

thunderbolts.info

Thunderbolts Forum

For discussion of Electric Universe and Plasma Cosmology. The ideas and opinions expressed on this forum do not necessarily reflect those of T-Bolts Group Inc or The Thunderbolts Project(TM)

[Skip to content](#)

- [Board index](#) < [New Insights and Mad Ideas](#)
- [Change font size](#)

- [FAQ](#)
- [Login](#)

The General Theory of Stellar Metamorphosis

Moderators: [MGmirkin](#), [bboyer](#)

[Forum rules](#)

[Post a reply](#)

[First unread post](#) • 3103 posts • [Page 111 of 207](#) • [1](#) ... [108](#), [109](#), [110](#), **111**, [112](#), [113](#), [114](#) ... [207](#)

- [Reply with quote](#)

Re: The General Theory of Stellar Metamorphosis

 by [JeffreyW](#) » Wed Jun 04, 2014 12:28 pm

viscount aero wrote:

Sparky wrote: Their observations are all there is...Don't have to accept their conclusions...

If the science is correct and huge planets can be rocky, what does that imply? 🤔

Lots of things.

Could be that planetary formation isn't at what is assumed. I think that's been a foregone conclusion even before this finding. But if we're seeing things like ringed asteroids and far-distant comets with tails, then nothing is off-limits except for the pre-existing theories that are disproven every time another "impossible finding arises.

I think its political. They claim to not understand it, therefore nobody else on the Earth could even remotely come close to explaining it. Remember, these people don't care for understanding of nature like they claim (that's the front), they want job security and a feeling of importance.

Outsiders like myself see clearly what they are doing wrong. They are assuming a "star" and a "planet" are mutually exclusive objects. They were never mutually exclusive. As a star cools and dies losing mass, it solidifies becoming the "planet". Stellar evolution is the process of planet formation. A star is a new planet and a planet, including this really big rocky one, is just a really old star.

When geologists study the Earth they are not studying an object that is mutually exclusive of the stars in the night sky, they are studying a star that is in its last stages of evolution, a star that is really, really old. Earth is an ancient star at the end of its evolution, just like that really big rocky one they found.

Will they accept this conclusion? Nope. They have been conditioned into believing stars and planets are mutually exclusive.

<http://vixra.org/pdf/1711.0206v1.pdf> The Main Book on Stellar Metamorphosis



[JeffreyW](#)

Posts: 1856

Joined: Thu Sep 08, 2011 6:30 am

Location: Cape Canaveral, FL

[Top](#)

- [Reply with quote](#)

[Re: The General Theory of Stellar Metamorphosis](#)

by [JeffreyW](#) » Wed Jun 04, 2014 1:18 pm

I think the truth about science, and especially in astronomy, is if you figure something out that contradicts what your peers believe, you get fired. Its the way of democracy, the majority determines what is correct, not the people who are rational and clear thinking (which are the clear minority in this case).

It is better to admit confusion than to proclaim a discovery these days. Those that proclaim discovery like I have get ridiculed. If I had a post at some university, I would probably have been fired already, for making an incredibly important discovery!

Thus, there is a culture of purpose-full "bafflement". Express bafflement... or else. I mean literally. If you don't bow down to the greats and express bafflement, then you don't get to access the halls of cult science.

google this exact phrasing in the search engine, quotes included:

"scientists are baffled"

<http://vixra.org/pdf/1711.0206v1.pdf> The Main Book on Stellar Metamorphosis



[JeffreyW](#)

Posts: 1856

Joined: Thu Sep 08, 2011 6:30 am

Location: Cape Canaveral, FL

[Top](#)

- [Reply with quote](#)

[Re: The General Theory of Stellar Metamorphosis](#)

by [Sparky](#) » Wed Jun 04, 2014 3:51 pm

Well, jw is off on another rant against people who have spent their whole lives attempting to learn their field. Poor paranoids who need someone to rile against.

If the science is correct and **huge planets can be rocky, what does that imply**

Try real hard jw! That in no way is political! It may be the death blow to gtsm!!!

Or is that why you ignored what was being said and began another of your rants???! 😞

"It is dangerous to be right in matters where established men are wrong."

"Doubt is not an agreeable condition, but certainty is an absurd one."

"Those who can make you believe absurdities, can make you commit atrocities." Voltaire

[Sparky](#)

Posts: 3517

Joined: Tue Jul 20, 2010 2:20 pm

[Top](#)

- [Reply with quote](#)

[Re: The General Theory of Stellar Metamorphosis](#)

by [viscount aero](#) » Wed Jun 04, 2014 6:35 pm

*JeffreyW wrote:*I think the truth about science, and especially in astronomy, is if you figure something out that contradicts what your peers believe, you get fired. Its the way of democracy, the majority determines what is correct, not the people who are rational and clear thinking (which are the clear minority in this case).

