


# THE AIR FORCE IS STILL FAKING SUNSPOT NUMBERS

*by Miles Mathis*



Those are three of the active areas today at Solen.info, as you see. They are listed as having 2, 3 and 13 sunspots. That column is tagged SWPC/USAF, and those are the official raw numbers. The next two columns are tagged as “magnetic”, and do not count toward official sunspot numbers. So concentrate only on the column containing 2, 3, 13.

The USAF is faking the numbers everyday, but I don't have the time or inclination to do this everyday, reporting it to you. I check and take note everyday, but can't be publishing papers on it everyday. You will have to follow along for yourself. But today they are using all the tricks, and it is very obvious, so I thought I would give you another lesson in how it is done. To start with, they simply undercount by underestimating the size of the spot. Larger spots count as multiples, as you can see, and they

miscount the larger ones. I would say the counts should be 4, 6 and 36. In the last, I am counting 11 in the first section and 25 in the second. So they have dropped 28 already. But they aren't finished. As you see, the section has spread since yesterday and is far larger. It should actually be split into two sections, and since each section counts as ten for the weighted number, our total for the three sections should be 86. But since they are counting it as only one, their number is 48. So they have now dropped 38.

And there's more:

S7449	2022.03.25	3		S13E40	0003	AXX		
S7450	2022.03.25			S18W36				
S7451	2022.03.26	10	5	N14E12	0040	CRI		
S7452	2022.03.26	4	2	N21E02	0010	BXO		
<b>Total spot count:</b>		18	93	40				
<b>Sunspot number:</b>		48	173	100	(total spot count + 10 * number of spotted regions)			
<b>Weighted SN:</b>		36	114	61	(Sum of total spot count + classification weighting for each AR. Classification weighting: X=0, R=3, A/S=5, H/K=10)			
<b>Relative sunspot number (Wolf number):</b>		53	95	80				

**Monthly solar cycle data**

Month	Average solar flux		International sunspot number (WDC-SILSO)	Smoothed sunspot number (4)	Average ap (3)
	Measured	1 AU			
MAR 27					

As you can see, they went totally blind for the last two sections, failing to see any there at all. But I see about seven in the first and one in the second, and with the two extra sections, that gives us another 28. That's 66 they “accidentally” overlooked. So instead of a sunspot number of 48, they should have reported the number 114. So they are seeing only about 40% of the spots that are there, which can't be dismissed as a simple error. They are missing about half the spots everyday, on purpose.

Why? Because the Jupiter/Neptune conjunction is moving into place and will be at max around June 1. At that time we will see another sharp peak like we saw at the end of 2020, when Jupiter/Saturn conjoined. I predicted the Jupiter/Saturn conjunction would cause a big early spike in Cycle 25, and

the mainstream just laughed that off as astrology. They were wrong, since it hit right on schedule and went to the very number I had predicted. Well, the same thing is happening again, and the spike will be even larger because we are further into the cycle. Although Neptune is smaller than Saturn, its alignment with Jupiter and the Sun will be nearer the line from the Galactic Core, further boosting the charge field feedback loop. [More than two years ago I predicted](#) this conjunction would cause the monthly sunspot number to go to 120, and as we just saw we are already closing in on that. We are only about two months away, which is very close in a 12-year cycle.

So the mainstream is panicked. So panicked they called in the Air Force after December 2020 to help them here with their propaganda and lies. They desperately need to make it look like the number won't go up to 120 this early in the Cycle, but they have encountered further problems. So far, even with their cheats, the reported numbers are running far above mainstream predictions. The Air Force's own numbers are almost doubling mainstream predictions, so it looks like they haven't yet cheated enough. They better find some more tricks, but the more they cheat the more obvious it becomes. Another problem is that many in the field aren't buying it. Many of them work for NASA or NOAA, not USAF, and they have been looking at these numbers for years or decades. So they recognize a push when they see it, and some of them are scaling the numbers back up like I am doing. This is also true of scientists in other countries, who aren't under the thumb of our Air Force. They have to deal with their own corrupt institutions, but many of them still retain some scruples. These are the people that are going to lead the movement over to me in the next couple of years. Or it is to be hoped.

Some who haven't been following this will say, "If this isn't astrology, what is it? You are using planetary alignments, and that is what astrology is". This isn't astrology because it is based on real physical fields that mainstream physics knows about. My theory tracks planetary positions, but the theory is based on **EM field interactions**, which are known to exist. So none of this is wuwu. The EM field and charge field is astronomy, not astrology, because it comes with a fully mechanical and dynamical explanation, using real particles—*especially* in my theory, which is *more* mechanical than mainstream theory regarding EM. All celestial bodies are recycling the charge field, which is made up of real photons with real mass and radius and energy. The Sun collects charge coming in from the Galactic Core in long lines, pulling them in at its poles and re-emitting them most heavily at the equator (or 30 degrees N and S). That charge then feeds out into the Solar System, where the planets then recycle it themselves in the same way. The charge then loops back to the Sun, and it is this loop that drives the Solar Cycles. [It also drives the planetary cores](#), keeping them hot and energized.

**Added March 30:** As if on cue, the day after I wrote this numbers went through the roof, with flux hitting 156 on Tuesday. The Sunspot count went to 125 yesterday and is holding today, and even that number was held down by USAF. It should be higher. So we are quickly approaching maximum numbers of the last Solar Cycle 24, and we are still nine months away from the first early peak I have predicted for Cycle 25.