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| --- | --- |
| 1 | 3. 2011 and 2015 Investigation |
| 2 | 3.2 Chasing the examination copies after PhD was awarded |
| 3 | A report based on the records disclosed under the UK Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) |
| 4 | Based on Ing-wen Tsai’s U.O.L. student file stored in the U.O.L. Archives, the email sent from the Research Degree Examinations office at U.O.L. on July 19, 2011, provides key facts about Ing-wen Tsai’s 1984 PhD. |
| https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/792874/response/1980587/attach/2/Withheld%20information%20A%20Redacted.pdf?cookie\_passthrough=1 |
| 5 | The green “record form” and the “reproductions of thesis form” usually sent with the hardbound copies to the Senate House Library were still in Tsai’s U.O.L. student file.  They are the crucial evidence proves that the Senate House never received Tsai’s final hardbound copies after the PhD exam to trigger the viva result notification letter. |
| Id. |
| 6 | It is consistent with the Information Commissioner’s finding on September 3, 2021.  Tsai’s viva result notification letter had not been retained in Tsai’s U.O.L. student file because it was never triggered. |
| https://ico.org.uk/media/action-weve-taken/decision-notices/2021/4018304/ic-83994-c7z4.pdf |
| 7 | Tsai’s U.O.L. student file had the green “Record form” and the “reproductions of thesis form” but no viva result notification letter to confirm the PhD award. |
| 8 | It indicates that Tsai’s PhD was awarded on March 14, 1984, 5 months after the PhD exam was held in October 1983, with no final hardbound copies and no viva result notification letter to confirm the award of a PhD degree. |
| 9 | The existence of Tsai’s U.O.L. student file in the U.O.L. archives proves that U.O.L. always knows it.  U.O.L. knew it before and after the PhD degree was awarded to Tsai in 1984.  U.O.L. also knew it when Tsai’s non-existing doctoral thesis was investigated in 2011, 2015, and 2019. |
| 10 | U.O.L.’s old explanation blaming the librarians for losing or mis-shelving Tsai’s doctoral thesis was not an inadvertent mistake. |
| https://ico.org.uk/media/action-weve-taken/decision-notices/2020/2617860/fs50908339.pdf |
| 11 | It is more so if the Senate House Library’s old card catalogue and the IALS Library’s record of the classmarks are taken into consideration. |
| https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/792874/response/1980587/attach/2/Withheld%20information%20A%20Redacted.pdf?cookie\_passthrough=1 |
| 12 | However, U.O.L. was not admonished by the First-tier Tribunal judge Hazel Oliver, Alison Lowton and Anne Chafer for its misrepresentation.  Three judges even decided the case in favor of U.O.L. |
| Appeal Reference: EA/2020/0286  https://www.casemine.com/judgement/uk/61c4c27cb50db9485a84119f |
| 13 | After the old explanation was rejected by the First-tier Tribunal, U.O.L. came up with a new explanation.  This time around, U.O.L. blamed the examiners for not returning the examination copies. |
| [The publication date of Tsai Ing-Wen’s PhD thesis which was held by Senate House Library? - a Freedom of Information request to University of London - WhatDoTheyKnow](https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/the_publication_date_of_tsai_ing#incoming-1949227) |
| 14 | U.O.L.’s new explanation was supported by Tsai’s U.O.L. student file.  Unfathomably, the Research Degree Examinations office chased the examiners and Tsai’s supervisor for the return of the examination copies, instead of chasing Tsai for the final hardbound copies, and the chase lasted for one and a half years. |
| 15 | On June 11, 2019, when Marcus Cerny learned that U.O.L. had chased the examination copies, not the final hardbound copies, his immediate reaction was:  Examiners copies were sporadically returned to institutions post viva and were probably simply left in an office, either centrally or in the department, unless specifically requested.  I would not have expected examiner copies used in the viva to be lodged in a library or retained formally at LSE. |
| FW: Ing-wen Tsai’s PhD thesis |
| 16 | Furthermore, the chase for the examination copies began not before but after the award was issued, and U.O.L. gave up the chase when no written entry clarified whether or not the examination copies had ever been received back. |
| 17 | The email dated July 19, 2011, the findings of the Information Commissioner and the First-tier Tribunal and U.O.L.’s admissions provide the necessary information to establish the U.O.L.’s procedure of awarding the PhD degree to Tsai in 1984. |
| 18 | To view the records in light most favorable to U.O.L. and Tsai, we assume the Senate House confirmed that Tsai’s thesis had been passed by the examiners after the viva exam. |
| 19 | The Senate House received no final hardbound copies of Tsai’s examined doctoral thesis in 1984, and the viva result notification letter issued on February 8, 1984, was not retained in Tsai’s U.O.L. student file.  The email dated July 19, 2011, stated that Tsai was awarded the PhD in February 1984, and the chase began after the award was issued.  Since no viva result notification letter was issued on February 8, 1984, to confirm the PhD award, in condition 1, we assume the chase for the examination copies began on March 14, 1984 when the PhD diploma was issued. |
