

# The ideological footprints of Pt. Deen Dayal Upadhyay on India's Foreign Policy and its Contemporary Relevance

Prof. Sanjay Gupta\*

## Abstract

Pt. Upadhyay's views on foreign policy are no less significant than his views on other issues of national life. Even after more than fifty years of his demise, his views continue to remain acutely relevant to the foreign policy mandarins. To a large extent, his position on various issues, including Non-alignment, India-Pakistan-China relations, United Nations and national defence are in tune with those of the present day foreign policy establishment of India. While deliberating on crucial issues concerning India's relations with other countries, he exhorted the policy makers to adopt a nationalist approach and uphold India's interest and its reputation upper most in their minds. He cautioned them not to give any place to romanticism or sentimentalism in their dealings. Unlike a pacifist or a naïve moralist, he spoke in realist terms, with an uncompromising and unforgivable attitude. He advocated for a foreign policy, which while reflecting India's civilisational and cultural values, would also take initiative to fight for the cause of the weak and the poor nations. Being a principal ideologue of nationalism, and regarded as the forerunner of the Bhartiya Janata Party, this paper, tries to trace Pt. Upadhyay's views on key issues of India's foreign policy and its influence on the Modi government's foreign policy.

**Key words:** Cultural and Civilisational values, Nationalism, Foreign policy, Non-alignment, Soft power diplomacy

## Introduction

Pt. Deen Dayal Upadhyay was a profound thinker, a passionate orator, a noble soul and a thorough nationalist who dedicated his life to the cause of the nation and the people. He emerged at a time when the nation had just come out of almost two centuries of British colonialism. The country stood socially and economically ravaged by years of unabated exploitation and oppression of the masses. The country was besotted with numerous problems with the society badly torn, and the lives of the common people bereft of the basic necessities of human life.

Against this background, the country needed nationalistic, public-spirited and visionary leaders who could bind the society together, infuse confidence among people and raise the morale of the nation. One of such towering figures who descended on the political horizon of India at this juncture was Pt. Deen Dayal Upadhyay. Though there has been no dearth of revolutionary leaders in this country who have rendered yeoman service to the nation, what makes Dr. Upadhyay special is his unflinching nationalist ideology and commitment to the motherland that is rooted in the Indian culture, tradition and spirituality. Through his numerous speeches and writings, he demonstrated that if India was to attain the glory and greatness of the past for which it was known, for long, it would have to take lessons from the past, it would have to rekindle and imbibe those civilisational values once again.

Pt. Upadhyay was both a philosopher and an activist; an idealist and a realist; a visionary and a 'hawk' who had the insight and the ability to see the danger coming from the enemies and the traitors of the country. Thus, it was not for nothing that he spoke of the need for having a strong national leadership like Chandragupta Maurya and Chanakya in order to secure India's territorial and political sovereignty, a leader who does not bow to international or regional pressures (Venugopal, 2016). He stood for a government that would enable the nation to become self-reliant, inculcate the values of nationalism and patriotism among people, and stand aloft in the comity of the nations.

While many leaders of his time were looking to the west and trying to figure out what the west stood for and what could be taken from the western ideas for India, he asserted that it was the Indian civilisational

---

\* Professor, Department of Political Science, Lucknow University, Lucknow.

values, culture and philosophy, and not the western 'isms'- Socialism, Communism, Marxism, Liberalism etc. that could provide answers to the problems of this country. He refused to prescribe foreign ideologies and western notions as remedies to the multifarious problems of this country. Though himself a profound exponent of nationalism, he was vehemently critical of the meaning assigned to the notions of nation, nationalism and state by the leaders and intellectuals of India. In his view, such interpretations did not fit the Indian way of thinking as they were devoid of the spirit of motherland and sacrifice for the nation, which to him, was the soul of the nation. Without understanding the soul, one simply cannot understand this nation, its culture and its ethos.

He constantly reminded one and all about the virtues of Indian culture which included the spirit of nationalism, patriotism, spiritualism, humanism and universalism. Building citizens' character, service to the society, devotion and selfless commitment to the nation were the hall marks of the philosophy of Integral Humanism which he expounded, preached and practiced throughout his short-lived life. Though an ardent advocate of Integral Humanism, he felt disappointed that due to many evils creeping in our society, viz, western materialism, political corruption and greed, people have forgotten the basics of the Indian nation, its virtues and ethos. He thus observed:

“All our ailments in today's political life have their origin in our avarice. A race for rights has banished the noble idea of service. Undue emphasis on the economic aspect of life has generated a number of lapses... Instead of character, quality and merit, wealth has become the measuring rod of individual prestige. This is a morbid situation... It must be our general approach to look upon money only as a means towards the satisfaction of our everyday needs: not an end in itself... this transformation in our attitude can only be brought about only on the basis of the ideals of Indian culture” (Upadhyay,1971).

