

Vicissitudes in Nepal-India Relationship

Saroj Kumar Timalisina*

Department of Political Science, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, Nepal

ABSTRACT

This article has discussed the historical context of Nepal-India relations. The information was analyzed by the researcher using study objectives, data interpretation methodologies, and secondary sources of information. The purpose of this study was to examine the new ties between India and Nepal and how they have developed using the dependency theory of international relations. This article has depicted the ups and downs in Nepal-India relations by tracing India's influences on Nepal's domestic and external affairs.

Keywords: Geo-politics; National interests; Nepal-India relations; India's influences; Vicissitudes

INTRODUCTION

The concept of international relations has played an important role in the formation of nation-states and the global political environment. However, the treaty of Westphalia, signed in 1648, heralded the start of modern state structure and international relations. Before this faith predominated in the heart of international relations, Westphalia established the legal concept of sovereignty as a crucial factor for autonomous foreign relations.

International relations are a fascinating topic since it involves people and cultures from all over the world. Officially, international relations are the study of interactions between national governments all over the world. These political relations, however, cannot be understood in isolation because they are inextricably linked to other actions, such as those of the UN, WTO, multinational organizations, and individuals, as well as other social relationships, such as those in the fields of economics, culture, and domestic politics, while also taking location, time, and geography into account.

A group's or state's contact with another group or state in the international system can vary from conflict to cooperation. All states are connected to each other in some way. No state may escape participating in international affairs in the present day, and this participation must be methodically based on a number of principles, including UN charter, regionalism (SAARC, EU, ASEAN, CEATO), NAM, international laws, Panchsheela, etc.

These fundamental tenets of international relations are also the foundation of Nepal-Indian relations.

The Panchsheel agreement, otherwise known as the five principles of coexistence, is a set of principles to govern relations between states. They were first codified during an agreement between India and China in 1954. The Panchsheel agreement served as the foundation for India-China relations. It would advance economic and security cooperation between the two nations. The implied assumption of the Five Principles was that newly independent states after decolonization would develop a more pragmatic approach to international relations.

The five principles of the Panchsheel agreement are as follows:

- Mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty.
- Mutual non-aggression.
- Mutual non-interference in each other's internal affairs.
- Equality and mutual benefit.
- Peaceful co-existence.

The five principles were emphasized by Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru and Premier Zhou Enlai in a broadcast speech made at the time of the Asian Prime Ministers Conference in Colombo, Sri Lanka, after signing the Sino-Indian agreement in Beijing. The five principles were subsequently modified into a statement of ten principles issued in April 1955 at the historic Asian-African conference in Bandung, Indonesia. The conference itself would lead to the foundation of the non-aligned movement, which gave shape to the idea that the post-

Correspondence to: Saroj Kumar Timalisina, Department of Political Science, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, Nepal; E-mail: timalisinasaroj8@gmail.com

Received: 22-Aug-2023, Manuscript No. JPSPA-23-26223; **Editor assigned:** 24-Aug-2023, PreQC No. JPSPA-23-26223 (PQ); **Reviewed:** 07-Sep-2023, QC No. JPSPA-23-26223; **Revised:** 04-Nov-2023, Manuscript No. JPSPA-23-26223 (R); **Published:** 11-Nov-2023, DOI: 10.35248/2332-0761.23.11.028

Citation: Timalisina SK (2023) Vicissitudes in Nepal-India Relationship. J Pol Sci Pub Aff Res. 11:028.

Copyright: © 2023 Timalisina SK. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

colonial nations had something to offer the bipolar world of the cold war.

It has been speculated that the five principles partly originated as the five principles of the Indonesian state. In June 1945, Sukarno, the Indonesian nationalist leader, proclaimed five general principles, or Pancasila, on which future institutions were to be founded. Indonesia became independent in 1949.

