

Crimes of Thought, National Security and the Limits of Protected Dissent in India

Syeda Asna Fatima Nahri

BA LLB (Hons), 5th year

Hindustan Institute of Technology and Science, School of Law, Chennai

Abstract: *India's constitutional democracy emerged from a prolonged struggle against colonial authority in which political disagreement, collective action, public criticism, and demands for rights became instruments through which people challenged oppressive power. That history gives contemporary debates concerning dissent and national security particular constitutional significance. This paper examines the boundary between the legitimate authority of the Indian State to combat terrorism and protect national security and the constitutional freedom of citizens to question government, protest peacefully, associate, express ideological beliefs, demand rights, and seek judicial protection. It argues that national security legislation is necessary where conduct involves terrorism, violence, incitement, recruitment, financing, conspiracy, or other legally punishable threats, but extraordinary powers must not become instruments for treating political disagreement, ideological association, or constitutional resistance as presumptive criminality. The paper locates this argument within India's constitutional guarantees of equality, expression, peaceful assembly, association, life, personal liberty, and procedural protection, while recognising constitutionally permissible restrictions and the State's responsibility to safeguard sovereignty and public order. It further considers the danger of guilt by association, preventive criminalisation, prolonged deprivation of liberty, and institutional misuse of security powers. Drawing on India's historical experience, constitutional structure, national security legislation, judicial responsibility, and international human rights principles, the paper proposes a people centred framework in which governmental power remains strong against genuine threats but restrained toward peaceful citizens. Accordingly this section supports a constitutional order in which public power remains lawful accountable evidence based proportionate transparent restrained reviewable while protecting national security and the lawful democratic freedoms of citizens.*

Keywords: Constitutional Democracy, Dissent and National Security, Fundamental Rights, Preventive Criminalisation, Judicial Accountability

Historical Foundations of Dissent in India's Constitutional Order

The relationship between dissent and governmental power in India cannot be examined without recognising the historical circumstances from which the constitutional Republic emerged. India's independence was preceded by a prolonged struggle during which people challenged an authority that possessed extensive legal and coercive power but was not democratically accountable to them. Political organisation, journalism, petitions, litigation, public meetings, peaceful demonstrations, civil resistance, mass mobilisation, intellectual argument, and demands for political representation all contributed in different ways to a national movement founded upon the conviction that governmental authority required legitimacy and accountability. India's experience therefore gives dissent a particular constitutional significance, not because every act of resistance is necessarily lawful, and not because the contemporary democratic State can properly be equated with colonial administration, but because Indian history demonstrates why opposition to those exercising governmental authority must remain distinguishable from opposition to the nation itself. Independent India differs fundamentally from the colonial State because its institutions derive their authority from a written



Constitution, representative government, universal adult franchise, judicial review, federal arrangements, periodic elections, and legally enforceable fundamental rights. The lesson drawn from the freedom struggle must accordingly be framed with care. History should not be used to suggest that citizens possess an unrestricted entitlement to disregard law, but it should remind constitutional institutions that political power must remain accountable and that disagreement with a government cannot automatically be treated as disloyalty to India. This principle becomes particularly important when security laws are applied to unpopular political speech. Colonial sedition law illustrates how the language of disaffection could be used to protect governing authority from political resistance, while constitutional adjudication after independence had to determine whether such a law could coexist with the freedom of speech. In the *Kedar Nath Singh v State of Bihar*, the Supreme Court upheld the former sedition provision but connected its legitimate operation with speech involving incitement to violence or a tendency to create public disorder. The decision therefore attempted to distinguish severe criticism of government from conduct threatening public order. Its contemporary relevance lies principally in that constitutional distinction because section 124A belonged to the former Indian Penal Code and should not be presented as the complete statement of present criminal law. The enactment of the *Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita* requires contemporary analysis to examine the current statutory framework separately rather than assuming that colonial sedition doctrine continues without legal change. Nevertheless, the democratic principle remains compelling. Constitutional liberty is tested most meaningfully by the treatment of ideas that are unpopular, uncomfortable, accusatory, radical, or politically inconvenient. If expression is protected only when the government agrees with it, the protection ceases to operate as a meaningful limitation upon authority. At the same time, the historical legitimacy of resistance cannot become a defence for terrorism, armed violence, recruitment for violent organisations, intentional assistance to terrorist activity, or threats against the lives and freedoms of others. A democratic State must protect citizens who dissent, but it must also protect citizens from those who employ violence to achieve political ends. The relevant distinction lies in the nature of the conduct and its legally established connection to harm rather than in whether its political purpose receives public approval. A citizen who criticises legislation, challenges executive action before a court, demands equality, protests an alleged injustice, questions police conduct, opposes a public project, or campaigns for constitutional reform does not cease to belong to the constitutional community merely because the government rejects the citizen's position. Accordingly this section supports a constitutional order in which public power remains lawful accountable evidence based proportionate while protecting national security and the lawful democratic freedoms of citizens. This historical perspective also requires attention to constitutional memory, because institutions preserve democratic legitimacy when they acknowledge how earlier legal controls converted political disagreement into punishable disaffection under colonial authority.

