## Astrophysicists do not Understand Communication

Jeffrey J. Wolynski August 7, 2013 Jeffrey.wolynski@yahoo.com Cocoa, FL 32922

Abstract: It has been assumed for some time that Earth was the center of the universe and that its study was completely independent of the stars. This faulty assumption has lead scientists to continually draw up confusing theories of stellar evolution that do not make any sense. As well their definitions are counter to consistency itself, thus are unscientific. We will see that the problems with astrophysics are rooted in language itself.

Before humans had telescopes it was assumed that the Earth was the center of the universe. It was immovable, unchanging, solid structure that was different than the heavens above. This mentality is still harbored even in the 21st century by confused astrophysicists. We can see this confusion in their theories of star evolution that do not include objects that are mostly liquid and solid structure such as the Earth.

The study of the Earth is kept as a mutually exclusive area of study called "geophysics" and "geology". These two fields of research go over the physics involved with the formation, structure and evolution of the Earth. The processes are both uniformitarian (mostly unchanging) and catastrophic (mostly quickly changing as in the case of electrical phenomenon, earthquakes and tsunamis). As we shall see though, it has not occurred to the astrophysicists that Earth itself is in outer space, as well it is the ending stages of a single stars' evolution. [1][2][3] This fact is ignored for very simple reasons, and one example for the root of this mentality is in their labeling of elements and of their neglecting the basic rules of communication and consistency.

To astrophysicists stars are helium and hydrogen but this leaves a gigantic problem, there are hundreds of other elements and compounds such as carbon, nitrogen, silicon, iron, gold, lead, bismuth, uranium, carbon dioxide, water, etc. They also have their own transitive groups in which they act similar to other elements from a chemical standpoint, but are different in their own right as some are more reactive than others. They are known to form a multitude of compounds and structures that even act differently together than they would as a whole, such as in the case of water, which is hydrogen and oxygen. These elements even have different overall classifications such as metals, noble gases, halogens, transition metals, etc. As we shall see though, the astrophysicists ignore these differences of elements, and even what happens when they combine with each other!

To astrophysicists, carbon, argon, oxygen, fluorine, krypton, neon, phosphorus, sulfur and bromine are all metals. As a matter of fact they believe that all elements that are not helium/hydrogen are metals. This is a very strange state of affairs because anybody with basic understanding of nature knows oxygen is not a metal! With this kind of irresponsible, inconsistent definition making we can not expect too much from these people. They ignore all of chemistry!

The reader now understands why astrophysicists are confused they ignore all of chemistry and even the Earth itself! They are conditioned in graduate school to believe that these fields of study are below them and can be brushed aside for pure mathematics. Clump all elements and compounds that are not helium and hydrogen into one group, ignore the Earth, write a bunch of math equations that are rooted in the idea that space and time are physical and you will make a great astrophysicist!

Wolynski, Jeffrey (2012). Stellar Metamorphosis: An Alternative for the Star Sciences. <a href="http://vixra.org/pdf/1303.0157vC.pdf">http://vixra.org/pdf/1303.0157vC.pdf</a>.
Abruzzo, Anthony (2008). Are Planets the End Products Rather than the By-Products of Stellar Evolution?. The General Science Journal <a href="http://gsjournal.net/Science-Journals/Research%20Papers-Astrophysics/Download/1160">http://gsjournal.net/Science-Journals/Research%20Papers-Astrophysics/Download/1160</a>.

[3] Oparin, Alexander (1924). The Origin of Life. http://www.valencia.edu/~orilife/textos/The%20Origin%20of%20Life.pdf.