Though he lived for a short time, he spoke at length on several issues concerning nation, people and the government, constantly emphasizing and exhorting the governments to work for the restoration of its age-old glory and greatness, which could be achieved only by imparting and imbibing the knowledge of Indian culture, values and ethics. These, to him, was not a collection of myth or superstitions, but thoroughly scientific and empirically tested.

Dr. Upadhyay was a voracious orator and a prolific writer, having spoken and written extensively on many subjects- social, economic, political, cultural, spiritual and religious. Hardly any issue of his day remained unscanned and untouched by him. But beneath his entire philosophy and vision, lay his unflinching commitment to the nation and culture of this country. Out of his many shades of opinion and beliefs, his views on India's foreign policy and international affairs holds special relevance, though they may not have been as widely discussed and deliberated, as much as, his views on other subjects. This paper would, therefore, try to capture some of his ideas on India's foreign policy issues.

### **Foreign Policy: A vehicle to promote India's civilisational values**

Pt Upadhyay was deeply concerned with India's foreign policy issues, no less than domestic ones. He sought to provide a strong ideological base to India's foreign policy and advocated for promoting the rich cultural and spiritual values of India through the foreign policy. His speeches and works reflected a foreign policy that was 'India-centric' and which gave primacy to 'India-First' approach. He stood for “adopting a foreign policy suitable for development and security of the country instead of following Russia, America or China”(India Today, 2017).

He believed the real strength of India was its cultural-spiritual power, which constitutes the soul of India. All aspects of national life should reflect this power, including the country's foreign policy. The avowed task of the foreign policy was, therefore, to disseminate the strengths and values of this country world wide. He fervently believed that if India was to occupy a place of pride and pre-eminence internationally, then both the scientific temper of modern India and spiritual-cultural values of this country should be given a central place in the foreign policy. Dr. Upadhyay was committed to seeing the expansion of India's cultural foot prints in foreign land, since only then India's cultural and spiritual greatness could be known to the world.

It is to be noted that Pt. Upadhyay's foreign policy prescriptions, for the first time, were given wings by the current NDA government under the leadership of Prime Minister Modi. The values which Pt. Upadhyay stood are now being translated and implemented through broad policy initiatives and programmes under the nomenclature 'Soft power diplomacy', since 2014. This soft power diplomacy aims at promoting India's

cultural and spiritual values, which include promotion of Yoga, Buddhism and reconnecting with Indian Diaspora worldwide, alongside showcasing India's democratic ethos and credentials. Thus, the hall-mark of India's soft power diplomacy in recent years has been its 'India Centric' and 'India-first' approach, towards the promotion of which, the government has been working assiduously (South China Morning Post, 2019).

At a lecture delivered by Sushma Swaraj, the former External Affairs Minister of India, she observed that the philosophy of Pt. Upadhyay of "integral humanism" must be leveraged by New Delhi through its foreign policy to expand its cultural footprint in other countries." Quoting pt. Upadhyay, she said that "Maintaining a national culture could lead to economic and political progress and foster respect for our country in the world. He (Deendayal Upadhyaya) accepted culture as a soft power. Upadhyaya believed that if one wanted to understand the soul of India, one has to understand it through the prism of culture, and not politics or economics"(Maheshwari, 2018).

Similarly, Vinay Sahasrabudhe, the head of the Indian Council of Cultural Relations (ICCR). New Delhi hailed Dr. Upadhyaya as a "philosopher-politician" who had envisioned the role of culture in shaping India's foreign relations.... Through this oration, we are commemorating Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya, who was a philosopher-politician in early post-Independent India. A proponent of integral humanism, he envisioned the centrality of cultural relationship in the process of shaping vibrant diplomatic strategic and economic relationship across the countries(Maheshwari, Ibid).

