CHAPTER – IV

EXPLOITATION AND VICTIMIZATION IN ACADEME

Encarta or World English Dictionary found on the web defines exploitation as “the practice of taking selfish or unfair advantage of a person or situation, usually for personal gain.” It also says that it is “the use or development of something in order to gain a benefit.” The Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary defines victimization as “making somebody suffer unfairly because you do not like them, their opinions, or something they have done” (1443).

The Academy or an Educational Institution is generally considered as a sacred one which is or which should be free from corruption, illegal practices, injustices or any kinds of selfish behaviour. It is supposed to be an ideal place where the youngsters fresh and filled with idealistic thoughts step into the realm of knowledge with good many hopes and aspirations. They enter with faith and ambition to learn and achieve success in life.

However, the academy filled with ordinary hypocritical, ambitious inmates struggles hard to maintain its idealistic status and proves to be an ordinary workplace where corruption, exploitation and selfish pursuits take place to a greater degree. The academicians prove that higher learning instead of improving one’s spiritual growth makes them gravitate to the gutter. The academic novel writers seem to indirectly hint upon that higher the degree, lower is the learning and good moral behaviour in academics.

Exploitation and victimization in academy is a reason for academic novel writers’ assumption for the above proclamation and hence is their satirical and farcical portrayals of the academy. The academic institution consists of teaching faculty, administrative staff and students and the exploitation and victimization factors revolve mainly around these three. It could again be called power struggle that emanates based on the hierarchy that exists in the
academic circle. A general or common picture of the academy portrays the teaching staff possessing power. Hence, the powerful position that they hold sometimes drags them towards taking selfish or undue advantage of situations or people, usually for their personal gain.

A careful study of some of the Indian academic novels shows teachers exploiting and victimizing students in a number of ways. The various exploitations and victimizations in the academy are conveniently grouped in this Chapter as monetary or material, physical, sexual and intellectual exploitations. Students are cheated and betrayed both physically and intellectually. Physical exploitation is a common and predominant theme that appears in most of the campus novels. Deflating most of the sanctimonies associated with the myth of teaching profession, the campus novelists try to portray reality. In this process, the academicians’ Ivory Tower crumbles down and shows that it is after all a castle built in the air and no such tower really exists. Teachers being self-effacing in the conventional representations are currently portrayed as greedy and lustful. They are shown as exploiting and victimizing students for monetary or material benefits.

Prema Nandakumar’s *Atom and the Serpent* (1982) vividly delineates this and various other kinds of selfish concerns that are exhibited by teachers towards their students. Prof. Yaugandharayana, the foreign-returned Professor and Head of Atomic Research Department is reputed for exploiting his students monetarily and sexually. A.S. Ratnam in his article “*Atom and the Serpent: An Analysis*” (2003) comments that “the author is more vitriolic in painting Yana, Head of the Atomic Research Department.” Her very contempt for Yana, “a lustful unacademic academician” (115) is evident when she calls him with names of animals.

Yana’s foreign life style, his sophistication and innumerable Americanisms, easily attracts students towards him. He exploits the attraction of his rich students by asking them to
bear the bill each time he throws a party at the Silka Pinta Bar. Silka Pinta Bar is a deluxe hotel that is a “symbol of the exotic for the idle rich, the merchant princes and the shady operators.” It is such an expensive place that even “an honest worker (even if he were an officer drawing a four-figure salary) could not hope to afford a cup of tea in that hotel, unless his entertainment allowance took charge of it” (AS 117). She satirically comments:

For most of the denizens of the University, the Bar was nothing more than a landmark in the town; they had no idea and no hope of seeing its insides. But there were pluckier teachers who impressed their richer students with their prerogative and gained easy entry into the Bar’s portals. Prof. Yana was an adept in this art, seasoned by his frequent foreign trips which gave him an irresistible glamour in the eyes of his students (AS 117).

Yana thus uses his affluent student Rajshekhar to host parties for him and the same student pays his bills. Vatsa, initially impressed by Yana’s concern in throwing such an expensive party for his sake, feels disillusioned and disappointed at the way students are being exploited by professors.

Sheela Rani enthusiastically participates in all such get-togethers given by Yana but never feels bad about his exploiting students. She never bothers to advise him on it since she too belongs to the same category. She in fact leaves the drunken Yana to the students and starts home in the taxi arranged and paid by the students. If Vatsa is indifferent and only feels bad about students’ exploitation, Sheela Rani acts as a partner in crime. She indirectly enjoys and encourages Yana to use students’ money.

The adept way in which Rajshekhar handles Yana’s drunken state, his vomitting and unconscious condition shows that this is not the first time this happens. Yana not only swindles
students’ money by such acts but also initiates the students into drink and debauchery. His over indulgence in harmful and immoral pleasures, and utilizing his students for such activities, throw Vatsa to humiliation.

Vatsa also once perceives Sheela Rani, another hypocrite and an exploiter, taking an expensive Banaras sari from one of her rich students. Although she accepts such “small tokens of affection” as she calls them most willingly, she talks as if it is of least importance to her. She says that this “intolerably rich student of hers must have made a bargain purchase in some reduction sale counter in Banaras” (AS 64) and thus shrinks the good pains taken by the student. Seeing these Vatsa feels that Professors, who are to serve as role models to their students are corrupting them. He wonders, “what had come over the Indian universities” (AS 148). Prema Nandakumar portrays a murky situation, which is beyond any hope. She portrays Vatsa, a silent spectator of the happenings of the university as shocked and dumbfounded. Her satire shows itself when she shows Vatsa painfully wondering at “Mother India shriveled up by the misdeed of her sons” (AS 117). It is ironical that Yana-like professors instead of spreading education with commitment and dedication initiate their well-to-do students into despicable habits. Prema Nandakumar, through such portrayals, seems to be pondering on the whole system of education, which is unhealthy and rotten.

The author has pictured the students losing their seriousness because of such contemptible behaviour of Professors and take undue advantage of them. Rajshekhar, for instance, never takes Prof. Yana seriously and once quits the seminar session in which he is to present a paper without prior permission. Yana is irritated but does not worry much about this since he conducts seminars for namesake only. He has another student Vandana to assist him in student-involved activities. Vandana too takes undue advantage of him, because of her assisting
him in all kinds of work. If the teachers exploit the students in a few ways, the students in turn exploit them by taking undue advantages of them.

A similar kind of unhealthy practice is portrayed in Prabhanjan’s *Kagitha Manidargal* (1995) also. Prabhanjan, through his straightforward and meticulous Vice-Chancellor, brings to the fore the teachers unethically grabbing money or some such similar material possession from students. As soon as Subramanian takes position as Vice-Chancellor, he condemns and warns professors who exhibit lustful behaviour towards students and who expect material benefits from them in order to do their duty. Taking the students’ complaints seriously, he warns Prof. Parimelazhagar Perumal. He interrogates and questions him on the delayed evaluation of M.Phil. and Ph.D. theses papers. Prof. Parimelazhagar Perumal delays the evaluation and the results of students expecting something in return. Condemning this act of the professor, the Vice-Chancellor reminds him of his social responsibility and advises him to do his duty properly.

