

EARTHQUAKE CLOUDS AND SHORT TERM PREDICTION

Lessons of the M9 Japan earthquake and tsunami

- April 5, 2011 -

Comment to "Japan faces up to failure of its earthquake preparations " of *Nature News*

The M9 Honshu earthquake and its tsunami killed more than 18000 people [1] and caused an explosion of a reactor of Fukushima Daiichi's nuclear power plants.

Nature News reported "Japan faces up to failure of its earthquake preparations" [2] Shou added a comment: "Lesson of the M8.9 Japan Earthquake and Tsunami", but it was too short to explain complicate lessons. This comment will show more.

In 1999, Nature Debates [3] showed no success of all widely studied earthquake precursors such as seismological, geochemical, electric, magnetic, electromagnetic, hydrological, geodetic etc. M. Wyss, optimist, admitted, "I am pessimistic about the near future" However, the Japan Meteorological Agency has ignored the debates, and adopted the world's densest seismometer network for prediction. Therefore, I propose two questions. First, how to predict devastating quakes that do not have 'foreshock' such as the Bam quake, the Northridge quake, etc? Second, how to predict no big earthquake that has hundreds of daily 'foreshocks' in a small place, e.g. those near Mammoth, Northern California from Nov. 1, 1997 to Jan.31, 1998? [4] Adopting an unreliable precursor to predict earthquake not only wasted budgets, but also got a big disaster, so it should be a lesson.

The United Nations published "Bam Earthquake Prediction & Space Technology" [5] and shared it to its all member states, including Japan in early 2005. Earthquake vapor precursor has the Bam prediction, Shou's 50 predictions verified by the USGS, etc on statistic significance to prove its reliability in practice. To help people, Shou appealed that 'governments use 0.1% of their budgets to solve the satellite data problems and the earthquake data problems ... for predicting a large epicenter in a circle with a radius of 20 km independently of very cold surroundings and a magnitude with an error of +/- 0.2M" in April 2006. [6] However, no government has noticed his appeal. On the other hand, earthquake vapor did predict the M9 Japan earthquake exactly. Look at the two following images. [7] [8] How exact and simple the geoeruption prediction was! Thus, ignoring the Earthquake Vapor Theory should be a lesson.

Various precursors do not work on prediction, while earthquake vapor works well. Why? The latter has a unique property. In 1997, Shou imaged that yield strength of a rock must have dropped sharply while its surrounding temperature increased to a threshold after vapor eruption. He drew a chart of "Dehydration" [9] and asked a librarian of Caltech about which books he could find a similar chart. With her help, he found the chart (pp190 of *Practical Handbook of Physical*

Properties of Rocks and Minerals. ed. Carmichael, R.S., CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida, 1990). Other precursors do not have this property, but widely published. For example, Gerstenberger et al published “Real-time forecasts of tomorrow's earthquakes in California” (*Nature* 435, 328-331) on 19 May 2005. Since then, 28 earthquakes of magnitude 5 or above have happened in California, and 4 of them were even bigger than or equal to 6, while “Real-time forecasts” have predicted nothing. Unreliable publications confuse governments and people, which should also be a lesson.

Many people urge me to predict earthquakes as I did before. I thank you for your belief, but I'm sorry for my age and health. As acknowledgement, I suggest you reading “[Bam Earthquake Prediction & Space Technology](#)” seriously, and predicting earthquakes with the vapor precursor that has neither false warning, nor loss. After long practice, you will do better than me and prevent you and your family from disaster. If you could urge governments to solve satellite data problems and earthquake data problems, described by [\[5\]\[10\]](#), an automatic device of earthquake prediction would be created to save people from earthquake hazard finally.

References

1. guardian. [Japan quake death toll passes 18,000](#) March 21 2011
2. David Cyranoski. [Japan faces up to failure of its earthquake preparations](#) *Nature* **471** 556-557, 2011
3. [Nature debates](#) February 25-April 8, 1999
4. Zhonghao Shou. [Daily shocks near Mammoth, Northern California](#) April 1999
5. Darrell Harrington and Zhonghao Shou. [Bam Earthquake Prediction & Space Technology](#) *Seminars of the United States Programme on Space Applications* **16** 39-63 (2005)
6. Zhonghao Shou. [Precursor of the Largest Earthquake in the Last Forty Years](#) *New Concepts in Global Tectonics* **41** 6-15 (2006)
7. Zhonghao Shou. [the M9 Japan Geoeruption at UTC 0:00 on Feb. 23, 2011](#) March 11, 2011
8. Zhonghao Shou. [How strong the M9 Japan Geoeruption was at UTC 3:00 on Feb. 25, 2011](#) March 31, 2011
9. Zhonghao Shou. [Dehydration](#) April 1997
10. Zhonghao Shou. [Earthquake Vapor, a reliable precursor](#) *Earthquake Prediction* 21-51 (ed. Mukherjee Saumitra. Brill Academic Publisher, Leiden-Boston, 2006)

[Home](#) | [Introduction](#) | [Publication & News](#) | [Predictions](#) | [New Predictions](#) | [Essays](#) | [Links](#) | [Contact](#)

[Sign Our Guestbook](#) [View Our Guestbook](#)

Updated: April 5, 2011 | [Webmaster](#)