



IJAHSS



Copyright@IJAHSS

Internal Dynamics of India's Foreign Policy towards Nepal

Arun Kumar

Research Scholar, Department of Geography, CCS University, Meerut, U.P

*Corresponding Author

Arun Kumar

ABSTRACT

Although monarchy, religion, and language all retained their key roles in state creation under the new system, the rulers were unable to put multiculturalism into effect. As a result, identity politics have been given a platform thanks to a shift in emphasis from changing systems to changing actors inside them. Because the Maoist movement recognized the identity-politics objectives of many castes, ethnicities, languages, sexes, etc., the violent fight of the Maoists was effective. As a result of the Maoists' desire for a peaceful conclusion to their fight and the south's recognition of the futility of multi-party players, Nepal entered a republican era and signed the twelve-point accord. Furthermore, the demands of excluded and disadvantaged groups rendered the state-building process ineffective throughout this period of transitional democracy. People's hopes and dreams were not quickly realized due to a lack of ideologically-oriented leaders and political parties. The administration was too ineffective to fulfill the people's hopes and dreams. From the start, internal actors have politicized people's sociopolitical difficulties and laid blame at each other's feet. Peace and political stability in Nepal have room to be affected by events outside the country.

Key Words: *Religion, relation, democracy, people, politics, peace, culture, security, treaty, race*

INTRODUCTION

Not only do India and Nepal have a very open shared border, but they also have a great deal of common history, faiths, languages, racial backgrounds, and familial ties. These ties elevate the significance and value of the two nations' diplomatic ties. Nepal's significance to India's security among the Himalayan republics dates back to the British era. Sikkim, West Bengal, Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, and Uttarakhand are the five Indian states that form its eastern, southern, and western borders, respectively; to the north is the Tibet Autonomous Region of the People's Republic of China. The India-Nepal Treaty of Peace and Friendship of 1950 is the cornerstone of the special connection between the two countries. Nepalese citizens in India now enjoy the same rights and protections as Indian citizens thanks to this treaty. India is presently home to over 60% of Nepal's population[1].

In order to concentrate on its principal goal of socioeconomic growth, India's policy towards her neighboring nations has been predicated on peaceful coexistence and the promotion of peace and stability.

Background

The Anglo-Nepalese War (1814–16) established the foundation for tense ties between India and Nepal. The Treaty of Sugauli, signed in 1816, caused Nepal to lose Sikkim, land west of the Kali River (Kumaon and Garhwal), and a sizable chunk of the Tarai area. Some of the Tarai region was given back to Nepal by the British East India Company in 1816. Also, the corporation has ceased sending Nepal its usual annual payment of 200,000 Nepali rupees. The Treaty of Sugauli, signed in 1925 by the governments of Nepal and British India, continues to serve as the legal basis for diplomatic ties between the two countries.

Two treaties, the Treaty of Peace and Friendship and the Treaty of Trade and Commerce, were signed with Nepal in 1950, officially establishing bilateral relations following independence. The first one is about maintaining diplomatic ties, which necessitates respecting each other's sovereignty, territorial integrity, and independence. The second is that Indian ports and territory are now open to Nepalese imports and exports. Goods passing through India would be exempt from customs fees.

The relationship between India and Nepal has been turbulent ever since India gained independence. Anti-India sentiments in Nepal have their roots in India's political meddling in the country, which the Nepali monarchy saw as supporting democratic movements. The Nepalese monarchy started an anti-India campaign in the 1950s for political gain. This animosity was stoked by the Citizenship Act of 1952, which made it easy for Indians to move to Nepal and get Nepalese citizenship[2].

India pushed for Nepal's leadership to bend to the will of people calling for political freedom and rights by liberalizing the country's political structure. The Indian government then takes active action in Nepal. The Ranas were compelled to negotiate with the monarch and the democratic forces along the lines proposed by New Delhi as a result. Through these talks, a deal was reached that legalized political parties, reinstated the monarchy, and formed a government chaired by the Rana Prime Minister that included both regime and Nepali Congress MPs. Elections to the Constituent Assembly were planned for 1952 in order to establish a permanent political structure.

In his first news conference after being named prime minister by King Mahendra, Tanka Prasad Acharya said, "Nepal will adopt a policy of equal friendliness with all countries; accept economic and other support from all friendly countries, including China and 'Russia.... Nepal and China resolved to maintain cordial ties in 1956. It formally joined the UN on December 15, 1955. It contacted not just India, but also the UK, USA, France, and the USSR, asking for help.

