

**Role and Perspectives of B.P. Koirala in  
Nepali Foreign Policy**

A Dissertation

**Submitted to**

Department of International Relations and Diplomacy

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Tribhuvan University

In fulfilment of the requirement for MIRD 525 thesis of  
Master's Degree in International Relations and Diplomacy

**Submitted by**

Janak Raj Chataut

Symbol Number: 2815

Registration Number: 7-2-39-79-2007

July 2022

## **Acknowledgement**

Firstly, I would like to express gratitude to my respected supervisor and program coordinator, Prem Khanal sir, for his continuous support, motivation, and patience throughout my dissertation writing. His valuable time advising knowledge and insightful feedback helped me to enhance my thinking and elevate the level of my work.

I have received tremendous cooperation and inspiration from my family members, friends, and well-wishers while writing this dissertation. My thanks also go to my friend, Grishma Paneru, for her unflinching support and constant motivation to improve my dissertation.

My sincere gratitude to Late Dr.Umesh Bhatatrai for providing me resources and his continuous support.

The inspiring and insightful discussion with my friend Researcher/Journalist Jagat Nepal and my friends Pratik Dotel, Mahalaxmi Acharya, Somesh Thapa, Deena Thapa, Basu Dev Khanal, Saurav Raj Panta has helped me generate new ideas and continue my preparation.

## Letter of Recommendation

I certify that this dissertation entitled “Role and Perspective of B.P Koirala in Nepali Foreign Policy” was prepared by Janak Raj Chataut under my supervision. I hereby recommend this dissertation for further examination by the Research Committee Department of International Relations and Diplomacy, Tribhuvan University, in fulfillment of the requirement for the Degree of MASTER’S IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND DIPLOMACY.

.....

Prem Khanal

Supervisor

Date: July, 2022

## **Declaration**

I hereby declare that this dissertation is my original work and that it contains no materials previously published. I haven't used its content to issue any form of degree or other credential. When information from sources belonging to other writers was used, those sources were identified.

.....

Janak Raj Chataut

July, 2022

## Approval Sheet

## **Abstract**

This research provides precise knowledge of Bisheshwor Prasad Koirala's role and perspectives in Nepal's foreign policy. This research is directed towards the historical analysis through the character played by B.P Koirala on Nepal's foreign policy. The research is focused on how Koirala had played significant role that has affected the foreign policy of Nepal internally as well as externally. The dissertation explore the significance as Nepal is emerging as a geopolitical hotspot, powerful countries are showing interest in Nepali domestic politics to increase their engagement.

In addition to this, BP had strategic vision, and acumen to make realistic judgment of developments and to for see the incipient geopolitics in South Asia and beyond. BP always looked ahead with wider perspectives for Nepal and the people of Nepal and had keen understanding to the seriousness of challenges. The leading exponent of Nepal's most treasured ideas, goals, needs and objectives was Koirala and Nepal realize the importance of her foreign policy choices, which could achieve the national interest. Therefore, Nepal has always tried to maintain a cordial relationship with every state globally; especially the balanced relationship maintained with her two neighboring countries, China and India, from the unification era to till date and B.P Koirala played well on his entire political life.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Contents</b>	<b>Pages</b>
Acknowledgements	i
Letter of Recommendation	ii
Declaration	iii
Approval Sheet	iv
Abstract	v
<b>Chapter 1: Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Statement of the problem	4
1.3 Research Question	4
1.4 Research Objectives	4
1.5 Significance of Research	5
1.6 Organization of the study	5
<b>Chapter 2: Review of Literature</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1 Perspective on history	12
2.2 Nepal's Foreign Policy Challenges	12
2.3 BP Koirala's stand in Nepali Foreign Policy	19
2.4 Understanding BP through his literary works and his vision embedded	23
2.5 Conceptual Framework	27
<b>Chapter 3: Research Methodology</b>	<b>28</b>
3.1 Research Design	28
3.2 Research Site	28
3.3 Data Collection Method	28
3.4 Data Analysis	29

3.5	Limitations	29
3.6	Ethical Concerns	29
<b>Chapter 4: Position and views of BP Koirala regarding Nepal's Foreign Policy</b>		<b>30</b>
4.1	Concept of Foreign Policy	30
4.2	Role and Perspectives of B.P in shaping foreign policy of Nepal	33
4.3	A synopsis of Foreign policy under the B.P government	43
4.4	Challenges faced by BP Koirala in Foreign policy of Nepal	52
<b>Chapter 5: Conclusion</b>		<b>54</b>
References		56



# CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Background

Bishweshwor Prasad Koirala popularly known as B.P Koirala, was the first democratically elected Prime Minister of Nepal, and one of the founders of the Nepali Congress. An ideologue of democratic socialism, his perspectives and roles on Nepal's foreign policy, post 1950, is outstanding. His character in building modern Nepal, post 1950 is exceptional. The proposed research will explore the roles and perspectives of B.P Koirala's on Nepal's foreign policy. Early decades of eighteenth century, King Prithvi Narayan Shah was defensive against British Imperialism- a dominant power in Indian sub-continent (Rose, 1971). After Sugauli Treaty 1816, Nepal lost one-third of territory. With Jung Bahadur's trip to England in 1850, the reorientation of Nepali foreign policy received more significance. What he seen in England confirmed his belief that British power in India could not be easily destroyed and that it would be pointless and dangerous for Nepal to snoop around or take part in snooping with this as the aim. This viewpoint contributed to shaping Nepal's significant involvement in later events on the Indian plains. The Rana regime marked the friendly relationship with British followed by retaining four lost districts Banke, Bardia, Kailali and Kanchanpur under the Jung Bahadur's leadership (Rose, 1971). After demise of Rana Regime, under the leadership of B.P Koirala, expanded Nepal's foreign relations with various countries of the world like the US, China, India and country like Israel.

The rise of Jung Bahadur established Rana rule and resulted in a major redefinition of Nepal's foreign policy (Rose 1971). A screwed authoritarian ruler like Jung Bahadur

was aware of the decline of Chinese power who quickly understood the rising British power in the Indian subcontinent to opt British friendly foreign policy (Rose, 1971). As a result, Nepal followed the British in almost all international issues blindly (Khanal, 2000). Nepali foreign policy was further clarified by Jung Bahadur's tour to England, which reinforced his belief that British control in India would not be easily toppled and that a confrontation with the British would be like playing with fire. Jung Bahadur's tour to Europe via Britain, as well as the commitment of the Nepali army in world wars in support of it, heightened the relationship. But Nepal remained aloof with rest of the world. It is true that the Rana authoritarian rule could isolate Nepal and eventually prove to continue regime to serve the country from British usurpation as well (Sharma, 2006). Finally, during Rana's days-- Nepal was thus isolated from the current of world opinion, parochial conservatism, distrust and doubt- all these elements cast their weight on the foreign policy in the past (Khanal, 2000).

Under BP's direction, the public revolt of 1950 saw the political transition that put an end to the 104-year-old Rana oligarchy (Rose: 1971). The recently established democratic government set a new pattern in the outlook on foreign policy. India, however, controlled Nepal's foreign affairs under King Tribhuwan. The two nations were said to have a "special relationship" with one another (Muni, 2016). The majority of this relationship was with Nepal's southern neighbor. Nepal's relations with China received little attention. The state of relations between Nepal and India was influenced by a number of reasons. During the reign of the Ranas, a special bond was established between the Rana ruler and British India. There were no significant changes in the circumstance following the British departure from the subcontinent. The significant events to have a special relationship with India include the signing of a tripartite agreement allowing the British to continue sending Gurkha soldiers to

India, a peace and friendship pact in 1950, an extradition deal with India in 1953, and others (Rose:1971). Additionally, it was claimed that Nepal feared a Chinese danger at the time the peace and friendship treaty was signed, particularly following China's takeover of Tibet (Saran, 2017). Additionally, it was customary for Indian diplomats to Nepal to attend cabinet meetings. The home secretary of Uttar Pradesh, Govinda Narayan, was appointed king Tribhuvan's special secretary (Koirala: 1998) In addition to this, the scenario was brought about by India's involvement in the anti-Rana campaign and the fact that Nepali freedom fighters were familiar with Indian land. When discussing special relationships, the issue of dependency, a particular focus, and an interest emerged for the small states (Koirala, 1998).

For the majority of its history, Nepali rulers had little interaction with other countries except from those in the Indian subcontinent, British colonialists, Tibet, and occasionally China, until the Rana regime fell in 1950 in the face of an armed revolt led and organized by the Nepali Congress (Levi, 1959). It sided with the British colonialists in India during the reign of Rana. It immediately linked its foreign policy with that of independent India in the years following Indian independence in 1947. This agreement, sometimes known as "special relations," was made official by "The Treaty of "Peace and Friendship" between the Governments of India and Nepal" on July 31, 1950. (Pandey, 2015). In a last-ditch effort to shield their shaky government from potential democratic usurpation, the Ranas had conceded to the Indian security demands: After the introduction of democracy, the "special connections" with India were further cemented. After his father's death in 1955, King Mahendra became the new king of Nepal, which sped up the diversification of diplomatic connections. Werner Levi asserts that foreign countries, not Nepal, were the ones who initiated the diversification (Levi, 1957). Such a claim, however, is implausible given that Nepal's

survival as a little state sandwiched between two enormous neighbors in the post-1950 regional and global political context was assured in large part due to the diversification of its external connections (Mehra,1994). A "buffer state" like Nepal could not have survived or averted "the formal surrender of sovereignty over foreign policy to the southern neighbour, to put it more concretely, could not have escaped the fate of Sikkim or Bhutan," without the diversification of foreign ties (Koirala.1998).

## **1.2 Statement of the Problem**

B.P Koirala's perspectives and roles on Nepal's foreign policy is often underestimated topic in Nepal. Koirala spent much of life time in dealing with India, lesser with China and occasionally with the West. Due to the lack of strong written records of Koirala's speeches an archive; new generation is unknown about this roles and perspectives on Nepal foreign policy. Koirala's roles and perspectives is still relevant. B.P's perspectives on maintaining close relations with India and friendly relations with China gives a sense when both India and China including the US is fighting for the global dominance, possible to make Nepal in trouble. So, to explore perspectives and roles of B.P Koirala; this research has been done.

## **1.3 Research Questions**

- How B.P Koirala's Role and Perspectives contribute Nepal's foreign policy enhancement?

## **1.4 Research Objectives**

- To explore B.P Koirala's Role and Perspectives and its contribution on Nepal's foreign policy enhancement.

## **1.5 Significance of Research**

There are numerous internal and external factors that influence Nepal's foreign policy. Politics is one of main factors that have a significant impact on the nation's foreign policy. Political decisions are crucial because they affect foreign policy. The political environment always comprises governmental institutions, legal frameworks, and advocacy organizations / political parties and international communities that have an impact on other social segments. This research has significance as Nepal is emerging as a geopolitical hotspot, powerful countries are showing interest in Nepali domestic politics to increase their engagement. In addition to this, Nepal's both immediate neighbours has a leader who is very politically ambitious and resemble the time of B.P. This historical similarity makes the roles and perspectives of BP's in Nepal's foreign policy is still much more relevant. That is why, this research is significant.

