

Becoming A Nation: The Post Independence Landscape of India

Aditya Prakash

Student, Amity University

Abstract

India's national unity after independence in 1947 is an important phase in the country's history, full of controversies, politics and diplomatic skills. This paper examines this pivotal period, focusing on the roles of key figures like Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel and V. P. Menon in orchestrating the integration process. Against the backdrop of India's hard-fought struggle for freedom from British colonial rule, the paper provides an overview of the challenges India faced and the strategies employed to bring over 500 princely states into the Indian Union.

Moreover, the article also highlights the unique situation of integration of certain princely states, including Bhopal, Assam, Junagadh, Travancore, and Hyderabad. Each state presented its own set of complexities, from religious and ethnic divides to geopolitical considerations. Through careful analysis, this article shows how India responded to these challenges, it highlights dialogue, political consensus and some military intervention that ultimately led to the successful integration of these states into the fabric of India.

Introduction

India's journey towards independence was characterised by a long and arduous struggle against British colonial rule, culminating in the attainment of freedom on August 15, 1947. However, this important period also brought formidable challenges: unification of multiple states, over 500 states each with its own ruler and autonomy, into the newly formed union of India. The British government granted autonomy to these princely states through the Government of India Act, 1935, leaving it to their leaders to decide whether to join India or Pakistan. Following the partition of British India in 1947, the princely states found themselves at a crossroads. While some acceded to India or Pakistan based on geographical contiguity or demographic composition, others faced complex geopolitical considerations. The integration of princely states into the Indian Union was made possible through the relentless endeavours of figures such as Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, who served as the first Deputy Prime Minister and Home Minister of independent India. Patel, often referred to as the "Iron Man of India," played a key role in persuading this grudging state leaders to join the union of India through a combination of negotiations, diplomacy and military actions.

The integration process was not without its difficulties, as some princely states, such as Hyderabad and Junagadh, posed significant resistance to joining India. The successful integration of princely states into the Indian Union laid the foundation for a unified and diverse nation, reflecting the ideals of democracy, pluralism, and territorial integrity.

Discussion

As the country, newly freed from British colonial rule, celebrates its independence, The challenge of integrating more than 500 princely states is scattered across the continent. Following their integration into the Indian Union, many princely states underwent a transformation, relinquishing their distinct identities. A memorandum issued on 12th May, 1946, concerning States Treaties and Paramountcy, outlined this transition: "*...His Majesty's Government will cease to exercise the powers of paramountcy. This means that the rights of the States which flow from their relationship to the Crown will no longer exist and that all the rights surrendered by the States to the paramount power will return to the States. Political arrangements between the States on the one side and the British Crown and British India on the other will thus be brought to an end.*"¹ The absence left behind was to be addressed through the princely States establishing a federal bond with the succeeding Government, alongside the phased implementation of a democratic governance structure.

As early as the Haripura Conference of 1938, Indian National Congress recognised the need for political harmony Throughout the country. INC had made clear their intention to bring these princely states into the union of India. Reflecting this sentiment, the Congress resolution declared, "*The Congress stands for the same political, social, and economic freedom in the States as in the rest of India and considers the States as integral parts of India which cannot be separated. The Purna Swaraj or complete independence, which is the objective of the Congress, is for the whole of India, inclusive of the States, for the integrity and unity of India must be maintained in freedom as it has been maintained in subjection.*"²

The concurrent operation of divergent political frameworks within the States and Provinces lacked substantiation based on inherent cultural distinctions among their inhabitants. This divergence was essentially contrived, as all communities encountered similar collective issues and aspirations. The inherent interplay between the States and Provinces, alongside their intertwined destinies, found reflection in the Montague Chelmsford of 1918, wherein analogous sentiments were elucidated: "*India is in fact, as well as by legal definition, one geographical whole. The integral connexion of the States with the British Empire not only consists in their relations to the British Crown, but also in their growing interest in many matters common to the land to which they and the British provinces alike belong.*"³

The Integration of princely States into the Indian Union is necessary to support the non-compliant regime. The proliferation of small States has given rise to administrative bodies, each with its own unique rules, thus erecting problems between adjacent areas. This difference in governance also affects the implementation of economic activities that are important for the development of the country. Efficient management is important for the efficient use of natural resources and encouraging participation in the production of goods. There for it is important to streamline management to achieve business planned goals.

