Heuer's "Review of Biases and Their Implications for Deception" and Stellar Metamorphosis

Jeffrey J. Wolynski
Jeffrey.wolynski@yahoo.com
March 23, 2019
Rockledge, FL 32955

Abstract: Perceptual biases, biases in estimating probabilities, and biases in evaluating evidence are presented with their implications concerning the continuation of modern astronomical/astrophysical deception. For new readers, it has been discovered that planets are older stars (planets and stars are the same objects), yet the biases plaguing astronomers and astrophysicists continue to keep the deception that a planet is something mutually exclusive of star, indefinitely. The outline is from Richards J. Heuer, Jr., "Cognitive Factors in Deception and Counterdeception," in Daniel & Herbig (1982), 62-63, and the experience portion is my own.

Perceptual Biases

Bias #1

Perceptions are influenced by expectations. More information, and more unambiguous information, is needed to recognize an unexpected phenomenon than an expected one.

Implication

It is far easier to reinforce a target's existing preconceptions than to change them.

Experience

The unexpected phenomenon is that a person not holding an official degree in any science should make a grand scientific discovery. So more unambiguous (clear) information is needed to confirm this. This is why I'm writing so much about how the discovery was made, what its implications are and trying my best to develop it and figure out where, when, how, why and which academics got it all wrong. I will probably need to write thousands of counter-deception papers and papers outlining the importance of this discovery just to show a major scientific discovery has been made. The overwhelming majority of degree holding individuals have very strong preconceptions that run counter to what has happened. It will take many years as well, as of writing of this specific paper it has been over 7 years since the discovery was made, and academics still claim stars are mutually exclusive of planets. Astronomers,

physicists and geologists are still ignorant of the discovery, and this is a factual statement because there is no evidence of acknowledgment either online or in print, as of March 23, 2019, of stars being young planets, and/or stellar evolution being planet formation.

Bias #2

Perceptions are quick to form but resistant to change. Once an impression has been formed about an object, event, or situation, one is biased toward continuing to perceive it in the same way.

Implication

It is far easier to reinforce a target's existing preconceptions than to change them. Ability to rationalize contradictory information may offset risks of security leaks or uncontrolled channels.

Experience

This is a very powerful problem in astronomy. I say powerful, because as children we are conditioned into believing stars and planets are "different", well before any graduate work is done, before any college classes are taken, before any high school physics examinations are given, before middle school occurs even. The perception of a star being mutually exclusive of planet is a perception that is molded in elementary school. We are told the Sun is a star, and the planets orbit stars. The truth is that the planets as they are called, are the old, highly evolved Suns that no longer shine and are all different ages and stages to their own unique evolutionary history. So not only is the deception quick to form, but it happens in the mind of a child, someone who is also quick to learn.

To explain the second half of the implication, rationalization of contradictory information is easy to do. Oh its on vixra? It wasn't peer reviewed? So it cannot possibly be correct. Oh, it contradicts what we have always known to be true even as children? See? It is very, very easy to rationalize away contradictory information when it both disagrees with deep seated and early molding of preconceptions, and rationalize away channels that are uncontrolled (not peer reviewed). This is why when people say, "oh has it been peer reviewed?" is a cop out. The peer review system of publication ***is the controlled channel.*** To expect contradictory information to appear on controlled channels is irrational, and even if it does, it is easy to rationalize away as being incomplete, false or misguided because it does not match what the preconceptions are.

Bias #3

Initial exposure to ambiguous or blurred stimuli interferes with accurate perception even after more and better information becomes available.

Implication

Impact of information can be affected by the sequence used in feeding it to a target.

Experience

This bias I have come across quite often. Just presenting the theory to people online shows this all too well. If I am to present blurred stimuli such as removing the clear delineation between brown dwarf and planets (their arbitrary mass cut-off for definition sake), by stating that brown dwarfs lose mass to become high mass Jupiters, then their acceptance of the idea is more reasonable. If I blur the stimuli to a greater extent and try to warp their perception by expanding the conclusion to include the fact that high mass stars lose almost all their mass to become high mass Jupiters, then their accurate perception of the same concept becomes reduced. Even further, if I am to present the blurring as high mass stars lose almost all their mass, even all the way down to Mercury sized, dead worlds, then they are completely lost, as the stimuli is too great.

