

Campus Violence In Educational Institution: An Experience (With Reference To West Bengal).

DR Sujit Narayan Chattopadhyay.
Principal.

ABSTRACT: *This is an article written on the problem of Campus violence caused by the Student/Student Union in different College, Universities. The special stress has been given on West Bengal. Since the change of Political Power in West Bengal the violence in College/University campus have increased to a considerable Number. Naturally this change is also affecting the teaching-learning process as well as the sanctity of the Academic Institution. This paper has tried to find out the probable cause of this unwanted disruption. Even the step against the Ragging has also been challenged by the Student Organization. There are number of occasion when Teachers, Principals are being beaten or murdered (As happened in Andhra). These are obviously hurting our sense, tradition and culture. This paper has tried to discuss and find out the reasons of this problem in detail. We feel the conjuncture in which we ,the direct participant are placed today is really critical one. An understanding of the conjuncture is essential is we want to move our democratic and anti violent voice forward. This development of understanding of the problem should be considered as preliminary efforts towards that end, nothing more than that.*

Violence in Educational campus is neither a new phenomenal word nor incident, nor is it a new phenomenon only happens in India or in any Third World countries. Rather to be more specific this has become a regular and problematic practice in developed western Countries. But the character, nature and dimensions of those violent incidents in developed Western Countries, are completely different from the violence that we are now facing in our Educational Campus. The prime reasons of these differences are, that our attitude, value and belief system to the Academic Institution are absolutely asymmetrical from the Western culture and belief system. Our attitude and values to the Academic Institution and their sanctity in student and student-teacher relationship, etc., are different from the Western Countries .Perhaps for this any deviation or derailment of the traditional value belief system and attitude to the Institution hurt us like a sensation of breaking down the social bondage. In our traditional belief system, teacher, student and Institution are part of a set of behavior and phenomena, centered round etiquette and acceptability. The unique traditional properties were built up with phenomena of teaching-learning stands on the plinth of teacher-student relationship. Still now we learn from our elders that the knowledge can only be acquired from “Preceptor”, none else.

However, from the days of our national Movement against the Colonial Power, our Student played a very significant role and came forward to take active part in the Liberation struggle. Even our National Leader unhesitatingly declared that, education could be suspended for a certain period of time, but national movement for freedom should be never be stopped. So Politics is in our tradition since the time of our National Liberation Struggle. During late 60’s and early 70’s of the last Century, Student Politics and campus violence were become synonymous with the College life in West Bengal. Still those memories of Naxalbari Movement are alive in our mind. But from late 70’s, the violence started to haunt with the State and its politics, but that time it was not without the tinge of idealism. But a new phase of campus violence has started from 2010 onwards. The nature of this new type of violence was directly directed against the Campus to take hold the position in the campus. It was neither ideology-tinged violence, nor any agitation or movement for benefit and betterment of the Student and/or learning system. Prof. Abirup Sarkar rationalized this in an interview with *Decan Herald* on 15-10-13, as, “Actually, winds of Political Changes are blowing in the State, and that is why there is this increase in Campus Violence. Thus the violence we witnessed during 70’s of the last century and the Campus chaos, which now we are seeing, are characteristically different in nature and dimension. Former had an ideology as guiding principles, but the latter’s intention is only to acquire possession on the campus, under the indirect leadership and guidance of local satraps. Naturally this radical change of principles and outlook have also affected the basic character of the actors, who are taking leading part in this chaos of professional politics, causing an identity crisis between the ruling party and constitutional Government, but this time it was haunting without any tinge of idealism. Some scholars termed it as “criminalization of Student-Union politics” which has graduated into the causes where

Teachers and Principals are being beaten and sometime are forced either to promote a student who has failed or to excuse students, who are alleged with the blame of ragging.

