


Stellar Metamorphosis versus Establishment Dogma: The Evolution of Stars

Jeffrey J. Wolynski
Jeffrey.wolynski@yahoo.com
February 12, 2014
Cocoa, FL 32922


Abstract: Two diagrams and an explanation for the public are provided which outline the main differences between establishment dogma and stellar metamorphosis in their predictions of star evolution.



Above is the standard solar model. So many problems with this model are presented, including but not limited to:

1. Absence of red dwarfs.
2. Absence of brown dwarfs.
3. Absence of black dwarfs.
4. Absence of blue giants.
5. Absence of grey dwarfs.
6. The completely false position of planetary nebula as being after red stars.
7. The birth of the Sun absent a gravitating body.
8. The lifetime of a star being determined by its mass, even though stars lose their mass over their lifetimes.

The problems are endless. To correct all this dogma the author had to spend a considerable amount of time and research. So for the public and the scientific community at large the proper evolution of stars is provided below so we can pull ourselves out of the dark ages again.



A-Star is born via nebula
 B,C,D-Star expands as it releases heat in most effective orientation
 E,F-Blue star, very hot and bright
 G-White star (also C,D stages)
 H- Yellow star (Sun)
 I- Orange Dwarf

J-Red dwarf
 K-Auburn dwarf
 L-Brown Dwarf
 M-Grey Dwarf
 N-Blue dwarf
 O-Blue-green dwarf (Earth)
 P-Smashed up remains of dead stars/black dwarfs

All stages of star evolution and proper placement of white dwarfs, planetary nebula and red stars is included.^{[1][2][3]} The reason why this understanding will not be accepted by establishment is because they have their careers and credibility resting on false assumptions.^{[4][5]} A star evolution model is physical, not mathematical based on dogma. The star is born as a nebula, it expands from the enormous heat becomes really big and bright, and then cools and shrinks combining the elements into molecules. Establishment scientists will consider this to be pseudoscience coming from a “crank/crack pot”, so please be careful when spreading this understanding. You will get mostly just ridicule and hatred from establishment scientists like I have.

Star evolution is planet formation.

^[1] Wolynski, Jeffrey (2012). *Stellar Metamorphosis: An Alternative for the Star Sciences*.

<http://vixra.org/pdf/1303.0157vC.pdf>.

^[2] Abruzzo, Anthony (2008). *Are Planets the End Products Rather than the By-Products of Stellar Evolution?*.

The General Science Journal <http://gsjournal.net/Science-Journals/Research%20Papers-Astrophysics/Download/1160>.

^[3] Oparin, Alexander (1924). *The Origin of Life*.

<http://www.valencia.edu/~orilife/textos/The%20Origin%20of%20Life.pdf>.

^[4] <http://vixra.org/pdf/1310.0227v1.pdf>

^[5] <http://vixra.org/pdf/1310.0259v1.pdf>