It is better to admit confusion than to proclaim a discovery these days. Those that proclaim discovery like I have get ridiculed. If I had a post at some university, I would probably have been fired already, for making an incredibly important discovery!

Thus, there is a culture of purpose-full "bafflement". Express bafflement... or else. I mean literally. If you don't bow down to the greats and express bafflement, then you don't get to access the halls of cult science.

google this exact phrasing in the search engine, quotes included:

"scientists are baffled"

Some yes some no. It's not really about bowing down to the "halls of science" inasmuch as it is about going along to get along. Not all science is false, mind you. However cosmology is fraught with guessing. If you want a position in that field you have to go along and guess with them. If you guess against them then you end up like Halton Arp.

Arp was able to continue his work albeit in a challenged way.



[viscount aero](#)

Posts: 2379

Joined: Mon May 12, 2008 11:23 pm

Location: Los Angeles, California

- [Website](#)

[Top](#)


-
- [Reply with quote](#)

[Re: The General Theory of Stellar Metamorphosis](#)

by [seasmith](#) » Wed Jun 04, 2014 6:55 pm

by seasmith » Sat May 31, 2014 11:03 pm

JefferyW wrote:



Just looking at the image there, is it yours?

May i suggest it's missing a set of arrows: between Liquid and Plasma would be the dual-reciprocal of Oxidation<> Reduction, as with electrolyte-s for example, or gasoline.

In most chemistry, gas and liquid are compatible transition states between dark mass and bright emission, maybe in stars too.


[[Enthalpy needs another arrow as well, for diabatic or adiabatic.](#)]

by LunarSabbathTruth » Sun Jun 01, 2014 9:35 am

Image

The diagram above is simple and straightforward, but it does not reflect the way that astronomers actually measure parallax on those distant stars. In real life,

they use more indirection, adding more layers of assumptions and errors.



No response

?

Last edited by [seasmith](#) on Wed Jun 04, 2014 6:56 pm, edited 1 time in total.

[seasmith](#)

Posts: 2678

Joined: Thu Mar 27, 2008 6:59 pm

[Top](#)

- [Reply with quote](#)

[Re: The General Theory of Stellar Metamorphosis](#)

by [JeffreyW](#) » Wed Jun 04, 2014 6:55 pm

viscount aero wrote:

JeffreyW wrote: I think the truth about science, and especially in astronomy, is if you figure something out that contradicts what your peers believe, you get fired. Its the way of democracy, the majority determines what is correct, not the people who are rational and clear thinking (which are the clear minority in this case).

It is better to admit confusion than to proclaim a discovery these days. Those that proclaim discovery like I have get ridiculed. If I had a post at some university, I would probably have been fired already, for making an incredibly important discovery!

Thus, there is a culture of purpose-full "bafflement". Express bafflement... or else. I mean literally. If you don't bow down to the greats and express bafflement, then you don't get to access the halls of cult science.

google this exact phrasing in the search engine, quotes included:

"scientists are baffled"

Some yes some no. It's not really about bowing down to the "halls of science" inasmuch as it is about going along to get along. Not all science is false, mind you. However cosmology is fraught with guessing. If you want a position in that field you have to go along and guess with them. If you guess against them then you end up like Halton Arp.

Arp was able to continue his work albeit in a challenged way.

Yea, those who go against the big bang creationism have a tough road ahead of them. I guess our best option is to give people options who want to work outside of the nonsense of big bang creationism.

I am still keeping this thread going because I know for a fact that I'm not alone in this. Only, the alternative that I propose gets ridiculed and put down a lot even by the people who think big bang creationism is nonsense. It's like that Dr. Seuss book "Green Eggs and Ham". Won't you try them? Won't you try my Green Eggs and Ham?

I am "Sam-I-Am", won't you try my green eggs and ham?



They all refuse to consider the notion of star evolution being planet formation. I am 100% sure it is a major contribution to humanities' sciences. Yet, silence and the random ridicule rule the day... strange, really strange state of affairs.

<http://vixra.org/pdf/1711.0206v1.pdf> The Main Book on Stellar Metamorphosis



[JeffreyW](#)

Posts: 1856

Joined: Thu Sep 08, 2011 6:30 am

Location: Cape Canaveral, FL

[Top](#)


- [Reply with quote](#)

[Re: The General Theory of Stellar Metamorphosis](#)

by [JeffreyW](#) » Wed Jun 04, 2014 6:59 pm

seasmith wrote:

JefferyW wrote:



Just looking at the image there, is it yours?

