

Experts are Not Always the Prepared Minds

Jeffrey J. Wolynski
December 2, 2018
Rockledge, FL 32955

Abstract: A small list outlines what future discoverers will be like. It is suggested to look out for them, as they think differently. This is a small list that is from the author's experience with the sharing of the discovery that planets are simply older, evolving and dead stars.

"In the fields of observation chance favours only the prepared mind."

-Louis Pasteur, Lecture, University of Lille (7 December 1854)

Somewhat true, but there is a strange paradox that needs to be explained. It is quite often assumed that prepared means, "educated", but this is not always the case. Being educated can block understanding. If I were to have received a first rate education at some high ranking university in Astronomy, I would have never made the discovery that stellar evolution is planet formation. I would have done the exact reverse of preparing my mind for discovery, I would have closed it. The fact that I did not receive a University education has been my single greatest career decision. Further, a prepared mind:

1. Can question assumptions.
2. Can challenge peers (is more free of peer control and pressure), without fear of reprisal, black listing or career damage, no matter how perceptively small.
3. Does not have a complete understanding of nature
4. Is willing to separate themselves in their minds from their own beliefs and educational conditioning (this is extremely difficult, most scientists cannot do this)
5. Is able to suffer criticism for thinking differently.
6. Has a mix of subjects understood, but is not an extreme expert on any one of them, being an "expert" has the tendency of becoming possibly really, really bad, because of the expert claims being based on information that is supposedly "basic" or "common knowledge". So when the basic claims are false, and the experts knowledge is based on those basic claims which are false, the entire house of cards falls. *(The example in my case is that astronomers claim to understand stellar evolution, yet they don't realize planets are ancient evolving, evolved, dead stars, this means all models taught in universities of both star evolution and planet formation are false, so what are we to make of expert opinion? It is deeply flawed and needs to be repaired. This does not mean all information is false, such as the Earth being round, or the Sun being the central object to the Solar System, it just means they made a huge mistake and need to adjust.)*

7. Can draw a distinction between common knowledge, which is what everybody believes is true, and what could be true. It is the scientist's mission to tease out the truth from common knowledge. It was common knowledge rocks couldn't come from outer space, heavier than air flight was impossible, germs did not exist, mosquitos did not carry disease, humans were not related to apes, etc. Further, it is common knowledge (albeit false) that a planet is something mutually exclusive of star, so it is only a matter of time before this is corrected as well.

8. It is best to look at a prepared mind as one that is unique. Forcing all human thought to conform to standards ruins our own individual creative problem solving skills. Think of a key that fits a specific door. You think all house keys are the same from the factory? That would be really bad. But that is how physicists train students in universities. They have to conform to standards of thought, all the keys fit the same lock. They don't want any keys to be different, yet, that is exactly what they need. A different key. It is no wonder particle physicists are in their "nightmare scenario", and astronomers still claim planet formation to be a mystery, even though it has already been solved.

9. Prepared minds deeply self examine routinely, without self-examination the scientist sort of withers away.