



SOLAR CYCLES

Confirmed




by Miles Mathis

First published April 28, 2019


I have been camped out at [Fourmilab's Solar System app](#) for hours, confirming [my 2014 theory](#) that Solar Cycles are caused by a charge feedback loop with the Jovians. I didn't know this app existed until yesterday, and I have been playing with it pretty much non-stop since then. I will show you here that it confirms my theory with huge exclamation points, so it is increasing incredible the mainstream is ignoring this. Not only ignoring it, but purposely burying it, as we saw a couple of days ago.

Fourmilab's app is simply a map of the planets as they circle the Sun. Then you can choose whatever date you like, and the map gives you that configuration. You can go both forward and back in time. So all we have to do is compare it to the chart below.



If I am wrong, that would be clear very fast, since the very first matchup we try should be false. To show you how right I am, I will pick about the wildest and furthest bit of data on that chart above, which would be that lonely little red x way off in the upper lefthand corner. That's telling us that we know someone counted about 240 sunspots on that day in about 1615—which, as you can see, almost matches the modern maximum of about 1960. It would be a miracle if my method could hindcast that lonely red x, wouldn't it?

Well, if we check the app, we find that Saturn and Neptune are lined up, with Jupiter near the line. All we have to do is go back a few months to **June of 1613**, to find them in a line. **A triple alignment.** And guess what, that year is also confirmed, since it happens to be *the year Galileo discovered sunspots*. Those are Galileo's little red x's. Our miracle just happened.




Time: Now UTC: Julian:


You may cut me off at the pass here, saying, “This seems like a no-brainer. Are you telling me no one ever thought to compare sunspots to planetary EM alignments?” That's what I'm telling you. Not only that, but now that I have proved this theory, *still* no one is accepting it. I am being told it is astrology

and can't be right. I am being told that I am the $\pi=4$ guy, so I can't possibly be right. Clear data is being ignored once again because it isn't convenient for the standard model. They don't like me because I have embarrassed them many times before, so they are simply pretending I don't exist and that this didn't just happen.

But let's ignore *them* and continue to confirm the theory with real data. Let's look at the second biggest spike on the chart, the one at about 1778. In July of 1779 we find a conjunction of Jupiter and Neptune on the left side of the system, and all four big planets on the same side of the Sun.



Curiously, we find the *exact same thing* with the huge 1959 spike.



That maximum was actually in August of 1958, and again Neptune is aligned with Jupiter on the left side of the Sun, with all the outer planets also on that side. But this time Mars is assisting in the early stages (late 1957). This not only confirms my major points, it confirms one of my minor ones: Jupiter-Neptune is actually more important than Jupiter-Saturn. See the math and logic of that in my 2014 paper.

With just those data points above, we already have almost certain confirmation of the theory. The odds against the two biggest spikes in modern data accidentally matching to identical planet configurations is. . . well, **astronomical**.

But let's continue. There's another big spike in about 1835. If we check the app, we find a Jupiter-Neptune opposition in July 1836, with Saturn exactly square.

What about the highs in 2000-2002? The first is a Jupiter-Saturn conjunction, the second is a Jupiter-Neptune opposition. The first is larger because it has no competition from Uranus and Neptune, which are square.

What about the high in 1989? Well, we have a four-planet near alignment in 1989, so the only question for me is why the high isn't higher. They never really line up, so it appears Uranus is pulling charge out of line or otherwise interfering in some way. We will look more closely at that later. The second high in that cycle is a straight opposition of Jupiter and Saturn.

What about 1870? That's a Jupiter-Saturn opposition. The second smaller hump in Cycle 11 is a Jupiter-Uranus conjunction.

What about 1946? That's a Jupiter-Neptune conjunction, with the second hump being a Jupiter-Uranus opposition. In August of 1951 we have a late third hump caused by Jupiter-Saturn in opposition, with Neptune behind Saturn interfering. Also more on that interference later.

Now let's check some minima. Minima are a bit trickier, since although some are caused by obvious misalignments, others are not. Others can only be explained by interfering charge streams. What do I mean by that? I mean that because we have four Jovians, we have two possible independent alignments. Depending on how those two alignments align, we can get either augmentation or diminishment. Since these streams are charged particles—meaning particles with real spin—we have to track not just the lines, but the spins. Or, to say it another way, this is EM we are dealing with, which is both electricity and magnetism. We have to be aware of the linear aspect (electricity) as well as the spin component (magnetism). In some configurations, the spin of one stream will be opposite the spin of the other, which will cause interference.

Let's start with now. What about the current minimum? The app makes it very clear why now is a deep minimum. No alignments, and both Neptune and Uranus are square to Jupiter.

But let's pick one randomly. What about Cycle 17? Its end in 1944 was a deep low. Again, we see why, with all three other planets square to Jupiter. Its high was in the summer of 1938, when both Jupiter and Saturn were opposing Neptune (though not perfectly).

What about 1985? All three planets are square to Jupiter, explaining the minimum.

