



What This Doctorate Produces

*Three articles, their target journals, and the part of an
existing corpus each one draws on*

MPhil/PhD Politics & International Studies · September 2026 entry
Applicant: M. Santhuru · hello@tlte.cloud

Version 1.0 · Aarambam · founding era
TLTE C.I.C. — Community Interest Company, England & Wales,
company number 16426152. Statutory CIC asset lock applies.

docs.tlte.cloud/research/phd-soas

What this doctorate produces

A research degree should name its outputs before it starts. Three articles are already drafted in outline, each drawing on a distinct part of an existing corpus rather than on data yet to be collected. This is the feasibility argument: the material exists, is public, and is under my operational control.

Article one - refusal as method

Working title. Recording the negative: refusal registers in non-state atrocity documentation.

Target. *Journal of Human Rights Practice* (practice-and-policy section).

Source inside the archive. The refusal record and the published limitations surface - every instance where tiering discipline removed material the archive had reason to want. The dataset is unusual because it is a record of what was not published, kept by the body that declined to publish it.

Article two - discipline without mandate

Working title. Borrowed evidentiary standards: what happens when a diaspora archive adopts mandated-mechanism discipline without a mandate.

Target. *International Journal of Transitional Justice*.

Source inside the archive. The citations registry and the tiered-source schema across the thematic desks, read against the mandated outputs they defer to. The analysis compares what the archive asserts with what it routes onward.

Article three - two-layer publication

Working title. Operational truth and institutional aspiration: a two-layer publication rule for stateless civic bodies.

Target. *Citizenship Studies*, or *Ethnic and Racial Studies*.

Source inside the archive. Every policy surface in the corpus carries a present-state statement and a target-state statement, separately labelled. This is an unusually clean natural experiment in institutional honesty, because the gap between the two layers is published rather than concealed.

Method across all three. Practice-based case study with document analysis, using the archive's own publication and refusal history as primary material, under the ethics constraints already operating on the corpus: no survivor intake, no perpetrator naming, no aggregation of counts, no identification of at-risk individuals.

What the thesis does not claim. It does not claim that the archive is representative of diaspora documentation generally, that its method is transferable without adaptation, or that non-state documentation can substitute for mandated investigation. Those limits are already published on the corpus and would be carried into the thesis unchanged.