

An Examination of the Factors that Contribute to the Formation of Exclaves

Justin Franco
Honors College
Florida International University
11200 SW 8th Street
Miami, Florida 33199 USA

Faculty Advisor: Gretchen Scharnagl

Abstract

The purpose of the study is to examine the factors that contributed to the formation of exclaves, or areas of land that are separated from their respective countries by the presence of surrounding foreign territories. A major focus of the research will be to analyze the effects that strategic advantage, nationalism, and mapping errors have on the formation of exclaves. Traditional and contemporary exclaves, such as the British exclave of Gibraltar and the Russian exclave of Crimea, will be studied from a strategic and historical context. Examples of exclaves reviewed during the study include the strategically important American exclave of Alaska in North America and the nationally significant French exclave of French Guiana in South America. A diverse array of literature exists examining the strategic and economic values of specific exclaves, however, the research project offers another perspective on the formation of exclaves by discussing generalizable factors that contribute to their formation. The research project was completed by analyzing national histories and cartographical source material from accredited map collections and academic professionals. An initial review of the research material illustrates that a large number of exclaves are the result of mapping errors, with a notable example being the Bangladeshi exclaves of Cooch Behar and the Tajikistani exclaves in the Ferghana Valley. Nationalism played a significant role in the formation of contemporary exclaves, while strategic advantage was significant in the formation of exclaves during the age of European colonization, as illustrated by Angola's exclave of Cabinda.

Keywords: Exclaves, Nationalism, Maps

1. Introduction

Exclaves are noncontiguous territorial units that are separated from the governing country by foreign territory. Even though the isolated nature of exclaves carries unique challenges to their governing countries, they can be found on most continents. The proliferation of exclaves has occurred during different periods of human history, however, most exclaves arose for similar purposes. Numerous exclaves came about as a result military conquest, with the conquered territory deemed to contain a strategic or economic advantage. A common *raison d'être* for sustaining nonstrategic exclaves is because of the nationalistic sentiment they evoke in the country's citizens. Also to a lesser extent mapping errors have generated numerous exclaves, such as the Indian territory of Cooch Behar and the American territory of Point Roberts.

Exclaves are unique territorial units that are not contiguous with the landmass governed by their respective national governments due to the existence of surrounding territory controlled by foreign nations. In his book *A Theory of Enclaves*, Evgeny Vinokurov examines common economic and political challenges encountered by citizens living in exclaves. His research concludes that modern exclaves were created during one of four historical events: early feudalism, the age of European colonization, the fragmentation of European colonial empires, and "... the breakup of postsocialist multinational states".¹

The era of European colonization led to the creation of exclaves in the form of colonial land holdings. Many factors contributed to the formation of European colonies, however, imperialism and the benefit of strategic advantage has consistently been used to justify the establishment of numerous exclaves. For example, the Angolan exclave of Cabinda remains an integral part of Angola because of its vast oil reserves. Even though Cabinda is isolated from the rest of Angola, the government remains committed to maintaining its sovereignty in the region. When the possession of an exclave isn't characterized by an obvious strategic advantage, its importance may stem from its perceived significance within a nationalistic context. Exclaves that evoke a strong sense of nationalism have been supported by countries, even if they represent a significant financial burden. Territories such as British Gibraltar, located south of Spain on the Iberian Peninsula, and French Guiana, situated in the Guiana region of northern South America, have been maintained for centuries due to their importance to each nation's respective identity.

Exclaves that originated during the era of feudalism were often the result of inaccurate maps, such as those between India and Bangladesh. In the publication *Borderlines and Borderlands: Political Oddities at the Edge of the Nation-State*, Alexander C Deiner and Joshua Hagen describe feudalism as a "... system [of government] not based on territorially defined sovereignty, but rather patronage that could vary from village to village".² When feudalism gave way to modern nation states, more accurate maps revealed the presence of exclaves surrounded by foreign territories, such as the Indian exclaves of Cooch Bechar. The failure of maps to distinguish territory during the era of feudalism resulted in the creation of numerous exclaves. Likewise, outright mapping errors resulted in the formation of accidental exclaves, such as the extension of the US-Canada border which resulted in the creation of Point Roberts.³ Maps created to promote disunity were also employed by the Soviet Union in the Ferghana Valley, thus contributing to the creation of exclaves in the region.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Exclave Formation Due To Strategic Advantage