These are the prime causes why the violence in campus of educational institution has recently become a burning issue and draws special attention of the teachers as well as of the conscious members of the Civil Society. The interest of the members of the Civil Society stems from the compulsory attachment of their progenies with the educational institution. It is true but unfortunate that the sanctity, acceptability, above all social vision towards Schools and Colleges or even Universities, in a word academic institution is in peril. Reasons may be of different, but the result is ransacking, frustration and humiliation. There was a time when we proudly pronounced the tradition of our learning process, the tradition of our Teacher-Student relationship. Our social identity was closely related with our learning process and tradition. But those days are now appearing as our past. We not only preach but also believe that the advancement of knowledge and understanding of social reality are the alleviator of humanity. But when Education is being divorced from morality and ethics, culture and civilization, we unknowingly or unknowingly lost its human impulses and social viability. Under this social and philosophical basis we need to put light on the growing trends of Campus Violence, especially in West Bengal, where the violent Campus have become an essential part of the daily news, in print and electronic media.

A number of arguments and reasons have so far been given by different corners of the society in view of the growing campus violence. These corners – like leaders of Political Parties, different Student Union Leaders, leader of Teachers' Organization, representative figures of different walks of life, professional analysts, even the media persons who play involving role in projecting these to the viewers and to the Civil Society, define and explain the causes of violence from their own respective angle of observation and understanding. The differences of these observations and understandings are spatial, but it has the potentialities of creating debatable issues to create a new road of rift among the different layers of the Civil Society. But on one point all are in the same platform, that these examples of growing violence's in the campus are hindrance to the advancement of learning and teaching. The result of which, is the creation of crack on the "instrumental role" of education, and loosing the reliability of the existing status of Education as well as Institution, which certainly have the capability of changing the way of life and the pattern of social behavior.

So there are differences of viewing and analyzing the situation, and these differences of angles and opinion only create rift, and ultimately a labyrinth on a issue, which affects all in the society. It is obviously their secular observation and analysis that makes these differences, difficult to resolve through empirical regularities. As a result, the end prediction that ultimately emerges from their own empirical observation and analysis cannot lead us to theoretical refinement. But this refinement is essential to be arrived at any revolutionary decision which may help us to control such unwanted campus violence in near and far future. At present, we, who are especially concerned about the society, are deriving our conclusion on the campus violence from naturally occurring violent process in different corners of the state, or in other words, the major sources of our discussion and analysis of the course are some observational and empirical data or 'happenstance'. Obviously this 'happenstance' did not occur within a controlled possible constant universe to facilitate in formulating the theoretical proposition for the reasons and remedy of such violence. Due to this gaps, the observations made by different corners of life, based on certain paribus (other things being equal) assumption. In such cases if other things changes or are not held in the constant universe, then it becomes very difficult to validate a theoretical premise that is being mooted. In the present case most of the analysis of every corners of life are connecting this violence with the involvement of Political Parties with the Student Union activities. Thus they pose two easy solutions to contain the problem of Campus Violence: - (1) to debar the Leadership of the Political Parties from the Student union organizations works within the College or in any educational campus; (2) to debar "Politics" from the student and to encourage apolitical student Organization or movement. In fact, there is a section in the society, (who happens to be closer to the State power and hegemony) who not only theoretically but also objectively opines and tries to influence the decision making authority to banish "Politics" from the Educational campus. According to their observation and corresponding explanation, "Politics" has become the synonym to the Political Party. Thus to them, the process of banishing politics means the banishment of Political Party. Apart from this short cut explanation they also mean by "Politics" a means of opposing the decision of the authority of the educational institution and of the Government. They actually want to say that they come to an Educational Institution to build up a career, to acquire a good placement in the job market, nothing else are their motivation.

There is another argument, which indicates to the Institution and its ability or failure to provide proper leadership to the Student. The failure on the part of faculty and Institution, paves the ways towards the road beyond the Campus where a different world of power and hegemony waits for them. The primary function and responsibility of the Institution and faculty is to make the student civic-minded. The Institution can give the

appropriate leadership to its Student towards value and civic-learning. But if this lacks, students are becoming an easy prey to that Leadership which easily lured them for power and hegemony.

