ISRG Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (ISRGJAHSS)

OPEN ACCESS

ISRG PUBLISHERS

Abbreviated Key Title: ISRG J Arts Humanit Soc Sci

ISSN: 2583-7672 (Online)

Journal homepage: https://isrgpublishers.com/isrgjahss

Volume – III Issue -V (September-October) 2025

Frequency: Bimonthly

Influence of Leo Tolstoy and Otto Von Bismarck on Sardar Patel: India's Independence movement and the integration of princely states in India.

Dr Rakesh Kumar

Pandit Deendayal Energy University Gandhinagar, India

| **Received:** 07.10.2025 | **Accepted:** 12.10.2025 | **Published:** 14.10.2025

***Corresponding author:** Dr Rakesh Kumar

Pandit Deendayal Energy University Gandhinagar, India

Abstract

The 19th-century unification of Germany under Otto von Bismarck and the post-World War II integration of princely states into the Indian Union under Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel are pivotal moments in the nation-building process. Despite differing historical contexts and locations, both leaders effectively utilized diplomacy, strategic force, and pragmatic political tactics to unify fragmented regions into cohesive nations. However Sardar Patel and Mahatama Gandhi were greatly inspired by Leo Tolstoy writings. Leo Tolstoy's ideas traveled from the Russian steppes to the Indian plains, inspiring a unique model of peaceful revolution. Through Gandhi and Patel, Tolstoy's doctrine of moral resistance became a dynamic force in India's struggle for independence. The Kheda and Bardoli Satyagrahas exemplified the fusion of spiritual ethics and pragmatic leadership, showing that enduring social change can arise not from confrontation, but from the disciplined power of conscience.

German unification set a precedent for the Indian National Congress and Sardar Patel, emphasizing the significance of the nation-state for security and power, especially as India gained independence. Patel's bold strategies helped transform India into a strong nation-state. Diplomacy and force were also instrumental in convincing the other 565 princely states to join the Indian Union. These efforts were rooted in Bismarck's realpolitik and strategic military actions, which contributed to India's development into a robust political, economic, and military power. This paper analyses that, the use of minimum or no force for accepting an idea for free and independent India was inspired by Leo Tolstoy's writings. Furthermore, it employs a comparative approach to evaluate their work in five broad categories: Diplomatic Tactics, Use of Force, Strategic Goal, Administrative Outcome, and Ideological Position. It examines how Bismarck's realpolitik and military strategies influenced or inspired Patel's diplomatic yet firm methods of integration. It also underscores the lasting administrative structures they established, which continue to support the stability of their respective nations to this day.

Keywords: *Nation-building, Realpolitik, Satyagraha, Otto von Bismarck, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, Loe Tolstoy*

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17346252

1. Introduction

The concept of nation-building has been influenced by political vision, strategic diplomacy, and, when necessary, the deliberate use of force. Historical examples include Germany's unification in the 19th century under Otto von Bismarck and the integration of princely states into the Indian Union after independence, led by Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel. Despite differences in time, geography, and culture, both leaders faced the challenge of uniting fragmented political entities into cohesive, sovereign nations. Their accomplishments were crucial for the survival and stability of their countries, offering valuable lessons in statecraft, realpolitik, and pragmatic governance. Realpolitik can be defined as politics or principles based on practical considerations rather than moral or ideological ones.

Sardar Patel's reputation and work is also linked to Leo Tolstoy, the Russian philosopher and novelist, who deeply influenced modern nonviolent movements through works like The Kingdom of God Is Within You (1894) and A Letter to a Hindu (1908). Unlike Bismarck, Patel employed peaceful methods in protests against British atrocities during India's independence movement and in its quest for unification.

The unification of Germany in the 19th century was a pivotal period in European history, marked by the rise of nationalism, industrial growth, and the breakdown of feudal systems. After the Crimean War, most of the European nations were scared of Countries like Great Britain, France and Austria, and thus needed to be politically and militarily strong to take them on in case of annexation attempt. At that time, over 300 independent German-speaking states existed within the loosely organized German Confederation. Chancellor Bismarck of Prussia aimed to create a unified German nation-state capable of competing with Europe's major powers. He pursued this goal through a pragmatic approach called "realpolitik," which prioritized practical, interest-based policies rather than ideological or moral ones. By carefully planning wars against Denmark (1864), Austria (1866), and France (1870–71), Bismarck not only strengthened Prussian control but also unified the German states under Prussia's leadership, leading to the founding of the German Empire in 1871. His strategic use of diplomacy, alliance manipulation, and military force highlights that nation-building often depends on both persuasion and decisive action.

Nearly a hundred years later, India faced a comparable challenge but in a very different setting. When India gained independence in 1947, it inherited a complex political scene with British-controlled provinces and over 565 princely states, each governed by hereditary monarchs with varying levels of autonomy. Lacking a clear plan for integration, the country risked political fragmentation that could have jeopardized its sovereignty, stability, and future growth. Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, India's first Deputy Prime Minister and Home Minister, responded with remarkable foresight and resolve. Known as the "Iron Man of India," Patel used diplomacy, negotiation, and, when needed, strong military action to bring these princely states into the Indian Union. His approach not only protected India's territorial integrity but also established the foundation for its emergence as a democratic, secular, and unified nation.