European exploration of the New World, South East Asia, and Africa was often followed by the creation of vast colonies. Overseas colonies usually supplied the mother country with resources and strategic benefits, however, they were difficult to maintain and resulted in the subjugation of indigenous populations. After the decolonization period of the late 20th century, many recently liberated countries inherited exclaves as a direct result of European policy in the region. In Africa the former Portuguese colony of Angola inherited the oil rich exclave of Cabinda, while European colonialism divided the nation of Brunei into two disjointed territories. Likewise, the purchase of Russia's former colony of Alaska was completed by the United States government for strategic purposes.

2.1.1 Angola and the exclave of Cabinda

Located on the western coast of southern Africa, Angola is a former Portuguese colony that is divided into two regions: Angola proper and Cabinda. The province of Cabinda is an exclave that is separated from Angola proper due to a stretch of coastal territory governed by the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC). The origin of Cabinda's status as an exclave is detailed by Patrick Chabal and Nuno Vidal in their book *Angola The Weight of History*.

The Portuguese began exploration of the Zaire River, or the Congo River, in 1483 when Diogo Cáo led an expedition into the region that today comprises northern Angola.⁴ The area was dominated by the Kongo Kingdom, so Portuguese efforts were primarily concerned with trade.⁵ It wasn't until the late 16th century that Portugal was able to establish its own colony in the region. "With the founding of the city of Luanda [,the modern capital of Angola,] and the control of the Kwanza valley", Portugal was able to gradually displace the Kongo Kingdom.⁶ By the 18th century, Portugal was a dominant power in the region and was able to secure a trading post in Cabinda, which was located in territory belonging to the Kongo Kingdom.⁷

Following the Berlin Conference in 1885, European powers effectively divided most of the African continent amongst themselves. Belgium acquired the northern half of the Kongo Kingdom, while Portugal retained the southern half of the Kongo Kingdom and Cabinda.⁸ The Portuguese portion of the Kongo Kingdom became Angola, while Cabinda remained a separate territory. Cabinda's acquisition by colonial Angola is detailed by Alan Neff in his publication *Cabinda, Angola: Angola's Forgotten War*. "The treaty of Simulambaco in 1885 recognized Cabinda's special status as a semi-autonomous state," however, oil exploration in 1954 altered the territory's significance.⁹ Originally an outpost to prevent territorial encroachments from rival European powers, the presence of vast oil reserves

facilitated Portugal's decision to combine Cabinda and Angola into a unified colony, even though the residents of Cabinda never consented to the union.¹⁰

The struggle to maintain Cabinda is discussed by Fernando A. Guimarães in his book *The Origins of the Angolan Civil War: Foreign Intervention and Domestic Political Conflict*. Following independence from Portugal in 1974, a civil war ensued in Angola that attracted the support of regional powers. "The annexation of Cabinda [was] identified as an aim of both the Kinshasa [, the capital of the DRC] and Brazzaville [, capital of the Republic of Congo] regimes, and was a major interest behind both countries involvement in the Angolan civil war".¹¹ Even though Cabinda is surrounded by the territories of the DRC and the Republic of Congo, the Angolan government vigorously fought to maintain the territory. Separatists continue to fight for Cabinda's independence, but the Angolan government remains adamant about retaining the exclave because of its vast oil resources, which account for "... approximately 60% of Angola's proven oil reserves".¹² The strategic advantage that is gained from governing the exclave is used as a justification for maintaining troops in the territory, which have "... numbered anywhere between a few thousand to nearly 30,000 in recent years".¹³

2.1.2 the United States and the exclave of Alaska

Separated from the United States (US) by the Canadian province of British Columbia, Alaska's origin as an exclave of the US stems from its strategic location on the western coast of North America. A historical account of Alaska's exclave status is given by Mark Stein in his publication *How the States Got Their Shapes*. Prior to becoming a US state, the territory of Alaska was a colony of the Russian Empire.¹⁴

Separated from Russia by the Bering Strait, Alaska's status as a Russian colony was justified as a result of the territory's strategic advantages. A main benefit of possessing Alaska was for its large coastline, which was dotted with "... barrier islands [that created] safe harbors for ships and fishing boats".¹⁵ A further analysis of Alaska's economic benefits is given by Stein in his book *How the States Got Their Shapes Too: The People Behind the Borderlines*.

