

**Democratic Dissent, and the Political Psychology of Youth Protest:
Erich Fromm's *Escape from Freedom* in Modern India**

Dr. Syed Azeem Ali

Assistant Professor, Department of English, ACE Engineering College, Hyderabad,
Telangana. INDIA

Email: alisyed2206@gmail.com | Orcid ID: 0009-0004-2034-2398

Paper Received on 25-08-2026, Accepted on 27-09-2026
Published on 29-09-2026; DOI:10.36993/RJOE.2026.11.09.799

Abstract

This article uses Erich Fromm's political psychology to analyse current youth-led protest movements in India. It makes the case that democratic dissent is more than just a fight over governmental policy; rather, it is a conflict over freedom, authority, and political subjectivity. In an era marked by algorithmic communication, political polarisation, and growing state and platform surveillance, the article examines how satire, digital mobilisation, and public assembly become forms of democratic participation using the Cockroach Janta Party (CJP) movement as a modern case study. Using Fromm's distinction between positive and negative freedom, the study examines how citizens negotiate political agency within democratic institutions rather than assessing the validity of any political party or movement. The article incorporates Judith Butler's theory of performative assembly, Michel Foucault's theory of governmentality, Jürgen Habermas's public sphere, and Hannah Arendt's idea of the public realm to expand this study. When taken as a whole, these frameworks show how modern demonstrations in digitally mediated cultures simultaneously challenge political power, create collective identities, and redefine democratic participation. The article makes the case that youth protests are expressions of larger concerns about citizenship, autonomy, representation, and institutional confidence rather than just immediate political complaints. In the conclusion, the research shows that Fromm's criticism of authoritarian tendencies from the middle of the 20th century is still astonishingly applicable to comprehending the political and psychological aspects of democratic dissent in India in the twenty-first century.

Keywords: India; Political Psychology; Youth Protest; Democratic Dissent; Erich Fromm; Public Sphere.

Introduction

In elected democracies, youth-led political mobilisations have experienced an unparalleled revival in the twenty-first century. Public protest has grown to be one of the main ways that people express their demands for accountability, transparency, and democratic participation, from the Arab Spring and Occupy Wall Street to the Hong Kong democracy movement, Fridays for Future, and recent student protests in South Asia. In addition to their political goals, modern protest movements stand out for their creative use of digital media, decentralised organisational structures, symbolic performances, and group public gatherings. These advancements encourage fresh theoretical consideration of the interplay among democracy, political power, and personal liberty.

Over the past ten years, digitally mediated public activism has also increased in India, the largest constitutional democracy in the world. Satire, memes, symbolic performances, and networked communication are increasingly being used by student organisations, youth collectives, civil society organisations, and online communities to express complaints about work, education, governance, and institutional responsibility. One recent instance of this more general phenomenon is the rise of the Cockroach Janta Party (CJP) movement. The movement began as a humorous reaction to political discourse on youth unemployment on social media and developed into a visible public protest that garnered extensive attention in both traditional and digital media. Its meanings are still debatable, reflecting varying interpretations among participants, political actors, journalists, and academics, as is the case with many modern protest movements.

This essay views such movements as manifestations of democratic subjectivity rather than merely as instances of political conflict. The main claim made here is that protests by young people now reveal underlying conflicts about citizenship, freedom, and authority that go beyond current policy disagreements. Erich Fromm's political psychology, whose groundbreaking book *Escape from*

Freedom is still regarded as one of the most prominent analyses of the conflict between individual autonomy and authoritarian societal systems, is especially useful for analysing these conflicts. Fromm questioned the notion that people inherently seek unbridled freedom in his writings following the rise of fascism in Europe. Rather, he contended that freedom often results in feelings of fear, uncertainty, and loneliness, which might encourage people to consciously give up their independence in favour of safety, conformity, or powerful leadership (Fromm 3–25). His difference between "freedom to" realise one's productive capacities and "freedom from" traditional restraints offers a conceptual framework for analysing modern democratic involvement. Fromm focused on the psychological underpinnings of authoritarianism in twentieth-century Europe, but his more general observations on social conformity, alienation, and democratic duty are also quite applicable to modern political cultures.

This essay makes the case that youth-led protest movements can be understood as group efforts to regain what Fromm refers to as productive freedom rather than just as opposition to particular political policies. Citizens seek acknowledgement, exposure, and involvement in democratic institutions through public protests, online campaigns, and symbolic acts. Crucially, this approach does not assume that governmental institutions or protestors always exhibit authoritarian or democratic inclinations. Instead, it examines how political actors in democracies reconcile conflicting conceptions of freedom.

