Inadvertent Expansion: How Peripheral Agents Shape World Politics

Data Codebook & Narratives

Nicholas D. Anderson

The George Washington University

19 August 2024

Table of Contents

Introduction……1

Codebook……1

The United States……10
Florida (1818/5)……10
Texas (1845/3)……10
California and New Mexico (1847/1)……11
Guam (1898/6)……11
Hawaii (1898/7)……12
Cuba (1898/8)……12
Puerto Rico (1898/8)……13
Philippines (1898/8)……13
Eastern Samoa (1899/12)……13
Marshall Islands (1944/2)……14
Mariana Islands (1944/8)……14
Palau (1944/11)……15
Okinawa (1945/6)……15

The United Kingdom……17
Nepal (1816/3)……17
Maratha Empire (1818/6)……17
Singapore (1819/2)……18
Gambia (1821/10)……18
Western New South Wales (1825/7)……19
Upper Burma (1825/12)……19
Western Australia (1829/5)……20
Falkland Islands (1833/1)……21
Aden (1839/1)……21
New Zealand (1840/5)……22
Hong Kong (1841/1)……22
Chatham Islands (1842/4)……23
Natal (1842/5)……24
Sind (1843/3)……24
Eastern Punjab (1846/2)……25
Labuan (1846/12)……25
Xhosa Territory (1847/12)……26
Orange River Territory (1848/2)……26
Punjab (1849/3)……27
Lower Burma (1852/12)……28
Keeling (Cocos) Islands (1857/3)……28
Andaman Islands (1858/1)……29
Kowloon (1860/10)……29
Sikkim (1861/3)……30
Bahrain (1861/5)……30
Lagos (1861/8)……31

Southern Bhutan (1865/11)……31
Basutoland (1868/3)……32
Nicobar Islands (1869/3)……33
Griqualand West (1871/10)……33
Western Peninsular Malaya (1874/4)……34
Fiji (1874/9)……34
Baluchistan (1876/7)……35
Transvaal (1877/4)……35
Walvis Bay (1878/3)……36
Xhosa Territory (1878/7)……36
Afghanistan (1879/5)……37
Zulu Kingdom (1879/9)……38
Egypt (1882/9)……38
Papua (1884/11)……39
Bechuanaland (1885/9)……40
Upper Burma (1885/11)……40
Somaliland (1887/7)……41
New Hebrides (1887/11)……41
Maldives (1887/12)……42
Sarawak (1888/3)……42
North Borneo (1888/5)……43
Pahang (1888/8)……43
Brunei (1888/9)……44
Cook Islands (1888/9)……44
Rhodesia (1890/9)……45
Zanzibar (1890/11)……46
Nyasaland (1891/2)……46
Trucial States (1892/3)……47
Gilbert and Ellice Islands (1892/9)……47
Southern Solomon Islands……48
Uganda (1893/4)……48
Pondoland (1894/3)……49
Bunyoro Kingdom (1894/4)……49
Ashanti Kingdom (1896/1)……50
Sierra Leone (part) (1896/8)……50
Weihaiwei (1898/5)……51
New Territories (1898/6)……52
Sudan (1898/9)……52
Kuwait (1899/1)……53
Nigeria (1900/3)……54
Orange Free State (1900/5)……54
Tonga (1900/5)……55
Transvaal (1900/9)……55
Ocean Island (1901/9)……56
Swaziland (1902/5)……56
Northern Peninsular Malaya (1909/7)……57
Bhutan (1910/1)……57
Johor (1914/5)……58

Togoland (1914/8)……...58
Kamaran Island (1915/6)……59
Cameroon (1916/1)……59
Tanganyika (1916/10)……..60
Qatar (1916/11)……...60
Palestine (1917/12)……..61
Transjordan (1918/9)……...61
Iraq (1918/10)……62
Eritrea (1941/3)……...62

France……64
Nosy Boraha (1819)……64
Algeria Coast (1830/7)…….....64
Nosy Be (1840)……65
Mayotte Island (1841/4)……...65
Côte d'Ivoire Coast (1842/2)……....66
Marquesas Islands (1842/5)……67
Tahiti and the Eastern Society Islands (1842/8)……67
Gabon Coast (1843/6)……68
Tuamotu Islands (1844)……....68
Algeria (1847/12)……69
Guinea Coast (1849/4)……70
New Caledonia and the Loyalty Islands (1853/9)……..70
Senegal (part) (1860/9)……71
Obock (1862/3)……...71
Eastern Cochinchina (1862/6)……72
Cambodia (1863/8)……..73
Western Cochinchina (1867/6)……73
Rapa Iti (1867/4)……..74
Gabon (1880/6)……...74
Congo (1880/9)……...75
Gambier Islands (1881/2)……76
Tunisia (1881/5)……..76
Western Society Islands (1881/5)……77
Guinea (1881/7)…….....78
Southern French Sudan (1883/2)……78
Porto-Novo (1883/4)……...79
Tonkin (1883/8)……..79
Annam (1883/8)……..80
French Somaliland (1885/3)……81
Madagascar (1885/12)……..81
Comoros Islands (1886/4)……....82
Senegal (1886/10)……82
Wallis and Futuna Islands (1887/4)……..83
New Hebrides (1887/11)……83
Côte d'Ivoire (1889/1)…….....84
Northern French Sudan (1893/4)…….....85
Laos (1893/10)…….....85

Dahomey (1894/1)……..86
Ubangi-Shari (1894/8)……87
Upper Volta (1896/9)……...87
Guangzhouwan (1898/4)……88
Niger (1899/9)……89
Chad (1900/4)……89
Eastern Morocco (1904/6)……...90
Southern Mauritania (1905/4)……..91
Casablanca and Eastern Morocco (1907/8)…….....91
Northern Mauritania (1909/7)……..92
Morocco (1912/3)…….....92
Togoland (1914/8)……...93
Cameroon (1916/1)……94
Alsace-Lorraine (1918/11)……...94

Prussia/Germany…….....95
Lauenberg (1864/7)……95
Schleswig (1864/7)……...95
Hanover (1866/6)……96
Holstein (1866/8)……96
Frankfurt (1866/8)……...97
Hesse-Kassel (1866/8)……97
Nassau (1866/8)……..98
Alsace and Lorraine (1871/1)…….....98
South West Africa (1884/4)…….....99
Togoland (1884/7)……100
Kamerun (1884/7)……100
New Britain and Northeastern New Guinea (1884/11)……...101
East Africa (1885/5)……...102
Wituland (1885/5)……..103
Marshall Islands (1885/10)……103
Northern Solomon Islands (1886/10)…….....104
Nauru (1888/10)……104
Shandong Peninsula (1898/3)……105
Western Samoa (1899/12)……..106
Austria (1938/3)……106
Sudetenland (1938/9)……107
Bohemia and Moravia (1939/3)……..108
Slovakia (1939/3)……...108
Klaipedia (1939/3)……...109
Western Poland (1939/10)……109
Croatia (1941/4)……110
Northern Slovenia (1941/4)……...110

Austria(-Hungary)……..112
Kraków (1846/3)…….....112
Holstein (1864/7)……...112
Bosnia-Herzegovina (1878/7)……113