May i suggest it's missing a set of arrows: between Liquid and Plasma would be the dual-reciprocal of Oxidation<> Reduction, as with electrolyte-s for example, or gasoline.

In most chemistry, gas and liquid are compatible transition states between dark mass and bright emission, maybe in stars too.

No response

?

Plasma to liquid and liquid to plasma sounds interesting. I do not know how to respond to that. So you mean plasma could skip the gaseous state and go directly to liquid? What would you call that? I did not respond because I do not know. You stumped me. I never considered that before.

Attack in that direction, I think you will find a lot of good stuff. Plasma chemistry too, that's a whole vast subject itself. Not gonna lie, that is way way way over my head.
<http://vixra.org/pdf/1711.0206v1.pdf> The Main Book on Stellar Metamorphosis



[JeffreyW](#)

Posts: 1856

Joined: Thu Sep 08, 2011 6:30 am

Location: Cape Canaveral, FL


[Top](#)

- [Reply with quote](#)

[Re: The General Theory of Stellar Metamorphosis](#)

by [viscount aero](#) » Wed Jun 04, 2014 7:02 pm

The irony is that, particularly lately, with the discoveries the latest "impossible objects," they are disproving the big bang right in front of their own eyes. But they're not outright admitting to it. Yet the observations unequivocally disprove the big bang theory. Their semantic dodging is entertaining.



[viscount aero](#)

Posts: 2379

Joined: Mon May 12, 2008 11:23 pm

Location: Los Angeles, California

- [Website](#)

[Top](#)

- [Reply with quote](#)

[Re: The General Theory of Stellar Metamorphosis](#)

 by [seasmith](#) » Wed Jun 04, 2014 7:13 pm

a

JeffreyW wrote:

What would you call that?

That was the intent of the "examples", crude as they are:

'electrolytic action' would be ionized 'plasma' to liquid / gas, and igniting gasoline could be considered liquid to plasma ...

[disclaimer- am Not a chemist, and the entire genre is hyper-way above my head. just looking at readily apparent physical states and some fairly logical conclusions]

s

[seasmith](#)

Posts: 2678

Joined: Thu Mar 27, 2008 6:59 pm

[Top](#)

- [Reply with quote](#)

[Re: The General Theory of Stellar Metamorphosis](#)

 by [JeffreyW](#) » Wed Jun 04, 2014 8:46 pm

seasmith wrote:^a

JeffreyW wrote:

What would you call that?

That was the intent of the "examples", crude as they are:

'electrolytic action' would be ionized 'plasma' to liquid / gas, and igniting gasoline could be considered liquid to plasma ...

[disclaimer- am Not a chemist, and the entire genre is hyper-way above my head. just looking at readily apparent physical states and some fairly logical conclusions]

s

I really have to look into that.

I do know that geologists ignore basic thermodynamic phase transitions already, such as gas deposition (gas directly to solid material). They just say rocks become other rocks, forgetting that there are other states of matter entirely that we find in the galaxy. Gas deposition at higher pressures and temperatures are what create crystalline structures such as quartz and mica, but geologists and astronomers never come to the logical conclusion: The gas temps and pressures needed to make granite (quartz, mica, feldspar crystals), would be much, much higher than what the Earth's current atmosphere allows for. In other words, we shouldn't even be finding granite on the surface of the Earth, it should only exist deep in the Earth according to their theories. Granite on the surface (literally comprising the surface) means Earth had a gigantic atmosphere at one point, it simply had to be a gas giant, with a very tiny core with which material will deposit on over many millions of years.

I guess what I'm saying is that we should focus on what we already understand, because the stuff we understand is still ignored by astronomers, astrophysicists and geologists. They would rather misdirect you with big bang nonsense than seriously consider the ramifications of the very basics of thermodynamics! When gases lose energy they combine into solids and liquids! Gas giants become small, solid worlds!

I guess in all seriousness, this understanding is treated as a joke. We are told the universe came from nothing (which is the real joke), and the very basics of thermodynamics are violated in almost every way by their weird creationism fantasies. It is really, really weird the mess we inherited.

<http://vixra.org/pdf/1711.0206v1.pdf> The Main Book on Stellar Metamorphosis



[JeffreyW](#)

Posts: 1856

Joined: Thu Sep 08, 2011 6:30 am

Location: Cape Canaveral, FL

[Top](#)

- [Reply with quote](#)

[Re: The General Theory of Stellar Metamorphosis](#)

by [Sparky](#) » Fri Jun 06, 2014 6:16 am

Granite on the surface (literally comprising the surface) means Earth had a gigantic atmosphere at one point, it simply had to be a gas giant, with a very tiny core

You are doing what standard theorists do, squeeze observations to fit a foregone conclusion. 😏

EU theory says that all matter is possibly made by electrical activity. gtsm has no validity when all of the observational evidence is considered. 😏

"It is dangerous to be right in matters where established men are wrong."

