have never formed life yet have organic remains such as natural gas lakes)
8. Strength of radiance
9. Heat production processes
10. Types of chemical reactions
11. Types of chemical equilibriums among material present
12. Ages
13. Orbital distances (or if they even orbit other objects at all)
14. Types of hosts (all hosts are polymorphic themselves!)
15. Rates of mass loss
16. Orbital direction
17. Rotational direction
18. Orientation of magnetic fields with respect to axis of rotation
19. Strengths of magnetic fields
20. Densities

The evidence for stellar polymorphism is also supported by the thousands of “exoplanet” systems currently and soon to be found by astronomers, as all the star systems show both direct and indirect evidence of polymorphism, as outlined by the list above and by the General Theory of Stellar Metamorphosis.
As the TESS (transiting exoplanet survey satellite) transmits information back to Earth, and the scientists see these objects indirectly due to them blocking out portions of the host star’s light, it will be made clear that all star systems are polymorphic. These new systems will not mimic the solar system, simply because they are not the solar system, which is a unique polymorphic system itself. Astronomers are trying to find solar system analogs, but this will turn up a dead end. They need to look at star systems as polymorphic. They all have stars in different stages to their evolution, and we know this because they all have a multitude of different characteristics. It is a fruit salad, and the tens of thousands of TESS transits of the stars up to Magnitude 12 are going to show this 100%. In fact, it is the most sure thing in the universe. We live in a highly random place, a polymorphous star system, in a sea of polymorphic systems which do not currently conform to establishment’s dogma, (the idea that star systems should all look like ours), by any means. [145a]

15.6 Accretion

All accretion happens inside the star/celestial body after it has formed and is outlined in the accretion principle:[146]

"The greater the surface area and stronger the gravitational field, the more an astrophysical body can accrete material in outer space."

This means that the only bodies that can do any appreciable amount of accretion are those bodies which possess large surface areas and large gravitational fields. Rocky bodies in outer space do not do any significant amount of accretion as compared to much younger stars.
such as Jupiter or the Sun, as their surface areas and gravitational fields are much larger than the Earth and other rocky bodies. This also means that it is impossible for small bodies 100 kilometers or less to do any accretion, as their surface areas are too small and gravitational fields too weak.

15.6.1 Accretion rate

As the star moves about the galaxy it collects the material in any size, dust, 1 cm sized particles, 1000 km sized objects and they become a part of the star. The rate then at which the star cools and evolves (and what it becomes) is also affected by how much material it collects as it moves about the galaxy.[147]

15.6.2 Location of accretion

The location for accretion is inside of a celestial body.[148] Stars are incredible bodies that can accrete lots of material floating in outer space. Young stars can provide the heat, the structure, the gravitational field, the ability to vaporize/ionize the incoming material and the increasing pressure as it evolves for the process of accretion to take place internally. This is in direct opposition to accretion outside a body, where no heat, structure, gravitational field, pressure or ability to coherently vaporize/ionize incoming bodies exists. As well it is noted that to form rocks/large metal bodies they are not pre-made before they accrete, they are destroyed when they enter the star, then are reformed in different combinations. Essentially stars have an additional function of being interstellar shrapnel recycling machines.
15.6.3 Accretion Friction Braking

It is required in stellar metamorphosis to brake material so that it loses the momentum that would prevent coalescence. In order to do any sort of accretion in outer space, the material has to clump together slowly and be pulled together and heated significantly. Even the slightest momentum with gaseous matter, dust, 1 cm sized particles or 1 km sized asteroids would prevent accretion and result in a further disintegration or deflection of the material.

Two rocky asteroids the size of school buses travelling at an extremely slow velocity of 25 M.P.H. relative to each other colliding would result in an explosive event on par with a couple pounds of TNT. Two school bus sized asteroids slamming into each other, (which is establishment’s version of planet formation) travelling at even the relatively slow orbital velocity of Neptune would yield an explosive event with the destructive force of many tons of TNT. Both velocities would completely prevent anything larger forming among the two objects, which leads us to the question, how exactly do rocks clump together in outer space? The answer is that they do not. You do not build planets in outer space by slamming rocks together at any appreciable velocity, because they will bounce off each other like billiard balls or obliterate each other like artillery shells.

Since planets are not formed by rocks slamming into each other at any appreciable velocity, how exactly do we end up with giant differentiated metal/ rocky objects the size of the Moon or Mercury? Surely they are comprised of rocky material, so the rocks and metal got there somehow! The answer is quite simple. Since planets are not formed by rocks slamming into each other in outer space, there has to be a way for rocks to lose their momentum so that they can reach the same spot in outer space, as well, that momentum
also has to be somehow transferred to heat so that the rocks can melt and clump together with other rocks making larger, completely solid, homogeneous objects. To slow any size rock down so that accretion can happen, you can slow it down with friction. Where are the places in the galaxy that giant 1 km sized asteroids can be slowed down with friction? It is clearly NOT other 1 km sized asteroids, they are too small, they would zoom right past each other because outer space is too large of a place for collisions of that type to happen in any appreciable amount. The place for friction braking of the asteroid is in young and intermediate aged stars.

There we will find that the star has enough inertia to prevent any object from pushing it around, meaning that all the momentum of the asteroid will be completely absorbed once it hits the star’s atmosphere. The enormous friction braking will heat up the asteroid, subsequently melting, vaporizing and even ionizing large portions of it so it then can be sorted out and differentiated into the central regions of the star. As well will spur enormous amounts of chemical reactions, but that is for another series of explanations. Placing the star as the location for planetary accretion solves multiple issues. The star can absorb the momentum of the asteroid with friction braking, melt/vaporize/ionize the asteroid completely, sort the material based on mass and other properties in the internal regions, prevent heavy material from escaping (core formation via physical vapor deposition), and even clump all size asteroids from vaporized iron particles all the way to Ceres sized behemoths. Not only that, but it can do this to trillions of these rocks because the gravitational field of the star can grab significant amounts of interstellar shrapnel, as well the star has an extremely large surface area compared to a plithy asteroid.
A very large surface area and gravitational field significantly increases the statistical probably of collisions. What this all means dear reader is that the location for planet formation is inside of stars. Those bright objects you see in the night sky are not nuclear furnaces, they are planet ovens. The Discovery Channel, National Geographic magazines, Scientific American articles, documentaries about big name astronomers and astrophysicists are all wrong when it comes to stars. The only thing cooking in a star is a planet. Matter synthesis happens in active galaxies or AGNs, events which actually have the energy required to fuse matter at high velocities, and in gargantuan quantities. We should demote the stars from nuclear furnaces, and promote planets to being ancient stars. This simple realization is required that way we can do good science and not rely on outdated theory which struggles to explain even the high school basics, such as explaining how to make rocks lose their momentum in outer space by having them hit other objects with vastly larger masses and how useful simple concepts such as friction are. Let us get back to the basics.\cite{148a}

### 15.7 Singular gravitationally collapsing object

Directly related to both the coherency and multiple nebula principle, the singular gravitationally collapsing object principle or SGCO principle states,\cite{149}

"A gravitationally collapsing nebular cloud or star forms a singular object."
"As a star or nebular cloud gravitationally collapses, it does not spawn multiple objects as remains of the collapse. If multiple objects came from a singular gravitationally collapsing object, then it means we have to invoke some mechanism/force that is both stronger than gravitation and long range to allow for the extra objects to escape the collapsing nebula/star. As well, since no star has ever been observed to spawn multiple objects as it gravitationally collapses, we can rest assured that as they collapse they remain singular objects. This means as the Sun collapsed from a large cloud (as recognized by establishment) then it could not have possibly formed multiple objects, it would remain singular as it is now. This means that the objects that currently orbit it are completely unrelated to the proposed giant molecular cloud which it formed out of, and the very concept of solar system is nothing but a temporary arrangement that cannot be founded upon any sort of formation mechanism of stars."

15.7.1 Change in gravitational potential energy of objects

The gravitational potential energy of objects near stars changes as the stars evolve.[150] In this theory, as stars have lost the majority of their mass and their gravitational fields and radii have diminished considerably, the rate of acceleration with free fall of objects in those gravitational fields diminishes as well. Therefore as a simple rule, the gravitational potential energy of objects in or near highly evolved stars such as Earth is much lower than younger stars such as the Sun. The GPE of objects inside or near stars diminishes at a smooth, continuous rate, given the change in height from the surface and mass do not change, and levels off as the star begins completely solidifying and has lost about 99% of its atmosphere. So to rewrite the equation, would could add Delta (change in) in front of the g. So it
would look like this: \( \Delta PE = m \Delta g \times h \) As well, the mass of the star constantly decreases, which means the delta will always be negative.

### 15.8 Type of differentiation

In this theory it is claimed that the differentiation process of solid material forming the central core out to the crust is inhomogeneous, meaning that the Earth formed its core, mantle and crust structures as it is currently studied and did not sort the material after the fact from a homogeneous liquid.[151] The differentiation process is therefore the exact opposite of the process hypothesized by the iron catastrophe, in which the differentiation process happens while the Earth a homogeneous liquid. All this means is that the core formed first before the rest of the mantle and crust, leading to the CBC and the FS principles listed below. In short, this theory has stars as being homogeneous when they are in vapor/plasmatic state, and then sorting the material into heterogeneous solid/liquid structure as it evolves.

#### 15.8.1 Foundational structure

This principle states that the differentiation process of an astron occurs while the interior is forming.[152]

"Accretion of a stellar core happens simultaneously as the differentiation process itself."

This means that any object that has a differentiated interior was a much larger object in its past, and places the possibility that impact remains (many dwarf planets) and
planets can be classified by an internal physical understanding other than orbits or current size.

15.8.1 Core before crust

In addition to the foundational structure principle, the core before crust or CBC principle states,[153] 

"The iron/nickel cores of stars form before their rocky crusts."

Large scale structures which comprise the Earth form well before any solidification of the crust can take place. As the crust of the Earth is also vastly smaller by volume than the inner iron/nickel core alone. The thickness of the highly evolved stars’ crust is a good indication of how much time the star has had to cool and solidify. This means that highly evolved stars also cool inside out (the core cooling off) as well as outside in (the crust solidifying and thickening).

15.8.2.1 Homogeneous nucleation

It is hypothesized that stars undergo homogeneous nucleation (crystal growth in similar patterns) of iron/nickel vapor during early stellar evolution.[154] The vacuum vapor deposition that occurs during red dwarf stages of evolution can even be done in a lab.
(Taylor, 2017)\textsuperscript{[154b]}

The deposition begins during late stage orange dwarf, early stage red dwarf evolution.
This evidence is provided in meteorites and inside of all ancient stars which possess these iron/nickel crystal cores. The vast majority of meteorites which give evidence of the cores of ancient dead stars that have disintegrated contain Widmanstatten structures. It needs to be further determined what location the iron was in the star based on the size and type of crystal structure observed. There are many types, including pallasites which mix non-ferrous material in larger amounts. Therefore self-assembly of the star begins at the core, including a new thermodynamic
phase and a new structure, the iron/nickel vapor to solid iron/nickel composite.

15.8.3 Ossification of crust

In this theory the Earth is younger than Venus and Mars, because neither Mars nor Venus have active volcanoes, lithospheric activity or significant magnetic fields which would indicate large fluid motion between the core and mantle.\[155\] If Earth and Venus, which are of comparable mass, had the same rate of heat loss due to volcanic activity, and required the same amount of energy to form, then it would be more plausible that their crust and internal heat would be at the same thickness and level of internal fluid motion, thus at a similar stage in evolution and very close in age. Since Venus does not have these indicators, it is more reasonable to consider that its crust is vastly thicker. The author would put a low estimate on the thinnest portion of Venus’s crust to be at least 1000 kilometers, and the thickest to reach all the way to its core, with large pillars of solidified magma.

