

## The Next Round of Fudging and Lying Begins



*by Miles Mathis*

*First published May 28, 2022*


Another prediction came true this week. On May 19 the Solar numbers drove a stake through the heart of mainstream scientists, and I predicted then that none of them would have the grace to admit they had been wrong. I predicted they would continue to lie and misdirect, to keep eyes off me. And less than five days later they proved me right again, lifting a zombie head out of the coffin long enough to cobble together some more pathetic spin and claim they were right after all.

See [this article rushed into print at \*Sky and Telescope\*](#), where the usual suspects try to convince a gullible audience they were spot on in their predictions. Other mainstream outlets including NASA have already admitted this Cycle is running **more than double** widely published mainstream predictions, but these people have the audacity to claim the numbers are falling within their predictions and confirming their models. Lisa Upton of the Space Systems Research Corporation (above, center) says


**The cycle is following very nicely along the strongest/earliest of [the panel's] predictions and is certainly on track to be another weak cycle.**

Really, Lisa? Being off by 120% is a confirmation then, is it? Good to know.

As I have been saying for years, these people are absolutely shameless. Just to remind you, this is what Lisa and her pals predicted:



While this is what [Dr. Tony Phillips at NASA](#) admitted in April:



He put it this way: “the sunspot numbers are racing ahead and the gap is growing.” And that doesn't even include the huge spike we just saw ten days ago, coinciding with the Jupiter-Neptune conjunction I predicted. Nor does it include the fact that the Air Force is purposely suppressing numbers by huge margins.

So just ask yourself, what sort of person could appear in print now claiming their predictions are spot on?

While claiming their previous prediction was not wrong, Lisa Upton and David Hathaway (above, right) are now updating their “prediction”, increasing it by 30%. Sort of silly, since why would you increase a spot-on prediction by 30%? Also sort of silly, since it isn't a prediction now. It is a *postdiction*. Real numbers are already above 100, showing increases of 120%, so increasing a “prediction” by 30% is just lunacy. Also lunacy is **to continue to claim this is a weak cycle**, even while we are on the steepest climb in living memory. I guess if this cycle hits 300 these people will continue

to sit in the coffin and claim it is weak, just as they predicted.




Just look at what Doug Biesecker from NOAA is saying in that article:

**Even with the recent activity, the sunspot number is still within the error bars of the solar cycle prediction from the panel.**

Sure it is Doug, since—as we can see above—you guys created error bars 90 spots wide. Unfortunately, your error bars at maximum only go up to 140, which is going to be a major problem when maximum goes to 240 or more, as I have been predicting for years. In fact, we are going to hit 140 **this fall**, in 2022, and 190 by early 2023, so you need to get busy expanding your error bars and predictions way beyond 30%. Remember, Doug is famous at IMDB for his aptly named 2010 miniseries *Bad Universe*. I guess they need to hire him for a sequel: *Bad Prediction*.

But you can see why I would be grateful they published this dreck, despite the fact they are misdirecting away from me with all possible energy. They are chronic and acute foot shooters, and they perform the usual suicide here, by continuing to flap their jaws. Here is their latest “prediction”:



The consensus model from Solar Cycle 25 Prediction Panel (red line) slightly underpredicts the Sun's current activity (sunspot numbers shown in black). But there's wiggle room in that prediction: give or take six months for the cycle's start and give or take 10 sunspots for the daily sunspot number. With an slightly earlier start and higher

activity, the panel's forecast is still spot on. *Space Weather Prediction Center*.

Yes, they actually say that: spot on. You have to laugh. They are moving a spot-on prediction by 30% and nine months, and it is spot-on both before and after they move it. “Confidence is high, captain. No appreciable damage!” as the boat sinks to the bottom of the Mariana Trench.

They are moving the peak back nine months to late 2024 and raising it from 115 to 125. But I guess they haven't heard: we are averaging 120 **now**. So if they want to predict 120-125 for maximum, they need to move it back another 30 months, *to now*. If the Air Force weren't misreporting numbers, the number for May 2022 would be 120 or more. We will see how they report it in a couple of days.

