

Scott McIntosh Continues to Steal my Ideas

by Miles Mathis

First published December 13, 2022

Today Spaceweather.com ran promotion for [McIntosh's new paper](#) at *Frontiers*, claiming his “discovery” there are two solar cycles overlapping in each cycle. They admit he didn't discover anything, since this has been noticed all the way back to 1903, and possibly earlier. But McIntosh and his buddies have dredged it back up, since they are desperate to draw attention away from me in any way they can, even if they have to go back to 1903 to do it. I guess this two-cycle thing is as close as they can get to my theory without setting off alarm bells and having their own colleagues come down on them. But it is getting very close.

So McIntosh is simultaneously stealing my ideas and turning them to crud in the way only he can. These people are pretending to just notice that each cycle has two peaks, something that is pretty obvious to anyone awake, and something [I pointed out almost a decade ago](#). They are also pretending to just notice the two separate waves of magnetism rolling across the Sun, although those too have been known for a long time. I discussed them in my first paper on this back in 2014.

You will say, “If the noticing of these sub-cycles go back to 1903, how can they be 'your ideas'?” They are mine because only I have shown the mechanical cause of them, which is what physics is all about. . . or used to be. Like the scientists from 1903, McIntosh only points at these two waves in each cycle, but neither they nor he have any explanation what is causing them. McIntosh gabs about his Terminator theory, but as we have seen that is just a pushing of data itself, with no physical causes offered. He claims the Hale Cycle causes the Solar Cycle, but since that is just rolling data itself, he only takes the question back a step: what physically causes the Hale Cycle? No answer. I give you his abstract *in toto*:

Through meticulous daily observation of the Sun’s large-scale magnetic field the Wilcox Solar Observatory (WSO) has catalogued two magnetic (Hale) cycles of solar activity. Those two (> 22-year long) Hale cycles have yielded four (> 11-year long) sunspot cycles (numbers 21 through 24). Recent research has highlighted the persistence of the “Extended Solar Cycle” (ESC) and its connection to the fundamental Hale Cycle—albeit through a host of proxies resulting from image analysis of the solar photosphere, chromosphere and corona. This short manuscript presents the correspondence of the ESC, the surface toroidal magnetic field evolution, and the evolution of the Hale Cycle. As Sunspot Cycle 25 begins, interest in observationally mapping the Hale and Extended cycles could not be higher given potential predictive capability that synoptic scale observations can provide.

The announcement of nothing. Data and nothing else. Not even a hint at any physics or mechanics.

The only reason any of this is getting any attention is because McIntosh stole my prediction for this Cycle, changing his earlier prediction from very weak to very strong. And doing it AFTER I had already predicted very strong.

McIntosh is trying to generate excitement by stacking this two-cycle claim on top of his correct prediction of very strong, but of course that begs the question what is causing the two cycles, doesn't it? His theoretical failure just doubled, but he doesn't want anyone to see that. If he is just now noticing


the dual cycle, you may wish to ask him how he successfully predicted anything without knowing that. How could he predict the cycle and *then* notice the dual nature of it? It doesn't make any sense, does it, just as a matter of timing? How does someone who has so little mechanical understanding of the data just luck into a successful prediction, while all his colleagues are missing it? Now you know.

What is amazing is that McIntosh and his merry band still have to pretend to be unaware of what is causing the two sub-cycles. They have to pretend not to have read my paper (over and over) and not to know that it is the Jupiter/Saturn cycle and the Jupiter/Neptune cycle. [I posted all the flow charts](#) in February of 2020, *proving* my first [idea from 2014 was correct](#): it is the planets—especially the big four—causing the Solar Cycles. But the main two sine waves in that Cycle are of course caused by Jupiter/Saturn conjunctions and Jupiter/Neptune conjunctions. I had long since done the simple math showing why Neptune was more important than Uranus, using charge field/unified field theory I had come up [in my Bode paper way back in 2009](#). That I was correct was proved over the past two years, as the biggest spikes in that period [have matched up perfectly with these planetary conjunctions](#).


You will say the planetary alignment idea goes way back as well, being dismissed over a hundred years ago by the mainstream. So again, how can I claim it is “mine”? Because only I have shown the mechanics, done the math, published the charts, and made the successful predictions. Only I tied this to the charge field/unified field, explaining all the mechanics from the ground up—from the spinning photon up. See that Bode paper, the [Axial Tilt paper](#) that came out at the same time, the [Lagrangian paper](#) that proved the unified field, [the Maxwell paper](#) that showed its historical genesis, and the hundreds of papers on the charge field that have come out since, redefining everything from [the atomic nucleus](#) to the [Earth's core](#) to [Galactic Rotation](#) to [unification](#).

I have predicted another big spike in very early 2023, again due only to planetary alignments (and alignment to the galactic core) and that is coming up very soon. After my earlier successes, the Air Force was called in to take over reporting of sunspots, which had never happened before and is a huge red flag. They have been suppressing totals by large margins, accelerating into the last quarter of this year, so I don't know if they will allow any big rise in data at this time. I guess we are about to find out.

Added December 15: Looks like the spike is already starting, two days after this paper came out. Here is the prediction from February 2020, so that you can see it for yourself:



We are on the third major spike there, which I have circled at about the turn of the year, predicting a monthly average of about 190. Those circled points are calculated points, meaning I calculated them by combining all the lines of influence between the four Jovians and the galactic core, **both** the lines to the Core and the lines between the planets themselves. As from this graph from that same paper:



Cycle 25 has already confirmed my first two peaks, and it is now confirming the third. The Jupiter/Saturn conjunction at the end of 2020 matched a large spike at that time, both in spots and flux, and the Jupiter/Neptune conjunction in April/May of 2022 matched an even larger one. Solen reported 175 today, but from their own published photos we can tell they trimmed about 100 off that. My count is about 275. They reported 11 active areas, giving us 110 as a baseline, and they (Air Force) then blacked out the first three of those area photos. In the others, Air Force consistently mis-weighs the size of all large spots.

Those cycles in my graphs are not caused by gravitational lines of influence, and are not strictly electrical either. They are caused by lines of **charge** coming into the system from the Galactic Core, cycling through the Sun, and being fed out into the Solar System on the Solar Equator. Charge then travels out to the planets, where they pull it in at their poles, recycling it through their bodies, and then returning it to the Sun on the same lines. It is when it returns to the Sun that it create the rolling waves of magnetism the mainstream has been cataloging for decades. They are caused mainly by the competing streams of Jupiter/Neptune and Jupiter/Saturn.

Added December 20: Since I outed their trick of publishing old photos of the Sun at Solen.info, they have simply proved my point by increasing the fraud. Today they published a coronal hole photo from December 2, *eighteen days ago*. Why? They have these available daily. I already told you: to prevent you from comparing those photos to the sunspot diagrams. In the sunspot diagrams the Air Force is now just erasing entire areas, but until recently you could compare that diagram to the coronal photo. You can't do that anymore because they are now hiding the coronal hole photos, in response to my recent analysis.

After allowing the sunspot number to go to 175 four days ago (should have been 275), someone jumped in and demanding that number go down. The next day they reported 140, when it should have been around 225. The next day it dropped to 130 when it should have been about 215.