

# "Rings of a Super Saturn" as Published in *Scientific American* vs. Stellar Metamorphosis

Jeffrey J. Wolynski  
jeffrey.wolynski@yahoo.com  
January 4, 2016  
Cocoa, FL 32922

Abstract: An overview of an article published in the January, 2016 issue of *Scientific American* in opposition to stellar metamorphosis theory is presented.

The authors' writing in black, the article quotes are in purple and italicized.

*"Much astronomy takes place in the offices and observatories where scientists work. But if you want to find the most exciting theories, you need to go where guards are lowered and wilder ideas can roam free."*

I think this is a correct statement, but it is coming from someone who works in the field, I'd consider the wild ideas he has the capacity to consider to be quite tame, albeit just inside of accepted theory, meaning, not so wild. The wild he is considering is a semi-feral house cat or two, not a Siberian tiger in its natural habitat, or a rare snow leopard leaping down the side of a mountain to catch dinner in sub-zero temperatures. Let us understand what he is considers "roam[ing] free" to be. If experts do not consider you a crank/crackpot then you are more than likely tame.

*"Along the way, we found not only a ring system larger than Saturn's but also what seems to be a newborn moon."*

I am okay with them finding a ring system larger than Saturn's (much, much larger), but claiming there is a newborn moon is stretching it. Not only that but in stellar metamorphosis (SM) any type of object found in the galaxy comprised of rocks/minerals/solid iron/nickel is immediately considered to be very, very old material. The firm reasoning is in basic geology. It takes considerable amounts of time,

pressure and heat to form rocks and minerals, or even the Thompson structures found in meteorites. Saying rocks just clump together in outer space neglects basic geology...what process formed the rocks absent pressure and heat in the vacuum to begin with? Let us not get ahead of ourselves here. To astronomers rocky, gaseous and plasmatic material in large quantities which comprise stars and their older remains are all very close in age. Not only that, but if the objects orbit each other then they are all the same age. When a beetle is orbiting your head, does it make it the same age as you? Why do we look at Earth and assume it's the same age as the Sun, just because it is in a similar locale, galactically speaking? In SM, hot bright plasmatic objects are young, gaseous ones are middle aged, and rocky/solid metal objects are very old. Radiometrically dating the meteorites that we have found on the ground, and even the ground itself shows this. Any other reasoning would be in denial of basic physical philosophy. Set a rock next to a blazing campfire, note which one lasts longer. It is not much of a thought experiment if you will, but it certainly applies in this case. Even if the Sun were nuclear powered as claimed, the rocks of the Earth will still last much, much longer. Two ancient dead Earths orbit the Sun, they are called Mercury, Venus and Mars.

*"The light curve did suggest that J1407 was a young, rapidly spinning star, but it also held other, more intriguing information."*

Whether or not a star is rapidly spinning is irrelevant to determine its age. If a star is young, it has a light curve in SM. Old stars (astrons) do not have light curves, they are comprised of rocks and minerals and are differentiated with iron/nickel cores. So put in perspective, the fact that it has a light curve suggests that it is a young star, as it is still hot and vibrant as opposed to much older stars which are stable, have solid surfaces with water, and are generally life friendly such as Earth. Dead stars do not have light curves or strong global magnetic fields, such as Venus and Mercury, but that is for later.

*"Further studies of this unique system promise to reveal new, unprecedented details of how planets and moons form around other stars."*

Approaching the issue inside of a false paradigm will not yield answers. You have to change the way you view the problem and question the assumptions. The theory you use will determine what you can see. Using false theory means you will not see very much.

