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*No Warden as Protector, No Brother who is tough*

*My Feminist Comrades Are Enough!!*

*Pinjra Tod![[1]](#endnote-1)*

Though “students’ mobilization has long been a prominent feature of movements for political reform around the world” (Weiss, Aspinall, and Thompson, 2012; see also Rhoads, 2016), India’s student population has faced significant challenges in recent years from governments aiming to reduce dissent and opposition. Paradoxically, in an “age of surveillance”, where governments worldwide use big data, CCTVs, and other sophisticated technologies to control their citizens, the governance techniques and ways in which surveillance is used to govern young people’s politics in India remain more traditional. These traditional tactics are particularly apparent in the government polices directed at the political actions of young women enrolled in institutions of higher learning. The reliance on these traditional methods is especially surprising in light of the creativity and innovation displayed by students mobilising and pushing back against government encroachment into their daily lives. In this chapter, I look at a women’s movement involving students enrolled in higher education, #PinjraTod[[2]](#endnote-2), and their clashes with the government. Though the movement originated in response to questions of housing and accommodation, Pinjra Tod student collective’s expanded scope reflects the government’s interest in the surveillance of student mobilisation in India more generally.

**Surveillance and State Repression**

While research on the political repression of social movements has often focused on the role of police or physical repression, (see Davenport 2005; Sheptycki 2005; Fernandez 2008; Della Porta and Reiter 2013), Starr et al (2008, p. 252) convincingly argue that “other forms of repression have been less visible and not well understood.” Starr et al focus on the impact of surveillance on mobilisation and free association, finding that surveillance of social movements has a destructive influence on young people’s access to resources, opportunities for progressive action, recruitment, and political consciousness. Fernandez (2008) found that state repression of social movements through surveillance is successful whether it deploys covert or more overt means e.g. violent forms of repression involving police action. Furthermore, fear of being surveilled also has a dampening effect on collectives and individuals. For instance, Davenport (2005) and Boykoff (2013) found that organisations shift towards defensive practices when members fear they are being surveilled. Other researchers found that surveillance can push individuals away from overt collective resistance (i.e. protests and rallies) towards forms of covert resistance (Johnston 2005), or in some cases, towards more violent forms of resistance (della Porta 1995). However, Heynen and Van Der Meulen (2016, p. 24) argue that “systems of surveillance are deeply gendered” and call on us to further investigate the intersectional impacts of surveillance. For instance, Kovacs (2017) analyses the gendered nature of surveillance, arguing it disproportionately reduces women’s mobility and access to freedom, thereby limiting their political activism.[[3]](#endnote-3) According to Koskela (2002), surveillance via CCTV’s erodes women’s confidence in institutions of power, while Law and Bruckert (2016) argue that surveillance through social networks (the surveillance web at strip clubs) allows for even those without technological capacity to participate in surveillance tactics and extend forms of control onto marginal bodies.

This chapter extends these arguments to the issue of student mobilisation in India. I argue that the government uses surveillance rather than physical policing as a method to repress and control women’s movements, like the Pinjra Tod movement. The reliance on surveillance allows the government to achieve the same impact as technologically sophisticated surveillance but with much lower administrative costs. I draw together arguments from research on state repression of social movements, surveillance and student mobilisation to present new empirical data on how state repression of student movements looks in the modern day.

**Pinjra Tod and Questions of University Access**

Indian universities typically encompass colleges within their administrative purview, and for the most part are public institutions, controlled by government rules. These colleges very often do not offer on-campus housing (referred to as ‘hostels’ in India, and known as ‘college dormitories’ in other countries) for their students. A majority of students must find their own accommodation while enrolled in college. Additionally, where hostels are offered to students, different rules apply for men and women who reside in these hostels, including but not limited to curfews, dress codes and personal technology policies.

