

Cheshire Innovation® / Latent Power Turbines Ltd

17 Vale Rd, Timperley, Altrincham, Cheshire, WA15 7TQ

Tel/Fax +44 (0) 161 980 5191

E-mail bill.courtney@cheshire-innovation.com

Web site www.cheshire-innovation.com

4 October 2017

Submission summary

This is a case study of university research integrity failings experienced by a small technology business owner. As a result of these failings, I have been unable to develop two patented inventions, in spite of considerable investment from the public purse. The first invention, Shock Absorbing Liquid received £290,000 public funding and was referred to in Hansard.

The second invention, Latent Power Turbines offers a low cost alternative to wind and solar power for generating low carbon electricity. This invention has received £200,000 tax payer funding

I discovered a method for improving power generator design during my undergraduate days at the University of Hull in the 1960s. But my proposed alternative was so radical that it was scorned by my peers and tutors.

Then in 1986, while working as a physics teacher, I made an entirely different discovery relating to crash protection. By combining common materials in a new way it is possible to create a class of impact energy absorbing cushions that I refer to as Shock Absorbing Liquid (SALi) Technology. SALi's crash protection properties are described on my website at http://www.cheshire-innovation.com/sali/what_is_sali.htm.

I decided to develop SALi and use it as a 'cash cow' to produce funds for research into my radical power generator ideas. After saving up for 10 years I enrolled as a 50 year old mature mechanical engineering student at an English University ("University A").

At about that time the university was planning to amalgamate with another university in the same city ("University B").

My priority was creating funds for research, not becoming wealthy. So I signed a 50:50 royalty sharing agreement with the commercial arm of University A. My vision was that half of the royalties would allow the post amalgamation **University of "A+B"** to become a SALi research hub, and I would use the other half for power generator research.

Unfortunately, my **University A** research supervisor was very unhappy about my pending University benefactor status and post amalgamation influence. He was also unhappy because I did not fit into the conventional hierarchy of being an ignorant student who learned from an older and wiser teacher. I was older than him, gained a local reputation as, "A millionaire in the making" [http://www.cheshire-innovation.com/sali/CrashSALi-Project_files/British%20Reward.htm] and received regular visitors at the University who chose to bypass him.

This media attention fired up student interest. It resulted in 'Mr Courtney' generating SALi PhD / MSc projects at several English universities, most critically at **University B**, where I became a guest lecturer. At a later date, a Welsh University also became involved in SALi research.

When the commercial arm of **University A** banned my supervisor from their SALi marketing meetings because of his disruptive behaviour, his hostility increased. For example, three of my SALi research papers were held back [www.cheshire-innovation.com/sali/pedsali.htm] and two publicly funded SALi research projects were sabotaged.

The sabotaged research projects

1 SALi based vehicle suspension research

This received £40,000 public funding, but, in spite of my protests, the wrong materials were used, and the wrong type tests were carried out.

I informed the **University A** vice-chancellor that I would withhold approval of public funds until the research had been done correctly. I also suggested that he should seek independent opinions on the validity of my complaints by consulting an engineer, Professor "Steve R" at **University B** and Dr "Michele C" who could confirm that I was not a fee paying client, but a royalty sharing partner. These

suggestions were ignored. Instead the counter claims by my supervisor Dr “O” and his line manager Professor “W”, that I lacked the competence to make research judgements was accepted. When my MP tried to establish the truth about my complaints about the misuse of public funds, the (by now) amalgamated **University A+B** created a smokescreen by using the reputable solicitors Eversheds to threaten me with legal action. I suspect that Eversheds were misled by **University A+B**, because when I wrote to them telling my side of the story, their intimidated letters ceased. However I am not able to prove this for certain because **University A+B** has refused my Freedom of Information request to release its correspondence with Eversheds.

Plagiarism by proxy?

Some years later, my complaint to the **University A** vice-chancellor was vindicated. An honest SALi researcher at the Welsh University discovered that while the wilfully bad suspension research was being done at **University A** and the legal threats were being made, the work was being done using the correct materials and test procedures at Nanjing University in China.

Somehow, my vehicle suspension designs that were privy to **University A** had ended up in China.

[(i) *Performance characteristics of a SALiM isolator*, H. d. Teng, Q. Chen, Nanjing University, Proceedings of the World Congress on Engineering, London, July 2009.

(ii) H. d. Teng, Q. Chen, Study on vibration isolation properties of solid and liquid mixture, *Journal of Sound and Vibration*, (2009) doi.10.1016/j.jsv.2009.04.036].

The Chinese work halted after I provided the journal editor and Nanjing University with proof that the journal paper included a very distinctive diagram plagiarised from my unpublished **University A** work. To be fair to the Nanjing researchers, I suspect that they were misled. Further investigations revealed evidence that Dr “O” had visited Nanjing University and had collaborated with one of the Nanjing authors, Chen.