Patel's approach to integration showed a clear understanding of both national and international contexts. He recognized that a newly independent nation could not sustain prolonged internal conflicts or the existence of semi-autonomous princely states. By persuading rulers to accept the Instrument of Accession through favourable terms and employing limited yet effective military actions like Operation Polo in Hyderabad (1948) when diplomacy failed, Patel maintained India's unity. His method closely resembled Bismarck's realpolitik, focusing on pragmatic strategies and the willingness to use force alongside negotiations when needed.

The comparison between Bismarck and Patel goes beyond mere historical analysis; it examines enduring principles of political unity and governance. Both leaders showed that forming a nation-state requires more than ideals or speechmaking. It needs decisive actions, strategic planning, and adaptability to existing political conditions both internally and externally. Bismarck's goal of unifying Germany was to consolidate power and counter European rivals, while Patel aimed to preserve India's sovereignty and maintain internal stability following colonial rule and Partition.

Moreover, the administrative frameworks established by both leaders have had lasting impacts. Bismarck's centralization of power and establishment of efficient state institutions laid the groundwork for Germany's industrial and economic ascendancy in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Similarly, Patel's emphasis on a strong central government, supported by the Indian Administrative Service (IAS) and other key institutions, has remained vital to India's stability and governance even in the 21st century.

This paper, titled "Unifying Nations through Diplomacy and Force: A Comparative Study of Bismarck's German Unification and Patel's Integration of Princely States in India," aims to analyze the strategies, philosophies, and legacies of these two leaders. It explores how Bismarck's realpolitik influenced Patel's methods, how both leaders balanced diplomacy and coercion, and what lessons their efforts provide for modern state-building in fragmented regions. Using a comparative approach, the study compares their work in five broad heads, i.e. Diplomatic Tactics, Use of Force, Strategic Goal, Administrative outcome and Ideological position. It highlights that, despite differing historical contexts, the fundamental principles of unification remained remarkably similar.

2. Tolstoy's Influence on Sardar Patel

Leo Tolstoy, a Russian philosopher and novelist, greatly influenced modern nonviolent movements' moral and spiritual ideas with works like The Kingdom of God is Within You (1894) and Letter to a Hindu (1908). He rejected violence, coercion, and state authority, promoting "moral power" as the key to social change. Tolstoy argued that individuals should oppose unjust laws via conscience-based civil disobedience, not force.

Mahatma Gandhi came across Tolstoy's writings while in South Africa. Their correspondence—particularly Tolstoy's 1909 Letter to a Hindu—had a profound influence on Gandhi's spiritual growth. He recognized in Tolstoy's Christian pacifism a universal value that resonated with Hindu principles of Ahimsa (nonviolence) and Satya (truth). This blending of Eastern and Western moral ideas led to Gandhi's concept of Satyagraha—meaning "truth-force" or "soul-force." This concept of Satyagraha greatly influenced Sardar Patel work and thinking.

Gandhi's initial experiments with these ideas occurred in South Africa, where he established Tolstoy Farm (1910) near

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17346252

Johannesburg, named after the Russian thinker. The Farm functioned as a social and moral testing ground for communal living, self-reliance, and disciplined nonviolence. Upon returning to India, Gandhi applied this philosophy to local socio-political issues. In Kheda (1918), when a severe crop failure left peasants unable to pay land taxes, Gandhi and Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, then an emerging nationalist leader from Gujarat, organized the farmers based on nonviolent resistance. This movement called for a halt to revenue collection without violence or hatred. The peasants' unity, discipline, and moral strength ultimately pressured the colonial government to grant partial relief.

Ten years later, in Bardoli (1928), Patel spearheaded another peasant protest against a 22% increase in land revenue. Inspired by Gandhian ideals, he rallied local women and men in disciplined non-cooperation—refusing to pay taxes while upholding strict nonviolence, even in the face of repression. The movement's success earned Patel the nickname "Sardar" (leader). The Bardoli Satyagraha became a classic example of organized civil resistance based on ethical principles rather than political confrontation.

Tolstoy's focus on inner moral awakening and nonviolent resistance was practically realized in Gandhi's Satyagraha, which Patel then brought to the grassroots level. The Tolstoyan principle that "evil must not be resisted by evil" formed the philosophical basis of India's independence movement. The Kheda and Bardoli Satyagrahas demonstrated that moral courage and collective self-control can achieve what armed uprisings often could not. Tolstoy provided the ethical guidance, Gandhi transformed it into a mass philosophy, and Patel used it as a tool for political organization and negotiation.

