

Journal of Political Science

(A Peer-Reviewed, Open Access Journal; JPPS Star Ranked and Indexed in NepJOL)

ISSN 2362-1273 (Print); ISSN 2773-8132 (Online)

Volume 22, February 2022

<http://ejournals.pncampus.edu.np/ejournals/jps/>

Published by

Department of Political Science, Prithvi Narayan Campus, TU, Pokhara, Nepal

Email: polsc@pncampus.edu.np; URL: www.pncampus.edu.np

Foreign Policy Behaviour of Small Power: A Study of Nepal

Bhim Nath Baral

Department of Political Science

Prithvi Narayan Campus, Tribhuvan University, Pokhara

Corresponding Author: Bhim Nath Baral, Email: baralbhimnath@pncampus.edu.np

Copyright 2022© The Author(s). With permission of the concerned author(s), the publisher shall publish the articles for first edition. The journal is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/).



DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3126/jps.v22i1.43039>

Submitted 29 Nov. 2021; Reviewed 10 Dec. 2021; Accepted 27 Dec. 2021; Published 15 Feb. 2022

Abstract

This article aims to analyze the foreign policy behaviour of Nepal, viewed from the lens of small power. The international system has remained under the dominance of greater powers despite numerous small powers. Most small powers have faced the problem of survival and it is their prime concern to protect sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence. Several internal and external elements always threaten their interest. Nepal, a small South Asian country, is situated in a very sensitive region from a geostrategic point of view. It has its own determinants in its external behaviour. Nepal exhibited different behaviours in different modes of history by considering the matter of security and stability. However, history tells that a policy of independence, a policy of isolation, Indo-centric special relations, non-alignment, neutrality and balanced relation remained in practice in its foreign policy behaviour. The research is qualitative and data are collected from the secondary sources. It is prepared in descriptive and analytical design.

Keywords: Balance, bandwagon, indo-centric, neutrality, zone of peace

Introduction

Foreign policy is regarded as a vast and vague discipline on the basis of which all international relations are conducted. It is the outcome of the state in the universal system. It is the process undertaken by a sovereign state going beyond its domestic affair in pursuit of

Foreign Policy Behaviour of Small Power: A Study of Nepal

national objectives. The scholars of different times have viewed the concept from their own perspectives. Even though their views and definitions vary, they have a common view that foreign policy is meant primarily for the preservation and promotion of the national interest of a state. Goldstein and Pevehouse (2009) state that foreign policies are the strategies governments use to guide their actions in the international arena. The policies spell out the objectives state leaders have decided to pursue in a given relationship or situation (123). "Foreign policy," in the words of Valerie M. Hudson, "is the strategy or approach chosen by the national government to achieve its goal in its relations with external entities" (2012, p. 14). It refers to how the functioning governments of sovereign states resemble each other in the international system to attain targeted goals (Jaiswal, 2016, p. 2). A foreign policy is generally prepared for protecting and promoting a state's national interests, security, economic prosperity and independent image in an international forum. In the view of Robert Jackson and Georg Sorensen (2013),

foreign policy is the management of external relations and activities of nation-states, as distinguished from their domestic policies. It involves goals, strategies, measures, methods, guidelines, directives understandings agreement and so on, by which national governments conduct international relations with each other and with international organization and non-governmental actors. (p. 252)

"Foreign policy," in the words of Schleicher, "refers to the actions (including the words) of government officials to influence human behavior beyond the jurisdiction of their own state. In the border sense, foreign policy includes the objective, plans and actions taken by a state related to its external relationship" (cited in Malhotra, 2014, p. 256). In the view of Padelford and Lincoln, it is "the key element in the process by which a state translates its broadly conceived goals and interests into concrete courses of action to attain those objectives and preserve its interests." According to George Modelski, "foreign policy" is "the system of activities evolved by communities for changing the behavior of other states and for adjusting their own activities to the international environment" (Modelski, 1962, p. 67). Similarly, Rodee opines, "Foreign policy involves the formulation and implementation of a group of principles which shape the behaviour pattern of a state while negotiating with other states to protect or further its vital interests (cited in Dahal, 2009, p. 21).