As stipulated by the Indian Independence Act of 1947, princely states had the option of cooperating with either of the newly formed dominion, India or Pakistan or to retain their status as

¹ "White Paper on Indian States issued by the Government of India in July 1948, Appendix m, p. 45"

² "Indian National Congress February 1938 to January 1939 (Allahabad, Published by General Secretary, All India Congress Committee) p. 10"

³ "Report Indian Constitutional Reforms 1918 (Calcutta, Government of India Central Publication Branch, Reprinted 1928) para 296."

independent entities. More importantly, the princely states constituted a large portion of pre-Independence India's population accounted for approximately 48% of its territory and, held a distinct legal status separate from British India. One such princely state, situated in the southern region of India and renowned for its abundant "*human and mineral resources*", initially contemplated pursuing independence. In 1946, Dewan, Sir C.P. Ramaswamy Aiyar of Travancore, influenced by the state's considerable resources and clandestine connections with the UK government, entertained the notion of establishing an independent state. However, due to subsequent conflicts and pressures, Travancore ultimately opted to integrate with the Indian Union on July 30, 1947.⁴

Similarly, Kashmir, a princely state ruled by a Hindu monarch over a predominantly Muslim population, found itself at a crossroads, eligible to accede to either India or Pakistan. The ruler of Kashmir, Maharaja Hari Singh, received standstill agreements from both India and Pakistan. Eventually, in 1954, the President issued a constitutional order under Article 370, formally integrating Jammu & Kashmir into the Union of India. This decision solidified Kashmir's status as an integral part of India. Subsequently, within a short timeframe, other princely states such as Hyderabad, Bhopal, and 565 others, were amalgamated into the Union of India, thereby consolidating the nation's territorial integrity and sovereignty.

“Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel: a Legacy of Unity and Leadership”

Born on October 31, 1875, in Nadiad, Gujarat, Vallabhbhai Patel pursued a successful career in law, experiencing a pivotal moment when he was chosen by Mahatma Gandhi to assist in leading the Kheda Satyagraha in 1918. Sardar Patel emerged as a prominent figure in the national struggle for independence. In 1931, he ascended to the presidency of the Indian National Congress during its Karachi Session.

As the Indian Independence Act of 1947 heralded the imminent realization of India's long-awaited freedom, daunting challenges loomed ahead. The journey towards unity was marked by complexity, given the presence of 17 British Indian provinces and more than 560 Princely States, which collectively constituted a substantial portion of the nation's territory. Although the Act relinquished authority over British India to the Indian Government, it empowered the leaders of the Princely States to determine whether they wished to align themselves with India, Pakistan, or remain independent.

Sardar Patel assumed a pivotal role in securing the attainment of the Princely States and their integration into the Indian Union. On June 25, 1947, the formation of the States Department under Sardar Patel's leadership marked a critical milestone. Alongside him, V.P. Menon assumed the role of Secretary, forming a formidable duo whose strategic acumen and diplomatic finesse surmounted seemingly insurmountable obstacles.⁵

Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel relentlessly endeavoured to persuade the princely states to align with India. During this period, he introduced a novel concept known as "Privy Purses," wherein the royal families of these states would receive substantial financial compensation through agreements facilitating their merger with India. Patel's proactive measures aimed at integrating the princely states into the Indian Union were notable.

Patel and Menon bolstered their diplomatic endeavour by crafting treaties intended to appeal to the rulers of princely states. Central to their strategy were two pivotal documents. The first, the Standstill Agreement, reaffirmed the continuation of existing agreements and administrative protocols. The second, known as

⁴ “Integration Of Princely States: Unacademy”

⁵ “Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel: The Man Who United the Nation, National Unity Day- 31 October, Ministry of Home Affairs”

the Instrument of Accession, entailed the respective ruler of each princely state agreed to integrate their kingdom into independent India, thereby ceding authority over specified subject matters to the newly established nation.

