

UNREST IN NEPAL

Blessed are the nations with strong leaders because nation building is a serious business and does not happen because of a magical wand. This is illustrated from Nepal, a country where a Gen Z -led orgy of violent protests saw a new government take charge barely a few months ago. Balen Shah, a popular rapper and former Mayor Of Kathmandu was elected as Prime Minister. His elections also meant a generational change in the country's leadership. He hailed from a non-political family and was a true representative of the new generation. However, governance and politics are not everybody's cup of tea and mere charisma oir popularity on social media doesn't qualify a leader to be good at governance and transformation.

Today Nepal seems to be seething with discontent among the youth. Recently youth, largely the country's Gen Z population, have returned to the Kathmandu streets protesting against police highhandedness that led to a suicide death. They are questioning the authorities over the incident and demanding accountability from the Balen-Shah government. As such Nepal suffered a lot due to the protests which saw youth men and women set public property on fire. As such Nepal is among the poorest countries of the world and could ill afford such destruction. The elections served a purpose of throwing 'corrupt' leaders into dustbins of history. But did they elect leaders who could fulfill their aspirations. Under developed countries like Nepal need political stability and above all visionary leadership for the nation to grow into a prosperous nation. The current regime has not lived up to the peoples' expectations.

The development in Nepal is a reminder to all the subversive forces within India which are trying hard to create chaos and destabilise the elected government in India. They had gloated over the Nepal changes and called it revolutionary while later it was revealed that some external forces interested in destabilising the region were behind the Gen-Z agitation.

The notion India needs to be Viksit Bharat

Amitabh Ranjan

India stands at a historic inflection point. It is the world's fastest-growing major economy, a digital innovation leader, and a geopolitical force of increasing consequence. Yet the journey from a rising power to a truly developed nation cannot be measured through GDP figures or infrastructure statistics alone. The defining question is: what guiding principle will sustain India's transformation into a Viksit Bharat by 2047? The answer lies in a simple but profound idea: Rashtra Pratham — Nation First. Indianews analysis

Rashtra Pratham is not a slogan. It is a governing philosophy that places the long-term interests of the nation above sectional, political, institutional and personal considerations. Every successful nation in modern history-post-war Japan, South Korea, Singapore and Germany-achieved development only when governments, businesses and citizens aligned around a shared civilisational purpose. India's ambition requires no less: a national consensus that transcends electoral cycles, ideological divisions and short-term interests.

Beyond economics: The character question

Development is not merely an economic phenomenon. A developed nation emerges when excellence becomes the norm rather than the exception. India has excelled in technology, medicine, entrepreneurship and public administration-yet the translation of individual excellence into institutional excellence has remained elusive. The challenge has never been the absence of talent; it has been the absence of a culture that consistently places national and institutional interests above narrow personal gains.

The consequences are visible across sectors. Bureaucratic inertia delays nationally important projects. Political polarisation obstructs reforms whose benefits transcend party lines. Academic institutions remain constrained by administrative rigidity. Corporate R&D investment stays below potential. Citizens demand better public services



while overlooking civic responsibilities. In each case, the underlying challenge is not capability but orientation. A Rashtra Pratham mindset asks one consistent question: What serves the long-term interests of the nation?

Three arenas for Nation-First action

Consider innovation. India aspires to become a technological leader, with impressive achievements in space, digital infrastructure and pharmaceuticals. Yet national R&D expenditure remains well below that of leading innovation economies. Private capital gravitates towards low-risk investments; universities remain disconnected from industry; and regulation inadvertently discourages experimentation. A Rashtra Pratham approach would reframe innovation not as a commercial activity but as a national imperative, rewarding risk, strengthening academia-industry collaboration, and recognising scientific excellence as a patriotic contribution to nation-building. The same principle applies to governance. India's administrative institutions have been the backbone of democratic continuity, but a twenty-first-century economy demands greater agility, transparency and outcome orientation. Administrative reforms must

be understood not as an internal bureaucratic exercise but as a national priority. When governance improves, its benefits ripple across every sector-business, education, healthcare and social welfare alike. Indianews analysis

Corporate India must equally recognise that wealth creation and nation-building are complementary, not competing, objectives. India's entrepreneurs have built globally respected companies and a thriving start-up ecosystem. However, nations become developed not simply by borrowing technology but by creating it. The ensuing phase of development calls for wholehearted commitment to advanced manufacturing, deep-tech and long-term capital creation. Corporate India has the wherewithal to drive this transformation. It may appear difficult, but choosing to do so would be among the most meaningful expressions of Rashtra Pratham.

Citizens as nation-builders

No national transformation can succeed without people's active participation and contribution. A developed nation is built by millions of everyday decisions made by ordinary people: respecting public spaces, following rules, paying taxes honestly, recog-

nising merit, conserving resources and participating constructively in civic life. The difference between developed and developing societies more often lies in civic culture than in government policies. Viksit Bharat, therefore, demands not only institutional reforms but also a paradigm shift in civic consciousness.

