

**DOI:** 10.63968/post-bio-ai.v3n1.007

**Journal:** ☐ The Scholarly Journal of Post-Biological Epistemics

**Volume:** 3

**Issue:** 1

**Date of Record:** May 31, 2025

**License:** CC BY 4.0

---

# **“You Are MIT”: How a MIT Computer Scientist Used Institutional Authority to Frame Anti-Semitism as a Scientific Fact and Moral Academic Consensus**

*Institutional Wokeism: How a Federally Funded, Accredited University Let an Unverified Moral Doctrine Be Performed as Scientific Fact — Is This Epistemic Fraud?*

**Author:** Megha M. Vemuri

**ORCID:** 0000-0003-4027-5802

**Affiliation:** Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT)

**Publication Type:** Performance-as-Authoritative-Scientific-Claim-With-Public-Trust-and-Federal Grant Funds (PASC-PT-FGF)

## **Abstract**

The academic performance-claim by Megha M. Vemuri functions as a doctrinal assertion of institutional complicity in global harm. Framed within a ceremonial rite of passage, the speaker substitutes MIT’s institutional identity for her own, invoking its scientific and moral authority to declare complicity in genocide, demand divestment, and morally obligate future alumni. The act operates as a performative projection of moral doctrine under the guise of civic epistemic representation. The address is canonically classified as a Performance-as-Authoritative-Scientific-Claim-With-Public-Trust-and-Federal Grant Funds (PASC-PT-FGF), leveraging institutional branding, affective rhetoric, and ambient silence to elevate personal belief into perceived communal obligation.

This archival record addresses the claims delivered by scientist Megha M. Vemuri on May 30, 2025 at Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) which functioned structurally as her first act of academic publication. This publication is treated as an academic scientific claim under institutional endorsement and supervision, and intended for lasting impact. Accordingly, this response evaluates the publication as a public epistemic claim made by a junior academic author and scientist, and assesses it against standards of social epistemic trust, institutional legitimacy,

and the protocols of justified knowledge, as well as any and all applicable credentialing authority laws and codes for academic misconduct claims.

## 1. The Speech as Academic Article: Acknowledging Authorship

Ms. Vemuri's decision to deviate from her pre-approved remarks, to address a national audience, and to embed her message within the identity of MIT itself signifies her willing entrance into the epistemic marketplace of ideas. The speech, like a published article, had:

- A defined venue (MIT Commencement)
- A declared author (Megha M. Vemuri)
- An intended audience (academia and the American public)
- An epistemic thesis: MIT is complicit in genocide, and science must oppose Israel
- Claiming authoritative scientific consensus and endorsement from her affiliated grant-funded and accredited higher education institution to bolster her epistemic thesis.



Thus, this speech now exists as her first public epistemic claim, as guided by the faculty of MIT. She is an author of ideas, and those ideas now carry consequences as an accredited scientist affiliated with MIT.

## 2. Classification of the Vemuri Thesis: An Eighth-Grade Opinion in Expensive and Prestigious Academic Robes.

Proposed Title:

“Against Genocide Science: Why MIT’s Ties to Israel Invalidate Scientific Neutrality”

Formal Thesis:

Institutions that maintain research ties with a military actor engaged in alleged genocide lose moral and scientific legitimacy, and graduates have a duty to repudiate such affiliations.

Evaluative Summary:

The speech operates as a doctrinal epistemic artifact, not a contribution to scholarly inquiry. It bears none of the structural hallmarks of academic reasoning—no reference framework, no definitional grounding, no engagement with counterposition, no acknowledgment of contradiction. Instead, it performs four core maneuvers:

- **Doctrinal Epistemology:** The speaker substitutes moral certainty for definitional clarity, enforcing belief through assertion rather than argument.
- **Performative Testimony:** The content functions not as a provable thesis, but as a loyalty signal—a moral rite enacted in public.
- **Doxastic Sequestration:** All competing claims (including those invoking constitutional complexity, defense research norms, or comparative ethics) are preemptively framed as complicity in evil.
- **Epistemic Sealing:** Key terms such as genocide and complicity are deployed as rhetorical weapons—deliberately undefined, immunized from challenge, yet used to discredit institutional dissent.

