Foreign policy is a broad network of objectives, principles and means to attain them, that an independent and sovereign state pursues in order to meet the contingencies of its diplomatic requirements. The architect of foreign policy tries to design it in such a way as to fulfil the enlightened national interest in the light of the nation's permanent domestic requirements and fluid and fast changing international situations. The principal problem is the identification of the national interest at a particular time by its ruling elite. A single man of eminence or a small coterie of men at the apex of political structure decide as to what it ought to be at a given time. Attainment of independence in 1947 raised a multitude of domestic problems like planning and economic development, restructuring of administration, adoption of parliamentary democracy, realisation of secularism and eradication of centrifugal forces such as linguicism, casteism and communal violence. Along with this mess of socio-economic and political problems, the problem of foreign policy was no less significant. As a developing country, India's ambition was far from being a mere quest for power. India had
to consolidate and project its image as a peace-maker to the antagonistic bipolar post-war world. India searched out in non-alignment a panacea to all international ills. The crux of the problem for India was to reconcile the two leaderships of the non-aligned groups and Afro-Asian region. In order to accelerate the pace of economic advancement India has to enlarge the area of peace. Tranquil borders and amiable terms with the neighbouring countries were the two pre-requisite to be achieved through the gimmicks of foreign policy. However, the border dispute with China happened to be an acid test to it. The trial to have negotiated peace utterly failed in the context of China.

Nehru’s leadership was the most remarkable factor in India’s political life. He held almost a monopoly over foreign policy making. Foreign policy of India became what Nehru intended to make it.

India adopted parliamentary democracy which requires interdependence of the Executive and the Parliament. In fact the Executive is subordinate or subservient to Parliament. The Executive is constituted from the Parliament and is responsible to the latter
for all its functions. The foreign policy making and implementation requires a proper liaison and interdependence of the Executive and Parliament which is ensured through the parliamentary system. The crux of the problem is to allocate this responsibility between the legislature and the Executive with regard to foreign policy.

The present thesis is an attempt to examine the main features of the foreign policy of India and the role of the Indian Parliament in shaping, controlling, directing, supervising and scrutinising it. Instead of exploring all the aspects of foreign policy, it is a special study of the Sino-Indian Border Dispute-1962. The first chapter deals with the Foreign Policy, its chief determinants and tenets. It includes a detailed survey of National-Interest as the major determinant. Nehru happens to be the Chief Architect of India's policy. Guided by the Western realism and oriental idealism, Nehru designed the principles of foreign policy to meet the requirements of a developing country.

The second chapter makes a broad analysis of the role of various agencies such as the cabinet,
the External Affairs Ministry and the Minister and Nehru as the dimmvirate combining in him the twin offices of the Prime Minister and the Minister of External Affairs. It also attempts to present the general organisation and functions of the Ministry of External Affairs. An attempt has been made to make an analytical study of all these agencies that can partake of the responsibility of formulating the foreign policy of India. As a matter of reference, it also studies the role of Parliament as the supreme legislative body in the Indian parliamentary set-up. The Cabinet which enjoys the confidence of the people and the Parliament gets an upper hand over the rest of the agencies. Moreover, one cannot ignore the mighty presence of the 'gentle collosus', Nehru as the chief steersman of the cabinet. The overall analysis of the mode of work in the cabinet shows that Nehru's keen insight in foreign affairs, his monopolistic nature, popularity and egoism in not consulting his cabinet colleagues in most of the matters made the cabinet a body subservient to his whims and caprices. Till Nehru was at the helm of affairs, no one had the guts to oppose him in the
making of major policy decisions nor he was in the habit of consulting his colleagues. Absence of consultations had eclipsed the role of other agencies. The parliament is not entrusted with the task of making foreign policy, consequently the most pertinent role is played by Nehru. However, the Parliament is entitled to supervise the entire machinery of administration.

The third chapter makes an analysis of the processes of parliamentary control namely the Parliamentary Questions, Ministerial Statements, various Motions such as the general resolutions approving or disapproving of the foreign policy, No-Confidence Motions, Adjournment Motions and Debates. In a parliamentary system these are the instruments through which the Parliament makes it obligatory over the Executive to account to it ultimately for all its activities. Through all these modes the implementation of foreign policy is brought to books. In a Parliamentary system, the Executive is sensitive to parliamentary criticism. These instruments of Parliamentary control are dealt at large with regard to the multitude of foreign policy problems. Measures
are suggested for their effective utilisation. These measures provide to the members of Parliament, the maximum opportunity to keep themselves informed of the latest developments in the foreign policy arena and international gimmicks.

Questions raised by the Members of Parliament efface the misunderstanding from their minds. It is the liveliest and most brisk mode of imploring relevant scrutiny of the decisions taken by the Executive. Debates on foreign policy resolutions provide an opportunity for discussion and criticism with which the Executive can benefit itself. The chapter also points out the limitations of these instruments.