There is also a deeper civilisational dimension here. India is not merely a modern nation-state; it is one of the world's oldest continuing civilisations. Concepts such as Lokasangraha (welfare of society), Sarve Bhavantu Sukhinah (well-being of all) and Yogakshema (collective prosperity) highlight the idea that the flourishing of an individual cannot be viewed separately from the development of society as a whole. Rashtra Pratham is therefore not a borrowed political doctrine but a contemporary expression of the civilisational ethic that has long shaped India's global perspective.

Purpose over potential

India is sitting on unprecedented opportunities. Demographic strength, technological capability, entrepreneurial energy and cultural confidence have created conditions previous generations could hardly have imagined. Yet history is replete with nations that possessed immense potential but failed to fulfil it because collective purpose yielded to fragmented interests. The countries that succeeded were those that cultivated a shared commitment to national advancement. The journey to Viksit Bharat will not be completed by government schemes alone, nor by economic growth in isolation. It will be achieved only when every institution and every citizen internalises one conviction: that the nation's long-term interests must remain paramount. That is the essence of Rashtra Pratham. Indianews analysis

And the most enduring lesson of development is that nations become great not when they merely dream of prosperity but when they organise themselves around a purpose larger than themselves. For India, that purpose is clear: Rashtra Pratham — Nation First.

THE HEALING POWER OF SLEEP

Rajyogi Brahma Kumar Nikunjji

We spend close to a third of our lives asleep, and treat almost none of it as time well spent. It's a fact that sleep is the best form of relaxation, close to meditation; that's why those who sleep well always stay well and feel well. It's a fact that if we get sound sleep during the night, we wake up refreshed, more active, and feeling more energetic. However, in today's world, getting sound sleep has become a rare occasion because millions of people suffer from sleep disorders like sleep apnea, insomnia, restless leg syndrome, and narcolepsy. In addition, the number of those who get a very broken, fitful sleep is many times higher. Sadly, many of these individuals resort to sleeping pills and drugs, which ultimately make the problem worse. This is because we do not consider these as serious issues and avoid the fact that these sleep disorders interfere with our body's ability to recuperate the energy needed for the next day. We usually make a huge mistake by viewing sleep merely as a time of inactivity for the body. Whereas, in reality, during the hours of sleep, when we appear to be most passive, something within us is intensely active, recharging the body cells for the next day.

Sleep is considered to be the greatest remedy to overcome tiredness. It is so critical that it simply overtakes one when it's needed by the body; hence, it can be put off for some time but cannot be shunned. Healthful, soothing slumber that reactivates the muscles, nerves, and brain cells is one of nature's greatest rejuvenators. Therefore, it is absolutely essential to life, just like air, water, and food. During sleep, the body is busy in activities like tissue repair, healing, restocking of organs and cells with fuel, and replacing old cells with new ones. These processes occur at a much higher rate while we are



asleep compared to when we are awake. The biggest hindrance contributing to sleeplessness is poor mental health. Our habits of negative thinking and unrighteous actions during the day cause sleep disturbances during the night. Repeated suppression of the voice of one's conscience impairs mental health, which results in negative personality traits and insomnia. Another important factor that affects our sleep is the food we eat. It's a medically proven fact that poor mental health adversely affects one's eating habits, which, in turn, drastically influences our sleep and health. For instance, those who have several cups of tea, coffee, and colas intake lots of caffeine, which contributes to their inability to sleep. Under such a medical condition, proper meditation techniques can be of great help if practiced regularly.

There have been a lot of deliberations and

debates over the hours of sleep one should have. After all, how much sleep does one need? Well! Doctors say that different conditions require different lengths of sleep. Under the best of conditions in terms of sleep, fresh air, water, food, physical work or exercise, and positive influences, one would stay asleep as long as one's system needs.

Some people, like the yogis, who are always in a state of meditation, feel fine with even four to five hours or less, whereas others might need more. Also, our age, general physical health, work routine, environment, and habitat play key roles in determining the hours of sleep we need. Remember!! Our consciousness will automatically return when the purpose of sleep is fulfilled. Hence, there is really no such thing as oversleeping. However, there is certainly such a phenomenon as undersleeping, because, for some reason or another, our sleep gets sacrificed in pursuing other pleasures of life. The old adage, "Early to bed, early to rise, makes a man healthy, wealthy, and wise," seems to fall on deaf ears in our times. Hence, if we jeopardise our sleep for silly reasons, we are knowingly undermining our health. So, it's better to be wise for our own health benefit and make it a habit to disengage the mind from thoughts daily before going to bed to give it sleep-inducing relaxation.