## **1.6 Organization of the Study**

Six main chapters make up the thesis statement. An overview of the research's history and methodology is given in the first chapter, the introduction. Additionally, the historical context is shown in this chapter. Literature Review and Conceptual Framework constitute Chapter two of the study. The main topic of the dissertation is highlighted in this chapter, which also evaluates the arguments in favour of the study that has been presented. Resources used during the research are discussed in Chapter three, Research Methodology. The research has become more efficient because to the usage of secondary sources. B.P Koirala's role and perspectives in Nepal's Foreign Policy is the fourth chapter. The political transition from the time of unification to the democratic federal republic is the main topic of this chapter. The research's Analysis and Comparison chapter is the fifth. The analysis and comparison of various political

trends and Nepal's foreign policy are covered in the fifth chapter. Summary and Conclusion, the last chapter of the research, provides a summary and wraps up the dissertation.

## **CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

### **2.1 Perspective on history**

Nepal's foreign policy is steadily evolving throughout time. The foreign policy of Nepal is still influenced by Prithvi Narayan Shah. Today's foreign policy has undergone many changes, but its fundamentals remain the same. King Prithvi Narayan Shah described Nepal's political position as "Nepal is a yam between two stones." The king carefully considered his foreign policies and always aimed to retain friendly ties with China and India, his neighbours. The king's notable foreign policies included keeping a balance in relations with China and India and upholding tough military tactics to ensure that the country's territorial integrity would always be preserved.

Hindu monarchy was no longer an active political system in South Asia as a result of the incorporation of the erstwhile minor republics into independent India and Pakistan. However, the Himalayan kingdom of Nepal, which had never been conquered, was home to the only surviving example. The current monarch is Prithvi Narayan Shah, whose conquest of the Kathmandu Valley in 1769 marked the beginning of Nepal's history as a unified state. The nation is still officially referred to as a Hindu kingdom (Rose: 1971). Power is mostly concentrated in the royal palace, as it was during the reign of Prithvi Narayan Shah. During much of that time, effective power was held by a minister acting in the king's name. Jung Bahadur Rana was appointed to this position in 1846 and was successful in making it a hereditary possession of his family. Jung Bahadur and his successors united the titles of Maharaja and Prime Minister from 1857 onwards, and the Rana family ruled the country until the 'revolution' of 1950 returned power to the Shah dynasty (Rose: 1971).

Throughout the Rana dominance, the royal dynasty maintained their nominal authority, preserving the title of Maharajadhiraj in an arrangement similar to that of a number of Hindu nations, most notably the Maratha svavajya and Vijaynagar. The goal of this study is to look at Nepali politics in the important years leading up to and following Jung Bahadur's accession of power, comparing the relationship between the basic elements of the state to the pattern seen elsewhere in the subcontinent. The primary focus will be on kingship itself, as well as the difficulty of retaining central control over a large region.

Nepal's King Prithvi Narayan Shah's famous didyaupadesh 'Yam between two boulders' quote reflects the great understanding of Nepal's security dilemma. His understanding of Nepal's "geopolitics" was not only clear but also proved to be a long term prescription to handle its huge neighbours after his death. He was one of the pioneers among the strategists of his time emphasizing on economic prosperity, state's monetary regulations and scientific agricultural farming. Besides these, his vision on the neighbouring powers was so sharp that enabled his successors to formulate military and foreign policies effectively. This has remained a cornerstone of Nepal's foreign policy to this day, owing primarily to the country's geographical location. Prithivi Narayan Shah recognized that Nepal would always be insecure in relation to its big neighbors, China and India, and emphasized the importance of Nepal refining, adapting, and modifying to deal with its powerful regional neighbors (Bhattra:2020). However, rather of maintaining the tough balancing act suggested by Shah, successive Nepali governments have sought to strengthen ties with its powerful neighbors in order to bolster their own hold on power. This tendency is likely to continue in the foreseeable future, unless Nepal is prepared to conduct its foreign policy in a



world dominated by the rise of China and India. While China and India compete for global and regional dominance, there is also worry about protecting their interests in their immediate surroundings. Both countries are fighting for influence in Nepal because they are concerned that Nepali land will be exploited against their primary interests. In the end, both nations have escalated their meddling in Nepal while seriously damaging "Nepal's sovereignty and its ability to cope" with these regional powers. In light of this, this commentary emphasizes the necessity of change in Nepal's foreign policy and makes the suggestion that Nepal adopt a new foreign policy based on "trilateral security cooperation" in order to handle the expanding strategic interests of China and India in Nepal. To address the growing challenges of China and India's foreign and security policies in Nepal, a shift in Nepal's foreign policy is being advocated (Karki, 2013).

"In his first speech outlining his government's foreign policy, B.P. Koirala said on May 28, 1959, that Nepal will neither join any military alliances or renounce its policy of neutrality in its ties with other countries (School of Democracy,2021). It should be emphasized that his government was the only one in Nepal throughout the country's ten-year democratic experience to not feel the need to use foreign policy to advance its political position. B.P. Koirala's position and viewpoints in relation to Nepal's foreign policy were primarily grounded in practical factors favorable to Nepal's national interests. He advocated for backing the UN since it was thought to be the guardian of the sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity of minor countries. Since he believed that power blocs in international politics represented a perpetual threat to the true independence of weak countries, he was against them. He chose non-alignment as his strategy because it was seen to be the only way to keep Nepal out of the cold war's whirlwind. Democracy must be supported by the least

privileged and most common members of a nation. Prior to being by the people, it has to be of the people. The focus should not be on wealth, but rather on one's health, love, creativity, and sense of connection, while also eliminating all forms of prejudice between races and between the wealthy and the poor ( Koirala B.P, 2019).

Regarding B.P Koirala's perspectives on foreign intervention which is closely linked with Nepal's foreign policy. Dinesh Bhattarai mentions in Bisheshwor Prasad Koirala: Satabdi Sandharva, While having the goodwill, cooperation, and support of foreign friends and well-wishers from the international community is absolutely necessary, it is also crucial that their assistance be fully aligned with the national priorities and urgent needs of the country, and that its use be fully regulated and monitored by national institutions to make it a useful addition to national efforts. Anything external in a nation like Nepal must go through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for the sake of clarity, consistency, credibility, and the strength of the national position. Numerous foreign actors and factors entered the nation under various covers, particularly during the ten-year Maoist war and the prolonged transition. China and India, Nepal's neighbors, have experienced economic growth, and this growth has attracted attention worldwide. There is more focus on Nepal as it is in between them. Concerning developments in the area and beyond and their potential effects on Nepal, there is a need for high-quality research and a competitive reporting system (School of Democracy,2021).

In his paper titled "Recent Trends in Nepal's Foreign Policy, and Role and Functions of our Diplomats: A Personal Viewpoint," Madan Kumar Bhattarai expressed his personal opinion. He defined "diplomacy and foreign policy" in the following way (Bhattarai M.K, 2018).This nation is like a yam wedged between two stones. Keep

your relationship with the Emperor of the North positive. Maintain cordial ties with the Emperor of the South, who is currently living abroad and is very cunning in maintaining Hindustan under his control. -Prithvi Narayan Shah, the designer of contemporary Nepal. The study of the unknown is called archaeology. In diplomacy, it's important to keep things subtle. Quotes by Thomas Pickering Thomas Pickering is the US Under-Secretary of State and ambassador to the UN, Israel, Jordan, India, and El Salvador (1931-). Study, study, study the past. All of statecraft's secrets are hidden in history. British Prime Minister and scholar Sir Winston Churchill (1874–1965).

We will discover that we have lost the future if we start a dispute between the past and the present. According to Sir Winston Churchill, the United States' first line of defence is its foreign service. US Secretary of State Dean Acheson (1893–1971) once said, "An ambassador bears no culpability." Diplomacy: the art of handling a porcupine without upsetting the quills, says a Chinese proverb. We don't have any permanent adversaries, nor do we have any eternal opponents. Our job is to uphold these interests, which are eternal and unchanging. Lord Palmerston (1784–1865) served three terms as foreign secretary and was a two-time British prime minister. The foreign minister vigorously defends his own national interests. His primary goal is to obtain as much for his country as possible while offering as little in return as feasible. He has a greater responsibility than any of his peers to recognize the limitations of his national perspectives and to endeavor to justify national actions in terms of a more expansive ideal. The Foreign Minister may become the nation's scapegoat for failing to get its way due to public sentiment and his own colleagues. Abba Eban, Israeli Foreign Minister and a distinguished statesman, diplomat, author, and academic.

Whatever strategy you choose, the basic goal of any nation's foreign policy must always be to determine what will benefit her the most. We might speak about global benevolence and actually mean it. We may sincerely mean it when we speak of freedom and peace. But in the end, a government works for the benefit of the nation it represents, and no government would dare take any action that would be obviously detrimental to that nation in the short or long term. Therefore, a country's foreign minister always has that country's interests in mind, regardless of whether that country is imperialistic, socialist, or communist. "The position of prime minister is not my vocation, and if it weren't for my interest in the foreign affairs ministry, I would have quit. I learned more in the field than anyone else in the nation. And the reason I haven't quit is because I believe that by leading the External Affairs Ministry, I contribute to and benefit the nation: Jawaharlal Nehru.

## **2.2 Nepal's Foreign Policy Challenges**

Professor of Political Science and Ambassador to India, Lokraj Baral; writes in "The Kathmandu Post" (Baral, 2021),

"Foreign and domestic policies are two distinct fields that should work in tandem. Particularly in Nepal, where foreign policy is put second to the interests of the ruling class, domestic politics take precedence. Few differences existed between domestic and foreign policies under the Rana and Shah regimes. There has been an increasing trend to domesticate foreign policy, even though such international and domestic policies still exist side by side to some extent today. However, it must be acknowledged that Nepal, if it has one at all, lacks both a clearly defined foreign policy and an efficient means of carrying it out. To fit issue-areas into the policy framework, first issue-areas must be recognized. Since no administration has ever

developed a specific plan of action, some concerns that exist between Nepal and its neighbours continue to be ignored. Issues are frequently pushed to the forefront for domestic political consumption and image projection, but they are quickly forgotten or put on hold. Some of the problems between Nepal and India are structural in nature, while others are more immediate and need quick solutions, such as border issues, damage from floods or other inundations, commerce and transit issues, and others that occasionally arise. Nepali politicians adopt opportunistic strategies for both structural and current concerns that serve their short-term objectives. Second, rather than being guided by values, Nepal's current foreign policy is built on ad hoc agreements that are frequently punctuated by hyper populism.

