

NASHA MUKTI

After LG Manoj Sinha’s campaign against drug abuse in J&K, Prime Minister Narendra Modi has launched 'Nasha Mukti Yuva for Viksit Bharat Sankalp Abhiyan'. PM’s involvement in the campaign shows that drug addiction is a serious problem across India and not in just in the border area. PM Modi’s emotional appeal to the youth to dissociate from this life threatening habit must be amplified. He beseeched the youth of India giving them reasons why they must do that. The drugs addiction, he rightly said not only harms the body, but also takes away a mother's smile, shatters a father's dreams, weakens a sister's hope, and takes away the respect of a younger brother. Most importantly he reiterated that the government is with them and would support them in getting rid of the addiction. The Modi government blames the foreign agencies and power which are inimical to India’s growth for pushing in drugs through the terror networks. They are keen to destroy the young generations of India, who are the real builders of the new and resurgent India.

INDIA'S STRENGTH
Why India doesn’t fail despite its myriad challenges? If you want an answer for this, just look at Assam, a state witnessing unprecedented flood due to rains. It seems the cream of India’s philanthropy club – corporate, CSR initiatives, religious bodies, social media influencers; sports persons have descended there to help people. The support for the people across India for Assam is so strong that chief minister Himanta Biswa Sarma had to ask the people not to send more relief supplies. It’s not just the stuff coming from rest of India for the people of Assam but an army of volunteers who are on the ground. This was seen during Punjab and Kerala floods too. This tradition of giving to others who are in crisis is so organic in the Indian system that the support system emerges instantly. The unity of Indians is best tested in the times of crisis.

When strength becomes a liability

Bhopinder Singh

onald Trump has built his political identity around a simple and powerful message, i.e., he is the leader who gets things done. He has often spoken in a triumphant, even imperious, tone about his own abilities and about his promise to ‘Make America Great Again.’ Whatever one’s political views, his political comeback represented a remarkable defiance of conventional expectations. Many scholars, commentators, public officials, and voices from across the ideological spectrum had warned that his return to power would face enormous obstacles. Yet Trump demonstrated an extraordinary ability to connect with millions of voters and overturn predictions that had underestimated his appeal.
His supporters did not merely vote for his policies; they were drawn to his persona. They embraced his confidence, his defiance, and his willingness to break political conventions. For many, his refusal to conform to traditional presidential behavior was

not a weakness but the very reason he appeared authentic. Actions and rhetoric that critics described as divisive, including his conduct surrounding 6th January and his repeated attacks on political opponents, were often dismissed by loyal supporters as the necessary disruption of a system they believed had failed them.
That combative style extended beyond America's borders. Allies such as Canada and the European Union, as well as partners like India, found themselves subjected to sharp criticism, tariff threats, and a more transactional approach to diplomacy. To Trump's supporters, this represented a long-overdue willingness to put American interests first. To his critics, it reflected an unnecessary erosion of alliances and a disregard for the conventions of international statecraft.
Trump's political resilience became one of his defining characteristics. Controversies that might have ended the careers of other politicians seemed to strengthen his bond with his base. Traditional institutional

checks, public criticism, and repeated scandals appeared unable to weaken his hold over the Republican Party. He seemed politically untouchable.
But every political force has limits. The prolonged conflict with Iran may represent the moment when political bravado collides with geopolitical reality. The qualities that helped Trump dominate domestic politics - relentless confrontation, personal attacks, public displays of toughness, and refusal to appear weak are far more difficult to translate into a successful wartime strategy. War& Conflict
War has a way of exposing the gap between rhetoric and reality.
A conflict that was expected by supporters to demonstrate American power has instead raised uncomfortable questions about cost, strategy, and endurance. As the war drags on, fatigue grows. Economic pressures mount. Military risks increase. The public begins to ask the question that eventually confronts every wartime leader: What is the endgame?
Historically, war has often provided

presidents with a surge in popularity as citizens rally around the flag. After the attacks of 9/11, even President George W. Bush, previously a relatively conventional and politically vulnerable leader experienced an extraordinary increase in public approval, reaching historically high levels (90% approval rating) as Americans united behind the government's response.
The current situation presents a very different political dynamic. Instead of producing a sustained rally effect, the Iran conflict has increasingly become associated with uncertainty, expense, and exhaustion. Rising costs, increased government spending, military casualties, and deepening political divisions have made the reality of war harder to ignore. The promise of quick and decisive victory is confronting the far more complicated reality of prolonged conflict.
The political danger for Trump is not merely opposition from his critics. It is the possibility that his own supporters begin questioning the

strategy itself. The most damaging shift for any leader is not when opponents lose confidence-it is when loyal supporters begin to wonder whether the leader's instincts are still serving the country.
And here lies the ultimate irony.
The only realistic path toward a negotiated settlement may require Trump to do something profoundly uncomfortable: become 'un-Trump.'
The same qualities that helped him rise politically may now need to be restrained. A successful diplomatic outcome will likely require patience rather than provocation, private negotiations rather than public humiliation, and strategic compromise rather than constant escalation. Insults, threats, and declarations of absolute victory may enrage supporters, but they rarely create the conditions necessary for peace.
A negotiated end to a war requires giving the opposing side a way to step back without total humiliation. It requires recognizing that diplomacy is not surrender and that compromise is not weakness. For a leader whose

