

Stars Do Not Transfer Mass, Can Planets Survive Stellar Evolution?

Jeffrey J. Wolynski
Jeffrey.wolynski@yahoo.com

May 6, 2020
Rockledge, FL 32922

Abstract: To make sure astrophysics remains coherent and consistent, I correct the assumption of astrophysicists in their claim that mass can be transferred between stars. As well, I answer the question, “can planets survive stellar evolution”. The answers and reasoning are straight forward, observed and explained using stellar metamorphosis and observations used well into the year 2020.

When a star is born, the coherency principle makes it impossible for stars to form anything of significance after they are born.

<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/8c90/e8b9a8ed6b445737f60e110020408a74ce0b.pdf>

What this means specifically is that any claim of a “planet” forming from the remains of star birth is wishful thinking. Doubly, since no Earth or even small meteoroid sized object can form from the remains of a star being born, it stands to reason that mass transfer from a younger star to an older star barely registers as being significant. Think about it. The Sun ejects matter in all directions, mostly hydrogen and helium. How does something like the Sun, with its extremely energetic particles make an orbiting object gain any significant mass? Especially, when that older smaller object would lose any “gained mass” in the form of hydrogen or helium plasma as soon as it came in contact, due to photoevaporation? Mass gain from a host is theoretical wishful thinking at best, irrational rainy day conjecture at worst, similar to black holes.

The solution is easy and ties into the realization that mass loss is a basic principle of stellar evolution, and leads us to answer the question, can planets survive stellar evolution? The answer is not what you would think. In fact, the planet is the highly evolved/dead star. The planet can survive stellar evolution, because the planet is the highly evolved star! So of course a planet can survive stellar evolution, because that is what a star becomes! The two objects are not mutually exclusive. Planet formation is stellar evolution! Yet, the assumption that planets and stars are mutually exclusive objects continues, regardless if it has been summarily falsified in total by Kepler many years ago, and continues to be falsified by TESS even today!

The paper linked here: <http://archive.is/Pv7ww> was written in 2007, a full four years before I started writing about stellar metamorphosis, so the authors simply did not know. So I’ll give them the benefit of a doubt. It is 13 years later though, they have no excuse to not be aware of this discovery. Their argument was that stars in gas giant phases will disintegrate if caught by a much younger hotter star, which is reasonable. Stars in gas giant phases have not been able to build up large solid cores similar to the Earth, their material is mostly gaseous. It is easily ripped apart because it still has left over heat from earlier stages of evolution, and the gas is at a high enthalpy (heat). It doesn’t take much to burn away what is already hot in other words. Much older/dead stars though are a different story. A really hot young O type star will have a difficult time ripping apart something like Mercury. It is solid, so similar to melting down a huge ingot of steel, you have to get it hot first, and then hotter until it starts to melt. Even then the molten steel won’t just become a vapor. You have to boil it, and that’s just on the surface! Mercury is

~2,400 kilometers in radius, you're not going to just simply boil that sucker away in a billion years. Check out the Moon if you want proof of it not just "going away".

So that the reader gets their monies worth, it has been discovered that stars are young hot planets (planets are the highly evolved dead stars). The theory that explains it is stellar metamorphosis, or GTSM.