The corruption of Prof. Parimelazhagar Perumal comes to limelight because of the students’ complaints whereas Prof. Yana’s remains in the dark since he exploits only his rich students. Moreover, the author has not shown him as compelling his students by threatening them with academic performances or achievements. Even Sheela Rani makes it in such a way that she accepts gifts only to make her students happy. Both Yana and Sheela Rani have created an image amidst students that students themselves, in order to please them, offer direct or indirect monetary or material gifts that they readily accept.

A much sardonic and satirical portrayal of teachers exploiting students is given by Prabhanjan when he talks in detail about how Professors exploit their students during their research period. She shows in detail how Prof. Arumugam, Azhagesan’s guide exploits him by
even making him wash his clothes, buy vegetables and do all sorts of household chores. Azhagesan in order to obtain his Ph.D. faithfully allows himself to be used. He in turn emulates his Professor and follows his footsteps. He exploits his students in a similar manner and the most affected victim is Sudalai, a student from a poor background. Sudalai is used by him and his family as an unpaid servant.

This, in fact, is a pitiable situation that many research scholars are subjected to. Caught in the webs of the Guide, the student is forced to oblige to the obligations the Supervisor expects of him. There is no way out for him to escape from the unspoken threatening clutches of the Guide, which even would go the extent of ruining his bright prospects ahead. Professor Azhagesan, Nachellai and Sudalai of *Kagitha Manidargal*, Geetika of *The Higher Education of Geetika Mehendiratta* (1993), and Sheela Rani’s student in *Atom and the Serpent* are examples of those students who come out successfully in their Research because of their patience and silent forbearance. There are novels that show the failure of students to achieve success if having gone against this unspoken rule of Research.

An example of this is found in Srividya Natarajan’s *No Onions, Nor Garlic* (2006). Shastri, Professor Ram’s Ph.D. scholar is exploited to such an extent that Shastri not only quits his Ph.D. without completing it but also becomes psychologically affected. He has been working towards his Ph.D. at Chennai University for over 14 years and is completely under the control of Professor Ram helping him in all kinds of odd jobs. He is like Azhagesan and Sudalai of *Kagitha Manidargal* who is made to perform even Professor Ram’s household chores that the author wittily and sarcastically remarks:

He had naturally become the professor’s full-time chamcha and right-hand man (that) some unkind persons suggested that Professor Ram’s own right hand had atrophied
completely. They even insinuated that he would not let Shastri finish his thesis, because if Shastri finished and left the university, Professor Ram would have to start eating with his left hand, which, as everyone is aware, is against the scriptures as well as being most unhygienic and intolerable. If you had hung around the university at the time I am speaking of, you too would have seen Shastri buying Professor’s Ram’s groceries and frying Professor Ram’s Bajjis, typing Professor Ram’s notes and wiping Professor Ram’s god-pictures, filling Professor Ram’s prescriptions and milling Professor Ram’s coffee. Sometimes you would have seen him right beside Professor Ram thinking Professor Ram’s thoughts; and at other times you would have seen him just behind Professor Ram, inhaling Professor Ram’s farts (NONG 18)

Here, Shastri, the powerless student, thus lays himself bare before the Professor and allows himself to be enslaved by his selfish self. His gullibility and weakness are exploited by Professor Ram and Professor Ram is dissuaded from helping him to complete his thesis. Thus, the authors, Prabhanjan and Srividya Natarajan are keen on presenting the kind of silent forbearing and slavishness of students. They show that this kind of exploitation of students has become a routine affair. It is normalized in such a way that deviating from this kind of practices would lead to unpleasant situations. The teachers exploiting students and the students willing to be exploited in return for some gain is sarcastically portrayed here.

If Prabhanjan and Prema Nandakumar end with the silent bearing of the students, Srividya Natarajan shows the students, unable to bear the prolonged torture, revolting against the Professors. Shastri, for instance writes appalling messages about Professor Ram in toilets, notice boards and on statues’ bases where everyone could see in the campus. Shastri’s attacks are sly but very effective. He creates tension and headache to Professor Ram and thereby
avenges him. Professor Ram ignores him on various occasions and gives him least importance. In fact, Shastri comes to his thoughts only at times when he expects him to do some menial work for him or when he wants Shastri to accomplish some of his personal tasks. This disappoints Shastri and makes him grow with vengeance. His vengeance leads him to perform unpleasant tasks and actually lead him to slyly act against Professor Ram. He thinks of ways Professor Ram could be pulled down. His tortures in the name of guiding or supervising him are boomeranged at him when he hysterically holds him at gunpoint and asks him to eat all the eight drafts of his thesis.

Professor Ram is unable to eat about 1662 pages that he regrets and repents for not letting Shastri complete his thesis in ten years. He thinks that he should have got rid of him ten years earlier without minding him being left without an unpaid servant:

Anyone will admit that it is very hard to eat 1, 662 pages of typescript, even if they are double-spaced, and within the first five minutes, Professor Ram was wishing with all his heart that Shastri had finished his thesis ten years earlier and left the university, right hand or no right hand (NONG 302).

From the number of drafts that Shastri has written it is clear that Professor Ram has not guided him properly but has been exploiting him and his obedience. Like Geetika Mehendiratta’s Supervisor of *The Higher Education of Geetika Mehendiratta*, he too does not give him proper guidelines but keeps asking him to rewrite his drafts, which finally erupts his smothered anger.

Students’ appearance in teacher-centered campus novels usually shows students playing a minor role. Rajshekhar and Vandana of *Atom and the Serpent*, Sudalai, Ratna, Gomathy and Vaitheeswaran of *Kagitha Manidargal*, Chandrika of *Nampally Road* (1991), Rufus and
Thamarai Selvi of *No Onions Nor Garlic* for instance are students playing minor roles. However, despite this factor, the prominence of their appearance is enhanced when they are shown as sufferers or victimized characters. Angela Hague, in her article, “The Academic World in Modern Literature” (1985) states that the students featuring in academic novels rarely have a stately appearance. They tend to fare quite poorly and she assertively points out “when students do emerge as individual personalities in academic fiction they are frequently depicted as victims, willing or otherwise, of the sexual and political machinations of professors.” Hague also observes that students, more commonly, remain faceless presences with insignificant roles. They will have little or nothing to do with the University’s day-to-day functioning or real purpose.

Manimegalai, Nachellai and Gomathi of *Kagitha Manidargal* and Vandana and Rajshekhar of *Atom and the Serpent* explicate or endorse the words of Hague since their appearance in the novels is merely to bring out the lecherous, maligned and corrupt nature of the professors.

Professor Azhagesan, an unethical academician, adding to his sin of exploiting students for material benefits also exploits them in a sexual way. He is such a lecherous man that he forces his women students to oblige to his sexual weaknesses. Nachellai is one of his sexual victims. Despite being educated and married, she befalls a prey to his attractions. He lures her by helping her to complete her Ph.D. at the earliest and by getting her a job in the university itself. In return, Nachellai offers herself. She is also forced and compelled by Azhagesan to continue this illegal relationship even after her marriage. He also blackmails her into helping him in his sexual pursuits. Although Nachellai hates to spoil another student’s life by doing this, she has to do it in order to safeguard herself.
Azhagesan troubles Manimegalai and exploits her role as a student. Once he retains Manimegalai in the class and sends away the other students. He utters titillating words to her and says that he would help her in completion of her Ph.D. by dictating the entire thesis. He also utters the same promises he did for Nachellai. He tells her that he would get her a job in the university itself if she complies with his sexual desires. However, despite all these promises, Manimegalai feels intimidated and threatened. She loses interest in studies because of his sexual advances. His promiscuity and seduction attempts damage the respect she has for the teacher and she feels frightened.

