

by Miles Mathis

November 3, 2025

[**November 8:** If you don't feel like reading 15 pages of me dismantling this guy, skip ahead to page 10 for the knock-out punch in round two, where he commits blatant scientific fraud in full view, knocking himself cold. To understand that all you have to have is eyes.]

I have been informed that the sad anonymous person at [OverdueRevolutions](#) posted last February a “refutation” of [my Solar Cycle prediction from 2020](#), but all he manages to do is shoot himself in the foot over and over, as we would expect from an anonymous person under that spook title. He signs the paper “OverdueRevolutions”, which I doubt is the name he got from his parents. So we see equal amounts of bravery and logic here. In nine months he only has comments from two other anonymous trolls, congratulating him for his amazing analysis, yadayada, so not really worth responding to . . . except for the fun we can have with it. And one of these two actually points out what is obvious: my graph above has matched mainstream numbers astonishingly well.

OR has an “about me” page, but it tells us nothing except that he claims to be an independent researcher from Toronto. No real name or bio. A complete ghost. He has published only a handful of articles, most of them spooky in some way, and he publishes this graphic on his articles page, for no apparent reason:



Doesn't give you much confidence in him, does it? There is another article there where he reminds us he was kicked of MathisianHaven for being an obvious spook, and why, if you are interested. He tries to spin it, but does a terrible job.


Readers have informed me that AI is also claiming to refute my prediction with similar misdirection, though its main “argument” is that the mainstream hasn't confirmed it, and what is AI but a bigger anonymous troll, given false authority for no other reason than that it is plugged into the wall. What problems in physics or any other field has AI ever solved? None. Zero. I also point out that AI, with its mainstream programmers, holds me to higher standards than its own heroes. It is always claimed I haven't made predictions that were then proved by experiment, and other things of that nature, but has AI or any other entity gone back through the history of physics and chemistry, holding all the famous people to that same fire? No, as I reminded you recently [in my paper on covalent bonding](#), and in many previous papers on hundreds of other subjects, the real history of science hasn't progressed that way. Standing theories in all subfields didn't win on any merits, much less prove themselves with experiments: they were cemented into place immediately due to the stature of their proposers, and later experiments and theories were forced to conform *to them*. Lewis didn't turn “electron sharing” into dogma overnight due to the brilliance of the idea, much less any predictions or conformation to subsequent experiments. Just the reverse in fact, since the theory is a mass of contradictions from the first word and it had to be massively tweaked to fit every new experiment, and still is. The same could be said for any other physical theory of the 20th century, all of them being—as I have shown extensively—awful tinkertoy constructions that had nothing going for them but the status of their proposers. They have required huge castles of post hoc corrections and fudges and apologetics, and even that wasn't enough since students still weren't buying it. By the 1960s the students had to be ordered to stand down, no longer asking any questions or expecting anything to make basic sense. If they did they were unceremoniously kicked out of the field as a nuisance.

But back to the matter at hand. After many pages of claiming I basically got lucky in my prediction, since it is based on a faulty theory, OR finally gets around to publishing an overlay of my prediction with actual data so far, as in the figure above.


[My prediction line, with circles, is in pencil; Air Force monthly counts are overlaid in blue, up to January 2025. The subtext is mine, with lines indicating planetary conjunctions. For example, JS is Jupiter-Saturn. Circles also coincide with conjunctions, or other special calculated points on the graph,

such as the mid-Cycle low at January 2025.]

He nitpicks it by pointing out the ways it is wrong, but I think anyone will be astonished by how many ways it has turned out to be right—when the mainstream has never been right about anything regarding Solar Cycles. The mainstream was wrong by around 100% on this Cycle and the last, both in timing and elevation (some sources admitting they were disastrously wrong), and they only published a super-smoothed prediction as usual with one smooth hump. How many monthlies did they correctly predict? Oh yeah, that would be zero, since they didn't make any predictions of that sort and never have.



The red line is the mainstream “prediction” as of 2024, with the black line being the same monthlies we just saw. They had actually updated their “prediction” several times by then, with the initial prediction back in 2020 being this:



Just big blurry blocks, to give them as much wiggle room as possible. The blue box allowed them to predict a maximum anytime from January 2023 to January 2026, and from 95 to 135. More bravery in action. They are now claiming to have been spot-on, of course, although maximum will be nowhere

near that blue box, being way above it and to the right.