"Doubt is not an agreeable condition, but certainty is an absurd one."

"Those who can make you believe absurdities, can make you commit atrocities." Voltaire

[Sparky](#)

Posts: 3517

Joined: Tue Jul 20, 2010 2:20 pm

[Top](#)

- [Reply with quote](#)

[Re: The General Theory of Stellar Metamorphosis](#)

by [Sparky](#) » Fri Jun 06, 2014 7:19 am

jw

I am "Sam-I-Am", won't you try my green eggs and ham?



They all refuse to consider the notion of star evolution being planet formation. **I am 100% sure it is a major contribution to humanities' sciences.** Yet, silence and the random ridicule rule the day... strange, really strange state of affairs.

Your best argument so far, for gtsm... 😄

Unable to accept reality. What do they call that? 😏

"It is dangerous to be right in matters where established men are wrong."

"Doubt is not an agreeable condition, but certainty is an absurd one."

"Those who can make you believe absurdities, can make you commit atrocities." Voltaire

[Sparky](#)

Posts: 3517

Joined: Tue Jul 20, 2010 2:20 pm

[Top](#)

- [Reply with quote](#)

[Re: The General Theory of Stellar Metamorphosis](#)

by [JeffreyW](#) » Mon Jun 09, 2014 3:27 pm

To Telluric Current,

Thank you so much for making this video.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XPjtPYNc48U>

Your efforts are not going unnoticed. To the readers and subscribers of new ideas, please use discernment, my own ideas tend to be on the fringe and some are very much incorrect, it is up to you to determine what is sensible.

<http://vixra.org/pdf/1711.0206v1.pdf> The Main Book on Stellar Metamorphosis



[JeffreyW](#)

Posts: 1856

Joined: Thu Sep 08, 2011 6:30 am

Location: Cape Canaveral, FL

[Top](#)

- [Reply with quote](#)

[Re: The General Theory of Stellar Metamorphosis](#)

by [viscount aero](#) » Mon Jun 09, 2014 3:45 pm

*JeffreyW wrote:*To Telluric Current,

Thank you so much for making this video.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XPjtPYNc48U>

Your efforts are not going unnoticed. To the readers and subscribers of new ideas, please use discernment, my own ideas tend to be on the fringe and some are very much incorrect, it is up to you to determine what is sensible.

Great video.

I love the earth's oceanic current animations. Is that available on its own somewhere?



[viscount aero](#)

Posts: 2379

Joined: Mon May 12, 2008 11:23 pm

Location: Los Angeles, California

- [Website](#)

[Top](#)

-
- [Reply with quote](#)

[Re: The General Theory of Stellar Metamorphosis](#)

by [JeffreyW](#) » Mon Jun 09, 2014 4:05 pm

viscount aero wrote:

*JeffreyW wrote:*To Telluric Current,

Thank you so much for making this video.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XPjtPYNc48U>

Your efforts are not going unnoticed. To the readers and subscribers of new ideas, please use discernment, my own ideas tend to be on the fringe and some are very much incorrect, it is up to you to determine what is sensible.

Great video.

I love the earth's oceanic current animations. Is that available on its own somewhere?

I saw them too. I have no idea. hahahaha, I'm just in shock right now that someone would take it upon themselves to make a quick video. I am quite happy because of it and am feeling a great sense of relief. I don't want this understanding to die with me.

<http://vixra.org/pdf/1711.0206v1.pdf> The Main Book on Stellar Metamorphosis



[JeffreyW](#)

Posts: 1856

Joined: Thu Sep 08, 2011 6:30 am

Location: Cape Canaveral, FL

[Top](#)

[Previous](#)[Next](#) Display posts from previous: Sort by

[Post a reply](#)

3103 posts • [Page 111 of 207](#) • [1](#) ... [108](#), [109](#), [110](#), **[111](#)**, [112](#), [113](#), [114](#) ... [207](#)

[Return to New Insights and Mad Ideas](#)

Jump to:

Who is online

Users browsing this forum: No registered users and 2 guests

- [Board index](#)
- [The team](#) • [Delete all board cookies](#) • All times are UTC - 8 hours [[DST](#)]

Powered by [phpBB](#) © 2000, 2002, 2005, 2007 phpBB Group