

I immediately identified that the supervisors at Swansea University did not have electricity physics expertise I thought they would have. They seemed okay with electronics knowledge but were lacking in electricity physics understandings, and this the supervisor allocated to me, Zhongfu Zhou, admitted to me. He did not understand the physics behind electric charge that I was discussing with him, although he came across as a very likeable, amiable person.

Commented [REDACTED]: Lack of expertise – issue of complaint

My work continued at home and I submitted a draft of my Thesis to the allocated supervisors in August 2020. This is when my supervisors stated they would not support my work if it contained Joseph Newman, the reason being:

*"Please note: Joseph Westley Newman, whose work has been universally rejected by all credible scientific examiners, including the American National Bureau of Standards after they thoroughly examined his apparatus. we would, therefore, be extremely wary of endorsing any published work 3 which referred to Newman's 'Energy Machine'. The supervision team does not support to include the work of Joseph Westley Newman in your thesis."*

Commented [REDACTED]: Issue of complaint

My 1<sup>st</sup> supervisor, Zhongfu Zhou, then subsequently resigned from the Thesis (see emails), and the university decided to offer a new team of supervisors, this was done. Both supervisory teams added no expertise or help of any kind to the Thesis, and both supervisory teams opposed the thesis due to the political crime and were not interested in the science I was bringing forward (although they also claimed they just wanted me to pass my Masters). It seemed to me, they were being coerced into this stance by some university hierarchy. Everything suggested the University's agenda was to fail this work at all costs, possibly protecting political and financial interests. This is the situation I found myself in

Commented [REDACTED]: Lack of support – issue of complaint

submitted my final Thesis in September 2021. Again the university were obstructive and claiming not to have received my initial submission. Ignoring my emails would become one of the tactics of the senior management and faculty, in the ensuing battle for truth, education and research.

Commented [REDACTED]: Communication issues – issue of complaint

Neither the external examiner nor the internal examiner presented a pre viva report on the day of the viva to Mr Blanche. They seemed unprepared, and this becomes evident from the transcript of the recording. One can see from the viva transcript, the examiners had not read all of Mr Blanche's work or any references to the volume of work, and they had decided to cherry pick four chapters as a way of trying to discredit the work. The examiners did not discuss the disputed work and this veered away from anytime Mr Blanche mentioned anything close to Newman's work.

Commented [REDACTED]: Viva prep – issue of complaint

It was as if these young men presented as experts in Electromagnetism, were handpicked by the university to be the sacrificial lambs at the pursuing slaughter that would undoubtedly follow, as they were not expert in this field of electromagnetism as they demonstrated. They were actors that went along with the agenda, implemented for one reason only, to commit scientific fraud with an 'agenda to fail' Mr Blanche's scientific research. An advancement in renewable technology and physics understandings was not allowed to be broadcast at any cost.

Commented [REDACTED]: Lack of expertise – issue of complaint

Chapter 4 of students appeal document is justifying his work – academic judgement (i.e see page 9)

(The examiners did not have the specialist knowledge to examine the Thesis. They demonstrated in the Viva oral examination that they would not and did not consider the thesis or abstract. They had a lack of basic scientific knowledge, electricity physics knowledge, electromagnetism knowledge, and even tried to claim there is no endothermic reaction with the surroundings whilst charging an electric field using lithium batteries.)

Commented [REDACTED]: Complaint

(Continually did not consider thesis or abstract through the whole process. This was the disputed work the supervisors had mentioned and should be avoided at all costs, even to basic scientific facts, ie. James Maxwell - The displacement current; Boltzmann/Planck constant; Electrons move in air around a conductor.)

Commented [REDACTED]: Complaint

There were no strengths identified, only weaknesses. Mr Blanche failed on everything, quite remarkable. There was no identification of the work covered in the thesis, title and abstract completely ignored by the examiners and only an agenda to fail was presented. The R & R form was not a detailed report including any scientific information or evidence that demonstrated why the examiners disagreed with Mr Blanche's observations.