"The crust of an old star thickens as the heat escapes and the solidification of the interior deepens."

It is concluded that since Mars and Venus are vastly older because of their crusts being a lot thicker, that they could not have formed in the same vicinity as Earth or the Sun, and came from somewhere else in the Galaxy. This fits well with the adoption principle.

15.8.4 Boundary solidification
The boundary between the interior crust of the gas giant has to almost completely solidify before its thick atmosphere/oceans dissipate.\(^{[156]}\) If this does not happen and the atmosphere and oceans are ripped away completely before the crust can solidify, then the molten material on the surface will boil away any oceans or thin atmosphere left, absent any hotter host impacting the star. This means that if a Hot Jupiter remains close to a hotter host for too long, it will ruin any chances of forming a water ocean, or any type of environment suitable for life, even long after the thick atmosphere has been ripped away.

"The boundary between the interior rocky crust of a gas giant and its atmosphere and oceans has to almost completely solidify before they dissipate, or there will be no possibility for life formation."

This principle can also be applied to the fundamentals for life formation, but it seems to be more of a foundational construct as life is mostly insignificant with regards to the full evolution and death of a star.

15.8.5 Goldschmidt classification

A classification developed by Victor Goldschmidt is available. It is a geochemical classification which groups the chemical elements within the Earth according to their preferred host phases into lithophile (rock - loving), siderophile (iron - loving), chalcophile (ore - loving or chalcogen - loving), and atmophile (gas - loving) or volatile (the element, or a compound in which it occurs, is liquid or gaseous at ambient surface conditions).\(^{[157]}\) In this theory, highly evolved stars can also be sorted out based on the the elements individual properties in large amounts, as
opposed to models that only accept three modes of differentiation of evolved stars with rocks (albeit unnamed), metal hydrogen and hydrogen. The different types of lithophile, chalcophile, atmophile, siderophile and volatile elements sort themselves out deep in the interior of evolving stars, as their internal and external enthalpies diminish.

15.9 Spherical celestial objects

The principle of spherical celestial objects states:

"Gravitation keeps objects mostly spherical as they form and evolve."

This means that disks are unnecessary to explain the evolution of a star, it retains its oblate spherical shape as it cools and evolves.\textsuperscript{[158]}

15.9.1 Diameter principle

Piggybacking on the principle of spherical celestial objects another reasonable principle is added, the diameter principle. It states:

"The changing diameters of stars is continuous."

The nebular hypothesis and all accretion theories have no explanation to why stars are found in all diameters. In fact, all diameters of stars are going to be different, because they are all in different stages of evolution. No star is the exact diameter of another, as well, it is continuous. A picture is given below to explain what the diameter
principle means and how powerful its predictive power really is.

As the reader can see, stellar diameters will be found in between observed stellar diameters all the way past Earth stages of stellar evolution. They are predicted to exist based on the diameter principle of stellar evolution. If you find a star that is 12 Earth diameters and another one 5 Earth diameters, you will guaranteed find one that is between 12 and 5 Earth diameters. For this example 8 Earth diameters is the predicted one. As well, since there are 200+ billion stars in our galaxy, then it is almost 100% likely that millions of objects in between 12 and 5 Earth diameters will be found just inside our galaxy.
Just so this principle is explained in real world terms, a screen shot is taken from the exoplanet website run by researchers in Europe at the exoplanet.eu website:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planet</th>
<th>Mass (M_⊕)</th>
<th>Radius (R_Earth)</th>
<th>Period (day)</th>
<th>a (AU)</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>i (deg)</th>
<th>Avg. dist. (arcsec)</th>
<th>Discovery</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kepler-1349 b</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>2.12839208</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2016-05-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kepler-1339 b</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.34155513</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2016-05-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To properly utilize the predictive power of the diameter principle, just look at the radius column, where it says R_Earth. There you will see that Kepler-1349b and Kepler-1339b are respectively .69 and .71 Earth radii. This principle simply means that there will be exoplanets (evolving/evolved stars) that are .69 < x < .71 Earth radii. This means there are objects orbiting other stars out there that are ~.70 Earth radii.

It also means that for objects that are listed as having the same radii, it is not completely accurate as no star is exactly the same size as another. So below another screen shot is taken to show that stars listed as .69 Earth radii are probably not .69 Earth radii, because the radii are not stepped, they are continuous. No star is exactly the same diameter of another.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planet</th>
<th>Mass (M_⊕)</th>
<th>Radius (R_Earth)</th>
<th>Period (day)</th>
<th>a (AU)</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>i (deg)</th>
<th>Avg. dist. (arcsec)</th>
<th>Discovery</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kepler-378 c</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>28.9190099</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2014-03-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kepler-141 b</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>3.105765</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2014-03-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kepler-1349 b</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>2.1282928</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2016-05-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

They are not lying about it, they probably just do not have the margin of error listed for simplifying the rows and columns numerically. That is common though, astronomers simplify and ignore lots of information to make their theories and conjecture work. It is probably closer to .6902, .693 and .691 or something like that. They will try to look for patterns where specific diameter objects are missing, but
that will fail them, because it ignores the diameter principle of stellar metamorphosis. It is essentially a common sense law, you can't have a large oak tree just pop into existence without first being a small oak tree with continuous growth up to that point. All oak trees are different sizes. \[158a\]

15.10 Stellar adoption

The principle of stellar adoption states:

"Stars adopt other stars and they evolve together once stable orbits are achieved."

This means that all star systems are adoptive systems.\[159\]\[160\] They are all singular in their formation, but wander the galaxy adopting other objects forming systems. This is caused by system dynamics which almost always involve more than two bodies, causing instability of the system, and is essentially a nightmare for mathematicians, because it can mean in their terms binary, binary systems can form, throwing all accepted solar system formation models out the window.\[161\] When adoption takes place, all angular momentum of the bodies have to be accounted for, which leads to the younger, heavier stars dictating the location of the older, smaller ones, as they have much more angular momentum.

15.10.1 Stellar age delineation

Since all exoplanets are actually older, evolving/dead stars, a companion star can not have its age determined simply by determining the age of its host, per
The principle of stellar adoption.\textsuperscript{[162]} The accepted belief that a gas giant star or rocky highly evolved star is as young/old as its host simply because they are orbiting each other is false. It is as false as looking at two plants in the forest and assuming they are the same age simply because they are growing next to each other. It is also as false as assuming that all the people on an airplane are the same age, simply because they are sitting next to each other and are all headed in the same direction. So the readers are clear of this issue a few examples are given. There exist young stars of 5 million years of age that have 2 billion year old objects orbiting them, or objects of 100 million years of age which have 60 billion year old objects orbiting it. Or another example, there exist young stars of just 70 million years that have objects which are 30 billion, 4 billion, 1.5 billion, and 75 billion years old orbiting it. Nature is not neat, perfect and organized like the astrophysicists want!

"The ages of host and companion stars can differ greatly."

This means that we can theorize the age of a star, but cannot theorize the age of the objects which orbit it based on that premise. Classifying the ages of objects which share relative locales is questionable in terms of solar system adoptive processes. It is suggested that the rule of thumb of stellar age delineation is that old stars orbit younger ones, the younger ones being the more massive, hotter ones.

15.11 Volume and surface area

The principles of volume and surface area are condensed into one:\textsuperscript{[163]}
"Stars expand greatly during stellar birth increasing both volume and surface area, and as they evolve from their most expansive state their volume and surface area decrease significantly."

This means:

1. High mass stars (follows from the principle of mass loss, stars lose mass as they evolve) which have small surface areas and volumes are still expanding outwards, this includes all white dwarfs.

2. White dwarfs are not the ending stage of a star’s evolution, they are actually very young, hot stars.

3. If a star is expanding then it is very young, and if it is contracting then it is evolving and much older.

4. Stars do not die by expansion, they die by contraction, as gravitation does not allow for stars to fall apart.

5. Stars are not born by contraction, they are born by expansion processes (they start with small surface areas and volumes then expand greatly).

6. Supernovas are not old exploded stars, the old stars are much less massive, have very small surface areas and volumes in comparison to younger stars and have stable rocky/metal interiors.

7. Supernovas are new stars.

8. The mechanisms behind stellar birth are not understood, but are most likely involve forces more powerful than
gravitation, because when the star is born it expands against the force of gravitation.

15.12 Stellar co-evolution

The principle of stellar co-evolution states:[164]

"All the stars in a star system evolve at the same time, at their own rate."

This means in all star systems, they do not evolve one at a time, they all evolve together albeit they can be in different stages to their evolution.

15.13 Biostellar Evolution

The principle of biostellar evolution states:[165]

"As a star evolves, life forms and evolves on it."

This means the chemical precursors to life began forming on Earth when it was a much hotter, younger star. As the Earth began cooling down from more plasmatic and gaseous stages, the first amino acids and various other chemicals began forming in its atmosphere. This also ties into the life principle. The idea of a “liquid water belt” to name the area where a cooling, older star can maintain liquid water on its surface as it takes up orbit around a younger, hotter star was coined by Hubertus Strughold and Harlow Shapley around the year 1953.[166] Alternative terms for the “liquid water belt” are also known as the “goldilocks zone” and the “habitable zone”. This hypothesis rests on the assumption that only a much younger and hotter star can heat up the surface of an older star to create liquid water externally. This is a grossly incomplete hypothesis because
it fails to consider that liquid magma has the ability to melt ice underneath the surface of a cooling star internally, regardless of how cold it is on the exterior of the star. This makes the habitable zone hypothesis which judges the capability of an older star to maintain liquid water oceans by external factors alone incomplete. For the hypothesis explaining the possibility of water to be present it needs to take into account both the internal and external factors that could allow for a cooling star to maintain liquid water oceans. The ability of a cooling star to maintain liquid water oceans is completely reliant on where the heat is located. Therefore there is no minimum or maximum distance for a host star to be located in reference to the cooling star. The surface of an older black or blue dwarf could be solid water ice and the interior could be violently geologically active creating vast oceans of liquid water. These liquid water oceans are hypothesized to be present on the black dwarf Europa, which is one of the smallest, fully differentiated stars observed in our solar system. This new hypothesis is called the Life Hypothesis and is directly related to this theory. It should also be noted for the reader that a man named Günter Wächtershäuser also realized how life probably originated from near hydrothermal vents without the need to orbit close to a hotter host star. As geothermal vents that sustain life are completely absent the heat from a host star and were not known to host life back in the 1950’s when the habitable zone hypothesis was created. Using the life hypothesis Neptune and Uranus are probably forming new life as this is being written as they are the next Earths. This also means that the Earth could change its orbits without any significant disruption in the process of life formation early in its history. A picture of a life sustaining geothermal vent is provided below, completely absent of the heat produced by an external star.
15.13.1 Time principle of life formation