### **Realism and Pragmatism: the twin Mantra**

Though not a diplomat or trained in the art of diplomacy, he was an astute observer of international affairs. A pragmatist philosopher and a proponent of action, he believed in practice more than theory. Like a realist, he advocated for a strong foreign policy that could fulfill the aspirations of the nation. He thus demanded "that the foreign policy should be framed with the sole objective of securing the enlightened self-interests of the nation and to be realistic, and take into account the mundane nature of the world"(Ganguly, 2016).

Demonstrating his realist attitude as early as 1961, he cautioned the government that "India by conceding to the demands of Pakistan for more land and water was losing the war strategically and that could sow seeds of future discord between the two countries." In his another write-up in 1961, he pointed out that "by allowing Pakistan to occupy banks of Sutlej in Ferozepur or use the river Ichamati that flows through Indian territory, we have not only lost the war strategically but also created the scope for future uncertainties." He realized that the untimely and defective outreach of the government towards Pakistan was creating additional problems for India. The government's decision to transfer half of the Berubari Union to Pakistan, which according to him, was not a dispute before the Radcliffe Commission was uncalled for. "This way", he said, "we have established only a harmful precedent for Pakistan to make fresh claims and raise new disputes"(Ganguly, ibid).

Dr. Upadhyaya cautioned the Congress leaders who spoke over-optimistically about Pakistan forgetting hostility with India if the Kashmir issue is settled to the satisfaction of Pakistan, of course, no less than to India. Then Pakistan and India, optimists claimed, would join hands against the Communist China. Disapproving this unrealistic claim, he quoted then Pakistan's Foreign Minister Z.A. Bhutto who declared "that Pakistan will not join hands with India even if she gets the whole of Kashmir"(Upadhyay, September 1963). Equally refusing to accept that Pakistan's proximity to China will lessen if there is no Kashmir issue, he cautioned the government against such unrealistic moves to attempt to win over Pakistan. This, to him, would only serve to weaken India's morale and will-power to check and resist the communist China.

Focusing on India's relations with China, he observed that the Chinese threat cannot be tackled unless the threat is realized and understood in all its dimensions, saying that "communism can be checked only if it's dangerous dimensions are fully realised and if other problems are relegated to a secondary position." He exhorted: "Let all those who are interested in checkmating the evil designs of Communist China, refuse to pay undue importance to paranoid Pakistan and, instead, concentrate on straightening India morally, militarily and economically so that she can give a rebuff to Communist China and restore the balance up set by power hungry China. That will also correct the psychological imbalance of Pakistani leaders."(Upadhyay, September 1963, Ibid).

So as to counter China, Deen Dayal favoured a strong action against China. Though not advocating for a war, he called for giving ultimatum to China to vacate their illegal occupation of Indian territory, failing which India should take unilateral military action to drive them out, thus suggesting a limited military role against China. India, he argued, should also adopt certain non-military measures, such as withdrawing recognition of Chinese sovereignty over Tibet and placing restrictions on Chinese diplomats in India (Upadhyay, January 1960).

It is worth mentioning here that the current NDA government, perhaps more than any other government at the Centre in recent decades, has realized the unlimited dangers posed by the Pakistan-sponsored terrorism in India. As such, in keeping with Pt. Upadhyay's vision, it has been taking strong measures against Pakistan since 2014 when it first came to power. Whether it was the Uri surgical strike launched by the Indian army across the border in Pakistan in July 2018, or the Balakot bombings of the terror camps by the Indian Air force in January 2019, or the regular elimination of the terrorists sneaking into the Indian territory from Pakistan is demonstrative of India's increased determination and caution against its prime adversary. With regard to China as well, India has taken firm decisions in recent years, going as far as pushing back the Chinese troops in the Doklam plateau in June 2017.

### **Non-Alignment but no appeasement**

Another issue which was critically and closely scrutinized by Pt. Upadhyay was India's policy of Non-Alignment. As the world got divided between the two power super powers- the USA and the USSR- at the end of the second World War leading to the beginning of the Cold War, India, then led by Pt. Nehru, became the principal spokesman of the policy of Non-Alignment which called for maintaining equal distance between the two hostile super powers, while at the same time, keeping relations with both powers. Perhaps, that was the need of the hour as India was a newly liberated country emerging from more than two centuries of British colonialism. As a pragmatic politician and a true nationalist, Pt. Deen Dayal understood the prevailing scenario and approved of Nehru's policy of Non-alignment upholding "that the policy could not be abandoned as India in this complicated situation but a more fundamental approach would be to think of measures for a lasting defence." He realized that India was surrounded by hostile powers and under such circumstances, it needed to be watchful of her interests. While being one with Nehru, he however highlighted the inadequacies of the policy. He argued that "the Prime Minister (Nehru) has often tried to give it a philosophical basis. We Indians have somewhat a weakness for philosophy, and so are susceptible to such polemics. The result has been a kind of sentimental support to Nehru's foreign policy and not a realization of our responsibilities on the acceptance of that policy....It is therefore necessary that we correctly propound our foreign policies and the reasons for adopting it" (Ganguly, 2016).