I predicted spikes on Jovian conjunctions, and as you see I have hit all three of those up to this point. The two marked and the Jupiter/Uranus conjunction and spike in summer 2024, which I didn't mark but which I still hit. It still counts for my theory since that IS my theory: spikes on Jovian conjunctions. I also hit the timing of the huge spike in January of 2023 perfectly, as you see from my circled spot, though I have it about 40 points too high. But considering the interference of Air Force*, which OR makes no effort to refute ([I prove it in a series of papers](#), but he has nothing to say about that), still pretty amazing. Also predicted a spike in January of 2024, which also happened. Even more amazing is the exact prediction of the low in January of 2025, which I hit in both timing and number, with my little circle actually circling both my dip and theirs. OR stops there, but I have also correctly predicted the rise in 2025 as well, matching the 160 numbers through the middle of the year.

So you have to admit it is fairly incredible he published that overlay in a REFUTATION of my prediction. You really have to laugh. It is such an obvious fail he will now have to field claims he blew this on purpose, to secretly promote me. Though I honestly don't think that is the answer. I think he is so blinded by envy he is unable to see when he is destroying himself. We have seen it many times.

Thus far my prediction is correct in timing and number and rise, and it is correct overall as well as correct in many details (at least seven major matches), and you can see that for yourself, without any comment from him or me. **And that is over six full years.** So to claim my prediction has failed is just an outright lie. Such a huge lie shouldn't give you any confidence in the rest of his "analysis", should it? His only hope after that is to claim it was all just wild coincidence, and that is of course what he does, with maximum uncton. But before you read what he says, you may wish to run some odds on that. If you are a scientist or mathematician, you should be able to run simple odds in your head. What are the odds my prediction was this astonishingly accurate, but that it was based on a theory and charts that were completely wrong? According to OR, I somehow just blundered my way into the most accurate prediction in the history of science, but do you really think that is likely, especially given all the other things I have done in physics? If I had wandered in here from a Star Wars convention or something, this being my first whack at physics, you might argue this was just an incredibly lucky roll of the dice—though the odds would still be wildly against you. But that isn't the case. I have also [diagrammed the atomic nucleus](#), being the first to do that as well. I have [solved the Bode sequence](#). I have [achieved unification](#). I have [rewritten solid state](#), diagrammed [superposition](#), and done a hundred other things the mainstream wasn't able to do. So to dismiss this all as dumb luck is the height of mendacity and envy.

And here's a question for OR and AI: if I am wrong here, then why is the mainstream stealing my ideas without credit? See [Helmholtz Zentrum](#), one of the largest scientific centers in Germany, with over 700 scientists. This is from their publication last August:

In the last ten years, they have developed a model that derives virtually all the Sun's known activity cycles from the cyclical influence of the planets' tidal forces. Now they have also been able to demonstrate that this external synchronization automatically curbs solar activity (DOI: [10.1007/s11207-025-02521-0](#)).

They concentrate on Jupiter/Earth/Venus for some reason, and say it is a result of gravity not EM, which is why they fail, but still, they ARE showing definite feedback from the planets influencing the Sun. Has AI or anyone else been sicced on them? Of course not, since they are mainstream and AI is

programmed to run interference for the mainstream.

OR admits he began his “refutation” by writing his own code to test my theory. **His own code was a complete failure in predicting Solar Cycles, he says.** Seems a slimy way to refute my theory, doesn't it? Why not test my theory by *testing my theory*, instead of testing his own theory and math? After no doubt wasting many days or weeks on that, he returned to my paper “to see if there was something he was missing”. Yeah, great idea, OR. But he still mucks it up, obviously on purpose, since he doesn't want to understand what I am doing. He says there is no way to join the two sine waves I generate, but there must be since that is where my final graph (above) came from. Does he think I just pulled it out of my shorts? No, I state that I got it by combining or integrating the two alignment series. He was clever enough to figure out what Steven Oostdijk was doing in generating the sine waves for me, but he pretends he isn't clever enough to see how I combine them into one, though it is straightforward. It couldn't be too hard since I did it in my head and then graphed it with a pencil on a piece of paper. He says,

The primary issue is that you cannot model a sine wave using another sine wave of a different period.

