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

5 February 2018 (Not acknowledged)
9 February 2018 (Not acknowledged)
14 February 2018 (Acknowledged

Submission of additional evidence to the House of Commons Science and Technology Committee Inquiry into research integrity

Following the appearance before the committee of Professor Sir Bernard Silverman and James Parry on 30th January 2018, I wish to warn the Committee that it is being misled.

Members of the Committee would have been left with the impression that the UKRIO is a powerful champion of British research integrity. But in my experience as a victim of research fraud, it is more interested in protecting the reputation of its subscribers.

This should become clear to you by reading the following email that I have sent to Sir Bernard Silverman.

From: Bill Courtney [mailto:billcourtney@lineone.net]
Sent: maandag 5 februari 2018 18:19
To: bernard.silverman@stats.ox.ac.uk
Cc: james.parry@ukrio.org; M.J.Taylor@sheffield.ac.uk; 'Christopher Hodges' <christopher.hodges@csls.ox.ac.uk>; omar.qureshi@cms-cmck.com; 'UKRIO Gordon Murray' <Gordon.Murray@ed.a
scitechcom@parliament.uk; 'GVR' <gerryrobello@gmail.com>; 'Linda Klee' <linda.klee@icloud.com>; 'Eileen Hendrie' <eileenhendrie@kpnmail.nl>; 'Janet Courtney' <janetambercourtney@tiscali.
Subject: Research into research integrity: A seminal case for inclusion

The aim of this email is to ensure that a particularly serious case of research misconduct is examined in the pending UKRIO research into research integrity

Dear Professor Sir Bernard Silverman,

I am writing to you in your role as chair of the UKRIO Board of Trustees.

When you appeared with James Parry before the Science and Technology Committee on 30th January 2018, you jointly announced that the UKRIO will conduct research into research integrity.

I question the credibility of any such research because for the last six years I have been presenting the UKRIO with evidence of research dishonesty within its own ranks, *but it has failed to act*.

I informed James Parry of the problem in August 2012 [UKRIO enquiry reference 2012-046] and subsequently sent him several reminders.

I have also alerted you to the problem on nine (9) occasions.

[(i) 09/07/2015, (ii) 24/1/2015, (iii) 19/02/2016, (iv) 10/04/2016, (v) 22/05/2016, (vi) 06/06/2016, (vii) 17/12/2016, (viii) 18/12/2016, (ix) 04/05/2017.]

A summary of my experiences as a victim of research fraud

With the collusion of the UKRIO, the University of Manchester has buried evidence of a serious research fraud that may have cost lives.

As a result of this collusion, I have been unable to develop two patented inventions, in spite of considerable investment from the public purse.

The first invention, ***S***hock Absorbing ***Li***quid (***SALi***) received £290,000 public funding and its smart car bumper application was referred to in Hansard. This bumper solved 'the conflict of car bumper stiffness problem'. That is, it would have been stiff for collisions with other vehicles, soft for collisions with adult legs, and even softer for collisions with children. The bumper was designed to meet EU requirements intended to come into force in 2005. But when research fraud prevented my bumper from being developed and their there was no other solution to the conflict of stiffness problem, the EU requirement was dropped, with the possibility of it being revived in 2012, if a solution could be found.
If successfully developed this bumper could have prevented many thousands of life changing injuries for European pedestrians. For details visit www.cheshire-innovation.com/sali/pedsali.htm

SALi was intended to act as a 'cash cow' financing my research into a novel type of power generator for producing 'green' energy. This device, known as a Latent Power Turbine, offers a low cost alternative to wind turbines and solar power. If successful, the UK would have led the world in reducing climate change. This invention has received £200,000 tax payer funding. But because my time, good health and private funds have been lost while fighting SALi research fraud, development has ground to a halt.
For details please visit
www.cheshire-innovation.com/Sky%20Tube.htm .

It is 52 years since I started work on my power generator and 32 years since I started work on SALi. So my chances of developing either of them before the grim reaper calls are rapidly diminishing.
In my fifteen year battle to expose research fraud I have lost my retirement savings of £140,000 and suffered poor health. This fraud took place at the University of Manchester, with the UKRIO becoming involved when Dr Pablo Fernandez, a member of the UKRIO Advisory Board, acted as the external member of a Formal Inquiry Panel.

In your statements to the Parliamentary Committee, you claimed that the inclusion of an external panel member was an example of the good practice encouraged by the UKRIO. In reality, my experience is that the inclusion of a compliant UKRIO external member simply added credibility to a corrupt formal inquiry process.

My evidence submitted to you on earlier occasions cites several examples of Dr Fernandez behaving unprofessionally as a panel member. You can find a testable example of his misbehaviour by studying Appendix Three on this web page www.cheshire-innovation.com/sali/pedsali.htm. In this example the Formal Inquiry Report authors created fictional evidence that supposedly shifted the car bumper research failings on to me.
This manipulation of the truth included:

(i) False and derogatory claims about how I believed my invention would work. These false claims made me look stupid by academic standards.

(ii) The creation of a non-existent technical committee that supposedly investigated 'my stupid claims' and found that I was wrong.
[Freedom of Information requests to Manchester University have failed to unearth any evidence of the existence of this committee.]

