

# NASA and HAO/NCAR begin Snuggling up to Me *of course without mentioning my name*

*by Miles Mathis*

*First published December 4, 2020*

My Dutch collaborator Steven Oostdijk has just informed me that [the Wikipedia page on cycle 25](#) immediately began changing after [our recent paper of a few days ago](#). Most predictions of cycle 25 are quickly being revised up, sometimes drastically. The biggest change reported there has come from Scott McIntosh, who, after earlier [predicting cycle 25 would be weaker than cycle 24](#), published a paper in mid-October revising that completely. He is now predicting it will be far larger, and might be the largest in recent times. This after implying that cycle 25 might hardly exist at all, saying odds were that we were entering a Grand Solar Minimum of extended weakness.

So what changed his mind? Couldn't have been [my huge paper from February 2020](#), showing not only a detailed prediction of cycle 25, but also the actual mechanism of all Solar Cycles. You will say it was early activity that prompted him, which was stronger than expected, but that can't be the case. His paper was from October, remember, and the rise didn't come until late November. Besides, his new paper is based on an old Solar model, not on an extrapolation of current data, so we know it wasn't prompted by that.

Amazingly, other papers were even retracted from places like *Nature*, and that happened when? **March 2020**, the month after my paper appeared. [See Zharkova et al.](#) Just a coincidence, I'm sure.

The Solar Cycle 25 Prediction Panel predicted in December 2019<sup>[4]</sup> that solar cycle 25 will be similar to solar cycle 24, with the preceding solar cycle minimum in April 2020 ( $\pm 6$  months), sunspots reaching a (smoothed) maximum of 115 in July 2025 ( $\pm 8$  months). This prediction is in line with the current general agreement in the scientific literature, which holds that solar cycle 25 will be weaker than average (i.e. weaker than during the exceptionally strong **Modern Maximum**).<sup>[5]</sup> Upton and Hathaway have predicted that the weakness of cycle 25 would make it part of the **Modern Minimum**.<sup>[6]</sup> Several varying predictions have been made regarding the strength of cycle 25, with predictions ranging from very weak with suggestions of slow slide in to a Maunder minimum like state similar to previous cycle 24<sup>[5]</sup> and even a strong cycle.<sup>[9][10][11]</sup> One published solar cycle prediction, which had claimed a very weak cycle with a slide to Maunder-like minimum in activity, was retracted from *Nature* due to fundamental errors which overstated Earth-Sun distance variability over a period of centuries.<sup>[7]</sup>

Source	Date	Cycle max	Cycle start	Cycle end
Thompson, M.J. <i>et al.</i> <sup>[3]</sup>	August 2014		Q4 2019	
Zharkova, V. <i>et al</i> 2014, 2015. <sup>[12]</sup> (Northumbria U.)	October 2014,	80% of cycle 24		
Upton, L.A. and Hathaway, D.H. <sup>[6]</sup> (Solar Observatories Group, Stanford University)	December 2018	95% of cycle 24	Late 2020 – Early 2021	
Xu, J.C. <i>et al.</i> <sup>[9]</sup> (Chinese Academy of Sciences)	August 2018	152.2–184.8 (2024)	October 2020	
Bhowmik, P. and Nandy, D. <sup>[5]</sup> (IISER Kolkata)	December 2018	109–139 (2023–2025)	2020	after 2031
Ozguc, A. <i>et al.</i> <sup>[10]</sup> (Harvard U-ty)	December 2018	154 $\pm$ 12 (2023.2 $\pm$ 1.1)		
NOAA / SSRC <sup>[13]</sup>	April 2019	95–130 (2023–2026)	mid-2019 – late 2020	
NASA <sup>[14]</sup>	June 2019	30–50% lower than Cycle 24 (2025)	2020	
NOAA / SSRC (update) <sup>[15]</sup>	December 2019	105–125 (July 2025)	April 2020 (+/- 6 months)	

I screenshotted that today to make sure we have a record of it. I may want to frame it at some point. Just to remind you, I have long predicted cycle 25 would be 62% *above* cycle 24. Also that cycle 26 would be a monster, comparable to 1958. I am also the only one who correctly predicted 25 would start back in 2018. I did that in 2014. Which it did, though these mainstream bozos are using [13-month smoothing](#) to hide it.