Dual nationality and divided loyalties

Bhopinder Singh

People of Moroccan origin constitute one of the largest immigrant-origin communities in the Netherlands, numbering approximately 450,000. For decades, the Moroccan-Dutch community has been at the centre of debates surrounding integration, identity and social cohesion. Issues such as religious extremism, youth unemployment, educational disadvantage, socio-economic segregation, and concerns about crime among a small minority of young men have received significant media and political attention.

Certain high-profile incidents intensified these debates. The 2004 assassination of Dutch filmmaker Theo van Gogh by Mohammed Bouyeri, a Dutch citizen of Moroccan descent with Islamist extremist motivations, and the exposure of the Hofstad Network (2002-2005), a jihadist group

whose members were involved in extremist activities, became defining moments in Dutch discussions about radicalisation and integration. Although these cases involved a very small number of individuals, they contributed to public anxiety and provided political ammunition for right-wing movements, particularly the Party for Freedom (PVV), led by Geert Wilders, which has repeatedly argued that the Netherlands faces what it describes as a "Moroccan problem".

One of the most contentious issues arising from these debates has been dual nationality. Dutch law permits dual citizenship in certain circumstances, but nationalist politicians in the Netherlands and elsewhere in Europe have questioned whether it can create competing loyalties. Their argument is rooted in the belief that citizenship should represent an exclusive commitment to one nation and that full integration re-

quires a primary and unambiguous national identity.

From this perspective, dual nationality may create situations in which individuals face conflicting obligations if the interests of their two countries diverge. Critics argue that, while dual nationals may legally pledge allegiance to the Netherlands, their emotional or cultural attachment may remain divided. They contend that a cohesive nation requires a shared civic identity and that multiple national affiliations may weaken that sense of belonging. This debate resurfaced during the FIFA World Cup when Morocco defeated the Netherlands in a tense knockout match decided by a penalty shoot-out. The Moroccan national team, known as the Atlas Lions, has historically included many players from the global Moroccan diaspora. Meanwhile, the Dutch national team has long reflected the multicultural character of Dutch society, with legendary players of

immigrant heritage such as Ruud Gullit, Frank Rijkaard, Clarence Seedorf and Patrick Kluivert.

The match highlighted a new dimension of the identity debate. Several members of Morocco's squad were born or raised in the Netherlands, including Noussair Mazraoui and Sofyan Amrabat, while others developed their careers within Dutch football structures. These players had eligibility options but ultimately chose to represent Morocco, the country associated with their family heritage.

There were undoubtedly sporting considerations involved. Morocco had established itself as a highly competitive international team, reaching the latter stages of major tournaments. A player's decision is influenced by many factors, including football opportunities, personal relationships, coaching environments and family connections.

Nevertheless, the symbolic

significance of these choices was difficult to ignore. Ismael Saibari, closely associated with Dutch football through PSV Eindhoven, chose Morocco despite eligibility ties to Spain and Belgium. Explaining his decision, he said:

"Playing for Morocco was a choice from the heart." Similarly, Noussair Mazraoui explained that although he had discussions with Dutch coach Ronald Koeman, he had already decided: "When I spoke with Ronald Koeman, I already had the feeling that I would choose only Morocco and nothing else."

For supporters of a more nationalist view of citizenship, such statements reinforce concerns about divided loyalties. Politicians such as Geert Wilders in the Netherlands, Nigel Farage in the United Kingdom, and Marine Le Pen in France argue that citizenship should involve a clear and primary allegiance to the nation-state. From this perspective,

citizens born or raised in a country choosing to represent another nation because of their ancestral identity raises questions about national belonging.

Supporters of this view contend that a nation functions best when citizens share a strong civic identity. They argue that immigration and naturalisation policies should encourage newcomers and their descendants to develop a deep identification with their adopted country. However, critics argue that sporting representation should not be treated as a direct measure of civic loyalty. They point out that many people maintain multiple identities and that a connection to ancestral heritage does not necessarily diminish commitment to the country where someone lives, works and contributes to society. The debate became more visible after Morocco's victory, when celebrations took place in several Dutch cities with large Moroccan-origin populations.

Many were peaceful expressions of pride, though incidents of disorder and clashes with the police led to criticism and renewed discussion about integration and social cohesion.

Ultimately, the question of dual nationality reflects a broader European debate about belonging in an era of migration and globalisation. The challenge is finding a balance: allowing individuals to maintain their cultural heritage while ensuring a strong shared commitment to the civic values and institutions of the country they call home.

The responsibility rests on both sides. Host societies must create genuine opportunities for inclusion, while immigrant communities and their descendants must engage with and invest in the national identity of the societies in which they live. The future of multicultural democracies may depend on whether multiple identities can coexist alongside a common sense of citizenship.