(iii) The credibility of this fictional 'technical committee' was enhanced by including an external industrial member, Dr Eugenio Toccalino, from the Dow Chemical Company. This inclusion of an external committee member echoes the UKRIO's good practice recommendations for formal inquiry panels.
However, as you can see from my website, Dr Toccalino denies membership of this fictional committee.

This fictional committee is discussed in a journal paper, Courtney, W, 'A private researcher's struggles against research fraud', *Journal of Biological Physics and Chemistry* **16** (2016) 142–156.
A copy of this paper can be found online at
http://www.cheshire-innovation.com/Meta-fraud%20fight/A%20private%20researcher%E2%80%99s%20struggles%20against%20research%20fraud%20JBPC%20%20Vol%2016,%20No.%203.pdf
I supplied you and James Parry with this link to the paper on 4th May 2017.

In your evidence to the Committee, you spoke in favour of replication as a method for flushing out bad research.
In reality, the UKRIO has been proactive in preventing such replication by helping to discredit my professional name and invention.

Around the time that Fernandez et. al., were hiding the bad car bumper research at Manchester University, encouraging small scale research into SALi filled car bumpers was being done at Cardiff University. On the assumption that Fernandez et. al. would deliver an honest report, Cardiff applied for EPSRC funding [1] to replicate the fraudulent Manchester SALi research, but do it correctly. Cardiff's aim was to develop a smart bumper to meet the EU's later 2012 deadline.
Unfortunately, Fernandez et. al. delivered a corrupt report suggesting that I was deluded and SALi was ineffective. The EPSRC was sent a copy of the report and the Cardiff funding bid was rejected.

This corruption resulted in Britain losing its second chance to make European roads safer.

The Panel cannot claim ignorance of Cardiff's plans because they were presented with conference paper evidence of the good but basic Cardiff research [2]. Receipt of this paper was acknowledged by the Manchester University Research Office Adviser to the Inquiry on July 8th 2009.
On the same date I also submitted evidence to the Panel that somehow my unpublished SALi based car suspension unit designs had ended up in the hands of an economic rival, China, and were being researched at Nanjing University [3, 4]. As you may recall, this curious case of plagiarism by proxy is also discussed on my website at www.cheshire-innovation.com/sali/CrashSALi-Project.htm.

The technically valid SALi research that took place at Cardiff and Nanjing Universities should have been cited by the Panel to expose the bad Manchester University work. But innocent readers of the Formal Inquiry Report (for example the EPSRC) were misled because the report makes no reference to the Cardiff or Nanjing work. Again, you and James Parry were alerted to this censorship of the truth on several occasions, including 4th May 2017.

My examples suggest that the UKRIO is far more interested in creating the illusion that all is well in British research institutes, rather than supporting research integrity. If I am correct then you may have misled the Parliamentary Inquiry when you said,

> "The evidence is that the problem is not vast. There is not a big problem, but the issue is important. "

Then later you said,

> "The absolute level is quite low. That is within a culture where we are now much more likely to retract bad research than we were in the past."

I cannot explain why Dr Fernandez became involved in this cover-up. However, I did note that in your Westminster evidence, you claimed to be actively seeking additional universities as UKRIO subscribers. This has integrity implications, because as the Committee chair, Norman Lamb, suggested, the UKRIO is not truly independent: it is compromised by relying on income from its subscribers for financial survival.

An honest Formal Inquiry Report would have been in the best long term interests of British science. But in the short term it would have caused problems.
(i) It would have shocked the European public because of its European road safety implications.
(ii) This would threaten lucrative European research funding.

(ii) It would have cast a dark shadow over Manchester University at a time when two of its researchers were in line for the Nobel Physics Prize for insolating graphene.
(iii) It would have risked your subscribers withdrawing their support.

Your evidence to the Committee also failed to mention that for the last three years I have been calling on the wider membership of the UKRIO to address the problem of internal fraud.

Here are two examples of these 'calls':

(1) I wrote to the Chief Executive, James Parry, the Board of Trustees, the Advisory Board and published subscribers in June 2016. This letter is available online at http://www.cheshire-innovation.com/sali/CrashSALi-Project_files/Evidence%20that%20the%20UKRIO%20needs%20reforming.htm

(2) I wrote to the UKRIO 10th May, 2017 annual conference keynote speakers. As you will be aware, these speakers included yourself and James Parry. Neither of you replied.

As you can see, I am copying this email to James Parry, the Trustees and members of the UKRIO Advisory Panel, where I have their addresses.
The Science and Technology committee are also copied in.

I would also like to copy in your new project officer, Dr Josephine Woodhams. But I do not have her email address. So I request that you forward this email to her – thank you.

A copy of this email will be published on the Cheshire Innovation website

Yours sincerely,

William A Courtney

References

1 Cardiff University EPSRC application reference: EP/I02990/1

2 Davies, H. et al., Cardiff University School of Engineering, Pedestrian Protection using a Shock Absorbing Liquid (SALi) based Bumper System, *ESV Conference, Stuttgart,* (June 2009), Paper Number 09-002

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

4 H. d. Teng, Q. Chen, Nanjing University, Performance Characteristics of SALiM Isolator, *Proceedings of the World Congress in Engineering*, 2009, Vol. II.