Among the initial states to join the Union were Bikaner, Baroda, and several others from Rajasthan. However, there remained a faction of princely states inclined towards aligning with Pakistan, while others aspired to maintain their independence. Consequently, some princely states opted to become part of Pakistan, diverging from the path of integration with India.

“The Unification Process: Integration Princely States”

The majority of princely states underwent integration through the signing of the “Instrument of Accession”, with the exception of Junagadh and Hyderabad. However, these two states were eventually incorporated into the Union of India.⁶ Following integration, a reconfiguration of internal arrangements within the states and their relationship with the central government occurred to align with the provisions of the 1950 constitution, which classified states into three categories.⁷

The territorial amalgamation of princely states manifested through three distinct approaches: (a) “absorption into adjacent provinces”, (b) “formation of separate units through the grouping of specific states”, and (c) “conversion of select states into centrally administered territories”.⁸ The process of aligning states with the new constitutional framework unfolded through a dual process. In the beginning, it encompassed the Indian states' accession to the Dominion of India, followed by endeavors to amalgamate small states into functional administrative units. This transition also marked the initiation of the establishment of democratic institutions and responsible governance structures within the states.⁹

The integration policy played a very Important in uniting the entire nation, under a unified political structure and resolving various administrative inefficiencies and financial disparities. This transformative initiative marked a monumental shift for India, profoundly influencing its political, economic, and social fabric. the words of Sardar Patel: "The great ideal of geographical, political, and economic unification of India, an ideal which for centuries remained a distant dream and which appeared as remote and as difficult of attainment as ever even after the advent of Indian independence," was realized through the implementation of the integration policy.¹⁰

BHOPAL

Founded in the early 18th century by Dost Mohammad Khan, a Pashtun adventurer, Bhopal emerged as a significant princely state in central India. He established the Bhopal principality after being granted land by the Mughal Emperor Aurangzeb. Under the rule of Dost Mohammad Khan and his descendants, Bhopal gradually emerged as a significant center of trade, culture, and governance in central India.¹¹

During the 19th century, Bhopal saw a period of relative stability and prosperity under the leadership of rulers like Nawab Begum Shah Jahan and her daughter, Nawab Sikandar Begum. These dynamic female

⁶ “Ibid., pp. 144-45 and 376-77”

⁷ “Constitution of India : As modified upto 1st September, 1951, Delhi, Govt, of India Press, 1951, First Schedule, pp. 205-207”

⁸ “V. P. Menon, n. 8, pp. 435 and 470”

⁹ “White Paper on Indian States, n. 1, para 63”

¹⁰ “Constituent Assembly Debates 1949, Vol. 10, pp. 166-667”

¹¹ “Hannah L. Archambault, Becoming Mughal in the Nineteenth Century: The Case of the Bhopal Princely State; page:4”

rulers were known for their progressive policies, including initiatives to promote education, women's rights, and infrastructure development. Bhopal became known as a beacon of female empowerment during a time when such concepts were rare in princely India.¹²

During the British Raj, Bhopal maintained a strategic alliance with the British East India Company, which later extended to the British Crown. This relationship ensured a degree of autonomy for the Nawabs of Bhopal while acknowledging British suzerainty. However, as India moved towards independence, Bhopal, like other princely states, faced the dilemma of choosing between acceding to the newly formed Indian Union or remaining independent.

Lord Mountbatten, the last Viceroy of India, played a pivotal role in facilitating the integration of princely states into independent India. His diplomatic efforts aimed to persuade princely rulers to accede to the Indian Union, thereby ensuring the territorial integrity and unity of the newly formed nation. Mountbatten's approach involved negotiations, persuasion, and occasionally, coercive measures to secure accession.

Nawab Hamidullah Khan, the ruler of Bhopal during the tumultuous period of India's partition, found himself at the center of this political upheaval. With close ties to the Muslim League, Nawab Hamidullah initially expressed inclinations towards aligning Bhopal with Pakistan. However, as the partition approached, mounting pressure from Indian nationalist leaders, coupled with the strategic significance of Bhopal within the Indian subcontinent, compelled Nawab Hamidullah to reconsider his stance.¹³

The process of integrating Bhopal into the Indian Union was marked by negotiations, consultations, and diplomatic maneuvering. Despite initial hesitations and concerns, Nawab Hamidullah eventually decided to accede to India, recognizing the benefits of aligning with the larger Indian nation. The integration of Bhopal into independent India symbolized a triumph of diplomacy and paved the way for the consolidation of the Indian state.