Even though Alaska provided safe harbors for Russian ships, the possibility of increased hostility from British Canada led to the territory's sale to the US in 1867.¹⁶ Largely unknown to the majority of US citizens, the purchase of Alaska was made possible by the efforts of William H. Seward, the US Secretary of State.¹⁷ The strategic benefit of the distant exclave was unknown to most Americans, who viewed Alaska "... as little more than a mammoth stretch of barren tundra and ice".¹⁸ Seward's justification for purchasing Alaska centered on the territory's economic benefits, which included natural resources, such as fish and timber, which were required by coastal communities in the Western US.¹⁹ Additional economic benefits for annexing Alaska came from its geographic location, which allowed the US to "... promote and protect American commerce with China and Japan".²⁰ Like Angola's exclave of Cabinda, Alaska's unique position and resources provide the US with a valuable strategic advantage.

2.1.3 Brunei and the exclave of Temburong

Strategic exclaves are typically formed as a result of military conquest or diplomatic negotiations, however, some exclaves are formed as a result of territorial loss, as is the case with Brunei. Located on the island of Borneo in Southeast Asia, Brunei is a small nation that is completely surrounded by neighboring Malaysia. Brunei's land on the northern coast of Borneo is divided into two separate areas, with the eastern district of Temburong unconnected to the western districts of Brunei.

Unlike Angola and the United States, Brunei's exclave of Temburong was created when it lost the territory of Limbang to neighboring Sarawak, thus resulting in two disjointed territories. An account of Brunei's territorial losses is detailed in Ooi Keat Gin's novel *Brunei: History, Islam, Society and Contemporary Issues*. By the time of Sultan Muhammad Hassan's reign in 1582, Brunei had a sprawling empire that "... had control over the entire island of Borneo to the north in the Philippines, including Sulu".²¹ During the reign of Saifuddin II, which lasted from 1828 to 1852, Brunei lost territory as a result of internal revolts and the leasing of lands to European powers.²² As compensation "... for his assistance in ending the anti-Brunei revolt (1836-1841)," James Brooke was made the governor, or Rajah, of Brunei's colony of Sarawak, even though he was a citizen of the United Kingdom.²³

Facing pressure from James' successor, Charles Brooke, to extend the territory of Sarawak, the Bruneian government leased the territory of Limbang to Sarawak.²⁴ Surrounded by both Sarawak and British North Borneo, which was comprised of land leased to the British North Borneo Chartered Company, Brunei elected to become a protectorate of the United Kingdom in 1888.²⁵ Unfortunately the British government proved unwillingly to reverse Brooke's unilateral annexation of the Limbang territory in 1890.²⁶

The geographical constraints of Brunei are described in an Encyclopedia Britannica article titled *Brunei*. Overall, Brunei is characterized by vast tropical rainforests, however, the land is "... deeply weathered, highly leached, and generally infertile".²⁷ Agriculturally useful land is centered around the island's rivers systems, such as the Limbang river.²⁸ By annexing the Limbang territory, Sarawak gained access to rich agricultural lands at the expense of Brunei's territorial contiguity, thus demonstrating that military conquests of national territory can result in the formation of exclaves.

2.2 Exclave Formation Due To Nationalism

A significant number of exclaves provide strategic advantages to their respective countries, however, there are many exclaves whose formation was not originally based in acquiring a strategic advantage. The formation of many exclaves was a direct result of nationalistic sentiment, which justified the continued ownership of non-advantageous territories. Exclaves formed as a result of nationalism, such as the French exclave of French Guiana and the British exclave of Gibraltar, were commonly seen as liabilities during their initial acquisition. The recent creation of Crimea as a Russian exclave offers limited strategic benefits, but its incorporation served as a method for encouraging Russian nationalism.