After the Modi administration enforced an unauthorized blockade in 2015, the then-prime minister KP Oli, who won office on the wave of "populist nationalism," allegedly received Chinese counsel to make concessions to his party's critics in order to preserve the unity of the Communist Party of Nepal. Oli is thought to have switched the partner (China) for India for no convincing reason other than to obtain the assistance of the southern neighbour for rescuing him from the unfolding issues in the country since he did not want to leave his combined job as prime minister and party president. His problems have been exacerbated by his inability to control his own party and the governance crisis that has prevented him from performing. The challenges impacting bilateral relations would not be resolved by Oli's new religious inclinations or his other efforts to align himself with the current Indian establishment, though they might be advantageous in the near term. As a result of these events, a number of top former Indian diplomats have advised the Modi administration not to place all of their hopes in the hands of the Oli administration, as the opposing forces would be just as crucial to bilateral interests. Thirdly, due to the focus placed on

choosing party members to fill diplomatic positions, Nepal's foreign policy has been hijacked and is currently a neglected issue. Since good communication skills are desired for these positions, Prime Minister Oli has nominated a majority of new ambassadors who are not only amateurs but also lack the barest of diplomatic requirements. A diplomat should have good communication skills, moral character, interpersonal acceptance, and confidence. How can we expect an ambassador to do well in diplomatic duties if they lack these qualities.

Despite his ambition for power, King Mahendra was a patriot when he came to power. The first democratic elections for the National Assembly were held in early 1959 after Mahendra established a new constitution. With a two-thirds majority, the Nepali Congress was elected to power, and its leader BP Koirala was appointed as the country's first prime minister. However, King Mahendra dismissed the first democratic administration in 1960 by dissolving parliament. King Mahendra changed international relations in spite of his totalitarian rule. Foreign policy in Nepal is thought to have been developed by King Mahendra. Initiating meaningful contacts with China, he expanded Nepal's overseas relations. He was in office from 1955 to 1972, during which time Nepal built diplomatic ties with a number of nations and was admitted to the United Nations. Nepal joined the Afro-Asian community and took part in the Bandung summit (Acharya, 2070,126). A historic treaty of friendship and peace was signed with China by Prime Minister BP Koirala in 1960. In Kathmandu, Chau En Lai, the Chinese Premier, and BP Koirala signed that important document. Both nations signed the border accord in a similar manner. China consented to build the Kodari Route, the first road connecting Nepal with North China, during the reign of King Mahendra. Diplomatic ties with China rapidly took on a new significance after King Mahendra's accession to the throne. The historical significance of Nepal as

a bridge between the civilizations of South and East Asia started to be emphasized during that time by both Nepali academics and government officials, frequently using wild exaggerations (Rose, 1971).

A careful balancing of the pertinent external influences was the initial step in the strategies developed to achieve these goals. It was intended to reduce their ability to limit Nepal's freedom of movement, to maximize the benefit (such as foreign aid) derived there from and to contribute to a Nepal's security, and secondly, to engage in judicious back-and-forth fighting between Nepal's two powerful neighbours as circumstances appeared to demand. Political diversification was achieved under Mahendra in a relatively short period of time with the least amount of fuss and trouble, even though it required diplomatic contacts with a large number of nations and an active engagement in the UN (Rose, 1971). On the diversification of Nepal's foreign policy, Prime Minister Kirtinidhi Bista made the most direct declaration in June 1969. It is impossible for Nepal to give up its sovereignty or accept what can be described as restricted sovereignty in exchange for India's purported protection. The King and B.P Koirala both believed that official diplomatic ties with the People's Republic of China would strengthen Nepal's independence (Sangroula, 2018). The Indian government's haughtiness in Nepal prompted King Mahendra to publicly scold them. "If we treat them like friends, India should treat us like friends as well." The spoilers' irresponsible actions shouldn't serve as a diversion for us. (Pandey, 2015)

Policy of Non-Alignment in the Zone of Peace The proposal that Nepal become a non-aligned nation was another modification to Nepal's foreign policy. As Nepal's Peace Zone, this was so proclaimed by King Birendra. Equal friendship with India and China was eventually construed to represent the non-alignment motto, "equal friendship for all," which had been adopted in 1956. As a result, Nepal was eventually

formally neutralized in the Sino-Indian rivalry by a proclamation of non-alignment (Rose, 1971).

Nepal strove to maintain its policy of equal distance from China and India throughout the Panchyat period. While China and Pakistan supported King Birendra's proposal for Nepal to be a peace zone right away, India refused to do so. Later, it received backing from 114 countries around the world, but it was rejected due to opposition from India, the country's immediate neighbour. Although Nepal's foreign policy did not perceive this plan to be a significant deviation, its effects lasted for a while. The Indian blockade was resisted by King Birendra, who also upheld equal relations with China and India. King Birendra's foreign policy was based on the tenet "Friendship with all, Enemy with none." Declaring Nepal a "Zone of Peace" has as its main objectives maintaining neutrality in international and regional disputes, as well as promoting domestic political stability and economic growth (Muni, 2016).

Foreign Policy Focused on Democracy In order to end the King's dictatorship, India was sought out. The establishment of constitutional monarchy and multiparty democracy replaced the absolute monarchy. A multiparty form of government superseded the Panchayat System in April 1990. A power and personality cult developed between the Gandhi and Shah dynasties of Nepal, resulting in the dual pillars of the Monarch as titular leader and the Multiparty System. However, the leaders of Nepal placed democracy at the top of their priority list. The democratic forces in Nepal are supported by the political authorities in India. The new Indian administration made the decision to prioritize bettering ties with Nepal. India started a normalization process and took a lenient stance toward the temporary Nepalese administration (Upreti, 2009). Despite the fact that China is still a communist state and



Nepal has adopted multiparty democracy during this time, ties between the two countries have remained cordial, warm, friendly, and cooperative. Even during the republican struggle, Nepal kept up this approach. Nepal's foreign policy appears to have become increasingly focused on India throughout the republican era. The duplicate of the First Delhi Agreement existed during this era, which was ruled by King Tribhuvan. The warring Maoists and Nepal's seven Party Alliances (SPA) signed the second Delhi agreement, also known as the 12-point pact, in New Delhi. (Khanal2073) Even though Nepali authorities denied it, India's establishment played a part in making the twelve-point accord possible because of its covert assistance. After the foundation of the Republic of Nepal, India's micromanagement of Nepal's everyday affairs became extensive; this made the tenure of the Nepali Prime Minister a subject of continual change. Foreign Policy change. The time of elected administration following the adoption of the new constitution stood out as a significant divergence in Nepal's history of international relations and policy. KP Oli was elected prime minister for the first time in 2016 and again in 2018. There were many enemies during his first term as premier. India had imposed the fourth blockade on Nepal. The previous administration fought against India's blockade while upholding the interests of the country. The signing of a trade and transit deal with China marked a clear historical turn in foreign policy.

The agreement for commerce and transit between Prime Minister KP Sharma Oli and Chinese President Xi Jinping was inked in Beijing in 2016. (MoFA, March23, 2016) India had been Nepal's primary source of transportation and infrastructure for transit. With China, Nepal's trade and transit has increased as a result of this deal. Nepal shouldn't rely on India to carry products, not even from third world nations. Our country, which was previously dependent on one country for transit, is now a true

landlocked country thanks to the recently concluded transport transit deal with our close neighbour China. Additionally, other agreements were struck during that time as well. The two main issues are the development of new pathways to China's northern borders and transmission lines, both of which may have a long-lasting effect on Nepal's and China's bilateral and multilateral relations. The government started putting those agreed agreements into practice, significantly improving relations with China. The guidelines were created. All of the bases are now set for putting the agreement into action. The rail connectivity is the second deal reached by the Oli administration. China and Nepal decided to join their countries through the Kerung-Rasuwagadhi route. Equilibrium Relationship Relative balance is used to describe the balance relationship rather than absolute balance. Originally taken to mean equal distance, it was later understood to mean equal proximity. The balance relationship is less of a policy and more of a geopolitical need. This government has preserved a careful balance throughout Nepal's history.

Following the first election held under Nepal's new constitution, which the constitution assembly made, KP Sharma Oli was elected prime minister for a second term. He was the leader of the Marxist and Leninist Nepal Communist Party when he initially took office as prime minister. He was the chairman of the Nepal Communist Party when he was elected prime minister for the second time. His second innings, in contrast to his first, were very practical. He officially introduced the "Neighbourhood Policy" in a speech on foreign affairs, when the balance between relationships with both neighbours was mentioned (MOFA., 2018). India and China both welcomed him. Prime Minister Oli first travelled to China, then to India. In both visits, the prime minister prioritized the interests of the country over his desire to retain a positive relationship with them. With India, the relationship's normalcy was reinstated. India

and Nepal inked the railroad deal. The rail agreement was signed with China. Both parties acknowledged their joy at the MOU on Cooperation for Railway Connectivity's signing. They emphasized that it was the biggest project in the history of bilateral cooperation and that they thought it would usher in a new era of cross-border connection (MoFA, June 21, 2018). When Prime Minister Oli agreed with India to connect Indian rail to Nepal, the approach of balancing relations became even more clear. Prime Ministers KP Oli and Narendra Modi made a deal to build rail connections during India's official visit (MoFA, 12 May 2018).

### **2.3 BP Koirala's stand in Nepali Foreign Policy**

In his inaugural speech outlining his administration's foreign policy, BP Koirala said on May 28, 1959, that Nepal would neither renounce its policy of neutrality in its international dealings nor ally itself with any military group. In Nepal's ten years of democratic experimentation, it should be highlighted that this was the only government that did not feel the need to use foreign policy to advance its political position. The majority of pragmatic factors favourable to Nepal's national interests informed B.P Koirala's ideas on foreign policy. He advocated for backing the UN since it was thought to be the custodian of the sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity of minor countries. Power blocs in international politics were viewed by him as posing a perpetual threat to the actual independence of weaker countries, hence he was against them.

Koirala adopted non-alignment because it was believed to be the only course of action that might keep Nepal apart from the cold war's tumult. The foundation of Lokatantra must be the most common and least privileged members of the populace. Before it can be by the people, it must first be of the people. Money shouldn't be prioritized;

instead, focus should be placed on one's health, love, creativity, and sense of community while eradicating all forms of discrimination against other races and classes of people (School of Democracy, 2021). Following his election as Nepal's first elected Prime Minister, BP noted that the country's foreign policy has changed significantly. More and increasingly bilateral relationships are being formed between Nepal and other countries as the country becomes more open to such relationships. The world is becoming more accessible to Nepal. More than ever, bilateral ties with two neighboring nations are enhanced. Now, Russia is free to open an embassy on Nepali soil. This change indicates that more and more nations are now welcome to establish embassies in Kathmandu, the nation's capital.