ASSAM

The Ahom dynasty governed Assam for approximately six centuries. In 1818, faced with Burmese invasion, the Ahom king sought aid from the British. Subsequently, in 1826, the Ahom kingdom entered into the Treaty of Yandaboo with the British East India Company, resulting in the British takeover of Assam following the defeat of the Burmese. This marked the culmination of 600 years of Ahom rule, with the British commencing their territorial expansion in the region thereafter. In 1921, Assam was designated as a separate province and placed directly under the jurisdiction of a Governor General, thereby becoming part of the Bengal province. Additionally, various hill kingdoms including Khasi, Jaintia, Lushai, and Naga hills were incorporated into the Assam province.¹⁴

Following the enactment of the Government of India Act in 1935, Assam witnessed a fervent political rivalry between the Assam State Congress, advocating for Assam's inclusion in India, and the Muslim League, striving for Assam's affiliation with Pakistan. The Muslim League adopted strategies to bolster the Muslim population in Assam, encouraging Muslim migration to the region. Syed Muhammad Saadulla's initiative of "Grow more crops" was cynically dubbed as "Grow more Muslims." Ultimately,

¹² "Hannah L. Archambault, *Becoming Mughal in the Nineteenth Century: The Case of the Bhopal Princely State*; page:3"

¹³ "Integration of Princely States After Independence, 2019. To the Point"

¹⁴ "Rishov Jyoti Sonowal, *National Integration of Northeast India*. IJRAR August 2023, Volume 10, Issue 3"

in June 1947, Assam's allegiance to India was decided. However, amidst these political dynamics, a burgeoning sense of nationhood emerged among the Nagas and certain segments of the Mizos.¹⁵

In 1945, the Naga hill district Council was established, evolving into the Naga National Council in 1946, advocating for a separate autonomous state for the Nagas. Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru's correspondence with the NNC secretary, T. Sakhrie, expressed India's stance against separate electorates, emphasizing the unity of the nation. Despite efforts by Angami Zapu Phizo to garner support for a separate Naga nation-state, the Nagas declared independence on August 14, 1947, a day prior to India's independence. Tripura merged with India, while the princely state of Manipur was compelled to sign a merger agreement in 1949. These intricate circumstances contributed to post-independence armed insurgency in the region.¹⁶

After independence, the Indian government failed to adequately address the complex realities of the North East, instead adopting a policy reminiscent of colonial isolation and alienation, treating the region differently from other Indian states.¹⁷ The Constitution enacted in 1950 included a unique provision known as the Sixth Schedule, aimed at governing "tribal" areas scattered across the country, with a specific focus on safeguarding the interests of tribal communities inhabiting the North East's hilly terrain. This provision delineated the "tribal" areas into two categories, Part A and Part B.¹⁸

Part A comprised Autonomous Districts, including the "United Khasi" and "Jaintia Hills" District, "Garo Hills" District, "Lushai Hills" District, "Naga Hills" District, "North Cachar Hills" District, and "Mikir Hills" District. These districts were administered by the Government of Assam, albeit with limited representation in the Assam State Legislative Assembly and National Parliament. Conversely, Part B encompassed regions such as the "North East Frontier" Tract, "Balipara Frontier" Tract, "Tirap Frontier" Tract, "Abor Hill", "Mishmi Hills" Districts, and Naga Tribal Area. Under Part B, administration was vested in the Governor of Assam, acting as the Agent of the President of India. Tripura and Manipur were designated as special administrative regions under central government control, rather than achieving statehood.¹⁹ Consequently, the process of state formation in the North East entailed the gradual separation of territories once integrated into Assam, ultimately evolving into distinct states.