Scholars over the years have argued that students are uniquely equipped to effectively mobilise and demand attention— “they are comparatively free of career and family obligations that might raise the stakes for acting out” (Weiss, Aspinall and Thompson 2012, p 5.)—and the shared space of the university provides the physical means to overcome the collective action barrier more easily. From its origins in localized campus struggles for equitable gender access to hostel accommodation, Pinjra Tod has succeeded in building a significant social movement. Its initial struggles were restricted in scope, in the numbers of participants, and in the limited nature of their victories. However, in September 2015, a small protest at a university in Delhi became the catalyst for a nationwide movement involving women students from across the country, all demanding equitable access to higher educational resources. The participants were women otherwise separated by geography, class, caste, religion, and socio-economic background, but coming together in support of equal access to education, and bound by their shared sense of alienation from institutional educational spaces. We see in Pinjra Tod the successful genesis of a national movement, one which achieves small-scale incremental but steady victories while developing a practice of activism and an increasingly heightened awareness of the student body’s latent political potential.

For instance, while the movement has primarily been framed as fighting for gender neutral housing policies and equitable access to educational resources, it has also proved to be a successful catalyst extending beyond what might be strictly considered women’s causes. It has become a key player in political activism intended to keep college campuses secular, resist the tide of oppressive nationalism currently sweeping India, shield minorities from caste and religious-based violence and protect educational funding from government attempts to privatise and corporatize higher education (@pinjratod Instagram account). It has also, so far, done this while retaining its political autonomy and remaining independent from political affiliation with university bodies and organisations like Women’s Development Cells and other women’s Non-Government Organisations. The movement, has also aroused hostility from other students and from administrators and government officials. For instance, Pinjra Tod members were physically attacked at a protest by members of the student wing of the ruling party (Kausar 2017). Members have been threatened with rape by elected members of student government in response to their mobilisation on multiple occasions (Interviews with Pinjra Tod members).

Paradoxically, in responding to a movement that draws heavily on new technology and social media to mobilise and sustain action, the government has primarily relied on tactics that draw on family structures, conservative ideologies and cultural repertoires. My research suggests that the government uses traditional surveillance techniques such as curfews and dress codes managed by hostel supervisors. Indian governments have become increasingly aware in recent years of the advantages of doing this as they set out to manage student mobilisation. In the case of the Indian government’s response to mobilisation by women students, this starts by framing such mobilisation as antithetical to the safety and interests of the women students.

Winter (2008, p. 6) defines framing as “the process by which political leaders communicate about issues by emphasizing certain features of an issue, downplaying others, and assembling those features into a coherent narrative with clear implications for policy action.” Important to note here is that “Frames specify *how* to think about things, but they don't point to why it matters,” (Ferree and Merill 2000, p. 485). While much of the framing literature focuses on how activists have mobilised to challenge and resist governments and institutions, I find here that the government also uses framing to co-opt and recreate narratives about public mobilisation. In effect, governments have begun using the very tools created to fight against them as ways to strengthen their political bases and grip over the state. The Indian government, for instance, justifies withholding the right of women students to access space freely through a concern for their safety and an interest in ensuring they focus on their academic study. In this way, the right to education that students mobilised to demand is utilized by the state as justification for their imprisonment—that is, the frame proposed by Pinjra Tod to define itself is now co-opted by institutions of power against the movement itself.

While the effectiveness of these methods of repression are yet to be determined, the Pinjra Tod movement is just one of many forms of student action the Indian government is attempting to eradicate through attacks on their leaders and ordinary members. In later sections of this chapter, I offer a brief overview of the higher education context in which the Pinjra Tod movement and state action against it belongs. I then detail the various methods of repression used by the government against the women of the Pinjra Tod movement, treating them as emblematic of attacks on politically active young women. I conclude by considering the implications of government surveillance and repression for the future of young people’s politics in India.

**Methodology**

In this chapter, I draw primarily on a series of semi-structured interviews with participants in the Pinjra Tod movement, conducted over a period of 18 months. I also rely on the movement’s own records, as its members have documented various measures adopted by the universities in their attempts to police young women. I also draw on a report compiled by the movement for the Delhi Commission for Women (DCW) which documents the history of the struggle for equitable access to education. Additionally, I use relevant secondary data culled from newspaper coverage. The movement is largely made up of students, many of whom are researchers and scholars at leading research institutions. Their reports and records reflect a high level of scholarly rigour and critical analysis of the situation. Finally, I draw on field notes and observations from a number of campaign events I attended over a period of two months in 2015 and another 2 months in 2017.