3. Historical Contexts of the Fragmentation of Germany and India

Nation-building is a complex process that develops from the remnants of divided sovereignties, competing power centers, and historic enmities. To truly understand the ingenuity and urgency behind Otto von Bismarck's and Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel's efforts at unification, one must first grasp the historical divisions they confronted and the political contexts of their times. In both 19th-century Germany and mid-20th-century India, there were loosely connected or autonomous groups sharing cultural roots but facing divergent political paths. The main challenge in both scenarios was to unify these entities, using a mix of political influence, strategic approaches, and, if necessary, coercive methods.

Pre-Unification Germany

German fragmentation roots can be traced back to the dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire in 1806. This empire, which had nominally united the German-speaking world for centuries, had effectively become a loose confederation of over 300 independent kingdoms, duchies, principalities, and free cities. After Napoleon's defeat and the Congress of Vienna in 1815, this disorder was restructured into the German Confederation, made up of 39 states. Although these states shared language, religion, and cultural traditions, they remained politically autonomous and often opposed each other.

The Confederation was a fragile alliance lacking a central authority, functioning primarily as a mutual defense pact rather than promoting unity. Austria presided over the Confederation, maintaining its longstanding influence over German matters, while Prussia, large in territory and military strength, became a rival. The rivalry between Austria and Prussia shaped much of early 19th-century German politics.

The push for liberal national unification reached its high point during the Revolutions of 1848, when the Frankfurt Assembly—a pan-German parliamentary body—sought to create a constitution for a unified, liberal Germany. Nonetheless, the effort failed due to internal disagreements, insufficient military strength, and the Prussian king's rejection of a crown offered by revolutionaries. This failure paved the way for a more authoritarian and militaristic route to unification. Otto von Bismarck later took charge, understanding that unification would depend not on idealism or sweet talk but on the strategic use of war and diplomacy, summarised in the phrase 'iron and blood.'

Bismarck's task was not only to unite a culturally connected population but also to overcome deeply rooted sovereignties and rivalries, especially Austria's dominance, while managing the broader European balance of power. His brilliance was in recognizing the limited chance between declining revolutionary energy and the necessity for stability amid Europe's industrial growth. His concept of a kleindeutsch solution—a Germany led exclusively by Prussia without Austria—would reshape Central Europe and permanently transform the continent's geopolitical landscape.

Post-Colonial India

A hundred years later and halfway around the world, India in 1947 encountered a different, yet comparable, kind of division. When the British colonial authorities decided to leave India, they left behind not a unified country but a profoundly divided subcontinent. The partition of British India into the Dominion of India and the Dominion of Pakistan was not the sole division in the nascent nation. A more critical and subtle threat existed in the 565 princely states—semi-autonomous regions governed by hereditary monarchs who had entered into subsidiary alliances with the British Crown but maintained internal sovereignty.

Following the end of British paramountcy, these princely states technically had the option to join India or Pakistan, or even declare independence. This prospect worried Indian officials, especially after the violence and displacement caused by Partition. The potential for princely states—especially those with strategic importance or majority populations at odds with their rulers—to remain independent was seen as a serious risk to India's territorial stability and unity.

The threat of Balkanization—drawing from the division of the Balkans in Europe—was both real and immediate. Regions like Hyderabad, Junagadh, and Kashmir served as potential flashpoints where separatist ambitions could lead to external intervention or chaos within the country. Hyderabad, a Muslim-ruled state in a Hindu-majority area located in India's center, opposed joining India and considered independence. Junagadh, a small coastal state in Gujarat with a Muslim ruler and a Hindu majority, chose to join Pakistan, leading to logistical and political contradictions. Jammu and Kashmir, a princely state ruled by a Hindu but majority-Muslim population, was caught between Pakistani hostility and Indian goals.

At this pivotal moment, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, India's first Deputy Prime Minister and Home Minister, became the key figure in unification. He faced the challenge of convincing hesitant rulers and maintaining national unity amid political instability, communal

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17346252

violence, and administrative changes. His strategy included constitutional tools like the Instrument of Accession, economic incentives such as privy purses, and, when needed, the strategic deployment of military force, exemplified by Operation Polo, which forcibly merged Hyderabad into India.

Unlike Bismarck, Patel operated within a democratic framework, prioritizing constitutional legitimacy. Nonetheless, the urgent circumstances left little time for extensive negotiations or ideological purity. Similar to how Bismarck employed external conflicts to unify internal regions, Patel leveraged the momentum of independence, the risks of disintegration, and national interests to persuade princely states to join the Indian Union. His achievement in doing so—avoiding prolonged civil war—stands as a notable example of diplomatic skill and remains a core element of modern India's foundation.

The fragmentation in 19th-century Germany and post-colonial India posed significant obstacles to political unification. In Germany, a collection of sovereign states opposed central authority, driven by dynastic pride and power struggles. Meanwhile, in India, democratic goals intermixed with feudal traditions, and the repercussions of Partition contributed to a turbulent setting. Bismarck and Patel approached these challenges with different methods, but both aimed for national unity. Recognizing their historical contexts reveals the strategic ingenuity of their unification efforts and the enduring impact they left through two strong, unified nations.

