

**From:** [Wilson,Clive](#)  
**To:** [Cerny,MW](#); [O'Connor,D](#); [Thomson,MT](#); [Kelloway,C](#); [Metcalf,F](#)  
**Subject:** RE: More on the PhD Thesis by Ing-Wen Tsai ...  
**Date:** 28 June 2019 16:12:03  
**Attachments:** [REDACTED]

---

Thanks Marcus

As a librarian I know my view is slightly coloured ☺ . But we can add notes to the record as well as purely bibliographic info, so I will see if I can come up with better wording to make it clearer.

And I know I told Marcus this already but this might also be helpful - I've copied here an email from three of our accounting faculty.

Some LSE Master's dissertations in the first half of last century were done by research. As a result they went to Senate House like the PhDs did.

When PhD theses were repatriated to LSE, the lists did not include the Master's dissertations. As a result most of those dissertations have been scrapped but the Senate House catalogue points to us.

Some of those dissertations are very heavily cited – so from a purely academic perspective are far more important - but if we did not have a duplicate they are lost. I find this heartbreaking. We get five or six enquiries a year about these. I would suspect all of those authors are dead now, but if a family member was doing some research and said, it's not on your catalogue but I have a copy – I'd bite their hand off!!

Clive

---

**From:** Cerny,MW  
**Sent:** 28 June 2019 14:09  
**To:** O'Connor,D; Wilson,Clive; Thomson,MT; Kelloway,C; Metcalf,F  
**Subject:** RE: More on the PhD Thesis by Ing-Wen Tsai ...

I am happy with this being available in the library. I can see that it as we have it, and it is of interest, it should be available where possible and my view is also that it is up to the Library to decide whether to accept materials and whether to store and make them available within whatever rules/conditions apply.

However, my decision from a regulatory standpoint, is that this has to be on the basis that this is a document provided to the Library in 2019 and be clear that we are not storing this as a formal record of the thesis examined or awarded.

What wording on the catalogue that might cover this and pre-empt questions is debatable but I think Clive's formulation is a reasonable one. Even if we got the question about it being genuine or whether we endorse it can we not simply fall back on the agreed statement? Noting again

that we are satisfied that the thesis was correctly awarded in line with the relevant procedures, that Senate House sent a copy to IALS, that neither Senate House nor IALS can locate a copy, and that Dr Tsai's office provided this version in 2019.

One final note on my position on this. It is not just a question as to whether we can prove that this is the thesis or whether we believe it to be. It is also a question that we would not accept a copy at this late remove in these circumstances for any other candidate and then record it as the examined or awarded thesis. Given this, for purposes of consistency, I do not think we should do so because of an individual graduates status. For the record, I am actually satisfied that this is an accurate version of the thesis examined (but I obviously could not prove it).

Thanks,  
Marcus

**Marcus Cerny**  
*Deputy Director, PhD Academy*  
*London School of Economics and Political Science*  
*Houghton Street*  
*London WC2A 2AE*

**Please consider the environment and do not print this email unless absolutely necessary.**

Please access the attached hyperlink for an important electronic communications disclaimer:  
<http://lse.ac.uk/emailDisclaimer>

---

**From:** O'Connor,D  
**Sent:** 28 June 2019 13:27  
**To:** Wilson,Clive; Thomson,MT; Kelloway,C; Cerny,MW; Metcalfe,F  
**Subject:** RE: More on the PhD Thesis by Ing-Wen Tsai ...

Hi Clive,

In normal circumstances, this all sounds very sensible.

However, as Marcus highlighted at the meeting, would we do the same if it were from a run-of-the-mill PhD graduate from the 1980s?

Also, I have a feeling announcing that we now have a facsimile copy might lead to a more confused message and a run of questions, such as : 'can you say it's genuine?' 'If not, are you *refusing* to endorse it?' "It says 2019, are you saying she only just wrote this?" etc. Answerable but may get us in the weeds.

Not saying we shouldn't go with the suggestion, it sounds like a good compromise, but just want to make sure our messaging is in order.

Hope that makes sense. Thanks very much,

Danny

---

**From:** Wilson,Clive

**Sent:** 28 June 2019 12:11

**To:** Thomson,MT <[M.T.Thomson@lse.ac.uk](mailto:M.T.Thomson@lse.ac.uk)>; Kelloway,C <[C.Kelloway@lse.ac.uk](mailto:C.Kelloway@lse.ac.uk)>; O'Connor,D <[D.O'Connor@lse.ac.uk](mailto:D.O'Connor@lse.ac.uk)>; Cerny,MW <[M.W.Cerny@lse.ac.uk](mailto:M.W.Cerny@lse.ac.uk)>; Metcalfe,F <[F.Metcalfe@lse.ac.uk](mailto:F.Metcalfe@lse.ac.uk)>

**Subject:** More on the PhD Thesis by Ing-Wen Tsai ...

Hi everyone

I received two copies of the thesis from Taiwan late yesterday. One soft bound and one hard bound. But both photocopies.

There are two draft chapters and an outline on the student record and – in my humble opinion - there is enough of those in the thesis to suggest it is good. And besides, even with the whole wheel of government behind you, it would still be a rather neat trick to fake or rewrite a thesis as if it was done in 1983 and in the same font as the draft chapters. ☺ However, as Marcus said on Monday, we still can't really prove that this is what she actually submitted in 1983.

One of my cataloguing colleagues has said we can probably catalogue it as a facsimile. For example:

Tsai, Ing-Wen. Unfair trade practices and safeguard actions: a facsimile copy of her 1983 PhD thesis presented to LSE Library by President Ing-Wen Tsai of Taiwan. 2019

This makes it clear it's a copy and was presented to us by her – so some deniability on our part if necessary.

By saying it was presented (again) and addressing her as President - it shows we are proud and still claiming brownie points for her as an LSE alumna.

The date shows as 2019 because that's when the copy was made – so again, not claiming it is the actual thesis.

To me, that sounds like a win-win for us and for her team. But happy to take it under advisement.

And then, as previously, we don't have permission to digitise it so it would only be available in the special collections reading room where we have two people at all times who can monitor any copying or defacing. And I would suggest we only give out the soft copy.

How does that sound?

Clive

Marcus in the PhD Academy is concerned that, although it almost certainly is valid, we can't prove that this is what she submitted in 1983. There are two draft chapters and an outline on the student record and there is enough of those in the copy to suggest it is good. And besides, even with the whole wheel of government behind you, it would be a rather neat trick to fake or rewrite a thesis as if it was done in 1983.

Clare said she needed to check but we could catalogue it as a facsimile. Marcus will (probably) be happy provided we make it clear (or ambiguous even) that we are not claiming it's the actual thesis.

So I am thinking something like:

Tsai, Ing-Wen. Unfair trade practices and safeguard actions: a facsimile copy of her 1983 PhD thesis presented to LSE Library by President Ing-Wen Tsai of Taiwan. 2019

If we make it available it would have to be reading room only. Can we restrict copying? Would we still hold it with the print theses? Would we add it to Theses Online even if it isn't digitised?