**Hostel Access – Questions of Power and Privilege**

There are currently close to 30 million students currently enrolled in over 700 universities and 35,500 affiliated colleges in India, of whom 46% (or 13 million) are women (Choudaha 2013). Delhi University’s various colleges have over 132,000 students enrolled in undergraduate and postgraduate courses (University of Delhi Website). Many of Delhi University’s students come from all over the country, seeking higher education and upward social mobility because of its reputation as one of the nation’s premier universities. However, in 2015, only 9000 spaces were provided at the university’s hostels (for men and women). Furthermore, these are granted on the basis of academic ranking rather than on a needs basis – so students who score better in end of school exams are offered hostel accommodation first. Universities do not therefore take into account a student’s socio-economic class, or individual needs when providing hostel access.

This system has immediate consequences for students. Access to on-campus accommodation is often cited as a determining factor for students and their families when deciding which college to enrol in. Several interviewees recall having to choose a lower ranked college because they provided hostel accommodation, in spite of being offered admission into a higher ranked college where they would be required to find alternate housing. This problem is particularly severe for women, as their parents tend to trust university provided housing to ‘protect their daughters’ as opposed to independent housing in the city. Interview participants recall friends and cousins (all women) who were not permitted by their parents to study in Delhi at all because they did not secure hostel housing. The rules of hostel access create barriers for young people from the beginning, especially for those rooted in vulnerable communities. Aware of this dependence on university housing, the government often uses hostel access as leverage to control student behaviour and repress their opposition to university and government policies.

*Preventive Backlash*

In the aftermath of the now infamous 2012 brutal rape and murder of a college student in Delhi (See Sengupta 2012, Zitzewitz 2013, Lodhia 2015), several Indian universities chose to implement even more stringent, primarily gender-specific, rules regarding hostel residency. The spectre of the brutal rape allowed university administrations to roll back basic civil liberties, a move justified under the guise of protecting their female wards. While this particular action was not directly in response to the Pinjra Tod movement, it none-the-less rolled back the victories eked out by the movement to ensure equitable hostel access in Indian higher education.

The newly updated accommodation regulations included, but were not limited to, strict curfews and dress codes, mandatory local guardians (registered residents of the city whose approval was required to participate in any non-hostel sanctioned activities outside college grounds), removal of locks from room doors,[[4]](#endnote-4) and installation of CCTVs within the hostels, including near bathrooms. While these governance measures uniformly targeted women, they had a different impact on different groups of women. For instance, the impact of the new rules regarding local guardians is felt more severely by poorer students, students from outside the city, and students from more conservative families. Students come to Delhi in the pursuit of higher education from every state in the union. Those from poorer backgrounds, or rural communities are less likely to have family in the city, as are those from the states furthest away from Delhi. Many students must rely on very distant family friends or relatives to serve as their local guardians, thus creating yet another hurdle for those from traditional families, and those with fewer resources. As one student recalled, her parents had to spend over a month visiting various relatives and friends of family, asking them to take responsibility for her. Students often found themselves with local guardians they had never met prior to joining college. These guardians tended to be wary of giving their “wards” permission to extend curfew, as they worried the students might hurt their family’s “reputation”—a concern often raised by university administrators when meeting local guardians. As such, the practice of requiring guardians served to further marginalise already vulnerable populations, who already experienced limited access to the city due to barriers imposed by their gender, caste, class or ethnicity.

The Pinjra Tod report provides details on the oppressive rules at Indraprastha College for Women, which included enforced strict dress codes in the cafeteria, ostensibly to protect “the modesty” of the women students in the presence of male staff working the cafeteria (Delhi Commission of Women Report 2015). Hindu College similarly required a dress code ostensibly to ensure the “safety of women students” and to “maintain decorum” (Sen 2016). Additionally, restrictive curfews were imposed on women residents at University hostels that required women to be back in the hostels by 6.30 pm in the evening in winters, and 7 pm in the summers.