JUNAGADH

Junagadh, situated at the southern tip of Gujarat within the Kathiawar region, comprised numerous petty estates and sheikhdoms within its territory. The complexity of the situation was such that it took the Government of India several weeks to accurately delineate the borders before devising a military strategy. Furthermore, legal ambiguity surrounded whether these small sheikhdoms held independent status or were under the suzerainty of Junagadh even after accession. Despite these challenges, Junagadh held significant

¹⁵ "Air attacks in Mizoram, 1966 - our dirty, little secret. (2013, February 19). The Economic Times. Retrieved August 21, 2023"

¹⁶ "Chaube S. K., 1999. Hill Politics in North-east India. Hyderabad: Orient Longman"

¹⁷ "Savyasaachi. 1998. Tribal Forest-Dwellers and Self-Rule: The Constitution Assembly Debates on the Fifth and Sixth Schedules. New Delhi: Indian Social Institute."

¹⁸ "Singh K. S. (1982, August 14). Transformation of Tribal Society: Integration vs Assimilation. Economic and Political Weekly, 17(33), 1318-1325."

¹⁹ "Singh N. S. (2006, April). Integration and Development in North-East India: An Assessment. The Indian Journal of Political Science, 67(2), 329-342."

importance, boasting a population of 700,000, with Hindus constituting 80% of the populace and the state being governed by a Muslim prince.²⁰

Probably influenced by his Dewan, Sir Shah Nawaz Bhutto, who was well-known in the Muslim League, the Nawab of Junagadh, Mahabhat Khan, decided to accede to Pakistan. This announcement came on August 15, 1947, coinciding with Pakistan's formation. Despite Muhammad Ali Jinnah's assertion that Hindus and Muslims could not coexist as one nation, Pakistan accepted Junagadh's accession in September.²¹ The Indian government, however, expressed outrage at Jinnah's decision, fearing that Junagadh's inclusion in Pakistan would exacerbate existing communal tensions in Gujarat.

In response, Sardar Patel opted to give Pakistan an opportunity to reconsider its acceptance of Junagadh's accession and proposed a plebiscite in the region. Meanwhile, Samaldas Gandhi established a democratic government-in-exile known as the Aarzi Hukumat, representing the people of Junagadh. This move aimed to uphold the aspirations of the local population amidst the political uncertainty surrounding Junagadh's status.

The government initiated various measures in response, including halting the supply of fuel and coal to Junagadh, severing air and postal links, and deploying troops to the frontier. Additionally, Indian forces reoccupied the principalities of Mangrol and Babariawad, which had previously acceded to India. Pakistan expressed willingness to discuss a plebiscite, conditional upon the withdrawal of Indian troops, a proposal rejected by India.²² Subsequently, on October 26, the Nawab and his family fled to Pakistan amid clashes with Indian troops.²³ Facing financial collapse and unable to resist Indian forces, Junagadh's court extended invitations first to the Aarzi Hukumat and later to the Government of India to assume control. In December, a plebiscite was conducted, resulting in an overwhelming majority of approximately 99% in favor of accession to India over Pakistan.²⁴

HYDERABAD

The State of Hyderabad was founded by Mir Qamruddin Chin Qilich Khan, who became virtually independent of Delhi by 1724. Upon his death in 1748, a succession war erupted, during which the English and French supported rival claimants. Eventually, Salabat Jang emerged victorious with French assistance. He ceded the Northern Circar districts to the French in exchange for protection against the Mahrattas, but the British wrested control of the Circars from the French in 1759.²⁵

Hyderabad, a vast state covering 82,000 square miles (212,000 square kilometers) at the heart of India, boasted a population of 16 million, with a majority of 85% identifying as Hindus. Nizam Usman Ali Khan, the ruler, maintained a longstanding relationship with the British Raj.²⁶ However, with the British ruling out dominion status, the Nizam, influenced by the Muslim radical Qasim Razvi, began contemplating

²⁰ "Sandeep Bhardwaj, Accession of Junagadh: Farce of History. August 28, 2013, Revisiting India"

²¹ "Rajmohan Gandhi. Patel: A Life., 292"

²² "Prof. Santoshkumar M Katke, A study on Contributions of Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel in consolidating Social Elements in New India after independence. IJCRT | Volume 3, Issue 1 March 2015"