Italy……114
Venetia (1866/8)……114
Papal States (1870/9)……114
Assab (1882/7)……115
Massawa (1885/2)……115
Somaliland (1889/5)……116
Eritrea (1889/8)……116
Libya (1912/3)……117
Dodecanese Islands (1912/5)……118
Sazan Island and Vlore (1914/10)……118
Albania (1918/11)……119
Austro-Hungarian Territories (1918/11)……119
Zara (1918/11)……120
Ethiopia (1936/5)……120
Albania (1939/4)……121
Croatia (1941/4)……121
Ljubljana (1941/4)……122
Kosovo (1941/4)……122
Dalmatian Coast (1941/4)……123
Montenegro (1941/4)……123

Russia/Soviet Union……125
Erevan and Nakhichevan Khanates (1828/2)……125
Moldavia and Wallachia (1829/2)……125
Amur Region (1850/8)……126
Ussuri Region (1852/summer)……127
Ak-Mechet (1853/7)……127
Sakhalin (1853/10)……128
Vernyi (1854/2)……128
Chimkent (1864/9)……129
Tashkent (1865/6)……130
Khujand (1866/5)……130
Khanate of Bukhara (1868/6)……131
Khanate of Khiva (1873/7)……131
Khanate of Kokand (1876/2)……132
Batum and Kars (1878/1)……133
Southern Bessarabia (1878/7)……133
Geok Tepe (1881/1)……134
Merv (1884/3)……134
Panjdeh (1885/3)……135
Liaodong Peninsula (1897/12)……135
Northern Manchuria (1900/11)……136
Eastern Belarus (1918/12)……136
Eastern Ukraine (1920/3)……137
Azerbaijan (1920/4)……137
Armenia (1920/12)……138
Georgia (1921/3)……138

Estonia (1939/9)……139
Eastern Poland (1939/9)……139
Latvia (1939/10)……140
Lithuania (1939/10)……...140
Finnish Territories (1940/3)……...141
Bessarabia and Northern Bukovina (1940/6)……..142
Ruthenia (1945/6)……..142
Southern Sakhalin (1945/8)……143
Kuril Islands (1945/9)……143
Crimea (2014/3)……144

China……..145
Tibet (1950/10)……..145
Dachen Islands (1955/2)……145
Paracel Islands (1974/1)……146

Japan……147
Ryukyu Kingdom (1872)……147
Bonin Islands (1875/11)……147
Pescadores Islands (1895/3)……...148
Taiwan (1895/4)……148
Southern Sakhalin (1905/7)……149
Korea (1905/9)……..149
Liaodong Peninsula (1905/9)……150
Mariana Islands (1914/10)……..150
Marshall Islands (1914/10)……151
Caroline Islands (1914/10)……151
Shandong Peninsula (1914/11)……...152
Northern Sakhalin (1920/05)……152
Manchuria (1932/2)……...153
Jehol Province (1933/3)……153
Inner-Mongolia (1937/11)……154
North China (1938/3)……154
Hainan (1939/12)……...155
French Indochina (1941/7)……156
Guam (1941/12)……156
Hong Kong (1941/12)……....156
Malaya (1942/2)……157
Burma (1942/3)……157
Philippines (1942/5)……158
Dutch East Indies (1942/10)……..158

Introduction

Thank you for your interest in the data accompanying *Inadvertent Expansion: How Peripheral Agents Shape World Politics* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2024). This document has two major components. The first component is the codebook for the data presented in the book. The second component presents brief narratives for each-and-every observation in the data. Each observation also includes individualized justifications for the coding of key variables as well as the sources used to generate the narratives and to code these variables.

I'll note up front that the data and this codebook are only very slightly updated versions of the data (version 1) and codebook that accompanied my article, "Push and Pull on the Periphery: Inadvertent Expansion in World Politics." The changes from the previous version (v1) to this version (v1.1) are as follows:

- The variable named "procedure" in v1 is now two dichotomous variables: "annexation" and "conquest"
- The variable named "risky" in v1 is now named "risk"
- The following actor dichotomous variables have been added: "us_dummy", "uk_dummy", "france_dummy", "germany_dummy", "austria_dummy", "italy_dummy", "russia_dummy", "china_dummy", and "japan_dummy"
- The following region dichotomous variable have been added: "whemisphere_dummy", "europe_dummy", "africa_dummy", "mena_dummy", "scasia_dummy", and "asiapac_dummy"
- The variable "risk" for observation id # 214 (Panjdeh) has been recoded from 0 (in v1) to 1

If you have any further questions, comments, or suggestions, please contact the author at: nick_anderson@gwu.edu.

Codebook

Citation Information

If you make use of this data, please cite either of the following sources:

Nicholas D. Anderson "Push and Pull on the Periphery: Inadvertent Expansion in World Politics," *International Security*, Vol. 47, No. 3 (Winter 2022/23), 136-173.

or

Nicholas D. Anderson, *Inadvertent Expansion: How Peripheral Agents Shape World Politics* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2024).

Data File

One file is included in this dataset:

1. "Inadvertent_expansion_data_v1.1.csv"

Description

The data includes 258 observations of territorial expansion by the great powers from 1816 to 2014.

Definition

For the purpose of this dataset, "expansion" is defined as the coercive acquisition of foreign territory that is intended to be long-term or permanent for the expanding state.

Empirical Scope

The empirical scope of the data is limited to the great powers from 1816 to 2014. I use the Correlates of War's (COW) State System Membership data on "Major Powers" to indicate the identity and the tenure of the great powers, with a few modifications.[1] The modifications and their justifications are listed in Table 1, below.

Table 1: The Great Powers and Their Tenures

Great Power	COW Range	My Range	Justification
United States	1898-2016	1816-2014	Its large territorial area and large population; the relative weakness of its regional neighbors; and the fact that it defeated the United Kingdom (1775-1783) and fought it to a standstill (1812-1815) in war. Studies of great power politics often include the 19th century United States.[2]
United Kingdom	1816-2016	1816-1945	Its heavy reliance for security on the United States through NATO after 1945.
France	1816-1940, 1945-2016	1816-1940	Its heavy reliance for security on the United States through NATO after 1945.
Prussia/Germany	1816-1918, 1925-1945, 1991-2016	1816-1918, 1925-1945	Its heavy reliance for security on the United States through NATO after 1990.
Japan	1895-1945, 1991-2016	1868-1945	Its relative power according to conventional measures doesn't change dramatically between 1868 (CINC = 0.021) and 1895 (0.031),[3] and the 1868 "Meiji Restoration" is as good a starting point as any. And its heavy reliance for security on the United States through the U.S.-Japan Alliance after 1990 rule it out in this period.

[1] Correlates of War Project. 2017. "State System Membership List, v2016." Available at: http://www.correlatesofwar.org/.
[2] See: John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, Revised ed. (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2014), pp. 238-261.
[3] National Material Capabilities (v6.0). J. David Singer, Stuart Bremer, and John Stuckey, "Capability Distribution, Uncertainty, and Major Power War, 1820-1965," in Bruce Russett, ed., *Peace, War, and Numbers* (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1972), pp. 19-48. Available at: http://www.correlatesofwar.org/.

