

SOLAR CYCLES

another prediction

by Miles Mathis

March 6, 2020

On February 2, [I posted charts of the upcoming Solar Cycles](#), including in-depth predictions for Cycle 25 and Cycle 26. I showed Cycle 26—which will peak in about 2037—would be similar in strength to Cycle 19, which peaked in 1957 and is the largest on record. That's the good news.

The bad news is that the strength of the upcoming Cycles will tend to be fodder for the Global Warming frauds, and I predict they will use the trend to claim victory and continue the scare tactics, using them to sell various treasury dips and new taxes.


Because what few have told you is that there is a correlation between global temperatures and longterm Solar Cycles. For instance, the Little Ice Age corresponds to the Maunder Minimum. Mid-20th century warming corresponds to strong Cycles in those decades, and cooling from the late 1950s to the 1990s also follows diminishing Solar Cycles. So a stronger Sun in the upcoming decades will likely lead to a real bump in global temperatures.

Remember, the big scare in the 1970s was Global Cooling, when they were sucking from the treasury to respond to that conjob. When that failed to pan out and temperatures flattened, they decided to switch gears and sell the Global Warming scare instead. These people are salesmen and they always have to be selling something.


This is not to say we don't have major environmental problems that require immediate action. We do. We have huge problems of pollution and environmental degradation caused by industry, military, government, corporate farming, and general modern lifestyles. But they won't be solved by more taxes or sucking from the treasury. They will be solved by passing laws and enforcing compliance. Since our huge military and Intelligence communities are doing nothing but wasting money on fake events, they could be tapped to enforce these laws. I know that isn't going to happen, but I can't help putting it out there.

Anyway, the reason I don't support current government programs to address Global Warming is that I know most data is pushed, in that field as in all other scientific fields. Mainstream science—like everything else now—is off the rails, and nobody on either side of any debate has any honor or scruples. It is little more than a Punch and Judy show.

As just one example, see this graph which I take from the [Wikipedia page on the Little Ice Age](#).



That should look somewhat strange to you if you are familiar with the Climate Change debates, especially the Hockey Stick graph of Michael Mann:



Where is the Little Ice Age on Mann's graph? If we are to believe him, the Little Ice Age was a .2 degree drop from about 1440 to about 1490. While on Wiki's anonymous graph (where is it from?) there was a full degree drop after the Medieval Warm Period, and they admit the Little Ice Age lasted from about 1300 to about 1850.

But even that is to understate it, since Wiki's graph under-reports the Medieval Warm Period. But first, where is the Medieval Warm Period on the Hockey Stick graph? If we are to believe Michael Mann, the Medieval Warm Period looks like it was a .2 degree rise from 1150 to 1200. According to Wiki's graph, it looks like a .7 degree rise from year 550 to 1000. So it is left off Mann's graph by just stopping the graph at a convenient point. However, previous to about 2000, the mainstream graph from the IPCC put the Medieval Warming Period at .5, peaking in around 1200, and the Little Ice Age at around -.6, peaking in around 1650. A 1.1 degree drop. Nothing like that appears on the Hockey Stick at all.

Mann has a .4 degree rise from 1910 to 1950, but no previous graphs showed that. The IPCC previous graphs from the 1990s showed only about a .2 degree rise in that period, and that looked like the continuation of a warming trend that went all the way back to 1590 (as you can see on the Wiki graph).

Also notice that on the Hockey Stick graph, Mann has the dip after 1940 being about .1 degrees. That isn't what they were reporting in the 1970s. When they were telling us the next Ice Age was upon us, NCAR was reporting [a .4 drop in the same period](#) (minute 2:40).* The National Academy of Sciences was reporting an even greater drop in its graphs of 1975 (minute 4:45) of about .75 degrees from 1938 to 1974. So it interesting that mainstream data is so malleable.

[**Added March 19, 2020:** It also helps to go even further back, since we find not only a Medieval Warm Period, we find a Roman Warm Period and before that a Minoan Warm Period. All three were at least as warm as the current Warm Period, and likely moreso. The mainstream admits these warm periods exist and were very warm, but then says we have been in a cooling trend since the Medieval Warm Period, so the current Warm Period can't be explained except by greenhouse gasses. But that doesn't fly because there were cooling trends before the other Warm Periods, too. This is cyclical, and these Warm Periods arise on about a thousand year schedule. The Medieval Warm Period was about 1000 years ago, the Roman was 2000 years ago, and the Minoan was 3000 years ago. There were other warm periods at 4000, 5000, 7000, and 8000 years ago. Just from that, we may assume that whatever caused the previous periods is causing the current one. Which would be some sort of Solar Cycle. Which one? Well, you won't believe how easy this is. We return to my 2011 [paper on the Ice Ages](#) to crunch the numbers. There we are reminded of the precession number 23,000 years, also known as the Great Year. Halving that gives us about 11,500 years, which is about the length of a sub-interglacial period. Nine of those give us an interglacial period of around 103,000 years. Well, the Solar Cycle period is about 11 years, so we just divide, $11,500/11=1,045$ years. **The length between Warm Periods.** So the Warm Periods are once again caused by a Solar System alignment to the Galactic Core. And of course this takes us back to my recent paper on the [Cause of the Solar Cycles](#), and my assistant Steven Oostdijk pointing out that our model wasn't yet 3D. We weren't including secondary tilts. This is one of those secondary tilts we are ignoring there, because it could only cause longer-term cycles. If you aren't yet seeing it, this 1,000-year cycle is caused by the tilt of the Solar System relative to the Galaxy. It is known to be tilted at 60 degrees to the Galactic plane. But it is also caused by the planets orbiting *inside* the Solar System. Combining those two cycles gives us a third one, defined by the positions of the planets relative to the Galaxy. Every **ninety** cycles, the planets hit an alignment that most efficiently pulls Galactic charge into the Solar south pole.