The democratic experiment in Nepal did not succeed for very long. King Mahendra overthrew the popular administration and the legislative system through a coup on December 15, 1960, after it had been in place for only a few short months. There has been an arrest warrant issued for Prime Minister B.P. Koirala and other Nepali Congress leaders, the dissolution of parliament, and the suspension of the Constitution of 1959. As a result, a new Constitution was implemented in 1962, creating a monarch-supervised party-free Panchayat System. As part of the New Constitution, the monarchy's direct political power was legitimized by making Nepal a Hindu state. According to Hindu mythology, the monarch has divine right since he is an avatar of Vishnu.

Indian Prime Minister Nehru was very critical of the decision, saying, "it is not for me to criticize the actions taken there, but obviously, it is a matter of regret for all of us that a democratic experiment or practice that was going on has suffered a setback." King Mahendra's move has been questioned by the Nepali Congress and other political groups.

Nepal signed up to the Non-Aligned Movement, which began in India in 1961, along with the other countries of the Third World. This initiative was started to stop countries from forming a military bloc and to ensure that any nation may pursue its own foreign policy goals independently.

In 1962, Nepal and Pakistan began trading with one other. China helped the Himalayan nation of Nepal in order to forward its goal of freeing Nepal from India's influence. The construction of the road between Kathmandu and Kodari started in 1963 and was completed in 1965. The road provided a direct strategic link between China and Nepal over the difficult Tibetan route[3]. After India's defeat in the Indo-Chinese War in 1962, this was seen as a threat to the country's safety. Due to fears for its own security, India gives up on its objective of creating democracy in Nepal, and the monarchy continues in power without a break until 1990.

Concerns in India over Chinese influence in Nepal have grown since China's Cultural Revolution. When the monarch noticed the young Nepalese people in Kathmandu in 1967 wearing Mao emblems and shouting communist chants, he got upset. As a result, the King instituted restrictions on communist and Chinese influence in Nepal. In March of 1968, he had a heart attack that caused him to reevaluate his broader political approach, which had not brought about the expected socioeconomic change for the Nepali people.⁸ The Panchayat system was approved, and King's cooperation was secured, when King took action to free B. P. Koirala and his friends in 1968. When King Mahendra disregarded Nehru's advise in the 1960s and early 1970s, India failed to counter China's destabilizing efforts in Nepal.

During the early 1970s, B.P. Koirala's brother and later Prime Minister of Nepal, G.P. Koirala, admitted on Nepali TV that India supported their struggle against the monarchy. India played a major role in the creation of Bangladesh in 1971, and the Nepali monarchy was concerned. He said, "I stole millions of Nepali rupees from a Royal Nepal Airlines plane in 1973 with the help of Indian Intelligence agencies fighting against the Nepali monarchy."^[4] When Sikkim officially joined the Indian Union in 1974, Chinese propagandists quickly began suggesting that Nepal was next on India's list of potential conquests.

B.P. Koirala was unpopular with Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's rule after June 1975, when Mrs. Gandhi declared a state of emergency in India. To get the backing of the Nepali King, Mrs. Gandhi cut off financial assistance for the Nepali Congress and urged B. P. Koirala to return home. B.P. Koirala was captured in Nepal and put on trial there for crimes against the state, one of which was the use of Indian territory to start an armed insurrection.

While Prime Minister Morarji Desai, who came to office in 1977 after Mrs. Gandhi's loss, sought sanctuary in Nepal to meddle in domestic politics. In 1980, Mrs. Gandhi returned to office just as Nepal was gearing up for a May national referendum on whether the country should keep its party-less Panchayat government or transition to a multiparty democracy. The King of India won the referendum by a razor-thin margin, but Indian public opinion sided with the Palace^[5].

The Charter of the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) was signed on December 8, 1985, by then-King Birendra Bir Bikram Shah Dev of Nepal and then-Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi of India. SAARC is a

platform for the smaller governments in the South Asian area to work together on a variety of issues, including education, agriculture, culture, energy, finance, etc. The SAARC Secretariat is based in Kathmandu, Nepal. The SAFTA11 agreement established a free trade area in the South Asian region.

India and Nepal's bilateral trade and transportation agreements both lapsed on March 23, 1989. In order to comply with international standards, India closed all but two entrance points on the Indo-Nepali border for transactions of commodities when the previous treaty expired and India requested a new one but was not taken seriously by Nepali authority. There was a severe scarcity of necessities in Nepal since India had cut off the supply of petroleum supplies. Media outlets across the world and in Nepal used the term "economic blocked" to characterize the effects of 'ajiv Gandhi's move to restrict trade flows on Nepal. In response to India's alleged "economic blockade," King Birendra Bikram's government actively sponsored anti-India demonstrations. The King has been vocal in bringing up this subject at every international gathering he can. Nepal has also welcomed high-level officials from both Pakistan and China, and it has imported armaments from China[6].