He cannot be serious. I am not “modeling” a sine wave using another sine wave, I am simply **integrating the two sine waves.** I am letting them run simultaneously over the same years and letting them influence one another via the existing field, which is a real charge field. So, for example, a high and a low will offset, meeting somewhere in between. Two highs will add, going higher, as will two lows, going lower. That is why I say the middle point in the Cycle was the most interesting, since it was a spike up on one graph and a spike down on the other. The M and the A in the data offset, you see, as a matter of shapes. An M goes down in the middle while a A goes up.

OR says this method isn't exact, since we ignore some secondary factors and since you have to know how to weight one field of numbers relative to the other to get *precise and final numbers*, but I admit to that roughness in the paper. Steven and I wanted to see if using these large first-order relationships between bodies would allow me to roughly predict a Solar Cycle. . . AND IT DID. The roughness doesn't make it wrong, it just means I had to guess somewhat when estimating how much a low would bring down a high. You have to admit I had a pretty good feel for the field, since my guesses were amazingly good. And honestly, it didn't take much brilliance in that regard, since anyone could have done what I did, overlaying the two graphs in his head and combining them to get one series of numbers. Steven Oostdijk wasn't mystified when I did it. He redid it with his computer to be sure I was close, but I chose to keep my pencil graph for the charm of it. I knew it would infuriate the mainstream all the more that way . . . especially the sort of mainstream scientist who can't go to the toilet without a computer holding his hand.

Then OR tells the most stunning lie of his paper:


The two obvious misses are the trough in the observed data at the end of 2023, and the huge peak in mid 2024. They are the most extreme features of the past two years, and neither correspond to a predicted feature in Miles' graph.

The huge peak in 2024 is the Jupiter-Uranus conjunction, and my theory is a theory of Jovian conjunctions, so obviously that peak scores hugely for me despite being left off my graph. I have commented on that in a series of papers, but OR just pretends he hasn't read those, I guess. The only question OR should have is why the peak is a bit late, coming in August instead of May, but as you see

from the graph, it DID start back in late April, simply increasing into August.

[**Added November 25, 2025:** In fact, there was a huge 4-day spike to 283 centering on April 22, which was EXACTLY the Jupiter/Uranus conjunction. The gigantic and [now famous Gannon superstorm](#) followed in May, compressing the Earth's plasma shield to a record low and endangering all radio communication. But as big as that reported spike was, [they STILL undercounted it by a large margin](#). You can follow along at Solen.info by taking that link. They list 17 active regions, but fail to count obvious large spots in S9600, S9621, 13648, dropping 30 off the top. Adding those spots back in and correctly reweighing all the rest gives us another 160, so we add 190 to 283 to get **473**! That's far higher than the reported daily spike of 326 on August 8. So you begin to see how they suppressed counts in April and May to try to hide the Jupiter/Uranus conjunction. They did that same thing every day for two months, which lowered the monthlies by at least 50%.]

But I can tell you why that spike in August happened as well (which they didn't bother to suppress as much, since it seemed to move the maximum off the Jupiter/Uranus conjunction, you see). We simply go to the charts to show it:



Now ☒ UTC: 2024-08-05 23:56:55 ☐ Julian: 2460528.4

As you see, [that is the Solar System](#), August 2024. The line coming into the Sun from the Galactic Core is at about 8 o'clock. What do you see there? Well, you see that although Jupiter/Uranus has moved slightly past conjunction with the Sun, we now have a short-term alignment to the Core with Venus. And although Saturn and Neptune aren't yet aligned relative to the Sun, they ARE aligned to the Core. This was the cause of the spike. I have been addressing these finer points of cycles for years already, and didn't just make this up to answer OR. Since Steven's two major sine waves don't include the inner planets, I have had to add these tunes by hand, but I think anyone can see the logic of them, given my theory of EM alignments.

You will say that alignment with Venus should have been too fleeting to cause an entire monthly spike, but due to its position on the tangent there, it was actually in line for nearly a third of Venus' orbit, making Venus seem to pause on that line from late May to almost September, when Mercury took over that position, creating a lesser effect. Mercury had also reinforced that line in June. So again, you can

only miss these alignments by refusing to look for them. OR has nothing to say about these easy-to-read charts, apparently hoping you never look at them to confirm this for yourself.