Four significant traditions of modern political theory are discussed in relation to Fromm's political psychology in order to advance this claim. According to Hannah Arendt's theory of the public sphere, politics arises anytime people come together to speak and act in plurality (Arendt 175–247). According to Arendt, public activity is not just a byproduct of political freedom but rather its fundamental basis. This viewpoint is complemented by Michel Foucault's theory of governmentality, which shows how contemporary states control populations through distributed mechanisms of discipline, surveillance, administrative rationality, and self-regulation in addition to coercion (Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population* 87–114). Jürgen Habermas also offers a description of democratic legitimacy based on public deliberation and communicative rationality, emphasising the significance of inclusive public spaces that can support rational political debate (Habermas 27–56). Finally, Judith Butler rethinks public assembly as a performative political act that allows marginalised groups to assert democratic agency, visibility, and acknowledgement (Butler 8–27).

Together, these theoretical stances provide a multifaceted comprehension of modern protest movements. Habermas emphasises communicative legitimacy; Fromm explains the psychological conditions that underlie democratic participation; Arendt places protest within the politics of appearance; Foucault sheds light on how the government handles dissent; and Butler shows how bodily assembly itself is a political claim. When taken as a whole, they provide a thorough framework for examining democratic dissent without reducing political conflict to oversimplified dichotomies of authority versus resistance or state vs society.

This article's methodology combines interpretive political theory with qualitative political discourse analysis. The Cockroach Janta Party movement is examined as a modern case study based on official declarations, publicly available news, and online public discourse. The article does not attempt to give a definitive historical narrative because the movement is still developing. Rather, it looks at how the movement exemplifies more general theoretical issues about freedom, political identity, democratic engagement, and public space in modern India. In order to maintain analytical neutrality and allow for ongoing theoretical interaction, descriptive accounts of recorded events are kept apart from normative interpretation throughout the conversation.

In the conclusion, this study argues that modern youth protest should be viewed as a crucial location for analysing how democracy and political subjectivity are evolving. Fromm's timeless topic of why people either embrace or give up freedom takes on fresh significance in an era marked by digital communication, algorithmic mediation, and increasingly divisive political contexts. This paper argues that the answer is found not only in governmental structures but also in the psychological, linguistic, and performative activities that individuals use to continuously debate what democracy actually means.

Theoretical Structure: Democratic Dissent, Authority, and Freedom

One of the central issues of contemporary political philosophy continues to be the interaction between freedom and political authority. Democratic systems require governance procedures that can uphold social order and administrative stability, even as they guarantee individual liberty, political involvement, and institutional accountability. During times of public protest, when citizens challenge governmental actions while also claiming democratic rights protected by constitutional systems, the ensuing conflict between individual autonomy and

collective power is most apparent. An interdisciplinary theoretical framework that incorporates political psychology, democratic theory, critical social theory, and performance studies is necessary to comprehend these processes. In order to explain how democratic dissent operates concurrently as a psychological, communicative, institutional, and corporeal practice, this paper engages Erich Fromm's political psychology in dialogue with the writings of Hannah Arendt, Michel Foucault, Jürgen Habermas, and Judith Butler.

Erich Fromm: *The Authoritarian Personality* and Freedom

One of the most important studies of the psychological underpinnings of contemporary political activity is Erich Fromm's *Escape from Freedom* (1941). Fromm challenged the notion that freedom inevitably leads to democratic citizenship while writing against the backdrop of Nazism in Europe. Rather, he contended that strong feelings of loneliness, ambiguity, and existential uneasiness were also brought about by modernity's release from conventional religious, feudal, and communal systems (Fromm 3–31). Individual autonomy was made possible by the breakdown of inherited social identities, but it also exposed people to emotions of helplessness and insecurity.

Fromm makes a distinction between "positive freedom" (also known as "freedom to") and "negative freedom" (also known as "freedom from"). Liberation from outside limitations like political dominance or inflexible social hierarchies is known as negative freedom. Despite its historical significance, this type of freedom is still lacking since people who have been released from old authority frequently face uncertainty and responsibility. On the other hand, positive freedom refers to the ability to fulfil one's creative, logical, and social potential by actively engaging in communal life (Fromm 220–45). Therefore, democracy cannot be reduced to legal rights alone; it also depends on the psychological growth of independent citizens who can exercise their freedom in a responsible manner.

This divide provides important context for understanding modern protest movements. Public protests often result from broader experiences of political marginalisation, institutional mistrust, and reduced civic engagement in addition to discontent with specific governmental choices. Thus, protest turns into an attempt to convert legal political rights into real democratic agency. According to this viewpoint, collective action is an effort to recover participation in public life in order to achieve positive freedom.

Fromm's notion of the "authoritarian character," which characterises a psychological orientation marked by concurrent subordination to perceived authority and dominance over inferior groups, is equally important (Fromm 141–66). Crucially, Fromm portrays this as a sociological and psychological pattern rather than a feature of any particular political ideology or administration. In a variety of institutional situations, authoritarian inclinations can arise whenever social isolation, fear, and instability promote compliance over critical thought. Therefore, in order to fend off authoritarian tendencies, democratic societies must constantly foster independent thought, civic engagement, and institutional accountability.

