

DOI: 10.3126/dristikon.v16i1.95138

The Shifting Foreign Policy of Nepal: Impacts of Domestic Politics on International Relations (2000-2025)

Bishnu Kumar Bhattarai¹, Anil Raj Bhandari² and Chakraraj Dahal³

¹Principal author

Lecturer

Department of Political Science

Mahendra Multiple Campus, Dharan, Tribhuvan University, Nepal

✉: bishnu.bhattarai@mahmc.tu.edu.np

²Corresponding author

Teaching Assistant

Department of Political Science

Mahendra Multiple Campus, Dharan, Tribhuvan University, Nepal

✉: anilrazbhandari@gmail.com

³Co-author

Lecturer

Department of Political Science

Mahendra Multiple Campus, Dharan, Tribhuvan University, Nepal

✉: chadai75@gmail.com

Paper: Submitted: 2025-10-09, Accepted: 2026-05-16, Published: 2026-05-29

Abstract

The paper explores how Nepal's transition from a monarchical regime to a federal democratic republic and the developing political instability have influenced its international relations. It explores evolving strategies of Nepal in balancing relations with India and China by using neorealist and constructivist theoretical lenses. It navigates regional and global pressures as well. This study reveals that domestic political actors, governments, parties, and leaders played decisive roles in shaping the foreign policy of Nepal. Each regime change brings adjustments in alignment. India's and China's strategic interests and rivalry, and the involvement of other powers like the United States, have further limited and influenced Nepal's foreign policy choices. The findings of this study contribute to understanding how a small state's quest for autonomy and security is mediated by domestic politics and external forces and circumstances. Although the geographic and economic constraints limit the extent of realignment, the study concludes that foreign policy shifts of Nepal reflect a hedging approach that aims at maximizing strategic autonomy.

Multi-disciplinary Peer Reviewed Research Journal

Keywords: Nepal foreign policy, domestic politics, India-China rivalry, foreign policy shifts, international relations

Introduction

Background of the Study

Nepal is a small landlocked state geographically located between two Asian giants, India and China, which occupies a unique geopolitical position. Historically, Nepal has maintained its sovereignty through diplomacy as described by its founding monarch, Prithvi Narayan Shah, as a “yam between two boulders”. It has emphasized the need to balance between the two neighbors (Rose, 1971). Nepal adopted a policy of non-alignment and sought friendly relations with all nations, joining the United Nations and the Non-Aligned Movement by the 1960s during the Cold War and post-Cold War eras. By the late 20th century, Nepal’s foreign policy was characterized by efforts to preserve strategic autonomy (Brown, 1971). Despite heavy economic and cultural ties and dependence on India, engagement with China has also grown significantly (Dabhade & Pant, 2004). In the 21st century, internal political upheavals of Nepal, from a Maoist insurgency to the abolishment of the monarchy along with the establishment of a republic, have created new dynamics of Nepal’s traditional foreign policy stance.

Focus of the Paper

This article focuses on analyzing the shifts in Nepal’s foreign policy from 2000 to 2025, which is driven by domestic political changes. Similarly, it examines how regime changes, power transitions, and political instability in the domestic politics of the country altered its diplomatic orientations and strategies. Furthermore, the study employs a combined theoretical approach based on neorealism and constructivism to explain how domestic political changes and external strategic demands collectively influence the formation of foreign policy. The major areas of research include the evolution of Nepal’s relations with India and China and its responses to regional and global influences.

Statement of Problems

The foreign policy of Nepal during 2000–2025 has faced several interrelated and intertwined issues. Maintaining national sovereignty and stability while navigating the intense geopolitical rivalry between India and China is a major challenge and concern. Domestic political turmoil and decade-long civil war (1996–2006), the 2001 royal massacre, the 2005 royal coup, and frequent changes of government after the peace settlement have contributed to an inconsistent of foreign policy (International Crisis Group, 2016). As a result, Nepal struggled with inconsistency in policy and reactive diplomacy that frequently oscillates between closer ties with India and China. Another problem was the domestic interest groups and public sentiment that had a significant influence on foreign relations. Anti-India or anti-

China sentiment inside Nepal is mainly fueled by issues like border disputes or Indian micromanagement in the domestic politics of Nepal that has direct influence on sovereignty (Bhattarai, 2021). In contrast, sometimes internal political alliances aligned with external patronage raise concerns about foreign interference in Nepalese politics. In addition, the absence of a long-term foreign policy strategy and weak institutional coordination has hindered ability of Nepal to respond proactively to international opportunities and challenges. The lack of an updated official foreign policy document until 2020 can be considered a major example (Acharya, 2020). These issues emphasize the difficulty in charting a steady foreign policy of Nepal amid the domestic circumstances and external pressures.