After making a hash of it so far, OR then adds more fudge by spending pages showing the sine waves go out of sync after several decades, something we admit in my paper. He uses this to dismiss the whole theory, ignoring what I say regarding that: that lack of sync moving out from the present is probably due to one factor we have ignored, possibly motion relative to the Core or motion of the incoming line of charge from the Core. I spend no time in the paper looking for that factor, but that doesn't mean it doesn't exist. Logically, such a match to the present and a shift both forward and back doesn't indicate the current match isn't right, it indicates an incomplete expression of the match. Anyone can see that. But OR needs a hook to hang me on, and this is all he can find. So he assumes, without argument or proof, that this is fatal to the entire theory. It isn't. All it requires is that I not predict too far into the future or postdict into the past without making that shift. I actually do that in the paper, making the shift and then correctly postdicting much data of the 20th century—another thing he completely ignores.

Then he moves on to this:

In order to give Miles' theory the best possible chance, I also used the sines and cosines of all planetary and galactic alignments to train a neural network to predict the solar cycles. If there is any straightforward relationship, then a neural network should be able to discover it and demonstrate good predictive power. This was not, however, the case.

Again, you have to laugh at the clumsiness of all this “refutation”. A neural network. But am I refuted by that, or is the neural network refuted by that? Or is OR's training refuted? We will never know, since he doesn't publish any of that training or networking. OR claims my paper is rough in places, but his refutation is all of this sort: complete handwaving. Argument by air. It is as if he asked Grok what it thought, it said I was refuted, therefore I am refuted. Good to know this is what science has come to. OR proves my larger points for me. So nice of him.

Finally OR gets to the problem of the Air Force entering this problem for the first time in history and fudging data. Here is his refutation of that: “it is a figment of his imagination”. That's it, the whole refutation. As usual, I spend years and write many papers on a subject, and someone refutes it with the rebuttal “no it's not”.

I just imagined that the Air Force started counting sunspots for the first time in 2021, though they had never done it in history. It had always gone to NASA or NOAA or SWPC. I guess it was just a coincidence they were called in after my first big hit in this prediction, when I hit that spike in January of 2021. So much luck and so many coincidences seem to surround me, eh? Also my imagination that [Air Force doesn't seem to be able to properly weight](#) a sunspot, failing to read the handbook on that and counting huge spots as just one. I caught them at it dozens of times. They also just fail to see spots in their own diagrams, as if they were all suffering from cataracts or something. Air Force also likes to combine areas in novel ways, keeping the number low so that when they multiply by ten the total is kept down. Very clever and very covert, since no child could see through that fudge.

But did OR train a neural network to analyze Air Force sunspot counts, checking all their spot sizes and area divisions and multipliers, consulting my many papers on what to look for? No, he forgot to train any neural network on that, since it wouldn't have been advisable. The neural network would just have to parrot its trainer in that case, saying it was just another Miles hallucination, while pretending to not

be able to follow the Air Force's methods.

Addendum November 5: Steven Oostdijk wanted to be part of the fun here, so I am adding his initial commentary. There may be more coming.

OR: However, after training it on all data from 1920 to 1970, it had terrible predictive power on the remainder of the dataset (in fact the correlation was negative). Then I also added the angles between each planet and the galactic core and tried again, using both degree measurements and the sines/cosines of those angles. Again the predictive power was terrible.

SO: whahahaha, if you have no clue what you are talking about then it is hard to make predictions is what he showed, yes.

OR: Given this failure, I went back to Miles' papers to see if there was something I had missed. In the 2020 paper Miles presents the work of Steven Oostdijk, showing a first order model with predictions for the years 1987 to 2029, along with actual observations until 2020. Thankfully, although no actual data or analysis files were shared. . .

SO: We have shared these files with all people that requested them.

OR: Miles is not great at open science.

SO: Ha, showing your "unprejudiced" scientific approach here. Miles gives away everything for free, but that isn't open enough for you?

OR: Miles did include a screenshot of the spreadsheet that included the calculations, allowing me to replicate Steven's model.

MM: I thought you just said no data was shared?

OR: And it did in fact match the observed solar cycles pretty well, at least in that date range

SO: Thanks for confirming. Not much of a refutation.