Naomi Wolf, a famous feminist and critic, a student of Harold Bloom speaks of her sexually victimized experience in her article “The Silent Treatment” (2004), which appeared in *The New York Magazine*. She says:

I was spiralling downward; I had gotten a C-, a D, and an F, and was put on academic probation. My confidence shaken, I failed in my effort to win the Rhodes Scholarship at the end of the term…. Once you have been sexually encroached upon by a professor, your faith in your work corrodes. If the administration knew and did nothing – because the teacher was valuable to them – they had made a conscious calculation about his and our respective futures: It was okay to do nothing because I – and other young women who could be expected to remain silent – would never be worth what someone like Bloom was worth.

Wolf comments on this experience and writes of the effect it had and continues to have upon her even years later. She writes:

Keeping bad secrets hurts. Is a one-time sexual encroachment by Harold Bloom, two decades ago, a major secret or a minor one? Minor, when it comes to a practical effect
on my life; I have obviously survived. This is the argument often made against accusers in sexual-harassment cases: *Look, no big deal, you’re fine.* My career was fine; my soul was not fine.

The same experience is undergone by Manimegalai. She quits classes and refuses to go to college. She feels mentally and physically sick. Unable to combat against the powerful professor she stays at home. But even there she is tortured. Azhagesan pays her a courteous visit for her supposed illness and expresses his love for her. He tortures her by saying that he would remove his beard only when she consents to love him. All these unethical and non-professional moves of the professor lead the student’s trust to be abused. Brian Martin, a well-known researcher on the topic of sexual harassment in education writes in his article, “Campus sex: a cause for concern?” (1993) that,

Teachers are in a position of authority and trust to foster the intellectual development of their students. When they engage in sexual relations with a student, they violate that trust implicit in a professional teacher-student relationship.

When trust and faith are corroded, it leads to problems that may affect the individual in many ways. Here Manimegalai goes to the extent of pretending to be sick and thus quits classes, which if left unattended might lead to discontinuing studies itself. However, luckily she is encouraged by her friend Vaitheeswaran to take the matter to the Vice-Chancellor. The Vice-Chancellor advices her to ignore this and asks her to concentrate in her studies.

A similar kind of sexual abuse is portrayed in *Atom and the Serpent* also. Here, Prema Nandakumar shows how students are used by professors for flirtatious purposes. Prof. Yaugandharayana not only exploits students materially and monetarily but also in a sexual way. He treats Vandana as his favourite student and passes on to her the benefits provided by
UGC. He does this for her expecting sexual benefits from her and that too by sidelining even some of his own colleagues. This irritates them and causes them to fight against him. This kind of revolt and bickering naturally disrupts the smooth functioning of the department. Teachers’ inclination towards sexual attraction is pronounced by the author when she comments through Yana’s colleague: “‘It’s a woman’s world here’, Dharma pronounced sagely” (AS 219).

He is irritated at the way Yana misuses the funds allotted for pupils and projects, for his sexual adventures. Yana unethically diverts part of his colleagues’ funds in order to enable Vandana attend a seminar in Australia and also prolong her stay over there until he joins her there. Yana’s promiscuity makes him do this in order to enjoy a sensuous life. The British novel Small World (1984) by David Lodge shows a Professor, Professor Swallow unethically using the funds allotted for conferences and seminars for his own lustful affairs.

The student too ignorant of the consequences of her victimization moves on with the suggestion under the pretext of intellectual development. As discussed earlier, seminars and conferences are not undertaken for the true purpose of it and are mostly used for licentiousness. Many campus novelists are interested in bringing to the fore this aspect of the professors. David Lodge in his academic Romance Small World shows how professors exploit students and teachers belonging to the lower strata in the academic hierarchy sexually.

Like Prema Nandakumar, Prabhanjan too brings out the promiscuous and licentious behaviours of Professors during seminars and conferences. However, unlike Prema Nandakumar, Prabhanjan deals in detail the lecturers exploiting and victimizing their women scholars. Once Professor Vadivelan is invited by Azhagesan for a two-day seminar. Vadivelan attends the seminar with his second wife, Sethambal. Sethambal was formerly Vadivelan’s student. Once a brilliant and witty student, she is now harshly silenced by her husband.
Azhagesan envying Vadivelan for possessing such a beautiful young wife treats him royally by making luxurious arrangements for him. He does this for Vadivelan in return for his similar kind of treatment earlier. Sethambal, in spite of being a doctorate degree holder is shown as a passive, silenced woman who, it is clear, is an exploited and victimized student of Professor Vadivelan.

Another instance of sexual exploitation portrayed in the novel is Azhagesan’s tour with his research scholar, Kalavathy. The novel that depicted the resignation of the sincere and good-natured Vice-Chancellor Subramanian ends with the corrupt Professor Azhagesan enjoying his status as a Professor. He, like Professor Swallow of Small World, is invited by many countries including France, America, Singapore, and Russia and so on for paper presentations. Unmindful of being called a ‘Touring Professor’ he goes to such places and enjoys government’s funds allotted for intellectual development purposes. Like Yana of Atom and the Serpent, he too does not go alone but makes up with one of his research scholars. When the novel closes he is shown as touring over Malaysia with his student Kalavathy and finds out from his clerk if the information has been passed on to the Deputy Registrar for getting sanctioned the fund for his intellectual tour.

The Virgin Syndrome (1992) by Rani Dharker too shows the teachers getting into a licentious or flirty mood during conferences and seminars. Ranga Rao’s The Drunk Tantra (1994) vividly describes the immoral nature of lecturers during intellectual sessions like seminars.

Hairy, a Lecturer who rises to the position of Principal is a lusty person. Before getting the Principal’s post, he literally behaves in a sexual way with the students and the female faculty. He openly exhibits his lust, and tries to seduce women by unbuttoning his shirt to
almost the middle and often carries a garish edition of the *Kamasutra* with a cover illustration of a convoluted sex asana. He indulges himself in verbal obscenity and embarrasses women in public:

If some stranger is introduced to him and that hapless chap were to say, ‘How do you do?’ the beast replies with a wicked grin, ‘The usual way, with legs on the shoulders.’ He goes to a woman colleague - he has spared me so far - and asks her about her weekly workload: ‘How many periods?’ and she replies, ten, twelve or thirteen, Hairy responds with great concern, ‘That’s too many’, and before the woman can fully appreciate his concern for her, Hairy turns to a male colleague and whispers, ‘Time for a D&C.’ Mr. Daash sent for him and talked to him; ‘Guruji,’ Hairy said with absolute deference and promptly went back to his lewd ways (DT 75).

Once he scares off Mrs. Karan who is jocularly known as the ‘Fertility Goddess’ by indirectly telling her that he can guarantee a male child that she yearns for. He suggests the same to a Political Science teacher who is highly outraged at him but is not able to do anything. Hairy happily continues with his plan of sleeping with 108 women and his conquest becomes the talk of the teachers. He makes numerous attempts at exploiting the women – both staff and students. One such attempt is attracting the city widows by joining hands with the anti-dam activists.