The Fourth Chapter makes a comprehensive study of the impact of the Opposition in a parliamentary democracy. It is an attempt to highlight the need to have organised Opposition in the Parliament. No Government can function without the existence of an effective Opposition. In India where the multi-party system operates, the role of the Opposition ought to be more defined and relevant. The ultimate decision of the national interest by the Government must be
based on the broad consensus generated by the Opposition. The Opposition formulates healthy public opinion. However, in the wake of independence in India, the Congress Party enjoyed the streamrolling majority and political preponderance over the rest of the parties. Nehru's position in Parliament was undomitable. Till now, the Congress had an overwhelming numerical majority. The variety of factors that reduced the Opposition to play a less articulate and pertinent role have been analysed. The Opposition was disjoined, disorganised, ineffective and lacked unanimity. Nehru was less sensitive to it. However, the reactions of Opposition were quite sharp over the deterioration of Sino-Indian relations, the failure of the India's policy to meet the trend, withholding of information from the house and skirmishes at the border in the light of Nehru's repeated assurances to have a peaceful border. Most of the criticism of the Opposition was wide off the mark. Measures are suggested to make it more effective as to perform the role it is destined to play in a parliamentary democracy like India. The problem under study is the Sino-India Border Dispute.
An attempt has been made to review the reactions and criticisms of the major Opposition parties. Their validity for the ruling party has been assessed. The Opposition should try to cultivate unanimity, coalesce on major issues, should present concrete alternatives and avoid criticism for the sake of criticism of merely to play to the gallery. The Parties should not be organised on the basis of caste or religion and their number should be reduced by law so as to give rise to a unified and organised Opposition. The Government should evolve a policy to make more consultations.

The emergence of a more articulate Opposition after the Sino-India debacle is a promising sigh. The rise of a full fledged Opposition would not be a liability but an asset to the better development and success of parliamentary democracy in India.

The V chapter is an attempt to give an insight into the history of the Sino-India relations. It probes into the genesis of the border dispute, legality of the historical but imaginary McMahon Line and the cartographic aggression. It peeps into the cordial phase of the Hindi Chini Bhai-Bhai, Panchsheel
the Chinese refusal to accept that Sino-India border was settled, Tibetan revolt, recognition of the Chinese suzerainty over Tibet which finished the buffer state between China and India, granting of political asylum to the Dalai Lama and the increased Chinese expansionist designs. The White Papers are discussed at large and at length. The host of factors led to deteriorate the relations to the extent that a full scale war occurred. India needed peaceful borders and amicable relations with the neighbours. But the situation ripened at the border in such a way that all efforts to the amicable settlement of dispute, miserably failed and a direct confrontation became inevitable. Nehru had many misconceptions about the Chinese designs and moves. However the conflict between India and China happened to be the first conflict between the Communist power and the non-aligned state. The India-China war was an acid test to India's foreign policy which made her assess the situations more realistically. The weakness in meeting the contingency make it incumbent upon the nation to shun the idealism in foreign policy, increase defence preparations and not to remain complacent.
The VI chapter is a case-study of the 1962 debates — held in the Parliament over the Sino-India Border Dispute. It describes the actual use made of the parliamentary processes like the Question-Hour, General Debates, General and specific foreign policy Motions, No-Confidence and Adjournment motions over the Sino-India Border Dispute of 1962. An attempt has been made to study the problem in the light of the behaviour of the members of the Parliament while speaking in the House. The study centres around the Lower House of Parliament, the Lok Sabha due to its popular nature, numerical strength and efficacy in a parliamentary system. Certain limitations to the role of Parliament have been pin-pointed, as are imposed upon it by the parliamentary system itself. During the crucial year of invasion-1962, the Members of Parliament did not demand to hold any discussion over the white Papers. However, their occasional reference is found in abundance. The decline in health and popularity of Nehru, increase in the prestige of Opposition incidentally helped the Parliament to gain a stature of eminence in the Indian Political system.
The VII Chapter is devoted to the detailed analysis of Parliament, its constitutional position, nature of proceedings, legislative control over foreign policy and foreign relations and the inevitable limitations on the measures of parliamentary control. The position of Parliament with regard to the treaty-making is also analysed. An attempt has been made to scrutinise the role of the Parliamentary Committees, namely the Consultative Committee, its organisation and general functioning. It also discusses the financial control of the Parliament. There is a host of factors both political and constitutional that limit the role of Parliament in the field of foreign policy. The crux of foreign policy is negotiation, secrecy and urgency. The Members have got their party affiliations, to safeguard the interests of their constituency and a pledge not to disclose information. The Committee works as mini-Parliament. The need to take Parliament more in confidence is emphasised to enable it to set guide lines for foreign policy and make more concrete suggestions and programmes. Its role as a registering authority is not sufficient. Though the Parliament merely conducts the ex post facto
enquiry, no government can afford to ignore its directives.

The conclusion highlights the limitations of Parliament in foreign policy domain. It suggests that the Members of Parliament should be given more information and the consultation with them should increase. They should try to create more interest in foreign policy problems so that a proper balance could be maintained in their interests. The problem of inter-dependence of the Cabinet and Parliament has also been examined. A proper liaison should be maintained in parliamentary approval and the Executive power, to initiate and implement policy. In fact the control of foreign policy by the Executive is equally democratic in spirit. However, parliamentary subservience is not a myth and a balance and coordination is to be maintained between these two significant branches of government. Foreign policy should not be left to the 'generalists', it should be entrusted to the 'experts'. Much remains to be done to streamline the defects of our diplomacy in order to take more positive steps in the realm of foreign policy. Suggestions are also made to accelerate the
the Committee work of Parliament in order to facilitate more parliamentary consultations.