Small power, on the other hand, has no specific definition. Some scholars view it as focusing on area, size of population and economy. Similarly, the power position of a state is evaluated from the perspective of the distribution of resources and in some way it is accounted on the basis of the behavior they exhibit in the international community. Some are viewed from the security point of view as they rely on others in their security. Likewise, the idea of perception and their involvement in regional and global organizations are also taken as the determinants of a small power ranking. However, the size of population and geography, economy and military are taken as the major factors to determine the small power category. In the view of Long (2017), while interpreting the framework of global south policy, small powers are for the poorest, weak, underdeveloped, alienated in global institutions and lack of material powers to bring about system-wide change in their own interests (pp. 185-205). In this context, Nepal, with an area of 1,47,181 sq. km. is the 40th largest country in the world in terms of population and the 94th largest country in the world in relation to geographical size. So, it is not small but is average-sized. However, it looks small before the large neighbours.

Foreign Policy Behaviour of Small Power: A Study of Nepal

Small states are always worried about the protection of their vital interest. The task is very challenging for a small country like us having a strategically critical location. They have different ways of behaving conditioned by several tangible and intangible factors. Nepal also has the experience of different behaviors in its foreign policy dealings. So, the question automatically arises that, as a small power what behavior does Nepal exhibit in its foreign policy determination. The paper aims to address the answer to this fundamental question.

Objectives and Methodology

The primary objective of this paper is to explore the foreign policy behaviour of Nepal. Apart from this, it has also the specific objectives to assess the pattern of Nepal's foreign policy behaviour. Despite its small capabilities, Nepal maintained its existence during its challenging modes of historical events of nation-building. But it faced several challenges of survival during its long journey of nation-building. Along with the passes of time, foreign policy making and its execution have become a challenging task. So, this paper is mainly concerned with the foreign policy behaviour exhibited by Nepal during different crises. As a descriptive and analytical design, it follows the qualitative review method to achieve its targeted objectives. Different books, journals, newspapers, documents and previous research works provide secondary data necessary for the completion of this study.

Theoretical Review

Realism, liberalism and constructivism, the dominating theories of international relations, have been applied for a better understanding of the matter.

Political realism is considered the leading theory in understanding international relations. International relations are concerned with the study of power relations from the perspective of political realism (Goldstin & Pevehouse 2009, p. 43). In the words of Donnelly (2008), political realism includes major propositions like anarchism, egoism, groupism, and power politics (pp. 150-182). The relations are based on a conflict mode that creates a struggle to be guided by the value of state survival and national security (Wohlforth, 2008, pp. 131-149). It has a less optimistic view of human relations. Furthermore, Mingst (2004) opines that human nature is selfish and power-oriented and people are organized in states where the activities of each individual are guided by the value of national interest (p. 66). The values are motivated by power relations.

To sum up, the realists believe that the desire for more power is rooted in the imperfect nature of humanity. So, states are continuously involved in a struggle to increase their influence. With regard to small power, the advocates of realist theory assume that small powers will balance against threatening states or bandwagon with them. It also predicts that as the structure changes small powers will adjust their foreign policy appropriately. Jesse and Dreyer (2016) made the following predictions regarding the behaviour exhibited by small states:

- a. Small states should react to structural constraints, most likely by bandwagoning or balancing.
- b. As threat levels increase, small states should act more and more realist along the lines of bandwagoning or balancing.
- c. Foreign policy choice is constrained for small states and the smaller they are, the greater the constraint. The more constrained the choice, the more the state should follow bandwagoning or balancing (p. 51).

Foreign Policy Behaviour of Small Power: A Study of Nepal

The liberal theory claims great potential for human progress in contemporary society with a free and competitive economy. According to Mingst (2004), political liberalism claims that human nature is good and the people themselves can establish better social order. He further adds that injustice, war and aggression can establish a free society through institutional reforms. But it requires joint effort (p. 62). Similarly, liberal thought argues that both small and large states jointly compose the international system. The change is achieved through international cooperation and institutional arrangement. The theory is optimistic about the elimination of unwanted war that obstructs human progress (Stein, 2008, pp. 201-221).

The new liberalism considers globalization as the universal situation of world relations. States and their engagement in their economic, social and cultural interactions bring the domestic and traditional society together. According to Moravcsik (2008), “globalization breeds distinguished demands from societal individuals and groups concerning foreign affairs. Likewise, the state represents the demands of a subject of domestic individuals and social groups, based on whose interests they define “state preferences” and act instrumentally to manage globalization.” Regarding the global system, he determines that the state’s behavior is shaped by the pattern of interdependence.

It is more rational to develop international cooperation than restoring to war. So, war and violence appear as irrational deviations that result from defective reasoning and that harm the interest of the opposing state. According to this theory, actors are naturally cooperative. Despite many subjects of disagreement, they can manage all war-prone situations. The rules and institutional arrangements are the efforts towards mutual gain (Goldstein & Pevehouse, 2009, p. 86). Reciprocity in international relations helps international cooperation that can ensure lasting international peace. The peacekeeping missions of the United Nations and the efforts towards disarmament are some instances of cooperation, as advocated by liberals.