Hairy’s attempts at exploiting women academicians have a grand finale when he meets a sexy woman called Cleopatra Carmen in an International Conference. Hairy receives a jazzy invitation to a scholarly conference on para-psychology funded by an American University in collaboration with an Indian institute of para-psychology. As the conference puts great pressure on the committee doling out invitations to speed up the process, Hairy receives the invitation by
mistake. The invitation sent to Dr. Hari Krishan Sarma reaches Hairy’s hands by mistake. Intrigued by the area of scholarship and by the prospect of attending a three-day conference at public expense in an attractive city, Hairy goes to the conference. Excited in seeing the Port Town filled with poorly clad foreign females, he excitedly utters, “Bitches on Beaches” (DT 102). This offends his woman friend of the day and she deserts him. Nevertheless, Cleopatra Carmen, another case of mistaken identity of the conference entertains him. They gain intimacy and Hairy is invited to her abode. There he is disappointed at Carmen’s feminist vengeance against men and suffers bedbugs’ pinpricks all over his body and thus ends his vow of sleeping with 108 women.

The case of Lecturers attending seminars and conferences or Lecturers appointed on mistaken basis identity is a common feature found in campus novels. It shows lack of seriousness on the part of the academicians. The organizers of seminars for instance, send invitations to wrong persons and the mistakenly invited person too accepts the invitation since it helps them to tour over to places of interest and if possible to have a holiday with their loved ones. Persse McGarrigle of David Lodge’s Small World (1984) is one such Lecturer who is not only appointed in the place of another fellow called McGarrigle but also invited to the conference on the same mistaken identity basis.

In Kagitha Manidargal Prabhanjan shows Prof. Parimelazhagar Perumal exploiting women like Hairy does. Prof. Parimelazhagar Perumal has the habit of giving lengthy meandering explanations to the passages that hint on sex in the textbooks. He indulges in pornographic speeches while teaching, and would throw coquettish glances at girls and thus would disturb their concentration. One of his frequent victimized students of this practice is Gomathy. Gomathy would feel uneasy and intimidated when the Professor indulges in such
acts. Gomathy’s classmate Krishnamurthy, sensing his friend’s unease would irritate and divert the professor from such behaviour with his intelligent questions and would in turn be reprimanded by the professor and be given poor marks in internals and exams.

Not only students but also women staff are cleverly and cunningly victimized by professors in power. Hairy, after attaining the Principal’s post is powerful and makes the women surrender without much efforts. Mrs. Karan, who used to be scared of Hairy’s sexual innuendos, later starts approving him. After he becomes the Principal she is all admiration for him and is interested in becoming the vice principal. She falls a prey to his lust. She is like Nachellai of Prabhanjan’s Kagitha Manidargal who rises up in her career by complying with the sexual desires of professors in power. She in fact delivers a male child through Hairy. Although she appears initially as a docile, traditional kind of working woman towards the close of the novel, she is shown as an ambitious woman who satisfies her boss sexually as well as achieves her wish of getting a son. She, like Nachellai acts as a Mistress to the powerful professor despite being married to a Dean of a university.

We see that the same tendency exists in women of the West also. Angela Pabst of Small World for instance is a Ph.D. scholar and a part-time teacher who is in search of a proper job. She flirts with Professor Swallow thinking that he might be in a position to give her the job she needs some day. Swallow’s wife complaining about her husband’s lusty nature and Pabst’s flirtatious tendency says, “that she could see that in her eyes as she hung on his every word” (SW 63).

These women utilize their exploitations to achieve their goals. In addition, the professors not only conveniently exploit the ‘weaker sex’ but also exploit their wives’ faith and belief in them.
There are many American and British campus novels that exhibit similar kinds of characters and exploitations. David Lodge’s *Small World* shows how Professor Swallow exploits students using his power. His wife Hilary grudgingly tells Professor Morris Zapp about Swallow’s “weakness for pretty students” (SW 59). She shows a Xerox copy of a girl’s examination script where the girl had written about Swallow seducing her. The girl also threatens the examiner by writing: “My tutor Professor Swallow seduced me in his office last February, if I don’t pass this exam I will tell everybody” (SW 60).

Hilary talking about Swallow’s affairs says that her “Silver haired spouse zooms round the world, no doubt pursued by academic groupies like that Angelica Thingummy he brought here the other night” (SW 63).

Hilary Swallow, instead of being happy at her husband’s academic growth hates it because his growth and power leads him to indulge confidently in promiscuous and lusty affairs, especially with his students. She contemptuously talks about him ignoring her and trotting around the world in the name of seminars and conferences. She says:

You’ve no idea the *mana* the title of Professor carries in this country … He started to get invited to conferences, to be external examiner at other universities, he got himself on the British Council’s list for overseas lecture tours. He’s always off travelling somewhere these days. He’s going to Turkey in a few weeks time. Last month it was Norway (SW 62).

It is during one of his conferences at Istanbul that Professor Swallow meets Mrs Joy Simpson, whom he recognizes was his sexual partner once – when she was a part-time teacher. Swallow, wishing to continue his relationship with her uses conferences as excuse. He unabashedly begs Digby Soames to help him by issuing an official call for attending a seminar
or any such intellectual gathering so that he might be able to continue with his love affair. He tells him, “Fix me up as soon as possible with another lecture tour, conference, or summer school – anything, as long as it was in south-east Europe” (SW 241).

With his importunate attempts Swallow moves on to Greece under the pretext of doing some research on classical background to English poetry and there he meets Joy as planned earlier. Despite holding an honourable position, Swallow uses the funds provided for lectures and conferences to get his personal desires and amorous adventures fulfilled.

Before meeting Joy, Philip Swallow contemplates about his uninteresting and monotonous sexual life with his wife Hilary and thinks of having affairs with students. However, his unfortunate affair with a student Sandra Dix makes him avoid students and rely upon his trips abroad for amorous adventure. Instead of thinking of his papers to be presented in Turkey, he thinks how liberated would Turkey women be so that he can make sexual advancements.

Rodney Wainwright is another such amorous Professor who exploits students in Small World. Wainwright sets his eyes and mind on his student Sandra Dix. When he prepares for a paper he is to present in a Conference, he thinks about his chances with students like Sandra. He thinks that at thirty-eight, he has no chance of winning over his students sexually and he like Swallow has not acquired much achievements or power to lure girls. Therefore, he plans to achieve things by first attending a Conference, for which he should write a paper, which in turn should be accepted, by the conference. Wainwright thinks that the acceptance of the paper will lead to the travel grant, which will enable him to fly to Europe. He thinks that this travel will “refresh his mind at the fountainhead of modern critical thought, making useful and influential
contacts, adding to the little pile of scholarly honours, distinctions, achievements, that may eventually earn him a chair at Sydney or Melbourne” (SW 84).

Here it is interesting to note that Vatsa of *Atom and the Serpent* too comes from Bombay to the Provincial University where the action of the novel takes place, only to present papers. Behind his notion of presenting papers is his ambitious desire of improving his materialistic prospects.

*Small World* pictures another amorous professor, Professor Morris Zapp, who divorces his wife and who tries to live with some of his graduate students. He says “I had various women living in, graduate students mostly, but none of them would marry me – girls these days have no principles – and I gradually lost interest in the idea” (SW 77).