Unit of Analysis

The unit of analysis is the great power expansion observation.

Inclusion Criteria

To be included in the dataset, an observation of territorial expansion had to meet five criteria:

1. The territory acquired had to be foreign at the time of acquisition. Thus, various forms of domestic territorial pacification are not included in the data.

2. The territory acquired had to be inhabited or claimed by another political entity. Thus, genuine *terra nullius* claims are not included in the data.

3. The acquisition had to be coercive in nature. Thus, gains of territory that are largely voluntary, such as through border agreements or non-coerced purchases, are not included in the data.

4. The acquisition had to be non-temporary, at least in its intent. Thus, cases of temporary military occupation are not included in the data to the greatest extent possible.

5. The acquisition had to be successfully carried out. Thus, cases where expansion was attempted but not completed, or where it was considered but not attempted, are not included in the data.

A detailed discussion of how the inclusion criteria were implemented in practice is in the "Discussion" section, below.

Variables

Each individual great power expansion observation includes a number of variables, which are presented and defined in Table 2, below.

Table 2: Inadvertent Expansion Data Variables	
id	A unique identification number for each expansion observations
year	The year in which the expansion observation was completed
month	The month in which the expansion observation was completed
gainer	The gaining great power
gainer_ccode	The gaining great power's Correlates of War (COW) country code[4]
annexation	A dichotomous variable indicating whether the territory was acquired via political annexation rather than armed conquest
conquest	A dichotomous variable indicating whether the territory was acquired via armed conquest rather than political annexation
entity	The territorial entity acquired

[4] COW, "State System Membership List, v2016."

entity_ccode	The entity acquired's COW country code (if any)
loser	The losing actor
loser_ccode	The losing actor's COW country code
inadvertent	A dichotomous variable indicating whether the expansion observation was inadvertent in nature
risk	A dichotomous variable indicating whether the expansion observation involved considerable risk for the expanding great power
telegraph	A dichotomous variable indicating whether the territorial entity acquired was connected to the global telegraph network at the time of acquisition
conflict	A dichotomous variable indicating whether the expansion observation is part of a broader conflict
region	The region in which the territorial expansion occurred. Here, 1 = the Western Hemisphere, 2 = Europe, 3 = Sub-Saharan Africa, 4 = the Middle East & North Africa, 5 = South & Central Asia, and 6 = the Asia-Pacific
extra_regional	A dichotomous variable indicating whether the expansion observation occurred in a region beyond the great power's own region
distance	The distance of the territorial entity acquired from the great power's capital in kilometers
polity	The gaining great power's Polity score[5]
democracy	A dichotomous variable indicating whether the gaining great power has a Polity score of 6 or greater
autocracy	A dichotomous variable indicating whether the gaining great power has a Polity score of -6 or less
vdem_polyarchy	The gaining great power's Variety of Democracy (V-Dem) Polyarchy score[6]
info_capacity	The gaining great power's "information capacity," a measure of its ability to collect and process reliable information about its population and territory[7]
gainer_cinc	The gaining great power's COW Composite Index of National Capabilities (CINC) score[8]
loser_greatpower	A dichotomous variable indicating whether the losing actor was a great power at the time of territorial loss

[5] Polity 5 Annual Time Series Data, 1800-2018. Monty G. Marshall and Ted Robert Gurr, "Polity 5 Project: Political Regime Characteristics and Transitions, 1800-2018," Center for Systemic Peace (2020). Available at: http://www.systemicpeace.org/polityproject.html.

[6] Michael Coppedge, et al., "VDem Country–Year Dataset v12" Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem) Project (2022). https://doi.org/10.23696/vdemds22; Daniel Pemstein, et al., "The V-Dem Measurement Model: Latent Variable Analysis for Cross-National and Cross-Temporal Expert-Coded Data". *V-Dem Working Paper* No. 21. 7th ed. (2022), University of Gothenburg: Varieties of Democracy Institute.

[7] Thomas Brambor, Agustin Goenaga, Johannes Lindvall, and Jan Teorell, "The Lay of the Land: Information Capacity and the Modern State," *Comparative Political Studies*, Vol. 53, No. 2 (2020), pp. 175-213. Data available at: http://www.stanceatlund.org/.

[8] National Material Capabilities (v6.0).

loser_regionalpower	A dichotomous variable indicating whether the losing actor was a regional power at the time of territorial loss
us_dummy	A dichotomous variable indicating whether the gaining great power was the United States
uk_dummy	A dichotomous variable indicating whether the gaining great power was the United Kingdom
france_dummy	A dichotomous variable indicating whether the gaining great power was France
germany_dummy	A dichotomous variable indicating whether the gaining great power was Germany
austria_dummy	A dichotomous variable indicating whether the gaining great power was Austria-Hungary
italy_dummy	A dichotomous variable indicating whether the gaining great power was Italy
russia_dummy	A dichotomous variable indicating whether the gaining great power was Russia
china_dummy	A dichotomous variable indicating whether the gaining great power was China
japan_dummy	A dichotomous variable indicating whether the gaining great power was Japan
whemisphere_dummy	A dichotomous variable indicating whether the expansion observation occurred in the Western Hemisphere
europe_dummy	A dichotomous variable indicating whether the expansion observation occurred in Europe
africa_dummy	A dichotomous variable indicating whether the expansion observation occurred in Africa
mena_dummy	A dichotomous variable indicating whether the expansion observation occurred in the Middle East & North Africa
scasia_dummy	A dichotomous variable indicating whether the expansion observation occurred in South & Central Asia
asiapac_dummy	A dichotomous variable indicating whether the expansion observation occurred in the Asia-Pacific
tc2018	A dichotomous variable indicating whether the observation appears to be included in the "Territorial Change Data"[9]
tc_number	The id number of the observations that appear to be included in the "Territorial Change Data"

A detailed discussion of a number of these variables is included in the "Discussion" section, below.

[9] Territorial Change Data (v5.0). Jaroslav Tir, Philip Schafer, Paul F. Diehl, and Gary Goertz, "Territorial Changes, 1816-1996: Procedures and Data," *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, Vol. 16, No. 1 (1998), pp. 89-97. Available online at: http://www.correlatesofwar.org/data-sets/territorial-change

Data Collection

The data were compiled from a wide variety of sources, including existing data on the topic, encyclopedias, historical dictionaries and chronologies, historical surveys, in-depth histories, and even primary source documents when necessary. The most detailed and comprehensive existing data on territorial expansion is the COW's "Territorial Change Data," collected by Jaroslav Tir, Philip Schafer, Paul F. Diehl, and Gary Goertz,[10] which was an indispensable source for my data. The data narratives section that follows after this codebook lists all of the key additional sources used for the coding of each observation.