The Nepali Congress and the Communist Parties began organizing a big uprising for November 1989. The Nepali Congress formally requested a parliamentary democracy be established under the framework of the "Constitutional Monarchy" in 1989. In January 1990, the party called a national assembly to prepare for the launch of the Movement for Restoration of Democracy (MRD), which united all the main parties, including communist groups. A multiparty democracy under Constitutional Monarchy was established on April 8, 1990, when King Gyanendra appointed an interim administration led by Nepali Congress President K. P. Bhattarai[7].

The return of democracy through mass action in 1990 was a watershed moment in the evolution of political parties. Originating in the late 1940s, on the eve of the 1950–51 armed revolution against the century-old Rana oligarchy, parties existed as a symbol of opposition before evolving into movement organizations during the 1960s–1990s, when the Panchayat system was in place and parties were not. Once the multi-party system was put back in place, the parties' roles and responsibilities shifted from those of unlawful groups to those of legitimate challengers to the executive branch.

The Rajiv govt. was deposed in India, and V.P. Singh (Janta Party) came to power. This new government began trade negotiations with Nepal and promised to stay out of Nepal's domestic problems. In time, India dispatched two of its top attorneys to assist with the constitution's creation: Dr. L.M. Sanghvi and A.G. Noorani. K.P. Bhattarai, India's new interim prime minister, traveled there in June 1990. India and Nepal reaffirmed their commitment to "respect each other's security concerns" and stressed the "unique, friendly, and brotherly" character of their ties with each other and their people. The idea of "Nepal as a sign of Peace" made by King Birendra seventeen years ago is no longer applicable in the contemporary political situation of Nepal, as called by Prime Minister Bhattarai.

The internal conflict in Nepal since insurgency began in 1996 had affected all economic activities in Nepal.

- (1) Continuous power cut
- (2) Ceaseless wage dispute employ vs. employer
- (3) Frequent strikes
- (4) Deteriorating law and order
- (5) Blocking of Highway
- (6) The continuing instability made situation worse
- (7) Inflation
- (8) Balance of payment crisis
- (9) Trade deficit and foreign exchange deficit

In November 2005, the SPA (Seven Party Alliance) and the CPN-Maoist signed a 12-point accord that represented a new beginning in Nepali politics, with three significant promises standing out in particular. The coalition of parties agreed to launch a peaceful movement against the royal regime, and the CPN-Maoist agreed to accept a multiparty competitive system. The mainstream political parties endorsed the CPN-Maoist's demand for an election of a CA. Since the Nepali monarchy seized power and dissolved parliament in February 2005, the Nepali government has been paralyzed since then.

King Gyanendra resorted to violence to put down the second, more widespread Jana Andolan, which began in April 2006 with the goal of restoring democracy and opposing the monarchy. Under increasing public pressure, King declared the reconvening of the disbanded House of Representatives from May 22, 2006. Elections for a new Constituent Assembly (CA) were conducted in 2008, and a government led by Girija Prasad Koirala was created on 30th April 2006 to design a new Constitution.

After the California elections, every party adopted a policy of conflict and obstruction whenever it was not in power. The peace effort ground to a halt because no one could agree on anything. India's opinions and attitudes on Nepal are still being seen as backing a political faction there. As a result, India is getting involved in Nepal's fractious domestic politics, which is bad for both the stability of Nepal and India.

The integration and rehabilitation of Maoist fighters, which would destroy the infrastructure established to wage the insurgency, and the writing of the constitution, which aims to address the purpose for which the Maoist insurgency and other violent agitations were conducted. All of these secondary issues have taken precedence over the primary ones, and it is plain to see that India has a serious problem on its hands because the political deadlock has not been resolved despite nine attempts to elect a new prime minister and the continuation of instability. This deadline of May 28, 2010 had to be extended by one year.

The Maoists held India responsible for their country's demise. The ongoing anti-India movement by Maoists has damaged public perception of India and strained relations between the two countries. Madhav Kumar was placed at fault by the UCPN (M). The Nepali administration, which New Delhi and Indian imperialism are effectively leading, has been the primary impediment to the constitution-drafting and peace-making processes.