| 20 | Condition 1.  after the PhD exam was held in mid-October 1983, the Senate House confirmed that Tsai’s thesis had been passed by the examiners.  The Senate House then waited for five months doing nothing.  On March 14, 1984, the Senate House issued a PhD diploma to Tsai, even though no final hardbound copies were received, and the viva result notification letter was not triggered to confirm the PhD award.  After the diploma was issued on March 14, 1984, the Research Degree Examinations office began chasing the examination copies for one and a half years and then gave up in August 1985. |
| 21 | The email dated July 19, 2011, stated that Tsai was awarded in February 1984.  On September 4, 2019, Tsai’s Office disclosed a copy of Tsai’s viva result notification letter dated February 8, 1984, on Facebook.  In condition 2, we assume the Senate House issued the viva result notification letter on February 8, 1984, even though no final hardbound copies were received and the chase began when the viva result notification letter was issued on February 8, 1984. |
| 22 | Condition 2.  After the PhD exam was held in mid-October 1983, the Senate House confirmed that Tsai’s thesis had been passed by the examiners.  On February 8, 1984, the Senate House issued the viva result notification letter even though no final hardbound copies were received.  After the viva result notification letter was issued, the Research Degree Examinations office began chasing the examination copies.  After chasing the examination copies for one month but to no avail, on March 14, 1984, the Senate House issued a PhD diploma to Tsai even though no final hardbound copies were received.  After the PhD diploma was issued to Tsai on March 14, 1984, the Research Degree Examinations office continued chasing the examination copies, for 17 months and then gave up in July 1985. |
| 23 | The email dated July 19, 2011, also indicated that the chase for the examination copies began after the award was issued.  So, condition 3 is similar to Condition 2, except that the chase began when Tsai’s PhD diploma was issued on March 14, 1984. |
| 24 | Condition 3.  After the PhD exam was held in mid-October 1983, the Senate House confirmed that Tsai’s thesis had been passed by the examiners.  On February 8, 1984, the Senate House issued the viva result notification letter even though no final hardbound copies were received.  After the viva result notification letter was issued, the Senate House waited for one month doing nothing and then issued a PhD diploma to Tsai on March 14, 1984, even though no final hardbound copies were received.  After the PhD diploma was issued to Tsai on March 14, 1984, the Research Degree Examinations office began chasing the examination copies for one and a half years and then gave up in August 1985. |
| 25 | The story does not stop there.  After Tsai’s PhD diploma was issued on March 14, 1984, U.O.L. issued at least four letters of certification to confirm Tsai’s 1984 PhD and reissued Tsai’s PhD diploma at least twice, once in 2010 and once in 2015. |
| 26 | The first letter of certification was disclosed by the Ministry of Education on January 8, 2020. |
| https://news.ltn.com.tw/news/politics/breakingnews/3033904 |
| 27 | The Free Chinese Centre in the U.K. was the predecessor of the Taipei Representative Office in the U.K. |
| 28 | In response to the degree verification request of the Ministry of Education for Tsai’s teaching position at the National Chengchi University in Taipei, the Free Chinese Centre in the U.K. contacted U.O.L. in June or July 1984. |
| 29 | On July 5, 1984, one A M Amos at U.O.L. Central Registry Academic Division issued a letter confirming Tsai’s 1984 PhD degree on July 5, 1984.  One P C Kennedy, also at the Central Registry Academic Division, signed the letter for Amos. |
| https://news.ltn.com.tw/news/politics/breakingnews/3033904 |
| 30 | Amos’ letter was issued on July 5, 1984, less than four months after Tsai’s PhD diploma was issued on March 14, 1984.  To confirm Tsai’s 1984 PhD, Tsai’s U.O.L. student file must be retrieved from the U.O.L. Archives.  In the file, Amos and or Kennedy could find the green Record Form and the reproductions of thesis form but no copy of the viva result notification letter, indicating that Tsai’s PhD degree was awarded without final hardbound copies of Tsai’s examined doctoral thesis to be deposited in the Senate House Library.  The file also indicated that the Research Degree Examinations office was in pursuit of the examination copies of Tsai’s doctoral thesis.  It is hard to imagine that Amos and or Kennedy disregarded all those records and issued the letter of certification on July 5, 1984. |