Again, I have to say this is pretty shocking. The math is so easy I can't believe I am the first one doing it. No one ever noticed this 1000-year cycle in warm periods and considered it must have a mechanical cause? Did they think comets were passing every thousand years, for some unknowable reason? They never thought to divide one known number by another? The only thing I can come up with is that they thought this smacked of astrology, and so were embarrassed by peer pressure from considering it. That, or it is just another one in a long line of shocking negligence by the mainstream. The top dogs were too busy jawing about black holes and the first seconds of the universe to divide 11,000 by 11.

Addendum April 30, 2020: I have gotten emails from those who don't understand the math I just did. They tell me I can't divide 11,500 by 11 here, since the number 1045 isn't thereby a period of time. Strictly that is true, but what they are missing is that the number 11 comes up multiple times in the math here, and that is no accident. In other words, all these numbers are periods of time: the Solar Cycle, the longer Warm Period, and the even longer Great Year. What is more, they are all *caused* by the same thing: the Solar Cycle, and specifically the alignment of planets. In that sense, the Solar Cycle is like the base of the fractal, with the longer periods being functions of that base. So the number 11 coming up multiple times isn't an accident. It is the way fractals work. Since we have chosen the year as the base unit, 11 then become the base number, since it is connected to the year at the ground

level. That base number then gets repeated in the math for a physical reason, creating the fractal in Nature. I will be told I can't just assume the fractal here: I should have to demonstrate it. I may get around to that, but for now the assumption will have to do. As you know, I have a lot of irons in the fire, to keep from getting bored, and I work on my own schedule. But in the meantime I felt I should post a short clarification, to undercut those using this episode to question my sanity. Yes, I am flying on intuition here, but that doesn't mean I am wrong. It is possible I am wrong, of course, but my intuition has a pretty good track record. I have previously shown many instances where number matches like this were not a coincidence, and they often come down to this sort of fractalization of Nature. Even with zero intuition, probability math tells us the same thing: it is very unlikely that the number 11 in both places is an accident.]

Since Wikipedia is running interference for Mann and the mainstream, it is curious they are letting their Little Ice Age graph stand. You would have expected them to have jettisoned it along with the IPCC graphs from the 1990s.

Which means. . . the mainstream just says whatever it wants and makes up data as it goes along. If it finds Global Cooling more profitable, we have that for a while. If it finds Global Warming more profitable, we have that.

Those coming here from my art/history site will also find this fascinating: in a 1976 *National Geographic* article (see previous link, minute 5:15), Dr. Mitchell from NOAA admits that the northern hemisphere went through an **era of significant warming** from 1880 to 1940. Furthermore, on March 2, 1975, the *Chicago Tribune* reported that “**for the first time this century** ships making for Iceland ports have been impeded by drifting ice”. Do you see what that means? That contradicts [the Titanic story](#), doesn't it? The *Titanic* allegedly hit an iceberg in 1912, which is the same century as 1975. And it allegedly did so far south of Iceland. The *Titanic* wreck is supposed to be at 41.7 N. Iceland is at 64.8 N. [That's about 1600 miles difference in latitude, or the same as the width of the US, from the tip of Maine to the tip of Florida.] There was no drifting ice at 64.8 N from 1900 to 1975, but we are supposed to believe the *Titanic* hit ice in 1912 at 41.7 N?

*Just so you know, by linking you to this guy, I am not supporting his conclusions. I don't know who he is, but he does link to Tony Heller, who quotes Bill Gates and appears to be an apologist for the energy industry. So I don't trust him. As usual I think both sides of this argument are manufactured by the Phoenician navy, and they profit either way. The entire debate is a diversion on both sides, since it keeps you off the real problems and the real solutions. They want you to think all progressives and environmentalists believe in Global Warming and believe in the current government solutions, and that everyone who doesn't believe in them is pro-industry. While the truth is behind the un-offered third curtain: Global Warming is a policy fraud to keep industry from having to deal with any of its messes regardless. If anyone ends up paying for a trashed environment, it won't be the people who trashed it. It will be the middle-class taxpayers, represented by no one in this debate and by no one in Washington.