

RAM MANDIR BUNGLING

The alleged financial bungling in the offerings and donations of Ram temple at Ayodhya needs serious investigations, for a few men can't be allowed to play with the faith and feelings of millions of Hindus. It's a good that the UP government has set up a Special Investigation team (SIT) to finalise the probe into the scam. This is important as it involves the faith and trust of people from across the country. It's good that the Trust managing the shrine has removed some key persons in view of the ongoing investigation to allow impartial probe into it. Temples across the country must have transparency in donations and the utilization of the amount. The resignations of General Secretary Champat Rai and trustee Anil Mishra in the wake of an interim report by the SIT have been accepted.

Till March 31, the temple offerings amounted to Rs 582 crore and of which Rs 391 crore had been utilized and the remaining amount is bank accounts. As Ram was an ideal Man, his temple must come up with a model for managing donations and offerings. The reforms in the Hindu Pujasthals must begin from here.

LEAVE VAIBHAV ALONE

Media and commentators must stop discussing Vaibhav Sooryavanshi, the 15-year old cricket in the national team who is playing his maiden test against England. They must realize that the wunder kid of Indian cricket needs to be left alone to play and not be loaded with huge expectations of the Indian fans and cricket lovers. The very fact that he is the world's youngest cricket player is the reason for not poking him all the time. This is probably why the BCCI invited Vaibhav's parents to join him in the international tours. This young boy has shown steely determination but ultimately the pressure of expectations is too much for him to bear all the time.

The Enduring Legacy of Dr Syama Prasad Mookerjee: Institutions, Ideas and Nation Building



Shri Gajendra Singh Shekhawat

History often remembers great leaders through the political battles they fought. Yet the most enduring contribution of statesmen is rarely confined to politics alone. Their real legacy lies in the institutions they create, the ideas they nurture and the values they leave behind for future generations. As the nation commemorates the 125th birth anniversary of Bharat Kesari Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee, it is worth revisiting an aspect of his public life that deserves far wider attention: his lifelong commitment to institution building as the foundation of nation building.

Independent India did not emerge merely from a political struggle. It had to build universities capable of educating its citizens, research institutions that could advance scientific knowledge, industries that could generate economic self-reliance, cultural organisations that would preserve civilisational heritage, and public institutions that could uphold democratic values. Dr. Mookerjee understood early that a nation's future depends not only on visionary leadership but also on strong institutions that outlast individual leaders and governments.

His remarkable academic career reflected this conviction. Appointed the

youngest Vice-Chancellor of the University of Calcutta, he assumed office at a time when higher education was becoming central to India's intellectual awakening. For him, universities were not merely places that produced graduates; they were institutions that shaped informed citizens capable of contributing responsibly to public life. Education, in his view, was inseparable from the larger task of nation building.

His commitment to scientific and technological advancement extended well beyond the university campus. As a member of the Court and Council of the Indian Institute of Science, Bengaluru, he contributed to strengthening one of India's premier centres of scientific research. In 1947, he laid the foundation stone of the Department of Power Engineering, recognising that engineering education and technological capability would become indispensable to an independent India's economic progress. Long before innovation became a central policy objective, he had recognised that scientific excellence and industrial development would determine the country's long-term strength.

This vision found practical expression after Independence when Dr. Mookerjee became India's first Minister for Industry and Supply. During those formative years, the newly independent nation faced the enormous challenge of creating an industrial base almost from scratch. Institutions such as the Chittaranjan Locomotive Works and the Sindri Fertilizer Factory were established not merely as manufacturing units but as symbols of India's determination to achieve technological competence and economic self-reliance. For Dr. Mookerjee, industrialisation was never an end in itself; it was an investment in national capability and collective confidence.

Institution building, however, requires more than physical infrastructure or ad-

ministrative efficiency. It demands compassion, public spirit and a deep sense of moral responsibility. These qualities were evident during the Bengal famine of 1943, when Dr. Mookerjee devoted himself to organising large-scale relief efforts for those affected by one of the greatest humanitarian tragedies of the twentieth century. Following Partition, he worked extensively for the rehabilitation of displaced persons, recognising that national reconstruction involved healing human suffering as much as rebuilding institutions.

His public life also reflected a profound appreciation of India's civilisational heritage. As President of the Maha Bodhi Society of India, he played an important role in strengthening India's cultural and spiritual ties with Buddhist nations. He participated in welcoming the sacred relics of the Buddha's chief disciples, Arhant Sariputra and Arhant Maudgalyayana, to India, recognising the enduring significance of civilisational diplomacy. Even today, India's efforts to share these holy relics with countries such as Mongolia demonstrate how cultural heritage continues to strengthen international goodwill and deepen historical bonds.