Based on these issues, the study seeks to address the following research questions:

- What are the major domestic political changes and instabilities between 2000 and 2025 that influenced foreign policy priorities and decisions of Nepal?
- How did governments, political parties, political leaders, and domestic interest groups affect the development of Nepal's foreign policy priorities and strategic directions?
- Why did external factors, such as the India-China rivalry and broader regional and global dynamics, influence Nepal's foreign policy decisions and choices?

Research Objectives

This study presents three key objectives:

- To examine the main domestic political changes and instabilities between 2000 and 2025 that impacted Nepal's foreign policy priorities and decisions.
- To examine how the governments, political actors, and domestic interest groups have contributed to the development of Nepal's foreign policy.
- To analyse why the external factors, like Sino-Indian rivalry and other regional or global factors, affect the foreign policy of Nepal.

Hypotheses

Governments that have a long-standing association with India or are facing domestic crises tend to favor the country. Indian. Even though there are changes in foreign policy, the limitations of geography and economy may have influenced the shift in Nepal's approach (Waltz 1996; Putnam, 1988). The structural limitations and domestic political ideology are interrelated, as suggested by constructivists, resulting in Nepal's foreign policy outcomes being influenced by both domestic politics and external strategic considerations.

Rationale of the Research Paper

It is crucial to comprehend the modifications in Nepal's foreign policy from both academic and practical viewpoints. In terms of academia, Nepal is an intriguing illustration of how a small state seeks to balance its national interests with its independence by operating between dominant neighboring forces. The research investigates how domestic political changes impact the country's ability to handle external pressures and strategic challenges. It is comparable to the experience in many emerging political transitional nations. By utilizing neorealism and constructivism as models to explain these dynamics (David, 1991), Nepal's experience is a further demonstration of how small states' foreign policy intersects with domestic politics. Nepal's geopolitical position in South Asia makes the study practical. Nepal's endeavor to sustain a congenial relationship with India and China will have significant consequences for regional integration. The perception that Nepal's foreign policy was at odds with the interests of neighboring countries has led to tensions in the past, such as during the implementation of border wall blocks by India. As a result, having broader knowledge of the domestic political factors that influence Nepal's foreign policy can aid decision-makers in comprehending changes in policy and help prevent potential misinterpretations.

Limitations of the Study

A wide scope of data is covered in this study, which relies on qualitative analysis of secondary sources. Period. Consequently, it may not encompass all or recent developments."'. Due to the lack of. The study's focus on major events and the primary data do not necessarily guarantee all the detailed aspects of the event. Changes in Nepal's foreign policy. In addition, the process is based on theoretical models. Why? Interpretive findings are based on the quality of available sources.

Literature Review

External structural factors are considered important in the literature of International Relations regarding small states. Small states' foreign policies are influenced by internal factors and constraints. (Waltz, 1996). Putnam, 1988). Many analysts have noted that the foreign policy of small states is driven by the essentials of survival in an anarchic international system. The need to balance or bandwagon with more powerful neighbors is a vital aspect. However, classic balance-of-power theory often falls short in explaining the subtle alignment choices of developing states that lead to concepts such as "omni-balancing", which assumes that Third World leaders balance external and internal threats simultaneously when choosing alignments (David, 1991). In the context of Nepal, earlier studies observed how its geopolitical position between India and China historically forced Kathmandu to pursue a delicate balance to preserve sovereignty (Rose, 1971; Muni, 1973). According to Madhavi Dabhade and Harsh V. Pant (2004), Nepal's democratic governments during the 1990s generally maintained close relations with India. In contrast, the monarchy at times tried to strengthen ties with China to balance the influence of India. Similarly, studies show that monarchs such as King Mahendra and King

Gyanendra often used closer relations with China to counter Indian pressure, whereas democratic leaders relied more on India's political support (Nayak, 2014).