Hairy’s conquest gives him more confidence and his sexual achievements and power encourage him to renew his goal of sleeping not just with 108 women but also with 1008 or even 10,008. He thinks, “Why he should not reset his target, like a multinational industrial giant, reset his target to 1,008 or even 10,008, life being so rich with possibilities and cousins and famished humanity” (DT 231). Had it not been for Hairy’s sexual disease priapism, he would have exploited most of the women at St. Jaans and outside.

In fact, like *The Drunk Tantra*, David Lodge’s *Small World*, Prabhanjan’s *Kagitha Manidargal* there are many more academic novels that show the academy as a place for sexual adventures. Campus novelists, apart from depicting professors, as Scott suggests, in the usual stereotypical moulds like the absent-minded professors, unapproachable intellectual snobs, intellectual charlatans, wise simpletons and so on, also show them as “burned out lechers” (83). Robert F. Scott in assessing the contemporary campus novel brings in the recurring character types in the campus novel:
At the heart of most campus novels stands the much-maligned figure of the college professor. Indeed, although there are notable (though few) exceptions, the professorial protagonists in recent campus novels are more often than not depicted as buffoons or intellectual charlatans. Among the well-established stereotypes, for example, are the absent-minded instructor, the wise simpleton, the lucky bumbler, the old goat, and the fuddy-duddy. Far removed from the inspiring figures of the kindly Mr. Chips or the dedicated seeker of knowledge, fictional academics - males in particular - are more likely to emerge as burned out lechers with a penchant for preying on their students or colleagues spouses (83).

In the famous American Campus novel *The History Man* (1975) by Sir Malcolm Bradbury the carnal desire of Howard Kirk, a lecturer in sociology is brought out. Stefan Kanfer, in his article, “School Daze: The Best Novels about the Campus” (2008), on analyzing the character of Howard Kirk, calls him the anti-hero of the novel who, “takes advantage of the poor (in this case graduate students), dismisses a decent gentlemanly undergrad whose opinions differ from his own as a “heavy, anal type.”” Kirk attempts to seduce any female within reach, a penchant that, Kanfer describes thus:

This might threaten the career of a lesser villain. Not this professor for one thing, he agrees with one of his students: turpitude in the 70s should be defined as “raping large numbers of nuns. Anything less is a minor transgression. For another, he considers himself in vulnerable to middle-class attitudes about sex and its consequences.

Kirk’s outrageous sexual activities and amoral practices especially with the academicians be it faculty members or students land him in trouble and he is threatened of being fired for gross turpitude. His wife who supports him in his insufferable fraudulence
commits suicide in the end, which Kanfer comments is “a tragic conclusion to a coruscating moral tale”

Like Hairy of *The Drunk Tantra*, Azhagesan of *Kagitha Manidargal*, Yana of *Atom and the Serpent*, Swallow and a few other Professors of *Small World*, Kirk of *The History Man* is highly predatory. These professors exploit women be they students or staff using their power position. Kirk even corrupts and encourages his colleagues by telling them that having sex with their students is not wrong. He convinces Dr. Macintosh, a sociologist from his wife’s department that having sex with one of his students during the end-of-term party is the right thing to do. He is not worried about Dr. Macintosh’s pregnant wife or about the students’ future. He is more bothered about bringing unconventional practices. The novel includes another exploitative researcher and academician – an opportunist - Flora Beniform who sleeps with men in whom she is professionally interested, in order to elicit information from them.

David Lodge in “Nabokov and the Campus Novel” (2008) talks about the entry of sexual intrigues in European campus novels. He believes that the campus novels produced before the sixties like Mary McCarthy’s *The Groves of Academy*, Randell Jarell’s *Pictures from an Institution* (1954), Nabokov’s *Pnin* (1955) etc. contained no telling sexual intrigues. They were comparatively chaste and if at all, some such thing appeared it would be like something that the narrator of *Pictures from an Institution* claims.

The narrator of *Pictures from an Institution* claims that in Gertrude Johnson’s cynical imagination, “the most powerful professor in the department was always just about to expose the head of the department’s love affair with a student in order to get the head’s rank and salary and power for himself” – typical campus novel plot (Lodge, “Nabokov,” par. 34).
Lodge asserts that only in the 60s and 70s that such sexual relationships became increasingly common phenomena in Britain and America.

As society became increasingly permissive in the sixties and the seventies, however, such relationships became an increasingly common phenomenon in reality, while still retaining an element of professional risk and ethical transgression which made them a useful plot device in fiction: “We all know what happens in universities,” says a character in Robertson Davies’s The Rebel Angels (1982). Nice girls turn up, professors are human, and Bingo! Sometimes it’s rough on the girl, sometimes it may be destructive to the professor (Lodge, “Nabokov,” par. 35).

As far as Indian novels are concerned, there are no campus novels that contains in it telling sexual intrigues. They have only cases of mild love affairs or exploitation treated at the most superficial level. Ranga Rao’s The Drunk Tantra of course deals with the aspect of sex but that too has its own reservations.

Francine Prose’s Blue Angel written in the year 2001 shows the fall of a Professor due to his seduction by a student. It is the story of Ted Swenson who teaches Creative Writing at Euston College in Vermont. Ted Swenson, married, falls a prey to a temptress, a student who uses him for her own ends. After seducing him, she puts him before the Campus Judicial Hearing with the help of a tape that revealed their encounter. Later on, he is fired for his sexual misconduct and feels an excruciating pain at the isolation and humiliation meted out to him. Unfortunately, this kind of plots where the Professors are victimized, especially sexual victimization is missing in Indian campus novels.

Another predominant exploitation that the inmates of the university experience is intellectual exploitation. This is a frequent one that seriously affects the students. Teachers
possessing more power steal the thoughts or intellectual production of the students and publish it in their names. The students, powerless are unable to act against this. They remain dumbfound at this kind of atrocity caused by their professors.

This selfish act of the professor is explicated by Prabhanjan in *Kagitha Manidargal*. Ratna, a research scholar of Reader Kannan works on folklore. She collects materials and strenuously works hard to write an article on it. Her enthusiasm and hard work gives her the confidence to even bring out a volume of book on folklore. She drafts a successful paper on it and submits it to her Supervisor Kannan who appreciates and applauds her on the wonderful draft. However, after a week she finds that the Supervisor has cheated her and has published her work as his own in a journal called *Dinachudar*. She is appalled at this but is unable to do anything against him. She simply remains dumbfound and even loses interest in her research.

This incident shows teachers stooping down to mean level of developing themselves at the cost of their students’ development. They survive in this ‘publish or perish’ environment by victimizing their students intellectually. This kind of victimization is common in the West also. Lodge in *Small World* points out at this when he portrays a Professor presenting Persse McGarrigle’s work as his own.

Another such case of intellectual victimization is brought out in Anuradha Marwah Roy’s *The Higher Education of Geetika Mehendiratta*. Dipankar Bannerjee like Ratna of *Kagitha Manidargal* is cheated by his Supervisor. He is a research scholar at Jana University who speaks dejectedly of Capital University and its reputation. He says that Capital University is not what it is known for since it has fraudulent and plagiarising professors. He talks of the injustice caused to him. His well-reputed Supervisor once had published one of his course work papers under his own name. The Supervisor was such a dullard, a quack that he published it
without even correcting a few spelling mistakes that Dipankar had made. This makes Dipankar lose interest in his research and his trust and faith in his teacher is shaken. He believes that Capital University that houses such quacks or plagiarizers is not a good university and so quits the place.

