

Magma-wave-interference-hypothesis and impulse-theories. How to ameliorate earthquake prediction?

by Kurt-W. Laufs, ©, 2011-05-05, rev. 2012-12-07

Naught hypothesis: all nonsense.

Alternative hypotheses:

1. Following a former idea the author had posed “underneath” earth shelf (-ves) a kind of loxodromic fluid counter rotation to earth rotation of magma, leading to magma waves after impulses on magma, e.g. about regions of heavy rainfalls, leading to magma-wave inferences about earth- (sea-) quake regions or vulcany eruptions. Skinner’s black-box s-r model in psychology)

2.1. Impulse theory after Heisenberg tells, impulse (i) to be like flow of effect ( $\Delta$ ) or work quantum (w) at location or region, locus agens (la); (after:  $\Delta w \sim i la$ ).

This “Unschärfe-Theorie” (comme-flou) in mind, there were no deterministic

localizations of effects possible in micro and smaller dimension in atomistic quanta theory. Impulse in mechanics and dynamics also as pressure per surface, area ( $\Delta i \sim p/a$ ).

2.2. To possibly look after for an analogy one could find impulse and interference theories in psycho-physiology, electrics and electronic theories and radio-transmission theories.

Could plot-clusters about radio-impulse theory describe about their interfering clusters similarities to earthquake eruptions and before a strengthening “spectrum” of preliminary clusters to compare to hypothetically assumed earth quake evoking interfering magma-waves?

3. If 2.2 did work, how to practically use radio impulse theory for equipments along earthquake threatened coasts? Would there help sensoric measuring in small tube-like connections or sensor measuring in cables on sea-ground to fasten analyzes of impulse clusters before earthquakes?