| 31 | Furthermore, the content of Amos’ letter indicates that the letter was authored by Amos or Kennedy or someone else who was ignorant about U.O.L.’s regulations and LSE PhD programs.  The letter stated that Tsai was an internal student of the London School of Economics and Political Science. |
| https://news.ltn.com.tw/news/politics/breakingnews/3033904 |
| 32 | It was inconsistent with the LSE Calendars in the early 1980s.  Students of the School who are reading for degrees or diplomas of the U.O.L are registered by the School as internal students of the University, not internal students of LSE. |
| https://lse-atom.arkivum.net/uploads/r/lse-institutional-archives/d/1/5/d15cf404f7a2c3c117a1a0b5712c784948484e93433fa93174d625b56127fcf3/d47f642e-7462-4468-885c-21767a309401-UKLSE\_DL1\_PU01\_001\_001\_0087\_0001.pdf |
| 33 | The second letter of certification was submitted by Tsai’s attorneys to the Taiwan Taipei Prosecutors Office on March 10, 2020, as Tsai’s Exhibit 43. |
| File 2, p. 164. |
| 34 | Three years after Tsai had been teaching at Chengchi University, the authenticity of her PhD degree needed to be verified again.  On September 23, 1987, the Free Chinese Centre in the U.K. sent another degree verification request to the Academic Registrar at U.O.L. |
| 35 | The Academic Registrar never responded.  Instead, P C Kennedy, who signed Amos’s letter on July 5, 1984, sent a letter to the Free Chinese Centre in the U.K. confirming Tsai’s 1984 PhD on September 30, 1987. |
| <https://www.chinatimes.com/realtimenews/20210902001137-260407?chdtv> |
| 36 | The letter was issued two years after the Senate House gave up the chase for the examination copies in July or August 1985.  When Tsai’s U.O.L. student file was retrieved from the U.O.L. Archives, the records of one and a half years of futile chase for the examination copies and a copy of Amos’ letter of certification signed by Kennedy had been added in Tsai’s U.O.L. student file. |
| 37 | The content of Kennedy’s letter once again shows that the author of the letter was ignorant about U.O.L.’s regulations and LSE PhD programs.  It certified that the minimum period of study for the PhD degree was two calendar years. |
| Id. |
| 38 | It was inconsistent with the 1983-1984 U.O.L Regulations.  The minimum period of study for the PhD degree in the early 1980s was two academic years, not two calendar years. |
| 8.1-8.2, 8.4 |
| 39 | Kennedy’s letter also raises an issue of degree fraud because it certified that it was not possible to issue detailed information on Tsai’s PhD since it was awarded after a course of research and the submission of a thesis title.  Even a diploma mill would not certify a PhD awarded after submitting a thesis title. |
| <https://www.chinatimes.com/realtimenews/20210902001137-260407?chdtv> |
| 40 | The third letter of certification was subpoenaed from Soochow University in Taipei on September 10, 2019.  On April 9, 1990, G F Roberts, Academic Registrar at U.O.L., issued the letter to certify Tsai’s 1984 PhD degree.  At the time, Tsai was applying for promotion from associate professor to professor at Chengchi University. |
| File 1, p. 156 |
| 41 | It was issued six years after U.O.L. awarded the PhD to Tsai, five years after the Senate House gave up the chase for the examination copies of Tsai’s doctoral thesis in July or August 1985.  When Tsai’s U.O.L. student file was retrieved from the U.O.L. Archives, a copy of Kennedy’s letter of certification had been added in Tsai’s U.O.L. student file. |
| 42 | As the Academic Registrar, Roberts knew better than anyone else.  The viva result notification letter usually issued by herself was not triggered by submission of the final hardbound copies. Kennedy issued a letter of certification on her behalf, which certified that Tsai’s 1984 PhD was awarded after the submission of a thesis title.  Tsai’s 1984 PhD was awarded with no final hardbound copies to be deposited in the Senate House Library and the examination copies had all vanished after the PhD exam.  It is hard to believe that Roberts issued the letter of certification instead of undertaking remedial actions. |
| 43 | In 2010, Tsai ran for the New Taipei City mayor.  Her PhD diploma was required by the Civil Servants Election and Recall Act to verify her PhD from LSE. |
| 44 | Tsai applied, and U.O.L. reissued Tsai’s PhD diploma when Tsai’s U.O.L. student file had all those records plus a copy of Roberts’ letter of certification issued on April 9, 1990. |
| file:///C:/Users/user30318/Downloads/ea1f235e-0a0f-4e3c-8758-ae9a0456f9c2%20(13).pdf |
| 45 | In 2015, U.O.L. reissued Tsai’s PhD diploma for the second time.  According to Tsai, she applied the reissued diploma because suspicions on the authenticity of her PhD was raised maliciously. |
| Id. |
| 46 | At the time, a record of Tsai’s PhD diploma reissued five years ago in 2010 had been added in Tsai’s U.O.L. student file. |
| 47 | A letter of certification was issued together with the reissued PhD diploma.  It was issued by Craig O’Callaghan, Chief Operation Officer at U.O.L., on September 22, 2015.  It bears no O’Callaghan’s embossed seal, rendering the letter of certification non-official. |
| Id. |