He told me about his research with a self deprecatory laugh. He also spoke about his supervisor in Capital University who had published one of course-work papers under his own name.

The man did not even see it fit to correct a few spelling mistakes I had made”, he said rolling his eyes (HEGM 152).

Like Reader Kannan of *Kagitha Manidargal*, Dipankar’s Supervisor too does not have the courtesy to recognise or pronounce the author of the articles in their published works. They do not even seek the permission of their students to get them published in their names. The students, powerless would not have been able to prove their authorship and thus have to silently fall a prey to their victimization. Like Dipankar of *The Higher Education of Geetika Mehendiratta* and Ratna of *Kagitha Manidargal* are so many other students who suffer intellectual victimization in the hands of their teachers.

The academic novel writers also criticize the professors’ lack of interest in updating themselves with current knowledge. The teachers, after achieving good job and enough money are too lazy to be intellectually productive. Some teachers are too lazy to even prepare for the classes. An instance of this is found in *The Higher Education of Geetika Mehendiratta* where the student Geetika Mehendiratta is not happy when she learns that her teacher is not familiar with some of the writers prescribed for study. It is more shameful when the teacher relies upon
the student to find materials on the prescribed texts. It is only when they enter the class do they think about the textbooks and fume at their inability to teach it.

Sharma entered the class. “There is not a single book available on Wallace Stevens”, she fumed, defeated by his poetry. “Have you found anything on him, Geetika Mehendiratta?” (HEGM 4).

Geetika is an intellectual student but her intellectuality is suppressed by some of the teachers. They do not nourish or cherish her intellectuality but often try to put down her witticism by being nasty towards her. Their narrow-minded natures do not tolerate her preparation of her lessons well in advance. They discourage her when she voices her doubts.

They (teachers) were too nasty to me too but that was because I always prepared my lessons too well and asked too many questions. They told me not to be so proud of my knowledge. I got higher marks than the others only because both my parents were in the teaching profession and helped me with my lessons (HEGM 11).

They are also not happy at her extra reading of authors like Hardy and Agatha Christie. They in fact tell her that she need not be too proud of her reading habits since it is only natural for a daughter of parents who are lecturers to do it. They also do not reward her, the All-Rounder’s award since despite her intelligence and her being the ‘studying kind’ she was not polite, disciplined and well behaved. This kind of suppressing a student’s interest itself is a kind of victimization since when discouraged in a crowd, there is tendency amidst the students to feel ashamed and thus quit the activity itself.

If at school Geetika is victimized, in college during Mrs. Sharma’s class the teacher exploits her intellectuality by asking her to find and prepare notes on Stevens, which she herself finds difficult to do.
Just like how Geetika’s teachers exploit and suppress her questing mind so does Ryan Oberoi’s Professor in Chetan Bhagat’s *Five Point Someone* (2004). Professor Dubey, during his first class to the freshers of Mechanical Engineering department asks the students to tell him what a machine is. When the students are scared of expressing themselves he proudly explains that anything that “reduces human effort is a machine” (FPS 9). However, when Ryan contradicts him saying:

> “Sir, what about a gym machine, like a bench press or something?” Ryan interrupted the bonhomie.

> “What about it?” Prof. Dubey stopped beaming.

> “That doesn’t reduce human effort. In fact, it increases it.”

The class fell silent again.

> “Well, I mean …” Prof Dubey said as he scouted for arguments.

As Ryan gains confidence about his intellectual query and feels happy in having made a point, Prof Dubey annoyingly asks if he is trying to outwit him by saying he is wrong. He discourages him by saying

> “Watch it son. In my class, just watch it”, was all Prof Dubey said as he moved to the front (FPS 11).

This is almost like the similar kind of insult and suppression that Geetika faces in *The Higher Education of Geetika Mehendiratta*. Like Geetika, Ryan too is dumbstruck at the Professor’s narrow-mindedness and his dislike for students who raise questions in classroom sessions. The Professors exploit the powerless silent state of the students to dominate them. The Professors suppressing the questioning mind of the students is brought out in Anurag Mathur’s *The Inscrutable Americans* (1991) also. Nevertheless, the difference lies in the protagonist
Gopal comparing Indian and American ways of education. He feels that American Professors encourage students to question them:

They loved questions. They didn’t care if they were insane, in fact the crazier the better, so long as they were also intelligent.

But this is just the opposite with Indian teachers for such questioning would have been heresy to them (IA 147).

The same kind of exploitation and dominance over silent, powerless students are found in *The Higher Education of Geetika Mehendiratta* where Geetika initially impressed by her Supervisor’s intellectuality is later disappointed by her shallow knowledge.

Geetika’s Supervisor, a Sorbonne-returned Lecturer ignores Geetika’s interest to work on Naipaul’s *A House for Mr. Biswas* and thrusts upon her, her passion for structuralism. Geetika’s passive, silent forbearance is exploited by her and she lacks the commitment to help her in her research. Although Geetika finds her Guide’s supervision superficial and unsatisfactory, she lacks the courage to go against her. She does not accuse or criticize the Lecturer openly since she is afraid of not completing her course and getting the degree. Geetika here is helpless and taken for granted just like Ratna of *Kagitha Manidargal*. Both Ratna and Geetika are silent about their exploitation and victimization in order to get the degree uninterruptedly and without any delay. Had they voiced out their anguish or made any complaints the administration would not have paid any heed to them because as Naomi Woolf, a victimized student puts it, teachers are more important and “valuable” (“Silent Treatment”) to them. In fact their vociferousness or articulation would only have made their guides “hold up your (their) degree for years” (HEGM 148) and that could be disastrous to their career. Dipankar who questions the guide on stealing away his course work paper only fights a losing
battle and it is he, who has to migrate to another university to complete his degree. His articulation leads him to have a break in his studies and seek another place since he is denied justice.

The teachers appointed on temporary basis or hourly paid teachers are a constant source of exploitation for the permanent or senior teachers. Even the teachers on probation are the butt of exploitation for the superior teachers.

This case is explicated in Dharker’s *The Virgin Syndrome*. The unnamed Narrator of the novel who is a University teacher on part-time basis is constantly advised by her Head of the Department not to indulge in innovative methods of teaching. Students enjoying her lectures, and she gaining popularity is not liked by the Head and hence she is asked by him to prepare them and coach them from examinations point of view. Her free innovative spirit is dampened by the senior professor. Even while working at school the Narrator experiences similar kinds of inferior treatment from the senior staff.

*The Awakening: A Novella in Rhyme* (1992) shows the exploitation or victimization of the heroine, a Lecturer on probation. The Principal SS is known for her bullying the non-permanent staff and the ones on probation. She is an opportunist who makes them toil hard and who neither rewards them nor recognizes their services. She exploits them for her own selfish gains and her autocracy knows no limits when she overworks them. SS exploiting teachers’ submission and quiet surrender is exhibited in her deflating the staff’s cars’ tyres. Her exploitation reaches the pinnacle when she, unmindful of the teacher supervisors in the examination hall, helps her niece to copy in the exams. When the supervisors JR and NV condemn her act, she disregards them considering their inferior status and continues with her helping her niece. She also boldly levels charges against the two teachers that they are trying to
taint her name since they are never-do-wells. Her arrogant victimization finally leads the protagonist JR to resign her job and in fact quit teaching job itself. Like *The Awakening* and *The Virgin Syndrome*, many other campus novels too show senior faculties misusing or insulting their juniors. It is because of the insult caused to her that JR resigns.