Amazing to see this tidbit still sitting at Wikipedia:

In November 2019, two reversed polarity sunspots appeared, possibly signaling the onset of cycle 25.

You really have to be kidding me. Mainstream scientists have been tagging reverse polarity sunspots since 2017, and I have cataloged several of those [in my papers](#). The admissions have been sitting on Solen.info for years. In the paragraph above that, Wikipedia even admits it, giving you those links themselves. So why would they tell you right after that that reverse polarity spots two years later were signaling cycle 25? They admit reverse polarity sunspots are a sign of Solar Minimum, admit we have been seeing them since 2017, and then tell you Solar Minimum was in Dec. 2019? Madness.

This is what has been added at Wikipedia since December 1:

As of December 1 2020, solar cycle 25 is showing early signs of being somewhat stronger than solar cycle 24.

- The 13-month average sunspot count for May 2020 was 5.6 spots per day, compared to 3.5 for the corresponding month in the previous cycle.
- November 2020 averaged 34 spots per day, 10 months earlier than the first month to average 30 or more in cycle 24.
- The first single day to have 90 spots has occurred in month 12 of this cycle, compared with month 27 in cycle 24.
- Since June 1 2020, there have been 78 spotless days, compared to 130 in the corresponding period of cycle 24.<sup>[24]</sup>

These figures are in early agreement with a new paper (October 2020) by McIntosh et. al.<sup>[25]</sup> which projects that solar cycle 25 will almost certainly be stronger than SC24 (ISN max 116), and most likely stronger than SC23 (ISN max 180).

“These figures are in early agreement”? I have news for them: this isn't “early”. This is almost 2.5 years into cycle 25—which began in July 2018 or earlier—and 10 months after I published my paper, before which NOBODY was predicting a 162% cycle 25.

Here is the abstract of McIntosh et al from Astro-ph.SR:

**Abstract The Sun exhibits a well-observed modulation in the number of spots on its disk over a period of about 11 years. From the dawn of modern observational astronomy sunspots have presented a challenge to understanding - their quasi-periodic variation in number, first noted 175 years ago, stimulates community-wide interest to this day. A large number of techniques are able to explain the temporal landmarks, (geometric) shape, and amplitude of sunspot “cycles,” however forecasting these features accurately in advance remains elusive. Recent observationally-motivated studies have illustrated a relationship between the Sun’s 22-year (Hale) magnetic cycle and the production of the sunspot cycle landmarks and patterns, but not the amplitude of the sunspot cycle. Using (discrete) Hilbert transforms on more than 270 years of (monthly) sunspot numbers we robustly identify the so-called “termination” events that mark the end of the previous 11-yr sunspot cycle, the enhancement/acceleration of the present cycle, and the end of 22-yr magnetic activity cycles. Using these we extract a relationship between the temporal spacing of terminators and the magnitude of sunspot cycles. Given this relationship and our prediction of a terminator event in 2020, we deduce that Sunspot Cycle 25 could have a magnitude that rivals the top few since records began. This outcome would be in stark contrast to the community consensus estimate of sunspot cycle 25 magnitude.**

**1 National Center for Atmospheric Research, High Altitude Observatory, P.O. Box 3000, Boulder,**

**CO 80307, USA**

**2 Centre for Fusion, Space and Astrophysics, University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, UK**

**3 University of Maryland-Baltimore County, Goddard Planetary Heliophysics Institute, Baltimore, MD 21250, USA**

**4 NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Code 672, Greenbelt, MD 20771, USA**

**5 Centre for the Analysis of Time Series, London School of Economics and Political Science, London WC2A 2AZ, UK**

**6 School of Engineering and Innovation, STEM Faculty, The Open University, Milton Keynes, UK**

So they are doing Hilbert transforms on the Hale Cycle, crunching 270 years of past data to track termination events. This is similar to what David Hathaway at NASA did in 2006 in predicting cycle 24 would be one of the strongest on record. McIntosh is just moving the bet up a cycle. But instead of using previous geomagnetic data, McIntosh is using heliomagnetic data.

