

My Opposition on the Solar Cycle Question

labyrinths of lubricity



by Miles Mathis

First published September 22, 2024

I finally thought to do a search on “Miles Mathis Solar Cycles” at Yandex, to see what came up in 2024. My own papers came up first, which is nice to see, but we see strange results nonetheless, even from Yandex. The third result is a discussion page at cloudynights.com from 2014—that is, **more than a decade ago**. The “discussion” was shut down after only 25 posts by only eight “people”, one for me and seven against. Of the seven against, only two are posting under real names. Both of them are apparently from the James Webb Space Telescope: David Knisely and Glenn LeDrew*. Of course the seven against have nothing substantial to say, sticking to weighty rebuttals like “two words: Solar Wind” and “crackpot”. Knisely dodges Solar Cycles altogether, sticking to *ad homs* and dismissals without readings: the usual unscientific kneejerk reaction we have come to expect from these my-other-car-is-a-bandwagon people. They call my one supporter a troll while acting like slimy trolls themselves. But Knisely stoops even lower, to outright lies, claiming my site appears to be abandoned in 2014, based on one broken link. Right Dave. Only thirty new papers in 2014, after 63 in 2013, and 81 in 2012. How many papers did you solo publish in those three years, Dave? And remember, my “abandoned” science site would soon go superviral, [outranking all the university sites and—on many questions—Wikipedia and the Dictionary](#). So no wonder Knisely and LeDrew crawled under a rock.

Also amusing is that by “Solar Wind”, this company man apparently means that because the Solar Wind is powerful and only moving out, no influences can move in. But of course if that were true, we wouldn't even be able to *see* the Jovians. The visible photons would be drowned out by the Solar

Wind, right? How can visible light, which is relatively weak, move back against a powerful Solar Wind? Well, these guys know the answer, which is why this is so pathetic. My theory is a theory of charge, and charge is photons, so it can dodge the Solar Wind in the same way the visible light does. Besides the Solar Wind moves on the charge field, not the reverse, so no real dodging is going on. The [charge field is primary](#), so it isn't dependent on the Solar Wind, for or against. Beyond that, these guys should know that EM fields are always bi-polar, which is why both electricity and magnetism are polar. In other words, the traffic is always two-way. If they didn't know the full extent of that before I came along, they should now that [I have diagrammed the nucleus](#), showing the mechanics from the ground up.

LeDrew dismisses any possible prediction as a matter of luck, so these guys have an answer for everything. If you don't make predictions you aren't a scientist, and if you do and get it right, you are just lucky. They are predefined winners and you are a predefined loser. Rather, LeDrew says I should be able to postdict previous cycles using my mechanism, claiming that is impossible. Others have tried it and failed. Except that [I did it extensively in 2020](#). What did LeDrew have to say about that? Oh that's right: nothing. That was just lucky, too, I guess. Not worth updating this exchange to admit they were wrong about everything. Not just wrong, but blocking for their masters.

Other anon posters are also sure to pre-bomb anything that might happen in the future (and that did) by claiming that even if I successfully predicted a Solar Cycle, it would just be luck. You have to laugh, this is so pathetic. I can see why they ended the comments: they didn't have any feet left to shoot off.

But the greater question is how this page can still rank so high on this question, even at Yandex, which—unlike Google and Bing—normally bases its results on numbers rather than censorship. That page must still be heavily promoted on the subject a decade later, simply because it is one of the only things they have. How sad. But promoted by whom? Who is faking the numbers of this site? NASA? The Air Force? The Pentagon? We don't know, but someone must be faking it, since there is no way an abandoned discussion from more than a decade ago could still be ranking #3, while I am writing updates on this question every month and those updates are going viral, galling the mainstream like nothing before in history.

I scanned down the Yandex results, expecting to find more things to respond to, but found nothing of merit or even of interest, which is even more surprising than these fake promoted results. Most of the results that weren't to my own site were to mirror sites or other re-publications supporting me. The mainstream seems to have effectively given up. Even Allan Wiesbecker and RatWiki didn't come up. I have bludgeoned and embarrassed so many of their agents, no one wants the assignment. It isn't winnable. They can't argue the facts, since the facts are all on my side, and they can't debate me with their usual bag of tricks, since I just reverse it on them, making them look like fools. So they have all slunk off to other projects.