²³ "Prof. Santoshkumar M Katke, A study on Contributions of Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel in consolidating Social Elements in New India after independence. IJCRT | Volume 3, Issue 1 March 2015"

²⁴ "Rajmohan Gandhi. Patel: A Life., 438"

²⁵ "V. P. Menon, The Story of the Integration of the Indian States. 1956, Orient Longman"

²⁶ "https://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/Political_integration_of_India"

independence. This prospect raised concerns among Indian nationalists and the public, as Hyderabad's secession would create a significant void in the envisioned unity of the nation.²⁷

Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, recognizing the strategic importance of Hyderabad and fearing its potential alignment with Pakistan, advocated vehemently for its integration into India. He held the view that the independence of Hyderabad might present a persistent risk to the future security of India. Despite these concerns, Patel, in agreement with Lord Mountbatten, initially opted to refrain from using force.

Hyderabad signed a Standstill Agreement, a unique accord not granted to any other princely state, with the condition that it would abstain from unifying with Pakistan. Mountbatten and India's agent K.M. Munshi engaged in negotiations with Hyderabad's envoys, but failed to reach an agreement. Allegations of a blockade by India and support for Razakar militants by Hyderabad escalated tensions further.

In response, Mountbatten proposed the Heads of Agreement, outlining terms for Hyderabad's eventual accession to India. Although Patel reluctantly signed the deal, he remained skeptical of the Nizam's acceptance.²⁸ The Nizam, following Razvi's counsel, dismissed the plan, prompting Patel to consider the use of force.²⁹

After securing the agreement of Prime Minister Nehru and Governor-General Chakravarti Rajagopalachari, Patel initiated Operation Polo, leading Indian forces to invade Hyderabad. Following intense combat between Indian troops, Hyderabad forces, and Razakars, Hyderabad was eventually integrated into the Indian Union.

Patel's conciliatory gesture of retaining the Nizam as head of state aimed to ease tensions and foster reconciliation. The operation's primary objective was to safeguard India's unity and prevent potential Hindu-Muslim violence. Patel emphasized the importance of Hyderabad's integration for ensuring the security and well-being of all communities within India's realm.³⁰

TRAVANCORE

The lineage of the rulers of Travancore can be traced back to the illustrious Chera dynasty. Embracing their hereditary connection, the kings of Travancore adopted the prestigious title of 'Vanchipala', symbolizing their role as protectors of the revered land of Vanchi, the ancient capital of the Cheras. Thus, the official title of the Travancore monarchs encompassed a grand epithet: Sri Padmanabhadasa Vanchipala Kulasekhara Kirtipati Manney Sulthan Maharaja Raja Ramaraja Bahadur Shamsheer Jang, a testament to their esteemed lineage and regal authority.³¹

Situated along the southwest coast of Cochin, Travancore boasts a strategic location with its boundaries stretching to meet the Arabian Sea. This geographical positioning has played a pivotal role in shaping the region's history and significance. However, the true glory and rise of Travancore are attributed to the visionary leadership of Marthandavarma, the esteemed founder of the Travancore dynasty. Marthandavarma's reign, spanning from 1729 to 1758, marked a transformative period characterized by prosperity, expansion, and enduring legacies.³²

²⁷ "Patel to Nehru, 26 October 1950, NAI, Ministry of States, 1(44) H, 1950"

²⁸ "Rajmohan Gandhi. Patel: A Life., 480"

²⁹ "Rajmohan Gandhi. Patel: A Life., 481-482"

³⁰ "Rajmohan Gandhi. Patel: A Life., 483"

³¹ "Innes CA, (1908) Madras District Gazetteers, Vol.1 Government Press Madras"

³² "Rejikumar J. (2009), A Guide to the Records of Regional Archives Kozhikode, Kerala state Archives , Government of Kerala , Thiruvananthapuram"

Under Marthandavarma's astute governance, Travancore flourished, emerging as a beacon of culture, commerce, and governance in the southern reaches of India. His visionary policies laid the foundation for Travancore's remarkable trajectory, setting the stage for centuries of prosperity and cultural richness. Marthandavarma's reign witnessed significant advancements in various spheres of life, leaving an indelible mark on the history and heritage of Travancore.³³