China has emphasized the Panchsheel agreement at the start of the negotiations between India and China that took place in Delhi from December 1953 to April 1954 between the delegations from the two countries. The negotiations were about the disputed Aksai Chin and what China calls South Tibet and India's Arunachal Pradesh. The April 29, 1954, agreement was set to last for eight years. When it lapsed, relations between the two had deteriorated, leaving the prospects of its renewal minimal. The Sino-Indian War of 1962 would break out between the two, which would put an enormous strain on the Panchsheel agreement in the coming decades.

The Panchsheel agreement began to break down when the Dalai Lama and his followers were given asylum in India on humanitarian grounds. This, as far as China was concerned, was a blatant violation of one of the five principles of the agreement: Mutual non-interference in each other's internal affairs. Closer to home, Bhim Rao Ambedkar, in a speech at the Rajya Sabha, questions how seriously the Chinese took the principles of the Panchsheel, taking into account that the principle of peaceful coexistence was violated when China invaded Tibet.

While India agreed to the principles, China showed an inconsistent and contradictory attitude by agreeing with many reservations. So five decades of no war are seen as mainly due to the evaluation of the high price of war and not to a love for peace. Due to recent clashes in the Doklam Valley in 2014 and the Ladakh incursions in 2020, it has been widely speculated by defense analysts in India that the time has come to move beyond the principles of the Panchsheel that would benefit both countries.

In contrast to previous confrontations, India has been proactive and aggressive in its posturing in Doklam and Ladakh. This newfound assertiveness by India has left China stumbling for a gambit. Peace is undoubtedly the best way to resolve conflict, but its application should not be selective and devious.

Objectives

- To outline Nepal-India relations through dependency perspective.
- To present ways forward in Nepal-India relations.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The majority of the information in this study was obtained from secondary sources. As a result, academic publications, essays for websites and journals, and works by other well-known authors have all been legitimately used. This article is built on descriptive and analytical research approaches.

Findings

Nepal-India political relations: The relationship between Nepal and India dates back to the Aryan culture, as evidenced by a number of academic publications [1]. The two countries' relationship is unique, having been molded by the subcontinent's rich history and braided into linguistic, religious, cultural, and resale strands. There are no two countries in the world with people and traditional connections as comparable as India and Nepal [2].

According to Joshi and Rose, in terms of political reforms implemented in both countries, the connection between Nepal and India is essentially bilateral. For example, Nepalese MPs and other Nepalese living in India strongly supported India's national independence movement. During this transition, British officials detained a considerable number of people. Similarly, in November 1950, India supported King Tribhuvan's efforts and settled a conflict between Nepali Congress leaders both before and after the violent revolt.

During the reign of King Mandev (521-562 B.S.), King Narendra Dev attempted to reestablish his sovereignty with the help of his northern neighbors. Nepal had done everything it could to maintain relations with both of its neighbors. Relationships between Nepal and India during the Malla kingdoms (split Nepal) have little relevance to this topic.

King Prithivi Narayan Shah, the creator of modern-day Nepal, compared his country to a yam trapped between two stones. Great friendship should be fostered not only with the northern emperor (China), but also with the southern emperor (India), whose residence is overseas. He has, however, taken Hindustan captive and is clever and sneaky [3]. It means that Nepal has a clearly defined foreign policy in its interactions with other countries.

The British East India Company government's commercially focused strategy toward Nepal was projected in British-later India's approach to that country in its early phases. However, BEICG's goal of strengthening trade links with China and Nepal did not go as well as planned [4]. Similarly, between 1814 and 1816 A.D., Anglo-Nepal succeeded in isolating Nepal from the rest of the world by bringing about the necessary political shift (the installation of a puppet government) under the authority of Rana rulers who adopted an appeasement policy toward BEICG. As a result of the British integrating them into Nepali politics, Ranas aided the British in both world wars. Nepali forces aided the British during World War I, thanks to a deal signed in 1923.