What about 1913? No alignments except Neptune and Uranus in opposition. This alignment of outer planets is too weak to cause a maximum, and Jupiter is interfering anyway. We have to go back two years to find a meaningful alignment, between Jupiter-Saturn. Unfortunately, there is again major interference with the alignment by Neptune and Uranus, who are also still aligned. Which is one reason Cycle 14 was so pathetic. All alignments are tamped down by other alignments. Of course this is what we just saw in Cycle 24 as well.

What about the equally pathetic Cycle 13? In 1901 we have a Jupiter-Saturn conjunction, but a minimum. Why? Because Uranus and Neptune are lined up at a shallow angle nearby, providing strong nullification with a competing and opposite stream. Cycle 13 is weak in the maximum because it is once again caused by a Jupiter-Uranus opposition. This is an alignment, but it is the weakest of the three with Jupiter. Before that, we have a Jupiter-Saturn opposition that gives us the first rise in 1892, but it is opposed by a near line-up of Uranus-Neptune, weakening it though not nullifying it. The minimum of 1890 is very clear, since nothing is aligned.

What about 1953? No alignments at all. In 1955, Jupiter and Uranus align, which starts a very steep rise, but since the other two planets are initially square, they add nothing in the beginning.

What about Cycle 20, which bottomed out in about 1975? Well, we have an opposition of Jupiter and Uranus, but Saturn and Neptune are both to the side, with Saturn being at 90. 1965 was also a minimum, and at that time Neptune and Jupiter were in opposition. In some configurations, that would be a possible maximum, but we see Uranus and Saturn not only at 90, but *aligned* at 90, creating the x-pattern I showed you in my 2014 paper. This nullifies the Jupiter/Neptune alignment.

I was able to immediately intuit explanations of most configurations, but I must admit some still stump me. It is difficult to see why some alignments do not create maxima. There remain fine points of this phenomenon I still do not understand, and which still require a solution. My early feeling, just based on collating these configurations, is that the stream from the Galactic Core is also a player here. That is completely logical, since that stream is what drives the entire configuration from the ground up. In the first instance, the Sun gets all his charge from the Galactic Core, and that stream has a definite direction. In other words, with our app, it is either coming in from the left or right, but not both. My feeling is that it is coming in from the left, so I am guessing Sagittarius must be positioned to the left of the schematic.

I was able to confirm that inner planets are able to cause the smaller fluctuations in the Cycles that we see. You saw one of those above, where Mars temporarily aligned to a larger alignment, causing a small boost. But inner planets can also cross-align, causing temporary interference.

We see that right now, since Solar flux levels are down to 66 today. This is very low, far lower than March, which averaged above 71. My body is not taking it well and is threatening to shut down altogether. I think this short term blip in April is caused by inner planets, so it should end soon. Consulting the Fourmilab app, we see both Mercury and Venus are square (90 degrees) to the Earth right now. Venus has been square all month. This will ease during May, especially after the 15th, as Venus moves on. So at that time we should be moving back to March levels, both in sunspot numbers and flux numbers.

On March 22 we saw a small spike in flux, rising from 69 to 82 in just five days. That appears to have been caused by the opposition of Mars and Venus on that day.

On July 20, we will see an alignment of inner planets with Pluto, so we should watch numbers then as well.

On around September 1 of this year, we will see an inner planet alignment, with Mars, Mercury and Venus all opposing the Earth. Neptune will also be in line, behind the Earth. I think that may give us a small temporary boost, but we will have to wait and see. Someone remind me to check the Solar Cycle numbers at that time.

Since we are tracking sunspots in this particular analysis, the position of the Earth in the schematic doesn't matter. But if we are tracking other things—like flux at the Earth—the Earth's position will obviously matter a lot. I have shown in previous papers that the Earth isn't just receiving Solar flux, it is receiving planetary flux returning to the Sun, and this hasn't been taken into account before me. Therefore, in some configurations it will matter a lot whether the Earth is in one of the larger planetary alignments, or square to it. Likewise, it will matter quite a bit (though not as much) whether the Earth is aligning to inner planets. Just as we have to track conjunction and opposition of the big four planets, if we want to understand the finer points of this phenomenon, we also have to track the conjunctions and oppositions of the inner ones. We have overlapping, stacking, and interfering loops of all sizes, from every planet to every other planet. The planets are not just linked to the Sun via these loops, they are linked to one another.

Charge—which is real photons—links all objects in the Solar System and Galaxy. So remember that as you play with this app. Planets take in charge at their poles and emit it most heavily at the equator (or within 30 degrees of the equator). So when I say that planets return charge to the Sun, I mean they return large amounts of it to the Sun. Emitted charge is captured by lines of charge returning to the Sun from far out in space. But not all charge is captured. There will be lesser charge streams moving directly between planets, and in some cases that may be important here. I will continue to study these interactions and will report to you any new findings.

Update May 29, 2019: Wow, it didn't take long. I said the mainstream was ignoring me, but they aren't ignoring my ideas. Turns out it only took them about three weeks [to steal this idea from me](#). A German group is being featured in worldwide press releases and promotion this week, announcing that Solar Cycles are caused by “planetary constellations”. With no mention of Miles Mathis. Hmmm. You mean like I told them in 2014, in a paper that has been listed on the front page at Google for several years?