After winning the elections in April 1959, Prime Minister BP Koirala broke the Ranas' policy of diplomatic isolation by establishing new ties with 16 nations, including "Pakistan and Israel notwithstanding the protest of King Mahendra" (Koirala, 1998). The nation entered a period of "diplomatic diversity" as a result of Koirala's action. This also signaled the start of Nepal's independent foreign policy, which led to fresh conflicts with India. In his speech to the UN General Assembly's 15th session, Prime Minister Koirala reaffirmed Nepal's claim to an autonomous foreign policy. It outlined Nepal's stance on how tiny states should be represented in the UN and reaffirmed its commitment to non-alignment. The equality of states, a suggestion for UN reform, recognition of Middle Eastern nations, the independence of colonized nations, financial support through the UN, diverting funds from the "war race" to economic development, as well as disarmament, were among the themes Nepal emphasized (Koirala, 1998).

It was recognized that Nepal was speaking out for a world that was just, peaceful, prosperous, participatory, and democratic. A conflict with the then-King Mahendra and even with Nehru is claimed to have resulted from BP Koirala's foreign endeavors and his high recognition both inside and outside of the country for a number of reasons (Koirala, 1960). Koirala had first been adamant that Nepal was a sovereign, independent state. Second, he had traveled to Israel, which India had not yet recognized. Third, Nepal and China exchanged state visits during a period when relations between the two countries were tense, and this helped to build bilateral ties. Furthermore, his interview in Delhi with a journalist regarding Nepal's stance of neutrality in the India-China dispute was not exactly pleasing to Indian ears (Koirala, 1998).

The support of Nepal for a Chinese seat in the UN was also not well received, according to the fourth point. Fifth, Koirala disproved Nehru's assertion that an assault on Nepal would be interpreted as an attack on India (Koirala, 1998:224–260) and stopped uninvited Indian officials from interfering with Nepal's cabinet discussions (Koirala, 1998). What happened next is historical and well-known to most political observers in Nepal: In 1960, King Mahendra staged a coup d'état, suspended the constitution, disbanded the legislature, and imprisoned Koirala and his associates. Although he acknowledged that it was a defeat for democracy, Nehru's reaction remained mixed. However, for the subsequent thirty years of the Panchayat regime, the independent foreign policy framework established by BP Koirala persisted. Nepal has diplomatic ties with around 70 nations and helped to establish the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation as a regional organization (SAARC). Despite escalating anti-Indian sentiment, diplomatic ties with India did not worsen, and during the first decade of the Panchayat in the 1960s, India boosted its aid and support by

270 times (Koirala, 1998). India thereafter became Nepal's biggest investor and partner in development. The rest of the opposition groups, including the communists, stayed largely hidden as the Nepali Congress carried on its campaign using both armed force and non-violent means. BP Koirala spent eight years in prison in Nepal before fleeing to exile in India where he remained till 1976. (Acharya, 1994). However, for the subsequent thirty years of the Panchayat regime, the independent foreign policy framework established by BP Koirala persisted. In addition to helping to establish the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation, Nepal established diplomatic ties with around 70 other nations (SAARC). Even though there was a rise in anti-Indian sentiment during the first decade of the Panchayat in the 1960s, diplomatic relations with India did not deteriorate, and India boosted its aid and assistance by 270 times (Koirala,1998). With this, India became the largest investor and development partner of Nepal. The Nepali Congress continued its struggle, both armed and through peaceful means, while the rest of the opposition forces including the communists remained mostly underground. BP Koirala remained in jail for eight years in Nepal and afterwards lived in exile in India till 1976 (Pandey, 2015). BP Koirala's initiatives on the international front and his high recognition inside and outside of the country is said to have generated a clash with then King Mahendra and even with Nehru for several reasons (Koirala, 1960).

Koirala had first been adamant that Nepal was a sovereign, independent state. Second, he had traveled to Israel, which India had not yet recognized. Third, Nepal and China exchanged state visits during a period when relations between the two countries were tense, and this helped to build bilateral ties. Furthermore, his interview in Delhi with a journalist regarding Nepal's stance of neutrality in the India-China dispute was not exactly pleasing to Indian ears (Koirala, 1998). Fourth, Nepal's support for China's

UN seat was not well received. Fifth, Koirala dismissed Nehru's assertion that an assault on Nepal would be seen as an attack on India (Koirala, 1998) and stopped uninvited Indian officials from interfering with Nepal's cabinet discussions (Koirala, 1998). Political leaders in Nepal were quite accustomed to supporting India while they were in power and using anti-Indian rhetoric when they were in the opposition at the time. Even Nehru's close friend and veteran Indian freedom fighter BP Koirala criticized Nehru's leadership. The cost of Nepal's excessive reliance on India, however, wasn't realized by the country's leaders until the 1950s (Menge, 2021).

#### **2.4 Understanding BP through his literary works and his vision embedded**

For more than three decades, beginning with the founding of the Nepali Congress party in newly independent India and continuing until his passing in 1982, Bishweshwar Prasad (or "BP") Koirala served as the public face of Nepali democratic politics. Throughout much of this time, he was either incarcerated or exiled. And out of power: His brief tenure as home minister in the first post-Rana cabinet ended in failure, and the palace coup of December 1960 terminated his promising tenure as prime minister before it had even lasted two years. Nevertheless, his political influence was successful, and he was one of the key voices during a crucial juncture in Nepali political growth, together with King Mahendra. *Atmabrittanta*, a wonderful book that was recently translated into English, is a remarkable work that provides a thorough account of most of his early political career. The final section of this article examines the creation of *Atmabrittanta*, BP's final taped memoirs that have since been transcribed and translated. But *Atmabrittanta* forcibly reminds us that BP was a multifaceted personality, going beyond a simple political narrative.

His diverse socialist political outlook was informed by considerations of psychology, creativity, and the individual. He was a striking and, to many, magnetic persona himself. His literary work was similarly driven by similar factors. But *Atmabrittanta* forcibly reminds us that BP was a multifaceted personality, going beyond a simple political narrative. His diverse socialist political outlook was informed by considerations of psychology, creativity, and the individual. He was a striking and, to many, magnetic persona himself. His literary work was similarly driven by similar factors. Because BP virtually has two distinct personalities that people remember: the political figure and the author. By implication, these facets of his life's work can be easily divided into several halves.

The imaginative ramblings of BP in a book like *Sunnim* must seem distant and abstract to a political scientist or historian who is interested in, say, intra-Congress intrigues or the war against the Panchayat system. From the day-to-day chess-like maneuvering in politics. His political life and his connections to the Congress are undesirable distractions for the literary critic, who may be focusing on BP's inventive and dramatic psychological short stories. Thus, we are left with two separate BPs. On the surface, *Atmabrittanta* appears to do little to change this, mostly focusing on BP's political career. In fact, the only mention of creative writing is of his excitement at having his first short story published in Hindi in Premchand's journal *Hansa* (Koirala, 1998) and of a productive period in Darjeeling where he wrote 15 to 20 stories after Suryabikram Gyawali convinced him to switch from Hindi to Nepali (Koirala, 1998).

Although tales of his imprisonment make it plain that BP needed to write and keep a log or diary, he opts not to include his fiction writing from the same time period in this passage. The argument of this small essay is that, in order to comprehend BP as a



person, leader, or writer, one must first integrate the numerous facets of his existence and see that they might be more intricately interwoven than is typically thought. *Atmabrittanta* is a great place to start for such an understanding, especially for a non-Nepali-reading audience (Chalmers, 2001).

This process of narrating about one's life in an autobiography is in general an autobiographical act which involves a very complex process. The problem is, such construction of the self through language is far away from the real self of the writer and partial in terms of the truth it supposes to claim. The major purpose of this chapter is therefore; to unfold how B.:Koirala, a renowned democratic leader of Nepal, constructs his 'autobiographical self'. This self in his autobiography is beyond his real self and examines the extent to which Koirala's claims of reality of his self projected in his autobiography are close to truth outside the autobiography. Basically, the focus is on the 'contractedness' of Koirala's autobiographical self, when he narrates the stories of his life implying the gradual formation of the self in his autobiography. He performs the autobiographical act of narrating the story of his self in relation to his childhood and upbringing in his family especially the relation with his father, his struggle for the freedom of Nepal from both anarchy and the unitary regime of Nepali kings in India and Nepal, his relationship with kings, fellow workers, general people and finally in relation to his growing popularity in the national and international level.

Regarding the historical context of writing Koirala's autobiography, his autobiography is in a sense, mediated one. When Koirala was cancer-stricken and was fighting with death at the eleventh hour of his life in his death –bed; he had spoken these words about his life which was recorded in a tape recorder and later this recording was

transcribed by a senior advocate of Nepal, Ganeshraj Sharma who also worked as an assistant and legal counselor of B.P Koirala. According to Sharma this tape - recording was done in a private room of Koirala, where he was bed-ridden, only in the presence of Sharma and Koirala's niece Sailaja Acharaya who was also a co-political worker of Koirala. So, according to Sharma, Koirala's autobiography is the result of Sharma's initiation of recording Koirala's life story and also the result of Koirala's eagerness to keep something important about his life in the record for the people of Nepal which is supposed to be significant in Nepali political history in the future.

Ganesh Raj Sharma claims that he has attempted his best to retain the original words and even the syntax of Koirala in the tape record. (Koirala, 1998) Further, Sharma states that there was no question – answer session to coax Koirala for the stories and events in his life. It was recorded as Koirala went on speaking about different subjects, people, events and issues in his life. This process went for several days in the morning when Sharma used to visit Koirala for the purpose of recording. Sharma assures that he did not ask any questions to Koirala and even he did not get chance to do so for the uninterrupted flow of Koirala's oral narration. Sharma claims that it was done so not to break the chain and an apparent chronology of events of Koirala's life in narration, yet there is no proper chronology in his autobiography. Many times in the autobiography, Koirala moves back and forth in time according to his autobiographical memory he brings into play. This background is really very significant from the point of view of how Koirala becomes selective to choose and highlight the subjects, events, people and issues of his life more from political field since his immediate audience and the 'coaxers' were people from political, intellectual and legal background, Sharma and Sailaja Acharaya.

Similarly, as mentioned in the preface of the autobiography by Mr. Sharma; Koirala himself was eager to articulate his experiences of political life for the record of future generation. This also aligned his autobiographical narration more towards politics rather than the personal affairs. It is because Koirala tends to be overtly political actor throughout his narration in greater degree in his autobiography than his personal and non-political affairs (Bhusal, 2013).

## **2.5 Conceptual Framework**

Too simply, this research is based on the Realism. Realism is an approach to the study and practice of international politics. It emphasizes the role of the nation-state and makes a broad assumption that all nation-states are motivated by national interests, or, at best, national interests disguised as moral concerns. This theory is primarily developed by Hans Morganthau. Here in this research, BP Koirala's continuous struggle with India and China for safeguarding Nepal's national interest and geopolitical gambling by these two countries—shows how individual national interest is the prime concern of the play.