During the British government in India, the Sugauli Treaty of 1816, which was later superseded by the "Treaty of Perpetual Peace and Friendship" of 1923, established the terms for Nepal's relations with India. However, the 1950 peace and friendship treaty control Nepal-India relations today. The treaty that recognized Nepal as a sovereign and independent country entered into force one year before the public uprising for democracy that destroyed the more than century-long tyrannical Rana government [5]. In this circumstance, understanding how the British controlled the Ranas and exploited Nepal to the greatest extent possible is critical. The Nepali people, on the

other hand, were eventually ready for political change. Independent India supported the Nepali Congress's weapons revolution in order to strengthen Nepal's defenses. They displayed their vested interest in Nepali politics by electing Mohan Shumsher as the country's first democratically elected prime minister, which was unfair and unjust to the Nepali people who had given so much for democracy through the Delhi Accord.

The 1950's treaty is accused of being unfair and improperly influenced by India. Those who oppose the treaty argue that Nepalese law prohibits open borders and that Indians cannot own land or conduct business in Nepal in their names. They further claim that the 1950 deal was signed by Nepal's inexperienced leadership and that it can be cancelled with one year's notice. Some Nepalese groups have criticized the deal, seeing it as an encroachment on their sovereignty.

Delhi had a direct blessing to bring about political change in Nepal in the 1950's. The Rana system was overthrown, but only a weakened democratic process could be launched.

According to India's strategic aims, it will only go step by step, gradually, in enabling the institutionalization of democracy in Nepal, with success measured in terms of minimal mutual consent between India and the inclusive Nepal political consensus.

The 1950's treaty is accused for being unfair and influenced unfairly by India. Those who oppose the treaty argue that Nepalese law prohibits open borders and that Indians cannot own land or conduct business in Nepal in their names. They further claim that the 1950 deal was signed by Nepal's inexperienced leadership and that it can be cancelled with one year's notice. Some Nepalese parties have criticized the pact, viewing it as an encroachment on their sovereignty.

Because the 1950 peace and friendship treaty placed Nepal under India's security umbrella, the relationship between the two countries is in shambles. As a result, an Indian military mission and checkpoint were established at the Nepal-China border in 1952. When Nepal's independence was questioned in the late 1960's, this mission and the checkpoints were unexpectedly withdrawn. However, Kalapani is still ruled by Indian paramilitary forces. It suggests that India's policy of big brotherhood and supremacy over Nepal shaped their relationship.

During the public end of the Rana regime, the key discussion about the 1950 India-Nepal peace and friendship pact took place. They, together with the Soviet-Finnish Treaty of 1948 and the Soviet-Mangol Treaty of 1966, both call for collaboration in the case of a foreign attack on Finnish territory. The same unjust and nasty scenario has formed between India and Nepal. While diplomatic relations between Nepal and India were established in 1947 under Rana Prime Minister Padhma Shumsher, India exploited the Rana's vulnerability and continued to throw Nepal under the wheel.

With the advent of democracy, Nepal-India relations began a new era of special relations. In his analysis of the particular epoch in Nepal-India ties, Leo E. Rose portrayed Nepal as

India's "midwife" [6]. However, upon King Tribhuvan's death, King Mahendra adopted the equidistant policy and proclaimed Nepal neutral in the 1962 Indo-China War. The similar international and local strategy was pursued by Letter on King Birendra throughout the Indo-Pak Wars of 1965 and 1971, as well as the Indo-China conflict at Doklam in 2017. King Birendra proposed Nepal as a zone of peace, underlining the geopolitical sensitivity between Nepal and India as well as Nepal and China. It means that India is aware that foreign powers are present on the territory.

Relationships between Nepal and India during Panchayat rule:

Because it supported the Nepali Congress in its efforts to establish a treaty of friendship and peace during the 2007 political upheaval, India's foreign policy is always centered on security issues and its goal to create a puppet government in Nepal. Because India was concerned about Prime Minister Biseswor Pd. Koirala's popularity, it considered Ranas and the Royal Coup da' ta' of Poush 1st 2017 as wins. However, the December 1971 Indo-Pak war and India's comeback as a regional political force influenced the development of relations between New Delhi and Kathmandu.