It is oftenly argued that in Third World countries, the complete banishment of Politics from the Student community is not possible. Because in Third World countries the sense of nationalism came through the wake of Politics and Political uprising against the Imperial power. Thus we need to find our legitimacy through the State and State power. So keeping "Politics" as a probable potent cause of violence, we need to find out an experimental method through which we may get an access to the source point of Campus Violence in a right and enlarged way, so that we can revalidate as well as eradicate the cause in future Here we should be careful in one respect. To find out the cause of violence we can use our historical memories and experience to judge different sequences of violence in campus during last fifty to seventy years or more specifically since 1960's in West Bengal specially and in India generally. But can we use these experiences a method of experiments to find out the cause? Perhaps this cannot be predicted emphatically, because social reality happens at a particular time and space, in a particular situation. But the characteristics of social science and its natural reality initially preclude almost in all cases the scope of controlled experimentation, because the situation with time and space can never be rewinded. Even then we look into different factors through our historical experiences controlling the confounded possible and obtainable result to validate our assumption and hypothesis for the cause of Campus Violence. In the process of our analysis, it may so happen that, in our attempt at experimenting the cause behind the violence, the situation or our experience may lead us to a new theoretical direction.

At the outset of our discussion on this problem, we may give a cursory glance to the present focus of urban middle class who as a normal practice of their social life (not by compulsion of Government or any provocation by any Non-Government Organization, or for any reason other than normal choice) send their progenies to the academic institution as part of their normal method of socializing them. In the arguments for de-politicization of academic institution, this urban middle class people are in the forefront. Of course this conclusion would remain partially dub to identify the Middle Class as the senders of children to the School and Colleges, the children of lower Middle Class family are also coming to the schools and Colleges in growing number. But so far Higher Education – plugging with Honors and ambition is concerned, still the primary dominance of Middle and Upper-Middle Class exist. Whereas it is our average experience that the majority of the student presently found with the head-on activities of the Student Union of any college/campus come from the Middle and Lower-Middle Class family with a General course profile. This subtle change of the social background of the Student Union activities has markedly changed the primary focus of the Student Union activities in the College campus. These students try to come to the fore-front in the College with the shadowed effect of the might or influence of the Union, and their authorities among others and also in relation with the College Authority fully and primarily depend upon their relation with the local, district and State level Leaders of their parent Political Party Organization of which the Student Union is only the epitome. This may also be looked as a process of empowerment of a class, who were so far not being elitised in the society. They obviously had a different set of value and cultural attitude from that of the culture and values of the educated middle and upper-middle class of the society. So the extension of opportunity of enrollment in Educational Institution opened a new avenue to substantiating their empowerment in the social power structure, and also paved a new road to the Job-Market initially as a window-job searcher or as a casual worker. Of course some of them get a successful headway in the market, by dint of their added expertise.

This opening has another facet, which also needs special attention. This secularization of education is actually a reaction against the traditional hegemony and elitism of middle and upper-middle class on education and educational institution. They so far enjoyed the empowered position and social hegemony because of their traditional attachment with the Education and for their direct involvement with Institution of decision making process. Traditionally the status of the common men was depicted as inferior in comparison to the educated men. This situation gradually started to take a new and wider shape from the late 70's and early 80's, when Education and Educational Institution started to spread among the common laity. This changing shape and perspective gave birth to a new generation to whom Institution was a medium of uplifting the social position rather than the process of internalizing a new culture of democracy and social understanding Thus this process of gradual democratization of education ironically contributed a new culture of separation between traditional values of Education and new sense of right, partially divorced from the actual sense of social and institutional values and responsibility. Transformation of value system obviously led to the changes in perspective and attitude to the Institution like Schools and Colleges. To pupils of new generation, educational Institution is no longer a sacred place for giving social identity to the Students, rather to them it appeared as a license for their social position, and a source of social empowerment. So they search their identity, in the competition of achieving power and authority among others in the Institution through their closeness with the Political Parties and Groups through the example of their

activeness in Student-Union activities, because these are to them the only media to substantiate their empowered position. Political parties and Groups on the other hand, taking the advantage of their influence in the Student