Domestic factors are more important factors of small state foreign policy choice. On the one hand, a lack of institutionalized domestic institutions often constrains a small state’s foreign policy. Lack of domestic capabilities to produce a coherent foreign policy limits the foreign policy option of small power. In the same manner, changes in domestic actors, particularly those who can capture government, often directly lead to foreign policy changes (Jesse & Dreyer, 2016, p. 45).

To conclude, change in the actors or the institutions is more responsible to bring change in the foreign policy of small power and the government formed therein. According to Jesse & Dreyer (2016), this change may occur because of any or all of the following:

- a. A change in control of the government as different parties control key leadership positions (e. g., the prime minister),
- b. A change in domestic institutions that lead to a change in the number of influences of veto players,
- c. A change in the power of non-governmental actors to influence policy decisions (military, courts, public opinion) (p. 49).

Liberalism focuses on international cooperation rather than power rivalry. Contrary to the realists, this theory concludes that state behaviour is more cooperative regardless of their size and capabilities. Democracy, trade, institutional affiliation and human values reduce the fear of uncertainty and make it possible to establish a peaceful world (Thorhallsson, 2018, p. 24). The liberals project a “collective security” arrangement, which can be a useful tool in

Foreign Policy Behaviour of Small Power: A Study of Nepal

ensuring security for a small state. But the outbreak of the Second World War created a serious question on the relevancy of this theory. Realizing this fact, Thorhallsson (2018) remarks that the existing dominating powers of the world system are highly dominated and influenced. So, the small states most of the time stand at the receiving end in such organizational provisions.

Social constructivism, on the other hand, has recently been appeared as one of the chief theoretical waves in contemporary international relations. Nicholas Onuf was the person who coined this theory in 1989. It was later developed by Alexander Wendt. This theory views the international system as constituted by the idea rather than material forces. Their external behaviour is influenced by the internal make-up of states (Jackson and Sorensen, 2013, p. 229). It assumes that the behavior of the state is guided by shared interests, which developed from the shared ideas and identities of peoples rather than the material power of the states. Viewed from the research programme, one of its fundamental contributions to the field has been to show that moral norms-and thus ethics- matter in world politics (Price, 2008, p. 317). This theory emphasizes the ability of actors within the international system to pursue goals related to security through the development and practice of norms. A norm is defined as a standard of appropriate behavior for actors within a given identity. Norms are established by the evolution of precedents, historical practice, and customary international law. The formation of norms, rules and shared understanding on a global scale impacts the identity of the nation (Jesse & Dreyer, 2016, p. 45). This theory rejects the assumption of realism of the primacy of tangible material factors; instead substituting identity and interest. Moreover, identity and interests are generated through long-term historical processes, both domestic processes and the process of interaction with the international system. According to Hurd (2008), international relations should be viewed through the social structure based on which institutions are formed and actors are involved in the event. People's understandings and beliefs guide their behaviour in the interaction with the global community (p. 213). Thorhallsson (2018) recommended applying constructivism in a different sense than that of liberalism or realism. He argues that ideas and identities play a significant role in shaping individual behaviour and the international system. Actors' behaviour is also considered a framework that highlights the role of ideas and identities in shaping systems and individual behaviour. Identities, interests and inter-subjective beliefs are more responsible for shifting the behavior of states (p. 25).

Jesse & Dreyer (2016) summarize that a change in foreign policy is common when the changes occur in norms and identity. This change may occur because of any or all of the following:

- a. The beginning or end of an established norm,
- b. The development of a new identity, and
- c. The changing of identity (p. 49).

Small State/Power Behaviour

Whatever may be the definition, foreign policy involves creating decisions, deciding and implementing decisions, which are 'relational'. It is 'relational' in the sense that foreign policy intends to influence the behaviour of other actors because finding equality in the international system is very difficult. It does not matter whether the state is small or big, the core values of national interest is the preservation of sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence (Goldstein & Pevehouse, 2009, p. 50) always governed the state's

Foreign Policy Behaviour of Small Power: A Study of Nepal

behaviour. The states are not sufficient in themselves. A state requires both human and material resources that need the cooperation of others and coordination with other actors. Small powers are more optimistic about this. Foreign policy, as both process and output, is also a link between the activities taking place within a state and the global scenario outside it.