Equally revealing was his concern for literature and scholarship. His correspondence shows the assistance he extended to the eminent poet Kazi Nazrul Islam during a period of personal difficulty. Such episodes remind us that public leadership is often measured not only by major policy decisions but also by quiet acts of generosity that seldom attract public attention. Dr. Mookerjee carried the same institutional outlook into the Constituent Assembly. Describing the framing of the Constitution as "a great responsibility" and "a solemn and sacred trust", he underlined the moral obligations that accompany constitutional governance. Those words remain strikingly relevant

today. The strength of the Constitution ultimately depends not only on its written provisions but also on the integrity of Parliament, the independence of public institutions, the rule of law and the civic responsibility of citizens. Constitutional democracy flourishes only when institutions command public trust and operate with integrity.

As India advances towards the goal of becoming a developed nation, Dr. Mookerjee's vision offers an important reminder. Economic growth alone cannot define national progress. Lasting development requires sustained investment in education, scientific research, technological innovation, cultural preservation and institutions that inspire public confidence.

Roads, airports and factories are indispensable, but so are universities that encourage inquiry, laboratories that expand knowledge, museums that preserve heritage and public institutions that safeguard constitutional values.

Institutions possess a remarkable quality: they outlive governments, political movements and even generations. They preserve accumulated knowledge, provide continuity amid change and enable societies to pursue long-term national goals. Leaders may shape history, but institutions sustain civilisation.

That perhaps is the most enduring lesson of Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee's public life. His legacy rests not merely in the offices he held or the debates in which he participated, but in his unwavering belief that strong institutions are the true custodians of a nation's aspirations.

As India continues its journey of development, strengthening those institutions that promote knowledge, scientific temper, cultural confidence and constitutional values would be the most meaningful tribute to his memory.

(The Author is Union Minister for Culture & Tourism, Government of India)

MINDSET THAT SHAPES OUR LIVES

Sharmila Vaidya

"Mindset" is a powerful word. It influences the choices we make, the way we face life's challenges, and how we interact with others each day.

These choices, challenges, and interactions reflect either a positive or a negative mindset. It is this way of thinking that we call "mindset". Ultimately, it is the kind of perspective we bring which shapes our attitudes, influences our actions, and determines who we are.

I have two friends who, when faced with the similar circumstances, made different choices and ended up with completely different outcomes. It started when they were laid off from work and were devastated. Both had families to support and children in college.

Finally, a couple of months later, they found jobs. However, it was out of town. Relocating to a different city was a difficult decision. One friend decided to move with his family. The other friend was reluctant. He was hopeful that, given more time, he would find a job in the same city.

For the family that moved, life gradually got back to normal. On the other hand, the friend who stayed back was unemployed for quite a few months. This resulted in him taking a loan, selling a car and not to mention the mental anguish and turmoil



that he and his family went through.

This is a good example of how both friends' states of mind influenced their choices and affected their lives in completely different ways. While one saw it as an opportunity for a better life, the other saw it as the end of the road. Their mindset was not the same, which prompted them to make choices that led to different out-

comes.

There are many such situations that we encounter in our daily lives or even go through them ourselves. In the end, it all comes down to the choices we make, which, in turn can make or break a situation.

However, what about people with greater financial resources. Since they

have more money at their disposal, we can assume, that they have a different mindset, so it will automatically be easier for them to make desirable choices. Research shows that while money might contribute to happiness, it does not guarantee a positive attitude or optimism. Other factors like relationships, health, purpose in life, are also important and can determine our mindset.

Another important aspect that depends on our state of mind is the kind of company we keep. People who are upbeat and cheerful are more fun to be around as opposed to people who are pessimistic and constantly complaining about their lives.

Who would you like to be with and why? The lens through which we see the world and respond to it is crucial. Our mindset influences the choices we make and, if left unchecked, can create a "ripple effect" which can grow exponentially unless there is a conscious effort to stop it. After all this discussion about choice, positive and negative attitude, optimistic and pessimistic people, it all comes down to our state of mind. While we cannot always control the circumstances we face in our lives, we can choose how we respond to them. The encouraging fact is that life is not fixed, it can be changed. This is very well captured in the following proverb, "We cannot change the wind, but we can adjust the sails."

The Tata legacy is India's pride

Prashant Tewari

The House of Tata is the grand vision of India's ethical Parsi business community: a legacy of trusteeship, integrity, and nation-building that must remain rooted in its founding values to continue serving India's long-term national interest.

