

PAK'S DECLINE

The anticipated defeat of Pakistan at India's hands in the T-20 cricket world cup group match in Colombo is symptomatic of that country. The problem with Pakistani cricket team is that it depends too much on Allah and bad mouthing others than working to improve its performance. Pakistan cricket Board is highly politicised, follows nepotism and has no long term plan to shape up its team to be of some reckoning. When it's close to playing against India – a top class team in the world of cricket- suddenly motor mouth Pakistan experts speak in full bravado as if words could help their imbecile team to win a match against a formidable opponent. After the defeat, the experts, former players and who is who of Pakistani cricket start bashing their players mercilessly. Against these experts fail to see the bigger picture which is leading to humiliating defeats of their team – the lack of clarity and moral rot that has set in their system. If a country raises terrorists as their support systems and proxy army, then protects them in cantonments while shedding crocodile tears as “victim of terrorism” there is something fundamentally wrong with Pakistan. The same thought percolates even to sports and its management. Haven't we see Shahid Afridi giving a call for jihad against India in Kashmir?

Not only cricket, Pakistan needs to reboot its thinking, systems and fundamentals. It stands exposed before the world. It's hollow from inside with dwindling economy which is so much dependent on loans from other countries and IMF. Bravado alone does not take a country ahead especially at a time of dynamic geo-strategic shift in the world. Also, as captain Surya Kumar Yadav said, Pakistan must stop self glorification by comparing itself with India, applies to all fields. India has not only moved up in socio-economic indices while making sure Pakistan diabolic game plan does not succeed.

Why new realities demand a fresh start

Umang Kohli

India has had great ties with the Hasina Government, but because of geopolitical interference and internal political dynamics inside Bangladesh, the government fell. Now, should the Indian Government keep holding to the legacy of Hasina or move forward, taking into consideration the new reality? Has the time come for India to reset its ties with Bangladesh?

To be fair to the Bangladeshi Army, the forces remained neutral and firm after Hasina was ousted. They have also been able to ensure more or less a fair election. Once the popular vote has been reflected in the mandate, does it not warrant India to reset its ties with the new government?

India does have a trade surplus with Bangladesh and, rhetoric besides, our states in the Northeast can use the Bangladesh ports more effectively. The Indian Army has had close ties with the Bangladeshi Army and that equation needs to be retained. The NDC course in Bangladesh has been attended by many of our top Generals and many Bangladeshi Generals have been trained/educated in India.

Under the Yunus regime, things moved south really fast and it looked like a major “setback” or outright stalemate.

Biggest issues? Border killings kept happening, water-sharing – like Teesta – stayed stuck, and trade talks froze while Bangladesh cozied up to Pakistan and China instead. Yunus even called India's Northeast “landlocked,” which did not help. A diplomatic chill set in – no real progress, just barbs and restrictions. And then communal violence in



Bangladesh made matters worse.

Now, with BNP sweeping the polls, a reset is good for both countries. Obviously, India cannot be handing over Hasina but, at the same time, our bilateral relations with Bangladesh need to come out of her shadow.

Coordination and Cooperation

Anti-terrorism: Bangladesh was created on the premise of hope, where Pakistan was to be totally shunted out. However, Bangladesh has hobnobbed with ISI in the last six months, raising fears of a rise in terrorism from their soil. ULFA used Bangladeshi soil for attacks back in the day, before Hasina came to power.

However, some days back, BNP straight-up promised “zero tolerance” for terrorism – no shelter, no support to anyone using the country against

neighbours. Tarique Rahman's adviser even said out loud they want stronger counter-terror sharing with India, not isolation. Like, “share evidence, build cooperation.”

Border: Bangladesh has been accusing India of allowing in murderers and India has been complaining about smuggling. Mutual patrols, tech like drones for monitoring, are the way forward.

Water: Teesta's deal, maybe interim sharing till a treaty, with joint monitoring, is a confidence-building measure.

Trade: Rather than political mudslinging, both countries need to speed up customs, make more ports, and build rail links. We need to cut red tape and add digital clearance.

Security: India does not want anti-India groups operating from Bangladeshi

soil. Quiet intelligence swaps may help.

Military-to-military ties need to be worked upon. Bangladesh needs to be clearly told that both Pakistan and China are a red flag and they need to stay clear of their military influence.

People-to-People: Student exchanges, tourism, and cultural festivals need to pick up to ensure a reset. Movies and literature bind the two nations too.

Ensuring Safety of Minorities: Bangladesh has seen the rise of Jamaat, which has roots in radicalism. Attacks on minorities and temples create a vibe of disharmony between the two nations.

Bangladesh would have to be more proactive against such attacks.

Illegal migration: One of the sour points India has been concerned about. This kind of illegal migration needs to stop immediately and Bangladeshi border outposts should develop mechanisms to do that.

Bottom Line: Tarique Rahman's team is leaning into “harmony first.” From what they are saying – zero tolerance for attacks, quick probes into any flare-ups, and this idea of a multi-faith Citizen Investigation Commission – this is a welcome change from what Yunus offered.

India wants security and no Pakistan drift. Bangladesh needs steady trade. A rail link between Akhaura-Agartala could help. China poking in does not help the India-Bangladesh relationship.

Ties may not become a “golden era” again overnight, but they must head towards a functional, mutually useful relationship. India will push democracy, Dhaka will balance.

