


# My Latest Prediction Success

by Miles Mathis

First published January 22, 2025

It has been almost five years since [I published a full prediction of Solar Cycle 25](#).



Those circled points are calculated straight from sine waves my friend Steven Oostdijk and I created from planetary alignments among the Jovians with the Sun and Galactic Core. You can see the specific conjunction tagged below, with JS meaning Jupiter-Saturn and so on. Well, I hit those first four circled predictions right on the head, as we have seen, sending the mainstream into convulsions. After the first hit they were so shaken they called in Air Force to take over reporting of sunspots, and they tried to fudge numbers to make it look like I wasn't right on the next three. To no avail, since they only pushed individual numbers but made no effort to move spikes. The spikes still hit right on my predicted months, **confirming Solar Cycles are caused by planetary alignments.**

Well, we are now on the fifth circle there, and the fifth prediction. The big dip at the end of 2024, which I have predicted at 130, as you see. So we just go to [Solen.info](#) and check the reported numbers. Sure enough, December 2024 showed a big dip. After hitting 190 in July (monthly average), December dipped all the way down to 135. Sort of uncanny, ain't it? Five years ago I predicted an early spike of 190 and a mid-cycle low of 130. And now we find that despite their bringing in the Air Force to fudge numbers, I still hit that prediction almost right on the head, since they have reported 190 and 135. How did that happen, if they were pushing numbers? I believe it happened because when July hit 190, Air Force gave up in disgust and told these mainstream people they were on their own. Numbers since July have been closer to correct, so we have been getting real data over the past seven or eight months. But before that, they were sitting on numbers by about 50%, which is why they weren't reporting 190 a year and half earlier. I have shown you in previous papers how they missed

many sunspots, or counted them as much smaller than they were. We were actually on a plateau from the end of 2023 to mid 2024, and although I got all the spikes in the right place, I actually missed the prominence of July 2024, due to overlooking the Jupiter-Uranus conjunction at that time. As you see, I haven't listed it below. Like everyone else, I rely on mainstream charts, and I guess I was consulting a chart that didn't include it, I don't know why. These things happen. But since my entire theory of Solar Cycles is based on Jovian alignments, I can take that spike as a hit regardless. Which is to say, my graph should have stayed up at 190 a bit longer.

And as you see, if I *had* keep my line up at 190 until July 2024, that fall-off in the second half of the year would have been even more precipitous, and therefore more unlikely as a prediction. No one else has been predicting anything like that, since, just as a matter of odds, it was EXTREMELY unlikely to see a fall of 65 points in five months, especially at this point in a cycle. The only way the mainstream can explain it is to rush in and claim we have already peaked. Yes, they think we are on the final downside of this cycle already. But that would again be highly unlikely, even if they didn't know about my prediction. Solar Cycles generally tail off gently, they don't crash and burn like this. According to their own timelines, we are only five years into a cycle that lasts on average 11 years, and as you can see from the steepness of the decline, if it continued on at this rate it would end in just a year or two. We have never seen a six or seven year cycle, so that does not compute. Even if they decided to admit I was right, conceding that this cycle began in 2018, not the end of 2019, that still gives them only an extra year and a half. An eight-year cycle is also very very unlikely.

So again, my hitting this prediction is like another arrow through the heart for the mainstream. Given the six arrows already through that poor heart, it is amazing any of these people are still breathing, talking, or appearing in public.

And it will only get worse, since I have predicted a steep climb over the next two years that no one else sees coming. There is an entire second peak coming up and it will be even larger than the last one.


I want to point out again how risky it was for me to publish that graph in February 2020. Not only because it was risky to predict monthlies like that: no one had ever done that so it wasn't even necessary. I could have beaten the mainstream with a cowardly smooth curve, couldn't I, one better than their cowardly smooth curve. But once I actually drew the graph, I saw it was even riskier, due to that very strange dip in the middle. That was very unlikely to be right, I knew, since it does not conform to previous cycles. Once I had all the sine waves in hand, I could already see this was going to be a very anomalous cycle, since the waves were overlapping in very low-probability ways. I pointed that out in the original paper, remember, saying that when I laid the two final waves on top of one another, it was like drawing an M over an A. Meaning, the M goes down in the middle, while the A goes up in the middle. So we have to integrate the two shapes, getting a sharp dip right in the middle of maximum, splitting maximum into two humps.

So I was right about that, but it was the longest of longshots. Or I should say, without the data I had, and the trust I had in my mechanical theory, it was the longest of longshots. No one trying to force information out of past data, like the mainstream is doing with their big computers, would have ever gone with that prediction, because it gave us that weird looking graph. The odds of one set of numbers indicating a hard spike up at the very same time another set was indicating a hard spike down was very low. That cycle looks like no previous cycle, and I have to think Steven thought I was an idiot to go out on a limb like that in support of such a graph. It almost *couldn't* be right. Except that. . . that is what the numbers and theory were telling us. **And as we have now seen, that weird middle dip was exactly right.**

I have to think that is one reason, among many, that the mainstream bet against me, and has continued to bet against me. Only McIntosh changed his bet, and only after I hit the first point, and even he hasn't mentioned my name. Nor has he admitted the spikes have hit on alignments. He is still trying to sell his own pathetic non-mechanical computer-generated theory, while stealing my numbers.

And, I remind you, I HAD to predict monthlies, in order to sell this theory of planetary conjunctions. There is no other way to PROVE spikes are falling on alignments than to actually calculate the spikes and predict them, is there? A smoothed curve could never tell us anything about alignments, even if it is exactly right in its curvature. It is the matching of spikes in the data to the alignments that is critical.

So where exactly does that dip come from? From here:



Go to 2025 on the orange line. See the big spike down? That's what caused the big dip in the middle of this cycle. You can see the M in the data, can't you? You can also see why I am predicting a second step rise in this cycle.

Steven didn't have nearly the confidence in that graph that I did, although it was his program that produced it. He advised caution and wasn't really happy that I rushed to publish a monthly prediction. But that is understandable: it was my numbers and theory, after all, some of which must have seemed highly speculative to him, even after my revolutionary [Bode](#) and [Tilt](#) papers. He may be as surprised as you are that this all panned out. I don't blame him, since he has been my most supportive ally over the past decade. I thank him again for these sine waves, which I am grateful I didn't have to create with a pencil and lines of numbers in a Big Chief tablet. Without him my theory would never have been kicked into high gear, or at least not as soon as it was. It was fortunate, I think, that he did this right at the start of a Solar Cycle, which is why I was in some hurry to publish it as soon as I was able to confirm it matched all my mechanics. I could see immediately the importance of this, and the importance of publishing it ASAP. That, too, has turned out to be correct. This wouldn't have had near the impact if I had waited a year or two to run more tests or check second-order perturbations. I knew without looking at them that they wouldn't appreciably change the main lines of this prediction. It was either going to be right or not, based on the largest bodies.