Morgenthau (1997), a powerful advocate of political realism, has given top priority to the use of force. Based on this element, he classified the behaviour of the state into three categories. First, a state seeks to possess the power by adopting the policy of the status-quo. Second, states that seek to enhance their position in the global hierarchy by increasing external expansion. Third, states that are satisfied with the rate of their power and they do not care about enhancing their power.

Small powers are much more worried about their survival in the international system. It is very rare for them to play a dominant role. Their behavioural pattern revolves around the real potentialities they pose. They do not always behave the same way and no single theory best explains their choices of foreign policy. The general pattern seems that when small powers are threatened by larger powers, the small power does not act according to realist predictions, instead of social constructivist theories are better predictors. Conversely, when a small power threatens/is threatened by another small power, the behaviour seems to approximate realist theory (Jesse & Dreyer, 2016, p. 177). Small powers indeed differ from large powers which behave differently and are worthy of being studied as completely separated and different units of analysis. They deserve research and the development of a theory that explains their foreign policy behaviour.

According to Hey (2003), the small powers exhibit certain common behaviours. Such behaviours include a narrow scope of foreign policy issues, behaviour is limited within the immediate geographical arena, low level of participation in global affairs focuses on using diplomatic and foreign policy instruments, more attention on implementing international law and other “morally minded ideas” involvement in multilateral institutions, choose a neutral position, depend on superpowers for protection, focus on cooperation rather involve in conflict and spend a disproportionate amount of foreign policy resources on ensuring physical and political security and survival (p. 5).

The state has its way of behaviour based on diverse factors. Maurice A. East (1973) outlines some of the options used by these states in their external dealings. His research finding concludes that small states prefer to minimize the cost of operating foreign policy by initiating more joint actions and by directing their attention toward joint or multiple actor targets, making minimum use of verbal action, behaving in an anti-balance manner and rely frequently more on the economic technique of statecraft than the largest states.

Besides, various theories have their own predictions in explaining small power behaviour. There is a clear distinction between small power behaviour as advocated by realist and social constructivist theories. According to realists, the small powers will try to balance against threatening states or bandwagon with them. In contrary to realists, the constructivists argue that small power foreign policy will be constrained by certain values and norms whereas the liberals argue that small power's behaviour will be dictated by the interest of domestic actors as constrained by the domestic coalition (Jesse & Dreyer, 2016). In this context, Nepal's foreign policy behaviour is found under the influence of all three theories, as mentioned above. Though small in strength, Nepal fought several wars with powerful

Foreign Policy Behaviour of Small Power: A Study of Nepal

neighbours, mainly to protect vital interests. Again, as advocated by liberalists, Nepal is involved in many peace treaties and its involvement in various regional and global forums by maintaining bilateral and multilateral agreements to achieve world peace. Nepal's history of bravery and peace, close ties with the immediate neighbours based on culture, religion, race, geography and a host of other dimensions have affected Nepali foreign policy behaviour as argued by constructivists.

Behavioural Pattern of Nepali Foreign Policy

The evolution of Nepali foreign policy dates back to Asian civilization. Ancient Hindu and Buddhist civilizations have made a significant contribution in shaping Nepali foreign policy and its behaviour. Nepal has always been guided by the ancient concept of "*Basudhaivakutumbakam*," calling the world a single family. The holy epics like *Mahabharata* and *Ramayana* have put enormous influence on its foreign policy behaviour and Chanakya's *Arthashastra* remains the important text on statecraft (Acharya, 2019, p. 80). In the medieval period, Nepal was involved in many wars along with making treaties with neighbours.

The foreign policy behavior of modern Nepal begins with the emergence of Prithvi Narayan Shah, the founder of modern Nepal, in 1769. A warning about the geostrategic position of Nepal, he suggested the succeeding rulers exhibit independent behaviour with the aliens, mainly the two immediate neighbours. It is the fact that is focused on his teaching (*Divya Upadesh*). According to him, "Nepal is a yam between two boulders". This '*Yam Theory*' is still popular as a fundamental principle of Nepal's foreign policy. He adds, "*This country is like a gourd between two rocks. Maintain a treaty of friendship with the emperor of China. Keep also a treaty of friendship with the emperor of the southern sea (the company)*" (Stiller, 2017, p. 42). His additional focus was that great friendship should be maintained with the northern ally, the Chinese emperor. It is equally essential to maintain a friendship with the southern seas (The British). He advised not to engage in an offensive attack, fighting should be done defensively. If it is found difficult to resist in the fight, then even means of persuasion, tact and deceit should be employed (Baral, 2020, pp. 1-22). But despite its declared policy of maintaining a friendship with China and the British, Nepal witnessed her diplomatic failure when she was involved in the war with Tibet and British India in 1792 and 1814 respectively (Manandhar, 2018, pp. 1-31). Nepal's defeat in the war with the British (popularly known as Anglo-Nepal War, 1814-1816) resulted in losing one-third of territory and limited external behaviour.