Discussion

Unit of Analysis

As noted above, the unit of analysis is the great power expansion observation. Deciding what counts as a single observation—or, what Bearman, Faris, and Moody refer to as "casing"[11]—was a challenge in many cases. To illustrate, a well-known 1920 map produced by the Geographic Service of French Morocco depicts the French occupation there as having occurred in thirteen separate steps, between 1907 and 1918—and even this is likely a profound oversimplification.[12] In short, territorial expansion is often a complex process that unfolds gradually over months and years, which makes deciding when an individual observation begins and when it ends difficult. As a general rule, I have tried to break cases into as few observations as possible. When a number of instances of expansion occur in the same area separated by only a few weeks or months, I tended to lump them together as a single observation—as I did with the French annexation of the Comoros Islands between January and April 1886 (id: 127). When instances of expansion in the same territorial area are separated by many years, I tended to split them apart as separate observations—such as with the British conquest of Upper Burma in 1825, Lower Burma in 1852, and the remainder of Burma in 1885 (ids: 19, 33, 55).

Coercion

As noted above, one of the inclusion criteria for expansion observations is that they are coercive in nature. Thus, I have excluded cases in which both the gaining side and the losing side voluntarily agree to have the territory change hands, such as cases of voluntary territorial purchase or border adjustment agreements. I have also excluded cases in which outside powers effectively "trade" colonial territories. These cases are clearly coercive with respect to the individuals living in these territories, but the actual sovereign on the losing side is one of these outside powers, which is acting out of voluntarism.

Non-Temporariness

---

[10] Territorial Change Data (v5.0).
[11] Peter Bearman, Robert Faris, and James Moody, "Blocking the Future: New Solutions for Old Problems in Historical Social Science," *Social Science History*, Vol. 23, No. 4 (Winter 1999), pp. 501-533.
[12] See: Service Géographique du Maroc, *Maroc: Les Etapes de L'Occupation Française*, 1/1,500,000, *Gallica*, Available at: https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b530648332.

As noted above, another of the inclusion criteria for expansion observations is that they are non-temporary for the expanding great power, at least in their intent. Differentiating between temporary occupations and more lasting territorial acquisitions was challenging, particularly with wartime expansion. The way I differentiate lasting territorial acquisitions from temporary military occupations is by requiring the observations to include the establishment of some form of formal political relationship after the acquisition, such as its incorporation into the great power's national territory, the formation of a formal colony, the establishment of a protectorate, or the establishment of a subordinate "puppet" state.

Date

To the greatest extent possible, the date noted in the data represents the month and year in which the acquisition itself was completed, not necessarily the month in which it was officially handed from one actor to another, which is often later. For example, Andrew Jackson successfully completed the conquest of Spanish Florida in May 1818 (id: 1), the Adams-Onis Treaty awarding Florida to the United States wasn't signed until February 1819, and the territory wasn't officially handed over to the U.S. until March 1821. In this case, and others like it, the date of the expansion observation is listed as May 1818. When this information was unclear or unavailable, the month and year listed indicates the date on which the territory was officially acquired by the great power in question.

Annexation & Conquest

The variable "annexation" indicates whether the expansion observation consists of political annexation and the variable conquest indicates whether the exapsnion observation consists of armed conquest. Following the Territorial Change data, and in line with international-legal definitions, I consider expansion to be annexation when territory is acquired primarily through diplomacy, and I consider expansion to be conquest when territory is acquired primarily through the use of military force.[13] In cases in which both annexation and conquest are used, I code the observations as conquest.

Inadvertent

The variable "inadvertent" indicates whether the expansion observation in question was inadvertent in nature. I consider expansion observations to be inadvertent when they are planned and executed by actors on the periphery, without the knowledge or authorization of leaders in the capital. My basic coding procedure for each observation was to seek out information on who specifically ordered the territorial acquisition in question. When I found evidence in the historical record that the acquisition was ordered or authorized by leaders in the capital, I considered the observations non-inadvertent, and therefore, implicitly, intentional. In contrast, when I found at least two sources indicating that the expansion was initiated without the prior authorization of the leaders in the

[13] Territorial Change Data (v5.0), "Territorial Change Coding Manual," p. 3; Marcelo G. Kohen, "Conquest," in Rüdiger Wolfrum, ed., *The Max Planck Encyclopedia of Public International Law* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015). Available at: https://opil.ouplaw.com/home/MPIL.

capital, I coded the observation as inadvertent. This "two-source standard" was met in all but three cases of inadvertent expansion, where only a single source was found.[14]

Risk

The variable "risk" indicates whether the territorial expansion observation involved considerable risk. I consider territorial expansion to be risky under any of the five following conditions: when it is 1) onto the territory, at home or abroad, of another great power, 2) onto territory adjacent to a great power's national borders, 3) onto the territory of a sovereign allied with another great power,[15] 4) in violation of a prior agreement with another great power on the territorial integrity of the entity in question, and/or 5) onto the territory of a regional power—a relatively powerful state that doesn't meet the conventional threshold of great power status. With only a few exceptions for missing data,[16] all states considered regional powers have Correlates of War (COW) National Material Capabilities (NMC) Comprehensive Index of National Capabilities (CINC) scores of 0.003 or greater. All states that are considered regional powers in the data are listed in Table 3.

Table 3: Regional Power Observation Years

State	Observation Year (& COW CINC score)
Mexico	1845 (0.008), 1847 (0.008)
The Netherlands	1942 (~0.005)
Spain	1818 (0.044), 1898 (0.017)
Poland	1939 (0.018)
Austria	1938 (0.005)
Hungary	1945 (0.004)
Czechoslovakia	1938 (0.013), 1939 (0.012)
Yugoslavia	1941 (0.004)
Romania	1878 (0.004), 1940 (0.012)
Ukraine	2014 (0.007)
Finland	1940 (0.003)
Denmark	1864 (0.003)
Ethiopia	1936 (0.014)
Persia	1828
The Ottoman Empire	1829 (0.056), 1830 (0.054), 1847 (0.049), 1878 (0.027), 1881 (0.022), 1912 (0.016), 1915 (0.009), 1916 (0.006), 1917 (0.006), 1918 (0.007)
Egypt	1882 (0.004)
China	1841, 1850, 1852, 1860 (0.174), 1895 (0.152), 1897 (0.121), 1898 (0.123), 1900 (0.120), 1905 (0.110), 1932 (0.126), 1933 (0.123), 1937 (0.117), 1938 (0.093), 1939 (0.097)
Taiwan	1955 (0.007)
Japan	1853
Vietnam	1974 (0.007)

[14] These cases are: the United Kingdom's conquest of the Maratha Empire (id: 15); the United Kingdom's annexation of Xhosa Territory in 1878 (id: 49); and France's annexation of the Gabon coast in 1843 (id: 104).

[15] I use the Alliance Treaty Obligation and Provision (ATOP) data, as well as the Correlates of War's Formal Alliances data, as measures of formal alliances. See: ATOP v5.1. Brett Ashley Leeds, Jeffrey M. Ritter, Sara McLaughlin Mitchell, and Andrew G. Long, "Alliance Treaty Obligations and Provisions, 1815-1944," *International Interactions*, Vol. 28, No. 3 (2002), pp. 237-260. Available at: http://www.atopdata.org/; Formal Alliances (v4.1). Douglas M. Gibler, *International Military Alliances, 1648-2008* (Washington: CQ Press, 2009). Available at: https://correlatesofwar.org/.