China's failure in South Asia combined with the USSR's help to India, transformed South Asian relations. Various state visits were held between friendly countries, but the Nepalese press depicted India's presence in Sikkim as an imperialist plot, fueling anti-Indian protests and attitudes. Nepal's perspective on the Sikkim issue impeded relations between Nepal and India, and New Delhi took a severe and hostile approach toward Kathmandu. The visit of Nagendra Prasad Rijal was beneficial in resolving disputes between Nepal and India. However, this is not the case because the USSR, China, and Pakistan frequently accepted and liked Nepal's proposal for a peace zone, and the responses of India's two regional rivals and competitors were anticipated. However, in reality, it is not as it seems because the USSR, China, and Pakistan frequently approved and admired Nepal's proposal for a peace zone, and the responses of India's two rivals and competitors in the region were expected. The expert of Indo-Nepal relations Mr. S.D. Muni claims:

"The Indo-Nepal relationship is obviously unequal". It is because Nepalese political changes have been successful as a result of India's assertive position, but such influences Nepal will not have in Indian political change that occurred in 1947, despite the fact that many Nepalese politicians and civilians battled against the British to drive them out of India".

DISCUSSION

The relationship between Nepal and India has been unpredictable since India consented to separate trade and transit treaties in 1978 to meet a long-standing Nepali desire. However, when the two accords were set to expire in 1988, India requested a single commerce and transit deal after Nepal refused to meet its requests. Following that, Nepal took a hard line, resulting in a rift with India. Following the extensions, the two accords expired on March 23, 1989, resulting in a quasi-Indian economic embargo on Nepal that lasted till late April 1990. The immediate cause was Nepal's acquisition of Chinese arms, but

the primary root cause was India's political and social dissatisfaction with the Panchayat system. This played an Indian role in attracting the Panchayati government [7]. As a result, India has played and continues to play a critical role in Nepal's political upheavals.

Although the researcher's review of the literature did not directly indicate India's direct involvement in Nepal's political developments, it nevertheless offers a stronger indication that India was involved in those events. Pandey also remarked that India has had a longer permanent presence in South Asia. None of the other six SAARC countries with which it shares a border have land links. Furthermore, while these countries are rarely a major electoral issue in India, India is a contested and divisive topic in nearly all of the smaller states. Disagreements between two close neighbors, such as India and Nepal, or any other smaller South Asian nation, are sometimes justified by India's size and domineering and big-brotherly attitudes.

After 1990: "Indo-Nepal relations are obviously unequal," says Mr. S.D. Muni, an expert on the subject. He feels that India's strong participation in Nepal's political reforms has contributed to their success, but that Nepal will not have the same impact on Indian political reforms. This demonstrates that Indian meddling in Nepali political changes is lopsided and overpowering. India's rejection of the concept for a peace zone in Nepal illustrates India's financial stake in Nepalese politics.

Nepal was keen for an international guarantee of its independence, sovereignty, and neutrality in the region's strife, akin to the Swiss model. However, the Indian school of thinking has long dominated and neutrality in the region's war, roughly along the lines of the Swiss model. However, when it comes to India's involvement in Nepal, the Indian school of thinking has long dominated. For example, the 1996 Mahakali Treaty, an unofficial economic block imposed in 2015, and recent open criticism of the Nepali Constitution all included the development of a DPR within six months of the treaty's conclusion and present state as one of its key goals. It indicates that, in the eyes of the majority of citizens, Nepal-India relations and agreements, including treaties, were illegitimate and unfriendly to Nepal's sovereignty and independence. India attempted to maintain good neighborly ties under the Gujral hypothesis, which was based on liberal neighboring nations.

The known as "Gujral Doctrine" came into action in 1997, putting the government in jeopardy while simultaneously increasing the neighborly spirit throughout South Asia. This required a substantial amount of community work. Several countries, most notably Nepal, have seen their relations with India improve as a result of a flurry of positive actions. On May 31, 1999, Nepal's general election was held, and the Nepali Congress won with a simple majority, delighting New Delhi with the victory of the democratic pro-India faction. According to Prime Minister Krishna Prasad Bhattarai, India and Nepal have the closest ties of any two independent nations. It gives indications, but no specifics, about the special relationship concept of the 2007-2011 B.S.