In order for a star to take the chemicals it contains and mix them just right into the arrangements found in nature as the building blocks of life, per the biostellar evolution principle above, a very long period of evolution is required. Basically it amounts to the statistical probability of forming biological processes increasing as the star combines its chemicals.\^{167} If a brown dwarf is captured by a much hotter star and the former rips it apart before it can begin combining the elements into biological molecules, then it will not have enough time to mix the elements into any coherent fashion. The fact that Jupiter, Neptune, Uranus and Saturn orbit much further away from their host star is ideal to form life inside of this theory. If the atmospheres dissipate much slower, then the statistical probability increases and the giant time gap between chemical precursors and biological molecules and beginning processes is bridged effectively. If a Jupiter sized object orbited too close to the Sun, at distances closer than Mercury, then the star would evolve too quickly and it would not have enough time to bridge the gap between non life chemicals and biological molecules. I guess the best way to explain this is to consider that a person could pick a fruit before it is ripe. The star has to have evolved enough before its core begins showing so that the molecules on the surface are no longer mostly chemical in nature, but highly biological, per the microbiological complexity principle below. I would give this amount of time about 5 billion years at the very least. If a Jupiter or larger sized brown dwarf takes up orbit around a hotter host and is ripped to shreds much quicker than it would orbiting at a further distance, then the probability of it bridging the gap diminishes considerably. This means there are probably
lava worlds out there that cannot host life and never will because they evolved too fast. This is a direct contradiction to the author’s previous statement that all stars will host life. Instead, it is posited with the time principle that all stars have the potential for life when they are younger, but not all will host it. As well, some might host life, but not to their full potential as Earth, given thinking organisms such as humans being that example. On the other hand, if a star evolves very slowly, increasing the complexity of the biological molecules to vast amounts, then its overall mass should at least be Earth sized or greater, as the star has had enough time to layer material in its interior to build the core, per the FS (foundational structure) and CBC (core before crust) principles. What this means is that we should expect the old stars which do host life to be at least Earth sized or bigger, meaning super-Earths will probably host life that evolved in a stronger gravitational field than Earth. What this also means is that if we can radiometrically date objects in the solar system as being quite young, then it is guaranteed that they never formed life. As well, if we find life on an object only 1 million years old, it most definitely came from somewhere else, as its current environment could not have had enough time to form it in-situ. As well, the time principle should also be applied to very old meteorites in outer space. They are old, this is true, but if they fail the other principles, the mobility, volume, gravity and container principles, then life forming on meteorites is probably invalid.

15.13.2 Microbiological complexity

The microbiology of the star increases in complexity as the star evolves.\textsuperscript{[168]} For example, it goes from ionized hydrogen, to hydrogen gas (diatomic molecule), to amino
acids, DNA, to large proteins, to flagellum, to viruses, to mycoplasmatic bacteria, to red blood cells and rod-shaped bacteria, to the nucleus of white blood cells, and amoebi, to colonial alga and then to louse and even the reproductive structures of bread molds. All the while the biological characteristics become more and more complex leading up to much larger organisms comprised of trillions of symbiotic, pathogenic and other types of microbiological structures. It should be noted that life itself rests on the structures and processes of the smallest of organisms. Therefore, as life is a by-product of stellar evolution according to the biostellar evolution principle, and the astrochemical principle, the complexity principle of microbiology can be stated:

"The microbiology of a star increases in complexity as it evolves."

15.13.2.1 Photosynthesis

All stars cool and synthesize photosynthetic molecules in their high atmospheres during late stages of their evolution.\[169\] These late stage stars contain hydrogen, carbon, nitrogen, oxygen and magnesium in their high atmospheres as they are very light elements. They form in late stellar evolution in stars similar to Jupiter, Saturn, Neptune and Uranus. As Jupiter and Saturn evolve they will become blue similar to Neptune/Uranus from an increased production of methane and other compounds and the latter will begin to have greener tints, as photosynthetic bacteria is synthesized in large amounts due to x-ray radiation and repeated mutation of the molecules on vast scales. These molecules will then be cycled through their turbulent, reducing atmospheres feeding a multitude of feedback loops required for the formation of life. The radicals needed to form chlorophyll (which is the base
molecule for photosynthesis to take place), are formed inside of evolving stars, not random asteroids/comets where molecules do not have atmospheres to cycle through.

Chlorophyll Molecule

The simplest biological reactions occur without organization in the atmosphere of a star first, as the star evolves. Organization comes after the chemical reactions take place, and they become biological as organization occurs randomly. These simple reactions form glucose, a simple sugar and its oxygen by-product. Photosynthesis occurs in the high atmospheres of intermediate aged stars. Since there are no organelles yet to produce the glucose, as life has not had enough time to evolve and no plants are available, the reaction occurs sporadically and in huge quantities without organization. As the star evolves, the reactions which are more complex occur more often as the heavier synthesized molecules sink into the star. Chemoclines (different levels of different types of chemical reactions and chemistry in a mediating fluid such as water) form inside the atmosphere of the star. Depending on the temperatures and pressures involved, will also dictate a new concept, bioclones where the biological matter forming will do so in layers. These are similar to thermoclines with which the temperature changes abruptly at intervals as you
go deeper in the ocean, the main thermocline being the very top portion of the ocean.

The reaction to form glucose can be organelle free (abiogenic), for example.

$$\text{6CO}_2 + \text{6H}_2\text{O} \xrightarrow{\text{Light}} \text{C}_6\text{H}_{12}\text{O}_6 + \text{6O}_2$$

Above is the overall equation for photosynthesis to occur. It is not mentioned that this process requires organelles, cells, organs or even has to belong to a larger organism full of a vast array of specific organs (they do not tell you this in first year biology). It is a simple reaction that can take place without any of the former organizational structure involved. If carbon dioxide and water are next to each other, and light is introduced (possibly UV light), they can form sugar and oxygen. Granted, they can also form a vast array of other chemical combinations, no organization is actually required. The statistical probably of this occurring is 100% as long as the ingredients are present in large amounts, and a light source is present.

A good analogy of this is to consider gasoline in a car engine. Sure, the gasoline vapor and air is introduced into a combustion chamber and a spark ignites the mixture, but the engine and chassis are not required. Anybody can take gasoline and light a match and introduce heat to the gas to create the reaction (given the reaction occurs in the air, which contains oxygen as an oxidizer). The same goes with photosynthesis. Plants are not needed to create sugar and large amounts of oxygen. Photosynthesis is just a chemical reaction, it is abiogenic and biological. As a simple principle, or rule of thumb, it can be stated that all the simple organic processes which combine molecules and
atoms together were at one time happening in large scales, without biological feedback mechanisms, in intermediate aged stars. Life arises out of non-life, and stars are what start it all off. Luckily it is easy to remember, as star is one letter off "start". Just add a "t".

Unfortunately this is a philosophical issue with the author as well, because it should be noted that atoms are permanently energized. Maybe one day the question will be solved, why are atoms permanently energetic? Maybe atoms are alive, and our definition of life is wrong. Who knows? It should be noted though, that there is no real difference conceptually from life arising abiogenically or biologically, except for high levels of organization.[169a]

15.13.3 Mobility

For life to form on any object, the molecules for life formation need to be able to move on vast scales.[170] This means life evolves on objects which have large gaseous atmospheres, as that would provide the most motion, as opposed to solid or liquid objects. Life begins where large amounts of mixing can take place between molecules. It is much more probable that a star can form complex chemistry naturally when it can mix trillions of tons of matter in a giant blender like configuration, as opposed to thinking that there is very little mixing.

"Life begins where the highest mobility for molecular interaction and mixing can take place."

15.13.4 Volume

Also, life begins in areas where there is a vast volume present.[171] The statistical probability will need to
be calculated, but the author is betting that objects have a higher chance of forming life if they are more voluminous. This is as opposed to the surfaces of very small bodies. The likelihood of molecules mixing to form amino acids and various other proteins is vastly higher in a giant object such as Neptune or Jupiter as opposed to just the surface of a small asteroid. The differences are huge, we can have molecules mixing in a volume of tens of billions of kilometers of material, or on a surface of a few hundred kilometers, with the former being the most probable.

"Life begins in objects which have very large volumes."

15.13.5 Gravity

Lastly life begins where the material can be stopped from escaping the body. This meaning there has to be a strong gravitational field to hold onto newly formed molecules.

"Life requires a significant gravitational field so that forming and formed molecules can not escape."

The gravitational pull of a small asteroid is not great enough to keep molecules which have formed in potentially explosive exothermic reactions, because their escape velocity is quite low. Once even a tiny bit of heat is introduced to a system, the thermal motion will more than likely eject any new molecules formed, especially on any appreciable scale. This is why if there are any type of molecules that resemble by products of life formation/evolution, they were probably preformed, and that asteroid is a piece of shrapnel from a previous impact event where life was already located.
15.13.5.1 Numbers added to the mobility, volume and time principles of the biostellar evolution principle

Star evolution is planet formation. This means the extreme timescales with which a planet is formed is the exact same for stellar evolution, as planets/exoplanets are evolving/evolved/dead stars. Since Earth is a very ancient core of a very, very old star, we can use it as a back drop to give some insight to how long it would take a star to form life, given the conditions are met, since Earth has life and is a specific size and age. It is proposed that the volume required to form life is 1 trillion cubic kilometers of highly mobile gaseous material, and that it takes in excess of 3 billion years of holding onto at least 1 trillion cubic kilometers of that gas.

It is also given that the gravitation of such object would be well beyond the escape velocity of any given molecules. This means the Taylor Threshold is variable dependent, which will be good for taking measurements in the future. To provide some examples for the threshold, it is noted that if an object evolves too fast, say, loses its thick >1 trillion cubic kilometer atmosphere within 1 billion years, then no life will have formed on the object. It should be noted that forming life is extremely time consuming and involves a much greater space of molecular mobility than Earth can currently provide.

This means that Earth as a given, and assuming the MVT numbers are valid (but not yet accurate), had to have been vastly larger, as its current gaseous envelop where the majority of the mobility is present, only accounts for ~4.1 billion cubic kilometers of space. As well, does not possess the current chemistry to form life from amino acids by themselves in large scales without life already present. So Earth could be in its current state for an excess of 3 billion years from now, but given the required mobile atmosphere
only being 4% of the required dimensions, forming life from scratch is highly unlikely.

What this all means is that finding a sterile world that possesses or has possessed a gaseous volume of at least 1 trillion cubic kilometers, and has been around for >3 billion years is highly unlikely. What is more likely is that life will be found, as a very large amount of stellar objects are both in excess of 3 billion years old and have greater than 1 trillion cubic kilometers of gaseous material to work with. It should also be noted that an atmosphere of greater than 1 trillion cubic kilometers could increase the molecular interaction and drastically shorten the time required for life to form, but that is under the assumption of the material being cool enough to form stable molecules that do not re-break. Re-breaking would be due to the heat of the evolving star, which is why the material is assumed to be gaseous (even superheated) but not plasma, where the material is completely broken into ionized bits as it was in earlier evolutionary stages.

In reference to all of the possible diversity that would form on a star given the minimum requirements, we should also consider the fact that some stars would evolve extremely slowly. Some stars might contain an atmosphere of greater than 1 trillion cubic kilometers for >3 billion years. These objects would produce vast populations of species, that make the diversity of the Amazon Rainforest look like a fish tank. Since human beings intermingled with Neanderthal man, and made one essential species, some of these worlds might be so large and have evolved for such long periods of time, that they possess two alpha species on the planet. Imagine if Chinese men and women could not reproduce with people from Europe. Equal but different would be much truer for those peoples than it could ever possibly for Earthlings.
The chances of the different world being much more massive than Earth renders the possibility of the people from those evolved stars being much shorter as well. If they were to take their space ship, land it on Earth, get out and walk around, their mannerisms would be more along the lines of astronauts hopping on the Moon, because of the weaker gravitation. These parts are just speculation of course, but the likelihood of finding life on objects is higher on larger ones. It would be a waste of time trying to find life on small worlds, such as the Moon, Io or Europa.