4. The Architect: Otto von Bismarck

Otto von Bismarck, known as the "Iron Chancellor" of Prussia, stands as a pivotal figure in European political history. His legacy is built on expert diplomacy, strategic use of force, and foresight, all of which led to the unification of Germany in 1871. When the German-speaking regions were divided into numerous kingdoms, duchies, and principalities, Bismarck envisioned a single German Empire under Prussian dominance, shifting European power dynamics. By skillfully managing alliances, leading three major wars, and creating a resilient yet adaptable federal administrative system, he not only unified Germany but also established a lasting model of realpolitik. His ideology combined rising German nationalism with a drive to maintain Prussian supremacy, making him both a nationalist and a pragmatic statesman.

Diplomatic Tactics: Alliances and Manipulation of Rivals

Bismarck's success in unifying Germany primarily relied on his skillful diplomacy. As a lawyer and expert in international relations, he knew that using force alone would be insufficient. He carefully crafted a web of alliances and diplomatic strategies to isolate foes, neutralize threats, and bring smaller German states into alignment with Prussia.

Bismarck's first diplomatic move was to establish an alliance with Austria to challenge Denmark over the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein in 1864. Though the alliance seemed cooperative, Bismarck secretly manipulated it to corner Austria, setting the stage for war. Following the Second Schleswig War, disagreements over controlling the conquered duchies emerged, which Bismarck cleverly exploited to incite a conflict with Austria.

He also built relationships with other European nations in a way that enabled him to pursue aggressive actions while reducing the risk of outside interference. Before the Austro-Prussian War (1866), Bismarck kept France neutral by convincing Napoleon III that Prussia only aimed to defeat Austria. Meanwhile, Russia stayed distant, still resentful of Austria's involvement in the Crimean War. This diplomatic isolation of Austria paved the way for a quick Prussian victory.

Before the Franco-Prussian War (1870), Bismarck manipulated a diplomatic crisis through the "Ems Dispatch," a carefully edited telegram that insulted France and inflamed French public opinion. This diplomatic sleight of hand pushed Napoleon III into declaring war on Prussia, thus casting France as the aggressor and uniting the southern German states with Prussia in the face of an external enemy.

Through these maneuvers, Bismarck guaranteed that each war was conducted under advantageous circumstances, minimizing global opposition. His diplomatic approach was based on pragmatic power and interests rather than ideology or moral displays—key features of realpolitik.

Use of Force: The Three Wars of Unification

While diplomacy formed the basis of Bismarck's approach, the unification of Germany relied heavily on military action. Bismarck led three key wars—each aimed at removing rivals and strengthening Prussia's control.

The Second Schleswig War (1864) was fought against Denmark over the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein. Bismarck temporarily allied with Austria to challenge Danish claims. The victory resulted in Prussia gaining joint control of the duchies and gave Bismarck a pretext for future conflict with Austria over their administration.

The Austro-Prussian War of 1866, also called the Seven Weeks' War, was pivotal in reducing Austria's role in German affairs. Bismarck deliberately provoked Austria over Schleswig and Holstein disputes, leading to war. Prussia's swift and decisive victory at Königgrätz enabled Bismarck to exclude Austria from German politics. Subsequently, he dissolved the German Confederation and established the North German Confederation under Prussian control, marking a key step toward complete unification.

The Franco-Prussian War (1870–71) united the southern German states, which had been hesitant to join Prussia. By distorting the Ems Dispatch and inciting France, Bismarck created a scenario in which Germany seemed to be defending itself. This war sparked nationalist feelings throughout the German territories. After a decisive victory and the capture of Napoleon III, the German princes declared the German Empire at Versailles in January 1871. Prussia became the leading power in the new empire, and King Wilhelm I was crowned Emperor.

Through these wars, Bismarck utilised military force not for conquest, but for the purpose of political unification. Each war was swift, strategically justified, and backed by a robust diplomatic apparatus.

Strategic Goal: A Prussian-led German Empire

Bismarck's primary goal was to unify Germany under Prussia's leadership. He was not interested in creating a liberal or democratic Germany, nor did he support including Austria, as that would weaken Prussia's control. Instead, he pursued a kleindeutsch (Lesser Germany) approach—bringing together the northern and southern German states while excluding Austria.

To accomplish this, Bismarck needed to balance nationalist feelings with regional allegiances. He reassured conservative

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17346252

monarchs by guaranteeing that unification wouldn't eliminate their traditional privileges. Simultaneously, he united the general public by promoting a common German identity, often using external threats like France to foster a sense of solidarity.

The new German Empire proclaimed in 1871 realized this vision: a strong, industrialized, and militarily capable nation that could stand alongside Britain and France as a major European power. Importantly, it was led by Prussia, whose king became Emperor and whose military and bureaucratic institutions formed the core of the empire.