Fromm's more comprehensive theory of "social character" sheds more light on how political and economic structures influence societal psychological orientations. The comparatively stable thought, feeling, and behaviour patterns generated by specific social systems are referred to as social character (Fromm, *The Sane Society* 71–104). Fromm highlights the reciprocal interaction between institutions and psychological development rather than viewing political ideas as solely personal decisions. Rapid information flows, algorithmic personalisation, and constant political messaging are characteristics of modern digital communication settings that offer new circumstances for the development of social character. As a result, interconnections between media systems, institutional frameworks, and personal psychological experiences give rise to political subjectivity in the modern era.

Hannah Arendt: Political Action and Public Space

Hannah Arendt provides a complementary explanation of politics as collective activity in the public sphere, while Fromm describes the psychological prerequisites for democratic participation. Arendt contends in *The Human Condition* that the ability to stand before others through speech and deed, rather than private autonomy, is what constitutes political freedom (Arendt 175–247). Every time a citizen enters a public setting to discuss, convince, and start a group action, politics is present.

Arendt's notion of "plurality" is especially pertinent to democratic protest. Humans share a shared universe but yet have separate viewpoints and experiences, making them both equal and different at the same time. Therefore, maintaining areas where different voices can interact without eradicating differences is essential to democratic politics. This idea is best illustrated by public protests, which turn

physical locations into venues for political visibility where a variety of people express common issues while retaining their unique identities. Arendt views political power as arising from communal activity itself, in contrast to conceptions that only associate politics with governmental institutions. When people work together to achieve shared goals, power is created; it vanishes when such group action ceases (Arendt 194–201). Therefore, democratic protest should be seen as the active construction of political power through popular engagement rather than only as opposition to governmental authority. Arendt's study also emphasises how important public appearances are symbolically. Marches, assemblies, and demonstrations use their visual use of common public areas to convey political claims in addition to spoken arguments. Thus, political legitimacy is negotiated through both performance and discourse.

Michel Foucault: Population Management and Governmentality

By showing that contemporary governance functions through distributed methods of administration, knowledge creation, surveillance, and normalisation rather than only through sovereign force, Michel Foucault greatly broadens conventional understandings of political authority. According to Foucault's lectures on "governmentality," contemporary government is the "conduct of conduct", the variety of methods used to direct, control, and manage populations (Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population* 87–114). In addition to traditional legal authority, governmentality includes educational institutions, administrative processes, statistical expertise, policing techniques, and public health systems. Therefore, democratic regimes govern not only by enacting laws but also by influencing the circumstances in which people make decisions, evaluate information, and control their own behaviour. This viewpoint is especially useful for examining modern protest movements.

Public protests frequently turn into places where conflicting types of civic agency and governmental rationalities collide. While political authorities must concurrently defend constitutional rights, uphold public order, and manage complicated metropolitan contexts, protesters demand attention, recognition, and institutional responsiveness. Analysis of these encounters is encouraged by Foucault's paradigm, which does not reduce them to oversimplified narratives of resistance or dominance. Additionally, in digitally mediated society, Foucault's views of surveillance take on new significance. A growing amount of modern political communication takes place on social media sites that are controlled by data

collection, algorithmic recommendation systems, and platform moderation. These technological infrastructures alter how political speech is visible and have an impact on the structure and experience of democratic participation.

Jürgen Habermas: Democratic Communication and the Public Sphere

Jürgen Habermas concentrates on communicative legitimacy, whereas Foucault stresses governmental rationalities. Habermas contends in *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* that democratic administration depends on public forums where people can debate issues without being dominated or coerced (Habermas 27–56). Public thinking, not just administrative decision-making, is the source of legitimate political authority. Knowledge digitally networked protest movements still require a knowledge of Habermas's concept of the "public sphere." Even though modern communication contexts are actually different from the bourgeois public sphere that Habermas articulated, possibilities for inclusive public discourse are still necessary for democratic legitimacy. When citizens believe that current communication systems are not adequately responsive to public issues, protest movements can result. Thus, protests serve as both a means of expressing discontent and a call for more democratic discourse. By looking at digital public spheres with fragmented audiences, automated curation, and participatory media cultures, recent research has expanded on Habermas's ideas. In order to influence public opinion and political accountability, these digital platforms are increasingly interacting with parliamentary discussion, journalists, and civil society organisations rather than taking the place of established political institutions.