A significant body of literature has emerged around Nepal's foreign policy behavior in the 21st century. It has often framed it as a "hedging" strategy. Raunak Mainali (2022) argues that Nepal has followed a hedging strategy in its foreign policy. Nepal tried to develop closer relations with China, especially after the 2015 blockade, to reduce its heavy dependence on India. However, India's economic influence in Nepal remains strong. Likewise, another study concludes that bandwagoning with either neighbor is impractical as Nepal adheres to non-alignment, seeking benefits from both (Johny, 2024). Scholars have also emphasized the role of domestic political actors in the foreign policy formulation of Nepal. Lok Raj Baral and other Nepali analysts have examined how different governments – whether led by the Nepali Congress, the Unified Marxist-Leninist (UML), or the Maoists – variably emphasized relations with India or China. For instance, governments dominated by the Nepali Congress historically maintained a "special relationship" rhetoric with India while reflecting ideological and personal ties dating back to Nepal's first democratic era in the 1950s. On the other side, leftist-led governments projected a more nationalist position by openly criticizing India's influence and seeking closer ties with China (Bhatta, 2022; Dahal, 2021). Dev Raj Dahal (2011) characterized Nepal's foreign policy as an "art of survival," focused that domestic elite consensus and stability are preconditions for a consistent external strategy. This implies that Nepal's frequent government changes have limited its ability to sustain long-term foreign policy endeavors. Empirical studies, in the same way, support this view. Gaurav Bhattarai (2021) points out that diplomatic efforts to resolve issues like the Nepal-India border disputes were hampered by changing political leadership and divergent party positions that often sent mixed signals to India.

Another study focuses on external influence and Nepal's strategic responses. Many studies highlight India's role in Nepal and note that India considers Nepal important for its security interests. These studies also show that India has at times tried to maintain this influence, such as by playing a role in Nepal's 2006 peace process and using pressure during the 2015 constitution promulgation processes (International Crisis Group, 2016). China's growing involvement has also drawn academic interest as well. China's interests in Nepal regarding Tibet and its broader goal of extending influence in South Asia via economic initiatives like the Belt and Road have also been studied (Behera & Mayilvaganan, 2021). The literature shows that Nepal did not respond passively to these external pressures. Instead, Nepal tried to use strategic balancing in its foreign policy. For example, Pramod Jaiswal (2016) explains that after 2006, Nepal used the "China option" to strengthen its bargaining position with India. At the same time, Nepal assured India that Nepal remained committed to a non-aligned foreign policy. A hedging perspective (Mainali, 2022; Dahal, 2021) integrates both

domestic and external factors. It argues that Nepal's strategy is to avoid choosing sides entirely. But there remains a gap in tracing specific causal linkages between domestic political changes and concrete foreign policy decisions. This study addresses that gap by examining how Nepal's internal political changes, that is, from monarchy to republic and through periods of conflict and constitutional change, interacted with the external pressures created by its position between India and China over a long period of time.

Research Gap

This study tries to address that research gap through a long-term analysis. Nepal's internal political changes, like the shift from monarchy to republic, Maoist insurgency, and constitutional changes, have been examined. The study also analyzes how these political developments interacted with the external pressures faced by Nepal because of its location between India and China. Earlier investigations have primarily focused on specific events or limited timeframes, such as the post-2006 republican transition or the aftermath of the 2015 blockade. Nonetheless, it is difficult to find adequate research on the consistency and variation of Nepal's foreign policy across various political systems in a singular examination. Likewise, a significant portion of the current literature is focused on either structural realist explanations, which emphasize India-China rivalry and Nepal's external limitations, or on domestic political factors such as leadership choices and party ideologies.

To address this gap, this study takes a holistic approach by examining how Nepal's internal political developments and external strategic environment have contributed to its foreign policy outcomes. It finds "long-term patterns and trends over the years 2000 through 2025" that may be invisible in shorter, more detailed analyses. The foreign policy of Nepal is portrayed in a more comprehensive manner. This document provides an overview. Through this research, not only does it contribute to the understanding of Nepal's foreign policy but also helps to understand how domestic politics and international pressures impact the foreign policies of small states like Nepal.