Constitutional Rights, State Authority and Democratic Accountability

The Constitution of India does not place individual freedom and governmental authority in absolute opposition. It establishes a structured relationship in which people possess enforceable rights, public institutions possess legitimate powers, and both remain subject to constitutional limitations. The Article 14 guarantees equality before the law and equal protection of the laws. Article 19 protects specified freedoms including speech and expression, peaceful assembly without arms, and the formation of associations or unions. The Article 21 protects life and personal liberty according to procedure established by law, while Article 22 contains protections relevant to arrest and detention. Together, these provisions make equality, political participation, liberty, and procedural restraint essential parts of the relationship between citizens and the State. These rights are not absolute but the Article 19 expressly permits reasonable restrictions upon specified constitutional grounds, including interests connected with sovereignty, integrity, security, public order, and other recognised concerns. A defence of dissent therefore need not deny that government can regulate speech, assembly, or association when the legal requirements for regulation are met. The difficult question concerns the scope, purpose, and application of those restrictions. A constitutional freedom may remain formally present while becoming practically weakened if the categories permitting governmental intervention are interpreted so broadly that citizens cannot reasonably distinguish protected participation from conduct producing severe legal consequences. Constitutional



examination must therefore ask not only whether an executive authority possesses statutory power, but also whether its exercise remains connected to the legitimate purpose for which that power was created. This requirement is particularly significant where government itself becomes the object of criticism. The political executive considering speech harmful may also be the executive against which that speech is directed. Fundamental rights cannot consequently depend upon whether those exercising public authority welcome the opinions expressed. The distinction between government and nation becomes central. Governments are temporary holders of political office and may be replaced through elections, whereas the constitutional Republic continues beyond individual administrations. Opposition to a minister, governing party, statute, policy, security operation, or administrative decision is therefore not equivalent to opposition to India. A citizen may profoundly reject the programme of one government while remaining committed to democratic and constitutional institutions. Electoral democracy assumes that organised opposition is legitimate, and judicial review assumes that governmental acts can be challenged and may be declared unlawful. The decision in *Shreya Singhal v Union of India* contributes significantly to this framework. While examining section 66A of the Information Technology Act, the Supreme Court distinguished discussion, advocacy, and incitement and held that the constitutional power to restrict expression becomes engaged when speech reaches the legally relevant stage of incitement rather than merely because an idea is unpopular or offensive. The judgment did not create unrestricted freedom for every form of online expression, but it recognised that vague and broad criminal standards could chill protected speech. The right to protest exists within similar constitutional boundaries. In the *Amit Sahni v Commissioner of Police*, which arose from the Shaheen Bagh demonstrations against the Citizenship Amendment Act, the Supreme Court recognised that people aggrieved by legislation retain a right to protest, but it also held that public ways cannot be occupied indefinitely in a manner that disregards the rights and convenience of others. The decision illustrates that protest and public order cannot be resolved through absolute claims on either side. The State must facilitate peaceful democratic participation, but protesters must also respect lawful restrictions and competing public rights. This balance should not be confused with unrestricted executive discretion. The requirement of reasonableness means that restrictions must remain open to legal scrutiny and the importance of

the Constitution lies precisely in its capacity to govern conflict between citizens and public institutions rather than assuming that one side is always correct. Accordingly this section supports a constitutional order in which public power remains lawful accountable evidence based proportionate transparent restrained reviewable rights respecting fair responsible careful while protecting national security and the lawful democratic freedoms of citizens. The constitutional inquiry must additionally consider whether less restrictive measures could address the identified harm, because necessity and institutional restraint help prevent exceptional powers from becoming responses to democratic disagreement.