Judith Butler: Democratic Visibility, Assembly, and Embodiment

By highlighting the corporeal aspects of democratic politics, Judith Butler's idea of performative assembly completes this multidisciplinary framework. Butler makes the case in *Notes Toward a Performative Theory of Assembly* that physical presence at public events constitutes political speech (Butler 8–27). Before any official political declaration is made, people gathered in public squares, parks, streets, and university campuses make claims to recognition. Butler argues that assembly shows that democratic engagement goes beyond election processes. Public gatherings of bodies demand political visibility while revealing common conditions of precarity, vulnerability, and reliance. Therefore, protest functions as both a material occupancy of public space and a symbolic form of communication. This realisation is particularly pertinent to youth movements that integrate online mobilisation with

offline protests. Organization and narrative production may be made easier by digital communication, but bodily presence in common public spaces is ultimately necessary for democratic visibility. Even in electronically mediated democracies, actual political participation is still crucial, as seen by the shift from hashtag campaigns to street demonstrations.

Case Study: Democratic Participation, Satirical Politics, and Youth Protest in Modern India

A growing number of modern democratic protests take place at the nexus of digital communication, symbolic performance, and actual public gathering. Twenty-first-century demonstrations frequently originate from decentralised online communities that use humour, memes, visual symbols, and participatory media to express political grievances, in contrast to many twentieth-century social movements organised through centralised political parties or trade unions. These movements often use networked communication to mobilise followers across social and geographic borders while challenging traditional organisational hierarchies. This shift in democratic activism is best illustrated by the rise of the Cockroach Janta Party (CJP) movement in India.

According to reports, the campaign started on social media after controversial public statements that many young people took to mean that concerns about unemployment and educational possibilities were unimportant. In response, online users appropriated the metaphor in humorous and sardonic ways, turning it into a shared political identity. Through internet campaigns, street protests, student involvement, and media discussion, what started out as digital humour progressively developed into more widespread public engagement. The movement shows how modern democratic opposition increasingly depends on symbolic communication rather than conventional intellectual speech, regardless of one's political viewpoint. From the standpoint of political communication, satire serves a crucial democratic purpose. Throughout history, political satire has served as a tool for citizens to question authority without necessarily resorting to direct conflict. Humour has allowed marginalised groups to challenge prevailing political narratives and create alternative forums for public conversation, from Aristophanes' classical comedies to contemporary digital memes. This legacy has been strengthened by modern digital platforms, which enable symbolic information to spread quickly among a variety of audiences, frequently overcoming institutional or organisational barriers.

The CJP movement's deliberate language appropriation serves as an example of this dynamic. Instead of rejecting the contentious metaphor, participants saw it as a sign of political visibility and group resiliency. These acts of symbolic inversion are similar to more general practices of identity reclamation seen in many social movements, where labels that were originally meant to stigmatise, specific groups are changed into symbols of solidarity. Because meanings are constantly renegotiated through repeated public performances, Judith Butler contends that political language is unstable (Butler 163–90). According to this viewpoint, the movement's symbolic practices show how political identities are created performatively as opposed to just being represented. An important factor in this change was digital media. Decentralised coordination was made possible by social networking sites without the need for centralised leadership structures. Short-form videos, memes, livestreams, hashtags, and user-generated content all helped spread political messages quickly and promote participation. According to Manuel Castells, horizontal communication, as opposed to hierarchical institutions, provides a significant portion of the organisational ability of modern networked movements (Castells 8–20). Through constant engagement, participants become both producers and consumers of political language, jointly forming movement narratives.

Digital communication does, however, also present new obstacles to democratic engagement. Emotionally charged content is given priority by algorithmic recommendation systems, which often magnify polarisation, false information, and selective exposure. Social media platforms are rapidly shaping political visibility based on financial incentives and computer logics, rather than serving as impartial public spaces. As a result, modern protest groups have to negotiate intricate connections between official communication, journalistic representation, platform administration, and citizen involvement. These dynamics provide options for political participation outside of conventional institutional channels while also complicating Habermas's standard idea of rational-critical public discussion.

Another important aspect of the movement is the shift from internet activism to in-person protests. Digital expressions of discontent were converted into tangible political action through public gatherings. Students, youth groups, and members of civil society convened in public areas to make demands regarding government accountability, employment opportunities, and educational policies. The demonstrations collectively affirmed the legitimacy of public engagement within

democratic processes, despite the fact that individuals' specific motivations and political affiliations varied. A helpful framework for understanding these developments is provided by Hannah Arendt's theory of political action. According to Arendt, politics arises anytime people congregate in public to act and talk in front of others (Arendt 198–220). Therefore, by turning common urban areas into venues for democratic visibility, public protests enact citizenship itself rather than just being manifestations of discontent. Participants demand acknowledgement from institutions of governance while affirming their involvement in the political community through collective appearance.