Administrative Outcome: A Federal Structure under Prussian Dominance

The German Empire established by Bismarck was not a centralized nation like France but a federation made up of kingdoms, duchies, and city-states. Despite this federal setup, Prussia held dominant influence, occupying two-thirds of the empire's land and population. It controlled the Reichstag through extensive representation and had significant authority over the Bundesrat, granting it veto power over laws. The chancellor—Bismarck himself—answered only to the emperor, not the parliament, which maintained authoritarian stability. Bismarck also unified economic and military policies: he introduced the Zollverein (customs union) to coordinate economic activity and boost internal unity. Militarily, a consolidated command under the Prussian-led General Staff ensured consistent operations throughout the federation. This arrangement allowed local autonomy while affirming Prussian dominance—a balance that fostered stability and growth without sparking internal unrest.

Ideological Position: Nationalism Blended with Prussian Supremacy

Bismarck was not a romantic nationalist. He saw nationalism as a political tool rather than a moral or cultural obligation. By cynically exploiting nationalist feelings, he strengthened Prussia's power, making unity serve the state's interests, not liberal ideals. Although German unification evoked shared language, heritage, and destiny, Bismarck prevented these emotions from threatening conservative stability. He opposed liberal reforms, censored the press, and sidelined democratic institutions. Nonetheless, he used nationalism strategically to justify his wars and to persuade smaller German states to support Prussia.

This balancing act of ideology made Bismarck's nationalism distinct—more pragmatic than emotional, more calculated than populist. It combined the legitimacy of national unity with the need to uphold traditional authority. Otto von Bismarck's unification of Germany was a remarkable achievement of statecraft that changed European politics forever. By carefully combining diplomacy, war, strategic planning, and ideological influence, he created a unified German Empire with Prussia at its core of continental power. His approach showed that unification results not just from shared culture or ideals but from clever leadership, tactical warfare, and institutional craftsmanship. As further discussed, his strategies and vision deeply influenced Sardar Patel's method of integrating India—highlighting the widespread relevance of Bismarck's practical, force-backed diplomacy in shaping modern nation-states.

5. Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel: Stature in Indian National Congress and Rise to National Leadership

Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel holds a prominent place in India's history, both in the struggle for independence and the formation of its government. As a dedicated nationalist, experienced administrator, and close associate of Mahatma Gandhi, Patel was a key figure in the Indian National Congress (INC). He played a vital role in the anti-colonial movement and in establishing the foundation of the modern Indian state. Dubbed the "Iron Man of India," his leadership combined practicality with determination, making him a decisive influence in India's political development.

Patel's political path started with the 1918 Kheda Satyagraha, where he effectively organized farmers to oppose oppressive revenue demands during a famine. His strong leadership and skill in rallying rural communities gained him national fame and Gandhi's trust. This was followed by the 1928 Bardoli Satyagraha, a pivotal event that earned him widespread recognition. His achievements in Bardoli led to the nickname "Sardar," meaning leader or chief. These campaigns not only elevated his status within the Congress but also demonstrated his ability to turn Gandhi's ideals of non-violence and civil disobedience into successful mass actions.

Within the Indian National Congress, Patel played a vital role as a member of the Congress Working Committee and long-time treasurer. His skills in administration, legal expertise, and discipline set him apart from more ideologically focused peers. While figures like Nehru were viewed as idealists and visionaries, Patel was known as a pragmatic and action-oriented leader—someone who could turn ideas into reality. He frequently served as the Congress's problem-solver, helping to preserve unity and enforce discipline during key moments of the independence movement.

At India's independence in 1947, Patel was second only to Mahatma Gandhi in stature. He played a key role in building consensus within the party and negotiating with the departing British authorities. During the critical time when the Congress was choosing its candidate for India's first Prime Minister, most Pradesh Congress Committees nominated Patel, due to his leadership skills and administrative experience. However, out of respect for Gandhi's preference, Patel stepped back to let Jawaharlal Nehru take the position. This act of discipline and humility, though it had political costs, showed Patel's strong dedication to party unity and national interest.

Sardar Patel's rise and stature reflect not only his personal abilities but also the immense trust placed in him by colleagues, the Congress organization, and the people of India. His legacy continues to influence India's political landscape and institutional strength.

6. Sardar Patel – Unification of India

The 1947 partition of India not only ended British colonial rule but also presented a huge challenge: uniting a fragmented subcontinent into one nation. With over 565 princely states varying in size, population, and governance, the task was enormous. Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, as India's first Deputy Prime Minister and Home Minister, took on the role of integrating these regions into the Indian Union. His success was more than administrative; it laid the groundwork for modern India's territorial and political unity. He used a combination of diplomacy, strategic force, legal persuasion, and a strong belief in democratic nationalism.