National Security, Counter Terrorism and the Limits of State Power

A people centred account of national security must acknowledge unequivocally that India possesses the legal authority and constitutional responsibility to protect its population and institutions against terrorism, organised violence, unlawful financing, recruitment, conspiracy, and other genuine threats. Fundamental rights do not require the government to wait until a violent attack has occurred before every preventive measure becomes legitimate. Terrorism may involve planning, financing, logistical coordination, recruitment, training, concealment, communication, and organisational assistance before physical violence takes place. An effective national security framework must therefore address legally defined preparatory and supportive conduct when evidence satisfies the applicable statutory requirements. The Unlawful Activities Prevention Act 1967 forms a central part of this framework. Its provisions address unlawful associations, terrorist acts, fundraising, conspiracy, terrorist camps, recruitment, harbouring, membership of terrorist organisations, support for such organisations, arrest, search, and modified procedural rules. These provisions serve legitimate public purposes because citizens who claim protection from governmental excess are also entitled to protection from terrorism, intimidation, and political violence. A rights based argument that ignores these threats would be incomplete because constitutional freedom cannot flourish where violence is permitted to



determine political outcomes. However, acknowledging legitimate security authority strengthens rather than diminishes the need for legal boundaries. Exceptional powers derive their strongest justification from exceptional danger, and their legitimacy accordingly depends upon maintaining a rational connection with that danger. If measures created to combat terrorism become mechanisms for managing ordinary political criticism, the distinction between democratic regulation and security intervention begins to collapse. Prevention must therefore be distinguished from speculation. Government may act before an attack where applicable law

authorises preventive intervention and adequate material supports it, but ideological disagreement cannot become a substitute for conduct connected to an offence. Ideology may be relevant to motive, association may be evidentially significant, communication may establish knowledge, and speech may cross valid legal limits. Nevertheless, their significance depends upon context and statutory requirements rather than political hostility alone. Strong criticism of a security policy differs from intentionally facilitating terrorist violence. Attending a public meeting differs from recruiting people for an armed organisation. Reading controversial literature differs from financing an attack. Knowing a person connected with a prohibited organisation differs from knowingly supporting that organisation's terrorist activity. These categories may overlap in particular cases, but their possible overlap does not justify abandoning the distinctions. The law must identify the elements that transform protected conduct into punishable participation. The Sections 38 and 39 of the UAPA require particular care because they address association with and support for terrorist organisations. They should not be described simply as provisions criminalising political sympathy. A credible analysis must examine the statutory language concerning association, intention, support, and the furtherance of a terrorist organisation's activities. This precision protects citizens from over broad characterisation while preserving the State's ability to prosecute genuine assistance to terrorism. It also strengthens national security institutions because security enforcement gains credibility when extraordinary powers are concentrated upon genuine threats rather than dispersed across political disagreement. The gravity of enforcement supports this discipline because national security proceedings can involve arrest, search, detention, prosecution, restrictions upon liberty, reputational harm, and prolonged litigation. Consequently, the decision to employ exceptional authority carries responsibilities proportionate to its effects. Security must also be situated within the broader purpose of government. A secure democracy is not merely one in which the State possesses extensive coercive powers. Accordingly this section supports a constitutional order in which public power remains lawful accountable evidence based proportionate transparent restrained reviewable rights respecting fair responsible careful reasoned limited disciplined constitutional impartial necessary consistent measured principled democratic humane effective while protecting national security and the lawful democratic freedoms of citizens. Effective counter terrorism policy depends upon public confidence, because communities are more likely to cooperate with lawful investigations when security institutions demonstrate precision, impartiality, and respect for peaceful civic participation.

Ideological Association, Individual Liability and Guilt by Association

The expression crimes of thought is used in this paper as a jurisprudential warning rather than as an assertion that Indian law creates a literal offence of thinking against government. The concern arises when belief, political sympathy, literature, association, communication, or criticism begins to operate as a practical proxy for criminality despite an insufficiently established connection with prohibited conduct. Criminal law properly examines mental elements such as knowledge and intention when an offence requires them, and terrorism investigations cannot reasonably disregard ideology when it supplies evidence of purpose or motive. However, an essential distinction exists between determining a person's mental state in relation to unlawful conduct and treating the belief itself as the underlying wrong. A constitutional problem emerges when the inquiry shifts from what prohibited act a person committed, intended, assisted, or facilitated to what the person believes, reads, whom the person knows, and whether those beliefs oppose government. Consider several people who encounter the same controversial organisation. One may study the organisation academically, one may report upon it as a journalist, one may have a family relationship with a member, one may share some political grievances, one may support peaceful negotiations, while another may knowingly finance