OR: "The odds that is a coincidence are zero" is a very bold and unjustified statement [from Miles], considering that two periodic functions with similar but different periods aligning over the span of a couple wavelengths is precisely what you would expect to see. It's simply a coincidence that they happened to align over the past 30 years rather than 100 years ago.

SO: Have to laugh again. "Simply a coincidence" sounds like mainstream protectionism. I agree with Miles that it is not just a coincidence. MM: would you also expect to see an overlay like the one above, top of page, with major spikes on all planetary conjunctions? Would you expect to see an exact mid-cycle hit on that low of January 2025, with my little circle encircling data five years in the future? Would you expect to see the same initial rise of the cycle, the same fall in 2024, and the same rise in 2025? Would you expect to see me hit that spike of January 2023 right on time, three years in the future, and showing you exactly how I did it, even circling it to indicate its importance to the graph? Would you expect to see me hit that spike of January 2024 right on time, four years in the future, and showing you exactly how I did it, even circling it to indicate its importance to the graph and to my prediction?

OR: The primary issue is that you cannot model a sine wave using another sine wave of a different period.

SO: IMHO he has no clue what he is talking about, there are no sine waves modelled by other sine waves. Yes, there are multiple waves with multiple periodicities and there are cross-correlation effects but that is why it is called a “first order model”. MM: OR tries to claim we didn't even match periods when integrating the data, but since the data is marked off by years, and years are periods, it is hard to tell what he is talking about. It looks like he is just creating confusion on purpose. Yes, the conjunctions have different periods, but obviously you just line them up by year and look where peaks and troughs add or subtract. We shouldn't have to teach basic math here, though we remind ourselves we are talking to a computer programmer.

OR: In order to give Miles' theory the best possible chance, I also used the sines and cosines of all planetary and galactic alignments to train a neural network to predict the solar cycles. If there is any straightforward relationship, then a neural network should be able to discover it and demonstrate good predictive power. This was not, however, the case.

SO: Here I no longer give him the benefit of the doubt. Of course anybody knows that if you train a dataset to interpolate you cannot use it to extrapolate. This is just misleading. Also the first order approximation is usable for a period in the range of the four large planets orbiting times. Shorter times should include inner planet effects and larger periods should include galactic effects.

OR: Any scientist investigating this theory would apply it to the entire collection of solar cycle data going back to 1818 and find that it is completely wrong (inverted) for many cycles, and that the periodicity does not in fact align with the solar cycles.


SO: OR pretends to do physics but has no idea of the influence of scale. A first-order model is used to make a prediction that is accurate enough for the nearest cycle(s) but of course not on a 10-20x larger scale. I think he really did not understand your model is based on mechanics. E.g. the weights of the large planets is related to the size of the feedback loop they have with the sun and the position of the core is the source of charge. It looks like his assumption is we created a ML dataset trained on the last few cycles so for him the weights of the large planets are arbitrary parameters.

MM: OR's basic problem here is that I DID predict the current cycle amazingly well, and anyone with two eyes can see that. So well, in fact, it should be frontpage news, with mainstream scientists rushing to do just what he says: with my help, extend and tune the theory to larger and smaller timescales, giving it more resolution and even greater predictive power. But, stung by me not kissing his ass enough in some old email exchange, he doesn't want to do that, preferring to attack the theory for not being born in complete and final form. That is all he shows here: amazing as the theory and prediction is, it needs a lot more work. There is still work left to do, including resolving that long-term sync, as well as integrating the inner planets. I have admitted we need to pin down the line of charge coming in from the Core as well, and determine any longterm motion it may have. But since I have now witnessed the mathematical and spatial abilities of OR (aka KieranZ), you can be sure I will not be working with him on that. Too bad, since he might have made himself useful. Instead he chose to join the ranks of Allan Weisbecker, Joachin Hermon, Philalethes, Ron Unz, Kevin Starr, and thousands of others whose words and thoughts will now live in infamy as long as science persists—which may not be long now.