2.2.1 France and the exclave of French Guiana

Situated in between Suriname and Brazil on the northern coast of South America, French Guiana is an exclave of France. The unique colonial history of French Guiana is described by Joshua R. Hyles in his published work *Guiana and the Shadows of Empire*. Like other European powers, France invested many resources in expanding trade and establishing colonies in the Americas. Faced with "... unfriendly indigenous tribes, torrid summers, and widespread disease," France was able to establish authority over the territory of French Guiana as early as 1637.²⁹

Colonial French Guiana suffered from many significant drawbacks that prevented the colony from growing. The geography of French Guiana is characterized by "... malaria infested swampland", and its remote nature dissuaded many slave traders from making the journey to supply the colony with slave labor.³⁰ Efforts to reinvigorate the colony ended in disaster, with disease claiming the lives of "... over fourteen thousand [new colonists] and cost[ing] nearly thirty million livres".³¹ After functioning as a penal colony for a number of decades, French Guiana was incorporated into France in 1952 as a department.³² As a department, French Guiana gained the same rights that were afforded to departments, or provinces, of continental France.

Even though French Guiana was able to benefit as a launch center for French and European Union space shuttles, the justification for maintaining the exclave was focused on its perception as a symbol of French power. After facing severe losses during World War I, "[t]he French imperial experiment was designed not to create new bastions of culture, but to resurrect the old one" and restore France's former glory.³³ The complete defeat of France in both world wars precipitated a desire amongst French citizens to reestablish the country's position as a global power. Regardless of the hardships faced by settlers in French Guiana, the colony's significance as one of "... France's four 'ancient' colonies – Guadeloupe, Martinique, Réunion, and French Guiana," meant that it was a historical symbol of French nationalism and imperialism.³⁴ The continued decision to maintain French Guiana as an enclave of France demonstrates the significance that nationalism has in the formation of distant enclaves.

2.2.2 the United Kingdom and the exclave of Gibraltar

Nestled between Spain and the Mediterranean, the British exclave of Gibraltar is located on a small peninsula that protrudes from southern Spain. In the book *Gibraltar a Modern History*, Chris Grocott and Gareth Stockey examine the history of Gibraltar and its significance as an exclave of the United Kingdom. Gibraltar's status as a British exclave came about during the War of the Spanish Succession. Before its capture by English forces in 1704, Gibraltar was a Spanish territory.³⁵ The territory was formally ceded to the United Kingdom in 1713 following the passage of the Treaty of Utrecht.³⁶

The acquisition of Gibraltar from Spain gave the British access to a fort on the Mediterranean, however, the "... [h]arbor conditions were poor, and winter conditions made it difficult to police even the local maritime area of the strait".³⁷ Critics at the time "... claimed that Gibraltar was expensive, of limited naval use, difficult to defend, commercially suspect and a diplomatic embarrassment," but the maintenance of the colony was justified on nationalistic grounds.³⁸ Inspired by the heroic feat of British soldiers in the capture and defense of Gibraltar against Spanish forces, the British public sided with the idea of keeping the territory as it came to be viewed "... as the ultimate symbol of British courage, ingenuity, steadfastness, and plucky resolve".³⁹

As Britain's colonial empire expanded in the 19th and 20th century, "Gibraltar became ever more important in protecting overseas trade routes and securing lines of imperial communication".⁴⁰ Similar to France's exclave of French Guiana, the possession of Gibraltar was originally justified from a nationalistic perspective, while the emergence of a significant strategic advantage occurred much later. Spain's diplomatic attempts to reacquire Gibraltar have failed to overcome British nationalism, which is evidenced by the Gibraltarians' identification as British citizens and the celebration of the 300th anniversary of British governance in 2004.⁴¹