Earlier protest actions by women students at University hostels had succeeded in having the curfew time delayed till 9 pm, and student residents were optimistic that they could improve on those advances. However, in the aftermath of the 2012 rape and the accompanying administrative overhaul of hostel administration, the curfew for women across all dormitories in the University settled on 6.30 pm curfews. The Union Minister of Women and Child Welfare went so far as to say that curfews are a ‘necessary safeguard’ that provide protection from teenage “hormonal outbursts”, and therefore needed to be enacted to secure the virtue and purity of “Indian youth” (Choudhury 2017).[[5]](#endnote-5)

The consequences of such a curfew are manifold. With curfew set for the mid evening, women students are unable to attend most cultural events, social events and or even go to the libraries and laboratories. Furthermore, private landlords who rent rooms to women students follow the government’s policies and surveil their tenants, use CCTVs, and impose rules about dress codes and no-visitor policies. The consequences of this are that University campuses essentially become all-male spaces in the evening. Even if some women are not bound by curfews, the absence of so many women from the streets makes many women who are on the streets feel unsafe and vulnerable to harassment, as women who occupy public space after dark are considered promiscuous (Kovacs 2017).

As an administrative measure, the curfew creates divisions between women students, whereby those who disobey the curfew or have lenient guardians, are labelled as “promiscuous” and therefore responsible for any violence they might experience (Law and Bruckert, 2016). This creates further divisions between students and working women outside the college space entirely. By prohibiting women in colleges from using public spaces, the state makes the streets more unsafe for women who have to usepublic space late at night for a variety of reasons, such as those who work late and/or rely on public transport to bring them home. Through these governance measures, the state succeeds in labelling some women as worthy of protection (those in higher education, those with families who will impose curfews, those who can afford to rent a private room from a landlord) while the others are left to fend for themselves on streets that are systematically being made more unsafe.

*Policing Tactics*

What happens to women when theyorganise and resist? Among the punitive measures available to governments is moral policing, which draws on traditional family structures and social structures to define *appropriate behaviour* in contrast to *transgressive behaviour*. Moral policing is a form of governance that draws its power from societal structures and customs, and the student embeddedness in social networks and families. Behaviour is monitored and punished through a reference on *moral* codes as opposed to legal ones. For instance, women are punished for missing curfew by hostel administrators (often referred to as wardens in the Indian context), not through fines, demerits, or other administrative sanctions, but with threats of calling parents with (often false) stories about sexual promiscuity. The involvement of parents in the disciplining process reflects a twin strategy of both shaming and infantilising as forms of governance. Shaming women who miss curfews, for example, both shames the woman for her adult choices and dismisses her as not being adult enough. A primary tool in the warden’s arsenal is to call a student’s parents and convey (exaggerated, if not blatantly untrue) reports of transgressive behaviour, primarily commentary on the students’ sexual behaviour. An interviewee recalled her father being phoned and told she had slept with all the men at a neighbouring boys’ college as punishment for missing a curfew by 15 minutes. In another instance, the 400 hostel residents of Patiala Girls College unanimously signed a petition demanding revision of their 6:30 p.m. curfew; in response, the administration informed all parents of this petition. Though the students were all legally adults, their ‘transgressive’ behaviour was deemed to be the parents’ responsibility. Many parents sided with hostel administrators and supported the suspension of their daughters’, their denied access to the outside world post the curfew, and some even endorsed additional punishment in some instances. Only students whose parents agreed they could extend the curfew were allowed an extension to stay out beyond the designated curfew time.

Such practices have significant political consequences for the development of young people’s politics in India, specifically amongst women. Participation in democratic practices like a protest can result in consequences for students; official complaints to families that more often rely on false reports are designed to malign the student and in some cases, result in the loss of their hostel accommodation for the following year. They are practices that also thwart the process by which some young women attempt to gain independence from their families, as any attempts to ‘be independent’ is reported back to their families. The University in this way is literally surveilling students and reporting back to families. Parents in turn tend to interpret these official reports from universities as evidence that their children aren’t taking their education seriously enough. As one student recalls, her roommate was withdrawn from college by her family due to her participation in protests about lack of amenities in her hostel, because her parents viewed her participation in politics as evidence of her lack of dedication to her education.[[6]](#endnote-6)

While moral regulation is effective, other popular strategies to govern young women’s politics rely on the law. On admission to a hostel, students and their parents must sign a residency contract. Much of it is standard, stating for instance that the student will not partake in drugs, alcohol, or bring weapons into the dormitory. However, such contracts also require that the student not criticise university policy in any form whatsoever, or partake in political activities that can be construed as critical of the University or its benefactors. Considering that most universities in India are public institutions, this is often used to silence democratic opposition to governments and institutions.