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17346252

Diplomatic Tactics: Personal Negotiations and Legal Agreements

Patel's initial strategy for integrating the princely states focused on persuasion and legal precision. Together with V.P. Menon, Secretary of the Ministry of States, he developed the Instrument of Accession—a legal mechanism enabling princely states to join the Indian Union while maintaining control over internal issues like culture and religion. This approach provided a dignified, non-coercive way to exit colonial arrangements and reassured rulers about their traditional roles, even as they became part of a sovereign India.

Personal diplomacy played a key role in Patel's approach. He interacted directly with monarchs, princes, and Dewans (chief ministers) of the princely states, appealing to their patriotism and the importance of Indian unity amid the unstable post-Partition period. These encounters went beyond formalities; they involved deep, detailed discussions. Patel employed logic, empathy, and sometimes firmness to persuade rulers that independence wasn't feasible and that joining India was in their best interest.

The task's complexity was significant. Certain states, such as Junagadh, were geographically connected to India but had rulers favoring Pakistan. Others, like Hyderabad, were governed by monarchs opposed to democratic integration. Additionally, states like Travancore and Bhopal considered independence. Patel needed to serve as a diplomat, lawyer, and nation-builder simultaneously, persuading these rulers to voluntarily unify their territories with the young Indian state.

His legal skill was complemented by political insight. To facilitate a smooth transition, Patel provided privy purses—annual payments to former rulers in exchange for giving up their sovereignty. This strategic move balanced royal prestige with the dominance of the republic. His actions resulted in the peaceful integration of most states, establishing a solid foundation for India's federal democracy.

Use of Force: Srinagar, Junagadh, and Hyderabad Operations

While Patel preferred diplomacy, he did not hesitate to use force when national integrity was threatened. Three critical cases—Jammu and Kashmir, Junagadh, and Hyderabad—tested his resolve and demonstrated his ability to act decisively.

In October 1947, Jammu and Kashmir, a princely state led by Maharaja Hari Singh, hesitated to join either India or Pakistan. Pakistan, however, triggered a crisis by initiating Operation Gulmarg, an invasion carried out by tribal militias with Pakistani Army support. Confronted with a serious threat, the Maharaja signed the Instrument of Accession on October 26, 1947. The following day, Indian troops were airlifted to Srinagar in a daring military operation that repelled the invaders and protected the valley.

While Prime Minister Nehru handled the international diplomacy over Kashmir, it was Patel's strategic foresight that was evident in the swift mobilization of the Indian Army. He saw the accession of Kashmir as more than just a military move; it was a clear signal that India would not accept external interference or internal hesitation regarding unity.

Junagadh (November 1947): Junagadh, a small princely state in Gujarat with a majority Hindu population but a Muslim Nawab, acceded to Pakistan in August 1947. This decision was geographically and politically untenable, as Junagadh was surrounded by Indian territory. Patel swiftly imposed economic and political pressure, leading to the Nawab's flight to Pakistan. Indian forces entered Junagadh, and a plebiscite was held in February 1948, where an overwhelming majority voted in favor of joining India. This move reinforced the principle that national integration would reflect the democratic will of the people, not the whims of rulers.

Hyderabad (September 1948): As the largest and wealthiest princely state, Hyderabad represented a major challenge to Indian unity. Governed by the Nizam, who aimed to stay independent, Hyderabad became a refuge for the Razakars—a paramilitary organization opposed to India and Hindus. The internal law and order situation worsened quickly, and efforts to the Nizam for a peaceful resolution proved unsuccessful.

In September 1948, Patel approved Operation Polo, a quick five-day military operation leading to Hyderabad's integration into India. The campaign achieved military success and was strategically important for affirming the sovereignty of the Indian Union. Patel kept the operation short, minimizing civilian casualties and quickly restoring governance to prevent prolonged insurgency or foreign interference.

These operations, though controversial, showed that Patel considered force a last but lawful option when diplomacy failed or when national security was threatened.

Strategic Goal: Indian Union under a Central Constitution

Patel aimed to establish a unified Indian Union operated under a central democratic constitution. He understood that simply integrating territories was not enough; consolidating political and constitutional structures was crucial to avoid future divisions. His vision was for a powerful Union, not a loose confederation of autonomous regions, where the central government controlled national defense, foreign policy, and communication, with states functioning within a well-defined constitutional structure.

Patel played a pivotal role in the Constituent Assembly, especially in matters related to federal structure and state relations. He insisted that integration of the princely states must not lead to ambiguity in the Union's authority. He worked to merge smaller princely states into larger administrative units, known as "covenanting states", such as Madhya Bharat, Rajasthan, and Saurashtra. This not only simplified governance but ensured administrative viability and democratic representation.

He also supported removing internal borders between former British provinces and princely states. Using constitutional arrangements and legislative reforms, he laid the foundation for a centralized republic with a uniform civil service. His pragmatic approach ensured that the integration process did not turn into endless negotiations over privileges but instead became a step toward participatory governance.

