

# Counter-deception in Astronomy: Unmasking the Second Greatest Astronomical Deception

Jeffrey J. Wolynski  
Jeffrey.wolynski@yahoo.com  
March 9, 2019  
Rockledge, FL 32955

**Abstract:** In this paper I will try my best to explain how nature has deceived millions of scientists and researchers, as well as how those very same scientists and researchers spread the deception. The deception is as follows, it is believed that a "star" is something mutually exclusive of "planet". It is the second greatest astronomical deception because the greatest was the belief that Earth was the center of the Solar System. Unmasking the Second Greatest astronomical deception needed more data, but now requires the humility to acknowledge the deception. Now that the data has already been obtained and the discovery made, we can review how the deception took place. There is a lot more to this than what I will write about here, this is just to serve as a back drop for future reference and research into what went wrong. It is suggested for the reader to study counter-deception and intelligence gathering processes in the political and military sphere as well as the scientific, as they are all very, very similar.

It is an unintentional and purposeless deception on nature's part to confuse millions of scientists and researchers. This is a good assumption because to unmask the deception what was needed was more advanced imaging technology, such as CCD's inside of large digital cameras, computers, and space telescopes themselves which followed rocket technology, along with a backdrop of thousands of inventions and processes that shouldn't be listed as it would defeat the purpose of this paper. To unmask the Second Greatest deception we needed a long history of technological advancements, coupled with thousands of brilliant engineers and scientists. Unfortunately engineering and theory development can sometimes not be enough to unmask deception, especially when there is a secondary type of unintentional deception taking place.


There are two basic parts to the second major astronomical deception that can be explained here. Firstly, nature has kept the overwhelming majority of evolved stars completely hidden from view. They are just too small to image, as well do not shine as bright their younger counterparts. This is called **dissimulation, which is hiding the real**. Operationally, dissimulation is done by hiding one or more of the characteristics that make up a distinctive pattern of a real thing, in this case the stars being on a mass continuum as they evolve and lose mass and energy all the way down to Mercury size, and smaller (dead stars). The vast majority of the dead stars are hidden and do not shine, thus it follows that that without the information required to make an accurate analysis of this intelligence, there can be no accurate analysis. This means the original deception can be set up with a secondary type, and completely masked by unwitting dupes, the astronomers. This is the foregone conclusion.

With deception detection, you do not need ALL of the hidden information. The big picture will usually become clear even before all the pieces are put into place in the correct manner. You just need *enough* information to unmask the deception. This is similar to a large table top puzzle. You do not need all the pieces to see the greater picture, you just need enough. This is great for scientific discovery as well, as was in Mendeleev's case of the prediction of the

missing elements in his periodic table, as well in my case as I can predict that stars will be found in all size ranges between all others on a continuum, all the way down to dead moons and wandering smashed up remains called asteroids/meteoroids. They are there, yet Nature has hid them from view since before humans were human. Nature is the main deceiver for the first part.

Secondly, there is **simulation, which is showing the false**, this is the part of the deception astronomers participated in, alongside the dissimulation (albeit purposeless) that Nature took part in. Astronomers had zero data on exoplanets before the 1990's, and a whole hell of a lot of data on their younger counterparts, labeled stars. This means the intelligence required to make an accurate analysis was destined to be heavily skewed from the get go. Astronomers only had intelligence on the youngest of objects, not the middle aged or the old ones. One does not have to go to extreme lengths to explain what happened next. They invented theories and models to explain away what they believed is true concerning the data they had on stars, yet this has become a very, very big mistake. If the majority of the intelligence was hidden for the entire process of hypothesis forming, then how could have they put together a meaningful picture? They had essentially zero data on the most evolved stars (exoplanets)!

That being said, astronomers have actually been engaged in **simulation**. Astronomers are unwittingly presenting false knowledge, by showing one or more characteristics that compose the distinctive pattern of a false thing, as outlined in the stellar life cycle below. Nature is engaged in dissimulation while simultaneously astronomers are engaged in simulation.



What makes this even more of a mess is that not only are astronomers engaging in simulation (showing the false), most of the data on actual evolved stars is still hidden, regardless if it is coming in with the Kepler space telescope and others. Nature is still engaged in dissimulation. This is so perfect, because for a highly advanced deception on the whole, both dissimulation and simulation are ideally placed together for the desired result. What has happened in short reader, is that the distinctive pattern of a real process was hidden, the astronomers took the stuff that wasn't hidden and drew up false conclusions and now are wondering why they cannot explain how planets form in any capacity. No wonder they will

never understand how planets are formed. They were deceived by Nature, then they unwittingly engaged in self-deception by spreading dissimulation, a.k.a. false knowledge.

1. Nature hid her data on old stars (exoplanets).
2. Scientists drew up ideas concerning the young stars that are visible and other phenomenon that might be unrelated, and made it a closed loop where most processes are visible (highly unlikely). (the above illustration).
3. So now they do not understand how stars evolve because they have tricked themselves with misinformation (canonized misinformation by the way), and they do not understand how exoplanets are formed, because they already had the false preconceptions for how stars evolve (regardless if planets ARE the evolved/dead stars).