violence or recruit participants for terrorism. The broad language of association could describe every person, but the legal significance of their behaviour differs profoundly. Treating proximity as decisive can erase distinctions central to individual responsibility, while declaring association irrelevant in every circumstance could prevent authorities from addressing genuine organisational participation. The appropriate constitutional objective is differentiation rather than immunity. The Supreme Court's 2023 judgment in the Arup Bhuyan v State of Assam is central to this debate because the larger Bench reconsidered earlier judgments that had approached mere membership of a banned organisation through doctrines developed in foreign constitutional law and had required violence, incitement, or violent disorder. The larger Bench held that the validity of statutory provisions could not be displaced without the Union being heard and restored the operation of provisions criminalising membership of banned associations. The decision means that contemporary Indian law cannot be summarised by repeating that mere membership is always constitutionally harmless. At the same time, the decision does not justify treating every social contact, ideological resemblance, or intellectual interest as proof of membership or terrorist support. The continuing legal question concerns how membership is proved, how statutory elements are applied, and how courts distinguish identity, sympathy, passive proximity, and active participation. The decision in Vernon v State of Maharashtra supplies another important dimension.

The Supreme Court considered bail appeals arising from the Elgar Parishad proceedings and allegations under multiple UAPA provisions, the case demonstrates the importance of assessing the evidence attributed to each accused rather than treating the broader ideological narrative of a prosecution as a substitute for individualised material. Digital communication intensifies this difficulty, people read contentious materials without adopting them, communicate with individuals whose affiliations they do not fully know, and participate in online groups containing members with sharply different objectives. Digital evidence can be indispensable to terrorism investigations, but its volume and ambiguity increase the importance of context. A constitutional system must guard against an inferential slide in which reading becomes presumed belief, belief becomes presumed membership, membership becomes presumed support, and support becomes presumed terrorism without each legally necessary connection being demonstrated. Guilt by association therefore describes a concern extending beyond a single judicial formula. It identifies the danger that responsibility may become ideological or collective rather than individual and evidential. Preventing that result does not require authorities to ignore meaningful organisational links. It requires them to distinguish passive proximity, lawful engagement, ideological sympathy, active assistance, and criminal participation. The State may protect itself against terrorist organisations, but democratic constitutionalism should remain strong enough to permit ideological diversity without requiring conformity as the price of liberty. Accordingly this section supports a constitutional order in which public power remains lawful accountable evidence based proportionate transparent restrained reviewable rights respecting fair responsible careful reasoned limited disciplined constitutional impartial necessary consistent measured principled democratic humane effective legitimate scrutinised balanced publicly justified institutionally controlled carefully bounded constitutionally supervised independently reviewed legally grounded institutionally accountable publicly defensible democratically legitimate judicially reviewable fact sensitive purpose limited non arbitrary rights conscious security focused citizen centred while protecting national security and the lawful democratic freedoms of citizens. Courts should examine the quality and individual relevance of alleged links, because labels, shared literature, digital communication, or political proximity cannot independently establish the knowledge and intention required by law.

Preventive Powers, Civil Liberties and the Chilling Effect on Dissent

The constitutional debate becomes most serious when preventive or national security powers move from legislative text into the everyday life of citizens because investigation, detention, bond proceedings, prosecution, and public stigma can produce substantial consequences before final guilt is determined. The argument is not that every preventive action constitutes misuse or that every person investigated is necessarily engaged in protected dissent. Such assumptions would disregard legitimate enforcement responsibilities. The issue is institutional. Powers capable of producing profound consequences require safeguards capable of distinguishing genuine threats from democratic participation