An additional unwelcome component was introduced during the election of choosing a prime minister, which ultimately failed after 9 attempts. When Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi sent his special envoy Shyam Saran to Nepal on the eve of the fourth round of elections for prime minister, some speculated that his mission was to stop the Maoists from forming a government and to keep the Madhesi vote from being divided in their favor. The Maoists' visit was characterized as an intervention. Because "anti-India feeling has become so deep," the Indian ambassador in Nepal was assaulted and shown black flags for the first time in October 2010.

China's reemergence as a significant role in Indo-Nepali relations and the resulting increase in India's security concerns are the outcome of the new foreign policy objectives and the drastically altered political climate. India faces a significant difficulty in ensuring that it remains Nepal's top foreign policy priority despite the country's generally positive relations with other nations.

Almost 19 million counterfeit Indian banknotes were discovered in 2009–10, according to Ambassador of India Rakesh Sood. Seventeen or eighteen terrorists entered India from Nepal last year. Next, in order to streamline security-related cooperation between India and Nepal, the SSB – SasatraSimaBal – has grown into a network of bilateral institutional mechanisms for border management and security sharing.

Before and after independence, the two nations have collaborated on a number of water projects, including:

- a) 1920 Sarada Barrage Project Assessment between British India and Nepal
- b) The 1954 Agreement on the Kosi Project (as revised in 19 December 1996)
- c) Agreement between His Majesty's Government of Nepal and the Government of India on the Gandak Irrigation and Power Project (Amended), 30 April 1964
- d) Tanakpur Agreement Concluded at the Time of Prime Minister Girija Prasad Koirala, dated on 6 December 1991
- e) Treaty His Majesty's Government of Nepal and the Government of India concerning the Integrated Development of the Mahakali River Including Sarada Barrage, Tanakpur Barrage and Pancheshwar Project (12 February 1996)
- f) Pancheshwar Multipurpose Project and setting up of Pancheshwar Development Authority:
- g) SaptaKosi High Dam Project and setting up of Project Development Authority to start the pre-construction activities of the Dam.
- h) Kamla and Bagmati Multipurpose Projects

In a press release, the Indian Embassy in Kathmandu noted, "India has supported a federal, democratic, republican, and inclusive Constitution in Nepal throughout the process of Constitution making in Nepal. We take note of the Constitution of Nepal being formally enacted today. We are worried about the continued violence in various border regions with India. Our Ambassador to Nepal has already discussed this matter with the Nepalese Prime Minister. If there are disagreements, they should be discussed in an environment devoid of violence and intimidation, and then institutionalized in a way that allows for widespread buy-in and acceptance. In doing so, the groundwork would be laid for peace, growth, and prosperity in Nepal. To the people of Nepal, our warmest regards.

"We've heard that there have been roadblocks at various checkpoints along the India–Nepal border." The claimed roadblocks are the result of disturbances, riots, and demonstrations on the Nepalese side. We have heard from our freight forwarders and carriers that they are having trouble moving about inside Nepal and are worried about their safety as a result of the ongoing turmoil, as was reported on September 21st, 2015. We stress again that the problems in Nepal are mostly political. Credibly and effectively, Nepal's authorities must address the issues behind the current state of tension. Resolving and institutionalizing conflicts requires widespread buy-in and support. We're praying for everything to calm down soon. Following reports in the Nepali media that India has reimposed a "Economic Blockade" on Nepal, the Indian Embassy issued the following statement.

There is a growing tide of anti-Indian feeling in Nepal, and public, media, and political opinion are all turning against India. For India, figuring out how to deal with these issues has come at a difficult moment.

In a press release, the Indian Embassy in Kathmandu noted, "India has supported a federal, democratic, republican, and inclusive Constitution in Nepal throughout the process of Constitution making in Nepal. We take note of the Constitution of Nepal being formally enacted today. We are worried about the continued violence in various border regions with India. Our Ambassador to Nepal has already discussed this matter with the Nepalese Prime Minister. If there are disagreements, they should be discussed in an environment devoid of violence and intimidation, and then institutionalized in a way that allows for widespread buy-in and acceptance. In doing so, the groundwork would be laid for peace, growth, and prosperity in Nepal. To the people of Nepal, our warmest regards.

"We've heard that there have been roadblocks at various checkpoints along the India–Nepal border." The claimed roadblocks are the result of disturbances, riots, and demonstrations on the Nepalese side. We have heard from our freight forwarders and carriers that they are having trouble moving about inside Nepal and are worried about their safety as a result of the ongoing turmoil, as was reported on September 21st, 2015. We stress again that the problems in Nepal are mostly political. Credibly and effectively, Nepal's authorities must address the issues behind the current state of tension. Resolving and institutionalizing conflicts requires widespread buy-in and support. We're praying for everything to calm down soon. Following reports in the Nepali media that India has reimposed "Economic Blockade" on Nepal, the Indian Embassy issued the following statement. There is a growing tide of anti-Indian feeling in Nepal, and public, media, and political opinion are all turning against India. For India, figuring out how to deal with these issues has come at a difficult moment.