Administrative Outcome: Unified Republic with Centralized Services

One of Patel's most enduring legacies was unifying India's institutions. He recognized that nation-building involved not just politics, but also strong bureaucracy and law enforcement. Consequently, Patel maintained and grew key centralized services like the Indian Administrative Service (IAS), Indian Police Service (IPS), and other All India Services.

His firm stance on keeping these services was initially met with resistance from those concerned about their colonial roots.

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17346252

Nonetheless, Patel saw them as the core structure of the Indian state, essential for maintaining administrative unity, law and order, and consistent development. In his notable speech to civil servants, Patel emphasized that although political leaders would change through elections, the services should stay neutral, effective, and committed to the Constitution.

Patel also managed the creation of state reorganization commissions, coordinated the integration of regional judicial systems, and ensured consistent law application across newly merged areas. These reforms contributed to India's political stability, even amid its extensive cultural and linguistic diversity. By his death in December 1950, Patel had guided the transformation from a fragmented, semi-feudal landscape into a cohesive federal republic with a robust administrative structure.

Ideological Position: Nationalism and Federal Democracy

Sardar Patel's ideological base was built on practical nationalism and a belief in a federal democratic system. He did not indulge in romanticizing India's history or promote cultural nationalism based on religion or ethnicity. For Patel, nationalism was a necessary political stance—the unity of India was crucial not only for gaining independence but also for maintaining its sovereignty as a secular nation. While deeply influenced by Gandhi's principles, he approached issues with a pragmatic outlook. His concept of federalism emphasized cooperation rather than loose decentralization, with states sharing authority without disrupting national unity. He considered secessionism, communalism, and parochialism as dangers to the country's cohesion.

Although Patel held conservative views on economic policy and was wary of socialist experiments, he was fully dedicated to constitutional democracy, universal suffrage, and the rule of law. His leadership was driven not by personal ambition but by a deep sense of responsibility. Unlike many of his peers, he saw power not as an end but as a tool to uphold India's integrity and stability. Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel's role in unifying India is one of the most significant in modern Indian history. His approach combined diplomacy with firmness, legality with military decisiveness, and nationalism with administrative discipline. In less than three years, he addressed a challenge that could have threatened India's sovereignty. His achievements went beyond territorial integration; he established the institutions and ideology vital for a united republic. Similar to Bismarck's unification of Germany through realpolitik and force, Patel unified India through constitutional pragmatism and pragmatic leadership. His legacy continues to influence India's political boundaries, administrative structures, and democratic values.

7. Leo Tolstoy and Bismarck's Influence on Patel

Leo Tolstoy's ideas traveled from the Russian steppes to the Indian plains, inspiring a unique model of peaceful revolution. Through Gandhi and Patel, Tolstoy's doctrine of moral resistance became a dynamic force in India's struggle for independence. The Kheda and Bardoli Satyagrahas exemplified the fusion of spiritual ethics and pragmatic leadership, showing that enduring social change can arise not from confrontation, but from the disciplined power of conscience.

Although Patel did not explicitly mention Bismarck in any of his writings, many scholars see parallels in their strategies and theories. Both were Lawyers, statesmen and nationalists. Both operated under tight time limits and amidst instability. They aimed to unify regions based on shared history and culture, despite political fragmentation. They also combined moral authority—Patel as the "Iron Man" and Bismarck as the "Iron Chancellor"—with pragmatic politics. Historian R. Coupland and biographers like Rajmohan Gandhi highlight Patel's preference for decisive action, a trait often linked to Bismarck's Realpolitik approach.

8. Conclusion

Although Bismarck and Patel functioned in very different settings—19th-century Europe and 20th-century post-colonial South Asia—their fundamental strategies demonstrated a common grasp of power, diplomacy, and national interests. Bismarck's approach involved pre-emptive actions, managed conflicts, and strict political authority. In contrast, Patel worked within a democratic, emerging republic, using indirect influence, legal measures, and the strength of nationalism to achieve his goals.

The long-term effects of their leadership are equally significant. Bismarck's Germany evolved into a powerful industrial and military nation, but its strict structure also played a role in eventual wars like World War I. Meanwhile, Patel's India has remained a stable federation despite diverse internal differences. In today's world, where nation-building is still ongoing in fragile states, these two leaders serve as important examples of how a combination of force and diplomacy—adapted to the situation—can influence a country's future. Their strategies are still studied in political science and diplomacy for their effectiveness and influence on national unity.