before political disagreement becomes presumptive dangerousness. A citizen need not be convicted for governmental action to influence future behaviour. If people believe that strong criticism, lawful association, or participation in unpopular causes may expose them to severe legal processes, some may choose silence even where their activity falls within constitutional protection. This is the chilling effect that broad or unpredictable enforcement may create. It cannot simply be presumed in every controversy, but its possibility explains why legal boundaries matter beyond the person immediately affected. A contemporary illustration appears in the *Neha v State NCT, 2026 of Delhi*, a decision of the Delhi High Court dated 23 October 2026 concerning protests associated with the Cockroach Janta Party. The Court considered a challenge to a notice issued under sections 126 and 130 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita after the petitioner invited people to assemble at Mandi House on 16 October 2026. The judgment records that she was detained at approximately 5.30 pm and released the following day. On 17 October 2026, she received a notice asking why she should not execute a personal bond of 10,000 with one surety in the same amount during an inquiry concerning the maintenance of peace. The police materials alleged that the petitioner arrived with approximately forty to fifty protesters, continued after warnings relating to prohibitory orders, encouraged participation in an unauthorised demonstration, and created an apprehension of a future breach of peace. Those statements were allegations contained in the police report and materials presented to the Special Executive Magistrate. Their reproduction in the judgment did not transform them into final findings that the petitioner had committed violence, incited a criminal offence, or caused a breach of peace. The High Court held that sufficient material existed for the Magistrate to initiate preventive proceedings and that the show cause notice satisfied the statutory requirements. It also held that Mandi House fell within the area covered by the relevant prohibitory order. However, the Court expressly limited its ruling to review at the preliminary show cause stage. It directed the State to provide the

petitioner with the material on which it intended to rely, required observance of natural justice, left the Magistrate to determine independently whether a bond was necessary, and preserved the petitioner's ability to pursue remedies later in the inquiry. The writ petition was dismissed, but the judgment did not finally determine that the petitioner had breached the peace. The episode is therefore valuable not as proof that governmental power was misused or that every police allegation was unfounded, but as an illustration of how preventive public order proceedings can affect political participation before final adjudication. It also shows why strict distinctions must be maintained among allegations, preliminary satisfaction, and findings of guilt. Media descriptions of the CJP as a youth oriented satirical movement and reports concerning other alleged detentions may provide political context, but they should not be represented as judicially established facts unless supported by official orders. The verified legal proceeding concerned preventive public order powers under the BNSS rather than prosecution under the UAPA. That distinction is essential because public order regulation and counter terrorism legislation engage different statutory frameworks even though both can affect dissent. The case also demonstrates that restrictions may involve competing claims. Accordingly this section supports a constitutional order in which public power remains lawful accountable evidence based proportionate while protecting national security and the lawful democratic freedoms of citizens. Preventive action should remain temporary, reviewable, and supported by current material, because speculative predictions of disorder can otherwise impose serious burdens upon liberty without safeguards available in a completed prosecution.

Judicial Review, Legal Accountability and Constitutional Safeguards

The judiciary occupies a critical position in preserving the boundary between national security and protected dissent because the invocation of security may involve matters of executive expertise while simultaneously affecting freedom, equality, association, and personal liberty. Judicial review does not require courts to administer national security, but it does require public power to remain subject to law. Courts provide an independent forum in which statutory authority can be examined, evidence assessed according to appropriate legal standards, procedural safeguards enforced, and constitutional claims considered without leaving the executive as the sole judge of its own power. The decisions in *Kedar Nath Singh v State of Bihar*, *Shreya Singhal v Union of India*, *Arup Bhuyan v State of Assam*, *Vernon v State of Maharashtra*, and *Amit Sahni v Commissioner of Police*; address different legal questions and should not be treated as