November 7, 2025: OR pretends to respond to this long paper in a few short paragraphs of misdirection, but has nothing new for us, ending on the ludicrous claim that I am just wasting *his* time. As we all know, he chose to spend his time claiming to refute me, by publishing overlays that proved I was right, which was indeed a waste of his time, but I am not to fault for that. He briefly repeats his Air Force non-argument, but continues to give us nothing but an assertion. “I imagined it.” He still refuses to address the fact that all three Jovian conjunctions fell on major spikes and that I predicted they would years in advance. He still refuses to address many of the other points I predicted years in advance, claiming it was just luck. He fails to address Helmholtz Zentrum agreeing with me that there is a feedback loop between the planets and Sun. If I am wrong, HZDR must be wrong as well, so why is OR not rushing to apply his shitty fake analysis to them—which he is now calling a Fourier analysis? Funny, it wasn't a Fourier analysis until one of his commenters used that term, but now it is. But maybe he isn't applying it to HZDR because he doesn't have a childish grudge against them? Or is it because they are mainstream and so they don't bother him?

Incredibly but predictably, OR doesn't address anything I say in this paper, ignoring it all as if I didn't say it—like most of what I wrote in the original papers. Just dismisses it all with a wave of the hand as *my* misunderstanding. He even says I don't add any charts or analysis here, but I do: see above p. 6 for the chart and analysis of August 2024, using a chart from Fourmilab and giving new analysis. So he is straight-up lying again.


But here is the clincher:



In his desperation he published an updated overlay, as above. See a little problem? He has changed it, hasn't he? Let's look at them side by side:



He has not only added another seven months of data, he has added the yellow dailies to try to hide behind, and he has CHANGED THE BLUE LINE. Has mainstream data changed in the past week? In his first overlay, 2024 ends in my circle, matching my prediction exactly. I had pointed out that match as one of my prime successes here. So what does he do? He fakes the blue line in the second overlay to pass my circle above this time, having it fall steadily since August of 2024. But that's not what the monthlies have done, according to mainstream data. I guess he forgot to read [my paper of October 27](#), where I published this chart straight from Solen.info, [a mainstream site that reports the Air Force/SWPC numbers](#).



The pink line is a 27-day Wolf number, which is the closest thing to a monthly here. It smoothes the daily red line. What do you see there with your own eyes? What I see is the Wolf line moving *up* from May 2025 to October 2025, peaking at 170, and **matching my prediction in that period.** While OR has it peaking at about 130 in the same period. His final hump in the blue line is drawn way too low, and that is to fake-match it to the falling red line—their prediction that this cycle is done. You will say a Wolf number isn't exactly the same as a monthly, which is true, but they don't diverge by 40 points! The dailies normally diverge by less than ten, and the monthlies by much less, of course. So that is another massive fudge here, contradicted by their own numbers.

But OR has changed the entire overlay, hasn't he, not just the end of it but the whole thing! In his first overlay, my circled peaks either match or coincide, but in the second overlay suddenly they don't. Look at my second circled point. Almost an exact match in the first overlay, but slid down and back in the second. Same for my first circled point.

So let's check that first peak in 2020. After indicating a separation of about three months in the first overlay, he has now graphed a separation of almost six months between my peak and his in the second overlay, to make it look like I wasn't right. But I clearly tag mine as **December 2020** on my chart. So we just go to [the archived sunspot reports](#), where we find they peaked at 29 in November, the daily peak being 84 on November 29, almost December. So I was wrong by two days, not six months, **meaning OR has faked his graph.** He has also changed the elevation of his spike, as you see. Criminal fudging of data, to try to hide the fact that early peak fell on the Jupiter-Saturn conjunction, just as I had predicted.

He has also responded to my comments about that spike in May of 2024 corresponding to the start of the Jupiter-Uranus conjunction by redrawing it much smaller, almost disappearing. It is about six times smaller in the second overlay! He has also hugely changed the spike of January 2024, to hide my hit there.

He even dropped the highest peak in Summer 2024, lowering it about 15 points in the second overlay, so that he could drop the red line down to 160 there, instead of up at 180 where it should be.

So this is how he responded to my claims of Air Force and the rest of the mainstream cheating: he cheated in the very same way, right in front of your face. How do you like it? Was it just my imagination?







This tells me he isn't just some envious guy working on his own. This big change to his overlay tells me his handlers jumped in to try to help him out here. As usual, it was a massive fail, so best guess is his handlers are actually. . . Air Force.

Steven wanted to chime in here as well:

Haha, we have a saying in Dutch: “a cornered cat makes weird jumps”. As usual their ploy blows up in their own faces. And yes, you are right that I was too easy on him. Was scavenging his Python code to check for something useful. Nada.