## **CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

Research methodology is a phenomenon of systematically solving and analyzing the research problem. Choosing the correct methodology is an integral part of the thesis as it states how research is accomplished. Qualitative method is applied to address the research objectives of this thesis.

### **3.1 Research Design**

Qualitative research methodology is used to analyze the BP Koirala's role and perspectives in Foreign policy based on the secondary data available from books, government sources, research articles, and BP Koirala's speech archives.

### **3.2 Research Site**

The study was based entirely on secondary data gathered through desktop review and analysis of online articles and information. The library, office, and house were all used for this investigation. The internet and books from the university library were primarily used for research. Materials from government agencies and departments dealing with international policy were used in some of the materials.

### **3.3 Data Collection Method**

Secondary sources are used to collect data and information. All of the information presented in the research comes from online sources and related books. A variety of sources, including books, articles, prior reports, and peer reviews, organizational documents, national and international publications, websites, reports, journals reviews, newspapers, and publicly available material, were used to gather secondary data.

### **3.4 Data Analysis**

The research is conducted solely through document analysis. All relevant documents that are important for the dissertation are thoroughly reviewed and analyzed, and key information is extracted accordingly. Because the analysis is entirely qualitative, the thesis presents the historical development of the events. This study relies on content analysis of articles and journals to determine BP Koirala's Role and Perspective regarding Nepal's foreign policy.

### **3.5 Limitations**

As every research; this research also has limitations. The research is done for the fulfilment of the requirements of the MA in International Relations. So, its sample size, study materials and data analysis is under the capacity of the students. That is why; this research can't be made generalized.

### **3.6 Ethical Concerns**

The research is conducted using the qualitative method, and all of the information in the thesis is based on secondary data. As a result, the issue of participant anonymity and confidentiality is minor. Because the thesis is based on secondary data collection, the original author is given credit whenever possible by quoting their work in the references itself. The work is rewritten while retaining the original work and plagiarism is usually avoided. In most cases, plagiarism is avoided, and all writings are of the researcher's.

## **CHAPTER 4: POSITION AND VIEWS OF B.P. KOIRALA REGARDING NEPAL'S FOREIGN POLICY**

### **4.1 Concept of Foreign Policy**

Foreign policy in the twenty-first century is more concerned with encouraging global peace, collaboration, and harmony rather than focusing solely on creating relationships with individual states. It could never have predicted that the concept of foreign policy would expand from a simple power conflict to far larger issues such as human rights and freedom of people with shifting dynamics. In general, foreign policy is the creation of a state's connection with another state. Because this connection occurs solely at the international level, it cannot be neglected when assessing any state's foreign policy. Foreign policy decision-making involves a number of steps and various actors. It is critical in a country's international affairs.

Beach (2012) claims that, "Foreign policy encompasses both broad behavioural trends and specific actions done by a state or other collective actor in relation to other collective players in the international system. Foreign policy acts can be carried out through a variety of instruments, including statements, speeches, treaties, economic aid to foreign countries, diplomatic activities such as summits, and the use of armed force".

Globalization has reached its pinnacle in the modern world, with every state interconnected and dependent on one another in some form. In such a scenario, the major purpose of every state's foreign policy is to protect its political independence and territorial integrity by advancing what is considered national interest, such as economic prosperity, national development, security, and defence, within the

framework of world order (Shah, 1975). Every state, no matter how big or small, strong or weak, will prioritize the development of a solid foreign policy that will maximize national interests. However, unlike huge and strong governments, lesser states are most vulnerable to bigger countries' power play.

In the international system of anarchy, where nations achieve maximum power through self-help, weak and small states are the most vulnerable actors. Foreign policies are those that all state governments develop in order to deal with other state governments in order to pursue the interests of the states at both the domestic and international levels (Beasley, 2013)—but developing foreign policy is not as simple as it sounds because several factors are involved, such as domestic and international factors that have direct and indirect effects on policymaking. It is also critical to examine the worldwide political system when analyzing the political structure of one's own country. A state should never disregard the international political implications.

Nepal's foreign policy has been preserved within the epicenter of the central authority's powers to the current decentralized government throughout its long history. Despite the numerous changes that have happened inside the nation and its administration, the dominant frameworks for achieving and preserving the sovereign independent character have remained constant. While enacting new policies, all political parties and governments in Nepal adhere to this fundamental principle of Nepalese foreign policy. This strategy promotes Nepal's non-aligned character, which is infused with values like as peaceful coexistence and UN deeds. Geopolitical realities, cultural links, historical experiences, the concept of national identities, and public opinion regarding Nepal's external validity have all contributed to the development of Nepal's foreign policy.

Since Nepal is a relatively small country sandwiched between two enormous neighbors, it is equally crucial that it consider itself through the prism of world politics. According to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' paperwork, bilateral connections describe the extensive historical, cultural, traditional, and religious ties that Nepal and India have with one another. It continues by stating that relations between Nepal and China have always been cordial and beneficial. It makes the case that Nepal has a variety of ties to both India and China, and that they both help Nepal in a number of ways, including through military, economic, and informational as well as other operations (MOFA, 2016). Additionally, it is always advisable and advised for Nepal to use neutral diplomatic practices due to its complex geographical setting. Consider a scenario in which political decision-makers create the ideal policies while keeping the geo-location situation in the background. Then, given that Nepal is a landlocked country and will always be dependent on other governments to use the harbor, this could prove to be a very advantageous situation for Nepal. The fact that India and China's foreign policies toward Nepal are driven by their own national interests is also beyond debate. At various times, any of the states has interfered with Nepal's internal affairs directly or indirectly. This makes establishing a wise foreign policy and maintaining neutral ties extremely important and in Nepal's best advantage. While going through Nepal politics through the lenses of international politics is vital to understanding why Nepalese political leaders choose a specific foreign policy decision from the very beginning the way they are today. During the unification era, King Prithvi Narayan chose to keep balanced relations with neighboring countries.

Meanwhile, the political transition after the fall of the Rana Regime can be considered the benchmark for Nepalese foreign policy. 1951 to 1990 was a golden era for



Nepalese foreign policy (Khanal, 2019). Nepal faced various political transitions from absolute monarchy to democracy. Different political leaders and their opinion brought changes in the system and shaped foreign policy differently during their courses. Various infrastructure developments were carried out during this time. Nepal embraced diplomatic relations with more than 90 countries around the globe which is an excellent achievement for Nepal. The core value of the foreign policy was given more emphasis as a policy of non-alignment, and peaceful coexistence was kept the priority during this period. Apart from the UN membership during this time frame, Nepal expanded its focus on various regional organizations. Hence, the aftermath of the Rana ruling is marked as the beginning of an era in Nepalese foreign policy as diversification and identification are at their peak.

#### **4.2 Role and Perspectives of B.P in shaping foreign policy of Nepal**

As one of the founding members of the Nepali Congress and Nepal's 22nd prime minister, Koirala also laid the groundwork for many significant diplomatic innovations. Koirala, who passed away on July 21st, 1982, worked in the company from May 1959 to December 1960 for only about 18 months. 2019 (Koirala) On the other hand, he has achieved some outstanding diplomatic milestones for Nepal in the global arena.

BP Koirala was the first prime minister of South Asia to recognize Israel at a time when many countries, including India, were hesitant to do so (Koirala, 1998). Official diplomatic ties between Nepal and Israel were established on June 1st, 1960. Along with that, he paid a 10-day state visit to Israel in August 1960. On the final day of his stay, the 23rd, he and Israel's founding father and current prime minister David Ben-Gurion issued a joint statement.

He met Israel's leaders while at a scientific symposium at the Weizmann Institute. It was discovered that Premier Koirala has also expressed a desire to deploy Nepali officers to Israel Army for training. He was also the first prime minister of Nepal to advocate for China's UN membership (Koirala, 1998). On the 15th regular session of the UNGA in 1960, BP Koirala vocally argued for China's admission as a Permanent Member of the UN. While speaking, he declared, "Until the People's Republic of China is granted its appropriate place in our organization, the United Nations cannot become global or reflect the political realities present in the outside world.

Until the People's Republic of China is included, the United Nations will not be able to successfully carry out some of its most significant goals and tasks. On October 25, 1971, the United Nations officially recognized the People's Republic of China as the organization's permanent member, displacing the Republic of China at the time (Taiwan). In a similar vein, BP was the first prime minister of Nepal to support Mongolia's UN membership. In his remarks at the 15th UNGA, Koirala passionately supported Mongolia's inclusion. More creativity and vision are required than what the UN has demonstrated thus far, he claimed (Koirala, 1998). Additionally, we believe that the Republic of Mongolia has a legitimate claim to participation in this group.

He is also the first prime minister of Nepal to discuss the Everest issue with Mao Zedong, the founder of China. In Hangzhou, China, on March 18, 1960, BP Koirala met Mao Zedong for the first time in history. Koirala actively brought up Mt. Everest with Mao during the meeting. This conversation has been covered in the book "Mao Zedong on Diplomacy," which was put together by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China and the Party Literature Research Center under the

Central Committee of the Communist Party of China and first published by Foreign Languages Press Beijing in 1998.

"Interaction between the two leaders is described from the verbatim records in the chapter titled "The Sino-Nepali Border Must be Peaceful and Friendly Forever. The following exchange took place between BP and Mao regarding Mount Everest. "There is a different query, a sentiment query. You refer to it as Qumolongma, the West refers to it as Everest, and we call mountain Sagarmatha (Koirala, 1998). Although Premier Zhou Enlai claimed it was in your territory, the location has always been within our boundaries, according to BP, who is quoted in the book. Similar to how he supported Algerian independence while the North African nation was under French colonial power and battling for its independence, he was Nepal's prime minister at the time.

In his 15th UNGA speech in 1960, Koirala blatantly backed Algeria's independence from France. The President of France made a solemn declaration last year, and we had hoped that the new French policy would result in Algerian self-determination and the end of the Algerian question once and for all. (Koirala, 1998) He said: It may not be necessary for me to repeat that we have always stood for Algerian independence.

Looking back on the developments of the previous year, however, we discover that the positive step taken by the president of France was not followed through to its logical conclusion. This was not due to Algeria's lack of response, however; rather, it was due to the unrealistic conditions that the French sought to erect around their initial offer of negotiations based on self-determination. After two years of BP's UNGA support for the Algerian independence movement, Algeria finally achieved its independence in July 1962.

In 2009, CPN Singh the then Ambassador of India to Nepal called on BP Koirala on high tea. This was the time of re-evaluation of Nepal's foreign policy and Delhi wanted to control Nepal's foreign policy matters. Ambassador CPN told BP that Nepal has no foreign policy of its own; the influence of western power was gradually felt on the ground which was not taken into the good spirit by India. Understanding these circumstances, BP feared that India wanted Nepal not to have its foreign policy and to make it happen India never wanted stability in Nepal's territory (BP Koirala's diary). BP without hesitation replied to Singh, "We are an independent country and we have our foreign policy."