Research Methods and Materials

Nepal's foreign policy was studied through a case study approach to examine the changes that occurred between 2000 and 2025. It primarily used secondary sources of data such as academic journal articles and books, policy papers or institutional reports, and other published materials on Nepal's foreign relations. A review of scholars' discussions on Nepal's diplomacy, geopolitical strategy, and foreign policy history was presented alongside studies conducted by international think tanks and organizations. Nepal's Constitution (2015) and the official Foreign Policy 2020 white paper, which are crucial government documents, were also reviewed.

A process-tracing approach was utilized in the study to determine the connection between major domestic political developments and changes in Nepal's foreign policy.

This study identified and analyzed the major political events of 2000–2025, looking at how they affected Nepal's diplomatic conduct in international relations with India and China as policy choices. Moreover, triangulation was used to increase the confidence in findings by interpolating information from multiple sources for each major event. Nepali and international perspectives were scrutinized to ensure fair interpretation. It was based on the theoretical frameworks of neorealism and constructivism.

The methodological framework provides a systematic and context-based understanding of the interaction between Nepal's domestic politics and foreign policy.

Results and Discussion

Domestic Political Changes and Foreign Policy Shifts

Nepal's major domestic political changes since 2000 have been closely linked with changes in its foreign policy orientation.

Monarchical Consolidation and Northern Tilt (2000–2006)

During the early 2000s, King Gyanendra's period of direct rule (2002–2006) was the time when Nepal sought to reduce dependence on India due to India's support for Nepal's democratic forces. After the king seized power in February 2005, the palace turned diplomatic isolated and sought to bolster ties with China as an alternative partner. Some of the major countries, only China maintained military assistance to King Gyanendra's government as India and the West suspended aid. It indicated a northern tilt in foreign policy, driven by the regime survival strategy of the palace (Nayak, 2014; Imran, 2021).

King Gyanendra's Regime-survival Diplomacy. King Gyanendra's foreign policy between 2002 and 2006 reflected a reactive attempt amidst rising domestic insurgency and declining external legitimacy. India, the United States and the United Kingdom condemned the coup and isolated it diplomatically (International Crisis Group, 2016). In this context, the palace sought the support of Beijing. In accordance with the non-interference doctrine, China didn't condemn the takeover and offered minimal assistance (Nayak, 2014; Imran, 2021). Many scholars argue that unilateral decisions made by the royal regime hurt its relations with both democratic forces and external partners. This revealed that the limitations on a monarchical foreign policy failed to garner common domestic political support (Dabhade & Pant, 2004; Rose, 1971).

China's Limited but Strategic Engagement. During King Gyanendra's direct rule, China's engagement with Nepal was still measured strategically purposeful. Beijing did not publicly endorse the royal coup, but it strategically supported the monarchy's emphasis on

sovereignty and non-interference principles, which aligned with China's own regional diplomacy (Imran, 2021). In contrast to India and the Western powers China had kept up functional relations (Nayak, 2014). It indicates Beijing's cautious engagement with a pragmatic calculus. It was intended to prevent Nepal from becoming a base for anti-China activities relating to Tibetan issues (Behera & Mayilvaganan, 2021). China's economic and political presence seems to be modest, but its steady outreach through aid, infrastructure offers, and diplomatic visits has helped position it as a reliable alternative partner. It created the strong foundation for deeper bilateral ties (Mainali, 2022; Johny, 2024).

Democratic Restoration and Diplomatic Rebalancing (2006–2015)

The restoration of democracy by the People's Movement of 2006 ultimately abolished the monarchy in Nepal in 2008. Nepal's foreign policy moved toward rebuilding relations with the international community and focusing on reassuring India. The interim government and the early republican governments reaffirmed Nepal's traditional relations with India. After 2006, democratic leaders quickly resumed high-level visits to New Delhi. At the same time, Nepal also maintained friendly relations with China, supported by China's policy of non-interference and its offers of economic cooperation.

