

Using Stellar Metamorphosis to Avoid Astronomical Pigeonholing

Jeffrey J. Wolynski

May 27, 2019

Jeffrey.wolynski@yahoo.com

Rockledge, FL 32955

Abstract: As exoplanet data is collected, astronomers need to use a theory that can guard them against the pitfalls of pigeonholing the discoveries.

The very first pigeonholing of observations came from the ancient Greeks. They divided stars that were not moving from the stars that moved, by making the terms star and "wandering star", or "planet". This simple mistake cannot be continued, or else it will cause continued confusion by expansion of the pigeonholing. Some pitfalls that the original ancient Greek pigeonholing caused are outlined:

1. Using categories that are poorly defined (e.g., because they are subjective). (The difference between "planet" and "dwarf planet" was highlighted with the Pluto problem. Is Pluto a planet or not? To pigeonhole or not to pigeonhole, that is the real question. It seems astronomers have kept with the ancient Greek tradition of pigeonholing observations, as Pluto is now defined as a "dwarf planet". Such definition is meaningless in stellar metamorphosis. It is just the remains of a dead star.)

2. Entities may be suited to more than one category.

Ocean worlds can have very thick atmospheres. Does this make them gas dwarfs or ocean worlds?

3. Entities may not fit into any available category.

Asteroids cannot be classified as "stars", but can be stellar remains, or the completely exposed disintegrating old stellar cores like 16 Psyche. Which is strange, as the word asteroid is from the word for "star-like". They are not whole stars in SM, but they are stellar remains so they have importance in the stellar ouroboros.

4. Entities may change over time, so they no longer fit the category in which they have been placed.

This is most important aspect. All stars evolve into "planets". Meaning the very original pigeonholing of planet/star causes lots of confusion in astronomy today. If you classify a blue giant as some

giant star that just disintegrates into nothing, you miss the part where it cools and becomes a large hot white star. The same goes for every single star in the universe. If you classify a brown dwarf as some "failed star", you miss the part that it was a red dwarf and shined bright enough to have a visible spectrum. They change over time and become completely observationally different, so at best they only temporarily fit the standard categories that are being created by astronomers. A good way for the reader to see where astronomers make this mistake is to look for the words, "in situ", which means "in the original place", or "in position". They can't have objects moving about and evolving greatly, they need cosmos or perfection via pigeonholing. They say "in situ" a lot because they need to believe they understand the original positions of objects, and their original sizes. Just notice where they say that phrase, and look at the pitfall #4 in this paper. They are making another mistake more than likely.

5. Attempting to discretize properties that would be better viewed as a continuum must be taken with caution.

While sorting stars from planets, it is clear they have discretized their properties, and then circled back around retroactively to try and prove the properties they originally sorted them by. A good example is when astronomers started classifying the brightnesses of "stars" by magnitude on photographic plates. Lots of work was done by early astronomers and researchers to give them all absolute and apparent magnitudes, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, etc. They made discrete magnitudes for a process that is on a continuum. In fact, no star in the universe matches exactly another star's magnitude. They can be damn close, but when you go off down the digits, for instance, 5.000023 to 5.000024, you realize it is futile.

If they had just realized that the magnitudes are not discrete, but continuous, then they would have realized there is no cut off for absolute magnitude (ipso facto no "fusion" cutoff based on subjective invented properties). The stars just get dimmer and dimmer, until their light slowly moves into the infrared spectrum, meaning they just remain hot, but not shining (brown dwarfs), until they cool off and leave the rocky/iron ball in the center called "planet". Instead, in the nuclear age they had all the uranium and plutonium and the power of ultimate war so they just lost their heads for a time. They started looking at the stars with war minds (paranoid and power hungry), and made the stars the objects that were powered by the ultimate war material, fusion power. So, yea. They went off the deep end, and their mentality bleed into the astrophysical community. Ooops. The war mentality should have been quarantined, unfortunately that would be impossible because some of the same people high up in the physics community who made the big bombs possible were the ones who also studied the stars in many cases, or worked down the hall from them.

So basically pigeonholing the magnitudes with discrete numbers in the late 1800's/early 1900's (coupled with the war-minds of the nuclear age just a short bit later), lead to us believing stars that shine and have visible magnitudes are fusion powered, and are as old as the ancient stars that we call "planets/exoplanets".