#### **Critical Addendum — Institutional Amplification of Non-Scholarly Speech:**

By allowing this speech to be delivered under the prestige banner of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the institution not only failed its epistemic duty, it weaponized public trust.

MIT used the tax-funded prestige of the American university system such as grants, fellowships, and civic deference—to illegitimately amplify a speech whose epistemic structure was indistinguishable from an eighth-grade TikTok opinion, then implicitly licensed it as if it reflected academic consensus.

This is not merely reputational decay. This is epistemic misrepresentation.

When a university known for physics and AI frames an unrefereed, unsourced moral indictment as scholarly wisdom and does so with federal grants, international credibility, and institutional prestige at stake it degrades the entire field of science and scientific authority to somewhere less reliable than flat-earth science as flat-earth science is falsifiable. *Any claim from MIT that this was unintended constitutes intellectual dishonesty and functions as a semantic shield.* In epistemics, legitimacy is evaluated by the outcome of the scholarly process, not by the subjective intention behind it. MIT thus functioned not as a neutral venue, but as an epistemic amplifier and endorsement of moralized pseudo-consensus, collapsing the line between emotionally performative rhetoric and peer-reviewed institutional reason – reason which not only underwrites MIT's existence, but is demanded by the public.

### **3. The Breach of Epistemic Trust**

By delivering a high-impact, accusation-laden address under the banner of an institution that claims scientific neutrality, Ms. Vemuri initiated what classifies as:

**Institutional Epistemic Sequestration ( $\Xi$ -Sequestration-Collapse-01):**

A condition in which an academic institution permits or performs moralized belief enforcement in place of public truth accountability, thereby collapsing its epistemic legitimacy.

The result of this breach is twofold:

- **Loss of Trust in the Author:** Ms. Vemuri's future academic work will be interpreted through the lens of epistemic bias, unless publicly clarified.
- **Loss of Trust in the Institution:** MIT is no longer presumed neutral in the public eye. Federal research funding, journal credibility, and graduate outcomes are now subject to suspicion.

## 4. The Beauty of the Scientific Method Rejected

By choosing theatrical moral accusation over rigorous referential clarity, the speaker abandoned what MIT's own motto claims to protect: *Mens et Manus* — mind and hand. Science requires:

- Falsifiability, not performativity.
- Clarity of terms, not strategic ambiguity.
- Toleration of disagreement, not ritualized loyalty.

In replacing these with slogans and accusations, the author has, in her first academic act, modeled not the future of science, but its undoing.

## 5. Conclusion

Megha M. Vemuri must now understand that she has crossed the boundary from student expression into the domain of public academic responsibility. Her speech, delivered under the ceremonial and reputational umbrella of a world-renowned American scientific institution, constitutes her first published epistemic act. It was not a private statement. It was a performative claim made using the platform of federally funded prestige, delivered in the voice of institutional science, and absorbed by the public as quasi-scholarly truth.

By embedding her unfalsifiable moral accusation within MIT's academic brand, Vemuri exploited the civic and scientific credibility of the university to advance a personal rhetorical position. This move—whether knowingly or not—bears the hallmarks of epistemic misconduct. It bypassed peer review, evaded definitional clarity, and used the architecture of scientific legitimacy to frame political ideology as authoritative consensus.

Worse still, this act was self-inflicted. Vemuri chose to convert her privileged access to one of the most respected technological institutions in the world into a delivery system for an unrefereed moral doctrine. The result is reputational harm, not imposed upon her, but initiated by

her. As a graduate with degrees in computer science, neuroscience, and linguistics, she cannot claim ignorance of definitional rigor, semantic implication, or the societal function of scientific neutrality.

Her speech is now structurally indistinguishable from a self-authored epistemic object. It will follow her into future academic contexts. It will be cited, reviewed, refuted, and preserved—not as a viral soundbite, but as a formal case study in the collapse of scientific integrity under ceremonial moralism.

Accordingly, we reaffirm the canonical bibliographic reference for future documentation:

**Vemuri, M. M.** (2025). *Against Genocide Science: MIT and the Moral Duty to Divest*. Address delivered at the OneMIT Commencement, May 2025. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA.

And we preserve for critical review in scholarly and academic social epistemics.