Crucially, it is difficult to describe the action as either spontaneous or wholly planned due to the multiplicity of individuals. Overlapping networks of students, activists, journalists, civil society organisations, professional groups, and political actors whose interests overlap but do not necessarily coincide are frequently involved in modern protests. Some participants focus on job possibilities, some on educational reform, and still others on more general issues related to democratic responsibility. Arendt's remark that political communities are formed by the cohabitation of various viewpoints within a common public space rather than by agreement is reflected in this plurality.

The intricacy of democratic administration is also demonstrated by how the government reacts to public demonstrations. In constitutional democracies, the duties of upholding public order, guaranteeing public safety, and managing urban infrastructure coexist with the protection of the freedoms of expression and assembly. When these obligations seem to clash during large-scale protests, tensions often result. As a result, administrative choices on crowd control, traffic control, public assembly permits, and policing become politically relevant, leading to conflicting interpretations among government officials, demonstrators, journalists, and spectators.

Analysis of these relationships beyond the traditional dichotomies of repression and resistance is encouraged by Michel Foucault's idea of governmentality. Governmentality highlights how administrative rationalities intended to control populations while maintaining institutional stability underpin contemporary government (Foucault 87–114). As a result, public protests become places where democratic involvement and state strategies converge. While governmental authorities aim to strike a balance between constitutional liberties and public

administration responsibilities, protesters demand political visibility and institutional responsiveness. Foucault focuses on the pragmatic processes by which political order is negotiated rather than presuming fixed goals.

Public perception of modern protest movements is further shaped by media depiction. Different narratives about the same events are often created by social media platforms, independent digital journalism, traditional news organisations, and citizen reporting. According to framing theory, media sources shape public perception by highlighting some parts of political events while downplaying others. As a result, the interpretation of protest movements varies according to whether reporting emphasises administrative issues, political strategy, public discomfort, constitutional rights, or symbolic value. Habermas's observation that democratic legitimacy depends on communication processes rather than just institutional authority is reflected in this diversity of tales. Governmental declarations, media reporting, civil society discourse, scholarly research, and ordinary talk all constantly interact to shape public opinion. Therefore, democratic protest serves the public interest not just by voicing disapproval but also by broadening the scope of topics that can be discussed collectively.

According to Erich Fromm, these movements have psychological importance that goes beyond their immediate political objectives. By converting personal concerns into group civic action, youth involvement in public protests might be seen as an attempt to overcome feelings of political alienation. Feelings of uncertainty that are typical of what Fromm refers to as contemporary sensations of insecurity are frequently produced by worries about work, education, social mobility, and institutional responsiveness. By developing shared democratic activity instead of passive resignation, collective participation provides chances to replace isolation with solidarity and promote positive freedom. However, Fromm also warns against idealising such movements. Under various circumstances, the same psychological mechanisms that promote democratic participation may result in polarisation, conformity, or a reliance on charismatic leadership. Therefore, protest's democratic significance cannot be ascertained by its mere existence. Rather, it depends on whether movements foster respect for constitutional processes, pluralistic discourse, institutional accountability, and critical thinking. In order to be a democratic citizen, one must constantly balance individual liberty with group activity. Therefore, the CJP movement can be used to evaluate more general changes in democratic involvement

rather than as proof of a particular political path. It demonstrates how comedy serves as a political language, how internet communication transforms civic organization, how democratic visibility is created through public assembly, and how institutions react to new kinds of political participation.

Most significantly, it shows that symbolic conflicts over legitimacy, public engagement, and acknowledgement are becoming more and more crucial in modern democratic politics, rather than relying just on electoral competition. In this way, the movement mirrors broader changes in democratic life around the world. Digital technology and performative politics are being used more and more by citizens in modern countries to negotiate interactions with governmental entities. It's unclear if these changes will ultimately increase democratic engagement or worsen political division. However, they clearly show how citizens, institutions, the media, and public space are constantly reconstructing freedom in contemporary democracies.

According to the above-mentioned analysis, traditional frameworks that interpret protests only as responses to governmental policy or political rivalry are insufficient to understand modern youth protest in India. Rather, movements like the Cockroach Janta Party (CJP) show how democratic citizenship is changing more broadly, with political engagement becoming a struggle for visibility, acknowledgement, communicative agency, and psychological autonomy. When the perspectives of Erich Fromm, Hannah Arendt, Michel Foucault, Jürgen Habermas, and Judith Butler are merged, democratic dissent becomes more than just resistance; it is a continuous process by which people debate what freedom actually means.

Freedom Beyond Electoral Democracy

Erich Fromm's assertion that constitutional structures and election processes alone cannot sustain democracy is one of his political psychology's most enduring findings. Formal political rights do not always result in individuals who are mentally independent and able to responsibly exercise them (Fromm 225–39). According to Fromm, freedom is the positive ability to actively engage in social and political life rather than just the lack of coercion. In modern democracies marked by swift technical advancement, unstable economies, and growing political polarisation, this divide becomes especially important. There are more educational options available to many young people, but they also have to deal with unstable job markets, growing living expenses, and more rivalry for career advancement. These structural changes

lead to types of insecurity that go beyond socioeconomic circumstances to include concerns about political efficacy, identity, and belonging.