Reflecting further on the policy of non-alignment, he asserted that Non-alignment should not be construed as a policy of weakness or helplessness or compulsion towards the two leading powers. Nor should this policy be based on ideological considerations as non-alignment has nothing to take with communism or democracy. It should be merely a policy of pragmatism, as foreign policy issues, he opined, are not permanent, rather grounded in the nation's self-interest. As such, non-alignment caters to India's national interest and it should be upheld till the circumstances warrant a nation to be. Citing examples of western countries, he argued that they formulate their foreign policy not out of love for democracy or any such lofty principles, rather simply because those policies serve their national interest best. He thus observed: "A country's foreign policy (was) formed on the basis of its enlightened self-interest. It is always a policy and not a principle, and, therefore, it can be changed if the interests of the country so demand it. If we have followed a policy of non-alignment, it is because our interests could be best served by it. It is a different matter that those who practised it could not secure the maximum benefit to the country." (Ganguly, *ibid*).

Explaining the true nature of non-alignment, Dr. Upadhyay made it clear that non-alignment to be successful should not be based on appeasing the one or the other nation. It should be followed without any fear or favour. But in our case, he opined, the government has followed the policy of appeasement in the name of non-alignment. Citing examples of this approach, he said that we allowed the Chinese occupation of Tibet and also mutely saw China annexing a large part of our territory in the Laddak sector. And all this for winning the Chinese support against Pakistan. Similarly, now we are trying to appease Pakistan in various ways so that

India is able to handle the Chinese threat effectively. However, he asserted, we have failed to deal effectively with none of them (Upadhyay, February 1960).

Calling for the notion of 'Dynamic Neutrality' to be made a part of non-alignment, he said that this will serve India's interest best. But that would require a leadership of high caliber and bold initiative. Such a leadership could ensure that non-alignment is erected on the foundations of India's strength and confidence and not cowed down under the pressure of the western or eastern (China) powers. Thus, he asserted: "non-alignment to be useful, required a bold policy which in turn needs strength and conviction. Only a strong and self-reliant India can preserve, protect and promote its interests. All steps should be taken towards this end." Bereft of this, non-alignment would fail "if it continued to be based on fear of displeasing the one or the other" (Upadhyay, February 1960, *ibid*).

### **Defence of the Nation: The top priority**

Another important aspect to which Dr Upadhyay sought to draw everyone's attention was to the defence of the nation, which included the preparedness of the defence forces and the defence of India's borders from violations from hostile nations. Displaying his understanding of India's crucial border issue, he said that "the defence of the borders depends not only on armed personnel but also determination of people in border areas." He lauded the government for giving serious attention to the border problem which included the handing over the border policing to the Centre, providing arms training to the civil population living along the border and for liberally supplying arms to those people. But he cautioned the government that the scheme of arms supply and training could be misused by the pro-Pakistan and anti-national elements. They may try to subvert and sabotage India's security. He, therefore, suggested that ten miles belt along the border should be cleared of all elements whose loyalty to the country can easily be undermined by the enemy. People should be rehabilitated else where and displaced people East Bengal should be settled in the places so vacated along the border (Upadhyay, June 1965).

Earlier too he called for strengthening the defence potential of India which included imparting training to all able bodied youths in the age group of 20-40 years and handing over the defence portfolio to a person who can inspire confidence among the forces and the common people, implying that the defence ministry is in the hands of a responsible and a committed person (Upadhyay, January 1960).

His views on border protection are very much in consonance with the present government's policy which is trying to secure and insulate the borders from external transgressions. Rehabilitation policy is one among such policies which aims to settle committed and loyal people along the border with Pakistan. As if Upadhyay foresaw the future shape of the things, he opined that "people and parties with extra-territorial loyalties should not be allowed to function in border areas and that the communist party, the Muslime League and the like should be prevented from undermining people's loyalties in vulnerable areas." (Venugopal, 2016). He further wrote: "if we cannot build a Maginot line, we can definitely create a human belt of staunch nationalistic bent, fully trained and equipped to defend any sudden and sporadic inroads into our country." (Venugopal, *ibid*).