[16] China does not have CINC scores for 1841, 1850, and 1852, though its CINC score in 1860 is 0.174. Persia/Iran does not have a CINC score for 1828, though its CINC score in 1855 is 0.006. Japan does not have a CINC score for 1853, though its CINC score in 1860 is 0.025. The Netherlands does not have a CINC score in 1942, though its CINC score in 1940 is 0.005. See: National Material Capabilities (v6.0).

Telegraph

The variable "telegraph" indicates whether the territorial entity acquired was connected to the global telegraph network at the time of acquisition. My basic coding procedure was to seek out information on whether there was a globally-connected telegraph station in the territory at the time it was acquired. As a general rule, I considered a territory to be connected to the global telegraph network if some part of it has a globally-connected telegraph station on it. For example, since India was connected to the global telegraph network in 1870, I consider all parts of India to have been connected from this point onward. This is a conservative coding decision that, if anything, should bias the results against my findings. Note that I assume all areas of the world to be connected to the global telegraph network with the start of World War II, in September 1939.

Conflict

The variable "conflict" indicates whether the territorial expansion observation occurred as part of a broader conflict. I consider expansion to be part of a broader conflict when it is undertaken during, and as part of, a broader war, or when it takes place in the immediate aftermath, and as a direct result of, a broader war. For the purpose of this variable, I consider wars as being those conflicts included in the Correlates of War's "Inter-state", "Intra-state", and "Extra-state" war data.[17]

Region

For the purpose of this data, I define regions broadly, dividing the world into just six regions: the Western Hemisphere (region = 1), Europe (2), Sub-Saharan Africa (3), the Middle East & North Africa (4), South & Central Asia (5), and the Asia-Pacific (6). The region classification is derived from the Militarized Interstate Disputes (MID) version 3 data.[18] For the variable "extra_regional" I consider Russia/the Soviet Union to be part of Europe, South & Central Asia, and the Asia-Pacific.

Distance

The variable "distance" lists the distance of the entity acquired from the great power's capital at the time of acquisition. Distance here refers to "Great-Circle" or orthodromic distance, measured in kilometers. The distance data were collected using the "Measure Distance" tool in Google Maps. In each case I attempted to measure the exact distance from the great power's capital to the specific area of the territorial acquisition, not just the capital or borders of the broader territorial entity it is currently a part of.

[17] "COW War Data, 1816-2007 (v4.0)." Meredith Reid Sarkees and Frank Wayman, *Resort to War: 1816 - 2007* (Washington DC: CQ Press, 2010). Available at: http://www.correlatesofwar.org/.

[18] Unfortunately, the region data is no longer available online. See: Faten Ghosn, Glenn Palmer, and Stuart Bremer, "The MID3 Data Set, 1993–2001: Procedures, Coding Rules, and Description," *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, Vol. 21, No. 2 (2004), pp. 133-154.

Data Narratives

The United States

1. Florida (1818/5)

Florida was acquired by the United States via conquest from the Spanish Empire between March and May of 1818, over the course of the First Seminole War. The conquest was carried out by U.S. Army and state militia forces led by Major General Andrew Jackson. Jackson's forces entered East Florida around 15 March 1818 and conquered Fort Gadsden, St. Marks, and Pensacola, before Jackson left Florida on 2 June 1818. The U.S. would partially withdraw while it negotiated a treaty of cession with Spain. Spanish Florida was officially acquired by the United States under the Adams-Onis Treaty of 22 February 1819.[1]

Inadvertent: YES. Jackson's conquest was on his own initiative, without orders from Washington.[2]

Risk: YES. Florida was Spain's territory, a regional power.

Telegraph: NO. The first long-distance telegraph line in the United States was only established in 1844.[3]

2. Texas (1845/3)

Texas was acquired by the United States via annexation as an independent republic in March of 1845. It was acquired as a result of a bill signed by President John Tyler on March 1, 1845. Texas had been an independent republic since it declared its independence from Mexico on 2 March 1836. Mexico disputed the annexation. Texas was officially admitted as the 28th state in the Union in December 1845, and Texas formally joined the Union in February 1846.[4]

Inadvertent: NO. The annexation bill was signed by President John Tyler and was the result, to an important extent, of the election of President James Polk, who campaigned on the "re-annexation" of Texas.[5]

Risk: YES. Texas' independence was disputed by Mexico, a regional power.

---

[1] Bradford Perkins, *The Cambridge History of American Foreign Relations*, Vol. I: *The Creation of a Republican Empire* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 152-155; George C. Herring, *From Colony to Superpower: U.S. Foreign Relations Since 1776* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 145-149; Daniel Walker Howe, *What Hath God Wrought: The Transformation of America, 1815-1848* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 97-109; Walter Nugent, *Habits of Empire: A History of American Expansion* (New York: Vintage Books, 2009), pp. 117-128; William Earl Weeks, *The New Cambridge History of American Foreign Relations*, Vol. 1: *Dimensions of the Early American Empire, 1754-1865* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 104-108.

[2] Herring, *From Colony to Superpower*, pp. 146-147; Howe, *What Hath God Wrought*, pp. 99-100; Nugent, *Habits of Empire*, p. 122. For a detailed examination, see Nicholas D. Anderson, *Inadvertent Expansion in World Politics* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2024), Chapter 3.

[3] Howe, *What Hath God Wrought*, p. 691.

[4] Perkins, *The Cambridge History*, Vol. I, pp. 178-185; Herring, *From Colony to Superpower*, pp. 194-196; Nugent, *Habits of Empire*, pp. 153-155; Weeks, *The New Cambridge History*, Vol. I, pp. 166-173.

[5] Herring, *From Colony to Superpower*, p. 196; Nugent, *Habits of Empire*, pp. 154-155.

Telegraph: NO. A telegraph line to the American south was only completed in 1848.[6]

3. California and New Mexico (1847/1)

California and New Mexico were acquired by the United States via conquest from Mexico between June of 1846 and January of 1847, over the course of the Mexican-American War. New Mexico was conquered without resistance by forces under the command of U.S. Army General Stephen Watts Kearney on 15 August 1846. California was conquered by three separate forces. The first was led by U.S. Army Captain John C. Fremont, who exceeded his orders and helped provoke an uprising among locals in the Sacramento Valley in early July of 1846. The second was led by U.S. Navy Pacific Squadron Commodore John D. Sloat (followed by Commodore Robert Stockton), who occupied Monterey on 7 July 1846. The third was led by General Kearney, who had ridden from New Mexico and crossed into California in November of 1846. A treaty signed with the armies of the Californios ended active resistance on 13 January 1847. California would become a state in 1850 and New Mexico in 1912.[7]

Inadvertent: NO. President James Polk came to power intent on seizing California, and in June 1845 he sent General Zachary Taylor across the Nueces River into Mexican territory as an act of coercive diplomacy, which sparked the Mexican-American War.[8]

Risk: YES. California and New Mexico were Mexico's territory, a regional power.