This kind of teachers quitting teaching job is found in a few campus novels like Irving Stone’s *Pageant of Youth* (1993), George Weller’s *Not to Eat, Not For Love* (1933), Mary Jane Ward’s *The Professor’s Umbrella* (1948) and Martin Larson’s *Plaster Saint* (1953).

These novels show their protagonists as young teachers with high idealistic notions about teaching. They are like the protagonists of *The Virgin Syndrome*, *The Awakening* and *Kagitha Manidargal*, who, with high ideals about teaching, fight hard to break away the narrow old practices of the school or college they work in and would finally leave the profession itself because of being unsuccessful in their attempts.

Caste-wise exploitation and victimization are brought out in the novels *Oru Dalit, Oru Adikari, Oru Maranam* (2005) by Panjangam and *No Onions Nor Garlic* (2006) by Srividya Natarajan. These novels propound the suppression and repression that the staff belonging to upper caste thrust upon the lower caste staff especially *dalit* lecturers and students.

In *Oru Dalit, Oru Adikari, Oru Maranam* Panjangam shows the death of a *dalit*, thereby asserting that education has not brought a revolution in modern man’s thinking and action. A *dalit*, be he educated or not, whether possess refined sensibility or not, society ignores him and refuses to accept him. The society and the educational institution from a larger perspective works with squashing this notion. Srividya Natarajan undermines the caste factor in a farcical manner. She, by turning a hardcore Brahmin into a *dalit* towards the end of the novel deflates the sanctimonies of caste. She questions wittily the very existence of caste and its practices and
shows that caste and its related affairs are false piety. Here also the aspect of sidelining and ignoring the dalits take place. Even the most respected Professor Ram is ostracised when the secret with regard to his birth is revealed.

As seen earlier, the Principal in *Oru Dalit, Oru Adikari, Oru Maranam* suppresses the dalit teachers in a manipulative way and supports upper caste students, neglecting their mistakes. He and some of the Brahmin teachers try to put down the dalit teachers by exploiting students’ anger towards them. Using his staff supporters the Principal goes to the extent of appointing an upper caste teacher in the place reserved for dalits. He tries to get the thing done by making the dalit teachers sentimental towards the appointee, a higher-class tutor. These upper caste teachers exhibit their disapproval of reservations and directly or indirectly try to deprive the dalits of the benefits provided to them by inflicting pain upon the lower caste teachers.

*No Onions Nor Garlic* exhibits open hatred and open vengeance of Brahmins against backward classes, especially dalits. Professor Ram a hard core Brahmin incites upper caste students to act against the dalits and shows open hatred for dalit students. He shows his anger against Government’s Reservations Policy that is a kind of positive discrimination that favours downtrodden minorities and caste discrimination. The Brahmin professors, like the Principal and his group in *Oru Dalit*, join and express their ill feelings and malevolence against the downtrodden. Professor Ram goes a step ahead in even inducing his Brahmin students in organizing a protest against the lodging of Ambedkar statue in the campus. He wants to install the statue of a Hindu Goddess Saraswati instead of Ambedkar’s who fought for the annihilation of caste discrimination.
Like the Principal of *Oru Dalit*, Professor Ram too along with his Brahmin supporters who are together called as TamBrahmAsses does everything to stop applicants for Reserved Category positions entering the University. He along with his friends scrutinizes their applications with extra care and sees to it that they exit at the entry level itself and that all the Reserved Category positions are vacant. It is only during his absence on a year’s sabbatical leave that the backward castes field in Dr. Laurentia Arul who gets into the nerves of Professor Ram. Like Balan of *Oru Dalit, Oru Adikari, Oru Maranam* is Professor Laurentia fighting for the downtrodden’s cause. Dr. Arul, most of the times avoids clash with Professor Ram but at the same time asserts herself. Professor Ram finds in her a challenging rival although he does not admit it openly. In fact, both Professor Ram and Dr. Laurentia Arul vie for the post of President of the ACS Conference.

*Oru Dalit, Oru Adikari, Oru Maranam* pictures a Dalit holding the position of a Lecturer, which is according to the academic hierarchy a dominant position. Here the students are subject to a not so powerful state. But despite the fact that Balan is a teacher, his belonging to lower caste makes him inferior before his students and so he faces problems through his socially superior students who of course combat with him with the help of some similar caste teachers.

However, in *No Onions Nor Garlic* Professor Ram enjoys a doubly dominant status wherein he is superior both in academic hierarchy as well as social hierarchy. Added to this he also enjoys the status of being a male, which gives him the confidence to cause injustice to the downtrodden both belonging to the teaching community as well as learning community. Dr. Laurentia Arul from the former incites his anger not only because of belonging to a backward class but also by promoting amidst students, Marx, Fanon and Feminist Criticism.
He is prejudiced against Dr. Arul and concludes that she is the person who writes unpleasant messages about him in many places including the toilets in the campus. He exploits Laurentia’s inferior caste position, throws false accusations on her, and demands of the Vice-Chancellor to suspend her through the Disciplinary Committee, which comprises of his Brahmin friends.

He goes to the extent of rubbing dirt and tearing his shirt in order to present him extremely pitiable and completely attacked by Laurentia Arul. His Chanakya-like manipulations forces the Vice-Chancellor to appoint a Disciplinary Committee. Dr. Laurentia Arul in spite of being a faculty struggles hard to fight against the domineering upper caste teachers. She is subjected to turmoil by them and is not allowed to work peacefully.

If a person holding such a position finds it difficult to fight against the over domineering Professor Ram, Jiva, Rufus, Thamarai like lower caste students struggle still greater to maintain cordiality with him. He does not treat them well and all the time exploits their inferior status and victimizes them in all ways. His caste discriminatory treatment is expressed by the author in the following lines:

Well, if you were in any of Professor Ram’s classes, you would have noticed the special teaching methods he used for students like Rufus and Thamarai Selvi, such as throwing their papers out of the classroom window, calling them names like dolt and nincompoop, which were not in the attendance register, failing them in every examination, giving them his sincere blessing when they dropped out of the course, and treating them at all times as if they stood no higher than vermin in the evolutionary order (NONG 82).
Failing students and thus victimizing them is a common aspect found among revengeful teachers in campus novels. Professor Ram too threatens Jiva of failing her in Viva-voce examination if she goes against his wish of refraining from the interview. He uses the same threat for Sundar also when he finds that he is in love with Jiva. Parimelazhagar Perumal of Kagitha Manidargal fails the student who talks ill about his sexual leanings towards his students.

Here it can be noted that the Professors make the personal political. Professor Ram and Professor Parimelazhagar Perumal use the awarding of marks for students’ performances in exams for subjective purposes. They threaten the students with this poisonous weapon that they possess.

In Lodge’s Small World, it is the other way round where a student threatens the Professor, blackmailing him about his seduction. She writes in her examination answer script that Professor Swallow seduced her in his office room and that if she fails in the exams she would reveal to the public about his seduction.