### **A United Nations for all**

The issue of United Nations assumed an important point of discussion even during the times of Dr. Upadhyay. Like a true democrat, he firmly believed in the significance of the United Nations. Thus while affirming his firm belief in the United Nations, he said:

"U.N. cannot be an instrument of depriving nations of their freedom. Permanent peace is not possible so long as there exist political slavery, economic exploitation, social discrimination and selfish lust for power. The western powers, if they have any regard for the U.N., should, exert their influence in putting an end to these evils which are a legacy of their own actions in the past." (Venugopal, *ibid*).

However, while upholding his faith in the United Nations and considering the organization of great significance, Dr. Upadhyay equally remained alive to the problem of the United Nations' relevance in its (then) current format. He doubted that the newly liberated countries of Africa would get equal and respectable place in the United Nations even though they are now sovereign nations, and they have the right to be treated equally under the notion of the 'sovereign equality of nations' in the United Nations. He thus raised the demand for the

reform of the United Nations and called for the revision of the U.N. Charter, He believed that without accomplishing this task, the relevance of this organization would remain incomplete and it will not be able to dispense justice to the weak and newly liberated countries. While congratulating the newly liberated countries of Africa, he demanded that since the United Nations was an important tool of world peace and amity, it should accord a status of equality and respect to these newly African countries. As such, like today, he raised the issue of the reform of the United Nations, and asserted that unless that was done, there could be no worthwhile place of the weak nations in it. He questioned the skeptics who doubted the success of any such reform initiative.

He, therefore, demanded "that steps should be taken to make the UNO an effective instrument for securing to the enslaved nations status of equality and freedom. Unless all nations of the world are truly represented in it, the UNO can hardly claim to bear that appellation. The UNO Charter needs revision. But fear has been expressed that any attempt to revise it may lead to the disintegration of the UNO. Well it may. But it will be no use allowing the UNO to repeat the history of the League of Nations. The test of Statesmanship of the leaders of world powers lies in successfully revising the Charter. It may not be impossible if Eisenhower realises that what Lincoln fought for was liberty of man not only in USA but in the whole world; If Macmillan can show that he no longer represents the die hard conservatives of the Kipling age, but an enlightened race which, of its own free will, could grant independence in a constitutional manner to a number of nations in succession; and if Khrushchev can establish that the sympathies of the communist world for slave and suffering peoples is not a political ruse to win such people to its side but an expression of the true nature of communism and therefore nations within its fold are also entitled to the same independent and honourable treatment. If that is done, there will be no case for nuclear or other weapons of destruction, and real disarmament will ensure." (Upadhyay, February 1960).

### **Foreign aid and assistance**

Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) which today has found place in the foreign policies of most of the countries including India, was an important issue even during the time of Deen Dayal Upadhyay. He realized the burdensome nature of foreign aid and assistance and the bargaining power that it gives to the lender to the borrower.

He cautioned the Indian government of depending too heavily on foreign aid and assistance of any one country as it could open doors to undue of foreign influence in the domestic affairs of our country. Citing America's decision to cut its foreign aid to India due to later's decision to buy Supersonic missiles from the Soviet Union, he termed it as American interference in India's internal affairs and termed it as 'unacceptable'. He thus asserted: "apart from the political influence inherent in it, foreign capital also determines the direction of our economic growth. By importing foreign technology we create a situation in which there is not only a big gap between production and needs of consumption but also an abundance of unutilised resources. It is for this reason that during the last 14 years despite large-scale unemployment and decapitalisation on the other." (Upadhyay, June 1962).

### **A friend and a critic of the government**

Many critical write-ups have sought to establish that Dr. Upadhyay was a bitter critic of the Nehru government and that he spared no opportunity in criticizing the government. Off and on, in seminars and academic discourses, it is held that due to strong ideological differences, Dr. Upadhyay became a natural and an unsparing critic of Pt. Nehru, as well as, of the Constitution of India. This is utterly false and mis-representation of the facts. The true spirit of Pt. Upadhyay's criticisms has not been understood by most critics and therefore they have painted him in different shades, far detached from reality (Tharoor, 2018).