2.2.3 Russia and the exclave of Crimea

A contemporary example of an exclave formed for nationalistic purposes is Russia's exclave of Crimea, which was formerly a territory of Ukraine. Separated from Russia by the Sea of Azov and bordered by Ukraine in the north, the Crimean Peninsula is a recently acquired exclave of Russia. The unique history of Crimea is discussed by Paul Kubicek in his book *The History of Ukraine*. Unlike other parts of Ukraine, Crimea "... is the only region of Ukraine with an ethnic Russian majority (59% in 2001)" and a history of Russian occupation dating back to 1783.⁴² In 1922 the territories of modern Ukraine were incorporated into the Soviet Union, however, Crimea was still administered by the government in Moscow.⁴³ The region was officially transferred to Ukraine in 1954 "... as a celebration of 300 years of Russian-Ukrainian Friendship".⁴⁴

Independence from Russia in 1991 resulted in Crimea being a territory of Ukraine, even though the residents of Crimea were given political autonomy because of their unique Russian heritage.⁴⁵ The region's uniquely Russian character facilitated its annexation by Russia in 2014. Crimea's annexation by Russia is explained by Paul Chaisty and Stephen Whitefield in their research paper titled *Putin's Nationalism Problem*. Facing repeated opposition to his rule, Russian President Vladimir Putin has adopted the "... mission to protect the citizens of the 'Russian World' that live beyond the border of the Russian Federation".⁴⁶ Using nationalism "... to divert attention from the regime's failings", President Putin annexed Crimea as a Russian exclave.⁴⁷ The annexation of Crimea was accomplished for political reasons, but it had clear nationalistic undertones as evidenced by Putin's rising approval ratings.⁴⁸

The benefits and costs associated with the annexation are described in an article sponsored by the Center for Eastern Studies, under the title *A Bottomless Pit: The Costs of Crimea's Annexation by Russia*. With the inclusion of Crimea into Russia, the country has gained access to the territory's natural gas resources, measured at 2 billion m³, and the Black Sea, which originally cost 80 million dollars in annual leasing fees.⁴⁹ The strategic benefits, however, don't outweigh the significant financial costs, with "... [t]he annexation of the [Crimean] peninsula [having] already absorbed nearly \$4.5 billion from Russia's federal budget".⁵⁰ "The draft budget for the years 2015-2017 estimates that the cost of Crimea and Sevastopol's maintenance will exceed \$2.5 billion per year," however, even with the significant costs Crimea will continue to function as a Russian exclave, thus illustrating the influence that nationalism plays in the formation of exclaves.⁵¹

2.3 Exclave Formation Due To Mapping Errors

Unlike exclaves formed for strategic benefit or nationalism, exclaves resulting from mapping errors were often ambiguous and unintended. The Bangladeshi exclaves of Cooch Bechar are remnants of the former feudalist kingdom of Cooch Bechar, while the American exclave of Point Roberts was a direct result of mapping errors that were made during negotiations with the United Kingdom. Both exclaves were formed as a result of knowledge gaps concerning the geography of their respective settlements. Numerous exclaves in the Ferghana Valley were erected as a result of the conflicting land policies adopted by the Soviet Union prior to the region's independence.

2.3.1 Bangladesh and the exclaves of Cooch Bechar

The land of Cooch Bechar is located in the border region between India and Bangladesh, and is comprised of over one hundred Indian and Bangladeshi exclaves. Prior to the arrival of the British in 18th century, the area was dominated by the Mogul Empire and the Princely State of Cooch Bechar.⁵² Warfare between the Moguls of Rangpur and the maharaja of Cooch Bechar ended in 1713 with the passage of a treaty that defined the boundaries between both feudal kingdoms.⁵³ "[T]he agreement simply stated that hostilities would end and the land controlled by each army would belong to that army's ruler", thus creating instances in which villages loyal to the Moguls were in Cooch Bechar, and vice versa.⁵⁴ Neither kingdom focused on defining their territorial boundaries, so maps of the region were often

unclear. For example, Robert Wilkinson's depiction of the Indian subcontinent was published in 1806, but it could only offer an approximation of the territorial boundaries in the area.