interchangeable. *Kedar Nath Singh v State of Bihar* historically distinguished criticism from speech connected with violence or public disorder. *Shreya Singhal v Union of India* developed the distinction among discussion, advocacy, and incitement while invalidating an over broad restriction upon online expression. *Amit Sahni v Commissioner of Police* recognised the right to protest but also addressed the rights of the public where demonstrations occupy public ways. In the *Arup Bhuyan v State of Assam* clarified the legal position concerning statutory membership offences, while *Vernon v State of Maharashtra* demonstrated the importance of evaluating evidence attributed to individual accused persons within UAPA proceedings. Together, these cases reveal that the boundary of protected dissent is not governed by one simple formula. Speech, association, protest, public order, membership, and terrorist support raise different doctrinal questions. The judiciary must therefore avoid both automatic deference and automatic suspicion. National security cannot become a phrase that terminates constitutional examination merely because the governmental interests asserted are serious. The seriousness of those interests may instead demand careful judicial scrutiny. At the same time, courts should not disregard relevant material or replace every preventive assessment with their own view before the statutory inquiry has occurred. The CJP proceeding illustrates this distinction. The Delhi High Court did not adjudicate the ultimate truth of the police allegations. It decided that some material existed for initiating the inquiry, required disclosure and natural justice, and left the substantive determination to the competent Magistrate. Such procedural discipline is particularly important because preventive proceedings operate before an offence is finally established. The principles discussed in *Madhu Limaye v Sub Divisional Magistrate* recognise that preventive justice may be legitimate but that powers affecting liberty require strict observance of procedural safeguards. Responsibility for constitutional restraint does not belong to courts alone. Legislatures must define offences and preventive powers with clarity. Investigative agencies must gather evidence rather than substitute ideological assumptions for proof. Prosecutors must exercise independent professional judgment. Magistrates must apply their minds to the material before them. Political executives must ensure that coercive institutions serve public purposes rather than partisan convenience. Each stage offers an opportunity either to preserve or to weaken the difference between unlawful danger and political opposition. The existence of legal power also does not mean that its maximum use is appropriate in every situation. Proportional and evidence based governance requires public institutions to distinguish circumstances demanding national security intervention from those better addressed through ordinary criminal law, regulation, political dialogue, or judicial resolution. Meaningful access to courts remains indispensable because rights cannot operate effectively if citizens lack a credible forum in which public action may be challenged. Accordingly this section supports a constitutional order in which public power remains lawful accountable evidence based proportionate transparent restrained reviewable while protecting national security and the lawful democratic freedoms of citizens. Reasoned judicial decisions also guide investigators, prosecutors, magistrates, and citizens by clarifying applicable thresholds, correcting unlawful practices, and demonstrating that security claims remain capable of principled examination within constitutional adjudication.

A People Centred Constitutional Framework for National Security

A durable constitutional model should reject the premise that the interests of the people and those of the State necessarily exist in opposition. Democratic government exercises authority for the security, liberty, welfare, dignity, and advancement of the population. The more accurate relationship is therefore one in which people and government remain under the Constitution, while national security protects the institutional conditions necessary for freedom. International human rights law supports this approach. The Articles 19, 21, and 22 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights recognise freedom of expression, peaceful assembly, and association, while also permitting restrictions satisfying the requirements and grounds stated in those provisions. The international framework does not demand a choice between unrestricted political freedom and unlimited security power. It requires legitimate restrictions to remain governed by law, necessity, and the recognised purposes for which limitations are permitted. A people centred Indian model should begin with individualised responsibility. Ideology may supply context, association may constitute evidence, and communication may demonstrate knowledge or intention, but criminal liability should depend



upon statutory elements and proof rather than political identity alone. The second principle should preserve the distinction between government and nation. Political administrations change while the Republic continues, and opposition to those presently exercising authority should not itself establish opposition to India. The third principle should maintain the connection between national security powers and national security purposes. The UAPA offences address serious forms of terrorist and organisational conduct. Their gravity supports effective enforcement, but it also requires careful differentiation from peaceful democratic activity. The fourth principle should demand procedural fairness at every stage. Where liberty may be affected, the individual should know the substance of the allegations, receive the material required by law, possess an opportunity to respond, and have access to independent judicial review. The fifth principle should recognise proportionality and institutional choice. Government should ask not merely whether some power technically exists, but whether the nature of the problem calls for counter terrorism law, ordinary criminal law, public order regulation, administrative action, or democratic engagement. The sixth principle should treat restraint as responsible governance. Government exists not principally to demonstrate its capacity to command, but to use authority for security, justice, welfare, development, and effective administration. Where peaceful criticism reveals a genuine grievance, engagement and reform may strengthen the country more effectively than coercion. This does not require government to accept every demand. Political movements can advance incorrect facts, legally unsustainable claims, or policies that impose unfair burdens upon others. However, disagreement with a demand should not transform the claimant into a security threat. The seventh principle should require precision in public and judicial language. Police allegation, prosecutorial assertion, preliminary judicial satisfaction, bail determination, and final finding of guilt are not equivalent. Treating them as interchangeable can distort both public debate and academic analysis. The CJP proceeding demonstrates the importance of this distinction because the High Court permitted a preventive inquiry to continue but did not finally find that the petitioner had committed a breach of peace. The eighth principle should protect civic space while recognising competing rights. Peaceful protest deserves constitutional protection, but public access, movement, safety, and livelihood may also require accommodation. Accordingly this section supports a constitutional order in which public power remains lawful accountable evidence based proportionate while protecting national security and the lawful democratic freedoms of citizens. The framework should encourage periodic legislative review of exceptional powers, supported by transparent information and parliamentary scrutiny, so that legal safeguards evolve with changing technologies, security risks, and democratic experience.