Telegraph: NO. The trans-continental telegraph in the U.S. was only established in 1861.[9]

4. Guam (1898/6)

Guam was acquired by the United States via conquest from the Spanish Empire on 21 June 1898, over the course of the Spanish-American War. It was conquered by U.S. Navy Captain Henry Glass aboard the cruiser U.S.S. *Charleston*. The Spanish gave up the island without resistance. Guam remains an organized, unincorporated territory of the United States to this day.[10]

Inadvertent: NO. President William McKinley gave Captain Glass orders on 3 June 1898 to capture and secure Guam on his way to Manila.[11]

Risk: YES. Guam was Spain's territory, a regional power.

---

[6] R.S. Cotterill, "The Telegraph in the South, 1845-1850," *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, No. 16 (1917), p. 152.
[7] Nugent, *Habits of Empire*, pp. 200, 203; Herring, *From Colony to Superpower*, pp. 197-200; Perkins, *The Cambridge History*, Vol. I, pp. 187-194; Weeks, *The New Cambridge History*, Vol. I, pp. 181-186, 193-196; Howe, *What Hath God Wrought*, pp. 752-762; "U.S. Invasion of Mexico," in Paul K. Davis, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Invasions and Conquests: From Ancient Times to the Present*, 3rd ed. (Amenia: Grey House Publishing, 2016).
[8] Herring, *From Colony to Superpower*, pp. 197-198; Nugent, *Habits of Empire*, pp. 193-194.
[9] Anton A. Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications* (Hoboken: Wiley-Interscience, 2003), pp. 99-100, 602.
[10] Herring, *From Colony to Superpower*, p. 319; Nugent, *Habits of Empire*, pp. 274-275.
[11] Herring, *From Colony to Superpower*, p. 319; Nugent, *Habits of Empire*, p. 274.

Telegraph: NO. Guam was first connected to the global telegraph network in 1903.[12]

5. Hawaii (1898/7)

Hawaii was acquired by the United States via annexation as an independent republic in July of 1898, during the Spanish-American War. Hawaii had existed as a republic since 1893, after the local American minister had organized a coup to overthrow the Hawaiian monarch. However, President Grover Cleveland, who came to office in March 1893, refused to annex the territory. President McKinley submitted an annexation resolution to Congress in 1898, which passed in both the House and the Senate. Hawaii would become the 50th American state in August 1959.[13]

Inadvertent: NO. Hawaii was annexed by a resolution written by President McKinley and was passed in Congress.[14]

Risk: NO. Hawaii was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Hawaii was first connected to the global telegraph network in 1903.[15]

6. Cuba (1898/8)

Cuba was acquired by the United States acquired via conquest from the Spanish Empire between June and August 1898, over the course of the Spanish-American War. It was conquered on land by forces under the command of Major General William Shafter and by sea by forces under the command of Rear Admiral William T. Sampson. The Spanish forces put up some resistance, but most fighting was over within weeks. Under the Platt Amendment of 1901, Cuba would become a U.S. protectorate, a status it would retain until 1934. The United States remains in possession of Guantanamo Bay, Cuba to this day.[16]

Inadvertent: NO. President McKinley called for intervention in Cuba in a message to Congress on 11 April 1898.[17]

Risk: YES. Cuba was Spain's territory, a regional power.

Telegraph: YES. Cuba was connected to the Global telegraph network in 1867.[18]

---

[12] Jeffrey K. Lyons, "The Pacific Cable, Hawai'i, and Global Communication," *The Hawaiian Journal of History*, Vol. 39 (2005), p. 42.
[13] Herring, *From Colony to Superpower*, pp. 296-297, 317-318; Nugent, *Habits of Empire*, pp. 256-264; Walter LaFeber, *The New Cambridge History of American Foreign Relations*, Vol. II: *The American Search for Opportunity, 1865-1913* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 139-141.
[14] Herring, *From Colony to Superpower*, pp. 317-318; Nugent, *Habits of Empire*, pp. 263-264.
[15] "The House and the Pacific Telegraph," The U.S. House of Representatives, Historical Highlights (2020), Available at: https://history.house.gov/Historical-Highlights/1901-1950/1903_01_02_Pacific-Telegraph/.
[16] Herring, *From Colony to Superpower*, pp. 316, 324-326; Nugent, *Habits of Empire*, pp. 277-286; LaFeber, *The New Cambridge History*, Vol. II, pp. 138-139; "U.S. Invasion of Cuba," in Davis, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Invasions and Conquests*.
[17] Herring, *From Colony to Superpower*, p. 314; Nugent, *Habits of Empire*, p. 279.
[18] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 138.

7. Puerto Rico (1898/8)

Puerto Rico was acquired by the United States via conquest from the Spanish Empire between July and August 1898, over the course of the Spanish-American War. It was conquered by 3,300 forces under the command of General Nelson A. Miles. The Spanish gave up the island after minimal resistance. Puerto Rico remains an unincorporated territory of the United States to this day.[19]

Inadvertent: NO. General Miles was acting under orders of 7 July 1898 from President McKinley.[20]

Risk: YES. Puerto Rico was Spain's territory, a regional power.

Telegraph: YES. Puerto Rico was first connected to the global telegraph network in 1873.[21]

8. Philippines (1898/8)

The Philippines was acquired by the United States via conquest from the Spanish Empire between May and August 1898, over the course of the Spanish-American War. It was conquered by forces under the command of U.S. Navy Admiral George Dewey. The Spanish fleet at Manila Bay was easily defeated, but the conquest would ultimately spark a war with the Philippines that would last until 1902. The Philippine Organic Act of 1902 made the Philippines a territory of the United States. The Philippines would remain a U.S. colony until its independence in 1946.[22]

Inadvertent: NO. Admiral Dewey was ordered to conquer the Philippines by Naval Secretary Theodore Roosevelt, and these orders were approved by President McKinley.[23]

Risk: YES. The Philippines was Spain's territory, a regional power.

Telegraph: NO. The Philippines was first connected to the global telegraph network in 1903.[24]

9. Eastern Samoa (1899/12)

Eastern Samoa (contemporary American Samoa) was acquired by the United States via annexation on 2 December 1899. It was annexed to the United States through the Tripartite Convention, a treaty between the U.S., Germany, and the United Kingdom. In 1878, the United States had acquired the rights to establish a naval coaling station at the harbor Pago-Pago on the island of Tutuila. When Germany sought territory in Apia Harbor on the island of Upolu in December 1888,

---

[19] Herring, *From Colony to Superpower*, pp. 318-319; Nugent, *Habits of Empire*, pp. 286-287; LaFeber, *The New Cambridge History*, Vol. II, p. 138; "U.S. Invasion of Puerto Rico," in Davis, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Invasions and Conquests*.
[20] Herring, *From Colony to Superpower*, p. 319.
[21] Bill Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018," History of the Atlantic Cable & Undersea Communications (2021), Available at: https://atlantic-cable.com/Cables/CableTimeLine/index.htm.
[22] Herring, *From Colony to Superpower*, pp. 316, 320-324; Nugent, *Habits of Empire*, pp. 265-272; LaFeber, *The New Cambridge History*, Vol. II, pp. 133-134, 141, 148-160; "U.S. Occupation of the Philippines," in Davis, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Invasions and Conquests*.
[23] Herring, *From Colony to Superpower*, p. 316; LaFeber, *The New Cambridge History*, Vol. II, p. 133.
[24] Lyons, "The Pacific Cable," p. 42.

it sparked a crisis and nearly a war with Britain and the United States. A hurricane in March 1889 cooled tensions between the three powers, and led to the Treaty of Berlin in June 1889, in which the three powers agreed to protect Samoan independence. This agreement would ultimately break down, leading to the 1899 Tripartite Convention, in which Germany acquired the Samoan islands of Upolu, Savaii, Apolima, and Manono, and the United States acquired Tutuila and Manua. The islands were initially an American protectorate, but would become an unincorporated and unorganized territory of the United States, a status they retain to this day.[25]

Inadvertent: NO. The Tripartite Treaty was negotiated and signed by Secretary of State John Hay.[26]

Risk: NO. While there were competing claims with Germany and the United Kingdom, the actual acquisition was facilitated by treaty with these two great powers.