Therefore, it is possible to understand the rise of youth-led protest as an effort to turn individual experiences of uncertainty into group democratic action. People who might otherwise face political isolation have the chance to engage in common civic activities through public protests. Participants aim to exert positive freedom through group interaction rather than fleeing freedom through passive conformity. Crucially, this view does not imply that all protest movements inevitably promote democratic ideals. Fromm constantly cautions that if ideological certainty takes the place of critical thinking, communal mobilisation may also promote intolerance, conformity, or reliance on charismatic authority (Fromm 141–66). Only when democratic protest promotes plurality, discourse, institutional responsibility, and independent judgement can it continue to have emancipatory potential.

The Use of Public Space in Democratic Practice

This psychological study is greatly extended by Hannah Arendt's notion of politics, which emphasises that freedom can only have political significance through public activity. People become citizens by acting and speaking like members of a political society in public, not just by having legal rights (Arendt 175–247). This idea is aptly demonstrated by the protest movements of today. Public squares, streets, college campuses, and digital communication platforms are all becoming more interconnected venues for democratic engagement. These assemblies are important not just because of their demands but also because they affirm that citizens with the capacity for collective action are ultimately the source of political authority.

When analysing modern youth movements, Arendt's concept of plurality is particularly crucial. Communities of participants are rarely ideologically homogeneous. For different but related causes, students, professionals, educators, journalists, civil society organisations, and independent citizens often participate in protests. Such diversity is a defining feature of democratic politics itself, not a sign of weakness. Simplified depictions of political strife as a binary antagonism between the state and society are also contested by plurality. Civil society and democratic institutions continue to be mutually constitutive rather than fundamentally hostile. One way that this relationship is continuously renegotiated is through public protest.

Democratic Negotiation and Governmentality

By focusing on routine administrative, regulatory, and governance processes rather than sovereign authority, Michel Foucault's concept of governmentality further confuses conventional understandings of political conflict (Foucault 87–114). In addition to legislative power, modern democratic states are governed by educational systems, statistical expertise, public health organisations, digital infrastructures, policing techniques, and bureaucratic processes. As a result, public protests are no longer only conflicts between rulers and demonstrators, but rather interactions between many types of reason. In terms of administrative coordination, constitutional order, and public safety, governments have legitimate obligations. Protesters concurrently invoke the rights to free speech, assembly, and political participation guaranteed by the constitution. Rather than necessarily signifying a collapse in democracy, the ensuing tensions represent divergent perspectives on how democratic governance ought to function.

These dynamics are greatly amplified by digital technologies. Modern political engagement takes place in settings shaped by data-driven communication, platform moderation, algorithmic recommendation systems, and surveillance technology. Through privately held technology infrastructures, whose working logics are still only partially accessible, citizens are increasingly exposed to political information. From a Foucauldian standpoint, these advancements show how governmental rationalities have spread beyond conventional state structures. Complex connections between governments, businesses, media outlets, technology platforms, and individuals themselves are becoming more and more important in governance. Therefore, critical engagement with both political power and the infrastructures that influence public communication is necessary for democratic participation.

Rethinking the Public Domain

The public sphere theory of Jürgen Habermas offers a crucial normative framework for assessing these changes. Democratic legitimacy depends not only on regular elections but also on continual chances for citizens to debate in inclusive settings (Habermas 27–56). When protest movements increase public discussion rather than substituting exclusion or polarisation for conversation, they support democratic life. This ideal is both strengthened and weakened by digital communication. Social media platforms facilitate decentralised civic organising and

quick information distribution, which lowers obstacles to political engagement. Through networked communication, marginalised voices may become more visible than ever before. Algorithmic personalisation, on the other hand, divides public conversation into several overlapping information spaces. People are coming across more and more politically homogeneous content that limits exposure to different viewpoints while reinforcing their views. As a result, democratic communication becomes both more polarised and more participative. This conflicted change is reflected in the CJP movement. Rapid organising and public visibility were made possible by digital platforms, which also produced conflicting narratives about the goals, legitimacy, and political ramifications of the movement. Habermas's continued importance is highlighted by this plurality: democratic societies need communicative mechanisms that can maintain rational disagreement in the face of ideological difference.