Reassurance of India through Democratic Legitimacy. The new political leadership of Nepal focused on reassuring India through the language of democratic legitimacy and renewed partnership. India had played a crucial mediating role in the peace-building process that ended the decade-long civil war. Nepali leaders sought to rebuild trust with the long-standing cultural, economic, and political ties (International Crisis Group, 2016). The interim and early governments emphasized parliamentary norms, constitutionalism, and open diplomacy (Dabhade & Pant, 2004). High-level bilateral visits resumed instantly, which signaled the revived policy continuity and confidence. India restored aid and security cooperation, recognizing Nepal's new democratic mandate as a stabilizing force (Rose, 1971; Bhattarai, 2021). This improved Nepal–India relations, but also increased dependence and limited the independent foreign policy space of Nepal (Mainali, 2022).

Growing Pragmatic Relations with Beijing. The newly established republican governments recognized Beijing as an important development partner as Nepal sought alternatives to mitigate its overreliance on India (Mainali, 2022). China responded by expanding aid, infrastructure assistance, and high-level visits, adhering to its principle of non-interference in Nepal's domestic affairs (Imran, 2021). China was engaged mainly for trade, connectivity, and investment by the democratic governments (Behera & Mayilvaganan, 2021). The proposed Trans-Himalayan Railway and cross-border infrastructure discussions symbolized this pragmatic turn. It is reflected in Nepal's interest in leveraging China's BRI for significant national benefits (Bhattarai, 2022a). At the same time, leaders remained cautious not

to provoke India. They emphasized balance and non-alignment consistent with India (Johny, 2024; Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Nepal, 2020).

Federal Republicanism and the 2015 Nationalist Turn (2015–2025)

The promulgation of Nepal's new constitution in 2015 and the domestic unrest due to Madhesh opposition due to dissatisfaction with certain constitutional provisions marked another turning point. Support of India for the Madhesi protests and its unofficial blockade of Nepal in 2015–2016 led to severe shortages in Nepal that ultimately gave rise to nationalist sentiment in Nepal (Mainali, 2022). In response, Kathmandu undertook a notable foreign policy shift that accelerated outreach to China. Domestic anger at India's perceived interference empowered Nepal's leaders. The leftist coalition government in late 2015 signed trade and transit agreements with China, ending India's monopoly over Nepal's supply routes. It reduced Nepal's total dependence on Indian ports for commerce (Bhattarai, 2022a). Nepal diversified its foreign partnerships in the following years. Nepal joined China's Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) in 2017, aimed fundamentally in seeking alternative trade routes and investments. The geographical constraints and difficulties in economic interdependence meant that these shifts were more adjustments than clear transformations (Johny, 2024).

The 2015 Blockade and Nationalist Response. The unofficial Indian blockade in Nepal created an atmosphere of general shortages and a wave of Nationalist feeling across the country. Indians saw Nepali actions as coercive interference in the internal affairs of an independent and sovereign country. It fueled the issues of sovereignty and policy independence needs in Nepal (Mainali, 2022). This is a major shift in the national conversation from dependence to self-reliance. It also initiated the discourse of embedding nationalism in foreign policy debates. However, analysts note that the tendency of emotional nationalism often outperforms structural capacity for real autonomy (Baniya, 2023).

Structural Economic Dependency on India. Nepal's economy is highly dependent on India. Indian infrastructure and ports are the main drivers of Nepal's trade, fuel supply, and transit routes. India gains a significant edge due to this (Mainali, 2022; Bhattarai, 2020). The asymmetry is reinforced by the proximity of geography, open borders, and significant labour migration connections. The economic diversification process is impeded in reality (Dabhade & Pant, 2004)... Despite having signed agreements with China, including the 2016 transit treaty that grants access to Chinese ports (Behera & Mayilvaganan, 2021), practical challenges have prevented Nepal from fully implementing them.

Nepal's Belt and Road Participation and Balancing Approach. The decision of Nepal to join China's Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) in 2017 symbolized economic aspiration as well as geopolitical caution. Nepal viewed the participation in BRI as an opportunity to expand connectivity, investment, and reduce its historical dependence on India (Mainali, 2022; Behera & Mayilvaganan, 2021). But Nepal has approached the initiative selectively i.e., signing

framework agreements but delaying major project implementation yet (Bhattarai, 2022a). Nepal tends to secure development benefits without compromising sovereignty or strategic neutrality (Johny, 2024; Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Nepal, 2020).