With the conquest of the Mogul Empire in the mid-18th century, the British acquired the Mogul Empire's former exclaves in Cooch Bechar. The British government soon became allies with the maharajah of Cooch Bechar and agreed to maintain the boundaries as stipulated in the 1713 boundary treaty.⁵⁵ Unfortunately the boundary treaty was ambiguous and the exclaves in the region weren't accurately demarcated until 1937.⁵⁶ The exclaves became finalized in 1947 following the partition of British India, in which the Princely State of Cooch Bechar joined India and the former Mogul districts of Rangpur and Dinajpur joined East Pakistan, which later became Bangladesh.⁵⁷ The origin of the Cooch Bechar exclaves is a result of the unclear mapping practices that characterized feudal kingdoms, which often emphasized patronage over "... territorially defined sovereignty".⁵⁸

2.3.2 the United States exclave of Point Roberts

Situated on a peninsula that extends from the northwestern corner of North America, Point Roberts is an American exclave that is completely surrounded by the Strait of Georgia and Canada. Following the passage of the Louisiana Purchase in 1803, the United States entered into negotiations with the United Kingdom to discuss the boundary of British Canada.⁵⁹ In 1818, the middle section of the border was defined as the "... 49th parallel from the westernmost longitude of Lake of the Woods to the crest of the Rocky Mountains".⁶⁰

The territory occupying the region between the Rocky Mountains and the Pacific Ocean was under joint ownership between the United States and the United Kingdom.⁶¹ Joint ownership of the region was proposed as a method of improving the prospects of American and British fur traders, however, the decline of the fur trade in the 1830's fostered an influx of settlers into the area.⁶² In response to the growing tensions in the region, both governments ended their joint ownership in 1846 with the passage of the Treaty of Washington.⁶³ The treaty established the border between the United States and Canada as a continuation of the 49th parallel.⁶⁴ Immediately after the signing of the treaty mapmakers, such as James Wyld, began publishing maps of the area based on the geographical surveys that were currently available. Unfortunately it took "... nearly two decades to confirm that Point Roberts was definitely south of the [49th parallel] and cut off from the rest of American territory".⁶⁵ Inaccurate maps led to the creation of Point Roberts as an American exclave, but the friendly relations enjoyed between the United States and Canada has ensured the exclave's survival as a viable community for both American and Canadian citizens.

2.3.3 Tajikistan and the exclaves of the Ferghana Valley

The Ferghana Valley is a large region of Central Asia that is completely encompassed by three different countries: Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, and Kyrgyzstan. Prior to the region's annexation into the Russian empire in 1876, the area was dominated by the Khoqand Dynasty, which was a remnant of the Timurid Empire.⁶⁶ Russia's political consolidation of the Ferghana Valley is discussed in the book *Ferghana Valley: The Heart of Central Asia*. In order to consolidate power over the various ethnic groups in the region, Soviet officials began the process of erecting administrative boundaries in the valley.⁶⁷ By 1936, the Soviet Union had created three distinct administrative units in the Ferghana Valley based on ethnic identity: the Uzbekistan Soviet Socialist Republic (SSR), the Tajikistan SSR, and the Kyrgyzstan SSR.⁶⁸

The effects of the boundaries in the Ferghana Valley are discussed in a research paper titled *The Ferghana Valley: A Soviet Legacy faced with Climate Change*. The resulting boundaries led to the creation of numerous exclaves in the Ferghana Valley, with each exclave housing ethnic majorities of their respective countries.⁶⁹ During the Soviet era "... border were open and local institutions were weak, [so] the revised boundary had little or no immediate effect" on individuals living in the valley, however, the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991 dramatically altered the situation.⁷⁰ Each soviet republic in the Ferghana Valley gained independence following the dissolution of the Soviet Union, and competing interest resulted in the closure of borders between them. The internal administrative divisions established by the Soviet Union led to the creation of militarized borders that walled off exclaves and ended the economic integration that was present during the Soviet Era.⁴¹

3. Discussion

Geographically disconnected from their respective national governments, the maintenance of territorial exclaves carries both logistical and administrative difficulties. Further issues in governance are experienced when the exclave is surrounded by a hostile country, thus making access to the exclave more difficult. The origin of many exclaves can be described as a result of either strategic advantage, nationalism, or mapping errors.