Nepal's foreign policy behaviour took U-turned mode after signing on Sugauli Treaty in 1816. Internal rivalry in the royal palace continued hindering in showing adequate behaviour in foreign policy matters. When Jung Bahadur came in power after *Kot Parva* on the night of September 14, 1846, he introduced the Rana regime. That incident brought a new turn in Nepal's foreign policy (Lamsal, 2017, p. 4). According to Rose, a practical politician like Jung Bahadur adopted British-centric foreign policy because he was aware of the decline of Chinese power and was not in a position or willing to challenge the British power in the Himalayan area (Rose, 1971, p. 106). The Ranas introduced Pro-British behaviour mainly to protect their dynastic rule in Nepal. Jung Bahadur helped the British to suppress the Sipoy Mutiny of 1857, and prime Ministers Chandra Shumsher and Judda Shumsher rendered valuable services to the British during the first and second world wars (Manandhar, 2018, pp. 1-31). Nepal had adopted an independent foreign policy and it had no war policy. But, Nepali armies were involved in both world wars supporting Britain. It is

Foreign Policy Behaviour of Small Power: A Study of Nepal

because Britain was the only ally in South Asia (Adhikari, 2018). According to Sharma (2006), all these incidents forced Nepal to remain in isolation from the rest of the world. The policy of isolation as adopted by Rana rulers contributed to the continuation of the Rana regime and to serve the country from British usurpation as well (p. 15).

Nepal's foreign policy behaviour turned toward India-centric in the form of "Special Relations" after the departure of the British from the Indian sub-continent. Nepal also experienced a political change in 1950. Democracy was introduced by ending 104 years old Rana regime. The newly introduced democratic system adopted a new pattern in foreign policy matters. However, Indian domination continued in Nepal's external relations during King Tribhuvan's rule. It described the two countries as having had "special relations" with each other (Muni, 2016, p. 59). It gave less importance to Nepal's relation with its northern neighbour, China. Various factors accounted for "Special Relations" between Nepal and India. Nepal had very close relations with British-India. Nepal also signed a tripartite agreement providing for the British recurrent of the Gurkha soldiers in India. Besides this Peace and Friendship Treaty of 1950, the extradition treaty with India in 1953 etc. were the major events to have a special relation with India (K.C. 2072, pp. 1-22). Indian diplomat, Shyam Saran (2017) also opines that both India and Nepal suspected with Chinese occupation over Tibet and came to conclude the Peace and Friendship Treaty in 1950 (p. 153). Indian domination prevailed in Nepal in the name of special relations. Govinda Narayan, the then home secretary of Uttar Pradesh, was appointed as the special secretary of king Tribhuvan. The relation seemed special that the Indian ambassador to Nepal used to involve in cabinet meetings (K.C., 2072, p. 14). Besides these, many Nepali freedom fighters participated in India's independent movement and they were familiar with Indian politicians. This tie turned into a close relationship after the independence of India.

Buffer position of Nepal signifies certain behaviour in foreign policy matters. A buffer state is a small state situated between two rival powers with an independent foreign policy (Jesse & Dreyer, 2016). Such a state generally displays the tendency to balance against or bandwagon with a belligerent. In the past, Tibet, a very close neighbour to Nepal, was free from Chinese control. The British had their influence beyond the Himalayas and Tibet served as a buffer state. But after the annexation of Tibet on China, Nepal is seen as a buffer state between rising Asian powers - China and India (Jaiswal, 2016).

Adoption of non-align foreign policy is the common behaviour of small power. The devastating Second World War brought sea changes in global relations. A significant number of small powers arose in world politics. The rivalry between two superpowers developed after the Second World War compelled the small powers to find out new ways in their foreign policy dealing. The Bandung Conference of 1955 coined the idea of non-alignment as the guiding principle of their foreign policy behaviour. Nepal's involvement in the conference was equally fruitful. Being inspired by the ideals of the movement Nepal has full adherence to the established principles of *Panchasheel*. Since then it became the guideline in Nepal's foreign policy behaviour (Baral, 2018, pp. 25-45). Highlighting the importance of following non-align principles Yadu Nath Khanal (2000), an eminent Nepali diplomat, opines that adopting the policy based on non-align principles was a historic necessity for Nepal and as well others which would create opportunities for the peaceful political development of nations and their survival (p. 425). The countries adopted the movement as a useful tool for their survival and stability. It was also a compulsive necessity for small powers as they had no more effective option than that of it.