These contracts are also often changed arbitrarily, with no explanation provided, so students are frequently unaware of which rights they have signed away. One interviewee’s attempt to stage a student production of Eve Ensler’s *Vagina Monologues* saw her “written up” because the material was said to be “obscene”.[[7]](#endnote-7) The fact that the student signed the contract was cited by the university and used to coerce her into dropping her plans to organise the production. While she agreed, she claims she could not recall having signed away the right to participate in dramatic performances. Pinjra Tod has found that many students and their families are unfamiliar with this contract system due to their social background, and are not informed of their rights when signing these documents and do not fully understand their content or appreciate their consequences.

University administrators have also found other ways of denying hostel accommodation to students deemed to be transgressive. For instance, St. Stephens College, one of India’s premier colleges, now requires mandatory interviews for admission to their hostel every year. Such a requirement works to intimidate and discourage student participation in protests as such action is considered to be grounds for removal from the hostel. For instance, the annual re-interview process was recently used to take away hostel access from students involved in protesting against the College administrations attempt to become autonomous from Delhi University. Autonomy for the college from the University would mean that St. Stephens College would not be bound by the rules concerning tuition and affirmative action that govern centralised Indian universities. This would therefore result in fee hikes and an end to the reservation system that ensures students from marginalised communities are provided places in Colleges. Students committed to protecting higher education from what they perceived as privatisation (an attempt to capitalise on the reputation of the college to demand higher fees than mandated by the Government) were punished by the revocation of their hostel privileges for the year (@pinjratod Instagram 9 May 2017).

This approach to controlling and monitoring young people isn’t all that hidden as an aspect of Indian politics. The St. Stephen’s College Principal for instance, claimed that “curbing women’s movement helps them improve academically and anyone opposed to the curfew is not serious about their studies,” (Joshi 2013) – effectively framing dissent on college campuses as the work of students not serious about their study, and thus deserving of expulsion. This approach to criminalizing students results in students being arrested for organising speaker forums, as well as being charged with sedition for protesting against a 1100% fee hike in one year (@pinjratod Instagram 12 April 2017). What must be noted here is that the criminalizing of student mobilisation is not restricted to universities in rural areas, or to universities promoting a conservative ideology. This narrative of ’unpatriotic’ students has pervaded urban institutions, the best educational establishments, including the universities where political leaders in the past have begun their own political careers.

**Hostels and Beyond**

This is not to say that young people and politics in India are not flourishing. Pinjra Tod continues to fight against hostel curfews across Delhi and the country, and celebrates every victory they achieve. However, the movement has also broadened its scope, since its inception. While still fighting various forms of gendered institutional harassment, they have now also become allied with other movements that are emerging to fight other forms of institutional harassment. For instance, Pinjra Tod has been active in protesting against the violence meted out by educational institutions to Dalit and Muslim students. A ‘lower caste’ student described her feelings about the suicide of a fellow Dalit PhD student through the Pinjra Tod platform, and exhorted her fellow students to

*“Build a platform for solidarity for only the oppressed will understand one another. The upper caste may sympathize but they will not understand us. We need to build a bond among the Dalit Bhaujan Adivasi community.”[[8]](#endnote-8)*

The anniversary of the brutal rape and murder of a 17-year old Dalit student in rural Bihar, India, also became a rallying point and site from which collective criticism was voiced to authorities and a society unconcerned with the violence perpetuated against marginalized citizens (@pinjratod Instagram 29 March 2017). Some Pinjra Tod members argue that the case of a missing Muslim student, Najeeb, who went missing the day after he had a confrontation about political opinions with members of a Hindutva right-wing political party, is an example of the religious violence that is becoming more common in India, where Muslims are being punished for ostensibly transgressing religious boundaries.[[9]](#endnote-9) Pinjra Tod therefore found common ground with other students protesting institutional insensitivity to Najeeb’s disappearance, a shared alienation from institutional spaces.

Pinjra Tod also joined forces with and documented their participation in a wide range of allied causes— e.g., in solidarity with working women on International Working Women’s Day, against campus sexual violence, against military impunity in Kashmir and the North East, and against a trend of increasing campus violence disproportionately targeting minority.[[10]](#endnote-10) Although these protests have moved beyond the hostel curfew issue, members of the Pinjra Tod collective are finding and creating new resistances aimed at reimagining the university in the face of the increasing radicalization of Indian politics more generally. The repression of women’s rights across India’s universities have in many cases created opportunities for the creation of shared narratives and strengthened alliances.