The sequence of the new stimuli presented, as it approaches the truth is less accurately perceived, due to pre-existing ideas that are already considered unambiguous (regardless if that is the real deception). It is best to present the new information in an agreeable manner first, rather than completely un-warp the perception of the academic in a single instant, so that they cannot turn back around. It is like leading someone out of cave, as in Plato's Cave, the closer their eyes get to the light the more they have to adjust. Just throwing all the light on them at once is blinding. I made this mistake so many times. Sure, I might have had the opportunity of having my preconceptions crushed into nothing and rebuilt by stepping out of the cave myself, but they haven't. They are still new, and need to be coddled at first so that they can "get it" without turning away, or get mad at me for showing the truth. As a side note some academics like their mental cave, they find security and comfort in delusion and accepted deception. So we cannot be too careful in assuming that astronomers want truth, when the fact might be they actually just want acceptance into a science group and truth is secondary. That is the conformity vs. non-conformity argument though and I won't be getting into that.

Biases in Estimating Probabilities

Bias #4

Probability estimates are influenced by availability - how easily one can imagine an event or remember instances of an event.

Implication

Employees of watch offices will generally overestimate the probability of whatever they are watching for. This leads to the cry-wolf syndrome. Cases of deception are more memorable, hence more available, than instances in which deception was not employed.

Experience

Major scientific discoveries are extremely rare. Their availability in someone's memory is therefore very low, as well they probably cannot even imagine what such an event would look like. So two ideas here before I get into the implication aspect in the Heuer list.

Academics have been conditioned into believing that major discoveries are easy to predict. It is when a whole bunch of people agree with each other at the same time, after having spent billions of dollars, and have published a paper which has hundreds of names attached, which is simultaneously heralded as valid the very second the publication is made. As if discovery thoughout history had the same backdrop!

In fact, the recent claimed discoveries of black hole waves and higgs boson exemplify the strange attitude towards what a discovery really looks like, when history shows the exact opposite. Most discoveries did not have billions of dollars poured into them, nor had hundreds of people working on the same experiment, nor were even accepted from the beginning as being important, accurate, valid or relevant to the progress of science! If anything, the attitude of academics and their ideas of what a major scientific discovery look like are heavily skewed toward recent history. This is not really surprising as the vast majority of scientists that were ever alive are alive right now. One should also wonder, with such requirements for making a modern discovery, when history tells the exact opposite tale, were the Higgs boson and black hole waves really discovered? On a side note, most murders happen by people who are related or close to family members, that is where we should look first as most detectives do. If discoveries are simple things as proven throughout human history, one should wonder what billion

dollar complications involving mental phase-locking of hundreds of researchers really are, as they sure don't look like discoveries.

Secondly, the availability of information of non-scientists making discoveries that were recorded in the history books is very low. It is doubly rare, even in the history of science that a non-scientist (or the old school natural philosopher) should make a very important discovery. How could someone of a non-science background make a major discovery? What is much more probable for making a discovery is an actual working scientist that has a large research institution funding him or her. This means the probabilities for both a non-working scientist who has very few people agreeing with him, no major publication paper, no huge university backing and being accepted as soon as the discovery is presented is very, very, very low.

This means that even if the probabilities are very low, they are brushed aside completely. The facts tell a different tale though, even improbable events happen. We cannot let our ability to imagine an event or remember when an event occurred skew our accurate analysis of the probabilities that are actually there. This is mainly to address the absurd notion that I have received over the years, of "oh, if it was a major important scientific discovery, it would be instantly heralded in as a fact and you would get a Nobel Prize and you'd be famous". That would be a trifecta of rarities. I am not going to receive any prize or award for this. That is not the goal. The discovery itself is the award. If people would just get that alone, they would get where I'm coming from.

Bias #5

Probability estimates are anchored by some natural starting point, then adjusted incrementally in response to new information or further analysis. Normally they are not adjusted enough.

Implication

It is easier to reinforce a target's existing preconceptions than to change them.

Experience

The starting point from an academic's standpoint is that their education will not lead them astray. This is the problem, as their education holds the deception anchor that prevents them from understanding how stars evolve (planet formation). They have separated in their minds star from planet, thus there is no way to adjust to the new information garnered from the exoplanet (evolving star) data. Academics just chug along with the same assumptions gaining more and more confusion as the data rolls in,

not realizing it is their education that prevents them from learning. Again, it is easier to reinforce a target's (the academics) existing preconceptions than to change them. When you have group think via peer review (the controlled channel) also preventing the change, naturally no incremental adjustment can occur at all. Peer review makes it so that preconceptions have to fail spectacularly and all at once before any fundamental change can be made at all to account for any new information in a rational manner.

Bias #6

In translating subjective feelings of certainty into a probability estimate, people are often overconfident about how much they know.

Implication

Overconfidence exacerbates the impact of all the biases, as it leads to self-satisfaction and lessening of efforts to improve judgment.