Union tries to make a positive and decisive in-road in the decision making process of the College. This is only the one side of the coin. On the other side of the coin, the dominant part is played by those students who come from the middle and upper-middle class families. Objectively one can see that in most of the Colleges in the urban and semi-urban sectors, these groups of student still hold the majority, and that their apathetic attitude in involving politics is very much prominent (exception may be seen for those Colleges where the authorities still have restricted their hinterland within the Middle and Upper-Middle Class of the Society through strict observance of their Admission process). These middle and upper-middle class groups are by and large the protagonists of neo-liberalism and advocate as an antidote to the Great Recession, because the great recession once becomes the potent cause of dissent of middle and lower-middle class. Those who did able to escape from the growing dissension on the very existence caused by the Great Recession gradually began to take the side of the neo-liberalism. The main cause of this silent shifting of position was that the dissension caused by the recession was not reflected through their economic position but the dissension actually expressed a protest against the State, and political institution, especially on the functioning of the institution of democracy.

This anti-political protest emerges in a new form of apolitical attitude and gradually it extended among the progenies of middle and upper-middle class student. This truth will be distinct if we take the trouble of sampling the front liner of College Student Union activities, especially since 2009 and onward. Even in this can be seen that a good percentage of leaders of Student Union, of the period of our discussion, come from the middle-class families with the potentiality of being a leader in future. Most of the workers and activists of the Student-Union come from the lower rank of the middle-class families, who are primarily identified as first generation learner, and can only afford to send their progenies to the College mainly because they are idle in the house. It will normally be evident from the gossip or informal hobnob of the middle-class “Bhaadrolok” that they have already began to nourish (as well as support) the idea that the tattered theory of representation, democracy, are no more useful for good and effective administration, rather it has become an institution in the hands of some loathsome pupils who come to college to spend some useless time. Political Parties and local leader (who appear to be local “satraps”) put their aim and thrives for their patronage to the Union pupils for sake of creating a banded force of supporter in their favour. And we find those “student” in the band, which are in the environment of neglect and abuse in their house, from their relatives and also in College. To them the only solution of this problem can be achieved through dictatorial administration of the college, decisive at the time of necessity and authority to punish for Academic guilt. In a word, they are found in the midst of negative attitude to the life society and social values.

The Middle class of especially urban sector have an instinct to support the neo-liberal ideologies. Especially this holds good for the people of organized sector or professionals and service people. The focus of neo-liberalism is uninterrupted market and unfettered public administration and decision making process. The easy and simplistic way of expressing this is negation of any kind of political organization. Politics and Politicians are to them the source of power. To them the image of politics and politicians is frailty, and it can never be an ambition to anyone, especially to them who are coming from the professional family background. The upper-middle class specially gives emphasis on this at the time of selecting the College or academic institution for their progenies. They primarily look into the structure of opportunities generally provided by the Institution, and possible availability of private tuition for ward, reputation of the faculties. Because they believe that class room teaching is not sufficient for career building. In the process of this career centric education, politics and Student-Union are considered as impediment to their progenies.

This part in the civil society is equally important to understand the nature and characteristics of the Student-Union and its mode of action in the educational institution. The prime focus of this part, as we mentioned earlier, is to follow the basic character of neo-liberal ideology which for establishing and maintaining the autonomy of educational institution, basically rests on the assumption of apolitical attitude for the Students. But the objective conditions hint to the fact that the students, who pretend to remain apolitical or abstain from Student-Union and its pro-violent agitation against the authority of the institution, do never hesitate to become the part of the enjoyer of the result of pro-violent pressure movement of the Student-Union is respect of extension of admission facilities by increasing “in-take capacity” during admission period or on the question of reconsideration of poor marks and/or poor attendance during the College examination and subsequently on the question of preparing “sent-up” list for the Final Examination. They, in the way of enjoying these advantages, do neither consider the color, nor the legality of justifiability of the demand, only they look for the end result and whether that serves “his/her” interest or not. They do never bother about the means of achieving the result. This indifference to the means signifies their Class position or the origin of their family class. In such cases students in

general are very much individualistic. Participation with the movement to the majority of the student, very much depends upon whether the demands are akin to the interests or not.