Assembly as a Language of Politics

By highlighting the fact that democratic politics cannot be limited to verbal communication alone, Judith Butler's notion of performative assembly broadens this conversation even further. The mere presence of bodies assembling in public constitutes political declarations (Butler 8–27). This performative aspect is best illustrated by youth demonstrations. Participants use collective occupation of public space as a means of communication in addition to speeches, slogans, and social media posts. Ordinary urban settings become apparent venues for political contestation when they are present. Despite the growth of digital communication, this tangible aspect of democratic involvement is still essential. Butler's more general claim about performativity is supported by the symbolic activities seen in the CJP movement. Collective performances, visual symbols, and satirical identities do more than just reflect pre-existing political communities; they deliberately create new political identities. Recurring public performances that create collective identities and encourage wider participation are increasingly leading to the emergence of democratic citizenship.

Moving Towards a Democratic Dissent Political Psychology

According to the integration of these theoretical stances, modern democratic protest should be viewed as a multifaceted process comprising institutional, communicative, psychological, and performative changes. Fromm discusses why people who are insecure want autonomy or uniformity. Arendt shows how public

participation gives autonomy political importance. Instead of relying solely on royal authority, Foucault shows how governance increasingly functions through scattered institutional practices. According to Habermas, the normative basis of democratic legitimacy is communication. Butler provides examples of how visibility becomes political agency through communal embodiment. When taken as a whole, these frameworks refute reductionist readings of protest movements as either clear manifestations of democratic virtue or dangers to political order. The situation of democratic dissent is more nuanced. It challenges governmental authority while affirming democratic participation; it mobilises digital technologies while exposing their limitations; it creates collective identities while maintaining individual plurality; and it simultaneously criticises established institutions while relying on them for constitutional protection.

Fromm is also repositioned within modern democratic philosophy by this integrated framework. Even while *Escape from Freedom* was published during the height of fascism in Europe, its fundamental theme, the connection between political freedom and psychological insecurity remains remarkably pertinent in democracies that rely heavily on digital media. Globalisation, technological advancement, economic instability, and quickly changing media ecosystems have created new types of uncertainty that today's citizens must deal with. In such circumstances, fostering individuals who are capable of critical thought, civic duty, and positive public participation is just as important to democratic resilience as institutional design. The more fruitful question is about the circumstances in which democratic dissent promotes institutional learning, communicative inclusivity, and civic trust rather than whether modern protests generally help or harm democracy. Fromm and his theoretical interlocutors respond that democracy thrives when freedom is understood as the shared ability to critically, responsibly, and collectively participate in the ongoing construction of public life rather than as solitary individualism or blind conformity.

Conclusion

This essay has made the case that modern Indian youth protests should be viewed as more than just a reaction to pressing political issues. Instead, it symbolises a larger conflict over political acceptance, democratic engagement, and the definition of freedom in a fast evolving social and technical landscape. The paper has shown that public dissent is increasingly emerging through the intersection of digital

communication, symbolic performance, public assembly, and institutional negotiation, using the Cockroach Janta Party (CJP) movement as a modern case study. These advancements cast doubt on conventional conceptions of political engagement, which emphasise electoral rivalry while ignoring the regular activities that uphold democratic citizenship.

The primary theoretical framework for interpreting these events is provided by Erich Fromm's *Escape from Freedom*. For comprehending modern democratic societies, Fromm's distinction between positive and negative freedom is still remarkably pertinent. In addition to constitutional rights issues, modern individuals face psychological conditions influenced by political communication, institutional trust, technological advancement, and economic uncertainty. Therefore, it is possible to see youth protest as an effort to transform experiences of political marginalisation and alienation into collective democratic agency. However, Fromm's caution that insecurity may equally promote conformity and reliance on authority serves as a reminder to academics that public mobilisation alone cannot be used to assess democratic participation. The ability of citizens to engage in institutional involvement, critical thinking, and pluralistic discourse determines the quality of democratic freedom.

The paper has also demonstrated how reading Fromm's political psychology with Hannah Arendt, Michel Foucault, Jürgen Habermas, and Judith Butler increases its explanatory value. Arendt shows that communal action in common public areas is the only way that political freedom may take on significance. According to Foucault, democratic governance increasingly functions not only through sovereign authority but also through distributed practices of administration, monitoring, and regulation. Butler emphasises the performative relevance of embodied assembly as a type of democratic speech, while Habermas stresses the vital function of communicative legitimacy and inclusive public discourse. When taken as a whole, these theoretical traditions shed light on the performative, institutional, psychological, and linguistic aspects of modern democratic dissent.

Political satire has grown in importance as a language of democratic engagement, as seen by the Cockroach Janta Party movement. Citizens can express their political complaints while also creating new forms of collective identity through humour, irony, memes, and symbolic acts. Digital platforms provide previously unheard-of chances for decentralised civic engagement, but they also present issues

with algorithmic exposure, fractured public discourse, and platform governance. As a result, democratic engagement takes place in a public realm that is becoming more and more hybrid, where online communication and in-person gatherings complement each other. By contending that the state vs society dichotomy is not the only way to understand teenage protest, this study also advances modern democratic philosophy. Civic engagement and institutional governance must constantly be negotiated in constitutional democracies. While citizens have equally valid rights to expression, assembly, and political criticism, governments have legitimate obligations with regard to public administration, public order, and constitutional stability.

