Another Fatal Wound to the Mainstream



by Miles Mathis

October 22, 2025

I am currently scoring another huge win on the Solar Cycle prediction, so I thought I would let you know. I had planned to wait until it came to full fruition early in 2026, but why wait. I haven't posted an update on this question in about six months, so you can't accuse me of harping on it. Anyone else who had done this would be posting videos on Youtube every other day.

Above you see their own charts of Solar activity since 2024. Focus on the pink and dark red lines, which as you see bottomed out last spring but have been going back up since then. The pink line is the closest to a monthly sunspot number, so it compares most closely to my own prediction, which was chart of monthlies. As you see the pink line dropped down to about 100 and has since risen to 170, averaging around 160 since July, and putting it back where it was at the first of the year.

Why is that so painful to the mainstream? Two reasons, the second far worse than the first. The first being that they had thought the cycle had peaked at around 220 in 2024, or about 200 on their 81-day smooth. That would make their own prediction for peak of 120 about 70% wrong, but which would at least fit into their spread of predictions for the timing, which was from 2023-2026. Yes, they really did give themselves a three-year spread there:



See the blue box there, which is three years wide. I have seen them bragging they at least got that spread right, but with numbers rising again, their panic is rising with it.

Which leads us to the second bigger problem for them, which is that [I predicted this rise back in February of 2020.](#)



Go to 2025 there, where you see I not only predicted this rise and a second hump, I predicted the right numbers. As you see, my prediction was for monthlies in 2025 to rise to about 160 for most of the year, exactly what has happened. They are still in shock from my accurate prediction of those first five circled points, the first two of which fell on Jovian alignments and the fifth of which predicted the middle dip, and now I turn out to be right about the late rise as well.

How did I know? Because the current rise is due to the upcoming Saturn/Neptune alignment, which arrives in February 2026. That will give us our next big peak, since they also align roughly with the Galactic Core, or the charge line coming in from the Galactic Core.



The line from the Galactic Core is at about 8 o'clock there, and Saturn/Neptune line up with the Sun to about 3 or 9, so the line isn't perfect, but it is close enough to cause a large peak. Jupiter and Uranus also point to near 8 o'clock, which may add to the effect.

If you are just getting here, you may think that reeks of astrology, but it doesn't. Read my papers and get back to me. This is an EM field alignment, and the EM field is not wuwu. It is now known the planets have EM field influences, so I simply calculated those influences, while including this alignment to the Galactic Core—whence all charge and therefore EM activity enters the system.

So if you are counting, that is six big prediction successes over five years, on a question no one had ever even bothered to make a specific prediction about. No one had ever *thought* of predicting monthlies here, or even numbers in a given year, because they had no mechanism for Solar Cycles and therefore no method for generating predictions. Even their broad predictions for overall cycle strength had always been catastrophically wrong, and their broad prediction for this cycle was. . . catastrophically wrong. 70% is catastrophically wrong, and it may get worse.

In fact, it almost assuredly will, since I would say it is already clear we are going to have a second hump—as in my prediction—the only question being how high it will go and when.

As to that, I do have something to say. My only mistake so far in predicting this cycle was leaving off the Jupiter/Uranus conjunction of 2024, which was simply an oversight. However, I still count that as a win, since we did see a big spike then. Since my theory is one of spikes on Jovian conjunctions, that one still scores hugely for me, despite me leaving it off my graph. Well, as you see, I have marked a Jupiter/Uranus conjunction in late 2027, which is odd since there isn't one. Jupiter and Uranus will still be aligned to the Galactic Core then, as they are now, but the Sun isn't included in the alignment, so it isn't really a conjunction. So why did I mark it? I now think I simply mismarked JU for some reason, putting it in 2027 instead of 2024. Possibly some website indicated it was then and I didn't double-check it.

At any rate, that second hump was primarily a function of the sine wave graphs I made, not the Jovian conjunctions only. See the very important orange line in my goody.pdf paper linked above, which I was following even more than the six conjunctions. For that reason I am not even bothering to issue a correction. If I did so, I might lower the peak of October 2027, but I might also raise the JN peak of September 2028, offsetting that somewhat. But that first diagram has been so good to me, I think I will leave it as-is. Whatever I was thinking in February 2020, I was keyed in pretty tightly to the right mechanics, so I will just let it ride.