The turbulence within the Tata Group and its holding structure, Tata Sons, is no ordinary corporate dispute. It concerns the future of one of India's greatest industrial institutions, a conglomerate built over more than 150 years through vision, philanthropy, discipline, and national commitment. Founded by legendary Jamssetji Tata and elevated to global stature under J. R. D. Tata, the Tata name became synonymous with ethical capitalism and nation-building. The institution survived colonial rule, socialist India, liberalisation, and global competition because it possessed something beyond commercial strength: moral legitimacy and civilisational trust.

That moral capital, however, has faced repeated strain in the last decade. Many observers believe the abrupt and unceremonious removal of Cyrus Mistry in 2016 marked a defining rupture in the Tata ethos. Mistry, despite representing the Shapoorji Pallonji family that held nearly 18.4% of Tata Sons, was widely regarded as one of the most capable and understated corporate leaders of his generation. His removal triggered a bitter legal and

emotional battle that eventually reached the Supreme Court. While the courts ruled in favour of Tata Sons, the larger damage was reputational. For the first time, India's most respected business house appeared vulnerable to opaque boardroom politics and personality-driven governance.

The return of Ratan Tata after Mistry's exit restored temporary stability, but the controversy permanently altered public perception. Ratan Tata remained an immensely admired public figure, yet critics increasingly questioned whether emotional decision-making and excessive centralisation weakened institutional processes within the group. The tragedy deepened further after Cyrus Mistry's untimely death in 2022, which transformed a corporate dispute into a lingering moral question within Indian industry. Today, after Ratan Tata's passing, the Tata establishment faces another difficult phase. Internal tensions have emerged within Tata Trusts, the philanthropic entities that control roughly 66 per cent of Tata Sons. Disagreements over governance, succession, board appointments, and strategic direction have increasingly spilled into the public domain. Reports suggest divisions among trustees, including Noel Tata, N. Chandrasekaran, Mehli Mistry, Venu Srinivasan, Darius Khambata and others over board representation and the future structure of governance.

These developments are troubling not



merely because they involve boardroom rivalries, but because the Tata Group is systemically important to India itself. The conglomerate contributes roughly 4 per cent of India's GDP through its vast ecosystem of over 100 companies. Its listed firms collectively command a market capitalisation exceeding \$365 billion: larger than the GDP of nations such as Finland, Greece, Qatar, and Pakistan. The group employs hundreds of thousands directly and supports millions indirectly. Giants like Tata Consultancy Services, Tata Steel, Tata Motors, Titan Company, Trent and Air India are not merely corporations; they are strategic national assets. This is precisely why the

current turbulence cannot be treated as an internal family quarrel alone. The Tata Group represents India's corporate credibility before global investors. Prolonged instability at the top can affect market confidence, employment sentiment, foreign investment perception, and long-term strategic projects, including semi-conductors, aviation, digital infrastructure, and manufacturing expansion.

In this context, Noel Tata emerges as perhaps the most natural and institutionally acceptable successor to anchor the future of the Tata empire. Unlike external technocrats or transient executives, Noel Tata carries both family continuity and deep operational experience. Over decades, he quietly built successful businesses within the group, especially through Trent and Tata International. He lacks the flamboyance associated with some corporate leaders, but that may actually be his strength. The Tata Group historically flourished under understated stewardship rather than personality cults.

Equally important is the symbolic dimension. The Tata institution was built upon a distinct Parsi legacy of philanthropy, moderation, trusteeship, and long-term thinking. Many within the community and the wider business ecosystem believe the continuity of that ethos matters deeply to preserving the soul of the institution. Noel Tata possesses both lineage legitimacy and managerial maturity, making him uniquely placed to restore equilibrium be-

tween the Trusts, Tata Sons, minority shareholders, and the broader public.

The government of the day and India's business establishment, therefore, have a larger responsibility. This does not mean interference in private enterprise but rather encouraging stability, transparency, and institutional continuity in a conglomerate whose health is intertwined with India's economic confidence. Reports already suggest senior government figures have informally encouraged reconciliation among competing factions.

The roadmap forward must involve three critical reforms. First, governance structures within Tata Trusts and Tata Sons must become more transparent and rules-based, reducing the scope for personality-driven conflicts. Second, a stable succession architecture should be institutionalised to avoid recurring uncertainty. Third, strategic focus must return to operational excellence rather than internal factional battles.

India cannot afford to see its most respected corporate jewel descend into prolonged instability. The Tata Group is bigger than individuals, larger than boardroom camps, and far more important than transient egos. Preserving its legacy requires reconciliation, institutional discipline, and leadership rooted in continuity and trust. At this crucial moment, Noel Tata appears best positioned to provide precisely that stabilising anchor for the future of corporate India.