Analysis

Based on research into the history of ties between India and Nepal since the treaty of 1816 between the British Raj in India and the Nepalese Monarchy, it would appear that the foundation of India–Nepal relations was laid by the British Raj in India, and a strong relationship between the two countries began after India's independence. As a landlocked nation in South Asia, Nepal relies on a positive relationship with neighboring India for commerce and security reasons; without India, Nepal would not be able to access the Indian Ocean.

India and Nepal Although culturally quite different from one another, there are numerous commonalities between the two countries. The political structures, intellectual foundations, and leaders' perspectives have all been unique to each period and place in history. Nepal's government has gone through many shifts in recent decades, from monarchy (until 1950) to parliamentary democracy with a multi-party system and monarchy (1951–1960) to the Panchayat system with monarchy (1961–1990) to a state of emergency and full control by the King (2002–2006) to the current democratic republic (since May 28, 2008).

India has had several changes in government but not in its governing structure, while Nepal has seen both. The diplomatic ties between India and Nepal shifted when a new administration took power in both countries. For a while now, it's been obvious that Nepal is using China as a threat to influence Indian foreign policy, and this has resulted in adverse consequences for Nepal thanks to the economic blockade enforced by India. These things demonstrate how the monarch, the prime minister, and the president of a certain country have directed its foreign policy in light of the interests of that country.

Both nations' foreign policy have undergone changes as a result of a shift in the political parties in power. All parties, including King Mahendra and Birendra, have played the China card, despite the fact that the Nepali Congress looks to India and the Communist Parties look to China. India is concerned about Nepal's treaty with China and bilateral relationship with Pakistan, and India's meddling in Nepal's domestic affairs has bred mistrust between the two countries. Since 1947, several prime ministers, kings/presidents, and other leaders from India and Nepal have visited each other's countries in an effort to maintain good relations and lay the groundwork for innovative new policies.

Nepal was the sole "Hindu rashtra" before it became a republic, and although though it is now a secular state, the majority of its citizens still identify as Hindu. When people have strong feelings about a particular religion, it motivates religious leaders and organizations to reach out to those people and educate them on the shared values and ideals that unite them. The RSS, VHP, Darul Uloom Deoband, etc. Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) like SUDDHI, SAFE, Swadesh Foundation, SEEDS India etc. are also active in the social, economic, and environmental spheres. Both nations' foreign policies are heavily influenced by the well knit family ties that exist amongst their citizens in the border districts. Relatives and friends in India are backing the current Madhesi, Tharu, and Janjati agitations in Nepal's border districts in protest of new constitutional provisions that would strip them of political and economic rights and citizenship if they married Indian women. After marrying a Nepali citizen, a foreign woman can only become a naturalized citizen of Nepal (Article 11(6)). Additionally, a descendant of a Nepali mother who is married to a foreign national will not be eligible for citizenship. This clause [Article 11(7)] is biased against Madhesi.

Nepali media and political leaders have stoked anti-India feeling among the people and the intelligentsia of Northern

Nepal by claiming that India is once again trying to meddle in Nepal's internal affairs and imposing an economic blockade. Since King Mahendra's reign, Nepal's leaders have spoken out against India. They feel that India has repeatedly meddled in their country's affairs, such as when it supported the Nepali Congress and provided cover for the Indian Communist Party during the country's transition to democracy.

Here two main causes from both sides found that affected the relations of India and Nepal:

From Indian side

- 1) India's intervention in Nepali politics and its internal affairs
- 2) Economic blocked unofficially imposed by India From Nepali side
- 3) Playing China Card
- 4) Political instability

Besides these causes there are also other causes which were and are affecting the relation on India and Nepal: China's politics, UN and other International Organizations intervention, USAs pressures, Nepal-Pakistan relations etc.

Global Movement and Impact

The dramatic events of World War II mark a turning point in history; the two-camp scenario emerged in the diplomatic arena. Different philosophies led the United States and the Soviet Union to cast wary glances at the newly independent nations. The situation in Nepal was not unique. The United States and its allies pushed for Nepal to adopt the same liberal democratic system that has been successful in neighboring India. If the allies hadn't known this, Nepal may have followed China's lead and started a revolution. The nationalist movement in India and the communist revolution in China both left indelible marks on the Nepalese mentality. To avoid having to cope with the disadvantages communism would bring, the newly ascendant elites in Nepal opted for a democratic system. India was only a supporting actor.

