



Date: Thu, 31 May 2007 01:46:05 -0700 (PDT) From: 🗺 "Ara"
< @yahoo.com>  [Add to Address Book](#)  [Add Mobile Alert](#)
Yahoo! DomainKeys has confirmed that this message was sent by yahoo.com. [Learn more](#)
Subject: Former USGS person is attempting to discredit you in chat rooms...
To: zhonghao_shou@yahoo.com
zhonghao_shou@yahoo.com

Dear Sir:

This is to alert you that former USGS "geophysicist" Roger Hunter has accused you of tampering with your data. He has made these accusations many times, but so far has refused to show any evidence backing them up.

He claims that the accusations he has made originate with Dr Allan Jones, in a paper that Roger Hunter has so far refused to cite in support of his claims.

The chat room in which he has made these allegations is found at:
<http://www.earthboppin.net/talkshop/anything/messages/661.html>

I find your work fascinating, and am dismayed and disgusted by some representatives of the USGS. That is why I am alerting you to the slanderous remarks made about you.

Below you will find some examples of his accusations about you. Please do not reproduce them publicly. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Ara

Date: May 31, 2007 at 00:19:00
From: [Roger Hunter](#)
Subject: Re: on Zong shao Shou's predictions-- slight addition

Steve;

Shou fudges his data to make it LOOK like he can predict quakes.

Roger

Date: May 31, 2007 at 01:00:37
From: [Roger Hunter](#)
Subject: Re: on Zhong shao Shou's predictions-- statistically significant...

Ara and Bopp;

I don't expect you to take my word for it but let me repeat that this information comes from Dr Jones, the one who created the math used by Shou. Jones says that Shou tampered with the

quakes information and predicted parameters in order to get that high significance and that when the tampering was removed Shou's significance vanished.

I invite you to contact Dr Jones yourself to be sure I haven't distorted his analysis.

Roger

Date: May 31, 2007 at 01:51:10

From: [Roger Hunter](#)

Subject: Re: What a real professional attitude... a real role model...

Ara;

Normally I would agree with you. But since in this case we are talking about unpublished material it's better if you contact him yourself.

Of course you're so lazy you need help to breathe so I know I'm expecting a lot.

Roger

Also , from

<http://earthboppin.net/talkshop/geology/messages/39960.html>

(the part about you is highlighted in red)

Date: May 25, 2007 at 00:02:13

From: Ara

Subject: Re: Significance versus Luck...

Roger,

>I can never decide if you are pretending to be stupid or simply ARE stupid. Clearly my example and explanation is over your head, that or you are deliberately misrepresenting it for your own ends.

Go over to LIAHO with your uninteresting and superfluous personal attack remarks.

>His [JOB's] first 5 years may have reached the 99th percentile and thus have been significant but as more predictions were added his overall significance dropped.

That's ridiculous, as I pointed out. The first 5 years of JOB's predictions form a dataset, which you determined to have reached the 99th percentile -- your criteria for significance. The significance of that dataset cannot change with the addition of other datasets. So, sorry to say, but **you have shown that JOB's 5 years of predictions were significant, by your own criteria.**

>What you're saying might be true if you did the math at the end of a long run but not in a case where the first 10 coins were heads.

Roger, are you saying that 10 heads will mathematically put the toss into the 99th percentile of significance? No, of course you are not, because you are saying it would be luck, **and the 99th percentile of significance excludes luck -- that is the purpose of the statistical analysis.**

By mixing analogies, you are once again implying that your prediction evaluations are only valid after an indefinite, unspecified "long run" of predictions, perhaps over the lifetime of a predictor. **However, this contradicts your own assertions (and those of Dr Jones) that 99th percentile results are valid for small datasets (even those smaller than 5 years of JOB's predictions). So no matter how you put it, JOB's 5 years of predictions were shown to be significant.**

You may maintain that his later predictions were **not** shown to be significant, but you cannot say (without contradiction and hypocrisy that negates the whole supposed purpose of what you are doing) that the 99th percentile results in the first 5 years was just "luck". **To the contrary, the significant results in the first 5 years lends credence to the later predictions also being significant, although they may not have reached the 99th percentile criteria.**

>As for the cloud man [**retired chemistry PhD Zhong Shao Shou, who analyzes satellite photos**], his work has already been debunked...

His 50 USGS-registered predictions (photos of them on his website) were shown to be **far above the 99th percentile** by your own beloved Dr Jones' formula. That is not much of a "debunking" -- rather, it demonstrates significance.

>and is absurd on the face of it anyway...

"on the face of it?"-- An unsubstantiated subjective opinion. The fact is, Shou's predictions met your own criteria for significance, regardless of whether or not he is correct in all aspects of how the clouds form, etc. So "on the face of it", **Shou is correct that quakes and clouds show correlations** -- though it may be that some of his speculation as to mechanism turns out to be incomplete or wrong.

What is "absurd" is that you ignore results demonstrating significance by your own 99th percentile criteria. That makes your interpretations meaningless, and your credibility zero.