Conclusion on Protecting National Security and Democratic Dissent

India need not choose between a State strong enough to confront terrorism and a democracy strong enough to protect dissent because both objectives form part of the same constitutional responsibility. Government must possess effective authority against terrorism, violence, conspiracy, unlawful recruitment, financing, and other conduct genuinely threatening public safety and constitutional institutions. However, extraordinary power derives legitimacy from the purpose for which it is conferred and should not become an alternative method for managing political opposition. India's history gives this principle particular importance. The independence struggle demonstrates the significance of challenging unaccountable authority, while the Constitution transformed that historical experience into a system through which disagreement may be pursued by elections, courts, peaceful assembly, expression, association, journalism, and public advocacy. The proper lesson from history is neither suspicion of all government nor unconditional approval of all resistance. It is that public power must remain accountable and directed toward the welfare and security of the people. Ideological belief, controversial association, criticism, and political sympathy may carry evidentiary significance, but they should not replace proof of the legal elements of an offence. Citizens similarly cannot use dissent as a defence for terrorism or violence. The boundary must be maintained through precise legislation, responsible investigation, professional prosecution, procedural fairness, meaningful judicial review, and political restraint. Cases such as *Shreya Singhal v Union of India*, *Amit Sahni v Commissioner of Police*, *Arup Bhuyan v State of Assam*, and *Vernon v State of Maharashtra* demonstrate that speech, protest, association, and terrorist support require distinct legal analysis rather than a single undifferentiated theory of dangerous dissent. The CJP proceeding



further shows why allegations, preliminary satisfaction, and final adjudication must be kept separate. The Delhi High Court allowed preventive proceedings to continue, but it required disclosure and natural justice and did not finally determine that the petitioner had breached the peace. Government must also remember that authority exists for purposes extending beyond coercion. Its powers should protect citizens, improve administration, address grievances, promote development, strengthen institutions, and preserve conditions in which disagreement can occur peacefully. A democracy demonstrates strength when it defeats terrorism, but it demonstrates constitutional strength when it can also tolerate severe criticism. Accordingly this section supports a constitutional order in which public power remains lawful accountable evidence based proportionate transparent restrained reviewable rights respecting fair responsible careful reasoned limited disciplined constitutional impartial necessary consistent measured while protecting national security and the lawful democratic freedoms of citizens. The enduring objective is security governed by law, liberty protected through institutions, and disagreement resolved without confusing citizenship with disloyalty.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Government of India, Ministry of Law and Justice, Legislative Department, The Constitution of India, updated through 10 September 2026.
2. Government of India, India Code, The Unlawful Activities Prevention Act 1967, Act No. 37 of 1967.
3. Kedar Nath Singh v State of Bihar, AIR 1962 SC 955, Supreme Court of India, 1962. <https://indiankanoon.org/prism/>
4. Shreya Singhal v Union of India, Writ Petition Criminal No. 167 of 2012, Supreme Court of India, judgment dated 24 March 2015. <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/110813550/>
5. Arup Bhuyan v State of Assam, Criminal Appeal No. 889 of 2007 and connected matters, Supreme Court of India, judgment dated 24 March 2023. <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/191186354/>
6. Vernon v State of Maharashtra, 2023 INSC 655, Criminal Appeal No. 639 of 2023 with Criminal Appeal No. 640 of 2023, Supreme Court of India, judgment dated 28 July 2023. <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/167636672/>
7. Amit Sahni v Commissioner of Police and Others, Civil Appeal No. 3282 of 2020, Supreme Court of India, judgment dated 7 October 2020. <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/145656971/>
8. Neha v State NCT of Delhi, Writ Petition Criminal No. 3342 of 2026, Delhi High Court, judgment dated 23 October 2026. https://images.assettype.com/barandbench/2026-10-23/9x50em7p/Neha_v_The_State.pdf
9. United Nations General Assembly, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Resolution 2200A XXI, adopted 16 December 1966 and entered into force 23 March 1976. <https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/international-covenant-civil-and-political-rights>
10. United Nations Human Rights Committee, General Comment No. 34 on Article 19, Freedoms of Opinion and Expression, CCPR/C/GC/34, 12 September 2011.