I provide the evidence to support my suspicions at

www.cheshire-innovation.com/sali/CrashSALi-Project.htm

2 SALi based car bumper research

This relates to a ‘smart’ SALi based car bumper that I developed and which attracted EPSRC funding for the *PedSALi project*. This bumper was soft for pedestrian leg impacts, but protected car bodywork because it was stiff for other low speed collisions. As explained on my *PedSALi* webpage [www.cheshire-innovation.com/sali/pedsali.htm] this was a timely invention because it solved a technical problem of interest to the EU Commission.

The PedSALi sabotage was exposed to the EPSRC when the PedSALi research assistant resigned and Dr “O” and his line manager tried to hide it. [http://www.cheshire-innovation.com/sali/pedsali_files/Dow%20complaint%20resignation%20deception.htm]

This happened shortly before the **University A+B amalgamation**.

PedSALi had European road safety implications which are referred to in Hansard [<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200102/cmhansrd/vo011025/text/11025w18.htm>].

The **University B** researchers were concerned that the PedSALi collapse could damage the amalgamated universities reputation in Europe. So they offered to take over the PedSALi research and do it correctly.

But, by using an ingenious trick described on my PedSALi webpage, **University A** management crushed this proposal. [Key search word to discover this trick on the webpage = *Turner*.]

Professor “Steve R” and Dr “John H”, the worried **University B** researchers and Dr “Michelle C”, the business manager who had banned Dr “O” from her meetings all resigned and took up new jobs in other parts of the country. In contrast, Dr “O” stayed on and was promoted from Lecturer to Reader, eventually becoming head of the research group when Professor “W” retired. During his time as leader, the bad SALi research continued. I only discovered this in 2008 when a distressed student contacted me, complaining that he was being instructed to carry out a SALi project that defied the laws of physics. The student was correct, the research design did defy the laws of physics, but his career was at stake. So to humour his supervisor, Dr “O”, he had to reluctantly “edit” his project results. I protested to **University A+B** about my intellectual property being misused to compromise an undergraduate into acting fraudulently. The University used another ingenious trick, involving an anonymous letter, to reject my complaint. For details visit www.cheshire-innovation.com/SmithSALiResearch.htm

As a result of my 14 year battle to expose the shenanigans at **University A**, the SALi research at other universities was wound down because nobody wanted to be associated with a whistleblower.

The editor of the Journal for Biological Physics and Chemistry (JBPC) heard about my struggles and invited me to write up my experiences. This was done and two papers have been published in the JBPC.

[1] Courtney, W, 'A private researcher's struggles against research fraud I. A case study',

Journal of Biological Physics and Chemistry **16** (2016) 142–156.

An online copy is published at

<http://www.cheshire-innovation.com/images/A%20pdf/A-private-researcher-struggles-against-research-fraud-JBPC-Vol-16,-No-3.pdf>

[2] Courtney, W 'A private researcher's struggles against research fraud. II. Suggestions for reducing the fraud problem' **17** (2017) 81–88'

An online copy is published at <http://www.cheshire-innovation.com/images/A%20pdf/A-private-researcher-struggles-against-research-fraud-2.pdf>

The editor was particularly keen for me to air my story because my evidence suggested that the UK Research Integrity Office was supporting the suppression of fraud by a British university.

- (i) Copies of the first paper were sent to the Vice-Chancellor, other senior management and the members of the Senate at **University A+B** [19/12/2016].
No replies have been received.
- (ii) Copies were sent to the UKRIO trustees, advisory board and subscribing universities [18/12/2017].
No replies have been received.
- (iii) Copies were sent to named staff at the Engineering and Physical Science Research Council (EPSRC) who had provided £212,000 for the PedSALi project. [19/12/2016].
No replies have been received.
- (iv) In late December 2016, an unsolicited copy of the paper was sent to The House of Commons Science and Technology Committee. .
- (v) Copies were sent to the UKRIO director, trustees and keynote speakers for the UKRIO 2017 Annual conference. (Held 10 May 2017). I invited them to raise the issues discussed in the paper during the conference.
I received two pledges, but nothing materialised.

Implications for my second invention, Latent Power Turbines

- (i) As explained at www.cheshire-innovation.com/Sky%20Tube.htm, considerable progress has been made in verifying the power generator theory. But my problems at “**University A**” have eaten up my private funds. Consequently, we are currently unable to finish the work by paying for a bespoke turbine to be installed. [Ironically, the University of Hull, where I started work on the design over 50 years ago have recognised the importance of my work and have offered to complete the research. But they need paying of course.]
- (ii) In order to attract potential investors, comprehensive details of the Latent Power Turbine designs have had to be published online. This places our designs in jeopardy of being stolen by a foreign competitor. To see what is at stake for Britain, please visit <http://www.cheshire-innovation.com/LP%20Turbine%20implications.htm>
- (iii) In a submission that I made to the earlier, pre-general election Integrity Inquiry by your Committee, I explained how the development of Latent Power Turbines has been held up by misbehaviour at a second English University.

Yours sincerely,
William A Courtney