In accordance with the terms of the 1950 settlement, the United States began providing financial assistance to Nepal. Nepal began borrowing money from a conglomerate of Bretonwood financial companies. The United States' influence inside United Nations institutions distributing aid to Nepal has grown steadily throughout the 1990s. The dramatic and traumatic fall of the Berlin Wall marked the end of the cold war and became the United States the world's sole superpower.

Role in Maoist Insurgency

In the perspective of political stability and peace, India's engagement in the Maoist insurgency appears dubious. India has always benefited when Nepal's government was unstable. Some Nepali analysts have blamed the marginalization of different social groups—such as caste and ethnicity, gender and geography—for the rise of Maoism in the country. However, the external element, especially the Indian factor, is the most significant driver of the Maoist insurgency. Nepal's democratic and communist revolutions were only feasible because of India, hence India has anticipated more from Nepal's political actors.

Help from India. However, it is possible that the new political landscape that arose after 1990 failed to live up to its ambitions, prompting it to resort to the Maoist as a negotiating chip. In 1996, at the outset of the Maoist movement, they presented the government with a list of forty demands. The government at that time was unable to meet the needs of the people. This is because in 1996, out of a total of forty requests made to the government, the top three all had to do with India in some way. The government had to admit that the "anti-nationalist" India-Nepal Tanakpur Agreement was "wrong" and should be nullified, along with the Mahakali Treaty, and (c) the entire Nepal-India border should be systematically controlled, and vehicles with the Indian number plates should not be allowed free entry. But in recent years, the Maoists have rarely been a problem, and anti-Indian language has all but disappeared from their official writings. In other words[8].

Since the Maoists declared the People's War, their rivals on the other side of the border have provided constant spiritual and material assistance. The strong proof corroborated what had long been suspected in Nepal: that the senior Maoists leaders had been hiding out in India with the knowledge of New Delhi. Nepal also saw that without Indian help, the Maoist issue would not go away. Nepal may have had a tough time getting Indian support before the September 11th proclamation of war on terrorism.

On November 26, the situation was rendered explosive by the declaration of Maoists as terrorists, the introduction of a state of emergency, and the deployment of the Nepal Army. India agrees that declaring a state of emergency is an essential measure for a democratic government to use in order to maintain law and order. Despite of the promise made by the foreign ministry spokesperson, Nirupama Rao, Indian would not allow its territory to be used by those unfavorable for the Nepalese interests, top Maoist leaders appeared to be able to function without restriction in India and during the Nepalese prime minister SherBahadurDeuba, top Maoists leaders, Mohan Vaidhya, C.P. Gajurel, and Top BahadurRayamajhi, were escorted by the Indian intelligence members.

King Gyanendra sacked Prime Minister Deuba and consolidated executive power in himself after Maoist threats forced the postponement of the general election. This followed international support for the government's fight against the Maoists. Because of this, authoritarianism and political instability spread throughout Nepal. Similarly, hopes for calm were in vain.

After all, it was the opposition that sparked the pro-democracy movement that ultimately brought the king to his knees and opened the way for multi-party democracy. The global impact of the specter of glasnost and perestroika was profound. Open border policies, commerce, and advances in science and technology have all contributed to a virtual dissolution of national boundaries. As the European Union came into being as a unified front, it began to play an increasingly important role in the governments of various emerging nations. The United States was expected to serve as a leader for the western community, a duty it occasionally failed to fulfill. Since the signing of the Twelve Point Agreement in New Delhi, Nepal has made great strides in establishing a republican government. Donors and European Union members were taken aback by the CA election's outcome, notably the Nordic nations' decision to roll out the red carpet for the Maoists. The United States, however, strongly disagreed and refused to remove them off its list of terrorist organizations. Prachanda, a Maoist leader, is courting the European and American business communities under the premise of advancing Lumbini. The ground-level effects of this effort have yet to be seen.

The Shah Dynasty remained a strong and reliable institution in Nepal for a long period. After the public revolt in 2006, things changed drastically. The monarchy as a political system has been overthrown. The other reliable friend that can prove its democratic bona fides The Nepali Congress was relegated to the role of supporting actor in the CA, forcing it to take a back seat. The newly formed CPN Maoist can only be countered by the combined might of the NC, CPN-UML, and Madhesi Parties. The United States has viewed the Maoists with skepticism since their totalitarian grid appears to be intact and there is no evidence of progress.