They were just not big enough for long enough periods of time to have formed life, this is of course based on how fast the iron core deposition rate for evolving stars is. It takes lots of space and lots of time to form life. The idea that astronomers even propose that something like an asteroid can form life, when they do not even have atmospheres or the gravitation to hold onto newly formed molecules is beyond me. One only needs to calculate the average velocity of a water vapor molecule formed from the explosive reaction of oxygen and hydrogen gas. I am sure it well exceeds the escape velocity of all asteroids in the solar system and across the galaxy, because those molecules explosively combining together are essentially rocket fuel, and the energy from those molecules combining is used to escape from the Earth itself in the form of rockets! If asteroids cannot even hold onto water as its forming, what makes astronomers think they are the locations for the beginnings of life?[172a]

15.13.6 Container principle

In addition to the mobility, gravity and volume principles of life formation the forth principle is the container principle.[173]
"If the gravitation is not strong enough on the object to hold onto newly forming molecules, then the life which forms would still need to be held back from escaping into interstellar space."

A good example of this would be subsurface oceans on an object with a very weak gravitational field. There could be lots of water underneath the rocky/icy surface that could allow for mobility of the molecules. Though it is suggested that only very simple microbial life would occur on smaller objects, as there is not enough mobility or volume for life to evolve to the point it currently exists on stars such as Earth. A good rule of thumb for this principle is to consider how large of a single container the object is, given container means physical matter trapping material, or a significant gravitational field to do the same. With that in mind, we can project the amount of evolutionary processes that would have taken place. A random thought to consider would be to realize how large a food chain is. If you have life forming and evolving in a very small environment, then there is no upward pressure to look for bigger and/or more abundant food sources, so the life would stay small and survive indefinitely, only changing and morphing into different forms, never really evolving to more complex organisms. Placing an animal such as a whale shark inside of a small lake does not make sense, because there will not be enough food. Placing a few bacteria would be ideal as the bacteria would grow and adjust to the changing conditions of the lake indefinitely. So we could have really ancient bacteria that never really changes being found in subsurface lakes on other worlds, given they are smaller worlds than the Moon for instance. It is more reasonable to therefore look at rocky Earth type objects and realize the abundance and variety of life would be much higher, versus objects that are a lot smaller and can only sustain certain species. All this
being said, future astro people will find ancient, small organisms on smaller evolved stars given all the other conditions are met appropriately, and large, evolved organisms will be found on larger evolved stars. A weird thought would be to consider that maybe there is a size threshold for stars concerning its ability to host really advanced life forms like humans. For instance, maybe it is a good thing Earth is so big or else any type of creature that would try to evolve on it would have killed itself long ago. A poor example would be to look at nuclear weapons. We set off literally hundreds of them around the world back in the 20th century, yet the danger of radioactivity is low currently. If we were to do the same on a much smaller object, the radioactivity would have been much more concentrated. A better example would be farming. We can farm huge portions of land which supports the continued growth of a giant population of humans, without that land, farming would not have got as far as it did. Therefore a smaller world would have inhibited growth, and a famine would have not only devastating effects, but could completely wipe out a civilization before they evolved to our current status. Or even plagues would have spread across the entire planet, the luxury of avoiding the epidemic of Ebola which plagued western Africa back in 2014 was a good example.

15.13.7 The non-equilibrium principle of life formation

We can also explain how thermodynamics applies to the beginnings of life. Since it is well understood now by dissidents to mainstream dogma that exoplanets are evolved/evolving/dead stars (astrons), we can make some observations to the nature of life and how it began. The principle of non-equilibrium is quite simple,
"the further from equilibrium an evolving star is as compared to its surroundings, the higher likelihood it will form life in its future, given it began from a sterile state."

Given two objects in outer space with all variables matching except for their enthalpy (heat), the hotter will have a higher likelihood for forming life. So the Sun, with surface temperature of ~5,700 Kelvin will, in its future, have a much higher chance of forming the molecules and biochemistry necessary for life as opposed to Pluto, which can reach 40 Kelvin on its surface, given both were completely sterile. In fact, Pluto is so close to being in equilibrium with outer space as opposed to the Sun, that it is safe to realize that even the formation of water will have ceased on Pluto, and is currently being formed in huge quantities from the Sun (hydrogen combining with oxygen) in comparison.

It is common sense really, if there is less motion due to objects being in equilibrium then nothing will happen, because there is nothing to push/pull the molecules around to combine, break apart and mix. The molecules need to jiggle around a lot to form biochemical precursors to life, but they cannot jiggle at the same rate either, so there is a slow, steady decrease of the star from non-equilibrium to equilibrium. This of course happens over billions of years, and is covered via the time principle of life formation.

A star spends its entire evolutionary timeline trying to reach equilibrium via gravitational collapse, but is prevented by the physical constraints of matter preventing complete collapse. In essence, non-equilibrium means life will form and the closer to equilibrium you reach the closer to the prevention of life forming will be realized. In a literary sense, society has it backwards. Hell is in outer space where it is cold, so very cold, as objects radiate away into the heat bath known as interstellar space all of their
energy. The heavens, or the place outside of Earth is where the hell is, and inside the ground is where heaven is, where the molecules can still move and jiggle around, and where the Earth is still hot. A star being a giant dissipative structure in non-equilibrium is the central tenet to the inevitable formation of all life on that star as it evolves. So now we have an additional definition for life, a process occurring as a direct result of a star trying to reach thermal equilibrium. What this means reader is that life is as inevitable as a star shining and cooling down, it is a by-product of a star. In a metaphysical sense, we are literal star children. The Earth made us.\textsuperscript{[173a]}

15.13.8 Researchers with similar ideas

15.13.8.1 Alexander Oparin

Alexander Oparin\textsuperscript{[174]} was a Soviet scientist working behind the Iron Curtain. Many of his ideas are true and can be further developed and added to the general theory. Although Oparin's started out reviewing various panspermia theories, including those of Hermann von Helmholtz and William Thomson Kelvin, he was primarily interested in how life began. As early as 1922, he asserted that:

1. There is no fundamental difference between a living organism and lifeless matter. The complex combination of manifestations and properties characteristic of life must have arisen as a part of the process of the evolution of matter. In SM, the complex combination of manifestations and properties characteristic of life arise as a part of the evolution of a single star as it evolves, cools and dies
becoming an “exoplanet/planet”, as stellar evolution is planet formation itself.

2. Taking into account the recent discovery of methane in the atmospheres of Jupiter and the other giant planets, Oparin suggested that the infant Earth had possessed a strongly reducing atmosphere, containing methane, ammonia, hydrogen and water vapor. In his opinion, these were the raw materials for the evolution of life. This also fits well with SM, when Earth had a very violent hot past before it even possessed a reducing atmosphere, it was big, hot and bright like the Sun before it was cool enough to allow for the formation of ammonia, methane, hydrogen gas and water vapor. They are the raw materials for the evolution of life, as life itself evolves on the star as it evolves, and dies when the star dies, as is the case of Mercury, Mars or Venus.

3. In Oparin's formulation, there were first only simple solutions of organic matter, the behavior of which was governed by the properties of their component atoms and the arrangement of these atoms into a molecular structure. Gradually though, he said, the resulting growth and increased complexity of molecules brought new properties into being and a new colloidal - chemical order developed as a successor to more simple relationships between and among organic chemicals. These newer properties were determined by the interactions of these more complex molecules. There was first the birthing of the star, in which all elements were completely ionized in what is called a “plasma” before they can even form stable diatomic molecules. The diatomic gases are formed as the star cools into red dwarf/brown dwarf stages of stellar evolution.

4. Oparin posited that this process brought biological orderliness into prominence. According to Oparin,
competition, speed of cell growth, survival of the fittest, struggle for existence and, finally, natural selection determined the form of material organization characteristic of modern - day living things. What is also important is determining how close the evolving star is to its host, that will determine if life itself can arise, as well as how evolved the star is. Stars without atmospheres or an appreciable magnetic field such as Mercury are dead, and cannot host life.

5. Mr. Oparin takes the stance that the center of the Sun is a red hot liquid nucleus on page 18, of his Origins of Life paper, and this is where he and I differ greatly. The Sun as it stands is hollow, like a basketball. There is no interior structure. It is too young to have formed a core, as core development happens as the star evolves. The surface of young stars like the Sun signal the material is much too hot to even be liquid, but exists in its ionized state and becomes gaseous as it cools and the gas condenses into the central regions of the star forming the core. This inward falling material would case the star to shrink and cool, forming the core as it gravitationally collapses. Core development is an end result of a star's evolution, young stars do not have them. Only a much older star would have a liquid nucleus.[174a]

15.13.8.2 Anthony J. Abruzzo

Mr. Abruzzo has asserted the same conclusion that stars and planets are essentially the same objects, only in different stages to their evolution as early as 2008.[174b]
In Chapter 6, Difficulties on Theory, in Darwin's Theory of Natural Selection,[174c] it is mentioned that since organisms evolve over long periods of time into completely different ones, there should be species in transitional states found in the crust of the Earth. Unfortunately the problem is that the preservation of organic material will be haphazard at best, and include giant gaps of time in between the appearance of specific types of organisms. It is mentioned that the crust of the Earth is essentially a vast museum by Darwin, and this is true, but finding the transitional states of organisms in the Earth continues to be quite difficult to accomplish. This is all interesting because when Darwin wrote the book in the 1800's, he wasn't aware of the fact that we actually would find many early humanoids that were not so human, thus their "transitional states" are a real thing. They can be found and are continuously found even in modern times. Early mankind was not mankind, in fact, taking Darwin's conclusions to their extreme it means that all life on Earth is related to all life. Plants are our common ancestors, bugs, birds, dolphins, cheetahs, all have common ancestors, it all just depends on how far back you go to find the commonality.

That being said, they are in essence not transitional states, but fully formed down their own lines of specialization and evolution. We won't be drawing the parallels with that, but only with the transitional states being absent or rare due to simply not enough information and data having been collected to present the theory completely. In comes the general theory. With the general theory, the same problem was apparent.
Astronomers were trying to solve the mystery of planet formation with only the solar system to draw conclusions. The planets as they were viewed, Uranus, Neptune, Jupiter, Sun, Venus, Mercury, Earth ... they all appeared to rely on the Sun as they orbited it. Little did astronomers know there was a rarity and in actuality a complete absence of the transitional states of planets (stars). When astronomers look at the planets, they see objects that formed fully "as is", thus could not have transitioned or morphed into their current state from some previous state. They essentially take the creationist vs. evolution approach in that the planets formed as we see them, just like human beings... we formed just as we are seen currently. They accept the idea that the Earth was created by a protoplanetary disk, yet ignore all the transitional states now observed in telescopes. Yet the observational evidence tells us something else entirely.

Earth evolved to its current state. Jupiter evolved to its current state. Uranus evolved to its current state. We are not looking at one time, one place objects, we are viewing objects that took hundreds of millions of years to evolve. What we have here is not only that the Earth is a giant museum, but all of outer space is a real-time, time machine. We can see what will become of the Earth, far, far into its future all the way to its complete destruction, as well can view its past, far, far into the past, even with our own eyes, no telescope required. That's how mother nature works, she hides her secrets in plain sight.