BTW, Air Force is up to old tricks again in the charts, I guess in response to my paper before this one. After going back to base during 2024 and letting the spots report themselves, they were ordered back in the spring of 2025, as I will show you now. OR wanted more analysis so I will now bury him with it.

They faked a big spike down last week, again criminally misweighing huge sunspots as just one or two, and overlooking multiple regions.

14261	2025.10.19 2025.10.20	1	2	1	S06W81	0010	AXX	AXX			was AR S11543 area: 0005 location: S05W79
14267	2025.10.22 2025.10.23	2	12	5	N02W39	0110	CSO	CSO			was AR S11549 area: 0190 location: N02W37
14266	2025.10.22 2025.10.23			3	N17W65	0006		AXX			was AR S11550 location: N17W67

See for example [those regions from October 31](#), where they are not only juggling regions to minimize them (Solen admits this in the comment: “was AR S11548”), but misweighing that big spot. Notice they count the spot above that as 1, and you can hardly see it, but the second one is huge but is only counted as two. Should be at least 20.


So just for kicks, I went back and checked those big spikes down in April and May of this year, that you can see in the big graph two up. They are what caused the big spike down in OR's second overlay. **Those were also fudged,** since [checking April 15](#) finds the reported number 58, but three spots in S10987 are ignored, and spots in 14050 and 14062 are grossly miscounted. 14060 should be split into two regions. Making all those corrections gives us six regions and about 63 spots, for a total of 123. So you can see how much that one number was fudged, a miss of 65, or more than 100%.

Check the charts, the next big spike down is [May 2](#), so let's look at that. Please take the link and follow along: you will love it. They report 18 spots in two regions, giving us a total of 38. [You multiply the regions by 10 and then add the spots]. Here is the first spot, which they count as one:

076	2025.04.23 2025.04.25	1	4	2	N06W36	0080	HSX	CSO	
-----	--------------------------	---	---	---	--------	------	-----	-----	--

But that is very large and should be counted at at least 20. It gets worse:

14079	2025.04.28	17	55	30	N07E27	1210	EKC	EKC
	2025.04.28							



That's the second region, which they count as 17 spots. But those are both gigantic and should be closer to 100 total. Should also be split into two regions, with the two big ones together and the outliers to the left being in a second one. They also miss spots in three other regions, not even giving us a photo of one of them. Hiding it. See 14072, which should have a photo. It's missing. Making all the corrections, we should find about 180, so the count was off by 142, or 5 times. **The spike down was completely manufactured.**

But why fake that minimum in May of 2025? To make it look like I missed it. They had seen me match that circled point in January 2025, which was a huge deal since I got it straight from the sine waves, with no use of conjunctions. So they needed to push the mid-Cycle minimum down more and forward to make it look like I had missed it.

This led me to return to November 2020, to check daily numbers for that spike. I remind you I have already done that for December 2020, blowing the cover of this fraud back to January of 2021, when I wrote the [first of many papers on this](#) called "The Sunspot numbers for December 2020 were grossly miscounted". There I show you the actual daily charts for the first time, and the ways they are fudging, starting with mis-weighting the big ones and counting too few regions. But of course they did the same thing in November, which is how they kept the spike down to below 30, when it should have been up with mine near 50. See as just one example [November 16](#), when they claim to have counted zero. But you can see with your own eyes there are several on the limb in S6613. They are also missing current photos in two other regions, telling me they are hiding sunspots there. That would give us at least thirty-five for the sunspot number for that day, not zero. By doing tricks like that every day they can drive the monthly average way down, you see.

It is also worth mentioning that although the Air Force sunspot number for November was reported as 29, the international sunspot number from SILSO is always higher, being 34 for November, a 17% difference. Indicating SILSO knows Air Force is suppressing numbers, though SILSO has also been fudging, though marginally less perhaps. This is just another way they can fudge this data down: use US monthlies instead of international monthlies or Wolf numbers. They haven't overcomplicated all this for no reason, you know, having three numbers for everything. This is standard practice in science and has been for a long time. Create such a Byzantine process for everything no one but insiders can follow it.