WHY SHIVA HAS A THOUSAND NAMES

Ashwani Guruji

Shiv tattva is not experienced by an ordinary person because he does not need it. A basic person spends his life in the pursuit of the five senses, which pertain to the five basic elements and the five basic chakras. The sense of smell is controlled by Mooladhar, sense of taste by Swadhisthan, sense of sight by Manipoorak, sense of touch by Anahad and sense of sound by Vishuddhi.

These five are sufficient for the daily pleasures, which one indulges in from morning till night. There is no need for anything beyond for experience of basic pleasures. When there is no need, then there is little incentive to look further, and so, an ordinary person remains unaware of the Shiv tattva. Shiv is beyond the five tattvas, the partattva, in which all the tattvas reside. The experience of Shiv requires the awakening of Agya through yog. You may be given the experience a couple of times forcefully, but till you have control over your basic senses, till you elevate to the level of Agya, it will not happen to you naturally. Till you keep evaluating everything in life with these five senses, you will not be able to go above them.

Even the thought to find Shiv will not come to you. Even though Shiv is right



here, sakshat, but you will not be able to see Shiv because that vision is not there; the third eye has not opened because you are bound by the other five senses.

Shiv is in the whole of brahmand and the whole of brahmand is in Shiv. A yogi has the sakshatkar of Shiv; a yogi is above the domain of five senses and their related pleasures. An ordinary be-

ing is tied to one or more of the basic senses, because of which this experience eludes him. Let us understand this with an example from daily life. If you see a man and a woman walking, holding hands.

A person at Anahad will see them as brother and sister, the one at Swadhisthan will think of them as lovers. A

yogi, the one who is at Agya, will call it a relationship of Shiv-Shakti.

He just will not see anything except Shiv and Shakti. The merger of Shiv and Shakti is creation and separation is dissolution.

The day you see Shiv and Shakti, understand, that you have come in yog, whatever anyone may say. When the awakening happens, all the pleasures of the five senses come within it.

You can get anything you want just by accessing the Agya but for this yog needs to be done. Shiv is at Agya but where are you?

Till the time you do not give first priority to yog, you will not see Shiv and Shakti and keep moving in circles in these senses only, even after doing yog for 100 years! ConclusionThe many names of Shiva are not a sign of divine multiplicity but of human fragmentation. As our inner clarity diminished, our need for symbolic anchors multiplied.

Each name – Rudra, Bheem, Ishan or Mrityunjay – points to a specific state of consciousness and a precise inner requirement. When seekers approach the sacred without knowing what they truly seek, they drift from one practice to another, mistaking movement for progress.

Moving through the shadows: A corporate lesson

APS Malhotra

During my corporate career spanning nearly four decades, I have handled a wide array of responsibilities, traversed myriad business environments, worked with leaders of different management styles, and encountered a steady stream of professional and personal challenges. On this long journey, there have been moments of accomplishment and recognition, as well as phases that tested my patience and resilience to the hilt. Looking back now, one posting remains vividly etched in my memory - not because of its duration, but because of the clarity it eventually offered.

During that phase, I reported to a manager who very often faltered on both depth and finesse, whose communication was, on several occasions, unclear and repetitive, whose instructions hovered precari-

ously close to the red lines of consistency, and whose expectations, more often than not, were difficult to understand. He liked to lay excessive emphasis on monitoring - where one went, how long one stayed, and what one did - especially during outstation assignments. While this approach may have stemmed from a belief in discipline and diligence, for me it created an atmosphere of unease that began to haunt me and eat into my morale, till, slowly but perceptibly, my productivity went into a tailspin. Within me, stress accumulated to dangerous levels, and the workplace, once a source of engagement and purpose, became increasingly demanding. I found myself withdrawing into a shell, focusing more on self-preservation rather than on productivity or gainful contribution. Eventually, recognising the need to pause and regain equilibrium, I went on a



sabbatical and stepped back. That period of distance revealed an important truth to

me: that professional environments and personal well-being are closely intertwined with

each other, and that prolonged emotional strain rarely remains confined to the mind,

but also manifests itself in the form of psychosomatic patterns - as happened with me; sadly, some of these bother me even today.

I might have continued to drift on this tumultuous course, had a timely human intervention - in the form of a mentor from an earlier stage of my career - not come to my rescue. Over a period, he discerned a marked shift in my demeanour, upon which, with empathy, experience, and an intuitive understanding, he reached out to me. He listened without judgement, understood my predicament, and offered support with quiet decisiveness. There was no melodrama, no demonstration of rendering a favour, but only reassurance and direction at a moment when both were needed.

Returning to work under his guidance felt steady and reassuring, and gradually, my confi-

dence was restored. With his encouragement and trust in my capabilities, my performance stabilised, and the remainder of that posting passed smoothly. What could easily have become a prolonged period of disengagement turned into years of consistent contribution and renewed self-belief.

Now, when I reminisce, I realise that the experience reinforced a simple yet powerful lesson for me - that while leadership has the capacity to unsettle and discourage, it also carries within it the power to restore, strengthen, and inspire.

The difference lies not in authority, but in compassion and awareness. And for the mentor who helped me regain balance at a crucial juncture, I remain deeply indebted.

His intervention shaped my understanding of what humane and effective leadership truly means.