In a similar way to Darwin's transitional species being found in the ground in the vast museum called Earth, the transitional stars (astrons) are now being found in outer space. The general theory can now be fully expanded and replace the protoplanetary disk/nebular hypothesis, as the transitional states of astrons are rolling in, and the giant planetary evolution puzzle is being pieced together. To any
astronomer reading this, please refer to the planets as evolutionary structures, because that is what they are, objects in different stages to their evolution. The general theory of planetary evolution does not require protoplanetary disks or any other ad hoc theories. What you see is what you get.[174d]

15.14 Refractory material

The refractory principle of planet formation states that material with very high refractory value is needed to melt down large amounts of iron/nickel in outer space, as vacuum does not properly shield against heat loss. The refractory material is provided by stars' thick atmosphere as they cool and die, keeping their interior hot for billions of years.[175] This is evidenced by the many billion cubic kilometer iron/nickel cores of evolved and dead stars, Earth and Mercury respectively.

15.14.1 The Absence of refractory material, fuel and gravitation needed to melt iron/nickel in outer space

It is well known to industry that refractory (heat blocking) material is needed so that iron and nickel can be melted from their ore in blast furnaces, as well as superheated air at high pressures and gravitation to provide direction for the iron to flow as well as a fuel such as coke. It is posed as a challenge to the astronomers to explain how iron/nickel melt without refractory material, without superheated air (vacuum is absent air), without strong gravitation or high pressure (provided there is air and gravity), or fuel as in coke, to form meteoritic material. Vacuum is a very poor refractory material (as it is actually
absent any material) as all radiative heat from any heated iron/nickel would escape rapidly and the iron/nickel would never melt, much less form an alloy in very large asteroid type bodies the size of small moons. As well, there is no superheated air to blast the iron/nickel or strong gravitation to provide pressure required to melt the metal. There is also no fuel to provide for the heat needed to melt the iron/nickel.

Yet we know for a fact that huge iron/nickel alloy chucks are floating about in outer space because they land on the Earth at terminal velocity, and some even slam into the surface at higher than terminal velocity. The largest iron/nickel meteorite on record being the Hoba meteorite, which weighs about 67 tons. One should wonder, where is the furnace in outer space that could form a solid chuck of iron/nickel of this size? You need fuel, refractory material, gravitation and pressure to form something like this, all of which the protoplanetary disk does not provide because outerspace is mostly a vacuum, possesses no fuel, and has not formed the bodies yet to provide the gravitation to begin with! Yet that is exactly where they come from, outer space!

If astronomers want people to believe there are iron/nickel alloy fairies that operate large foundries outside of stars, then there is no use for this theory, or science itself! The answer is simple reader. The astronomy experts do not understand basic smelting, they do not understand what it takes to melt iron or metal in basically any quantity. They propose that iron/nickel alloy form in outer space absent air, refractory material (has to be more refractory than iron/nickel which are both refractory metals themselves!), fuel or a heat/electrical energy source such as electrodes, and a direction for the metal to separate from the lighter constituents. It seems they rely on magical interpretations that nobody mentions. They must have fairies doing all the
work and only the astronomers with the big expensive
telescopes can see them! Or we can go with an alternative
that makes more sense.

The iron/nickel collect inside of a star as it cools and
dies as it moves though the galaxy. The star provides a thick
atmosphere (refractory material), the gravitation (the
iron/nickel can sink to the center), the heat and fuel
(gravitational collapse and plasma). The resulting smelting
a star can do should be able to provide extremely large
iron/nickel balls which would remain in the interiors of
stars as they cool and die. (That is unless the fairies
transport them out of stars again after they smelted the iron,
but enough of establishment's fairies).

The stars that have cooled down enough will still
have the cores they formed, they are called "planets" by the
astronomers. Many of the cores will be more than 1 billion
cubic kilometers of iron/nickel alloy, like the Earth's inner
core. The planet then smashes into other objects, eventually
exposing the core, which then breaks apart further forming
the objects that fall onto the ground on Earth. It is my wish
for astronomers to choose common sense over supernatural
explanations or theory that has no mechanism and ignores
widely known processes used in industry. Maybe an iron
worker can talk to an astronomer and let them know how
to smelt iron, so that they can learn how nature works.
Staring at black boards with math equations and through
the lens of an expensive telescope is one thing, working
with liquid iron is something else entirely. If talking to an
iron worker is below an astronomer because their egos are
too big, maybe an aerospace engineer can talk to them about
how difficult it is to melt iron/nickel alloy, as they use it in
the internal components of jet engines. Either we can
explain nature with fairies, dark matter, magic and big bang
explosions, or we can use common sense with real processes
that are used to make real things. It is up to the reader to decide.[175a]

15.15 EMHD

EMHD is short for electromagnetohydrodynamics. It refers to the properties of young stars being dominated by electromagnetic forcing due to constantly changing magnetic and electric fields in a plasma (ionized gas). The hydrodynamic regime of young stars is in direct opposition to models which refer to them as static structures, as observations hold them as dynamic and fluid.[176]

"All young stars are electromagnetohydrodynamic systems, and their structure is determined by the interactions of ionized matter."

15.15.1 Plasma instabilities

Young, hot stars are composed of plasma. Their energetic nature gives rise to plasma behaving very unlike anything in gaseous, liquid or solid form. Plasma instabilities dominate young stars, and as they cool the instabilities diminish.[177] The plasma becomes genuinely neutral matter, not averaged out neutral. Averaged out neutral means they are looked at as not being charged objects, regardless if young stars are comprised of mostly positive and negative ions. As the plasma recombines to gas, the plasma/gas mixture is less subject to electromagnetic forcing, and the turbulent nature of the star diminishes. As the instabilities diminish, the matter can then begin to sort out based on multiple properties and characteristics. Because of plasma instabilities young stars are too unstable to have any coherent process powering them. Young stars are not differentiated and organized,
they are roiling balls of plasma many times the diameter of Earth as well as vastly younger.

“Plasma instabilities decrease as stars evolve.”

This means older stars will not have super energetic plasma being ejected from its surface. The older plasmatic stars will be much calmer, meaning the rate of flaring will decrease.

15.16 Energy/Mass dissipation

The energy/mass dissipation principle states that as stars evolve, they lose mass/energy at rates which decrease.[178] This means the youngest stars are losing mass and energy the fastest and as they evolve their rate of mass/energy loss diminishes to the point of losing very little mass/energy.

"The rate at which astrons (stars/exoplanets/planets) lose energy/mass decreases as they evolve."

15.17 Plasma to rocks/metal

Young stars shine very brightly in the plasmatic state of matter. As they cool, phase transition and cease to shine brightly in the visible and infrared spectrum, their final phase or state becomes rocks/minerals and metal.[179]

"Rocky and metal bodies were once completely plasmatic (comprised of completely ionized matter) during earlier stages of stellar evolution, which is in line with the conservation of energy and the general theory of stellar metamorphosis."
15.17.1 The principle of crystallization

Rocks and minerals do not form in any significance in vacuum in outer space. To form crystals in any large amount, a much larger body is required to maintain the stability required for the growth of the given amount of crystals. As an example, to form a small asteroid the size of a battleship, a gaseous object the size of a small moon would be required to allow for the slow internal crystallization of the gaseous material in the center. So given, there have been no observed gaseous objects the size of small moons observed, as their stability would be nearly nonexistent due to the escape velocity being too low to hold the gas together, we can deduce that all crystalline structures were parts of gaseous objects that were vastly larger. As well, the escape velocity of the volatile compounds that those crystals are formed from has to be higher than those elements in their gaseous form at any temperature. Put simply, rocks, minerals and all crystalline structures at all sizes were part of larger bodies that had at least the escape velocity of the elements they are composed of. This principle has wide reaching consequences because it means that no matter what size an object is, if the elements present in the rocks and minerals in their gaseous form can escape from that body given its current size, then that object had to have been either much larger itself, or a part of a larger body. The whole idea that dust and pebbles in outer space can form something the size of the Moon without an object allowing for stability for the long term crystallization process is therefore irresponsible reasoning based on wishful thinking.\textsuperscript{[179a]}

15.18 Vortex principle
The angular momentum problem is restated and made into a principle of stellar formation in which a spinning disk would not allow for the central regions to be of high density. The gas would migrate outwards and if star systems were formed in this manner, there would be no central star, and all the angular momentum of the gas would be in the outer regions.[180]

"A star/planet (astron) or a star (astron) system in a disk orientation can not form from a spinning vortex."

This paper is just a re-stating of the very well known problem in astrophysical understanding, the angular momentum problem of solar system formation. Jupiter, Saturn and the Sun could not have formed in a disk, especially since the Sun has the majority of the mass, and very little angular momentum relative to the former objects. It is referenced that no spinning object can form in a disk orientation, unless there is a mechanism for angular momentum loss. In stellar metamorphosis this is solved, the angular momentum of the gravitationally collapsing nebula is lost as mass, as per the mass loss principle. Depending on how much mass is lost will determine how slow/fast the object will continue spinning as it evolves. This understanding can bring about theory adjustments in gyrochronology as well.

15.19 Radiometric dating

As a star cools and dies, its radioactive elements decay according to their specific half-lives. Since the Sun is
relatively young compared to red dwarfs, and red dwarfs are young compared to brown dwarfs so on and so forth, the Sun can be used as a planet to give a back drop for the initial conditions of the radioisotopic abundances found on Earth.[181] Using this principle we can accurately date solar system objects, given the Sun being many billions of years younger than accepted interpretation. This theory therefore is the complete reverse of accepted theory, in which the Sun is taken as being older than the Earth, regardless of all the counter - interpretation of the evidence provided.

“The initial conditions for taking accurate radiometric dating measurements of solar system objects are present in the Sun, given the solar system planets are highly evolved stars not related to the Sun by any sort of formation process.”

Chapter 16, Stellar Groupings

In this theory, the populations of stars are not based on their location in a galaxy, but on their physical structure regardless of their location. It is stated that Population I stars are the youngest and mostly plasmatic material. Population II stars are mostly gaseous and middle aged, such as Jupiter and other types of gaseous stars. Population III stars are mostly solid/liquid material such as Earth, and are very, very old and have had their thick atmospheres ripped away for the most part. Population IV stars are solid throughout, as the majority of their heat has completely dissipated and all that is left is a cold rocky/metal ball which wanders the galaxy, which are very similar to Mercury.[182] Lastly you have star shrapnel or "guts" as its worded, which comprises the remains of collision events,
including moons, asteroids and comets. The purpose of these stellar groupings is to encompass the phase transition principle of stellar evolution in which the oldest stars are at their lowest enthalpies, and the youngest are at their highest energy state.

16.1 Main star types

This list is an overall generalization of the stellar types, some may overlap in different characteristics. This list is also subject to change as the data rolls in and classification becomes more detailed.

16.1.1 White dwarfs

16.1.1.1 White dwarfs, Nova and stellar youth

White dwarfs are the youthful stars in the General Theory. Therefore some corrections can be made concerning the establishment's acceptance of them being old stars. White dwarfs are in the tens of thousands of degrees Kelvin, some even hundreds of thousands. No dead star is that hot on its surface, dead stars have temperatures in the tens of Kelvin. It was theorized that white dwarfs can cool down to the tens of degrees Kelvin, but since none have been observed in any part of the galaxy, and the universe is eternal according to the eternal universe principle, then the concept of a super - dense Earth diameter black dwarf the density of a white dwarf can be laid to rest. As of 2018 not a single exoplanet has been measured to have the mass of a white dwarf but not radiate strongly in the visible spectrum. Below is a diagram that shows where white dwarfs are located on an evolution diagram. They are on the left hand side and are very hot, young, dense stars that expand outwards becoming blue giants. It is mentioned in the book,
Voyage Through The Universe: Stars, by Timelife (1989), that,

"astronomers were even beginning to understand how stars evolve --- except for one nagging question. If stars shine by burning up their nuclear fuel, then what occurs at the end of a star's life when its fuel is exhausted?"

