

MORE ON THE SOLAR CYCLES

by Miles Mathis

May 30, 2019

Due to the recent [press releases](#) from Helmholtz-Zentrum Dresden-Rossendorf and Frank Stefani announcing the discovery of “planetary constellations” as the cause of the Solar Cycle, I have done more research on the history of this question. I found Stefani published preliminary results of this back in 2016. Before that, V. P. Okhlopkov published [a similar finding in 2015 in iopscience](#). All that postdates [my paper of 2014](#). But before my paper was published, we find a debunking of the planetary tidal theory at [Futurism in January 2014](#). It is debunking [a paper from 2012 by Abreu et al](#), and *Futurism* tells us that the gravitational influence of the planets on the Sun was found to be “largely insignificant” in later studies. The author at *Futurism*, Colin Robson, then tells us,

It was a good correlation, the 11 year solar cycle with Jupiter’s 10.86 year orbital period, it was worth the look but ultimately, it was proven to be a fruitless endeavor. So, we’re back to having no clue as to how we can forecast solar activity beyond the very predictable 11 year solar cycle.

He assures us that the Solar Cycles are caused by the Sun's convection zone.

But the question goes way back before that. The first result on a Google search takes us to a 1913 paper by [G. F. Kronenberger at adsabs.harvard.edu](#), which also debunks the theory. He points to the year 1788 as disproof of planetary alignments as the cause of maxima, showing the big four planets “so scattered that their forces could not be combined” at that time. However, a quick check of our app at Fourmilab shows this isn't true. Not only is Neptune in line with the Earth and the Galactic Core (which I would assume is the main cause), the other three are lined up among themselves. No, they aren't in line with the Sun or Neptune, but they line up perfectly themselves. Given an EM or charge cause of the Solar Cycle, this could be important.

So it turns out that the question of planetary influence on the Solar Cycle goes way back. And the mainstream has been dismissing it all along. However, we have seen that the question has always been one of tidal or **gravitational** influence. Frank Stefani's theory of 2019 is still one of tidal influence. According to my brief research on the history of the subject, it appears my 2014 paper was the first to suggest a charge or EM cause of the Cycle. I am certainly the first to use my charge math to calculate the relative influences, and that is clear because no one had the mechanics to do what I have done until I did it. I used my multi-body math from my papers on [Axial Tilt](#) and [Bode's Law](#) to solve the Solar Cycle problem, which required I use the fields I introduced there. That included using charge lines to and from the Sun that worked in very specific (and previously unforeseen ways). In other words, it required understanding that charge returning to the Sun from the planets would follow lines set by charge coming out from the Sun. This would cause charge to be compressed, gaining density as it neared the Sun. The main outcome of this was the weighting of outer planets' charge, especially that of Neptune, making him a major player here. No one had ever gotten near that realization before me.

Therefore, it now appears that Stefani's theory is being promoted to draw attention away from mine. The problem now appears to me to be not that he and his team are stealing my ideas, but that they are

failing to incorporate them. What we would have expected is that the mainstream would either have reported on my findings in 2014, promoting them as a major advance; or critiqued them, presenting some data showing that Solar Cycles could not be caused by a charge loop with the major planets. After all, my paper was not some minor occurrence, buried on the web. As I have said, it has been highly listed for years, ranking in the top four on a search for “cause of the Solar Cycle”. My paper is better known and higher ranked than any of the mainstream papers on the subject over the past decade, including the papers of Stefani. So you should ask yourself why the mainstream has decided to completely ignore me. They continue to ignore me even after I successfully predicted the start of Cycle 25. Not only am I the only person in the world who predicted the start of the Cycle, I am the only person *in history* who has predicted a Solar Cycle.

So I think the promotion of planetary influences on the Solar Cycle now is deeper than a stealing. It is a bit more complex than that. They clearly *cannot* critique my theory, showing contradictory data, since any honest study of the problem would show I am right. So the best they can do is surround it with noise, as usual. They promote this tidal theory, which they know has been pooh-poohed back to 1913, in hopes that when it inevitably crashes once again, the crash will take me down with it. Working physicists witnessing the fall of this latest tidal theory will be that much less likely to look seriously at my theory. In this way, they hope to keep me—the greatest thorn in their side—buried for another few years.

However, that burying isn't working. They can ignore me all they want, but that hasn't kept my papers from going viral while theirs are languishing. Even with no promotion, millions of people all over the world are reading my papers. And even with heavy promotion, very few people are reading theirs.

Addendum July 8, 2019: It now appears to me that Solen.info is also fudging numbers, though perhaps not in response to me. What clued me into this is the average sunspot number reported for June. I followed sunspots closely in June, so the numbers were already in my head. It wasn't hard, since June had almost no sunspots. Solen is now reporting 24 on one day, 12 on another, and 11 on two days, giving a monthly total of 58. Divided by 30 days, that would be 1.9 per day. But if we check the daily numbers, we find 4 sunspots on that day, not 24. 24 is the weighted number, not the real number. The other numbers were 2, 1, and 1. Those eight were the only sunspots in June, so the daily average should be .27, not 1.9.

Why is this happening? Possibly to make this Solar Minimum look somewhat less awful than it is. Often when NOAA and NASA report 0, Solen reports one or two “magnetic” sunspots, adds then adds ten to the number, which acts to boost the monthly averages by a large margin.