Roles of Political Actors in Shaping Foreign Policy

Monarchical and Party Contrasts in the Early 2000s

Domestic political actors played contrasting roles in determining Nepal's foreign policy priorities during the early 2000s. King Gyanendra and the army pursued a sovereignty-centric foreign policy. India and Western powers were often accused of interference by the King and the army. Hence, the king leaned towards China to gain diplomatic support (Imran, 2021). In contrast, democratic forces like the Nepali Congress and the Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist) sought India's facilitation during the 2005–2006 peace process and to restore democracy in the country (International Crisis Group, 2016).

Coalition Politics and Ideological Realignments after 2008. After Nepal became a federal republic in 2008, fluctuating coalition governments brought changes in foreign policy orientation. Prime Minister Pushpa Kamal Dahal (Prachanda) broke diplomatic tradition by visiting Beijing before New Delhi. It reflected the Maoists' left-nationalist position and created temporary tension with India. Subsequent India-friendly coalitions reversed course, emphasizing restoration of traditional ties with New Delhi. This pattern showed Nepal's limited non-aligned position, where each government's foreign policy reflected its ideology and its attempt to appear different from previous governments. (Staniland, 2025).

Leadership Personalities and Contemporary Foreign-Policy Direction. India-friendly coalitions reversed the course, focusing on the restoration of traditional ties with New Delhi again. This pattern resembles the limited non-aligned position of Nepal. Each government's foreign policy reflected its ideology and its attempt to appear different from previous governments. (Staniland, 2025).

Leadership Personalities and Contemporary Foreign-Policy Direction. In the mid-2010s, a populist style, one personality trend emerged as a decisive factor. K. P. Sharma Oli's tenure was characterized by strong nationalist policies and proximity towards China. This was reflected in trade and transit agreements and Nepal's participation in the BRI (Mainali, 2022; Baniya, 2023).

Likewise, Sher Bahadur Deuba's governments steered Nepal towards accommodation with India and the West, leading to the Millennium Challenge Corporation agreement (Chand, 2021). Despite these changes, all leaders continued to follow the basic principle of non-alignment by maintaining relations with both India and China. Foreign policy was also used to gain domestic political legitimacy and support for identity-based politics.

External Factors and International Influences

External factors have both constrained and provided opportunities for Nepal's foreign policy choices. Major among these is the strategic rivalry between India and China, which has intensified and often played out within Nepal. Nepal has been traditionally regarded as part of the security sphere by India. Considering the open border and deep socio-cultural linkages, India has sought to keep Nepal firmly within its influence (Garver, 1991). China has also increased its economic and diplomatic footprint in Nepal. This attempt of China is heavily driven by concerns over Tibet and by its global Belt and Road ambitions (Behera & Mayilvaganan, 2021). This big-power rivalry has at times pressured Nepal's foreign policy decisions. For example, Nepal's invitations to Chinese investments in infrastructure have raised concern in New Delhi, and India has occasionally responded by offering competing projects or diplomatic enticements (Nepal, 2021). Nepali leaders emphasize that Nepal does not want to be a "pawn" in any great-power competition, thus seeking friendly relations with both neighbors based on equality. In practice, Nepal has responded with a hedging strategy – welcoming investment and aid from both India and China. It has adhered to the strategy of carefully voicing support for each neighbor's core interests and refraining from taking sides on contentious issues (Johny, 2024; Imran, 2021). The success of this strategy, however, depends largely on the external environment. Nepal's balancing act becomes more difficult when India–China relations are tense, as each neighbor grows more suspicious on Kathmandu's engagement with the other.

Global developments beyond South Asia also influenced Nepal's foreign policy. In the early 2000s, the global "War on Terror" led the United States to support the Nepali government against the Maoist insurgency. As the conflict gradually ended, Western countries shifted their focus toward supporting the democratic transition. This international pressure also contributed to the 2006 political settlement in Nepal (International Crisis Group, 2016). In the 2010s, Nepal found itself subject to competing international courtships as part of the emerging Indo-Pacific strategic contest. The United States' increased interest in South Asia translated into initiatives like the MCC grant to Nepal. While MCC was officially a development program, it became highly controversial within Nepal. Some in Nepal argued it was an instrument of the United States' Indo-Pacific Strategy and warned that it could undermine Nepal's non-alignment (Chand, 2021). The debate led to protests in early 2022 until Nepal's parliament ratified the MCC compact with assurances of Nepal's non-alignment.