And of course there is a second greater question begged here by this search: How can there be no mainstream response to my Solar Cycle theory since 2014? That year was just my initial effort on the question, and I admitted I was still working on it. I soon predicted in an update to that first paper that minimum would be 2018, rather than 2020 as the mainstream was predicting, and I was right about that. Even [Geryl at Solen.info joined me on that](#), before he was shut down and told to get onboard with the mainstream prediction. But [my huge paper on this subject](#) didn't arrive until February 2020, when I posted a full prediction of Cycle 25, including all the biggest planetary alignments and monthlies. I also published sine waves of all the planetary charge conjunctions. I have hit those like clockwork for the past four years, giving the mainstream huge fits, but no response has been posted since 2014, even

on forums full of trolls? How can that be? How can there be absolutely nothing for me to respond to? Did these people all kill themselves? Are they all in therapy? Did they quit the field and go into politics?

My guess is that when the Air Force rode in and took over reporting on sunspots in 2021, they ordered everyone else to go mute. The famous Glomar response. Or **Nomar** response. Best not to engage me, since they can only lose in the exchange. They always had and didn't see any way around it. At that point, it was no longer a question of science, it was a question of power. Air Force would drown me by sheer force. They would fake the numbers and control the media, leaving reality in the dust. They did that, but it still didn't work. Why? Because those in the field still knew the truth. You can order people to keep quiet, but you can't order them not to read, not to think, and not to judge. These scientists may be afraid to access my sites at work, but they also have computers at home and private phones, and Air Force can't control what they do on their own time. Yes, many in the field are like the toadies at cloudynights.com, protecting their own little pile and therefore hostile to any real science or progress. But many remain with some scruples and some ability to weigh evidence and argument: they are not so easy to cow, especially over the long term. After four years of being gagged, they tend to grow restless. They don't like seeing me discovering something they should have seen, but they like being lorded over by Air Force even less. They start to weigh their options, coming to the correct conclusion that I am far less dangerous to them than Air Force or some other military bureaucracy. Like the best of them, I just want to know the truth. As someone with good ideas, I am the best friend of real science, since I will lead to its honest expansion. The current path leads only to its continued strangulation and death.

Science has long been on the same arc as art, and modern science is quickly becoming Modern Art. It is the inversion of science being sold as science, so that the field can be used for money laundering and treasury dipping. As art was stripped down to critical theory and performance in the 20th century, taken over by a cast of poseurs from the rich families, so were all the sciences. That has become blindingly obvious in the past 40 years, as science—and especially physics—has deconstructed itself down to illusion, mentation, and observerism. Most of theoretical physics is now no more than a magician's trick, not even as convincing as a bird being pulled from a pie. But this isn't what most scientists signed up for back in the day when they came into the field as bright-eyed boys and girls. Those at NASA or NOAA aren't interested in that, for the most part, especially those in the trenches or at the midlevels. Engineers have no interest in seeing themselves as Modern Artists, selling some flimflam in the glossy magazines. That's why Air Force's takeover here didn't stick in the longterm. I smell a silent revolution in science, the same silent revolution we can feel society-wide and worldwide. We are moving toward Mordor and none of us signed up for that when we squeezed through the birth canal, much less when we paid thousands for a PhD or other degree. We wanted to do science, not be herded by a bunch of billionaire crooks and their military gestapo.

I have told you that I think Air Force quit this project earlier this year, writing it off as a lost cause. So the question is, what will these mainstream scientists do now? They have watched me beat Air Force by myself, not—I admit—so much with my words, as by being right. Cycle 25 is about double what was predicted, so there was no saving it. I predicted all of the big peaks on the upside, and Air Force couldn't hide that fact. So what will the rank and file at NASA, NOAA, and the other agencies learn from that? Hopefully they will learn how things really stand, not only regarding who I am, but who they are.

Even weirder? When I finished this paper I went back to the first search at Yandex, and it had updated in the time I was writing. Somehow, the cloudynights.com listing moved up from #3 to #2 in that time, just from my clicking on it. A handful of hits moved it from #3 to #2? How is that possible? It shouldn't be possible, unless it originally only had a handful to start with, and every real hit is multiplied by ten thousand or something. I found the same thing happened with the SpaceWeather forum I hit below. With only a handful of hits by me in a matter of minutes, it moved up from #11 to #10, jumping to the front page of results at Google. But a handful of hits on my own pages, to be sure the links were working, produced no such jump.