This is one of reasons why in most occasions the student union movements within the College very easily turn into a violent or partially violent pressure movement. Actually this is that “Hole” or “means “through which outside local satraps make successful entry into the College on the plea of helping to achieve the end result. However, because of this asymmetrical pattern of participation of the Student-Union, any change of color or nature of direct participation does not create any basically fundamental change in the pattern of student demand and nature of pressure politics with the help of outside satrap leaders of the locality. Now the question may be raised that why the outsiders are getting in-road to play something directly, effectively and in some cases indirectly but meaningfully. Student politics is basically a non-institutionalized model of political behavior and its functioning depends upon the socio-psychological attributes of the participants. Student gets structural link with the State and Political System through academic institution like Schools, Colleges, and Universities etc. This attributive link became more meaningful through the authoritative connection of the State with the policy and decision formation on education and educational system. Especially in Third World Countries State, as we have discussed earlier, is the main provider of education service to the society, by building up necessary structural reorientation for catering education. State, in fact, takes this as a part of its welfare activities. Taking this as an advantageous source, the Party in State Power tries to suppress the activities of the opposition in this welfare attempt and spread its influence in the society as it is one of the easiest ways to reach to the bottom of the society. Mainly because of this, any opposition to the ruling government’s policies is often portrayed as anti-State treasonable activities against which the Party in power uses the administration to arrest the motivation of challenging the State hegemony over education.

The emerging incident of violence in the academic institution are certainly an unwanted dialect, i.e., which is not congenial for the peaceful maintenance of the administration of the academic institution. This dialectic sometimes emerges out of the clash of interest between the student in general or of a particular section of student and authority of the institution as a whole. Our empirical experience as well as the prolonged experimentation on the objective fact reveals that during admission in First Year (which is primarily bounded by at least two preconditions : i) approved “In-Take” capacity of the institution ; ii) criteria of secured marks in the last eligible examination – these two criterion determine the eligibility list of admissible candidates on the basis of merit), or during the publication of result of the Institutional examination, are the initial potent causes of dialect with the student and the authority of the Institution. In these two occasions Student Union shows their position of pressurizing the authority either to yield their pressure or to succumb to their demand. They use these to get in-roads to the general and/or victim students to fetch support to their further activities. The common point of discontent on Institutional examination rose from the issue of debarring any student or a few students from appearing in the Final Degree Examination either due to poor performance in the examination or due to the low percentage of attendance in the Institution. Especially in the second incident, the interference from local satraps is seen at the final point of dialect, when they appear as a savior of a sinking career. In other case the outsider are rarely seen to be prone to interfere from the very beginning. The local satraps outside the Institution but within the radius of the hinterland of the Institution have an intention to incite the deprived students having reclined merit and ambition through an institutional frame of “Student-Union”, and to utilize the same to gain support for their own Political Party in the name of “struggle”, “agitation”. “Student movement” etc.. It is also seen through our experience that in some occasion the authority of the Institution willingly or carelessly ignore, some essential demand of the students. Even sometimes the authority dilly-dallies with the vital need of the student; they treat them as “no-body’s concern”. These mentalities on some occasion gradually become the cause of flaring up which ultimately bursts into the violent behavior.