Professor Ram’s dislike for the dalits does not stop him from hating them but also devices means in allowing them not to rise. Jiva is his Ph.D. scholar in whom he shows little genuine interest. He chooses to be her Supervisor only when the Vice-Chancellor himself needed an explanation from Professor Ram for not guiding even a single non-Brahmin student in his career of nearly ten decades. Although he guides her for namesake, and in order to escape from inquiries, he asks Jiva a favour as a mark of her esteem for him. He first requests her to refrain from attending the Interview for the post of Lecturer in the department of folklore and Drama at Chennai University under Open Category, since his son Sankaranarayana or Chunky is competing for the same. When Jiva refuses to do it, he threatens her by telling her that her
dissension would lead to drastic effects like her failing in the *Viva-voce* examination. This is almost the kind of exploitation that, Geetika faces in *The Higher Education of Geetika Mehdendiratta*. Professor Ranganathan advises Geetika not to have any controversies with her Guide since there is every possibility of her not allowing Geetika to complete her thesis in time. Professor Ranganathan also tells her that it might seriously affect her career.

The same thing happens in Jiva’s case but the difference lies in Professor Ram openly threatening Jiva by frankly stating that issuing of Recommendation letter for her *Viva-voce* is in his hands. He adopts mean measures in order to promote his son, in the process victimizes, and exploits his poor *dalit* student. He also stops her from presenting any papers in the ACS Conference by not circulating to the downtrodden the Call for Papers. Jiva too hesitates to ask him permission to present a paper since she is scared of Professor Ram. Therefore, like Ratna of *Kagitha Manidargal* and Dipankar and Geetika of *The Higher Education of Geetika Mehdendiratta*, Jiva too remains silent and dumbfound against her victimization and exploitation.

Not only Professor Ram but also other Brahmin Professors are shown as being keen in exploiting the downtrodden. It is Professor Nagarajan, who incites Professor Ram to exploit Jiva’s position as a student. It is he, who gives him the idea to ask Jiva to absent herself from the interview. He tells Professor Ram to exploit his status as a teacher by quoting the Sanskrit slogan that equates a teacher to Divinity itself: ‘“*Guru Saakshaath parabrahma*’, said Professor Nagarajan piously. ‘The teacher is equal to the ah-Over-Soul…”’ (NONG 91)

Professor Nagarajan thus corrupts the already exploitative Professor Ram and Ram who loves to see himself palimpsestically reflected against his divine namesake gains confidence to threaten Jiva to refrain herself from the Interview.
Unlike traditional idealistic students who usually comply with their teachers’ requests, how much ever unjust they are, Jiva refuses to comply with the wishes of her Guide and Supervisor. Professor Ram’s unethical behaviour in the class reflects upon the mental make-up of such an intelligent student like Jiva. His ill treatment of the students belonging to the downtrodden groups stops her from approaching Professor Ram in seeking permission to present papers in Conferences. Professor Ram stops lower caste students from attending seminars and conferences as if attending such is the sole prerogative of upper caste students. He openly encourages Sundar, a Brahmin student to prepare a paper for the ACS Conference by stating: “I’ve turned down a number of papers to squeeze yours in, so don’t take this too lightly. It is not every student, who gets a chance to be published at your stage” (NONG 95-96).

This kind of open favouritism slashes the nobility of teachers and far more brings out the ugly aspect in them.

Professor Ram takes enough care not only in the interviews for Lecturers post to filter out undesirable non-Brahmin candidates but also filters non-Brahmin students whom he calls as “undesirable elements” (NONG 96).

His classroom victimization of students is more appalling where he exhibits open disgust for the dalit students. Even as he enters the class, he looks for a suitable victim on whom he throws verbal garbage, shouts, and insults them in front of the class.

His exploitative tendency turns out in vengeance and revenge when he sees Jiva and Sundar walking intimately. Instead of reprimanding Sundar he accuses Jiva of possessing lose morals. He breaks up the news of Sundar’s marriage to his daughter and accuses her whole caste as follows:
I know your cas-type has no morals, but I am sure even you understand how inadvisable it is to attempt to seduce my future son-in-law one week before your viva-voce examination (NONG 270).

He meanly threatens Sundar that if he goes behind Jiva he would see to it that he reaps its consequences. He says:

If you defy me now, I will make sure that your scholarship gets cut off. I’ll ensure that you never get a University job in your life. In fact I’ll make sure you never get any job (NONG 271).

When Sundar pays least attention to his threats he comes out with another which arrests him. He threatens that Jiva would never get her degree. This kind of cheap manipulation for his personal selfish ends is highly depressing. He exploits students’ weaknesses to put them down and makes them lose their confidence.

Thus, the Chapter propounds the various kinds of exploitations and victimizations that take place in the academy as shown in a few Indian academic novels. Four kinds of victimization or exploitation namely monetary or material exploitation, physical exploitation, sexual exploitation and intellectual exploitation have been discussed. In fact, whatever names or divisions we give for the different kinds of sufferings or tortures undergone by the academicians it all ultimately are related to one another. Looking from outside, the inside world of the academy might give a picture of being idealistic, united, free from clashes, ill-feelings etc. but a close look at it might reveal that this little world consists of the same narrow-mindedness, corruption, illegal practices, injustices and selfish kinds of behaviours.

Initially entering the arena of academy, full of faith, ambition, hope and idealistic thoughts, the academicians pass on to the stages of survival, benefits and so on. As expressed
by Steven Connor, the university, like other closed societies has “its own norms and values, which is thick with the possibilities of intrigue. Indeed, the very restriction of elements in the academic world, with the stock characters, with their cosily familiar routines of evasion and abstraction and their conspicuous, if always insecure, hierarchical structures, and the well-established situations and plot-lines, seem to generate a sense of permutative abundance.” (qtd. in Showalter, “Campus Follies,” par. 13). It is a place filled with ordinary human beings with very ordinary desires, who have no control over their humanly (negative) qualities. It is a place where they play out their obsessions but pretend to be free of it.

Prema Nandakumar’s subtle portrayal of teachers’ exploiting students is not as scathing as Prabhanjan’s Kagitha Manidargal. Prabhanjan’s Kagitha Manidargal and Ranga Rao’s The Drunk Tantra bring out the sexual relationships of the academicians, which it can be noted is still on reserve in Indian writing. A marked difference noted between European campus fiction and Indian campus fiction, is that sex is blatantly discussed in the former and that all reservations towards it are withheld in the latter. Indian campus fiction has miles more to cross in this and may be the cultural background is one reason for it.

Another difference between European and Indian campus fiction is that Indian novels propound more of teachers or faculty victimizing or exploiting students, whereas European novels have not laid their hands on students subjecting professors to exploitation and victimization. An appropriate example of this is Francine Prose’s Blue Angel and J.M.Coetzee’s Disgrace (1999). These two novels teach teachers a lesson not to involve sexually with students.

In fact, the European novels have largely exhausted most of the elements of sexual exploitations. Campus novels starting from “the teacher as liberal and innocent victim of social
repression, and the teacher as lecher and guilty seducer of the young” (Fiedler 6) has appeared in Britain and America. However, in India there are still many more aspects, which have to find a way into the campus novels.

Though this is the case at present, the mushrooming growth of Indian campus novels would one day exhibit to the world their capability in this also.