References

1. Azad, M. A. K. (1959). India Wins Freedom. Orient Longman. chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://kvinshamlalibrary.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/india-wins-freedom-an-autobiographical-narrative-1959-by-maulana-abul-kalam-azad-1888-1958-z-lib.org_.pdf
2. Bhagavan, M. (2010). India: The Road to Independence and Partition. Penguin India.
3. Gandhi, M. K. (1927). *An autobiography: The story of my experiments with truth.* Ahmedabad: Navajivan Publishing House.
4. Hardiman, D. (1992). *Peasant resistance in India: 1858–1914.* Delhi: Oxford University Press.
5. Tolstoy, L. (1909). *A letter to a Hindu.* London: The Indian Sociologist Press.
6. Weber, T. (1996). *Gandhi, Tolstoy, and the Tolstoy Farm: A study of moral influence. Journal of Peace Research, 33*(3), 319–328. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022343396033003005
7. Blackbourn, D. (1998). The Long Nineteenth Century: A History of Germany, 1780â€“1918. Oxford University Press.
8. Chandra, B. (1999). Essays in Indian Nationalism. Har Anand Pvt. Ltd. https://books.google.co.in/books/about/Essays_on_Indian_Nationalism.html?id=m1k7OgAACAAJ&redir_esc=y
9. Chopra, P. N. (1955). The Collected Works of Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel (Vol. XII). ALLFED Publishers.https://konarkpublishers.com/books/746

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17346252

10. Constituent Assembly of India. (1949, October 12). Constituent Assembly Debates.
11. Craig, G. A. (1978). Germany 1866â€- 1945. Oxford University Press.
12. *Danish War (1864) - (AP European History) - Vocab, Definition, Explanations | Fiveable*. (n.d.). Fiveable. https://library.fiveable.me/key-terms/ap-euro/danish-war-1864.
13. Dr. Ajay Pal Singh. (n.d.). Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel and Otto von Bismarck: A Comparative Study. R.G. Govt. P.G. College, Ambikapur. https://ir.rgpgcapur.ac.in/IRDOCUMENT/76.pdf
14. Durgadas. (1971). Sardar Patelâ€™s Correspondence (Vol. V). Navajivan.
15. Encyclopedia Britannica. (n.d.). German Foreign Policy, 1870-90.
16. Gandhi, R. (1990). Patel: A Life. Navajivan Publishing.
17. Government of India. (1948). White Paper on Hyderabad.
18. Government of India. (1948). White Paper on Jammu and Kashmir.
19. Hardiman, D. (1981). Peasant Nationalists of Gujarat: Kheda Districts, 1917â€- 34. Oxford University Press.
20. HARINI, K.V. (2021, Sep 30). Compare the Policies and Methods Used by Otto Von Bismarck and Sardar Vallabh Bhai Patel in Unification of Germany and Integration of States of India. https://www.scribd.com/document/528638591/
21. Krishna, B. (1945). Sardar Patel: Indiaâ€™s Iron Man. Indus.
22. Manekar, D. R. (1974). Accession to Extinction. Vikash Publishers.
23. Menon, V. P. (1956). The Story of the Integration of the Indian States. Orient Longman.
24. Noorani, A.G. (2001). The Kashmir Dispute: 1947â€- 2012. Oxford University Press.
25. Rakesh Ankit. (n.d.). The accession of Junagadh, 1947-48: Colonial sovereignty, state violence and post-independence India. *Research Gate*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/305888652_The_accession_of_Junagadh_1947-48_Colonial_sovereignty_state_violence_and_post-independence_India
26. Rangaswami, V. (2019). The Story of Integration: A New Interpretation in the Context of the Democratic Movements in the Princely States of Mysore, Travancore and Cochin 1900â€“1947.
27. Round Table Quarterly. (1948, December). Review of the British House of Commonwealth Affairs, 9â€“14.
28. Security Council. (2017). Security Council: India-Pakistan Question. International Organization, 11(2), 368â€“372.
29. Shankar, V. (1974). My Reminiscence of Sardar Patel (Vol. I). Macmillan.Singh, B.P. (2017). North-East India: Demography, Culture and Identity Crisis. Modern Asian Studies, 21(2), 257â€“282.
30. Spate, O.H.K. (2018). The Partition of India and the Prospects of Pakistan. Geographical Review, 38(1), 5â€“29. https://doi.org/10.2307/210736
31. Talbot, P. (2019). Kashmir and Hyderabad. World Politics, 1(3), 321â€“332. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2009033
32. Taylor, A.J.P. (1955). The Struggle for Mastery in Europe, 1848â€“1918. Oxford University Press
33. The War of 1866 and the Undoing of Vienna By: Randall Lesaffer. (n.d.). *Oxford Public International Law*. https://opil.ouplaw.com/page/549
34. The War of 1866 and the Undoing of Vienna By: Randall Lesaffer. (n.d.). *Oxford Public International Law*. https://opil.ouplaw.com/page/549
35. Throat, S. P. P., & Krishna, M. B. (1945). Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel: Indiaâ€™s Iron Man.
36. Vincent, R. (2019). The French in India: From Diamond Traders to Sanskrit Scholars. Popular Prakashan.
37. Wainwright, A. M. (2019). Inheritance of Empire: Britain, India and the Balance of Power in Asia, 1938â€“55. Praeger.
38. Warner, W. L. (1960). The Native States of India. Macmillan
39. Wood, J. (1971). The Political Integration of British and Princely Gujarat: The Historical Political Variable in Indian

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17346252