Commented [REDACTED]: Feedback , issue of complaint

particular field.

The examiners failed to mention how the candidate defended his theory and thesis rigorously, but instead invented science, and ignored scientific knowledge presented by the candidate with one sole purpose, to fail the candidate, as detailed in chapter 6 of this report. They resorted to defamation and made unfounded derogatory comments in their reports about the candidate's character and behaviour. i.e *"During his explanations, the student came across as defensive, aggravated and at times condescending. Agreement on many discussion points were difficult to achieve"*. The examiners demonstrated they had no intention of explaining how the candidate's thesis and theory adds to the body of knowledge in his particular field of renewable energy and the physics of electromagnetism. Internal and external examiner did not demonstrate any understanding of the thesis during the whole procedure.

Commented [REDACTED]: Academic judgement

It soon became apparent during the oral viva, the examiners had not examined the Thesis in a rigorous manner, and were far from experts in Mr Blanche's field of study of renewable energy and electromagnetism. They had not read much of the thesis or examined any of the references, the evidence is in the transcript which Mr Blanche made, and he did this as he was suspecting there would be foul play. You might expect the examiners to refer to a reference that was given and explore how Mr Blanche came to his theory. The examiners did not prepare for this viva with any presentation of a pre viva report to Mr Blanche on the day or before the 16 viva, they were obviously under instructions what to do from some member(s) of the Swansea university staff.

Commented [REDACTED]: Issue of complaint

Page 17 – 53 – going through transcript of viva and scrutinising internal and external examiners – academic judgement

Doesn't feel that chairperson was independent

University give a different account of process compared to the external examiner (from Warwick University). Internal examiner fails to reply to three emails.

1. Geoff emails Perry for minutes Sat June 4<sup>th</sup> **EMAIL 1**
2. Geoff emails Widanalage for notes on Monday June 6<sup>th</sup> at 11.25 **EMAIL 8**
3. Perry replies at 15.58 June 6<sup>th</sup> stating R&R form to be supplied to the University by examiners any time within the next month. **EMAIL 5**
4. Geoff requests Summers notes again from Perry at 16.41 Monday 6<sup>th</sup> June **EMAIL 2**
5. Widanalage emails Geoff at 18.38 Monday June 6<sup>th</sup>, stating Huw Summers is coordinating feedback **EMAIL 9**
6. Geoff emails widanalage again requests info on MON June 6<sup>th</sup> 21.11 **EMAIL 10**
7. Widanalage emails Geoff on Tuesday June 7<sup>th</sup> at 16.15 and says: "All documents need to be sent to you via Swansea research office (or equivalent degrees office), I can't directly email to you. My notes appear as the External examination report which Swansea has, there is also the Internal examination report as well (which Swansea will have as well)."

Regards Dhammika" **EMAIL 11**

8. Perry replies to Geoff on Weds June 8<sup>th</sup> AT 10.55 and says: **EMAIL 6**

"Dear Geoff, Thank you for your email. The notes that Professor Summers made during your viva were to assist him in completing the Chair's Report in the Report and Results form. **As soon as that form has been received and ratified therefore, we will provide you with a copy of it.**"

Many thanks Zoë

9. Geoff claims victory in viva **EMAIL 15**

10. Perry informs of receipt of R&R form Friday 10<sup>th</sup> June at 11.22 **EMAIL 7**

11. Geoff receives what are supposed to be the

**Commented** [REDACTED] : Correspondence concerns – issues of complaint

Correspondence relating to the students stance on COVID19 and vaccine etc – not relevant to an academic appeal.

**Commented** [REDACTED] : Issue of complaint

Pages 91 – 98 – scrutinise the feedback/comments of the external examiner pre-viva – academic judgement

Continues in same vein

Many points repeated.