Telegraph: NO. There were no telegraph stations in the South Pacific until 1902.[27]

10. Marshall Islands (1944/2)

The Marshall Islands were acquired by the United States via conquest from Japan between 30 January and 23 February 1944, over the course of World War II. They were conquered by a U.S. Marine and Army amphibious force of 85,000 personnel. The Japanese occupying force put up stiff resistance. The Marshall Islands would remain a U.S. possession until their independence in 1979.[28]

Inadvertent: NO. The attack on the Marshall Islands was planned and ordered by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.[29]

Risk: YES. The Marshall Islands had been occupied by Japan, a great power.

Telegraph: YES.

11. Mariana Islands (1944/8)

The Mariana Islands were acquired by the United States via conquest from Japan between February and August 1944, over the course of World War II. The Marianas—the largest of which are Saipan,

---

[25] "Samoan Incident (1888-89)," in Jon Whiteclay Chambers, ed., *The Oxford Companion to American Military History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), Available at: https://www.oxfordreference.com/; Herring, *From Colony to Superpower*, pp. 295-296; Nugent, *Habits of Empire*, pp. 254-256; LaFeber, *The New Cambridge History*, Vol. II, pp. 83-86.
[26] George H. Ryden, *The Foreign Policy of the United States in Relation to Samoa* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1933), pp. 558-573; Paul M. Kennedy, *The Samoan Tangle: A Study of Anglo-German-American Relations, 1878-1900* (Dublin: Irish University Press, 1974), pp. 249-254.
[27] Lyons, "The Pacific Cable," p. 42.
[28] "Marshall Islands, Naval Campaign," in Spencer Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of World War II: A Political, Social, and Military History* (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2004), pp. 957-959; "Marshall Islands Campaign" and "Eniwetok Atoll," in I. C. B. Dear and M. R. D. Foot, eds., *The Oxford Companion to World War II* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), Available at: https://www.oxfordreference.com/; "U.S. Conquest of Pacific Islands," in Davis, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Invasions and Conquests*.
[29] "Marshall Islands," in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWII*, p. 958; "U.S. Conquest of Pacific Islands," in Davis, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Invasions and Conquests*.

Tinian, Rota, and Guam—were conquered by the U.S. military as part of Operation Forager. Saipan was acquired by Lieutenant-General Holland Smith's 77,000 personnel 5th Amphibious Corps between 15 June 1944 and 9 July 1944. Tinian was acquired by Major General Harry Schidt's 5th Amphibious Corps between 24 July 1944 and 5 August 1944. Guam was acquired by Major General Roy Geiger's 55,000 personnel 3rd US Amphibious Corps between 21 July 1944 and mid-August 1944. The Mariana Islands remain an insular area and commonwealth of the United States to this day.[30]

Inadvertent: NO. The attack on the Mariana Islands was planned and ordered by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.[31]

Risk: YES. The Mariana Islands were occupied by Japan, a great power.

Telegraph: YES.

12. Palau (1944/11)

Palau was acquired by the United States via conquest from Japan between September and November 1944, over the course of World War II. It was conquered by forces under the command of Major-General William Rupertus of the U.S. First Marine Division over the course of the Battle of Peleliu. The Japanese put up a very stiff resistance, making this one of the bloodiest battles of America's Pacific War. Palau remained a U.S. possession until its independence in 1994.[32]

Inadvertent: NO. The attack on the Palau was planned and ordered by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.[33]

Risk: YES. Palau had been occupied by Japan, a great power.

Telegraph: YES.

13. Okinawa (1945/6)

Okinawa was acquired by the United States via conquest from Japan between April and June 1945. Okinawa was conquered by four divisions of Lieutenant-General Simon Buckner's Tenth U.S. Army from 1 April to 22 June 1945. Overall, the U.S. committed over 500,000 troops to its acquisition, and 170,000 directly participated in its capture. Japanese forces stationed on the island put up fierce resistance. In 1950 the United States Civil Administration for the Ryukyu Islands, under the

---

[30] "Mariana Islands, Naval Campaign," in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWII*, pp. 951-953; "Mariana Islands," "Tinian," "Capture of Saipan," and "Guam," all in Dear and Foot, eds., *The Oxford Companion to WWII*; "U.S. Conquest of Pacific Islands," in Davis, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Invasions and Conquests*.

[31] "Mariana Islands," in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWII*, p. 951; "U.S. Conquest of Pacific Islands," in Davis, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Invasions and Conquests*.

[32] "Caroline Islands Campaign" (pp. 291-293) and "Battle of Peleliu" (pp. 1172-1173), both in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWII*; "Capture of Peleliu," in Dear and Foot, eds., *The Oxford Companion to WWII*; "U.S. Conquest of Pacific Islands," in Davis, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Invasions and Conquests*.

[33] "Caroline Islands Campaign," in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWII*, p. 292; "U.S. Conquest of Pacific Islands," in Davis, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Invasions and Conquests*.

Department of the Army, was set up for Okinawa. Okinawa would remain a U.S. possession until May 1972, when it was returned to Japan.[34]

Inadvertent: NO. The attack on the Okinawa was planned and ordered by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.[35]

Risk: YES. Okinawa was Japan's territory, a great power.

Telegraph: YES.

[34] "Invasion of Okinawa (Operation Iceberg)," in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWII*, pp. 1121-1123; "Capture of Okinawa," in Dear and Foot, eds., *The Oxford Companion to WWII*; "U.S. Conquest of Pacific Islands," in Davis, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Invasions and Conquests*.

[35] "Invasion of Okinawa," in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWII*, pp. 1121-1122; "U.S. Conquest of Pacific Islands," in Davis, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Invasions and Conquests*.