This shared resistance does, however, increase the risk of young women being targeted for attack, including the threat of violence. The increasing encroachment of India’s right-wing Hindutva government into university spaces, largely carried out by their sponsorship of the student body party ABVP, has divided university student debates about the public sphere and freedom, with the right-wing locked in opposition to all other political student groups in Indian universities. Pinjra Tod itself has actively campaigned against ABVP and criticized their oppressive politics. In response, ABVP members have physically threatened protesting students, and beaten up those they oppose. The mobilisation of political action by Pinjra Tod has also been met with direct threats by ABVP party cadres, involving threats of rape. A participant involved in putting up posters for the movement in its initial days had to file a police report against an ABVP cadre who threatened her with rape in response to her activism. Pinjra Tod however continues to resist even in the face of such violence.

**Conclusion**

The Pinjra Tod movement continues to resist oppressive government policies. The movement’s reliance on decentralised organisation is one of the few key elements that allows it avoid the deleterious effects of surveillance on its organisational strength and cohesion. India’s universities are fast becoming a microcosm of the larger battles fought out in India’s democracy. Indian universities have typically been accessible to even those from the poorest backgrounds, as colleges were designed to be democratically affordable to all granted admission. Restricting access to universities by welcoming only populations the government views as “worthy” of higher education, is reflective of larger governmental efforts to reshape the Indian population more generally. Marginalisation of vulnerable populations has become integral to the way the government interacts with its citizens, and a reliance on traditional narratives to do so allows the government to label attempts to resist these policies as “pro-Western”, and thus “unpatriotic”. The rise of the surveillance state has far reaching consequences for the nature of Indian democracy in the 21st Century. As Jasbir Puar argues, surveillance “has certainly not become more democratic: who receives discipline and punishment, who is deemed worthy of pleasure and intimacy remains distributed in deeply uneven manners.'” [Puar as cited in Kovacs (2017)]. Kovacs (2017) observes that surveillance is pre-emptive - surveillance “can also shape what you will do in the future. That is because surveillance can incentivise certain kinds of behaviour, and discourage others.” The continued surveillance of students will eventually impact on the capacity of students to mobilise themselves, thus undermining one of the key sources of resistance to the power of India’s elites. Decentralised opposition that evades surveillance, is likely therefore to be one of the few successful tactics of resistance available to young people in India.
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5. Politicians and bureaucrats responsible for Women and Child Welfare across the country follow a similar logic, when it comes to evolving policy. For instance, The Karnataka Legislative Assembly’s Women and Child Welfare Committee Chairperson, NA Harris, recently recommended that IT companies in the IT Hub of India, Bangalore, should hire more men, so as to ensure women didn’t have to work night shifts. This was included in a report aimed at investigating solutions to make Bangalore safer for working women (Ananya 2017). [↑](#endnote-ref-5)
6. The interview participant believes the parents are currently searching for a groom for her ex-roommate while the woman herself is currently enrolled in a secretarial course. [↑](#endnote-ref-6)
7. Ironically, this occurred the same year that the university principal organised a campus-wide event where the author of the *Vagina Monologues* was the key note speaker. [↑](#endnote-ref-7)
8. Lama (2017). @pinjratod Instagram post (March 16, 2017). [↑](#endnote-ref-8)
9. Najeeb Ahmed, a MSc student at Jawaharlal Nehru University. went missing on October 15, 2016. The night before he had been involved in a brawl with ABVP members. While possibly unrelated, the JNU administration has been accused of apathy and bias in handling the issue, and of obscuring the brawl he had been involved in. As of April 2016, there have no major breaks in the case, but rumours abound. Many of these rumours have been negative – such as an alleged Google search for ISIS, his dependence on prescription medicines to treat mental health disorders, and reported presence in Muslim universities across the North. (Mallick 2017; BBC 2016; Kidwai et al 2016) [↑](#endnote-ref-9)
10. The Pinjra Tod Instagram page and their Facebook page document their participation, their involvement, and often their messaging to those beyond the movement [↑](#endnote-ref-10)