Nepal has also engaged with non-regional partners and multilateral institutions for broadening its diplomatic options and not to be solely dependent on its neighbors (Hey, 2003; Baniya, 2023). However, the main challenge of Nepal remains managing its equidistant approach towards India and China. Some analysts argue that Nepal often tries to balance India and China to protect its own policy space (Kochhar, 2021). The current environment shows that

while Nepal can leverage external interest to some extent, it must continuously calibrate its policies to prevent being drawn too far into any one camp.

Conclusion

Nepal's foreign policy in the last two decades has resembled a close interrelation between domestic political transformation and external actors. The end of the monarchy, the creation of a federal republic and ongoing instability in coalition governments have led to cyclic swings in diplomatic initiatives. The engagement of Nepal with India, China or other foreign powers has been influenced by each political transition.' These modifications were also within the scope of structural realities. Despite Nepal's landlocked status, economic dependence on India and growing Chinese influence have all hindered the country's regime it has to manage. The foreign policy of Nepal can be best explained by a combination of neorealist and constructivist perspectives, as indicated by these findings.

Implications of Findings

A number of key findings in this examination pertain to Nepal's foreign policy, which is influenced by two sources: external pressures from China and India and internal changes within Nepal. Political instability, government turnover, leadership disunity, and constitutional changes are the four primary influencing factors at the domestic level. For many years, Nepal has been a mediator between China and India to safeguard its sovereignty and national interests. To address regional and international pressures, Nepal should implement a clear foreign policy strategy and strengthen its institutional coherence, according to this study. The effects of domestic governance and geopolitics on the foreign policy of small countries can be supported by relevant studies.

References

- Acharya, M. R. (2020). *Foreign Policy and Strategic Affairs A Perspective Paper PRI Publication Series No. 011*.
[https://giwmscdnone.gov.np/media/pdf_upload/PRI3905_Raman%20Acharya%20\(3\)_08rm2kn.pdf](https://giwmscdnone.gov.np/media/pdf_upload/PRI3905_Raman%20Acharya%20(3)_08rm2kn.pdf)
- Adhikari, D. R. (2018). A Small State between Two Major Powers: Nepal's Foreign Policy Since 1816. *Journal of International Affairs*, 2(1), 43–74.
<https://doi.org/10.3126/joia.v2i1.22575>
- Baniya, D. B. (2023). The Thriving Strategy for Nepal amidst Triangular Competition of China, India, and the United States. *Unity Journal*, 4(01), 112–130.
<https://doi.org/10.3126/unityj.v4i01.52234>

- Behera, A., & Mayilvaganan, M. (2021). The China–Nepal–India Economic Corridor: wishful thinking or regional aspiration beyond rhetoric? *The Round Table*, 110(2), 250–263. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00358533.2021.1904586>
- Bhatta, C. D. (2022). Understanding Nepal’s Geopolitical Dynamics: Connected History Disconnected Future. *Journal of Foreign Affairs*, 2(01), 89–106. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jofa.v2i01.44008>
- Bhattarai, G. (2021). Challenges to Diplomatic Efforts in Resolving Nepal-India Border Problems in the Himalayas: A Foreign Policy Analysis (FPA). *Nepal Public Policy Review*, 1–30. <https://nepjol.info/index.php/nppr/article/view/43418>
- Bhattarai, G. (2022). The gridlock of the Trans-Himalayan railway: China’s strategic calculations about Nepal. *Stosunki Międzynarodowe – International Relations*, 2, 17. <https://doi.org/10.12688/stomiedintrelat.17507.2>
- Bhattarai, G., Bista, P., & Adhikari, S. (2026). *Why didn’t Nepal Join the Indo-Pacific Strategy (IPS)? A Critical Assessment of Nepal’s Foreign Policy Response to IPS*. icm.edu.pl. https://cejsh.icm.edu.pl/cejsh/element/bwmeta1.element.ojs-doi-10_15804_ap2022_2_02
- Brown, M. (1971). The Diplomatic Development of Nepal. *Asian Survey*, 11(7), 661–676. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2642973>
- Chand, H. P. (2021). Nepal’s Engagement in BRI and MCC: Implications on Nepal’s Geopolitics and Foreign Policy. *Journal of Political Science*, 21, 60–77. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jps.v21i1.39288>
- Dabhade, M., & Pant, H. V. (2004). Coping with challenges to sovereignty: Sino-Indian rivalry and Nepal’s foreign policy. *Contemporary South Asia*, 13(2), 157–169. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0958493042000242945>
- Dahal, D. R. (2012). The Art of Survival: Policy Choices for Nepal. *Dhaulagiri Journal of Sociology and Anthropology*, 5, 31–48. <https://doi.org/10.3126/dsaj.v5i0.6355>
- Dahal, G. R. (2021). Nepal’s Strategic Hedging Behaviour: 2008-2019. *Journal of South Asian Studies*, 9(1), 15–24. <https://doi.org/10.33687/jsas.009.01.3416>
- David, S. R. (1991). Explaining Third World Alignment. *World Politics*, 43(2), 233–256.
- Eby Johny. (2024). Foreign policy strategies of Nepal between China and India: bandwagon or hedging. *International Politics*. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41311-024-00560-1>
- Garver, J. W. (1991). China-India Rivalry in Nepal: The Clash over Chinese Arms Sales. *Asian Survey*, 31(10), 956–975. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2645066>
- Government of Nepal. (2015). *Unofficial translation CONSTITUTION OF NEPAL 2015 Constituent Assembly Secretariat Singha Durbar*.