political brand has been built on never backing down, this may be the greatest challenge of all.
Trump's problem is no longer simply how to defeat Iran. It is whether he can overcome the very instincts that made him politically successful but may now be preventing him from achieving the outcome he wants. The supreme irony is this: to preserve the image of the strongest man in the room, Trump may have to stop behaving like the only man who refuses to listen. The war may not be decided by who can threaten the loudest, but by who can recognise when strength requires restraint. The ultimate test of the strongman may be whether he can learn the art of peace. Executive-Branch The most damaging shift for any leader is not when opponents lose confidence-it is when loyal supporters begin to wonder whether the leader's instincts are still serving the country. (The writer, a military veteran, is a former Lt Governor of Andaman & Nicobar Islands and Puducherry; Views presented are personal.)

Gau Mutra: Science should not be ridiculed

Meenakashi Lekhi

Priyanka Gandhi’s recent reference to an IIT Director as a “gau mutra expert” has ignited a debate that extends beyond politics. The real question is not whether one personally believes in traditional remedies or not. The question is whether scientific inquiry should be encouraged or ridiculed. Science advances by testing hypotheses, not by mocking them.
Throughout history, many medicines originated from traditional knowledge. Aspirin evolved from willow bark, artemisinin from traditional Chinese medicine, and numerous modern drugs have their roots in indigenous medical systems. The correct scientific approach is to investigate traditional claims objectively, accepting those supported by evidence and rejecting those that fail rigorous testing. For the sake of dispelling ignorance, I must state that more than 70 per cent of chemicals used in modern medicine are phytochemicals, which means originating from plants, and a whole lot of those plants aren't originally from the Western Hemisphere.
Contrary to claims that there is “no science” behind gomutra, several peer-reviewed studies have investigated cow urine and cow urine distillate. Published research has reported antibacterial activity against certain bacteria, antifungal activity, antioxidant properties, immune-modulating effects, and potential bio-enhancer properties that may improve the effectiveness of some antibiotics in laboratory settings. Most importantly, these findings are primarily laboratory (in vitro) or animal

studies, and in India, it has been practised on humans as part of traditional medicine. Therefore, they should be viewed as promising research and further establish the same with precision for medical treatments. IndianMarket Analysis
The two patents in the United States of America, which were highlighted by Parliamentarian Sudhanshu Trivedi in the Lok Sabha, very strongly relate to cow urine distillate, involving pharmaceutical compositions using cow urine distillate as a bio-enhancer and use of bioactive fractions of cow urine distillate to enhance antimicrobial and anticancer agents. Research involving cow urine or cow urine distillate has been carried out by scientists affiliated with institutions in several countries, including India, Nepal, United States, and United Kingdom, includes collaborative research and publications. The research has largely focused on antimicrobial compounds, antioxidant activity, bio-enhancer effects, veterinary applications, and antiviral screening.
Recent laboratory work has investigated whether compounds isolated from cow urine distillate demonstrate antiviral activity against viruses such as Chikungunya under laboratory conditions. This illustrates an important scientific principle that Traditional medicinal claims deserve investigation in order to identify positive laboratory findings, and nothing stops the sceptics to research further and test the safety for human use, which may require rigorous clinical evidence.
The issue becomes bigger than cow urine when parachute or hereditary politicians