Exclaves that confer a strategic advantage to their respective mother country usually contain valuable economic resources. During the 16th and 17th century, European nations invested heavily in the administration of far flung colonies because of the vast supply of natural resources that they contained. Angola's exclave of Cabinda was established by Portugal during the last decades of Portuguese colonization in Africa. The decision to unite Angola proper with Cabinda was supported by the discovery of oil off the coast of Cabinda. Following independence from Portugal in 1974, Angola continued to govern Cabinda as an Angolan exclave in order to maintain its claims to the region's oil resources. The desire to gain an economic advantage also led the United States (US) to purchase the territory of Alaska in 1867, thus giving the US increased access to natural resources and trade with China and Japan. Unlike the peaceful acquisition of Alaska, Brunei's exclave of Temburong was created as a result of territorial losses to Sarawak, which later became Malaysia. Connecting Brunei to the province of Temburong, the Limbang territory was annexed by Sarawak on account of the region's fertile soil. The resulting acquisition resulted in the dismemberment of Brunei, with Brunei effectively disconnected from Temburong by Malaysian territory. The benefits gained from acquiring a strategically significant exclave often justified the costs associated with governing the otherwise disconnected region.

Exclaves that confer an economic advantage provide physical benefits to the mother country, but exclaves rooted in nationalism are also highly valued. France's former colony of French Guiana was established in South America in 1637, however, the population was relatively small due to the harsh environment. The recurring issue of tropical disease and expansive swamp lands resulted in the colony's transformation into a prison system in the 19th century. During the decolonization period in mid-20th century, France relinquished all of its colonies in Africa, but it promoted French Guiana into a province of France. The decision to incorporate French Guiana as a French exclave was decided because of the colony's historical and cultural significance as one of France's first colonies in the New World. Similar to French Guiana, the United Kingdom's (UK) exclave of Gibraltar also carries a high cultural value. Annexed from Spain's southern frontier in 1713, Gibraltar was a British exclave that was costly to maintain and of limited value due to its poor harbor conditions. Justifications against returning the territory to Spain centered on the exclave's cultural value, since it was viewed as a symbol of British courage against Spain's military forces. Russia's annexation of Crimea in 2014 was also accomplished for nationalistic purposes, with the stated aim of protecting the region's Russian majority population from the Ukrainian government. Acquisition of the territory gave Russia access to Crimea's natural gas reserves and naval base, however, the cost of annexation is expected to exceed 2.5 billion dollars. Exclaves rooted in nationalism were often of great symbolic importance, and in many cases they also conferred a future strategic advantage. For example, French Guiana became a French space shuttle launch station in the late 20th century and Gibraltar was an important naval base during World War II. Though originally annexed to protect the local Russian population, Crimea's location in the Mediterranean may offer a later strategic advantage to the Russian navy.

Unlike exclaves that were created for strategic or nationalistic purposes, exclaves based on mapping errors were erected by accident. Bangladesh's exclaves of Cooch Bechar originated in 1713 following a treaty signed between the Mogul Empire and the Princely State of Cooch Bechar. Both states practiced feudal control over their territories, so numerous exclaves existed in the frontier region between them. Britain's conquest of the Mogul empire respected the territorial authority of Cooch Bechar, which continued to have exclaves surrounded by Mogul territory. With the independence of India in 1947, the exclaves were transferred to both India and East Pakistan, which later became Bangladesh. While the exclaves of Cooch Bechar were the result of feudalism, the American exclave of Point Roberts was created by accident. The extension of British Canada's southern border along the 49th parallel mistakenly cut across the Tsawwassen Peninsula, thus giving the lower half of the peninsula to the US. Because the region was sparsely settled, it took approximately twenty years before the mapping error was noticed. Tajikistan's exclaves in the Fergana Valley were constructed by the Soviet Union for the purpose of uniting ethnic communities together. Even though the exclaves in the Fergana Valley were purposely created by the Soviet Union, their boundaries were never intended to function as international borders. When the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991, the soviet provinces of the Fergana Valley became independent states with ethnic communities disconnected from their territory. Exclaves rooted in strategic advantage and nationalism were created for a specific purpose, however, exclaves rooted in mapping errors were the result of uncontrollable external factors.