*"If we were right, the gargantuan planetary rings would be the first found outside of our own solar system."*

Not so fast. Astronomers have already found gargantuan planetary rings, they are called

"protoplanetary disks". Which begs the question, when does a planetary ring stop being planetary and become a protoplanetary disk? Are they not the same things? Again, this mirrors the issue. Stars are young planets they are both termed "astrons". A protoplanetary disk is nothing but a debris disk, which is also nothing but a planetary ring. Some are bigger than others, most dissipate as the material falls out of orbit, some are recent and glow in the infrared, some do not. They all signal destruction, which goes back to the claim of a new born moon. It is more than likely the remains of an impact event which lost its material and formed the ring to begin with, a giant shrapnel field of an object which was partly destroyed if anything, far from being a newborn moon. They are observing a violent, nasty collision crime scene of a pre-existing object slamming into another pre-existing object. Of course, this is never mentioned in the article, destruction is not quite understood in astronomy though it is claimed to be. The author was in artillery in the Marines, and knows that when things collide with explosive inertia, they do not make bigger objects, they make smaller ones. Again, physical philosophy is paramount, but ignored. It is suggested that astronomers seek out Marines so they can relay the explosive events and what they do to matter. Experience with these events can give astronomers a much richer understanding of nature than staring at math equations and solving for x.

*"Given its estimated age--only 16 million years--any gas-giant planet around it would still be glowing brightly in infrared light from the heat of its formation."*

The gas giant could be glowing in infrared light from the heat of its formation, and if it is, this is correct and has no problem fitting in with SM if you fit its formation as starting out as a much bigger, hotter, brighter star. The bright star in the center is probably only 16 million years old, sure as well has no issues inside of SM. But the gas giant orbiting it is actually much older than its orbiting host, they are definitely NOT the same age. It is a much older brown dwarf if it is glowing in infrared light clearly, which was adopted by its host... again, its new adoption probably caused it to swing a pre-existing object out of its orbit to then smash against another pre-existing object forming the shrapnel field called "planetary disk" which is so massive. Consistency in theory is paramount and available if astronomers wish to see Siberian tigers in their natural environment.

*"It is thought that Saturn once had larger rings, but the small particles at the system's outer edges clumped together through their mutual gravity in a runaway process that formed some of the Saturnian moons familiar to us now. This vista would have been as beautiful as it was fleeting--any observer would have been lucky to live in just the right slice of cosmic time to see it."*

Rings forming into giant spherical moons? This "rings" that all too familiar bell, "how exactly did the rings lose their angular momentum?" Glossing over the same problem as the protoplanetary disk theory again. Ignore, ignore, ignore. Plus they make formation of a moon as a fleeting process? This is poor physical philosophy. It takes millions of years for a mountain to form, how does an object many millions of times larger just clump from tiny dust grains and rocks with gravity alone in a fleeting process? This reeks of creationism, and has a backdrop of catastrophism. Forming an object as large as a Saturnian moon does not happen in a fleeting moment, destroying something that is larger than it, yes, but clumping dust and pebbles together in a supposed runaway process and BAM there you have it? Where do we insert the free miracle? Do the rocks form absent their chemistry of formation or they clump together absent losing their angular momentum?

*"Wreathed with fans of debris produced by collisions, the ring plane would be awash with undulating waves of clumping material."*

In SM the rings were formed from a collision event, they are not going to form back into the object that was destroyed creating them. Astronomers can destroy and create at the same time using the same physical mechanism apparently, like an artillery round exploding and then reassembling back into a smooth bullet shaped shell, with gravity alone mind you!

*"Proving the existence of moons around extrasolar gas giants would greatly expand the possibilities for places where life could exist."*

This is easy for SM to explain. They have already been found. A star is a young gas giant, and they have been found with "exoplanets", which are going to lose their mass to photoevaporation and collision events (which create rings) becoming what are called "exo-moons". They are already proven if you will, it is all a matter of what theory you use to explain how they form/evolve. Use SM, its already done, use false protoplanetary disk theory, you'll be searching for a while longer.

I hope this paper helps people understand that semi-feral cats are not tigers.

Kenworthy, Matthew. "Rings of a Super Saturn." Scientific American Jan. 2016: 34-41. Web.