| 48 | When O’Callaghan’s letter of certification and Tsai’s PhD diploma were reissued in 2015, it had been over three decades since U.O.L. awarded Tsai a PhD in 1984.  Three letters of certification had been issued and one PhD diploma had been reissued. |
| 49 | For awarding a PhD to Tsai without the final hardbound copies of Tsai’s examined doctoral thesis, U.O.L. blamed the librarians and the examiners, but not Tsai, the PhD candidate then and the president of the Republic of China now. |
| 50 | U.O.L. chased Tsai’s supervisor and examiners for the examination copies for one and a half years, but no records show that U.O.L. had ever contacted Tsai for the long-overdue final hardbound copies after the PhD was awarded, and before four letters of certification were issued, and two diplomas were reissued. |
| 51 | In 2015, U.O.L. investigated Tsai’s non-existing doctoral thesis again, resulting in the email dated June 29, 2015, at 15:13.  The new development was that the Internal Examiner left his copy of the PhD thesis with the supervisor, Michael Elliott, post-viva. Elliott left both copies with the LSE asking the LSE to return these to the Senate House. These were never received. |
| https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/792874/response/1980587/attach/2/Withheld%20information%20A%20Redacted.pdf?cookie\_passthrough=1 |
| 52 | On June 24, 2019, Clive Wilson discovered that Elliott was away from LSE in the last year of Tsai’s PhD and subsequently left LSE in 1984 to join the Economist. |
| RE: Greetings from the Presidential office of Taiwan |
| 53 | Tsai’s registration ended in June 1982. |
| https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/792874/response/1980587/attach/2/Withheld%20information%20A%20Redacted.pdf?cookie\_passthrough=1 |
| 54 | Elliott was not assigned as Tsai’s supervisor after June 1982. |
| https://www.facebook.com/presidentialoffice.tw/photos/pcb. 2429761177247604/2429760790580976/ |
| 55 | In other words, after June 1982, Tsai was not registered and Elliott was not assigned to supervise Tsai. |
| 56 | Elliott was President and Chief Executive Officer of One Campaign from 2011 to 2016. |
| <https://www.one.org/africa/person/michael-elliott/>  https://www.one.org/international/press/michael-elliott/ |
| 57 | An article originally published in The Times on July 22, 2016, can be found on the website of One Campaign. |
| https://www.one.org/international/blog/michael-elliott/ |
| 58 | According to this article, Elliott lectured at LSE and then went on to work in the Central Policy Review Staff in the U.K. Cabinet Office as an adviser to the former Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher until she disbanded the unit after the 1983 general election. |
| Id. |
| 59 | The [1983 United Kingdom general election](https://www.parliament.uk/globalassets/documents/commons-information-office/m09.pdf) was held on June 9, 1983.  It indicates that Elliott had been away from LSE long before June 9, 1983. |
| [m09.pdf (parliament.uk)](https://www.parliament.uk/globalassets/documents/commons-information-office/m09.pdf) |
| 60 | Elliott then had an opportunity to work for the big management consultancy firm Deloitte.  But after he met Andrew Knight, the Editor of the Economists at the time, Elliott joined the Economists. |
| https://www.one.org/international/blog/michael-elliott/ |
| 61 | The Economist responded to an inquiry on April 4, 2022, confirming that Elliott joined the Economist approximately in February 1984. |
| 62 | Instead of checking Elliott’s personnel file to be sure when Elliott left LSE and whether or not he was Tsai’s thesis supervisor after he left LSE, LSE argued that it was not unusual for supervisors to continue overseeing students even if they moved to different institutions. |
|  |
| 63 | According to LSE’s argument, Elliott continued overseeing Tsai for almost two years when both of them were no longer affiliated with LSE after June 1982. |
| 64 | U.O.L. permitted Tsai to submit the doctoral thesis in June 1983 and sit the viva exam in mid-October 1983 while Tsai was not registered. |
| 65 | When Elliott was away from LSE long before the U.K. General Election held on June 9, 1983, and not assigned as Tsai’s supervisor, the internal examiner left his copy with Elliott after Tsai’s viva exam, and Elliott left both copies with LSE. |
| 66 | After the award was issued, the Senate House began chasing Elliott for the return of the examination copies and gave up the futile chase after one and a half years. |
| 67 | The chase began right around the time when Elliott started working at the Economist. |
| 68 | At the time, The Economist was based in St James’s at the iconic building informally known among the company as the ‘Tower.’ The address was 25 St James’s Street in London, |
| 69 | According to Google Maps, it was a 27-minute walk from the Senate House at Malet Street.  It took one and a half years for the Research Degree Examination office to chase Elliott, who was a 27-minute walk away, for the return of the examination copies but eventually failed. |
| 70 | Voice generated by FreeTTS  To be continued…. |

/End