What does it all mean? It means that if you want to know the real numbers for this Cycle, you would be smarter to follow my graph than that of the Air Force/SWPC. Real data has followed my prediction

almost exactly in all periods, and the Air Force line isn't even close to real data, being a huge fudge of it in most months. Any time I have checked the actual mainstream photos and charts of sunspots day by day, as above and in [many previous papers](#), I have found the Sun matching my prediction far better than it matches the mainstream reported numbers. The photos from the Sun don't lie, but mainstream scientists assuredly do. We have caught them at it over and over.

In closing, it is worth drawing your attention to a couple of other things. Although it took my readers and me nine months to find OR's response, again indicating his reach, as you see it took him and his handlers just a few hours to be alerted to this paper. Meaning they are keeping pretty close tabs on me, as we have seen many times before on both of my sites. Contradicting their claims I am just a marginal character of no importance. The other thing to notice is that this response to me came from a nameless and faceless computer guy, not from one of the mainstream people in the field that I have attacked by name, including the top names in Solar Cycle prediction. You have to imagine they knew they would get chewed up like this (since they already had many times) and passed the job on to their lap and yap dog OR, who, being an anonymous nobody, had nothing to lose here. This is also typical of the mainstream, which has exhibited all the honesty and backbone of a moist earwig since I first arrived on the scene 25 years ago, proving my thesis that science has bottomed out like nothing else could.

November 13, 2025: I have been keeping my eye on the sunspot counts, and they are indeed faking again by huge amounts. [Check the charts today at Solen.info](#), where you will see they have reported 150, when the real count should be about 240 [if that takes you to the main page, click on archived pages for this date]. As just one example, we see them again misweighing the big spot in region 14275, counting it as one when it should be at least 20. They do this across the board, suppressing the count by about 40%. This is to hide the big rise we are in now, as Saturn and Neptune start to move into alignment.

November 18, 2025: Back to show they are doing this every day now, faking by huge margins. They count three regions, but there should be at least six. They publish photos of three regions that clearly have sunspots, but refuse to see them. See regions S11613, S11616, and S11619.

S11613	2025.11.16		2	1	S14E64	0020	HRX		
S11614	2025.11.16				N06W04				
S11615	2025.11.16				N14E15				
S11616	2025.11.16		6	3	S21E68	0020	CRO		


They also miscount spots in 14284. Making those corrections, we should find about 100, instead of their report of 45.

November 25: They are still at it of course, reporting 99 today as the sunspot number, when it should be more like 190. They completely miss many spots in 14286, and underweigh all other regions.

December 1: They failed to report at least two regions (S11649 and S11640) and 85 spots, being a total of 105 short in the daily count. They reported 108 for the sunspot number when it should be around 213. A miss of almost 100%.

December 2: The mainstream spot count jumped by 67 today, up to 175, as a huge group moved across on the lower left. But that was still ignoring at least one region (S11654), and misweighing all others by 70. So the sunspot number should be 255.

December 5: Another big manufactured fall today to 133, as they fail to split the huge region 14294 into two regions as they should, censor the photo for 14302, and criminally misweigh everything else. 14294 is counted as 29 when it should be at least 50, 14296 is listed as 8 when it also should be about 50, 14299 is listed as 3 when it should be about 25, and 14298 is listed as 2 when it should be about 20. Making those corrections takes the number up from 133 to 257.



*Note, for instance, that my line runs above the Air Force line from 2020 to mid-2022 by about 20%, but after 2023 the Air Force line falls, dropping to 30-40% under my prediction. But suddenly in 2024 the mainstream line snaps up to my line, and they have moved along together since then, falling together in 2024, hitting the same low point, then rising together in 2025. Kind of strange, but I have told you why that is: Air Force was brought in in 2021 to keep numbers down, but they weren't doing enough of that, so they got a second memo in 2023 to double the fudging, which they did. At the end of 2023 they were suppressing numbers down to about 75, which was criminal. But in 2024 the real numbers went so high, with dailies hitting modern records above 380, that Air Force could no longer keep up. It just wasn't possible to fudge a 230 monthly down to 140, to keep it below my prediction. I think they quit and told the mainstream scientists at NOAA/SWPC and SILSO they were on their own. After my big hit on the mid-cycle low in Jan. 2025, Air Force was ordered back in to fake a lower low that spring, as I show above.