- Hey, J. A. K. (2003). *Small States in World Politics*. Google Books.
https://books.google.com.np/books?hl=en&lr=&id=WP1_-k2RGoMC&oi=fnd&pg=PP11&dq=Hey
- Imran, S. (2021). Sino Indian Strategic Balancing in Nepal. *Strategic Studies*, 41(1), 67–86. JSTOR. <https://doi.org/10.2307/48732269>
- International Crisis Group. (2022, April 4). *Nepal's Divisive New Constitution: An Existential Crisis* | International Crisis Group. Crisisgroup.org.
<https://www.crisisgroup.org/rpt/asia-pacific/nepal/276-nepals-divisive-new-constitution-existential-crisis>
- Jaiswal, P. (2016). Nepal Between India and China: Demystifying Big Powers' Interplay. *India-China-Nepal-Decoding Trilateralism*, 91-106.
- Kochhar, G. (2021). *INDIA AND CHINA Economics and Soft Power Diplomacy*. Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.
- Lin, C.-M., Chang, M.-C., & Chao, Y.-H. (2022). The Forced Turnover Effect on an Overconfident CEO: Evidence From Taiwan-Listed Firms. *SAGE Open*, 12(1), 215824402210799. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221079915>
- Mainali, R. (2022). Analysing Nepal's Foreign Policy: A Hedging Perspective. *Journal of Asian Security and International Affairs*, 9(2), 301–317.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/23477970221098491>
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Nepal. (2020). *Nepal's Foreign Policy* | Ministry Of Foreign Affairs. Mofa.gov.np. <https://mofa.gov.np/pages/foreign-policy-of-nepal-1/>
- Muni, S. D. (1973). *Foreign Policy of Nepal*. Delhi: National [Publishing House.
- Nepal, D. (2021). Nepal's Relationship with India and China in the Changing Context. *Mangal Research Journal*, 2, 37–46. <https://doi.org/10.3126/mrj.v2i1.43574>
- Nihar Nayak. (2014). *Strategic Himalayas: republican Nepal and external powers*. Published by Pentagon Press in association with the Institute For Defence Studies and Analyses.
- Putnam, R. D. (1988). Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: the Logic of Two-Level Games. *International Organization*, 42(3), 427–460. Jstor. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2706785>
- Rose, L. E., & Studies, A. (1971). *Nepal: Strategy for Survival*. Univ of California Press.
- Staniland, P. (2025). *Major Power Rivalry and Domestic Politics in South Asia*. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
<https://carnegieendowment.org/research/2025/07/major-power-rivalry-and-domestic-politics-in-south-asia>
- Waltz, K. N. (1996). International politics is not foreign policy. *Security Studies*, 6(1), 54–57.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09636419608429298>

Wendt, A. (1992). Anarchy Is What States Make of it: the Social Construction of Power Politics. *International Organization*, 46(2), 391–425.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818300027764>

Whelpton, J. (2008). *A history of Nepal*. Cambridge Univ. Press.