While it is true that he had differences with the Nehru government on a number of issues, it is pertinent to note that his criticisms were entirely and plainly based on the merit of the issues and in conformity to the national interest of the country. He had nothing personal against Pt. Nehru, though critics have sought to derive the theory of 'clash of personalities' in his relationship with Nehru.

Infact, a closer look at Dr. Upadhyay reveals that he was a true statesman. He acted as both a friend and a critic of the government. He witnessed the Second World War and the horrors of genocide committed by Hitler and Mussolini. He saw how the powerful nations- Germany, the Soviet Union and the USA- dominated

the world politics and fulfilled their national ambitions through their economic and military might. He wanted to make India too a great power and therefore advocated for a strong leader who could take India to the heights of glory. He knew Pt. Nehru was a great statesman but realized that at times, he handled the situations unrealistically, giving rise to confusion and disappointment. Taking a leaf from the stronger nations, he thus spoke of “the need for having a strong national leadership like Chandragupta Maurya and Chanakya in order to secure India's territorial and political sovereignty, a leader who does not bow to international or regional pressures.” (Venugopal, 2016).

On many occasions, Pt. Upadhyay cautioned the government, particularly concerning the twin challenges posed by China and Pakistan. At the same time, he also supported the government for taking the right decision as in the case of non-alignment. In one of his earlier appreciations, he complimented the government for taking a decisive action in liberating Goa from the Portuguese rule in December 1961 clearly saying that the “GOI action in Goa had enhanced the prestige of the country, revived the confidence of the nation and instilled new hope in the subjugated peoples and hence would strengthen the U.N., rather than weaken it as had been said in some quarters.” (Upadhyay, June 1962).

### **Contemporary relevance of Pt. Upadhyay's ideology**

As mentioned before, Dr. Upadhyay was both an ideologue and a realist. He combined in himself the two rare qualities of a philosopher and a practitioner. He translated his words into actions, practiced what he preached, and as such, it would not be wrong to say he was a 'philosopher in action'. He was a freedom fighter, a legal critic, a true nationalist, wedded to the idea of giving a respectable place to India's civilisational values in the Indian Constitution.

Though more than half a century of his death may have passed, the nationalist ideology and its impact on India's foreign policy is still very vivid. His views on multifarious issues of foreign policy amply reflect the nationalistic fervor. His critical observations and reflections on the outstanding issues of his day are still as relevant as they were during his days. For instance, his constant warning to the Nehru government about the threats posed by Pakistan and China still serves as an alarm to the present day government. His belief that India's overtures in diplomatically and politically winning over China to its side would lead to the de-hypensionation of Pakistan-China relations, and will lessen the Pakistani menace for India as being so misleading and self-defeating, is still so acutely true even after more than fifty years of his demise. The NDA governments' foreign policy, both during the Vajpai government (March 1998-May 2004) and the Modi government since 2014, has generally been on the highest alert in so far as both Pakistan and China are concerned. The Modi government has, in particular, adopted a tough stand on Pakistan-sponsored terrorism.

The relevance of Dr. Upadhyay's views is self-evident in his appeal for the reform of the United Nations, which today is the focal point of India's foreign policy. Pt. Upadhyay was not convinced with the role being played by the United Nations, particularly with regard to the newly liberated countries. He was distressed to see that the powerful nations of the West were manipulating this global organization to serve their hegemonistic goals along with stifling the voice of the smaller nations. Therefore, he exhorted the United Nations to work for Africa, as well as, appealed to powerful nations to support the United Nations for the cause of world peace and security. Working on the same lines, the present government has taken up the reform of the United Nations Security Council in a big way with a view to securing India's place in the Security Council as a permanent member. All issues raised by Pt. Upadhyay pertaining to the United Nations are today the foreign policy goals of India, including building special and enduring relationship with African countries.