This brings up an extremely important point, one that I have just realized while writing this. The processes behind fusion can only occur inside of electron degenerate matter and where the matter has a high enough velocity to overcome the Coulomb barrier, when it smacks into itself. White dwarfs can be a location for fusion type reactions, as an additional source of heavy material, other than AGN's and radio galaxy jets, though they are not dead stars as well they cannot experience any large scale fusion type reaction after large portions of the electron degenerate matter have gained electrons. This means that the CNO cycle as well as the proton-proton chain reaction are probably false.

As well they cannot fuse matter without an event triggering the reaction, as young white dwarfs and stars in general cannot fuse matter strictly by themselves. There has to be a stable nuclear potential formed, and then triggering reactions take place after the fact. This is very, very different than what the dogma accepts, as well it means that as a white dwarf expands outwards the likelihood of events to trigger fusion reactions from the electron degenerate matter being compressed is lowered, because there is less degenerate matter to work with. The electron degenerate matter undergoes plasma recombination near the surface where it can interact with interstellar dust and the electron shells that expand outwards cause the whole body of the star to expand from the outside in. The central regions are the last place for electron degenerate matter to take up
residence. So essentially establishment dogma has it backwards. The white dwarfs are where the action occurs, and once they get really big and all the degenerate matter slowly transforms into regular matter, the fusion potential party is over. From then on dull but still highly energetic thermochemical and electrochemical events take hold, causing the star to exhibit elemental interactions that we are familiar with on Earth.

1a. Establishment dogma has white dwarfs being the ending stages of a star's evolution, yet none have been found that are near the low temperatures of the most evolved stars like Neptune or Earth.

1b. Dogma also has them not being powered by fusion at all, but the leftover heat from fusion reactions, long in their theorized past. Yet, clearly they are the beginning stages of star evolution, so forcing them to have long histories is misguided.

1c. As well, actual dead stars are composed of material that are full of electrons, such as rocks/minerals, which prevent their nuclei from interacting. This means as the star spent the majority of its evolution slowly collapsing and losing mass, it will never explode. It will just take the normal matter and compress it into stable structures, such as crystals found in igneous and metamorphic rocks.

1d. Lastly, they have degenerate matter as lacking electrons, thus forced a concept called "electron tunneling" to overcome a barrier that was never needed to begin with, inside of stars that are no longer fusing matter on large scales, such as the Sun. White dwarfs have no electron barrier between the nuclei of their atoms. If a large iron rich asteroid were to smack into a white dwarf when it is young,
it would trigger a fusion reaction, thus an actual physical explanation of (super)nova is provided. The extra electrons would be forced into the white dwarf, causing it to experience a fusion event and large scale recombination, as well as forcing it to expand due to the newly added electrons.

It also explains why you can see supernova or nova remnants, the entire star did not explode, just a large part of the electron degenerate matter gained electrons, causing enough pressure to push the already close nuclei of the degenerate matter together, because of the newly expanding electron shells. Once the nuclei touch, they trigger a fusion reaction, making large amounts of heavy material. Basically the degenerate matter is not perfectly stable when you have a body in outer space, especially when you have iron/nickel asteroids roaming about.\footnote{182a}

16.1.2 Hot blues

16.1.3 Subdwarf B stars.
V391 Pegasi

16.1.4 Blue giants
Bellatrix.

16.1.5 White stars
Vega, Formalhaut.

16.1.6 Yellow stars
Sun

16.1.7 Orange dwarfs
Sigma Draconis, Gamma Draconis.
16.1.8 Red dwarfs
Mu Cephei (Not a hypergiant, just a normal Sun-like star with a large cloud surrounding it more than likely).

16.1.9 Auburn dwarfs

16.1.10 Brown dwarfs, Jupiter, Saturn, HD 106906 b (Gallifrey)\textsuperscript{[183]}, Teide - 1\textsuperscript{[184]}

16.1.11 Grey dwarfs, Kepler 35b\textsuperscript{[185]}, Kepler 58c, HD 85390 b, GJ 433 c, 55 Cnc f, HD 177830c

16.1.12 Blue dwarfs
Neptune\textsuperscript{[186]}, Uranus

16.1.12.1 Uranus is a Star

According to establishment dogma, Uranus is an “ice giant”, which is based on poor theory. Uranus is not “ice” nor is it the actual giant size it was in its past. It is a highly evolved star probably even older than Neptune for various reasons.

1. Uranus is less massive than Neptune. As a rule of thumb in the General Theory objects that are less massive are older, but there are exceptions to the rule, such as having been in orbit around a hotter host and having lost more of its mass at a faster rate. This means the potential size of the end result Earth would be considerably smaller, and would also explain the puffiness of Uranus as compared to Neptune.
2. Uranus has a lower heat flux per its size and composition. In the General Theory an object with a lower heat flux as compared to an object with a similar size and composition is older. Heat flux meaning heat transfer from inside the object, to out of the object.

3. Uranus has a comparable magnetic field size to Neptune, which means it is at least comparable in age to Neptune, given the possibility that it could be younger. Most importantly it is much older than Jupiter and Saturn, which both have much stronger, larger magnetic fields.

4. Uranus has more methane by volumetric composition (2.3%) than Neptune (1.5 + - .5%) which means it has had more time to build up methane in the atmosphere. This is comparable to Jupiter and Saturn with ~ .3% volumetric composition. It is reasonably predicted that Uranus is therefore a tad bit older than Neptune, as well much older than Jupiter and Saturn, which fits Uranus right after Neptune on the graph, and well on its way to becoming an ocean world. Upon closer inspection of the graph the reader will see that Neptunes are about 2 billion years old. A Uranus would sit probably about 2.1 billion years old.

This fact causes enormous complications to the dogma. It means there are probably at least 100 million years of time separating Neptune from Uranus, so they could not have formed in the same vicinity of each other. As well, they are both about 1.5 billion years older than Jupiter which means they also did not form anywhere near Jupiter, as they were evolving well before Jupiter was even a twinkle in Mother Nature's eye. This all means we have yet more evidence that we have a system of adopted objects, none of them are related to each other by formation. The only thing that relates them together is the fact that they are currently orbiting the Sun. That is it. Unfortunately the
dogma has created an entire astrophysical study based off making one assumption into dogma.

The objects in our solar system are not related simply because they are all currently orbiting the Sun. It is not the picturesque nuclear family of 1950's suburbia, it is an adopted family full of rejected and subsequently adopted, beautiful souls of the 2010's. If astronomers and astrophysicists continue to assume they are all related just because they orbit the Sun, then they will continue to be confused in explaining the very simple questions, such as why is Uranus’s orbit off its axis of rotation by so much? Why is it more puffed out compared to Neptune (it probably was ejected from a system where it was orbiting really close to a hotter host). Why does it orbit so far away like Neptune? It was probably adopted by the Sun and Saturn, which then flung it out to the edges of the Solar System. Who knows? The facts though are that unless we actually look at the object and stop assuming things to be true (like all the objects in the solar system are all the Sun’s leftovers after it formed), then astrophysicists have no hope of explaining the very basics of astrophysics.

If I could have a time machine and really teach Herschel what is now understood about Uranus, it probably would have been extremely obvious to him too. It is a damn shame we have only sent one probe to check them out. They are actual, physical, billion year old stars, not the theoretical nonsense of establishment dogma. They are the objects in the solar system that are the closest to Earth's stage of evolution.[186b]

16.1.13 Ocean worlds
TRAPPIST - 1g, GJ 1132b[187]
16.1.14 Dark blues
Earth

16.1.15 Black dwarfs
Venus\textsuperscript{[188][189]}, Mars

16.1.15.1 Correcting the Gross Misinterpretation of Black Dwarf Stars

Black dwarf stars are grossly misinterpreted by establishment astrophysics. Their hypothetical, unseen, unverified theoretical black dwarf is pitted against real black dwarfs.

Per Wikipedia on “black dwarf”:

“A black dwarf would have a mainly smooth surface due to the black dwarf’s high gravity with very few irregularities (such as mountains). The surface would also be dry with no surface volatiles such as water. The atmosphere of the black dwarf would consist mainly of carbon, and would contain no clouds or weather system due to thinness of the atmosphere.”

In stellar metamorphosis theory Earth is well on its way to becoming one. Venus and Mercury are black dwarfs. Their surface structure and volatiles are pristine examples of their actual physical structure and composition, as opposed to the theoretical, unverified, unobserved black dwarfs of establishment. Real black dwarfs are not in any way connected to the pseudoscientific theories accepted in astronomy today, but are real objects that can be experimented on and have firm foundations in observation for hundreds of thousands of years, before humans were even human. Either we can accept the nonsense of establishment, or we can consider a real physical awareness
of stars at the very end of their evolution, which currently orbit the Sun. Therefore a correct description of black dwarf follows below \[^{189}a\]:

“It has both rough and smooth surfaces due to the black dwarf’s weak gravity, which are called mountains, valleys and plateaus. The surface is also wet or dry depending on its orbit with a host star and the conditions of the environment (deserts/swamps), some with lots of surface volatiles such as water. The atmosphere of the black dwarf consists mainly of oxygen, carbon dioxide, argon and nitrogen, and contain clouds as well as a weather system depending on the black dwarf’s location to its host star (if one should be in the vicinity).”

As of March 24, 2018, not one single observation of the black dwarf of establishment has been made, it is therefore becoming more and more likely that their black dwarfs do not exist. They should have been found by now orbiting other stars, due to the sheer volume of Earth and Neptune massed objects found orbiting other stars (near the mass ranges of actual black dwarfs). It is predicted that their black dwarfs do not exist, as they are fictional entities that were based on unsound conjecture. It should also be noted that as of March 15, 2017 their surface and atmosphere section of the black dwarf page was deleted.

16.1.16 Dead stars
Mercury\[^{190}\]

16.1.17 Asteroids/small moons

The asteroid 16 Psyche is claimed to be a protoplanet that did not continue its formation process in the “early
solar system”.[191] This is false. The asteroid is a piece of the core of a dead star as it is mostly comprised of iron/nickel composite. Since there is no heating mechanism in outer space to melt together the vast amount of iron/nickel into a giant oblong ball, it is much more reasonable to consider that it is the debris of a long dead star. It has had the majority of its layers ripped away, even parts of the core matter itself. The heat, gravitational field and time required to collect those amounts of iron/nickel only exist inside of stars. The iron/nickel cores grow inside of stars as they cool and die. Once they are completely dead, they just wander the galaxy smashing into other objects, leaving a vast array of different material left behind. All asteroids are just pieces of dead stars, nothing more, nothing less. Any left over magnetic field present in this object will only signal the fact that it was a part of a much larger object, which possessed a dynamo to magnetize it.