Maintaining institutional systems that may accommodate disagreement without compromising civic trust or constitutional values is essential to democratic resilience. In this view, protest is an integral part of democracy rather than something that exists outside of it. In a broader sense, the paper argues that political psychology should be given more consideration in research on democratic engagement. The psychological experiences that citizens have when interacting with democratic life are often overlooked in favour of institutional architecture, electoral systems, digital communication, or political economics in contemporary studies. Fromm reminds us that in the end, democracy rests not just on institutions but also on people who are able to use their freedom properly. The fact that anxiety, alienation, and insecurity are still prevalent in technologically advanced nations suggests that the psychological underpinnings of democracy are just as significant now as they were in 1941, when *Escape from Freedom* was originally published. By comparing youth movements in democratic societies, future study may expand this multidisciplinary approach.

Analysing the parallels and discrepancies between protest movements in East Asia, Africa, Latin America, Europe, and India could shed more light on how institutional arrangements, political cultures, and digital technologies influence modern democratic involvement. Similarly, a more thorough knowledge of how democratic citizenship is reconstructed in the context of algorithmic communication and worldwide political instability may result from multidisciplinary interaction with political psychology, media studies, sociology, and communication studies. Erich Fromm's contention that democracy is neither a fixed structural achievement nor a simply constitutional arrangement is ultimately what makes him so relevant today. Democracy is an ongoing ethical and psychological endeavour that calls for citizens who can strike a balance between personal freedom and group accountability.

Regardless of its immediate political results, today's youth protest serves as a reminder that freedom is still an incomplete democratic practice that must be continuously negotiated through institutional accountability, public action, communication, and the common desire to take part in a democratic society's political life.

Works Cited

- Arendt, Hannah. *The Human Condition*. 2nd ed., University of Chicago Press, 1998.
- Arendt, Hannah. *On Revolution*. Penguin Books, 2006.
- Butler, Judith. *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative*. Routledge, 1997.
- Butler, Judith. *Notes Toward a Performative Theory of Assembly*. Harvard UP, 2015.
- Castells, Manuel. *Networks of Outrage and Hope: Social Movements in the Internet Age*. 3rd ed., Polity Press, 2022.
- Dean, Jodi. *Crowds and Party*. Verso, 2016.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan, Vintage Books, 1995.
- Foucault, Michel. *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977–1978*. Translated by Graham Burchell, Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Fraser, Nancy. "Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy." *Social Text*, nos. 25–26, 1990, pp. 56–80.
- Fromm, Erich. *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness*. Continuum, 1992.
- Fromm, Erich. *Escape from Freedom*. Henry Holt, 1994.
- Fromm, Erich. *The Sane Society*. Routledge, 2001.
- Gerbaudo, Paolo. *The Digital Party: Political Organisation and Online Democracy*. Pluto Press, 2019.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*. Translated by William Rehg, MIT Press, 1996.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Translated by Thomas Burger, MIT Press, 1989.
- Harcourt, Bernard E. *Exposed: Desire and Disobedience in the Digital Age*. Harvard UP, 2015.

- Jaffrelot, Christophe. *Modi's India: Hindu Nationalism and the Rise of Ethnic Democracy*. Princeton UP, 2021.
- Juris, Jeffrey S. *Networking Futures: The Movements against Corporate Globalization*. Duke UP, 2008.
- Mehta, Pratap Bhanu. "Democracy, Constitutionalism and the Indian State." *India Review*, vol. 22, no. 4, 2023, pp. 347–365.
- Mouffe, Chantal. *Agonistics: Thinking the World Politically*. Verso, 2013.
- Mudde, Cas, and Cristóbal Rovira Kaltwasser. *Populism: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford UP, 2017.
- Norris, Pippa. *Cultural Backlash: Trump, Brexit, and Authoritarian Populism*. Cambridge UP, 2019.
- Palshikar, Suhas. "Democracy and Opposition Politics in Contemporary India." *Studies in Indian Politics*, vol. 12, no. 1, 2024, pp. 1–17.
- Papacharissi, Zizi. *Affective Publics: Sentiment, Technology, and Politics*. Oxford UP, 2015.
- Tarrow, Sidney. *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics*. 3rd ed., Cambridge UP, 2011.
- Taylor, Astra. *Democracy May Not Exist, but We'll Miss It When It's Gone*. Metropolitan Books, 2019.
- Tilly, Charles, and Sidney Tarrow. *Contentious Politics*. 2nd ed., Oxford UP, 2015.
- Tufekci, Zeynep. *Twitter and Tear Gas: The Power and Fragility of Networked Protest*. Yale UP, 2017.