Maoist music transformed the yam of "Divyopadesh" by Prithvi Narayan Shah into explosives. Nepal's foreign policy has seen notable changes under Bhimsen Thapa, Jung Bahadur, Chandra Shamsher, Mahendra, B P Koirala, Birendra, and Now Prachanda. Since then, Nepal's economic situation has deteriorated to unprecedented lows. Nepal is one of the world's poorest countries. Domestic policy is in disarray due to ongoing instability, and the decade-long armed struggle has left deep wounds in the search for calm and security at home and abroad. Foreign countries' real concern for supporting peace and stability in Nepal would be of little help and little benefit as long as the decisive Nepalese actors inside the nation are continually embroiled in pursuit of their political and other safety. The destiny of peace and stability will remain precarious as long as the domestic stakeholders do not settle on a shared minimum point.

India and China are always seeking to influence events in Nepal to suit their own ends, and they have plenty of material to use as cover. China has always, practically speaking, agreed with the Indian position on Tibet because of the friction between the two countries. It's hard to predict India's position once Chinese ambitions take center stage. Nepal's strategic location in the South Asian area attracts the attention of world powers.

China Factor

Communists generally support China ideologically, and the country is strategically significant as a counterweight to India. This is made abundantly obvious in communist debates on the Tibetan issue in Nepal. All main parties recognize Tibet as a part of China, with communists offering especially staunch support for the central government and denouncing any leniency shown to "Free Tibet" efforts in Nepal.

Nepal did get help from China during the struggle with India that followed Mahendra's takeover in the 1960s. In October 1962, China's foreign minister made the declaration that China would support the Nepalese people if any foreign force took the reckless decision to attack Nepal.

Both China and India were disturbed by the United States' increasing involvement in the globe after 9/11 in the name of suppressing and fighting all sorts of terrorism (particularly Maoist in the context of Nepal). The Chinese government believed that having troops stationed in Nepal would jeopardize national security along the Nepal-China border. Using Nepali land as a launching pad, the West is prepared to cause trouble for China at any time under the guise of the Free Tibet campaign, according to China.

Several high-ranking Chinese security, administration, and political officials and delegates traveled to Nepal to assess the country's shifting political and strategic landscape in the context of recent events. After the Maoist uprising, China became increasingly wary of Nepal and developed a strong interest in the country as a means to prevent the west from using China's strategic location to destabilize Tibet. It was for this reason that China had offered a new peace and friendship treaty, similar to the one signed with India in 1950. Similarly, China's growing aid to the Nepalese army in a variety of guises demonstrates China's eagerness to establish relations with the Nepal Army.

America and Western Factor

Compared to its relationships with India and China, Nepal's ties to the developed world are less strategically

important. However, the Nepalese government relies substantially on foreign aid and loans from the developed world. In most cases, aid is dispersed either directly between governments or, more recently, through international organizations like the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the World Bank.

American policy in the 1950s and the decades that followed was heavily impacted by the cold war, especially in light of China's takeover of Tibet. This was true of most western countries. While the United States initially followed Britain's example in responding to King Tribhuwan's escape to India, it did not become a significant aid donor until the 1950s, when it did so largely on the basis of the assumption that economic growth in Nepal was required to avert communist takeover.

Since the United States, like China, values its ties with India, she stayed out of the spotlight throughout the embargo in 1989 and 1990. Once the "Janaandolan" had begun, the United States was torn between the desire to be viewed as supporting democracy and the necessity to keep customary good relations with the Panchayat authority.

Although the governments of the United States and the United Kingdom were hesitant to break with the palace during the 1990s movement, educated opinion within these nations and throughout the West played a different role. During that time period, Krishna Prasad Bhattarai announced that various countries have pledged support for the democracy movement. He said that with such backing, the Panchayat administration would have no right to put down the uprising once it had begun.

The question of what approach western nations and the international community should take toward the UML, which had been a partner and later a strong opponent to congress, emerged after the movement's victory. How banks and other financial institutions in Nepal would react to a communist administration. After the Royal massacre in June 2002, the United States and the western community began taking an even more serious interest in Nepal, which had been dormant since the 1990s.

After President George W. Bush's trip to India, the United States' attitude toward Nepal began to shift significantly. Nepal was first viewed through American eyes, but once the nuclear deal was signed with India and India was described as the regional power, America began to view Nepal through Indian eyes as well. President Obama's "aid to feed the future" project has made Nepal one of its 20 focal nations, reflecting the administration's optimistic view of the country. As a result of their enormous financial help to Nepal since the reforms in 2006 [9], Japan, Germany, and Canada have all exerted a significant economic influence on Nepalese foreign policy.