We also find this amazing claim in that article:

**In 2019, that panel of experts reviewed the available models and predictions for the next solar cycle. In doing so, they recognized that physics-based scenarios were more successful than other prediction methods, such as those based on empirical data of the Sun's behavior. In particular, the most successful models incorporated the behavior of the Sun's magnetic fields, especially those at the poles, as well as an understanding energy flow within the turbulent solar interior.**

You see what they are doing? They are trying to get you to believe they are more interested in mechanical models, which they are calling “physics-based”. Rather than just crunching old data. So they are trying to sell their latest number-crunching as mechanical, simply because it has to do with magnetic fields. Unfortunately, that is the opposite of the truth, since all their modeling is still non-mechanical and therefore non “physics-based”. It is pattern recognition, which is based on. . . crunching old numbers. They don't have anything else, so the only thing they can do is play with their computers, trying to force something out of them. They admit they don't know what causes Solar Cycles, so how could they possibly produce real numbers? To predict a Solar Cycle, you have to have a very firm theory of cycle creation, since even broad strokes won't help you. Eleven years is a very short cycle, in the grand scheme of things, so you need a great deal of precision to predict a single cycle. You can see this by [studying my own mechanics, and my own method of prediction](#). There is no noodling or imprecision there. I have to follow the positions of Sun, Galactic Core, and the four major planets, integrating nine different sine waves. Before I even do that, I have to have a firm knowledge of the charge field and how it works—something the mainstream does not have. The mainstream doesn't have even the most basic tools to solve this—even just concentrating on charge recycling and ignoring planet positions—so I know that nothing they are doing is “physics-based”, and that includes Scott McIntosh.


I mention him because of course *Sky and Telescope* is careful to cover all their bases, giving a late plug to McIntosh in that article. As Lisa Upton and David Hathaway and the others continue to crash and burn in the ugliest fashion, the mainstream will fall back on McIntosh at NCAR as the great savior and genius, guaranteeing they will never have to mention my name or admit I was right. They will neglect to tell you McIntosh's predictions were also not predictions, being based on his reading of my paper—which came out long before his and was already viral before he flipped his switch. They will forget to tell you that, like Upton and Hathaway, McIntosh's numbers are not mechanical or physics-based. They will forget to tell you that McIntosh never predicted specific peaks or specific monthlies, much less hit them on the head like I did with December 2020 and May 2022.

I have told you these people are loathsome, and they continue to prove that on a daily basis, racing


ahead with the gap growing.

**Added May 29, next day:** as if on cue, the Air Force increased its miscounting of sunspots today, reporting only 34 when they should have reported about 80. They miscounted several very large sunspots as singles, counting them as one instead of 10 or 12, say. They are doing this to keep the monthly average down, seeming to prevent it from hitting my prediction of 120. So they manufactured a big spike down right now, in support of Upton and the rest of these jokers.

**Added June 7:** Spaceweather.com updated its solar report today, giving us this nice graphic:



And admitting that numbers continue to run more than double predictions. I reprint that because it gives us McIntosh's prediction at about 185 with maximum in early 2025. It also lists his prediction as 2022, which interests me because my last prediction was **February 2020**. Here it is one more time:



As you see, I give you the actual monthlies, with 12 points calculated from my sine wave data. Monthly peak is at 240, way above McIntosh, and it comes very late, near the end of 2026. I have

calculated a dip around the first of 2025, due to misalignments among the large planets. Also an early peak in the beginning of 2023, just six months away. It will already be at 190 then, matching or beating McIntosh more than two years before his predicted peak.

Also notice that the mainstream, including McIntosh, don't even bother to give their predictions double humps, although they must know all cycles have them. They just give you a smooth curve that looks like a smoothed prediction, though I am not aware that it is. If it is smoothed beyond monthly they aren't telling us what scale it is smoothed on. That's because they haven't got any way to predict which hump will be larger, or how wide the separation will be. They have no mechanism of double humping, so they just ignore it, pretending each cycle has only one major spike. But I have shown the second hump will be larger precisely because we have more planetary alignments then. Saturn/Neptune will align in 2026 and Jupiter/Uranus in 2027.