Foreign Policy Behaviour of Small Power: A Study of Nepal

Introducing the Zone of Peace proposal is considered the most original and important innovation of Nepali foreign policy behaviour. Declaring Nepal as a 'Zone of Peace' was the important foreign policy innovation of the then king Birendra. The concept was first introduced in 1973 at the non-align summit held at Algiers. The principal aim of declaring Nepal as a 'Zone of Peace' was to maintain neutrality in all possible regional conflicts and also ensure domestic political stability and economic development. It was the concept introduced as the result of the events developed in the neighbourhood. Annexation to Tibet, a tiny Himalayan state close to Nepal, a nuclear test by India in 1974 and India's tilt to the Soviet Union by signing a 20 years peace and friendship treaty inspired Nepal to introduce a new policy initiative to be declared Nepal as a 'Zone of Peace' (Dahal, 2011, p. 41). The Khampa incident on the northern border was equally responsible for the emergence of this proposal. The king expressly referred to the potency of the establishment of a peace zone as an effective means to remove the problem of regional, bilateral, and multilateral alliances. This proposal got overwhelming support from 116 countries but could not be materialized as India has yet not welcomed.

Nepal's foreign policy behaviour is more vital in dealing with immediate neighbours. Nepal must exhibit balance behaviour with them because of its geopolitical and geostrategic location. It was basically after the arrival of king Mahendra at the throne, Nepal tried to adopt an equidistance policy with the two immediate neighbours and non-align behaviour with the outside world. The behaviour shifted after 1990. Nepal adopted an equi-proximity policy in dealing with immediate neighbours. But Nepal's foreign policy behaviour in dealing with its immediate neighbours is not free from criticism. Several Indian scholars believe that Nepal's policy of balanced relations is impractical because of cultural, economic, geographic and social ties with India (Singh & Shah, 2016, p. 56). However, Nepal's foreign policy behavior has been remained neutral in the conflict between India and China. Nepal strongly put its opinion to remain neutral in the Doklam issue in June 2017. Nepal also made it clear that it will stay neutral in the latest India China conflict and also requested to make a peaceful settlement of the issue. Nepal continued to exhibit neutral behaviour in the subsequent conflicts between two immediate neighbours. It was also evident that Nepal remained neutral in the Indo-China war of 1962.

According to Hey (2003), involvement in regional and global organizations can best serve small states' interests. Their focus remains the implementation of international law. Accordingly, Nepal's foreign policy behaviour appeared in a new form after it entered the international community. It became a member of the UNO in 1955. Since its admission to the United Nations, Nepal has been firm in its commitment to the charter of the UNO. Its active involvement in various activities of the UN has won international admiration. Further, Nepal also served the UNO twice (1969-1970 and 1988-1989) as the temporary member of the Security Council. Despite small strength, Nepal's active involvement in the non-alignment movement, the role played in the establishment of SAARC in 1985 and involvement in various specialized agencies of the UN serve in the protection of national interest. SAARC secretariat stationed at Kathmandu, the capital city of the country and its engagement with BIMSTEC (Bay of Bengal Initiative for Multi-Sectoral Technical and Economic Cooperation) is taken as vital efforts towards exhibiting its behaviour in the global community (Baral, 2018, pp. 25-45). Its participation in both peacekeeping and peacemaking operations launched by the UNO supports various resolutions aimed at promoting global peace and fraternity are some notable behaviours in the way to attain its foreign policy objective. Besides these, Nepal has established diplomatic relations with 171 countries of the world, 30 embassies, three permanent missions and six consular offices.

Foreign Policy Behaviour of Small Power: A Study of Nepal

Nepal has a labour agreement with 110 countries of the world. Regular exchange of visits by different foreign and national dignitaries to each other's countries and similar other behaviours have been contributing to consolidating Nepal's foreign policy.

The constitutional arrangement has remained the fundamental principle in guiding Nepal's foreign policy behaviour. The post- Loktantric constitution has made clear provisions regarding Nepali foreign policy through which its external behaviour is directed. It is the constitution, under part four, that has made the provision of directive principles, policies and obligations of the state. According to this provision, the state shall direct its international relations towards enhancing the dignity of the nation in the world community. It is also mentioned that international relations will be conducted based on sovereign equality while safeguarding the freedom, sovereignty, territorial integrity, independence and national interest of Nepal (Article, 50(4)). In the same manner, article 50(m) of the constitution tells about policies relating to international relations. Sub-article 1 is about conducting the independent foreign policy based on the Charter of United Nations, principles of *panchasheel*, international law and the norms of world peace. The constitution is also committed to safeguarding the national interest i. e. protection of sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence. Adding more provisions in the constitution than to previous constitutions, article 51(m) (2) tells about the pursuing the policy to review the treaties concluded in the past. All these agreements and treaties should be based on equality and mutual interest.