Nevertheless, the 1999 airline hijacking scandal strained Nepal-India relations. The tragic tragedy between the two friendly

nations harmed bilateral relations. Similar to how the airline hijacking scandal strained Nepal-India relations. The tragic tragedy between the two friendly nations harmed bilateral relations. Similar to how the royal massacre on June 1, 2001 offered substantial justification for India's vested interest in Nepal, India's assistance in bringing the Maoists to the peace process is seen as forceful.

However, Prime Minister Prachanda's state tour to China ahead to his visit to India raised eyebrows in the Indian South Block. During the country's state visit, Prime Minister Jhala Nath Khanal's administration, which was seen as independently created and not welcomed by India, did not appoint a PM. In this case, India accuses Nepal's communist parties of mimicking China [8]. As can be seen, India has a larger involvement in Nepali politics. Several commentators believe that strong pressure from Indians contributed to the fall of Prime Minister Prachanda's cabinet. Although the occurrence involving Army Chief Katuwal was the main focus [9], India was also a key concern [10].

S.D. Muni makes it plainly clear that India played a role in Nepal's political instability. In an interview published on April 8, 2012, in Kantipur Daily, he asserted that Nepal is at the center of India's strategic agenda. Nepal is always the first to arrive in India, followed by Pakistan and China [11]. On good days, Indian diplomats and politicians accuse Nepali political leaders of always seeking favor and spectral connections with India, while on bad days, they stir anti-Indian feelings. According to Gorkhapatra daily, the Indian ambassador to Nepal, Mr. Rakesh Sood, takes a stricter attitude to India's Nepal policy [12].

CONCLUSION

The significance of India in Nepalese politics has been perceived through elder eyes after the second great upheaval. Since the 2006 interim constitution and the Terai revolt, Indian interest has grown. On the other hand, Indian support for Terian agitating parties against constitutional provisions, as well as Nepal's unofficial economic blockade in 2015-16 and subsequent events, as well as views expressed by Indian officials, politicians, and diplomats, demonstrate that India has wielded undue and unfair political influence in Nepal. The researcher discovered that the literature she cited to support her allegations about Indian impact on Nepalese politics and political transition existed and is still active.

REFERENCES

1. Bahadur K, Lama MP. New Prospective on India-Nepal relations. Har Ananda Publication. 1996;277.
2. Dharamadasani. Nepal in transition (Studies on Contemporaries issues and Trends). Shalimar Pub House, Varanasi. 1997;171.
3. Dharamadasani. Indo-Nepal partnership and South Asian Resurgence. Kanishka Publications and Distribution. 2000.
4. Dharamadasani. India and Nepal (Big power-small power relations in South Asia. South Asian Publishers Pvt. Ltd. 2001.
5. Elmsiedel VS, Malone D, Pradhan S. Nepal in transition: From peoples war to fragile peace. Cambridge University Press. 2012;398.

6. Joshi B, Rose LE. Democratic innovations in Nepal (A Case Study of Political Acculturates). 1st ed, Mandala Publications. 2004;570.
7. Muni SD. India and Nepal. A changing relationship. Konara Publishers Pvt. Ltd. 1992.
8. Muni SD. India's foreign Policy: The democracy dimension. Cambridge University Press. 2012.
9. Rose LE. Nepal's strategy for survival. London University of California Press. 1971.
10. Singh NK. Nepal and the British India. Anmol Publication Pvt. Ltd. 1996.
11. Singh NK. Global Dimensions of Indo-Nepal Political Relations. Nepal Foundation for Academic Studies. 2009.
12. Timalsina SK. Nepal-India relations, special reference to peace and friendship treaty 1950. M.A. Thesis, T.U. 2002.