Experience

This is the role graduate education fulfills in astronomy and astrophysics/geophysics. The academics transfer all their hard work and dedication into feelings of superiority over others, not realizing they are building a large confidence off nothing in particular. Their arrogance blinds them. The deception is still there, only reinforced to the point of being impossible to expose at this point. I have overviewed the simulation/dissimulation research in this paper: http://vixra.org/pdf/1903.0165v1.pdf The academics ability to perceive that they have been deceived is lessened considerably, and evidence to the contrary is ignored and brushed under the rug.

Biases in Evaluating Evidence

Bias #7

People have more confidence in conclusions drawn from a small body of consistent data than from a larger body of less consistent information.

Implication

Deceiver should control as many information channels as possible to reduce amount of discrepant information available to the target. Deception can be effective even with a small amount of information.

Experience

The small body of consistent data is the mostly flat disk the planets sit on in reference to the Sun, and the fact that the large bodies all orbit the Sun in the same direction. The large body of less consistent information is that a large percentage of exoplanets found by Kepler Space Telescope and others contradicts this. Many do not orbit their hosts in flat disks nor in the same direction, many of them are retrograde!

If you want to give confidence to astronomers and astrophysicists given them very little data to show how correct they are, and ignore the larger body of data that is inconsistent with their beliefs. This is how the concept of the Fulton Gap arised. There are actually hundreds of exoplanets discovered that sit directly between 1.5 and 2 Earth radii. There is no gap. Deception can be effective even with a small amount of information, just as long as information channels are reduced, which is of course a given, as peer review drastically reduces the number of available channels. All Fulton had to do is pick a little data, make sure it was consistent, produce the data on a single channel (best bet) and viola! Deception that a gap exists! Astronomers do this a lot. I could list hundreds of examples this is just one case I remember.

Bias #8

People have difficulty factoring the absence of evidence into their judgments.

Implication

For the deception planner, errors of omission will be less serious than errors of commission. To detect deception, analyze what inferences can be drawn from fact that some evidence is not observed.

Experience

This the BIG ONE. There was no evidence that stars remained hot, big and bright for the majority of their life spans. As it would be obvious, if astronomers were to see them, then the counter-evidence would have been apparent. It was an absence of evidence that they failed to account for. The astronomers and astrophysicists drew up conclusions concerning the entire life spans of objects under the assumption they had all the evidence required to do so. They never considered that evidence required to draw up accurate analysis of the situation would be out of reach for a long time. Now that the new evidence is coming in, the preconceptions are still there, thus leading to the

next bias. Impressions tend to persist even after the evidence on which they are based has been fully discredited. You cannot "unring" a bell.

Bias #9

Impressions tend to persist even after the evidence on which they are based has been fully discredited. You cannot "unring" a bell.

Implication

Consequences of a security leak may not be as serious as might otherwise be expected.

Experience

People tend to believe what they were conditioned into believing. This is no secret. It can be much more pronounced when that conditioning is done over time, with hours and hours of painful institutionalization via academic books and self-study.

The nebular hypothesis and all variants of it is fully discredited. Yet, it is still on Wikipedia as being the most widely accepted hypothesis concerning the formation of planets. It is a strange time we live in. This is to serve as a lesson for future researchers, it does not matter if an idea is fully discredited it will still persist. So, given the overwhelming evidence shows that the nebular hypothesis is false, one should wonder, does the evidence really matter? No it doesn't. Not in the short term at least. Not only does the evidence have to fully discredit the outdated hypothesis, it has to stay put for decades, and even when the new understanding is brought to light, many reluctant researchers will say, "there is no evidence to support the contrary conclusions".

Falsifying, discrediting and debunking ideas is not enough. I've learned this lesson really hard. I'm constantly told online that falsification holds the ultimate power over theories and hypothesis, which is not true. Social order and impressions hold precedence over evidence, those persist and have greatly more power over falsification and discrediting of evidence. In fact, I could also argue that this is why we have the concept of Justice and the court system. You cannot convict a suspect off impression and social order only, you need evidence. Yet, when the evidence is discredited, the impression and social order still persist! Scary! This bias means we have innocent men and women in the prison system right now, and killers and rapist still walking the streets. Same goes with science. We have nonsense theories and educated guesses that have been fully discredited being taught to students right now, and great theories that have explanatory power being ignored simply because they do not conform to impressions and social order.

There are more biases, this is just a few of them. I hope this paper helps people to understand how complex of an issue we are dealing with here. Science is not perfect, not by a long shot, and all the systems used to support its lack of perfection suit to deceive the unknowing, and support the potential deceivers regardless if they are complicit or ignorant of the situation. This paper isn't to say all academics are deceivers by nature, it is only to remind people that being duped is not a matter of intelligence, or any sort of intentional deception, it is a matter of learning how to detect deception. The fact is, you can deceive people without realizing you are deceiving them. Deception and intentional deception can be mutually exclusive.