4. Endnotes

1. Vinokurov, Evgeny. *A Theory of Enclaves*. Lanham, Md: Lexington Books, 2007. Print.
2. Diener, Alexander C, and Joshua Hagen. *Borderlines and Borderlands: Political Oddities at the Edge of the Nation-State*. Lanham, Md: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2010. Print.
3. Ibid., 177.
4. Chabel, Patrick, and Nuno Vidal. *Angola: The Weight of History*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2008. Print.
5. Ibid., 23.
6. Ibid., 26.
7. Ibid., 39.
8. Ibid.
9. Neff, Alan. *Cabinda, Angola: Angola's Forgotten War*. American University ICE Case Studies. Web. 2004.
10. Ibid., 1.
11. Guimaraes, Fernando A. *The Origins of the Angolan Civil War: Foreign Intervention and Domestic Political Conflict*. New York, N.Y: St. Martin's Press, 1998. Print.
12. Neff op. cit., 1.
13. Ibid.
14. Stein, Mark. *How the States Got Their Shapes*. Washington D.C: Smithsonian Books, 2008. Print.
15. Ibid., 20.
16. Stein, Mark. *How the States Got Their Shapes Too: The People Behind the Borderlines*. Washington D.C: Smithsonian Books, 2011. Print.
17. Ibid., 259.
18. Ibid., 256.
19. Ibid., 259.
20. Ibid.
21. Keat Gin, Ooi. *Brunei: History, Islam, Society and Contemporary Issues*. Florence: Taylor and Francis, 2015. Ebook Library. Web.
22. Ibid., 102.
23. Ibid., 103.
24. Ibid.
25. Ibid.
26. Ibid., 104.
27. Damit, Mohamad Yusop; Thambipillai, Pushpa, and Ooi Jin Bee. *Brunei*. Encyclopedia Britannica, 2016. Web.
28. Ibid., 1.
29. Hyles, Joshua R. *Guiana and the Shadows of Empire: Colonial and Cultural Negotiations at the Edge of the World*. Lanham, Md: Lexington Books, 2014. Print.
30. Ibid., 56.
31. Ibid., 57.
32. Ibid., 111.
33. Ibid., 108.
34. Ibid., 142.
35. Grocott, Chris, and Gareth Stockey. *Gibraltar: A Modern History*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2012. Print.
36. Ibid., 10.
37. Ibid., 20.
38. Ibid., 21.
39. Ibid., 7.
40. Ibid., 25.
41. Ibid., 128.
42. Kubicek, Paul. *The History of Ukraine*. Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press, 2008. Print.
43. Ibid., 91.
44. Ibid., 8.

45. Ibid., 11.
46. Chaisty, Paul, and Stephen Whitefield. *Putin's Nationalism Problem*. E-International Relations. Web. 2015.
47. Ibid., 1.
48. Ibid.
49. Fischer, Ewa, and Jadwiga Rogoza. *A Bottomless Pit: The Costs of Crimea's Annexation by Russia*. Osrodek Studiow Wschodnich (OSW). Web. 2014.
50. Ibid., 1.
51. Ibid.
52. Diener op. cit., 18.
53. Ibid.
54. Ibid.
55. Ibid., 20.
56. Ibid.
57. Ibid., 21.
58. Ibid., 18.
59. Stein op. cit., 3.
60. Ibid.
61. Diener op. cit., 177.
62. Ibid.
63. Ibid.
64. Ibid.
65. Ibid.
66. Ibid., 36.
67. Starr, S. Fredrick, Baktybek Beshimov, Inomjon I. Bobokulov, and P. D. Shozimov. *Ferghana Valley: The Heart of Central Asia*. Armonk, N.Y: M.E. Sharpe, 2011. Print.
68. Ibid., 114.
69. Baker, Nicolas. *The Ferghana Valley: A Soviet Legacy faced with Climate Change*. American University ICE Case Studies. Web. 2011.
70. Starr op. cit., 114.
71. Deiner op. cit., 41.