ridicule scientific investigation because the subject originates from traditional knowledge - knowledge of which they lack, they risk discouraging legitimate research. The scientific method requires openness, scepticism, replication, and evidence. The appropriate response is therefore not blind acceptance or blanket dismissal, but rigorous evaluation.
Priyanka Gandhi’s description was intended as political criticism, but it raises a deeper question: Should scientific inquiry be dismissed because its subject appears unconventional or rooted in traditional knowledge? The remark has drawn criticism from hundreds of academicians, who argued that reducing a distinguished scientist to a single label undermines academic discourse. History reminds us that many scientific ideas initially faced ridicule before they were properly evaluated.
I am reminded of Galileo, who did not become famous because he was always right. He became famous because he insisted that evidence-not ridicule or authority-should decide scientific questions. When Galileo argued that the Earth revolved around the Sun, many dismissed or opposed his work because it challenged accepted beliefs. Over time, observations and evidence established the heliocentric model.
If the politically driven criticism was directed at specific scientific claims, those claims should be challenged with data. If the criticism was directed simply at the fact that a scientist has researched or discussed cow urine, then it risks discouraging inquiry into traditional knowledge. Ridicule has never been part of the scientific method.
The appropriate response to controversial research is not to dismiss researchers with labels, nor to accept every traditional claim uncritically. It is to let evidence decide. Whether future research validates, refines, or disproves claims about gomutra should be determined in laboratories and clinical trials and not in political speeches.
What the global Scientific Community agrees is that cow urine contains biologically active compounds that merit scientific investigation. Secondly, laboratory and animal studies have reported antimicrobial, antioxidant, and immunomodulatory effects. While scientists in India such as Dr Suman Preet Singh Khanuja led research on cow urine distillate as a bio-enhancer that could improve the absorption and effectiveness of antibiotics and anticancer drugs and is also the co-inventor of US patents on cow urine distillate. Dr Mahendra Pandurang Darokar, who is a medicinal plant and natural products researcher, worked on antimicrobial and pharmaceutical applications of cow urine distillate as part of the CSIR team. This balanced perspective allows one to argue that research into gomutra is a legitimate scientific endeavour, also recognising that extraordinary medical claims require extraordinary clinical evidence. In 2026, researchers at IIT Roorkee reported that an Ayurvedic cow urine distillate (Gau Mutra Ark) significantly reduced the chikungunya virus in laboratory experiments. According to the institute, viral load was reduced by over 90 per cent, with an optimised formulation achieving up to 99.85 per cent reduction under laboratory conditions. Research on cow urine has involved multiple Indian scientific agencies, including the Department of Science & Technology (DST), Department of Biotechnology (DBT), CSIR, ICMR, ICAR, and the Ministry of AYUSH under collaborative research programmes. This indicates that the subject has been considered worthy of scientific investigation rather than being dismissed outright. IndianMarket Analysis
The 200 academicians who issued an open letter criticising the comment made by Priyanka Gandhi argued that reducing a scientist to a dismissive label undermines academic integrity and discourages scientific inquiry. The question is whether scientists should be mocked for investigating traditional knowledge. History shows that many modern medicines originated from traditional practices. Research on cow urine has identified antimicrobial, antioxidant, bio-enhancer, and antiviral properties in laboratory studies, while agricultural applications have also been explored. The scientific approach is to test claims rigorously-not to ridicule researchers for studying them. That is how science progresses.”
As a political worker, I tried to analyse the Gaumutra Vishe-shagya jibe at Prof. Kamakoti and came to a conclusion that it was a slur of choice to mock Hindus and associated practices of their faith. In addition, it was also a jibe at the institution which functions under his leadership. I am citing my tweet: Priyanka Gandhi probably doesn’t know about Aryabhata, but surely, she would’ve visited her Nanihal and the famous Galileo Museum.

THE QUIET GRACE THAT SHAPES OUR LIVES

The quiet grace that shapes our lives

by Sanjay Chandra



Sanjay Chandra

We often speak of the wisdom contained in our scriptures and epics, and the importance of introducing our children to them so that they may navigate life's complexities with greater clarity. I inherited these values through stories passed down by my parents, teachers, elders, and countless conversations over the years. Among them, the Mahabharata has perhaps influenced me the most.
One idea stayed with me from an early age. We are taught to perform our duty to the best of our ability without becoming attached to the outcome. The results, we are told, are not entirely within our control. Somewhere beyond our limited understanding exists a larger order that ultimately looks after us.
As the years passed, I began to see traces of that wisdom in ordinary human relationships. Throughout my life, there have always been people who quietly appeared when I most needed guidance or reassurance-my parents, my wife, my children, my friends, my teachers, my seniors, and even strangers whose advice altered the course of my decisions. I remember one such incident from my first posting in the Railways. I wrote an official letter to the

Headquarters and was pleasantly surprised to receive a personal reply from a senior officer. He welcomed my first official communication and gently suggested better wording for future correspondence. That small gesture inspired me to give a little more than what duty alone demanded. Only later did I realise that such mentoring was part of the organisational culture and was extended to officers throughout their careers. Looking back, I realise it was only the first of many such moments that shaped my understanding of

these values. I have often found myself carrying that tradition into both my professional and personal life.
However, when I look at the world around me now, I sometimes wonder whether younger generations receive the same reassurance. We live in an age that measures almost everything instantly. Success is counted in followers, likes, promotions, visibility and constant comparison. Many of us spend so much of our energy keeping pace with an increasingly demanding world that we naturally become more occupied with our own journeys than with quietly encouraging someone else's. Outcomes often appear to matter far more than effort, and appearance often seems to matter more than substance. Patience has become un-

fashionable, while uncertainty is increasingly viewed as failure rather than as an inevitable part of life.
So, are the values with which I grew up still relevant? I believe they are. Modern life may make them less visible, but it has not made them less meaningful. The people who quietly embody those values have not disappeared. They continue to guide, encourage and reassure, often without realising the difference they make. Perhaps what has changed is not the values themselves, but our ability to notice them amid the speed and noise of contemporary life.
Whether there is a Supreme Being watching over us is something I still do not know. But I have come to believe that grace often reaches us through such people. Perhaps the divine does not always reveal itself through extraordinary events. Sometimes it is found in a thoughtful word, an unexpected act of kindness, or in someone who appears at just the right moment. And perhaps that is reason enough to continue believing that the values we inherited still have a place in the world we live in today. The writer is a founder of Kala - Krazy About Literature And Arts, is an author, speaker, coach, arbitrator, and strategy consultant; Views presented are personal.