Nehru had a reservation of Nepal's political leaders meeting with foreign power center. So, to condemn this matter, Nehru wrote a letter to Nepal's the then Prime Minister Matrika Koirala.

In response to this letter, BP Koirala vehemently condemn this manner of India , citing Nepal is an independent country and has its own strategy on meeting with any political leaders of any county of the world. In the same time, Kathmandu was in tremor due to rumour of government change. Conspiracy was on the peak. Matrika government performance was below average and there was a demand of replacing the incumbent government with all party political consensuses government (BP Koirala's diary). IN the meanwhile, King Tribhuvan planned to visit Delhi. Delhi wanted to occupy Nepal in the same manner that of Sikkim.

In Republic Day ceremony, BP Koirala was not invited. BP analyzed it as a repercussion of him vehemently condemning India's policies towards Nepal and siding with the newly grown nationalism concept. This concept of nationalism was sprouted due to India's regular intervention. India from the day of independence

treated Nepal as their own colony not a country. The internal political conflict within Nepal was taken to their advantages by Indian and was regular played in their favor. BP in his address to the mass gathering, announced India Mission of Military that was stationed in Nepal should be sent back.( BP Koirala's diary) BP koirala always stressed on the people to people connection of India and Nepal. While addressing a gathering in Kunanti, India. He addressed to clarify the misinformation spread of him in Indian media as anti-Indian. While addressing, he stressed that Indian people should be aware of the recent events in India- Nepal relations, as this may create a confusion among Nepali people as if Indian in response are conspiring against Nepal.

He was criticized by some section of Indian media for my stand against Indian military mission and advisory group. From Indian angle, it was against their national interest. But we as Nepali leaders always wanted Nepal- India relations should be based on non-inference, equal partners. Our economic activities should be based on mutual benefit to each other. We were against the so called advisories that were interfering in our internal matters, we were never against India. In Delhi, BP was called on by Nehru. He spoke about his perspective on India (BP Koirala's diary). He clarified that he was not against Indian Congress and also told that his relation with Matrika government was not as bad as it was rumored in the corridor of Delhi political circle. Nehru in response commented that we are in proximity in terms of geography and there is no doubt that nether USA nor China will come to Nepal to help her. Nehru commented on BP personality as a person who cannot be read and predicted. In response BP encountered against the attack on him. After that, Nehru told that he wanted Nepal to be independent and assured to help in every possible ways. To do that, Nehru requested BP to help Matrika government in every possible way. In the visit, he met with Lal Bahadur Sastri, kadhighbhaiji and Rajendra Prasad.

After meeting Bhagwan Shahya in Kathmandu, BP, from the conservation came to a conclusion that Nepal's policy of India is not of cooperation and coordination. There was no change in their policy towards Nepal. He came into conclusion that every step of King was in direct consultation with Indian counterparts. How to overcome the riddle of Indian political chessboard? How come I wait and watch their misdeeds against Nepal? Indian wanted us to make coalition government with Bhadrakali's party. This was a blunder for us, which were being set up by the Indian establishment. If happened, Indian will get a chance of hand and gloves into Nepal's internal affairs forever.

The King and the Indian side were not in favour of adult suffrage. Indian advisers wanted the upcoming election (2015 BS) to be limited to a few voters. And they wanted the election to be indirect. In this connection, the name of Indira Gandhi was also mentioned. BP was shocked and out of response. But he did not give up: Gathering some courage, he told the then Chief Election Commissioner, "Both limited voters and indirect voting will not be acceptable to BP and his party." BP was confused as to why Indians wanted a nominal parliament. However, according to the BP, he and his party were in favour of election. If the King and the Indians opinion were followed, there was a danger that the election would not take place (BP Koirala's Diary). On 17 Shrawan 2011 BS, Nepal signed an agreement on diplomatic relations with China, which was also the entry of a new side in Nepali politics. In any case, it was also a door opener for the ideology represented by China. This new relationship was welcomed by all sections of Nepali political circles. BP was very happy because of this agreement.

In Mangsir 2011 BS, BP Koirala visited an industrial complex in Delhi. The establishment was very grand. While other countries were making such progress, BP was very saddened by the obstruction of Nepal's development process. At that time, Delhi did not like the role of King Tribhuvan and K.I. Singh. In India, BP's argument was more accepted than ever. BP and Jawaharlal Nehru had a 45-minute conversation. Nehru's sentiments were friendly. But no concrete assistance was offered. Nehru's only advice was to BP Koirala get involved in the government or else be the Prime minister or BP can help someone capable for Prime Minister.

At this time, the priority of Nepal's foreign policy was to establish diplomatic relations and gain support from as many friendly countries as possible. Accordingly, BP Koirala reached Europe on Bhadra 14, 2013 BS. On the first evening, BP met various people at a reception organized by the Nepali Embassy in London. At that time, China was treating Burma as India did to Nepal.

The Burmese Ambassador asked BP about China's role in Nepal. He also said that Burma was facing problems due to China. At that time, China occupied a small part of northern Burma (BP Koirala's Diary). Due to which the Burmese ambassador was very angry with China and its expansionist character. From this incident, BP felt a strong international partnership on the problems of small countries. The main purpose of BP's visit to Europe was to learn the development model of European countries and to expand Nepal's international relations.

King Mahendra made two proposals related to foreign relations that are: making Nepal a zone of peace and as a landlocked nation, we should have the natural right to reach the sea through India. Both proposals were undisputed in themselves. But the way he was pushed forward was not right. Because of this, these proposals were

brought under the influence of foreign powers so that there would always be tension between Nepal and India. In which there is a clear call for protest against India. So it was foolish to expect India to accept these proposals. This will only create bitterness between Nepal and India. Nepal must accept the nationalist side of these proposals.

BP should be accepted in principle and taken as an ideal goal. But the task of achieving this goal must be given to a political force that has become truly national, which is not considered anti-India and India can trust. China must also acknowledge that these powers are not entirely in the side of India. The main thing that King Mahendra needs to understand is that India has a great interest in Nepal, which they do not want to negotiate. China, on the other hand, is just a stick to scare India. If the relations between India and China are good, China will have no interest in Nepal. India has a great interest in Nepal for its own security and other reasons. In addition, the historical proximity between the two countries has automatically established Indian influence. This influence is greater in Nepal than in any other power. We cannot ignore this. In such a situation, we have to be very careful in formulating policy with India. Unfortunately, for some years now, foreign policy makers have been blowing the alarm. "We are well suited to do this," says BP The king must be convinced of this (Pheri Sundarijal, BP Koirala). Those who want to do this job need some qualifications. These are: the ability of the people to believe and rule with their consent, nationalism in their holistic approach and recognition of such an identity from within and outside the country, domestic policy slightly moderate, acceptable to India, not anti-China. BP says, "We have all these qualifications. Therefore, we are qualified to work towards achieving the ideal goal of the proposals put forward by the king. "



BP seems happy with the defeat of Indira Gandhi and her party in the 1977 Indian general election. Because Indira Gandhi's attitude towards Nepal will have to be changed by Morarji Desai's Delhi government. Because some of the members of the new government have friends like Madhu Dandwate, George Fernandes, Rajnarayan were quite young while friends like Jagjivan Ram and Viju Patnaik were not so young. They are all friends of BP, Shanti Bhushan and Atal Bihari Vajpayee were also familiar with BP. As Bajpayee is the foreign minister, it remains to be seen what his views on relations with Nepal will be. Jaya Prakash Narayan was also a friend of BP. At the same time, King Birendra's visit to Delhi for two days without a formal invitation indicates that the king had bowed down.

In response to a question about BP and his party in 1977, King Birendra said only that he expected India to adhere to the principle of non-interference. In this regard, BP feels that China is not strongly supporting the king. This may be why the king is trying to improve relations with India. Russia can take the side of the king. There are two possible reasons for this. First, the current government is not as close to Russia as the previous government (Indira Gandhi's government). Second, India's attitude towards China may change accordingly. Pro-Russian magazine 'The Patriot' has sharply criticized Jayaprakash Narayan. Because Jayaprakash Narayan had advocated for the ongoing democratic movement in Nepal. In BP's view, this indicates that due to the King's stubbornness, Nepal is becoming a hotbed of open international movement and a center of international retaliation. Even if such a situation seems favorable to the king for the time being, it will be suicidal for Nepal (Pheri Sundarijal, BP Koirala). Nepal will not have any control on its own land. Nepal will have to follow one or another great power. Due to which the nationality will be hurt. The

unity of the people will be shattered by the clash of various international powers. As a result, India will reap the full benefits.

In 1977, General Malla who was representing the king, the royal guard who came to visit in prison to BP Koirala, BP said, "There are elements in power who do not want any understanding between us (BP and King). There are also foreign powers that want to keep us divided. I want to discuss many things with the King. " BP was saddened that the then Prime Minister of Nepal made it impossible to meet him Late King Mahendra even though he had many more to discuss, because of India. India's intentions were not good. But to meet this challenge, unity among the forces within Nepal was necessary (Pheri Sundarijal, BP Koirala). Nepal could not irritate India. But BP was of the opinion that while being friendly with India, BP and his party could have played a better nationalist role than anyone else.

Reacting to Ganeshman Singh's statement that the Indian establishment (Indira Gandhi government) did not support Nepal's democratic movement while being inside the jail, BP was of the view, "It is our destiny that India does not help us, otherwise the situation is becoming favorable and India would get credit of the relevance. Now we are on our own. We are a force that stands on our own (Pheri Sundarijal, BP Koirala)." Returning to Nepal voluntarily for the second time during the Janata Party government in Delhi was an expression of BP's faith in the future and that Nepal was independent of India. When BP and his party friends were in power in India, BP had the opportunity to stay outside Nepal, but BP did not do so and chose to stay in jail in Nepal.

### **4.3 A synopsis of Foreign policy under the B.P government**

Bishweshwar Prasad Koirala, well known by his stage name B.P, joined the "Quit India" Movement and put his life on his support for democracy since he thought it could not be divided. For him, the only political concerns in the world were those relating to democracy and the fight for it. B.P: shown exceptional bravery and never wavered in his devotion to the country and democracy (School of Democracy, 2021). The Koirala administration's foreign policy was nationalist in focus and internationalist in attitude, and it was founded on geopolitical realities. In order to project Nepal's independence, the government enhanced development cooperation that was entirely in line with national plans and priorities and practiced brave pragmatism in the conduct of foreign policy. In accordance with the best interests of the country and in order to preserve the honour and dignity of its citizens, it adopted a policy that allowed each issue to be evaluated on its own merits without bias or fear. With regard to how Nepal's foreign policy should be carried out, the Koirala administration had a strong adherence to the "Panchsheel" ideas.