After the adoption of the new constitution, India felt reluctant which resulted in an undeclared blockade of critical goods and supplies across the border with Nepal. Anti-Indian sentiment gradually grew in the country. India claimed that it was not a blockade rather the problem was created by the Madhesis on the part of Nepal obstructing the movement of goods. To manage the deteriorating relationship between two historical allies, EPG, a team of foreign policy experts from both countries had formed. The EPG was assigned with the task to make recommendations in the way to consolidate relations between two countries. But foreign policy behaviour of both countries could not address each other's sentiment. After the annexation of Jammu-Kashmir on November 1949, India published a new map including Nepali territory-Kalapani, Limpiyadhura and Lipulekh. Nepal strongly opposed and as a counter, it also issued a new map of Nepal on 20 May 2020 including the territory which was missing in the previous map. Further, it was on 14 July 2020, prime minister K.P, Oli gave a speech regarding the religious site Ayodhya. His strong claim was that Ayodhya lies in Thori village of Nepal and Ram, the historical king, was a Nepali. Frequent demonstrations are also occurring in the country opposing the matter related to border encroachment from the south. The issue of border encroachment in the north is also raised. There is a dilemma in Nepal's dealing with MCC and BRI projects. The governments are also criticized for their foreign policy being tilted to China and India. Our country is struggling hard to find balance its relations with its neighbours and overseas allies. Paradoxical behaviour always leads to deterioration of relations in upcoming days.

Conclusion

Small powers in world politics are always worried about their survival. They usually lack material power and are often threatened by greater powers. The case is more serious for a small and weak power located at a buffer zone. Some states lost their identity and many others disappeared from the globe in the history of civilization. However, the twenty-first century is more hospitable for small powers than any other time in history. Their role in

Foreign Policy Behaviour of Small Power: A Study of Nepal

international relations cannot be minimized. By considering the matter of survival, the small powers have used various options and behaved accordingly as per the global trend and internal determinants. In course of history, Nepal has never been colonized by any world power. However, it has been facing critical modes throughout history. The incidents developed in the neighbourhood and global scenario inspired Nepal to choose different policy options in its foreign policy behaviour. However, Nepal's geostrategic position between two emerging global powers gives few options to maintain balanced relations. But policymakers are not found aware of the reality as their behaviour seems to be tilt either towards the south or the north or sometimes beyond the sea. Party line still matters in foreign policy behaviour.

To sum up, it cannot be denied that small powers exist in the international system and their foreign policy interest, behaviour and roles in international relations are different from the super, great and middle powers. Mostly, external behaviour is determined by national interest and survival remains the fundamental concern of small power. Their behaviour changes following changes in their domestic politics as also changes in the existing external environment. The role of ruling elites is equally influencing their behaviour. Thus, it seems hard to examine the multi-dimensional behaviour exhibited by small powers in their external dealings. It is for this very reason small powers are deserving of continuous research and development of a theory that better explains their foreign policy behaviour.

References

- Acharya, M. R. (2019). *Nepal world view* (Vol. I). Adroit Publishers.
- Adhikari, B. (2018). Successive constitutions and geopolitical pinches. In D. N. Dhungel & M. K. Dahal (Eds.), *Nepal: A country in transition* (pp. 63-105). Rupa Publications.
- Baral, B. N. (2020). *Dibyaupadesh: Pragmatic guidelines to Nepalese diplomacy*. *Journal of Political Science*, (20), 25-45. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jps.v20i0.31792>
- Baral, B. N. (2018). Changing dynamics of Nepalese foreign policy: Patterns and trends. *Journal of Political Science*, (17), 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jps.v18i0.20437>
- Dahal, D. (2011). The art of survival: Policy choices for Nepal. *Dhawalagiri Journal of Sociology and Anthropology*, (5), 31-48. <https://doi.org/10.3126/dsaj.v5i0.6355>
- Dahal, R. K. (2009). Challenges in the formulation of foreign policy for Nepal. In S.R. Pandey and P. Adhikari (Eds.), *Nepalese foreign policy at the crossroads* (pp. 19-50). Sangam Institute.
- Donnelly, J. (2008). The ethics of realism. In C. Reus-Smit & D. Snidal (Eds). *The oxford handbook of international relations* (pp. 150-162). Oxford University Press.
- East, M. (1973). Size and foreign policy behaviour: A test for two models. *World Politics*, 25(4), 556-578. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2009952>
- Goldstein, J. S. & Pevehouse, J. C. (2009). *International relations* (8th ed.). Pearson.
- Hey, J., A. K. (2003). *Small states in world Politics: Explaining foreign policy Behavior*. Lynne Rienner Publications.