Ceres, Moon, Pluto, Charon, Titan

16.1.18 Not stars

16.1.18.1 Red giants

Using the principle of spherical celestial objects, it is determined that red giant stars are not actually stars.[192] The principle of spherical celestial objects states that, “gravitation keeps objects mostly spherical as they form and evolve.” If the object is not spherical, then chances are there is another force more dominant than gravitation that either has caused, or is causing the object to be deformed. In the case of mis-shapen asteroids they were created by impacts, so they had enough mechanical energy to ignore gravitation
after the impact to form irregular shapes that are not mostly spherical. In the case of red giants, they do not possess a defined photosphere, which is in essence the defining characteristic of a mostly spherical star. Since they are therefore hypothesized to not actually be spherical, then we can reason that they are also not actually stars as claimed by establishment. This reasoning is both counter to both the author’s previous attempts to explain why these objects are both so big, as well as the authors claims of them having their distances mis-measured. It is best to have more options, as red giants just might be the very beginning of a star’s birthing. They are actually the nebulas with which a single star is born in. The giant nebula (red giant) forms the white dwarf in its center. The outer atmosphere then dissipates away forming a planetary nebula. The white dwarf then expands greatly to release the heat. Once it becomes as big as it will get, it then begins shrinking and losing mass, going along the regular lines of evolution.

Chapter 17, Alternative Interpretation of Discovery Methods

It is stated that since exoplanets are simply older stars, the youngest ones can be directly imaged without the need of viewing apparatuses. This meaning the actual count of confirmed exoplanets already exceeds ~6,000. Currently with the help of telescopes and computers we can easily count hundreds of billions of exoplanets given the interpretation provided.\[193\]

"Specially designed direct-imaging instruments such as Gemini Planet Imager, VLT-SPHERE, and SCExAO will image dozens of gas giants, however the vast majority of known older stars have only been detected through indirect methods. About 6,000 of the
youngest exoplanets (stars) can be easily directly imaged from Earth without any telescope or viewing apparatus. With the help of powerful new telescopes, many billions of young exoplanets can be observed, as they shine brightly in the visible spectrum across the Galaxy, and other galaxies."

Chapter 18, Open and Globular Clusters

Four arguments are presented in stellar metamorphosis why open and globular cluster ages and compositions are misinterpreted. The alternative is presented to describe them.[194]

18.1 Spectrum dilution

Older stars have been in orbit around the galaxy for longer periods of time, so they have collected more material to dilute their younger appearance of having mostly hydrogen in their spectrum. This means older stars with visible spectrums will actually have higher metallicities.

18.2 Opening transition

The oldest stars do not possess spectrums, meaning that open clusters probably have just as many stars as globular clusters, it is just that they have cooled down so much that they give the appearance of opening up, as they have lost their visible light spectrums. In other words, open clusters have many more planets (evolved stars).

18.3 Decay
Immediately after all the stars were formed from a giant molecular cloud, they maintain their positions in a globular cluster. Over time, they are shredded apart and wander the galaxy via interactions with other stars. This means that the open clusters are probably the more ancient, as they have had more time to be torn apart. This decay is mirrored in the disintegration of organic matter.

18.4 Metal migration

Just because a star absorbs more iron than another does not make it older inside. The oldest stars do not have spectrums, and the majority of their iron/nickel has migrated towards the central regions forming the core.

Chapter 19, Galaxy Evolution

It is theorized in stellar metamorphosis that birthing galaxies contain the energy, heat and velocities required to sustain fusion reactions. As well young galaxies known as quasars are not at their proposed redshift distance according to Hubble’s Law, but have absolute magnitudes on a log scale according to their B - V index, thus do not possess their proposed luminosities nor their vast distances,\(^{195}\)[196][196a][197]

19.1 Embryonic galaxies, or Galaxy Seeds (Pulsars)

The term pulsar means pulsating star to 20th century scientists. Unfortunately this is not true, because pulsars are much different than stars. Some differences are listed below to explain why stars are not pulsars.
1. **Pulsars emit beams of electromagnetic radiation.** Stars shine in all directions evenly.

2. **Stars outnumber pulsars by tens of trillions in count this means pulsars are exceedingly rare compared to actual stars.** There are only a couple thousand pulsars found in our galaxy.

3. **Pulsars have extraordinarily powerful magnetic fields.** Some are measured to be well into the $10^{15}$ Gauss, which is incredible as opposed to the polar magnetic field strength of the largest star in our system (the Sun) of only 1 - 2 Gauss. This is $1,000,000,000,000,000$ (1 quadrillion) times stronger than the Sun!

4. **Pulsars are really small some only a couple miles in diameter.** Stars are many thousands of miles in diameter.

5. **When pulsars die they eject their material so that stars can form, which is itself galaxy formation.** When stars die they cool and shrink becoming what is called a “planet”.

6. **Pulsars resemble superconducting magnetic storage mechanisms.** Stars resemble large cohesive thermodynamic dissipative events.

7. **Pulsars are probably embryonic galaxies.** Stars surround a dying pulsar (aging galaxy).

8. **Pulsars supposedly spin at extreme rates.** Stars spin slowly.

   With these eight distinct characteristics it is now understood why pulsars are not stars at all. They are a stage in the formation of an entire galaxy. An easy logic analogy is presented below:
The Definition of Pulsar (n.):

*An embryonic galaxy*

The pulses are similar to a baby animal’s heartbeat, as both are electromagnetic phenomenon. They both function as relaxation oscillators.

When a galaxy dies it dissipates the energy in bi-polar configurations. These bi-polar configurations then condense forming stars, these stars then form density waves forming spiral arms. Spiral galaxies are decaying galaxies that no longer have a heartbeat. They are very, very large and form billions of structures that dissipate their energy. These structures are known as stars. As we can see pulsars are not stars at all.

A branching idea to the embryonic galaxy idea would be to consider that they contain all the atomic information required to form an entirely distinct galaxy. This means the elemental ratios of galaxies will be different, due to the seeds being different. This of course is far beyond the capacity of mainstream scientists to comprehend. So it is up to you to develop it further. It will be apparent that the different galaxies will have different elemental ratios, so some should have more hydrogen than helium than others, or some should have more carbon than iron than others, etc.[47]

19.2 Galaxy brightness

According to the brightness principle of galaxy evolution:[198]
"Older, evolved galaxies have much larger absolute magnitudes than quasars."

Chapter 20, Universal Age

In this theory the universe does not have an age, it is eternal in both time and space. It is noted that objects come into being and fade away inside of the universe, but the universe as a whole does not have a beginning or end. This contradicts both Young Earth Creationism and Big Bang, which are both championed by priests. It should also be noted that time as viewed as a linear construct might be misguided. A linear concept of time is useful for organizational purposes for experiments, but is fundamentally untrue, as time has never been show experimentally to possess orthogonality.

Chapter 21, Implications for Society and Culture

21.1 Worldview change

Familiarity suits academic societies and research organizations where keeping in line with the paradigm makes structured research easier, but we cannot be too careful to accept the tenets offered by structured research, as sometimes they allow for the study of nature to become too familiar, thus close the mind of the researcher to much richer, alternative explanations of nature. Since worldviews are dominated by familiarity, it should be no wonder why they are so resistant to change. People have a difficult time with things that are unfamiliar as the feeling of being lost is unsettling to most academics. As well, it is argued that it
would be embarrassing for professional astronomers/astrophysicists to admit that the very basics of star science were not understood, in that the closest star to humanity is not the Sun, but the Earth itself.[200][201]

21.2 Semmelweis Reflex and Worldview Lag

Nobody likes to be told "you're wrong". Being blunt about ideas does not increase their effectiveness in human circles. It might be easy to be a teacher and use red ink on exam papers, but that is given the condition that the student is well aware they will be wrong about something, however, small or large. It was already agreed that the student has already accepted the fate of being wrong in some way. Unfortunately as students age and progress through school, being told they are wrong has a greater and greater impact on their ego, as they more than likely have spent more and more time and energy making sure they were not wrong about something. As they move through college, and become the experts of a given field of study, the likelihood of that agreement of being wrong somewhere is diminished. Thus, to tell an expert in any given field that they are wrong concerning something has a much more damaging impact on their ego. As well, past the Ph.D level they become their own teacher essentially in social circles, so the previous agreement of being wrong about something on a test has long vanished. There is no more unspoken social agreement between teacher and student because the student has become the teacher. This means that the way new ideas are approached is no longer under the social contract of knowing you will be wrong about something, it is under the social contract that you should have known better. As a teacher, there is no more wiggle room for being wrong. As it turns out, social contracts are illusionary when it comes to the facts of nature, the teacher in fact is always (and has
always been) the student, as mother nature has always been
the real teacher. Unfortunately, putting nature first is not
what is practiced anymore, the expert is under enormous
social pressure and can no longer be wrong, and if they are
wrong, then it is something very little and easy to change. It
cannot possibly be a huge wrong. This is problematic, as it
leads directly into a known phenomenon called the
Semmelweis Reflex. The tendency to reject new evidence or
new knowledge because it contradicts established norms,
beliefs or paradigms is very human.

We like to believe that ideas are solid and that the
ideas we have accepted are factual of nature and that they
go unchanged forever. Human beings hate change,
unfortunately that is the essence of current civilization,
change is happening much more rapidly that we like to
admit or even acknowledge. So to tie in the tendency of
human beings to reject change, multiply that by the effect of
schooling and expertise at very high levels, add ego
inflation based on changing social contracts and we get a
very different picture of why worldviews take so long to
change. Humans are creatures of habit and that coupled
with experts rejecting new evidence due to over-education
and their unspoken acceptance that they are somehow the
ultimate teachers (regardless if that is actually mother
nature doing the teaching) on social contracts, leads to only
one option for designing new worldviews. We simply have
to ignore the old worldviews. This leads to lag in worldview
development and is currently being experienced by the
author who knows that planets are old stars and the
majority of the scientific community is completely oblivious
to this fact.

It is suggested that progress can only happen so fast.
Think of a giant rubber band attached to a very large rock.
The more someone stretches it out and makes progress in a
certain direction, the more the rock will appear to fall
behind and the stronger the rubber band will try to pull them back. It is a mistaken belief that because a discoverer makes a discovery that it will be immediately used or accepted simply because that individual is making progress. There is no amount of pushing progress forward on an individual level that will lead to huge gains in acceptance in much larger communities. The lag is even more pronounced when that person is not inside the community because they are not attached by a rubber band. They are free to roam and make advances far, far in advance of the acceptance of any community. This lag is further complicated via over-education and scientists constantly playing the credibility game and obsessing over their own egos, which is noted in them not being able to accept critical eyes. Scientists are insulted very easily because their egos are inflated to the extreme. This is a direct result of the changing social contract of student to a teacher, and over-education in fields that are not fully understood such as astronomy, astrophysics and geophysics.\[202\]

### 21.1.1 Astronomical Pseudoscience via linguistics and culture

Since the mystery of planet formation is solved by the discovery that planets are older stars (stellar evolution is planet formation), the continued mystery of planet formation as accepted by establishment dogma is pseudoscientific. Thus a different type of pseudoscience is present, the ignoring of discoveries. The only problem now with getting the discovery recognized is a deep culturally rooted belief that they are mutually exclusive, regardless if the facts of nature are in direct contradiction of the culture.

Young boys and girls are taught in early schooling that a star is something different than a planet. It has been culturally accepted for centuries, thus very few people
questioned whether the two were actually the same. Even if they were to question it, most of those questioners did nothing about it, because it is a belief that is rooted in culture and persists even in the year 2018. Think about it. Young boys and girls long before they learn the scientific method are told, by their teachers who are most likely not scientists, that planets and stars are different. The Sun is a star and the Earth is a planet along with the other 8. It is an enormously unfortunate event in the life of a child.

