

EARTHQUAKE CLOUDS AND SHORT TERM PREDICTION

Eager for an open organized debate

- September 8, 2008 -

Many Chinese people have told me that our website has been blocked. We have set up a new website, and I told them about it. However, they told me that it has also been blocked. I am very surprised because our website does not involve politics. Moreover, I have not received any warning. The only politician I invited is Director Chen of the Chinese Seismological Bureau (CSB) for an open debate because he claimed that earthquakes could not be predicted [1]. However, this debate is completely scientific, so I really wonder “Why?”

If it were because of my two China predictions on May 21 [2] against Chen’s “unpredictable” theory, then the prediction of an M6~7 “Aftershock” in May 19-20 of the CSB [3] would be against it, too. Therefore, it should be something else. A possible reason I guess is the detailed comparison between the results of the predictions of both the CSB and me. People told me that when the CSB predicted the quake, it failed; while the CSB cleared its alert, an M6.4 quake happened on May 25. On the other hand, people appreciated mine: the cloud on May 17 just hit the M6.4 quake on May 25, and the cloud on May 19 hit the M6 on Aug.5 and the M5.7 (USGS or M6.1 CSB) on Aug.1. According to the USGS, the both M6.4 and M6 are the only big earthquakes in the area of 20~50N, 100~120E from May 17 to Sep. 8. Their low probability demonstrates the reliability of my theory in practice once again. Furthermore, the two predictions were made despite serious satellite data problems and earthquake data problems [4, 5]. If there weren’t those problems, I would have predicted an earthquake in a circle of a radius of 10 km, so I would not have waited until Sep. 8 to decide whether or not the cloud on May 19 (500km) predicted an M7 or two M5.5~6.4.

If the above comparison is the real reason to block our website, I am friendly and willing to advise Chinese scientists about my theory in order to improve their prediction technology. If it is not the real reason, I would hope that, in the spirit of scientific debate, the Chinese people can nevertheless learn about my Earthquake Vapor Theory, an important discovery published by the United Nations (UN) in its yearbook that is shared with all members of the UN, including China.

Several scholars from the Chinese Science Academy (CSA) and the CSB together published that a “crash” of the Indian-Australia Plate and the Europe-Asia Plate caused the M8 Sichuan quake. It implies that my theory is “wrong”, and earthquakes can “not” be predicted. However, they should answer three questions: First, their theory looks like a **missile** because the M8 quake is an “inner” quake and has a distance of **750km** to the boundary [6]. Thus, they should prove whether or not a serious crash of two irregularly shaped cars could kill as many animals as in a car with perfect outlines. Second, the Indian Plate should have received an equal and opposite reaction from the Europe-Asia Plate according to Newton. Can they show this reaction with the data of the USGS?

Third, can they explain how the Bam cloud appeared suddenly from and kept in touch with Bam for 24 hours continuously by their Missile Theory? Can they show a prediction or a set of predictions as good as my Bam prediction or my 50 other predictions verified by the USGS respectively?

The M5.7 quake (predicted) injured 231 on Aug. 1, and the M6 quake (predicted) killed 1 and injured 23 on Aug. 5 after the M8 Sichuan quake. People are looking for answers to save lives. For the advancement of science and the safety of people, I urge the CSA and the CSB to organize a team of five top Chinese and international scholars to hold an open and fair scientific debate between their team and us regarding whether or not earthquakes can be predicted. I do not think that blocking an opposing view is a good idea for science or people, e.g. killing Nicolaus Copernicus (1473-1543) did not block his Sun-Center Theory.

References

1. [一封给中国网民的公开信](#) on May 31, 2008
2. [The two Sichuan clouds & their predicted earthquakes](#)
3. [The aftershock prediction of the CSB](#) on May 19, 2008
4. Darrell Harrington & Zhonghao Shou. [Bam Prediction & Space Technology](#) *Seminars of the United Nations Programme on Space Applications* 16 39-63 (2005)
5. Zhonghao Shou. [Earthquake Vapor, a reliable precursor](#). *Earthquake Prediction* 21-51 (ed. Mukherjee Saumitra. Brill Academic Publisher, Leiden-Boston, 2006)
6. [The M8 Sichuan earthquake map](#) by the USGS on May 12, 2008

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

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

Updated: September 8, 2008 | [Webmaster](#)