

[return to updates](#)


SOLAR CYCLE 25 IS STRONG

by Miles Mathis


First published January 9, 2022

As you already know, the mainstream, including NASA, NOAA, and all the other top institutions wimped out and predicted Cycle 25 would be pretty much the same as Cycle 24. They did that only based on the raw odds, though they made up some rough computer models to hide that. They had no reason to predict anything else, since they admit they don't know what drives the cycles. In the recent past, they have tried to crunch past numbers to force some sort of pattern, but weren't able to do it. They were embarrassingly wrong about Cycle 24, using that method. So this time they voted and decided to play it safe. With zero data, you would bet the next cycle would be similar to the last one, so that is what they did. One guy read my paper of February 2020 and decided to steal my prediction, but he will just end up embarrassing himself in a different way, since his colleagues will know where he got it. He tried to manufacture an algorithm, but when compared to my mechanical theory, it is just pathetic.

We are about two years in now and [mainstream data is matching my predictions almost exactly](#), confounding all hopes of the institutional people. The graph below is from NASA, and they are being forced to admit numbers are running more than double the official forecast.



[Here was my forecast](#), posted long before theirs came out:



As you see, I predicted about 85 for December 2021 and am predicting 120 for April 2022. That is when Jupiter begins aligning strongly with Neptune. The mainstream predicted about 29 for December and 38 for April. The number for December is being reported as 67.6 at Solen.info, but I just calculated using their own daily numbers, getting 69.4. Apparently they don't know how to use calculators. They claim someone projected 57, but as you see from the mainstream chart above, the projection was below 35. You will say that is a smoothed prediction, and someone found a way to project a number for December. No, the projection at Solen is tagged "smooth". They don't have any way to predict monthly numbers, since they have no mechanics. Only I have been able to predict monthly numbers, since I provided all the charts.

Which means we need to smooth my numbers, to compare them directly to the mainstream predictions. If you smooth my graph at December, you get about 70.

But it is even worse than that, as I have shown in many previous papers, because they have been fudging the numbers for more than a year, to keep them low. The monthly black line in their own chart above should be EVEN HIGHER. That climb is far steeper than they are admitting, because they were instructed after my paper came out to suppress numbers. The Air Force came in and took control of sunspot counts, although that had always been done by NASA, NOAA, or other agencies, never the Air Force. That is because they had been thrown into crisis mode by my correct prediction and theory. They needed to make it look like I wasn't correct, so they just pretended not to see many spots, or to see them as far smaller than they were.

So my "prediction" for December was actually too low. Why? Because, as I admit in the paper of Feb. 2020, those particular spikes aren't hard predictions. They are just fake peaks I drew to indicate the climb, and to remind everyone this wasn't a smoothed graph. The only *calculated* peaks or monthly predictions are the ones circled. Those are taken from charts higher up in the paper, and are tied to planetary alignments. Those full charts are published in that paper, and if anyone wishes to calculate more monthlies from them, they easily can. I didn't do it myself because I am working with pencil and paper. I am not a data or computer guy, I am a theory guy. My job was to post the theory and main

numbers. Others can do the rest. I keep moving on to new problems.