There is a third potent phase when an Institution faces or apprehends the violent situation. Here again we may find the indirect presence of the Political Government as a chief wheeler of the situation. The situation crops up during the Election of the Student-Union. Once, our national leader visualized a free, neutral and democratic Institution for our Country, where the future citizen would be built up for the Nation. Perhaps they kept it in their memory, the famous Carlyle Act of 1905, where the political and social knowledge of the Students was stated as “absolutely subversive of discipline, and in the highest degree injurious to the interest of the boys themselves. It is impossible to tolerate this in connection with institution which government either assists or countenance,” Once we condemned and criticized the Act of 1905, we also condemned the interference of government through providing assistance and countenance to Institution. The Founding Father of our Constitution also made such arrangement in Article 45, and directed the Political Executive to extend their Administrative wishes to make Education available to everyone. But that too has later been depended upon the wishes of the political executive to provide help and assistance to the Institution to build up their essential infrastructure for providing modern education.

This dependence has ultimately curtailed the myth of neutrality and democratic autonomy of the Institution. Actually this is the way through which Political Party in Political/Executive power in the State, is finding its headway to get entry into the Power-Game in the Institution through Student Union, because students are the most soft organs of the Institution whose tenure within the campus is comparatively short. The calculated navigation of the Political Party becomes prominent during the Election of the Student-Union, which provide the actual platform to extend influence and extra-constitutional authority to the administration of the Institution. Our experiences tell us that the general peace during Student-Union election will so long exists as long as there will neither be any strong opposition nor any electoral competition. The minimum presence of any of this factor may instantly change the total peaceful scenario, to the turbulent violence and even in some occasion blood-shed. In fact, in such situation, the authority remains as a mere spectator, who pretends to be a neutral and democratic. Actually this neutrality is an atypical state of a weak and frail administration, which has only a Chair without having any authority to put it on the right place at the right moment. This is an observation of an onlooker and insider, who professionally experienced this as a part of its job and service.

There is reason to believe that in some cases the authority of the Institution utilizes the incident of Student violence to garner support for its own “deeds” on behalf of the sanctity of the education and the Educational Institution. This clandestine mutual wrap and woof between the Student-Union and the authority of the Institution gradually tries to legitimize the violence in the society and thus vitiate the student and teaching profession as well as the atmosphere of the Educational Institution. Now the most important thing that has to be thought how the implicit originator/source of violence could be dissociated from the normal contradiction between the authority of Academic Institution and student of the same Institution. This contradiction between teacher and student or authority and student is normal because its premise is the exposition of being into consciousness. Academic world is the world to a student which teaches him/her to recognize the surroundings with materiality and knowability and also teach him/her to examine knowledge. Here the question rises that how one is to identify the reality, that is, his/her existence as an individual or as a part of an organized whole? The actual answer of this question can reach him/her to the greater consciousness of better understanding of the life. Further if the organization is identified with causeless violence then at a certain point of time a new contradiction on association/ Student-Union may be raised to lead it towards a negation from all these realities.

The necessary logic for this is to identify whether “you are with violence and cause of violence or against it.” Otherwise all such encompassing discourses that whether there will be ‘Politics’ of ‘no-politics’ actually would be considered as disadvantages to the student movement. For the course of knowing self and educational improvements, such discourses will ultimately mislead us to reach a decision of banishing the ‘Politics’ from the Student-Union organization. It is a fact that violence within the campus in the name of Student Union activities can neither solve the problems of the student nor change the outlook and mind-set of the authority of the Institution or the State authority, who are constitutionally the ultimate authority to take decision for an institution in particular and educational system in general. Rather it will only increase atrocity among the professionals of the Institution and peace problem to the State authority, to take any positive and substantive decision on Education and the related infrastructure. The fact is also that the violent Student Union leader obviously cannot change the educational system and decision making process of the authority in the true sense of the term. It can only create a temporal and local disorder in any institution with a negative effect on attitudinal behavior of the participants and of the service provider to the service. Even under the situation of violence the Government may force to bring down some sorts of Karlianian measure on the movement which will ultimately pushed back the tempo and basis of Student movement. Only in some occasion their violence may cease the function of the service provider to provide any particular decision. But that too does not have any long term effect on the educational system as a whole. It is because of the fact that they do not have any clear conception of what and how the educational system can be changed through violence, except some temporary gain through winning over the politics of pressure upon the authority of the Institution, throwing back the prevailing system as inconclusive to the interest of the student. The recent example of Jadavpur University of West Bengal, and the student movement held there, may be cited as an incident for our understanding.