Transcript of viva to support issues of complaint

**Commented** [REDACTED] : Not sure if permission to record was obtained

Accusations of false statements continually made

**Commented** [REDACTED] : Issues of complaint

[REDACTED]

Blanche

PG Research

Failed to take into account all work submissible and properly submitted for assessment

Defects/irregularities

Prejudice/bias

This is a claim against you for

Scientific fraud, academic fraud, procedural fraud, Defamation, trying to censor research, serious harm to a career, failing to meet GDPR 2016 regulations, failing to meet freedom of information act 2000.

You have seven days to respond and 28 days to reply to these claims.

Regards

Geoff Blanche

Reject and reclassify as a complaint

- Not allowed to include the work of Newman .
- That you believe the university failed your work to please investors.
- Change in supervision team
- Was originally advised viva would be held online.
- Online held face to face in may
- - no minutes of viva kept
- Was informed that he was not allowed to take a witness into viva . Then was allowed to take witness in.
- Student was not privy to the notes
- Internal and external examiner did not provide a report
- Student does not believe examiners read the full submissions.
- Examiners not experienced 'The examiners portrayed little knowledge of electromagnetism, as-well as showing some very inept basic science understandings' which you believe is demonstrated by the questions asked by the external and internal examiners during the examination
- Chair was not independent

- Delays in the chair providing notes
- That you have not had sight of the Chair's notes
- That Paul Rees (2<sup>nd</sup> supervisor) is line managed by H Summers.
- Zoe Perry 'lies and is being told what to say by Summers, and she is the go between of deceit, one will notice that lots of the communication in emails is with the Postgraduate research team email address, that all the staff seem to have the privilege of using. This really does show they are all in it together.'
- Internal examiner failed to reply to all emails.
- Chairperson did not fulfil their roles.
- Report and Results form was not returned to academic services immediately.
- Original r and r form and notes not provided to the student
- You believe the findings of the examiners set out in the R and R form are incorrect for the reasons set out by you within your rebuttal document. ( academic judgment)

There is no guessing to the motivation for this crime, with US government agencies being involved in fraud against Newman, Swansea University hierarchy try to protect American government agencies and past criminality. There is a connection between American Politicians and Swansea University, for example, Swansea renamed their law society in 2017 to, the 'Hillary Clinton Law Society', and the Clinton foundation is also an investor in the University, see reference 12. Another motivation is to protect the University's benefactors in current renewable energy research and development. Endothermic Renewable energy generators will be a serious threat in terms of corporation profits from energy. What is quite remarkable as-well, is the fact that this University along with all other universities, are preaching the climate change agenda for carbon reduction and a change of energy production sources. Yet, they are prepared to commit crime to oppose this renewable scientific educational research Thesis! They are prepared to lie about fundamental science as if their lives depended upon it! 217 They have a total disregard for past, present and future education of students by trying to suppress this study. I say once more, this is a heinous crime; to stop this science research and theory. You have to ask yourself, WHY do they go to this extreme?

Some issues may be academic judgement

Outcomes

A first class Masters with honours for this ground breaking piece of electricity physics research. Noteworthy of a Nobel Prize for discovery and confirmation of Maxwell's displacement current as a usable renewable energy source. Read chapter's, 12 to 18, a new piece of electricity physics that has laid hidden since Nikola Tesla who first identified 'cold electricity' in the 1890s. 2. Fully published apologies by Swansea University in National Newspapers, dismissal of all staff and examiners involved in this scientific fraud, as-well as a suitable punishment. 3. Publication of Mr Blanche's work in any reputable Journal. 4. A hefty financial settlement for the mental abuse, defamation and the career damages that the examination board along with others have tried to inflict. Financial claims against: External examiner Internal examiner Chairperson Zoe Perry Postgraduate Research Committee PAB Board nominee Swansea University 5. A written apology to all past, present, and future students for trying to cover up this new educational knowledge by research and failing to represent education in an open, honest, transparent way. 6. Compensation for stopping me being able to undertake a PhD on this subject, if I so desired.