

The Conservation of Mass and Stars in the General Theory

Jeffrey J. Wolynski
Jeffrey.wolynski@yahoo.com
February 2, 2018
Rockledge, FL 32955

Abstract: The meaning of conservation of mass is given and applied to stars. This paper completely destroys all past theories of stellar evolution except for 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."

The above 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 reader, they are delusional.

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 absurd! 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. 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.

1. Global Thermodynamic Characteristics:

a. Type of thermodynamic system:

We see the star: so it cannot be an isolated system. Historically, stars have been modeled as closed systems: only radiative (energy) fluxes.
 Hack's (1969) summary of stars with observed/inferred mass-fluxes shows

The reader should wonder. Why on Earth would they model stars as closed systems? Well, because the rate of mass loss is too little to have any real significance to the 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**'ed 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. Physicists should really try to UNDERSTAND what they are talking about, before moving on to their careers, or else they will perpetuate falsehoods such as planets and stars being mutually exclusive.