Foreign Policy Behaviour of Small Power: A Study of Nepal

Hudson, V. M. (2012). The history and evolution of foreign policy analysis. In S. Smith, A. Hadfield & T. Dunne (Eds.), *Foreign policy: Theories, actors, cases* (2nd ed.) (pp. 13-34). Oxford University Press.

Hurd, I. (2008). Constructivism. In C. Reus-Smit & D. Snidal (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of international relations* (pp. 289-316). Oxford University Press.

Jackson, R. & Sorensen, G. (2013). *Introduction to intentional relations: Theories and approaches* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Jaiswal, P. (2016). Nepal's foreign policy and strategic Significance. In P. Jaiswal & G. Kochhar (Eds.), *Nepal's foreign policy and her neighbours* (pp. 1-32). GB Books.

Jesse, N. G. & Dreyer, J. R. (2016). *Small states in the international system: At peace and at war*. Lexington Books.

K., C., S. (2012, B. S.). *Nepalko bharat niti तथा sandhi-samjhautaharu*. In Aman Shrestha et. al., *Nepal-Bharat Ra Chin Sandhi: Samikshyatmak Vivechana* (pp. 1-22). Madhuvan Prakashan.

Khanal, Y. N. (2000). *Nepal's non-isolationist foreign policy* (5th ed.). Satyal Publications.

Lamsal, Y. (2017, March 7). Jung Bahadur's foreign Policy. *The Rising Nepal*.

Long, T. (2017). Small states, great powers? gaining influence through intrinsic, derivative and collective power. *International Studies Review*, 185-205.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/isr/viw040>

Malhotra, V. K. (2014). *International relations* (4th ed.). Anmol Publications.

Manandhar, T. R. (2018). Historical perspective. In D.N. Dhungel & M. K. Dahal (Eds.), *Nepal: A country in transition* (pp. 1-31). Rupa Publications.

Mingst, K. A. (2004). *Essentials of international relations* (3rd ed.). W.W. Norton and Company.

Modelska, G. (1962). *A theory of foreign policy*. Pall Mall Press.

Moravcsik, A. (2008). The new liberalism. In C. Smit & D. Snidal (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of international relations* (pp. 234-254). Oxford University Press.

Morganthau, H. J. (1997). *Politics among nations: The struggle for power and peace* (6th ed.). Kalyani Publishers.

Muni, S. D. (2016). *Foreign policy of Nepal*. Adroit Publishers.

Price, R. (2008). The ethics of Constructivism. In C. R. Smit & D. Snidal (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of international relations* (pp. 317-326). Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199219322.003.0018>

Rose, L. E. (1971). *Nepal: strategy for survival*. Mandala Book Point (South Asian Edition).

Saran, S. (2017). *How India sees the world*. Juggernaut Books.

Foreign Policy Behaviour of Small Power: A Study of Nepal

- Sharma, J. (2006). *Nepal: Struggle for existence*. Comminc.
- Singh, B. & Shah, S. H. (2016). Nepal's equidistance policy towards India and China: Exploring the shifting paradigm in the post-monarchical era. In P. Jaiswal & G. Kochhar (Eds.), *Nepal's foreign policy and her neighbours* (pp. 49-66). GB Books.
- Stein, A. A. (2008). Neoliberal institutionalism. In C. Reus-Smit & D. Snidal (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of international relations* (pp. 201-221). Oxford University Press.
- Stiller, L. F. (2017). *The rise of the house of Gorkha*. Educational Publishing House.
- Government of Nepal, Ministry of Law, Justice, Constituent Assembly and Parliamentary Affairs (2072 B.S.). *The Constitution of Nepal (2072 B.S.)*. Law Books Management Committee.
- Thorhallsson, B. (2018). Studying small state: A review. *Small states and territories*, 1(1), 17-34. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327074818>
- Wohlforth, W. (2008). Realism. In C. Reus-Smit & D. Snidal (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of international relations* (pp. 131-149). Oxford University Press.