**"Both simulation and dissimulation are always present together in any single act of deception. Nothing is ever just hidden; something is always shown in its stead,** even if only implicitly-- the housewife who hides her money in the cookie jar is pretending (showing) she has no money at home; or the machine-gun team that hides under camouflage netting pretending there are no machine guns here. It is the two in combination (hiding and showing) that misdirect the attention and interest of the target, inducing it to form misperceptions (false hypotheses) about the real nature of what is impending."

- Excerpt of Bill & Waley's "*Matrix of Deception*"

The above statement is so very true in this major deception unmasking, of which both Nature and astronomers participated in. Nothing is ever just hidden, something is always shown in its stead. In the case of understanding how planets are formed, it is not we just need bigger and better telescopes to find the hidden parts (counter the dissimulation of Nature), we also need to be detectives and point out where we have accepted misinformation, and have shown it as true for many years. The false knowledge shown in the "planet formation's" stead is how stars evolve. That's the trick! The dupes of astronomy aren't catching on because of preconceptions and assumptions. The young planets were never "just hidden", they are hidden in plain sight but were masked with the simulation of astronomers (we were told they are a completely different type of object)! The young planets are the stars!

Adding to this is **Whaley's Law of Cognitive Triangulation**. From what I have personally experienced, astronomers are trained to all believe the same root assumptions and the assumptions of any subset group regardless of proximity will share those assumptions. This is both good for group cohesion and goal driven activity, but bad when a serious consequence to a change in any assumption is registered or noticed by a group member. Since it's the assumptions of the group which give it clarity and cohesiveness, any change in the assumptions will cause significant distress inside the group, and the group member will either change their assumption to match, hide their real thoughts and not speak up or else the group will reject them. Therefore what happens is that a sort of tunnel vision is formed off social pressure that makes it so that the group members only see the world with one set of eyes, with one vision, with one over all worldview. Of course any reasoned person can see issue with this, luckily we have a simple

heuristic to mitigate that. (Astronomy follows the same pattern as the modern echo chambers of political discourse so pervasive in our society, but I'm not going into that.)

No deception that relies on visual (cognitive) characteristics (of simulation or dissimulation) can display or hide any of them from all perspectives (angles of vision, lines of sight, or cognition). As we saw though in the first few paragraphs of this paper, the astronomers have both issue with simulation, Nature hides her data, and simulation, they have created a truth that was misrepresented on grossly incomplete data. Not only that, but astronomers have root assumptions that are shared inside of their group. So not only are they being deceived by nature, they are deceiving themselves and have no means of changing the assumptions that are deceiving them. Making this even worse is that any seemingly obtuse angle that can view the issue from another vantage point is labeled as someone who is uneducated or ill-informed, or given the classic term "crank" or "crack pot". Let me give an example of triangulation:

"There were two of us in the hunt [for Jack the Ripper]. When two men set out to find a golf ball in the rough, they expect to come across it where the straight lines marked in their mind's eye to it, from their original positions, crossed. In the same way, when two men set out to investigate a crime mystery, it is where their researches intersect that we have a result."

-Victorian medical detective, Dr. Joe Bell (no year)

As we can see in the above example, the golf ball can be found if two people approach it from different angles. If three do so from another angle then the likelihood it will be found is ever greater, but that is the issue with astronomers. They are only trained to look at the stars with one cognitive angle, as well no astronomer is trained to consider different assumptions. They are trained to accept assumptions based off the socially accepted layered deception (masquerading as truth and true facts), their long history of having a lack of intel concerning the most evolved stars (dissimulation) and their false knowledge concerning star evolution (simulation), which was invented conjecture at the onset. It is an absolute dead end, unless they can learn to accept other cognitive angles as valid, which is socially unacceptable, as well as strange. Why wouldn't someone want another angle in order to solve a mystery? It seems very paranoid and defensive. Only working astronomers can "find golf balls"? Ridiculous sounding isn't it?

Only accepting their own conditioned worldview is extreme tunnel vision, and prevents seeing the mystery from multiple angles, which is why it is instantaneously obvious to anybody that first learns perspective I have to offer and then tries to make sense of the simulation provided by the dogma. It is the work of a true detective to be able to challenge your own assumptions, and to find where you might have been deceived. It is a work of a detective who is in constant understanding of their own biases that can solve these mysteries, and astronomers do not have that ability because they don't realize they have been unwittingly deceived by the people who had no intention to deceive (their professors and earlier astronomers), and by Nature itself. For those who are new to this theory, the second deception being unmasked by stellar metamorphosis, I have placed a graph at the bottom called the Wolynski-Taylor diagram. It shows that stars and planets are not mutually exclusive. There are not "types" of worlds, they are only stages of a world. We are looking at a frame in a movie when we view the stars, if we play the movie by looking at many more frames, we should see them evolve into what is most familiar to us, the Earth, planets and moons themselves.

THE WOLYNSKI-TAYLOR DIAGRAM  
"Luminous stars cool to become non-luminous exoplanets."