We have number of examples, which happened recently in different Institution of West-Bengal. Even outside west-Bengal one Head of the Institution was killed brutally by his own College students who were rusticated by the authority on a proven allegation of ragging against them. The same incident of ragging was also happened in Jadavpur University of West-Bengal, where a few students were suspended from the University for an “Allegation” of ragging against them. We have witnessed two separate types of reaction from the students of two different States for same type of allegation In Andhra, the Principal was killed brutally and in West-Bengal, Vice-Chancellor and other university officials were detained for 39 hours in their Office by “Gherao” demonstration.

Unfortunately both these violent incidents ultimately failed to get an effective decision from the authority in the favour of their “Andolon”. Actually in both the cases the State were not in a position to make sure of something in the favour of the students without risking their Constitutional legality and responsibility. At the same time the Government cannot even deny or overlook the onus of campus violence, because at least Civil-Society wants to see some positive steps and decision from the Government. Thus might of the students is not anything unless and until it is not backed and protected and supported by the stretched out invisible hands of the Political Executive through its structure of Party. Satraps of these Parties actually misled the Student-Union and influence them to take a plunge against any decision taken by the authority of the Institution and to baffle it in the name of the “student” interest. But when the actual Political Executive, considering its Constitutional role, responsibility and image, dissociate itself from the plunge of Student-Union activities, then satraps are made themselves scared from the screen, leaving the internal leaders of the Union aloof. At this point of time bewildered leaders of the Student-Union are left for absconding from the spot of demonstration, to protect their social and legal security. This is really an example of decadent culture, which has recently extended its claw towards the educational institution. Prof Sunanda Sanyal recently in an interview with *Decan Herald* opined that, ‘there is an urgent need to stop criminalization of politics. Political Parties are using the student for their own interest. That should be stopped or it will destroy the future’.

Our general experience also tells us some separate perspective. Our experience also shows that the member of the Student-Union failing to stand against the interference of the outsider start to play tricks with the authority of the Institution using the student as a shield of their actual aim of extending their influence and hegemony on the administration of the institution. The students in fact do not have that might to cut through their influence and to stand up against the cunning violence of the political leaders. Because the primary source of their power and influence is their connection with the power-centre of the State or of the locality or area. Thus they use the student as a violent shield to the authority of the institution and gradually and increasingly they are shifted from the “shielded violent” force to the “Political violent” force of the Political Parties and used as a reserve force to maintain dominance over a particular locality or area. The violence in the campus of Academic Institution in this way gradually changes to a new form of violence and those alleged students become the line force of new violent group behind a particular leader. Thus we see, these leaders come to the campus at the optimum point of violence with a vague and self imposed authority and diffuse the actual demand of the Student (if there is any!!) and establish the claim to others and also to the media-giant / Manager that they have come to change/normalize the scenario of violence in the campus and to restore peace. The surprising matter is that, their authority is imposed by themselves. So there are reasons to belief that behind the curtain of their “self imposed authority” there remains a plan of creating a terrorized atmosphere in the campus, so that the steering of control may ultimately come to them. This further ensures their interference in other or in all matters of the Institution in the name of Democracy and Neutrality.