The basic tenet of interstate relations for creating a stable, peaceful, and prosperous global order are the five principles of peaceful coexistence, popularly known as "Panchsheel," which are derived from Lord Buddha's teachings. These values promote equality and respect for one another, as well as peace, progress, and prosperity on a bilateral, regional, and international scale. They are mirrored in Nepal's foreign policy, which is one of cooperation, peace, and tolerance. Rapid changes at home, in adjacent nations, and throughout the world have had a significant impact on foreign policy. The process has presented opportunities as well as obstacles for the nation because of its highly sensitive and challenging geopolitical placement between two

enormous neighbours, China and India. Nepal's neighbours have moved toward the centre of focus as global geopolitical scenarios have changed. As a result, Nepal is now on everyone's strategic radar (School of Democracy, 2021). Therefore, in order to effectively manage the huge social and cultural diversity of the nation, neighbourhood policy should strictly follow the reality of the ground.

Foreign policy is governed by domestic principles and power, therefore for it to be effective, the country must endeavour to strengthen its domestic front and boost its economic might. B.P Koirala was aware of these facts and gave them a thorough, critical analysis. B.P believed that the country had the ability to affect its neighbours' futures and the course of their spectacular ascent to become world powers. Nepal wanted to cooperate closely with our neighbours to tap into the potential that has been dormant for mutual benefit based on the reality on the ground.

Bishweshwor Prasad Koirala, the party's founding leader, put forward a resolution at the Nepali Rastriya Congress' first meeting in January 1947 expressing support for the Indonesian people in their fight against Dutch colonial oppression.(School of Democracy,2021) Nepal also supported Algeria's independence. He claimed that the people of Asia have looked to Nepal for too long as a model of modernity and democracy, putting its citizens at the heart of the West's quest for justice. It was now time for them to make their own choices. B.P Koirala believed that when the vast majority of ordinary people felt a sense of dignity, freedom, and security, the world would be at peace.

The Nepali Congress Working Committee demanded that Nepal formally establish diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China when it convened shortly after the democratic movement of 1951 was successful. In his article published in

May 1952, Koirala made it very evident that having an independent, democratic Nepal was in the best interests of its neighbours. (School of Democracy,2021) According to B.P the Nepali Congress thinks that preserving Nepal's independence will benefit both Nepal and Hindustan. China is in our best wishes. Regarding China, we have only honourable feelings. We wish to have closer ties with that country, particularly in light of the social and political experiments that are occurring there. Because the Rana rulers viewed the outside world through a British lens, NC criticized their policy of one-sided and unequal interactions. Nepal adopted a policy of extending and varying its diplomatic ties in order to emphasize its autonomous identity and project its worldwide reputation. The Nepali constitution reflects the spirit of independence in actions and choices made in both local and international affairs. BP exemplified heroic bravery and never wavered in his devotion to the country, its democratic government, and its independent foreign policy.

On May 28, 1954, Prime Minister Bishweshwor Prasad Koirala said in his first broadcast to the country that Nepal would no longer maintain its neutrality policy and would not align with any military bloc.(School of Democracy, 2021) Additionally, B.P established the framework for Nepal's foreign policy, which will help the nation project an independent image, increase engagement with all parts of the world, and secure its place in the community of nations. While describing Nepal's relations with India as "historic and inseparable" and Nepal's relations with China as "age-old," the prime minister also said that the United Nations serves as the custodian of small nations' independence, territorial integrity, and sovereignty. Neighbourly relationships were built on the principles of equality, trust, and confidence. When Koirala's administration took office, China was reaffirming its hold on Tibet in the face of a rebellion against Peking's rule and the Dalai Lama's flight. Relations between China

and India started to worsen, with possibility for a war. Nepal's foreign policy had to quickly adapt to the new circumstances, and the Nepali Congress government was fully responsible for them.

The Koirala administration outlined the foreign policy tools needed to maximize national security and moved swiftly to diversify Nepal's diplomatic and economic ties in order to advance the country's interests and forge an independent international identity. In 18 months, the government established diplomatic ties with seventeen more nations based on the concepts of equality and respect for one another. The development of diplomatic ties with the State of Israel at a time when the rest of Asia and several nations on other continents were hesitant to recognize it is evidence of Nepal's independent foreign policy and diversification of its diplomatic relations based on its merits and national interests. According to Prime Minister Koirala, who expressed opinions on the non-alignment policy, "we do not desire to commit ourselves beforehand to support one side or the other and wish to keep our independence of judgment in assessing international matters as they emerge. The only way we can truly be unbiased and detached in our analysis of the problems that occasionally may confront the global community is through non-alignment. Our refusal to support one power bloc over another is not motivated by a wish to abdicate our role as members of the world community in making judgments on the issues.

Koirala had a thorough grasp of Nepal's two neighbours: he saw China and India as the country's greatest friends and oriented Nepal's foreign policy toward fostering and enhancing friendship and cooperation with them based on an appreciation of their equality and respect for one another. B.P emphasized the importance of engaging with the larger world community while working to develop Nepal's autonomous identity on

a global scale. In 1960, he travelled to numerous nations before delivering a speech at the UN's 15th General Assembly in New York. B.:s remarks and interactions offer insights into the government's foreign policy and add new facets to Nepal's foreign policy.

In January 1960, Prime Minister Koirala traveled to India. While the relationship between Nepal and India is a special illustration of ever-ongoing friendly connections existing among sovereign and independent nations.(Koirala, 2016) It is both a historical and cultural reality, according to Koirala, that "our two countries march together hand-in-hand for the noble cause of independence and self-dignity," and that "India and Nepal have always manifested to the world the unique of example of ever continuing cordial relations subsisting among sovereign and independent nations." The critical interest Nepal and India have in one other's freedom, integrity, security, and growth was also acknowledged by Nepal and India.

Prime Minister Koirala immediately stated, "Nepal is a completely sovereign independent nation," during a discussion about unilateral Indian military action in the event of aggression on Nepal by a third country in the Indian Parliament. Without ever consulting any external authorities, it determines its own internal and foreign policies. India would provide assistance if it were ever required. It could never be interpreted as implying that India will act alone. Nepal, according to Prime Minister Koirala, is "at peace with everyone" and does not understand "any hostility from any source." The prime minister stated that Nepal, not India, would determine whether there had been "any attack against Nepal" in the event that the Nepali border was violated.

The People's Republic of China should be accepted as a recognized member, the Prime Minister of Nepal pleaded vehemently when speaking at the 15th UN General Assembly on September 29, 1960. "In our perspective, the United Nations cannot become universal or reflect the political realities existing in the world today unless the People's Republic of China is given its proper place in the Organization," B. P stated to the international body. Premier Zhou Enlai was told by US National Security Advisor and later Secretary of State Henry Kissinger that "reality has brought us together and we believe this reality will shape our future" while on a covert mission to China in July 1971 to lay the groundwork for President Richard Nixon's visit in February 1972 (Koirala,2019).

In the month of March 1960, Prime Minister Koirala traveled to China. The visit resulted in choices being made to establish a precise border between the two nations, resolve any issues, and foster friendly relations. The two nations also agreed to open embassies in their respective capital cities. It was made abundantly apparent by Prime Minister Koirala that "it belonged to Nepal and Nepal alone" by taking a strong stance about ownership of the Sagarmatha (Mount Everest). China acknowledged the maps and information supplied by Nepal and acknowledged Nepal as the rightful owner of Sagarmatha, or Mount Everest. The Koirala government fiercely criticised the Chinese move as an encroachment into Nepali territory when they caused an incident at the Mustang border region in the north when Chinese troops were involved. The "assault" was interpreted by the government as a challenge to Nepal's sovereignty and a breach of the border delimitation agreement reached just three months prior, "under which China and Nepal committed not to deploy armed personnel or military patrols within twenty kilometers of the line." On July 2, 1960, the Chinese Prime Minister wrote to the Prime Minister of Nepal and described the incident as "unexpected" and



"unfortunate," attributing it to carelessness on the part of some low-ranking members of the Chinese military.(School of Democracy, 2021) The Chinese government expressed "deep sadness," offered its condolences for the tragic loss of Nepali soldiers, and compensated unfortunate Nepali army deaths were acknowledged, and the Nepali side was compensated for its losses.

In a letter from 1960 to Premier Chou Enlai, Prime Minister Koirala stated that "Nepal-China friendship is of essential importance for the peace in Asia in the first instance and the world peace in the end." Nepal would make every effort to strengthen and deepen our ties on a daily basis. This remark is supported by further developments. This time period served as the foundation for Nepal and China's current relationship. Regarding the Mac Mohan Line border issue between China and India, the Koirala government adopted a strict neutral stance. At a news conference on October 4, 1959, Prime Minister Koirala declared, "The quarrel between India and China is an undesirable development.(School of Democracy, 2021) It is a matter between the two nations that they may settle amicably by themselves. It is appropriate for a third country to maintain its neutrality, according to B.: The foundation of Nepal's policy is harmony and goodwill. We formally hold the opinion that the promotion of world peace can only occur if we refrain from associating with any military alliances or power blocs and instead express our opinions on each global problem on the basis of its own merits.

We strongly believe that our state cannot exist as an independent state unless we develop economically, unless people are motivated, unless there are democratic institutions, and that we cannot just stagnate, vegetate, or tuck away on the slopes of the Himalayas. Our state is situated between two great powers of Asia, India and

China, both of which are developing rapidly. We need to advance; we need to think democratically and in terms of the current world. The King and everyone in Nepal, who has the best interests of the nation's people in mind, in my opinion, must have understood this message.

In his address to the 15th session of the UN General Assembly, Prime Minister Koirala emphasized the essential tenets of foreign policy, stating, "One of the cardinal elements of our foreign policy is our deep-seated suspicion of the political blocks and of regionalism." In evaluating new international concerns as they emerge, we want to maintain our independence of judgment. In his address to the world community, B.P made it plain that Nepal did "not want any other country to tell us how we should think or how we should conduct our internal affairs."

"The Foreign policy of Nepal is totally inspired by the principles and goals of the United Nations Charter," B.P further stated. We see the United Nations as a bulwark for our freedom and rights as well as for our independence and security. The largest emphasis was placed on Nepal's historical independence by Koirala, who also declared that "my country is fiercely proud of its freedom, which we have never entirely lost." Although Koirala reaffirmed his complete faith in the UN's ability to serve as the guarantor of nations' integrity and sovereignty, he added that "we cannot afford to let this agency to become in itself football between the power blocs." In order to improve the living conditions of those who live in underdeveloped nations, Koirala called on the international community to make the best use of its human, material, and technological resources.

