

LATEST REPORT ON THE SOLAR CYCLES

by Miles Mathis

First published December 20, 2019

OK, I have been comparing planetary charts to Sunspot charts for several months now, primarily to help me predict the finer points of the next cycle. And I have to start by admitting that I can now see why other scientists over the past 150 years have given up Sun cycles as a result of planetary influences. Once you get in, it becomes complex very fast, and if you aren't sure of your theory and mechanics, you will probably get frustrated and move on. However, I *am* sure of my theory and mechanics, so I have kept at it where others have bailed. This persistence has served me well in the past, as you may know, and it continues to serve me well here. The other thing that is keeping me going is my spin mechanics, which I have taken far beyond any other similar mechanics of the past. You have seen my improvements to the spin mechanics of Newton and Maxwell in many previous papers, and what we learned there is what is going to save us here.

Specifically, I mean my tracking of photon interactions in complex charge fields. That is what allowed me to solve the [Bode problem](#) when no one else could, and what allowed me to solve the [Axial Tilt problem](#) when no one else could. By tracking spins on these photons, I was also able to solve the [Stern-Gerlach problem](#), when no one even knew there *was* a problem there. My use of the antiphoton has allowed me to solve many problems since then, and it is a big part of the solution here as well.

Direction is crucial in all these problems, that is to say, and my ability to visualize is what has allowed me to follow these multi-direction problems in my head. Here, perhaps the most important realization was that the Galactic Core was *the* central player in this dance. Others before me might have missed that, because when you study the current schematics, the only players on the board are the Sun and planets. But since we are tracking lines of charge between them, we have to include the main incoming line of charge from the Galactic Core. He becomes an 11th man on the field, and is the quarterback in many ways. He is the driver of the whole machine. So if you have been following my papers of the past several years, and have been studying the schematics [at Fourmilab](#) along with me over the past year, you should have by now placed the Galactic Core to your left, at about 8 o'clock. That will give you another body to include in each and every alignment. **Eight** on the clock then becomes your main line of charge, since it is the (mostly) unmoving line between Sun and Galactic Core. Only once you have that set in your head can you begin to study other lines of charge in relation to it.

For instance, we saw in previous papers that the largest maxima in modern times have occurred when the big planets are all left of the Sun. See 1958 and 1779, for instance. At first, I thought this was just due to having the big planets on the *same* side. But it was more than that. It was that they were on the left or Galactic Core side. With more study, I found that when planets were aligning on the right side of the Sun, they often weren't creating the expected maxima. This would have confused any previous scientists studying the same charts, since these alignments would have been taken as data negative to the planetary hypothesis. However, I could see that the data wasn't negative to the hypothesis, it was only negative to the rawest assumption of that hypothesis. But if we looked closer, the data was **positive**, since it confirmed the charge hypothesis as well as the planetary alignment hypothesis. Why? Because charge coming from the right would naturally be upside down to charge coming from the left, as a matter of spin. A spin is reversed simply by reversing direction. Since this is a magnetic or

submagnetic effect, we have to follow charge spin at all times.

So Neptune positioned on the left side at 8 o'clock wouldn't be expected to act like Neptune positioned on the right side at 2 o'clock. In fact, he would act precisely opposite. His charge coming from the right would cancel charge coming through the Sun from the Galactic Core from the left. Whereas when he was on the left, his charge would stack with the Core charge.

But that is only one subtlety I have uncovered. Uranus is another, since I found that at maxima Uranus tended to be at 90°, and to be in line at minima. I could quickly see that this was another confirmation of my spin mechanics, since, given that, we should expect Uranus to act the opposite of the other planets. Uranus is lying on his side, remember? So while other planets are emitting charge east/west, say, Uranus is emitting north/south. So, strangely, Uranus is in charge alignment to the Core/Sun when he is at 90°.