As a result, the economic dimension of Nepal's foreign policy is increasingly determined and formulated by the Nepal Development Forum, which is comprised of a number of bilateral and multilateral donors, powerful and wealthy international non-governmental organizations, multinational companies, and big business houses. Similarly, European Union members, notably Scandinavian ones, promoted proactive democracy at the bilateral and international levels.

Non-governmental organizations (NGOs), civil society organizations (CSOs), and other private institutions and organizations also raised a number of issues, such as restructuring the state, federalism, participation, inclusive democracy, republic, and secular state etc., and finally encouraged for the determination of the social fragmentation in terms of caste, language, religion, culture, etc.

CONCLUSION

To sum up, it's obvious that major international countries see Nepal favorably. The unfortunate issue is that they have no time to think about peace, political stability, or the development of Nepal in the worst sense since their slogan remains to promote their benefit, not our interest of peace and political stability. Our nation's decision-makers put their own needs first while they consider just their own. The academic community, for instance, is still divided over whether to follow anti- or pro-Indian, Chinese, American, or European instruction. In its most basic form, this is the national tragedy.

Since the union of contemporary Nepal, there have been periods of calm and political instability, and evidence suggests that India plays a large influence in both. For instance, India was instrumental in brokering the seven-point agreement between key political parties and the twelve-point settlement between the SPA and the Maoists. This seven-point pact is based on the idea that following the demise of the monarchy in Nepal, India has altered its strategy toward that country in order to establish dominance in South Asia via the use of political parties. We have not yet heard the reaction of the West, notably the United States, to India's approach toward Nepal. Currently, American policy may be evaluated in light of the fact that Washington is committed to maintaining its "two pillar policy" of supporting both multiparty democracy and Nepal's monarchy, without which neither can function effectively. Similarly, China, as a good neighbor, would prefer that no hostile operations take place in Nepal's territory. This is especially true for the "free-Tibet movement," which China has long suspected the United States of encouraging and torturing. Also, European nations persistently push for their philanthropic presence in the guise of social change, which is rooted in religious and cultural imperialism. In order to achieve long-term peace and political stability, Nepal must rethink its foreign policy toward

India, China, the United States, and western nations. Finally, it was determined that Nepal's relations with India were impacted by the country's political upheavals, instability, insurgencies, agitations, and search for peace and stability. Additionally, the brief period of stability and evolution of democracy in Nepal was a result of India's efforts. Finally, it was determined that Nepal's new Constitution and the Parliamentary Federal Democratic Republic will ensure the internal peace and stability and that will help in the continuation of good relations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adhikari, B. (2003). The Context of Conflict and Human Rights Violations in Nepal: Some Preliminary Observations. In Adhikari, Bipin(Eds.). Conflict, Human Rights and Peace Challenges before Nepal: RishikeshShaha Memorial Lectures 2003, Kathmandu, National.
2. Dahal, D. R. (2006). Civil Society Groups in Nepal, Their Roles in Conflict and Peace-Building. Kathmandu, Support for Peace and Development Initiative, UNDP.
3. Ministry of Peace and Reconstruction (2008). In Agreements and Understandings on Peace Negotiation of Nepal, Government of Nepal. Kathmandu, Ministry of Peace and Rehabilitation p.74.
4. Mishra, B. P. (2009). Strength and Weaknesses of the Nepalese Peace Process. Kathmandu, Fine Print Books.
5. Nepal, P. (2003). The Maoist Movement and Its Impact in Nepal. In Karki, Arjun and David Seddon (Eds.), The People's War in Nepal, Left Perspective, Delhi, Adroit Publishers.
6. Sondhi S. (2007). International Relations Search for Security and Development. South Asian Publishers Pvt. Ltd., Rangamahar, Pataudi House, Daryaganj, New Delhi: pp. 1-38.
7. UNDP (2009). Getting the Peace Process Right. In Nepal Human Development Report 2009: State Transformation and Human Development, Kathmandu: UNDP Nepal, 2009, p. 49.
8. Mishra R. (2004). India's Role in Maoist Insurgency. Asian Survey, Vol. 44(5), pp. 627-646. Retrieved from the JSTOR.org database in 2009.
9. Dahal, R. K. (2010). Dynamics of Nepal's Foreign Policy. Nischal N. Pandey, Anand P. Shrestha, Janardan R. Sharma, Daniel Mendies, DilipDhakal, SreyasaMainali and Gaurav Bhattarai(Eds.), Sangam Journal, Vol. 2(3), Kathmandu, Nepal.