A very deep and powerful history of the Earth and the stars can be presented to them from the very start, but they are first conditioned into a culturally accepted idea that is officially completely false. It is like teaching children the Earth is flat. It is a strange event as even though I am one of the principle discoverers of this understanding, because of the cultural conditioning I was subjected to in school from a very early age, it is still hard for me to accept mentally and emotionally. How can people come to terms with something this powerful if even one of the very people who made the discovery have a difficult time accepting it?

It puts me into a separate group of people socially, as I cannot discuss this new fact, not even with physics teachers! They just get upset! It is unlike anything I have ever understood before, as well, to understand it takes a mind that is actually, genuinely open to new ideas. Once children reach a certain age, say, young adulthood, their minds are mostly completely made up. Their worldview was presented and given to them, and was accepted by them long before they even got to college and began studying the stars. Thus, their culturally defined meaning of planet/star remains and they look through their telescopes absolutely sure of what they are seeing, long before they started questioning what they are looking at.

The transcendence of astronomy was murdered, by a large overwhelming majority of people who do not
possess the capacity to question themselves. An echo chamber of cultural proportions was thrust upon them long before they learned what an echo really is. The confirmation bias that I as a discoverer am up against is deeply rooted in people's childhoods. The confirmation bias that astronomers/astrophysicists are up against internally is actually to this day unaddressed, as that is the essence of the fallacy. Only read stuff that already conforms to your belief, so the very instant that the possibility of stars being young planets is nearly instantaneously rejected.

That immediate "wrongness" is deeply rooted in cultural beliefs, coupled with the pain of social stigma, mental hardship and an emotional turmoil that goes unmatched by any new discovery to date. Even discovering different Earths out there pales in comparison, as all of the hot young stars are possible new Earths, long into their futures.

It is a very strange phenomenon to me, seeing scientists trying to scientifically define planet, star and exoplanet when they do not realize they are still keeping their cultural definition. They are trying to change their cultural definition of planet/star without actually changing it, by approaching the issue in scientific terms. This of course is going to fail them (and continues to fail them), because their definition only applies to the solar system bodies, as well needed to be voted on, as if voting was scientific! Which step in the scientific method does voting occur, or even finding consensus? There is not a step in the scientific method for that!

In short, the reason why we do not understand planet formation is because young planets are culturally defined as being something other than planet, via linguistics rooted in culture. All models and theories that were invented that separate planet formation from stellar evolution came after the objects were culturally defined.
Planets were small, cold and dim, and stars were big, hot and bright, long before theories/models were drawn up to explain them. The actual idea is easy to digest, the real complications come from a deep seated cultural belief that the two objects are somehow different, that is what causes the problem. Previously held beliefs are getting in the way of understanding nature.

Establishment dogmatists will never admit that their worldview complications all began when they were children, and they should have never accepted the false ideas to begin with. Teach children to use the 4.5 billion years of evolution on their shoulders. We come from a long line of great creatures that survived and evolved, do not let it go to waste believing the Earth is just a giant rock.[202b]

21.2.1 Definition reversal for the Sun

Masses, orbits and definitions of stars change as they evolve with us. In the beginnings of astronomy, all the solar system objects orbited in concentric spheres called epicycles and the Earth was the center of it all. The Sun was inside one of the spheres, and was a “wandering star” (planet) as were all of the others. Fortunately, this idea was tossed in the trash can once we found out which objects are orbiting which. Once that was done, we began classifying stars by their mass according to Newton's laws. Unfortunately they took this method to its pseudoscientific limits as it is the only physical characteristic that is taken to have importance when differentiating planet from star. Instead of actually figuring out what is happening to the object internally, they were classified by how big they were, which led to complete hypotheticals.

Astronomers had no idea whatsoever what actually happened to stars as they evolved, nor did they know what old stars looked like! They could have been standing on one
and not know it (stellar metamorphosis theory). Yet, no astronomer will tell you they just made everything up, all according to "1" physical characteristic! Nothing of their physical nature besides their mass could be determined by their orbits, they simply did not have the technology yet to give additional defining characteristics. Which leads us to the next point, astronomy is overly reliant on basing everything on their mass, which is based on orbits! It is a closed loop! Figure out the mass, figure out the orbit, figure out the orbit, figure the mass. We got their orbits corrected, then their masses, then we defined them, based on their masses! They took one tiny slice of observation and based everything on it. They took a closed loop and went off the deep end, when there were no observations to back their hypotheticals. So asking the question, “what happens when objects lose mass in large amounts over billions of years?” is instantly ridiculed and ignored! They say, the orbits are stable, so the masses are stable, the stars do not lose mass so they do not lose orbits either. The next step in astronomy should have been, “well, we have their orbits down and now we have the masses calculated by their orbits...What happens to the orbits when they lose mass?” The reasoning for the next question should have come from the observation that the objects in our system are all different masses. Not only that, but this question should also have been arrived at in the 20th century, “what happens if the object loses enough mass to where it cannot do what we think it does.” This is of course is in reference to the hypothetical nuclear processes in heavy stars. If the star loses mass, then there can be no nuclear reactions because it is not heavy enough... Then what happens? These questions are almost always ignored, yet are the next step in understanding the stars. The stars were assumed to be thermodynamically closed systems, so the question of mass loss was ignored, regardless if stars are physically observed
to be losing mass in CME's, flares, solar winds and we can observe stars that have lost the majority of their mass. Calling old stars, "planets", and new planets, "stars", does not subtract their actual evolutionary history, it just ruins our ability to make sense of the observations.[203]

21.3 The Krypton hypothesis

Iron/nickel meteorites could only have been formed where the temperatures, pressures and methods (physical vapor deposition) were available, meaning inside stars as they evolve, cool and die. According to the life hypothesis, all young stars have the potential to form life, and many actually do form life on large scales similar to Earth, given many conditions are met. That being said since life has a high probability of forming on the star when it is past ocean world stage of evolution, where people like us are walking around, then how exactly do we find broken up bits and pieces of cores of ancient stars? The answer is that their home worlds were destroyed. When someone picks up an iron/nickel meteorite or even is looking/touching one at a museum, they are potentially touching a piece of the core of a long since destroyed world which had alien life just like us walking around on its surface. We therefore know the fate of the Earth if we stay here. It will be recycled back into the universe as if it was a steel can in a large shredding machine, to be mixed and deposited at random on other alien worlds... giving future alien worlds the very same clues I am using to determine the Earth's fate. As well, some iron/nickel chunks do have similar origins, such as the Campo de Cielo meteorites, but some do not. This being said, if there are meteorite fields in different locales of the Earth, then it means we are finding pieces of multiple destroyed worlds. That alone should stress the magnificence of the universe. It can form entire civilizations
and remove them from memory almost completely. If we did not find these iron/nickel meteorites and appropriately interpret their formation, then we could have never known a worldview so wide reaching and more incredible than any science fiction story to date. The richness of the universe depends on the theory we use, and the Krypton Hypothesis is derived directly from Stellar Metamorphosis theory.\cite{204}

22.1 K2-138 System

It is suggested to dispose of all currently accepted stellar evolution and planet formation models and theories, unless those models and theories state that stellar evolution is planet formation, or that all exoplanets are highly evolved stars, or all stars are hot young exoplanets, or that they are all astrons in different stages to their evolution. There are many options available for phrasing, and they are all more complete and inclusive of the Kepler and space and ground telescope exoplanet data as opposed to the outdated nebular hypothesis, accretion disk and accretion theories (which were invented hundreds of years ago) of all angles that separate conceptually the young from the old as being mutually exclusive.

In the diagram below, I have placed a red box where the K2 138 evolved stars are. In fact, they could be dead moons or ocean worlds as they are very highly evolved. We need to find their densities and atmospheric compositions next as the nebular hypothesis has no method of determining how evolved they are, or what they are at all. The American Astronomical Society and the editors at the Astrophysical Journal, for example on the whole, have no idea what they are talking about with regards to planet formation and stellar evolution, as they all believe those two processes to be mutually exclusive. It is suggested for the reader to re-work all the data so that it makes sense using
this discovery, as the author is doing, as opposed to acceptance of the nonsense still taught by University Professors.

The graph was designed on purpose to be vague, as the idea and theory are still relatively new, as opposed to the many hundred year old nebular hypothesis which has predicted nothing. It places stars by relative diameter and gives an estimate of their ages. This of course does not include density or atmospheric composition, but those can be inferred as well will be observed very soon. The older the star the more rocky, the younger the more hydrogen envelopes it. This is a graph that can be used to give the wide reaching possibilities of the objects, but completely rejects the notion that the evolved stars are as young as their hosts.

What most laymen do not realize is that the nebular hypothesis is still taught in schools. It makes the assumption
which has turned into dogma that planets are mutually exclusive of stars. As well, it makes the assumption that has turned into dogma that if there are older more evolved stars orbiting really big, young and hot stars, then they have to be the same age, both dogmas are completely false.

It needs to also be followed that the actual locations of these objects in their orbits, closer than our own Mercury to the Sun, is irrelevant to determine their actual age. They are independent structures and can evolve on their own, as well can be slowed down or sped up in their evolutionary phases due to the irradiation of a host, and their mass can be lost slower or faster so that the amount of material that is deposited on the core is diminished. This is why some rocky worlds can turn out to be smaller than others, their atmospheres were ripped away faster. Looking at the graph, we can see that the K2 - 138 evolved stars can be 65 billion + years old or completely dead rocky worlds, or even extremely tenuous gaseous evolved stars that have not had enough time to really form cores, so they will end up with unsubstantial atmospheres which are ripped away easily by hotter hosts, exposing the still forming core. This is probably what happened to Io. When Jupiter was in its red dwarf stages it ripped away the outer layers of Io which it has a hell of a lot more atmosphere to work with but at an extremely rapid rate. Basically when you see Io you are looking at the core of a star that evolved way, way too fast. This would be a good example of a star that never formed life. It was tossed around too much. If it did host life at one point, then the core material would be extremely stable, not geologically active as if it was still forming. It is essentially one of the younger moons in Jupiter's collection.\[205\]
22.2 The Trappist-1 System

Looking at the diagram below we can see that the variability of star’s sizes increases because some might have lost mass faster than others, as determined by its orbital past with hotter/colder hosts. So you could have much more evolved stars as being more massive than smaller ones. The variance increases as the star evolves due to mass loss. This represents the TRAPPIST - 1 system. Some could be ocean worlds, Earths, or dead moons of all different masses. This also means that mass alone cannot determine the stage of the star’s evolution. You have to observe the star to determine what stage of evolution it is. Unlike what is claimed on Wikipedia pages:
Stellar evolution is the process by which a star changes over the course of time. Depending on the mass of the star, its lifetime can range from a few million years for the most massive to trillions of years for the least massive, which is false. All stars live for very long times, even if they lose mass extremely fast. By living I mean they will be fluid motion in the form of an atmosphere or inner mantle motion in the form of magma, as well as the star continuously differentiating itself.

Below is a diagram showing how variable the Trappist 1 system could really be.\[120b\]
From the diagram it is apparent that we could be observing large mini-Neptunes, or dead, rocky moons more massive than the Earth. We do not quite know yet, but one thing is for sure, the Nebular hypothesis and all the dogma has no explanation for why they would be different, nor can they explain what they actually are, which is really bad. How can they be experts in their field, and not understand what they are looking at? It is like being an expert on trees, and not understanding that they are a specific type of plant.

My guess is that the Trappist-1 system has ocean worlds, dead moons and Earths. Not only do they have those, but I think there are even more rocky objects orbiting Trappist-1. All they need to do is observe for longer periods of time.
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