Before we look at his paper, such as it is, let us notice a few things in the abstract and authors list. The abstract is wordy and has almost no content, tipping us off to what is to come. He could cut the entire first half and lose nothing. But the author's list does throw up some red flags. Such as the London School of Economics. What are they doing here? [Read my paper of yesterday](#) and I think you will figure it out. Same for the STEM guy from the Open University.

The first really amusing thing we find in the article is the claim that cycle prediction has become a high stakes business. That can hardly be true, since no one has ever gotten anything right in the history of Solar Cycles prediction. And no one has ever suffered anything from that failure. So how is that high stakes? McIntosh told more truth in the preceding paragraph, where he admitted no one in the mainstream knows what is going on, so everyone is free to pull some wild theory out of their shorts—with no mechanics to back it up. Nothing but computer models. Although these theories all disagree, amazingly they all manage to be wrong every time. That is of course because they have no idea what is causing the Solar Cycles, and McIntosh has no intention of telling you here. Because he doesn't know or pretend to know. Like the rest, he has simply noticed a pattern in back data, and thinks it might give him a lead. So he rolls the dice.

All these “models” listed by Wikipedia aren't really theoretical models, since they aren't based on a mechanical theory of cycle cause. They are based on a computer crunch of past data, trying to force some lucky prediction from that. Which means that even in the case one of them accidentally correctly predicts something, the model is still wrong. None of these models can be right, because they have no mechanical content. They are just numerical computer models given fancy names and tied to fancy maths.

Next he tells you the best method has so far been the “polar predictor model”, which exploits solar minimum data to predict the maximum. *Of course* that is the best method, since the minimum data they are using is the first upswing. That is already part of the cycle and the build to maximum, so that is sort of cheating, isn't it? That is what they are doing right now to adjust all “predictions” up. But predicting a peak after the line has already started going up isn't really a prediction, it is just an extrapolation. It is better than anything else they have, because beyond that they have nothing. The only way they could cheat more is to use data right before maximum to predict it. But they have done that in the past, and patted themselves on the back for it. They have also used data after maximum to “predict it”. No, seriously.

The next amusing thing we read is this:

**Sunspot Cycle 25 is no different in terms of stakes - bringing some of the most sophisticated physical model forecasts to the discussion in addition to the robust and refined data-motivated methods - the international NOAA/NASA co-chaired Solar Cycle 25 Prediction Panel. . .**

Sophisticated? Yeah. Robust? OK. Data-motivated? That I can buy, since they certainly aren't theory or mechanics motivated.

Next, McIntosh admits that he used the same Hale Cycle model back in 2014 to predict the opposite of what he is predicting now. So apparently his method isn't as robust as he claims. The difference, he claims, is that his previous analysis only including the past 60 years of data, where the new analysis is using 270 years of data. So we are supposed to believe that would flip the prediction from very weak to very strong? More data of the same sort normally tunes your prediction, it doesn't flip it completely.

The rest of the paper isn't worth reading, since we know without looking at it that it is wrong. Even if the prediction turns out to be correct, that must be just a lucky guess or a push, since we know Solar Cycles are not caused by conforming to past data. In other words, the Sun doesn't look at past data to figure out what to do now. The present is not caused by the past. It is caused by present *relationships* in the Solar System and Galaxy. In the same way, we know the Sun is not causing its own cycles, by actions upon itself. That isn't the way that physics works, and it isn't the way the universe works. Cycles aren't causing themselves. The Hale Cycle isn't causing the Solar Cycle, though they are both outcomes of the same thing. It would be like saying the growth of a baby's arm was causing the growth of its leg. No, eating food is causing the growth of both, along with other factors. It is those real factors we seek, not matching patterns between arms and legs.

All these scientists should know this, and I assume they do know it. Which is why I think they are wildly dishonest to continue this fraud, and especially to continue to bury me on purpose to suit themselves. They must know by now I am right. You would have to be dense beyond reckoning not to know it, so I give them the benefit of the doubt.

Reading McIntosh's paper confirmed what I suspected from the start: like some of these others, he has no doubt read my paper and seen the writing on the wall. So his little mind began cranking to see if he could make some short-term hay from it. He is gambling that I will be right, and at the same time gambling that most of his colleagues don't know about me. We will see how that second part works out for him. Since my physics papers have long outranked those of mainstream outlets, it is doubtful he is right about that. His colleagues may not nod to me even after the fact, but they will know where he got his idea.