Situated in the southern part of India, Travancore, also known as Kerala, boasted abundant natural resources and strategic maritime positioning, making it a coveted territory. Initially, there was a strong desire among some quarters within Travancore to maintain its independence, fueled by the belief in its self-sufficiency and reluctance to align with either India or Pakistan.³⁴

Jawaharlal Nehru, the first Prime Minister of independent India, made concerted efforts to persuade the Dewan of Travancore, C. P. Ramaswami Iyer, to accede to India. However, Iyer, known for his anti-communist stance and staunch advocacy for Travancore's autonomy, remained steadfast in his refusal to sign the Instrument of Accession, despite Nehru's invitations to Delhi for negotiations. This resistance to accession created tensions within the kingdom, particularly with communist factions who opposed Iyer's policies.³⁵

The dynamics shifted dramatically when C. P. Ramaswami Iyer faced an attempted assassination on July 25, 1947. Following the attack, which was believed to be orchestrated by political opponents, Iyer, from his hospital bed, recommended to the King of Travancore that the state should join India. This recommendation marked a significant turning point in Travancore's stance towards integration, as it signaled a departure from its previous aspirations of independence.³⁶

The decision to accede to India was further influenced by strategic considerations and international factors. Sir C. P. Ramaswami Iyer, had expressed intentions of forming an independent state but eventually shifted towards the idea of joining the Indian union. It is rumored that Iyer had clandestine ties with the UK government, who supported an independent Travancore in hopes of gaining exclusive access to valuable mineral resources like monazite, which could potentially tip the balance in the nuclear arms race.³⁷

On July 30, 1947, Travancore formally joined the Indian Union, marking the culmination of a complex process of negotiation and decision-making. The integration of Travancore brought the region under the umbrella of India's sovereignty and paved the way for its participation in the nation-building efforts.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the integration of princely states following India's independence was a pivotal chapter in the nation's history, marked by intricate negotiations, political acumen, and, at times, military intervention. Each state posed its own set of challenges, whether it was the religious tensions in Junagadh, the strategic significance of Hyderabad, or the delicate balance of power in Bhopal. Despite these complexities, the Indian leadership, led by figures like Sardar Patel and Jawaharlal Nehru, demonstrated remarkable foresight and determination in ensuring the unity and integrity of the newly formed nation.

³³ "Rejikumar J. (2009), A Guide to the Records of Regional Archives Kozhikode, Kerala state Archives , Government of Kerala , Thiruvananthapuram"

³⁴ "Integration of Princely States - Background, Reasons, List of Princely States, Role of Sardar Patel & More, 2023. testbook"

³⁵ "Manish, 2023. The Integration of Princely States After Independence, List, Map"

³⁶ "Integration of Princely States - Background, Reasons, List of Princely States, Role of Sardar Patel & More, 2023. testbook"

³⁷ "Integration of Princely States After Independence, 2019. To the Point"

Through a combination of diplomacy, coercion, and popular sentiment, India successfully incorporated these princely states into its democratic framework, laying the foundation for a diverse yet united nation. The integration process, while not without its controversies and setbacks, ultimately solidified India's status as a sovereign republic and paved the way for its emergence as a global leader in the post-colonial era.

