

Correcting the False Worldview of Chondrites with Stellar Metamorphosis

Jeffrey J. Wolynski
Jeffrey.wolynski@yahoo.com
December 30, 2017
Rockledge, FL 32955

Abstract: Chondrites in the year 2017 are still accepted and interpreted as being formed from dust in the early solar system just as they were in 1987, before the age of Astrons and before stellar metamorphosis theory was developed (the author was only 2 years old). The replacement interpretation is presented and shows the reader where mainstream science went wrong, and where alternative science is correct.

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.