

Dear John,

20040714

I would like to talk about TOPIC 1 at first due to its problems and my delay to enter your on-line conference.

First, **TOPIC 1-2-vi** writes, “Support the infrastructure and mechanisms needed to observe, analyse and predict physical hazards, including, *inter alia*, severe weather, floods, droughts, wild fire, tsunami and volcanic eruptions” excluding “**earthquake**”. However, earthquake is the most serious nature disaster. Moreover, [World Conference on Disaster Reduction](#) will be in **Kobe, Japan** on **18-22 January 2005** or the 10-year anniversary of the 6.9 Kobe earthquake that killed 5,470 and injured 33,000 people. Thus, I suggest adding **earthquake** into the hazards.

Second, the same item “Support the infrastructure and mechanisms” is ambiguous between what work should support, and what work should not support. As a result, it may support useless work continuously, while nothing supports a meaningful work. For example, a team of NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL) supposed geodetic to trigger earthquakes, set up a GPS (Global Positioning System) sensor array with satellites in the later 1990s, and predicted the next large earthquake in **Los Angles** on Aug. 3, 1999 (1, 2). However, the Tangshan, China earthquake in 1976 disproved geodetic as a short-term precursor, and proved large error for its epicenter (3, 4). Moreover, my earthquake vapor theory disproved it, too. On Aug. 10, 1999, I predicted the next largest earthquake not in Los Angles, but in either “the black triangle” or “the border between California and Nevada” to the public

<http://quake.exit.com/A990810.html>

with the following image

<http://quake.exit.com/images1999/199907260900eSCalGB.jpg>

On Oct. 16, 1999, the 7.0 Hector Mine Earthquake, at 34.60N 116.27W exactly in the black triangle, announced my success.

I also predicted the failure of both the **Parkfield** prediction of the US Geological Survey (USGS) on Nov. 15, 1993, and the Japanese “**Tokai Network**” when I read Normile’s news report (5) in 1994 because their models were wrong. Each above project wasted multi-million dollars just due to supporting wrong works.

On the other hand, it may still ignore scientific study, due to which avoidable hazards may become tragedy again. For example, I published “**Earthquake Clouds, a reliable precursor**” in 1999

<http://quake.exit.com/A991003.html>

It had an unusual earthquake model, supported by references and reliable predictions by the clouds with satellite image and statistic evidence. Meteorology could explain neither how the hollow formed in the giant weather cloud, nor how the dwarf linear cloud formed in the hollow of the following image

<http://quake.exit.com/images/9801010732part1.jpg>

While my model could, by which I predicted the 6.1 Afghanistan earthquake to both the USGS and Los Angeles Times on Jan. 5, 1998 with a probability of 13% successfully. The earthquake killed 4,000 and injured 16,000 people on Feb. 4, 1998, but the society still ignored my work. No budget supported it. Working on a poor condition, I found the Bam cloud at 17:36 UTC, Dec. 24, 2003 (3 days later) and predicted an earthquake of magnitude “ ≥ 5 within 98 days” and “likely ≥ 5.5 within 60 days” in Fault AB with the following satellite image to the public at 17:58 UTC Dec. 25, 2003 according to the web time recorder.

<http://quake.exit.com/images2003/200312210000xIranCB.jpg>

After narrowing the windows, I got a better prediction as “one ≥ 6.5 or two ≥ 5.5 with 35 days in Fault AB”. When I opened my email account to write an Iranian scientist to warn people at about 17:30 UTC, Dec. 26, two congratulations, one from Chinese Scientist Chen, and the other from Turkish Scientist Cerit, had already been there. **Due to not recognizing my scientific work, I got the cloud 3 days later.** As a result, an avoidable hazard became a tragedy: 25,000 deaths and 50,000 injured people.

The above comparison between supporting wrong works, wasting multi-million dollar budget each, and not supporting my meaningful work, inducing an avoidable hazard to a tragedy, demonstrates a big problem of **TOPIC 1** about what work should support, and what work should not support. Thus, I suggest **recognizing scientific works that have reliable predictions at the first place for budget.**

About whether or not my work is scientific, I and my colleague Darrell Harrington proposed an article “*Bam Earthquake Prediction & Space Technology*” for the Bam prediction, a developed model of earthquake clouds and earthquakes, a new precursor, statistic evidence, error analysis, and a suggestion to overcome data problems for evacuation in the UN/Iran Workshop in Tehran on May 9, 2004.

<http://quake.exit.com/Bam/BamPaper.pdf>

Here is a comment from the workshop

<http://quake.exit.com/Bam/Amolicomment.pdf>

A similar version was presented in the Chinese Meeting of the Committee of Natural Hazard Prediction in Nanchang, Jiangxi province by Scientist Chen on May 12, 2004.

Here is a comment

<http://quake.exit.com/Bam/Chen20040601.pdf>

Any organized debate is welcome. I believe in that my earthquake model is a discovery. The more debate about my theory, the quicker an earthquake-evacuation will be, and the more budgets the society will save.

Sincerely,

Zhonghao Shou

References:

1. Martin Kasindorf. L.A.'s Big Squeeze likely site of next major quake. *USA TODAY*. **8/3** 3A (1999).
2. Tom Clarke. Water thrown on earthquake prediction. *Nature* 23 August 2001
3. Xie, J.M. & Huang, L.R. The vertical deformation before and after the Tangshan earthquake of 1976. *Seismology and Geology* **9, No. 3**, 1-19 (1987).
4. Zhang, C.D. & Xiang, J.C. Three essential signs of crustal deformation during the period of the strong earthquake preparation in the case of Tangshan. *Seismology and Geology* **5, No. 1**, 71-77 (1983).
5. Dennis Normile. Japan Holds Firm to Shaky Science. *Science* **264** 1656-1658 (1994)