References

1. White Paper on Indian States issued by the Government of India in July 1948, Appendix m, p. 45. <https://www.scribd.com/document/303546204/White-Paper-on-Indian-States-1950>
2. Indian National Congress February 1938 to January 1939 (Allahabad, Published by General Secretary, All India Congress Committee). <https://dSPACE.gipe.ac.in/xmlui/handle/10973/38105>
3. Report on Indian Constitutional Reforms 1918 (Calcutta, Government of India Central Publication Branch, Reprinted 1928).
4. Integration Of Princely States: Unacademy. <https://unacademy.com/content/wbpsc/study-material/polity/integration-of-princely-states/>
5. Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel: The Man Who United the Nation, National Unity Day- 31 October, Ministry of Home Affairs. <https://static.pib.gov.in/WriteReadData/specificdocs/documents/2021/oct/doc2021103031.pdf>
6. Hannah L. Archambault, Becoming Mughal in the Nineteenth Century: The Case of the Bhopal Princely State. https://www.academia.edu/67702481/Becoming_Mughal_in_the_Nineteenth_Century_The_Case_of_the_Bhopal_Princely_State
7. Integration of Princely States After Independence, 2019. To the Point. <https://www.drishtias.com/to-the-points/paper1/integration-of-princely-states-after-independence>
8. Rishov Jyoti Sonowal, National Integration of Northeast India. IJRAR August 2023, Volume 10, Issue 3. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/373265739_National_Integration_of_NorthEast_India
9. Air attacks in Mizoram, 1966 - our dirty, little secret. (2013, February 19). The Economic Times. Retrieved August 21, 2023. <https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/opinion/et-commentary/air-attacks-in-mizoram-1966-our-dirty-little-secret/articleshow/18565883.cms?from=mdr>
10. Chaube S. K., 1999. Hill Politics in North-east India. Hyderabad: Orient Longman.
11. Savyasaachi. 1998. Tribal Forest-Dwellers and Self-Rule: The Constitution Assembly Debates on the Fifth and Sixth Schedules. New Delhi: Indian Social Institute. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327791216_Tribal_Forest_Dwellers_and_Self-Constituent_Assembly_Debates
12. Singh K. S. (1982, August 14). Transformation of Tribal Society: Integration vs Assimilation. Economic and Political Weekly, 17(33), 1318-1325. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4371239>
13. Singh N. S. (2006, April). Integration and Development in North-East India: An Assessment. The Indian Journal of Political Science, 67(2), 329-342. DOI:10.2307/41856220
14. Sandeep Bhardwaj, Accession of Junagadh: Farce of History. August 28, 2013, Revisiting India. <https://revisitingindia.com/2013/08/28/accession-of-junagadh-farce-of-history/>
15. Prof. Santoshkumar M Katke, A study on Contributions of Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel in consolidating Social Elements in New India after independence. IJCRT | Volume 3, Issue 1 March 2015. <https://ijcrt.org/papers/IJCRT1133074.pdf>

16. V. P. Menon, The Story of the Integration of the Indian States. 1956, Orient Longman. https://rarebooksocietyofindia.org/book_archive/196174216674_10154461547101675.pdf
17. Rejikumar J. (2009), A Guide to the Records of Regional Archives Kozhikode, Kerala state Archives , Government of Kerala , Thiruvananthapuram
18. Integration of Princely States - Background, Reasons, List of Princely States, Role of Sardar Patel & More, 2023. testbook. <https://testbook.com/ias-preparation/integration-of-princely-states>
19. Manish, 2023. The Integration of Princely States After Independence, List, Map. <https://www.studyiq.com/articles/princely-states-in-india/>
20. Phool Kumar Sharma, Integration Of Princely States And The Reorganization Of States In India. The Indian Journal of Political Science, Vol. 28, No. 4 (October-December 1967), pp. 236-241. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41854232>
21. Anuradha Jaiswal, Integration of Princely States into Indian Union. https://www.rncollegehajipur.in/rn/uploads/products/PG-Sem-II%20CC-IX%20Integration_of_Princely_States_into_Indian_Union%20by%20Dr.%20Anuradha%20Jaiswal.pdf
22. Holden Furber, The Unification of India. Pacific Affairs, Vol. 24, No. 4. (Dec., 1951), pp. 352-371. <https://www.scribd.com/document/402970432/unification-of-India-pdf>
23. Kyoko Inoue, Integration of the North East: the State Formation Process. https://www.ide.go.jp/library/English/Publish/Reports/Jrp/pdf/133_3.pdf
24. Taylor C. Sherman, The integration of the princely state of Hyderabad and the making of the postcolonial state in India, 1948-56. December 2007, The Indian Economic & Social History Review 44(4):489-516. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/217898.pdf>
25. Sarath Pillai, Fragmenting the Nation: Divisible Sovereignty and Travancore's Quest for Federal Independence. Law and History Review, Vol. 34, No. 3 (August 2016), pp. 743-782. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24771433>