Another subtlety I didn't see until I got well in is that planets don't have to align to the Sun. In some configurations, they can skip the Sun and align directly to the Core. See the maximum of 1884, when all four big planets are lined up pointing directly at the Core. It isn't a large maximum, since the Sun isn't involved, and Uranus may actually be interfering. But with Neptune in opposition to the Core, it was as good as it was going to get in that cycle. This is because the Core is actually the primary line here, even stronger than the Sun. Especially when Jupiter is left of the Sun, the other planets can align to the Core/Jupiter line, leaving the Sun out of it. This is because, under normal circumstances, the main lines of charge are to and from the planets and the Sun. But there are always lesser lines of charge directly from planet to planet, and from planet to Core. In tracking Solar cycles, you have to track ALL the lines at the same time. Because in some situations, minor lines will become major, and vice versa. Major lines may interfere, leaving minor ones as the largest. Or minor ones may stack, taking them above single major ones. So even when you have no major alignments to the Sun, you have to check for major alignments between the planets.

You will say, "How does that work? If the planets are aligned to the side of the Sun, say, how does that line turn to get recycled through the Sun?" It doesn't have to, as long as it has a component aligning strongly to the Core. In other words, as long the planets are aligning mainly east/west on our Fourmilab schematic, a component of that line will be aligned to the Core.

Cycle 12 in the 1880s helps us understand our current cycle, since the switch from Cycle 12 to 13 took several years in a deep minimum. This was caused by Neptune in opposition to the Core, preventing many link-ups through the Sun in the direction of the Core. Neptune isn't now in opposition, but he is nearly square, which can also cause blockages. We now have Uranus at Core-opposition, which also causes problems, though of a slightly different sort. However, both Uranus and Neptune are acting to block other line-ups, and I fear they may act to suppress the upcoming Jupiter/Saturn conjunction, as they did in 1842. Uranus and Neptune were also in Core-opposition during the Maunder minimum, which should help us understand that.

This again explains why we are in a longterm weakness: Neptune is to the right (past 5 o'clock), and has been since about 1998. Since he is an even bigger player than Saturn in this dance with Jupiter and the Core, we will see weakness in the cycles until he returns to the left side in around 2077. Neptune hits 2 o'clock in about 2036, so we will be descending until then. After 2036 we will be ascending, with Solar Cycles looking up after that.

In a previous paper, I showed that an opposition was often as good as a conjunction, which remains

true. But I now realize that it is not *always* true. This is because you can't just look at whether the planets are aligning or opposing, you have to see where they are relative to the Core. Are they aligning or opposing the Core?

The inner planets are also important, as we see from the many smaller spikes in the graphs at Solen.info. These can only be caused by the faster moving bodies of the inner Solar system, as they go into and out of alignment with the larger bodies. In these positions, they can either act as channelers or blockers. And they can again act in tandem, especially the Earth and Venus. It appears that Venus acts opposite to expectation, like Uranus. And when all four small planets are on the same side of the Sun, they can become quite powerful, boosting or blocking main lines strongly.

Only once you include all these theoretical subtleties, can you begin to successfully track and predict Solar cycles. You can't just track Jupiter/Saturn and Jupiter/Neptune alignments, finding the double humps of the cycle every time. Yes, you start with that, and in some cycles that will indeed give you the main maxima. But in most cases you have to look at all the other variables as well, since in some positions those main alignments won't provide a maximum. That first alignment may be blocked or negated in several ways: by an interfering Uranus, by being misaligned to the Core, or for several other reasons. I intuit there is at least one other influence I haven't yet pinpointed as well. It may be an incoming charge line from Alpha Centauri, or from some other direction. There also may be multiple lines of charge coming in from the Core, since these lines go through major star clusters and very large stars. It is also likely these lines change as the Solar System orbits the core.

So as you can see, I have made some progress on this question in a pretty short period of time. The planetary alignment hypothesis had far too much positive data to be wrong, or to be chance. But it had far too much "negative" data to be explained by simple conjunctions alone. I could tell at a glance that there had to be many secondary factors at work here, and I have already teased out a number of them. Others will be deduced in future. I think I have enough input already that a good computer program could tell us where the hole or holes are, and all we would have to do is seek a source along that line(s).

Addendum January 14, 2020: Only three weeks later [I was able to map the effect from the Core](#), showing a sine wave that matched the periodicity and amplitude of the known Solar Cycle. See the spreadsheet at that link. This also allowed me to correct my predictions above for the upcoming Maximum. I could now edit the text above to conform to that new knowledge, but I won't. I have no problem letting my natural progression stand, since it may be of interest to future historians of science.