I didn't want to check Google on this same search “miles mathis solar cycle”, because I knew what a tragedy it would be, but finally did. This contentless cloudynights.com page ranks **first** on that search, *and also sixth*. My own big paper ranks #5—which is kind of like finding Newton's *Principia* ranked #5 beneath results from *Mad Magazine* and *The National Enquirer* on a search for “Isaac Newton Principia”. So was there another cloudynights page I missed? No, it is the same page twice. Google is already recycling results on the front page!

On page 2, at #11 **and #14**, we find a discussion page at Spaceweather from February of 2023, so Google is also recycling that result, giving it multiple listings to drown out my own results. But as soon as I am mentioned at SpaceWeather they shut down the discussion. Some physigogue who calls himself Philalethes says the moderators don't want them talking about this. Yeah, I wonder why? Philalethes dismisses me offhand on that page, but provides a link where he implies he addresses it in more detail. But in the link he doesn't address anything I say. Nothing. Instead he creates some scarecrows that don't resemble me at all and hits them. He says he emailed me and I didn't even know where the galactic core was. No, I state [in a series of papers](#) that the line of charge is coming in from near 8 o'clock on the map (see below), which is what I used as the zero line. I intuited that from much previous data, since that is when alignments caused the greatest peaks. Whether it is the actual location of the galactic core isn't to the point, since the line of charge coming here from there doesn't need to come on a straight line. Obviously it will come through the largest clusters. So as usual, his critique is soundbite and not to the point. It doesn't get near addressing the fact that I have now hit all the major peaks on the upside of this cycle, which did indeed come at planetary alignments. Also that I postdicted [in that same paper](#) a whole slew of past cycles, peaks, and troughs. He ignores all that completely, immediately misdirecting you into his own pathetic labyrinths of lubricity.

In fact, I recommend you read his response [here](#). I hate to give them any more hits, but it can't be helped. This will hurt them far more than it helps, and they will wish they never got those hits. He purposely fails to follow my mechanics, then says it doesn't work. He says,

in 2019, from around spring to fall, Jupiter, Saturn, and the galactic core were all almost perfectly lined up as seen by an observer on Sol, which according to that model should have produced a lot of activity even despite the poor placement of the other two Jovians...

But that simply isn't true:



That is from [Fourmilab, dated 5/23/2019](#). My line of influence from the core is at 8 o'clock on that map, so as you see absolutely nothing is aligned except Uranus in opposition. But even if you choose a different line for the core, nothing lines up at all. Jupiter and Saturn are not in conjunction, either from the Earth or the Sun or the core. So he is either lying to your face or he doesn't know how to read these charts. Probably the former. I would guess he is/was an Air Force cabana boy, since he hasn't made a peep about me in 2024. But Air Force seems to have realized how weak his responses are, since they, tapping Google, listed him only at #11. They judged the raw *ad homs* at cloudynights.com from 2014 to be stronger than his compendium of bald lying in 2023, and toplisted that instead of him. Any of his colleagues at SpaceWeather that can read a chart must be able to see he is lying, though they probably avoid their own forums for that reason.

You can see why most of their agents begged off on this assignment years ago. They never win. [They never even get off the field on their feet.](#)

*Actually, a search on this guy LeDrew pulls up almost nothing. He is apparently *not* involved with the Webb Telescope, being only a “freelance astronomy educator” who writes for various mags on things like binoculars. The only [David Knisely that comes up on a search](#) is a guy with a BS in marketing from George Mason University. He was a White House intern right out of school in 2002, then went to work for AT&T. By 2008 he was an “Intelligence Manager” at immixgroup, McLean, VA, front porch of the CIA. So I don't think this is our cloudynights dude in rural Nebraska. No David Knisely appears to have anything to do with the Webb Telescope, so both he and LeDrew seem to be hiding behind that heading to gain prestige. So why are they pretending to be experts on celestial mechanics here, gatekeeping for the mainstream and getting boosted to the top of my searches? Now you know.