Thus the logic of violence or no-violence in the campus of any Institution in fact is used for crushing the democratic opposition and/or activities/movement etc. Otherwise the plea of interfering into the matter could not be established. In other words the conscious movement of the student may create a barrier to the outsider to take control over it and to steer it in their way and directives. Instead of that they are taught to join in the planned movement led by political satraps, harping on the spontaneity of any event which gradually turns to a violent tremor. Using this logic, a section of middle class and upper middle class of the civil society, try to apply the logic of banishing “politics” from the student, as well as from the campus of the Academic Institution, as a precursor of neo-liberal ideas. The end result of their opinion is, in the name of protecting the campus from the violence of the Student-Union, to become the subject to the decision as State and a host of satraps who are “no body”, of either the institution or of the cause of education. Hence the internal as well as external condition gradually turns into such condition where any opposition of the interference would become a daring example for the authority of the Institution. In this way the Student Union politics is gradually succumbed to the satraps for the benefit of their dominance and capabilities of creating violence, and the authority of the institution would be veiled by the dictated terms of the silent violent condition of the satraps. At present the demand of the majority student can only be used as a shield against the dictatorial terms of the local leaders who are using small groups of student as pawn in maintaining their uninterrupted authority of violence.

A democratic movement against the violence in the campus of an Institution and the subjective attempt of apoliticised the Student Union must be launched against the drift of outside interference in the administration of Academic Institution. This struggle should be fought by the teachers, teaching staff members, student, above all the members of the Civil Society in unison, and this struggle will become harder, the more the drift is allowed to continue.

The desired positive democratic movement against this will have to gather momentum to fight back the drift of outside-interference for the cause of unification and democratization of the administration. In this process of struggle the democratic forces can take the advantages of whatever contradiction exist within the local satraps of different Political Parties in and around the hinterland of an Institution. This careful alienation from outside interference the Institution will gradually exactitude their own contradiction through their determined action of controlling the Institution and its administration in the plea of better education and management, and they will indirectly be forced to roll back the attempt of stationing some student within the structural frame-work of the institution for establishing and holding their control over the administration of the Institution. Their attempt in interfering with the administrative matters and squabbling in the interest of the students and their attempt to stabilise the affairs are nothing but outwardly ostensible, because their inner-face and aims are to confirm their influence and power in the Institution and over the administration. Having followers within the structural frame of Institution actually is a means of influencing the event and decision of the Institution and hence of extending maximum concession. Thus their aim is neither democracy nor education, but only to get the controlling power. Here we loose democracy and the "Politics" which are the gateways of consciousness. The modes of operation of such local satraps are initially, to transplant any pretence and to start squabbling and ultimately their ostensible attempt of resolving the problem on a "Zero" point of actual benefit of either of the student or the authority or to the cause of education, but what they actually do, is destabilishing the credibility of the authority of the Institution to the general student and create a division among the student – as those who are benefitted and those who are not benefitted – to the foreground of the client. The most interesting matter is that the satraps of local politics continue their pretension of their deep concern to serve the purpose of the pupils and congenial atmosphere in the Academic Institution. With the help of this they try to project their flared images to the society for positive support. Of course the Government has a role in maintaining the congenial atmosphere for education and Academic Institution, but that too also in not disturbing the authority of the Academic Institution. Thus the Government and its administration should revive as an active and independent (in the sense of neutrality) agency whose primary objective would be to nourish democratic movement for education. But the Parliamentary system in the Third World countries have come under the thralldom of politics, based on some self-made leader. It, in the most cases, so happens that this local satraps do not feel the necessity of taking prior authority or permission from Government or even from the Party hierarchy (in most occasion this hierarchy is very much blurred) before staging their undue pressure politics upon the authority of Institution, using the Student-Union as tunnel way to enter into the Institution. Only after everything happens, the Government of Party Hierarchy in some cases interfere either to minimize or to pacify the intense situation.

The other aspect of this drama, that is staged, is the democratic "consciousness?" of Society actively opined in favour of the institutional autonomy and democracy within campus o Academic Institution. It is also expected that in such event the Parliamentary Government will play its own justified political role by using the source of force in the Civil Society in the process of activating is democratic will. The conjuncture, in which we the direct participants of Academic Institution are placed today, is really a critical one. An understanding of the conjuncture is essential if we have to move our democratic and anti-violent voice forward. This development of understanding of the problem should be considered as preliminary efforts towards that end, nothing more than that.