Of all his views on India's foreign policy, perhaps none is more relevant than his stand on non-alignment. In the name of non-alignment, he criticized the Nehru government for appeasing China and other big powers and succumbing to their pressures. Giving a call for shunning emotionalism or romanticism of any kind in the foreign policy, he exhorted the government to be absolutely pragmatic and focused on its national interest while following the policy of non-alignment. The concept of 'Dynamic Neutrality' is yet another contribution of Pt. Upadhyay to the foreign policy of India. The present government, following into his footsteps, is pursuing an India-centric policy with its focus on the principle of 'India-first' approach. Thus, it has been able to strike a right cord between the two opposite sets of countries, who in international relations happen to be mutually sworn enemies. Through its foreign policy, today India has established close bilateral relations

with Saudi Arabia and UAE on the one hand, and Israel on the other. Similarly, it has fine-tuned its relationship with both Iran and Palestine on one side and their sworn enemy- the Israel- on the other side. In its outreach to the international community, India has given no place to romanticism in its foreign policy even to its closest friends- Russia, USA or France. Only national interest is the guiding force of the current dispensation.

Pt. Upadhyay's call for incorporating and disseminating India's civilizational values through its foreign policy again finds a notable mention in India's soft power diplomacy, which is one of the hall marks of the Modi government. Never has been India's cultural-spiritual strengths so magnificently showcased and demonstrated to the world as in the present time by the current dispensation. As a result, India, of late, has emerged as one of the world's 'Cultural tourism' centre.

In sum, the influence of Pt. Upadhyay's nationalist ideology on the foreign policy of India is crystal clear. His many prescriptions have been adopted and his constant appeals and warnings on India's relations with its neighbouring, as well as, Western countries have been taken note of by the foreign policy establishment of India. A large part of the laurels that India have won during the Modi government since 2014 owe it to Pt. Upadhyay's ideological imprints. The need is to further propagate and disseminate, through the foreign policy, the rich civilisational values of India that Pt. Upadhyay so ardently advocated for. Paying glowing tributes to Pt. Upadhyay, Vinay Sahastrabuddhe, thus said:

“Pt. Upadhyay had an insight into the role India can play in making the world free from conflicts, misery and deprivation. The relevance of integral humanism propounded by him is not only eternal, but also applicable beyond boundaries of nations. India enjoys goodwill across the world and a need is felt to further consolidate it by adopting a more focused approach for spreading understanding about Indian culture, civilization and the people.” (India Today, 2018).

### References:

1. Ganguly, Anirban: “Both Visionary and Pragmatic, The Pioneer, 14 September, 2016.
2. India Today, “Modi Government pursuing foreign policy envisaged by Deen Dayal, January 30, 2017”.
3. India Today, “Deen Dayal's ideologies relevant even today” 17 May, 2018. <https://www.indiatoday.in/pti-feed/story/swaraj-to-deliver-inaugural-iccrs-pt-deenadayal-upadhyay-memorial-oration-1235284-2018-05-17>
4. Maheshwari, Dhairya: “India's foreign policy must take inspiration from ideals of Deendayal Upadhyaya: Swaraj”, in National Herald, 22 May 2018. Sushma Swaraj delivered the inaugural Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya Memorial International lecture, Soft Power Diplomacy: Strength of India, in New Delhi. The address was organised by the Indian Council of Cultural Relations (ICCR), New Delhi.
5. South China Morning Post: “It's 'India first' as PM Narendra Modi seeks to fend off China in Maldives and Sri Lanka”, 9 June, 2019.
6. Tharoor, Shashi: “What to expect if the Modi government is inspired by Hindutva to revise India's Constitution”, 28 May, 2018. <https://theprint.in/pageturner/excerpt/modi-govt-hindutva-constitution/31617/>.
7. Upadhyay, Deen Dayal: “Rashtra Jeevan Ki Disha” (The Direction of National Life, Lucknow: Lohit Prakashan, 1971.
8. Upadhyay: Deen Dayal: “An Alternative China Policy” [Political Diary, 11 January, 1960.
9. Upadhyay, Deen Dayal: “Non-alignment or Double Appeasement?” [Political Diary, 22 February, 1960.
10. Upadhyay, Deen Dayal: “The lesson of the US-Cut Episode”, Organiser, 4 June, 1962.
11. Upadhyay, Deen Dayal: “Action in Goa Will Strengthen U.N., Not Weaken It”, Organiser, 4 June, 1962.
12. Upadhyay, Deen Dayal: “What Is Wrong with Mr. Kennedy's Stand on Kashmir”, [Political Diary, Organiser, 16 September, 1963.
13. Upadhyay, Deen Dayal: “Clear the Border of Pro-Pak Elements and Settle the Refugees There”, Organiser, 21 June, 1965.
14. Venugopal, Vasudha: “This top BJP ideologue predicted 56 years back that Pakistan would plan Uri”, Economic Times, 5 Oct 2016.