In order to the best of its capacity, Nepal was able to connect with other nations through the United Nations and international institutions. Koirala believed that the

country had the power to shape the course of its neighbours' extraordinary climb to global power and their future. Long before the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) was established in 1985, B.P. Koirala predicted that Nepal will play a significant role in South Asia and stated, "We can play an important role in South Asia." According to BP, a strong foundation of national unity and socioeconomic progress at home allowed it to play a role abroad. Meetings with world leaders held by Prime Minister Koirala on the fringes of the UN General Assembly were notable for including one with US President Dwight Eisenhower on September 22, 1960. (School of Democracy, 2021) The PM's argument regarding the influence of public opinion was acknowledged by the President throughout the meeting. Links between people have been a vital component of Nepal-America relations. These ties forge deeper and more thorough connections between Nepal and America at the local level, fostering ties in trade, education, culture, migration, and tourism. Thousands of Nepali students have chances now thanks to American educational institutions, which also act as important hubs of higher study.

Further quoting B.P Koirala's sensible advice, "Nation is not territory, the nation is the people," would not be out of place. Building barriers of haughtiness cannot replace helping, advising, and consoling the populace. Provocative slogans do not serve the purpose of providing comfort to the suffering. It is unwise and detrimental for long-term national objectives to politicize foreign policy in order to gain domestic political dominance. We need to take foreign policy seriously and be more prepared in light of the quickly evolving geopolitics in Nepal's immediate area (Simkhada,2018).

#### **4.4: Challenges faced by BP Koirala in foreign policy of Nepal**

B.P Koirala faced challenges regarding governance of Nepal. There was an incident in this regard when he was the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister of India Jawaharlal Nehru, while addressing the Parliament, said, "The attack on Nepal and Bhutan will be considered as an attack on India itself. He read this statement of Nehruji in a newspaper. The Indian media asked him, 'What do you say about this?' Yes or no, they started asking for answers. He replied, I have not read the document of the Indian Parliament. Therefore, based on the news in the newspaper, it is not the appropriate time to respond to the Prime Minister of India's speech. When he told this to the journalist, Indian media persons brought the report of the parliament and said, 'Tell me now.' And in reply he said, 'Nehruji should not have said that: Nepal is an independent nation with complete sovereignty (Adhikari, 2019). After this event, journalists asked Jawaharlal Nehru, "Did the Prime Minister of Nepal disagree with what you said?" Then, Nehruji said, What he meant is right. What I have said is the meaning of BP's interpretation, he said again in Parliament. And the letter of agreement with Mohan Shamsheer was brought out for the first time (Adhikari, 2019). At the same time, special relations and equality are being said at the same distance, and these things are to the detriment of our nation.

During the visit of the Prime Minister of Nepal to India, Indira Gandhi had said, "Nepal should not make India the basis for ensuring security. We can only help Nepal to the extent of being a responsible friend (Adhikari, 2019). The Indian side at the time said, "They will supply goods to Nepal in accordance with the international price policy." (Adhikari, 2019) And, Nepal has to pay it in foreign currency. India itself buys these items in dollars. Nepal was shocked when such a statement came from the

Indian side. This completely ended the king's faith in India. It also changed China's attitude. Because the king's usefulness for China is over.(Adhikari, 2019) At the international level, the king has such a role; the situation inside the country is different. Maharaj's political influence is waning. The system imposed by the king is becoming unstable day by day. Political responsibility is being handed over to the villagers. However, no section of the people is satisfied with this. Now at such a time I am going home. It cannot be said that it has surrendered. I am going inside the country with a risk based on political analysis (Adhikari, 2019).

## CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

Koirala remains the guiding spirit of Nepal's democracy and balanced foreign policy. It was not the best of times when he became the country's leader. Koirala was known far and wide, not primarily by the power he held but for his vision. He lifted the spirit of the nation, with a unique clarity of thinking. BP had strategic vision, and acumen to make realistic judgments of developments and to see the incipient geopolitics in South Asia and beyond. BP always looked ahead with wider perspectives for Nepal and the people of Nepal and had a keen understanding of the seriousness of challenges. The 1970s scenario study by BP still holds up as a reflection of the nation's and the world's current state of affairs. To this day, Nepal has not produced a leader with his brilliance, vision, and ability to thoroughly examine the situation and map out the country's course.

The leading exponent of Nepal's most treasured ideals, goals, needs, and objectives was Koirala. In the course of world history, few leaders have been able to transcend their party allegiances, understand and interpret events in the context of changing geopolitics, and manage crises and difficulties to emerge as really national figures.

Foreign policy has significantly changed throughout time as a result of both quick domestic change and the swiftly moving geopolitical trends in nearby nations and around the world. These patterns have been amplified by the Covid19 epidemic, resulting in significant plate tectonic movements. As international attention has gravitated toward Nepal's neighbour in the context of changing global geopolitical scenarios, the nation is now on the radar of international strategists.

It is unwise and detrimental for long-term national objectives for today's leaders to excessively politicize foreign policy for domestic political power. Analysts argue that Koirala addressed "whatever imbalances may have developed in Nepal's external relations since 1951" in their thorough analysis and objective examination of the country's political system and foreign policy, and that "The B.:Koirala cabinet was the only government in the decade of democratic experimentation which did not feel the need to use foreign policy as one means of strengthening its political position." Koirala was able to maintain cordial ties with the rest of the world while balancing the interests of two domineering neighbours.

Therefore, at a time when the waves of populism, nationalism, jingoism, and identity politics are surging and causing conflicts and division in communities, it is imperative that we carefully examine and comprehend Koirala. Populism is a worldwide problem, not only in Nepal. Recall Koirala's statement from forty years ago: "I do not propose to speak or do anything which I think is not correct, even if it is popular. We cannot afford to give in to populism if democracy is to be protected. We may occasionally need to make unpopular decisions and convince the populace to accept them in order to safeguard democracy. Of course, that will have to be accomplished through persuading the populace rather than using despotic means. In these trying times, Koirala's foreign policy insights serve as compass points. Learning these lessons and adhering to them will be a truly respectful tribute to the vision, authority, and character of the renowned leader.

## REFERENCES

- Bhattacharai, U. (2020). *Nepal intertwined with India-China Interest*. New Delhi: Adroit .
- Koirala, B. (1998). *Bisheshwor Prasad Koirala Atmabritiyanta*. Kathmandu: Jagadamba Publications.
- Pandey, R. N. (2015). *Kuntniti ra rajniti*. Kathmandu: Sangrilla Books.
- Rose, L. E. (1971). *Nepal Strategy For Survival*. California: University of California Press.
- School of Democracy. (2021). *Bisheshwor Prasad Koirala: Satabdi Sandarba*. Kathmandu: Print Preview Press.
- Simkhada, S. R. (2018). *Nepal India China Relation in the 21st Century*. Kathmandu: Biti Printing.
- Adhikari, B. (2019, July). BP Koirala Archives and Records . Retrieved September 5, 2021, from Bipin Adhikari: <https://www.bipinadhikari.com.np/bpkoirala-archives/foreign-policy.php>
- Anupam, B. (2020, September 7). Nepal's five historic diplomatic 'records' made by BP Koirala. Retrieved October 12, 2021, from E Adarsha: <https://www.eadarsha.com/eng/nepals-five-historic-diplomatic-records-made-by-bp-koirala/>
- Baral, L. R. (2021, June 23). Nepal's foreign policy failure. Retrieved 1 2021, November, from The KathmanduPost: <https://kathmandupost.com/columns/2021/06/23/nepal-s-foreign-policy-failure>
- Bhattacharai, M. K. (2018). Recent Trends in Nepal's Foreign Policy, and Role and Functions of. Journal of APF Command and Staff College.
- Bhusal, M. (2013). Self and Truth: Politics of Writing an Autobiography in the Autobiographies of MK Gandhi and BP Koirala. Doctoral Dissertation, 44-45.



- Chalmers, R. (2001). Translating a Life: B.: Koirala's Atmabrittanta. *European Bulletin of Himalayan Research*, 209-216.
- Karki, R. (2013). Trilateral Security Cooperation: Nepal's New Foreign Policy. *Strategic Analysis*, 405-410.
- Menge, C. D. (2021). Nepal-India Relations: A Story of Democracy, Dignity, and Dependence. In I. Adhikari, *Gaida's Dance with Tiger and Dragon* (p: 163-175). Kathmandu: Fes Nepal.
- <https://bipinadhikari.com.np/bpkoirala/b-p-koiralas-ideals-and-vision-relevance-has-not-faded-shanker-man-singh-the-himalayan-times-july-23-2010/>
- Whelpton, J. (1987). *Nepali Politics and Rise of Jung Bahadur Rana, 1830-1857*. Department of History, School of Oriental and African Studies.
- Koirala, B. : (2016). *Pheri Sundarijal*. Kathmandu: Jagamba Publications.
- Koirala, B.: (2019). *BP Koirala ko Dairy 2008-2013*. Kathmandu: Sikha Books.
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs Nepal. (2016, March 23). *Joint Press Statement between the People's Republic of China and Nepal* [Press release]. <https://mofa.gov.np/joint-press-statement/#:~:text=The%20Nepalese%20side%20reiterated%20its,anti%2DChina%20or%20separatist%20activities.>
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs Nepal. (2018, June 21). *Joint Statement between Nepal and the People's Republic of China* [Press release]. <https://mofa.gov.np/joint-statement-between-nepal-and-the-peoples-republic-of-china/>
- Acharya, J. (2014). Nepal's Foreign Policy: A Reflection. *Sopan Monthly*. Retrieved 2021
- Khanal, G. (2019). Foreign Policy of Nepal: Continuity and Changes. *Journal of APF Command and Staff College*, 2(1).

- Khanal, P., & Poudel, I. (2021). NEPAL'S FOREIGN POLICY SINCE 1950. (A. Pande, Ed.) *Routledge Handbook on South Asian Foreign Policy*.
- Khanal, R. (2009). *Donor Community and Nepal's Foreign Policy in Nepalese Foreign Policy at the Crossroads*. Retrieved from <https://www.nepjol.info/index.php/JPS/article/view/20437/16766>
- Muni, S. (1973). *Foreign Policy of Nepal*. Delhi: National Publishing House. Retrieved from <http://web.stanford.edu/group/tomzgroup/pmwiki/uploads/1745-1973-Muni-a-MSJ.pdf>
- Sharan, S. (2017). *How India Sees The World*. New Delhi: Juggernaut.
- Mehra, P. (1994). Managing India's Nepal Policy The Raj After. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 851.
- Levi, W. (1961). Nepal in World Politics. *Pacific Affairs*, University of British Columbia.
- Upreti, B.C. (2009). *India and Nepal: Treaties, Agreements, Understandings*, Kaling Publications, Delhi.
- Beach, D. (2012). *Analyzing Foreign Policy*. Palgrave Macmillan
- Shah., R. (1975). *Nepali Politics: Retrospect and Prospect*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Beasley, R., Kaarbo, J., Lantis, J., & Snarr, M. (2013) *Foreign Policy in Comparative Perspective: Domestic and International Influences on State Behaviour*. London: Sage Publications (CQ Press)