14. Nepal (1816/3)

Nepal was acquired by the United Kingdom via conquest between November 1814 and 15 March 1816, over the course of the Anglo-Nepalese (Gurkha) War. Nepal was conquered by 22,000 British East India Company (EIC) forces under the command of Major-General David Ochterlony. Gurkha raids on EIC territory led Governor-General Lord Moira to declare war. The Gurkhas put up a strong resistance to British forces on difficult terrain. With the Treaty of Segauli, the Gurkhas were forced to cede Kumaon, Garwhal, Sirmoor, and much of Terrai, to the British, and Nepal became a British protectorate. This began a long the close relationship between the British and the Gurkhas. Nepal would remain a United Kingdom territory until its independence in 1923.[1]

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. The use of force in Nepal was approved by the Court of Directors in London as early as February 1814.[2]

Risk: NO. Nepal was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. South Asia was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1870.[3]

15. Maratha Empire (1818/6)

The Maratha Empire (contemporary India) was acquired by the United Kingdom via conquest between October 1817 and 3 June 1818, over the course of the Third Anglo-Maratha War. The Maratha Empire was conquered by 120,000 personnel of the British East India Company under the command of Francis Rawdon Hastings, the Earl of Moira. With this conquest, the British Empire gained control of the Indian subcontinent south of the Sutlej River. This war ended nearly 50 years of conflict between the East India Company and the Marathas, and left the British as the preeminent power on the subcontinent, south of the Sutlej. The Indian subcontinent would remain a United Kingdom territory until India's independence in 1947.[4]

---

[1] Penderel Moon, *The British Conquest and Dominion of India* (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., 1989), pp. 377-383; Lawrence James, *The Rise and Fall of the British Empire* (London: Little Brown, 1994), pp. 134-135; "Gurkha War, 1814-1816" (pp. 492-493) and "Nepal" (p.792), both in James S. Olson and Robert Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1996); Tony Gould, *Imperial Warriors: Britain and the Gurkhas* (London: Granta Books, 1999), pp. 62-68; "Gurkha War," in Harold E. Raugh, Jr., *The Victorians at War, 1815-1914: An Encyclopedia of British Military History* (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2004), pp. 155-156; "Anglo-Nepal War," in Carl Cavanaugh Hodge, ed., *Encyclopedia of the Age of Imperialism*, Vol. 1 (Westport: Greenwood Press, 2007), pp. 35-36; Richard Gott, *Britain's Empire: Resistance, Repression and Revolt* (London: Verso, 2011), pp. 197-198; "Gurkha (or Nepalese) War," in Kenneth J. Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015), pp. 222-224.

[2] John Pemble, *The Invasion of Nepal: John Company at War* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), p. 50.

[3] Anton A. Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications* (Hoboken: Wiley-Interscience, 2003), p. 127.

[4] Moon, *The British Conquest and Dominion of India*, pp. 402-410; Lawrence James, *Raj: The Making and Unmaking of British India* (London: Little, Brown and Co., 1997), pp. 72-73; "Maratha Wars," in Richard Holmes et al., eds., *The Oxford Companion to Military History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), Available at: https://www.oxfordreference.com/; "Maratha Wars," in Hodge, ed., *Encyclopedia of the Age of Imperialism*, Vol. 2, p. 458; Gott, *Britain's Empire*, pp. 218-222; "Maratha Wars," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 315.

Inadvertent: LIKELY YES. The conquest was conducted by the East India Company without orders from leaders in London.[5]

Risk: NO. The Maratha Empire was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. South Asia was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1870.[6]

16. Singapore (1819/2)

Singapore was acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation on 6 February 1819. It was annexed by Stamford Raffles of the British East India Company. Raffles annexed the territory by deposing the local prince who was allied to the Netherlands. Raffles apparently had the backing of the Governor-General of India Francis Rawdon-Hastings. Singapore became part of the Straits Settlement in August 1824, after the signing of the Anglo-Dutch Treaty in March of 1824. Singapore would remain a United Kingdom territory until its independence and joining with neighboring Malaysia in 1963.[7]

Inadvertent: YES. Raffles annexed Singapore without orders from leaders in London.[8]

Risk: NO. Singapore was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Singapore was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1870-1871.[9]

17. Gambia (1821/10)

Gambia was acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation between 23 August 1816 and 17 October 1821. The British had had a presence in Gambia since the 17th century. The acquisition began with the purchase of Banjol Island by Captain Alexander Grant on 23 August 1816. By 17

---

[5] Moon, *The British Conquest and Dominion of India*, pp. 391, 393.
[6] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 127.
[7] Roland Hyam, *Britain's Imperial Century, 1815-1914: A Study of Empire and Expansion* (London: B. T. Batsford, 1976), pp. 342-345; R. M. J. Stewart, "Raffles of Singapore: The Man and the Legacy," *Asian Affairs*, Vol. 13, No. 1 (1982), pp. 23-24; "Thomas Stanford Raffles" (pp. 926-927) and "Singapore" (pp. 1015-1016), both in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*; "Singapore," in John Stewart, *The British Empire: An Encyclopedia of the Crown's Holdings, 1493 through 1995* (Jefferson: McFarland & Co., 1996), p. 242; A. J. Stockwell, "British Expansion and Rule in South-East Asia," in Andrew Porter, ed., *The Oxford History of the British Empire*, Vol. III: *The Nineteenth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 374-375; Gott, *Britain's Empire*, pp. 230-232; "Thomas Stamford Bingley Raffles" (p. 427) and "Singapore" (pp. 480-481), both in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*.
[8] Hyam, *Britain's Imperial Century*, p. 343; Stewart, "Raffles of Singapore," pp. 23-24; Moon, *The British Conquest and Dominion of India*, p. 411; Mark R. Frost and Yu-Mei Balasingamchow, *Singapore: A Biography* (Singapore: National Museum of Singapore, 2009), p. 47; Steven Press, *Rogue Empires: Contracts and Conmen in Europe's Scramble for Africa* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2017), pp. 29-30.
[9] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 136; Bill Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018," History of the Atlantic Cable & Undersea Communications (2021), Available at: https://atlantic-cable.com/Cables/CableTimeLine/index.htm.

October 1821, all forts and settlements in Gambia were placed under the rule of the West African Territories. Gambia was governed from a distance by the colony of Sierra Leone. The West African Territories dissolved in 1850. Gambia would remain a United Kingdom territory until its independence in 1965.[10]

Inadvertent: NO. The British Colonial Secretary, Earl Bathurst, was involved in the initial acquisitions.[11]

Risk: NO. Gambia was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Gambia was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1885.[12]

18. Western New South Wales (1825/7)

Western New South Wales was acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation on 16 July 1825. Western New South Wales was annexed when New South Wales had its western boundary extended to 129 degrees east longitude by its governor, Lieutenant-General Ralph Darling. In 1824, a military and trading post had been set up by the British government on Melville Island, off the coast of Australia but beyond the then-boundaries of New South Wales. New South Wales would remain a United Kingdom territory until the independence of Australia in 1942.[13]

Inadvertent: NO. The annexation order came from the colonial minister in London, Earl Bathurst.[14]

Risk: NO. New South Wales was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Australia was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1871-1872.[15]

19. Upper Burma (1825/12)

Upper Burma (contemporary Myanmar) was acquired by the United Kingdom via conquest between 5 March 1824 and December 1825, over the course of the First Anglo-Burmese War. Upper Burma was conquered by a force of 10,644 personnel of the British East India Company (EIC) led by General Archibald Campbell. Territorial disputes and Burmese raids on EIC detachments were the

[10] "Gambia," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 452; "Gambia" (p. 135) and "West African Territories" (p. 276), both in Stewart, *The British Empire*; "The Gambia" (pp. 197-198) and "British West Africa" (pp. 95-96), both in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*; Filip Strych, "A Small Piece of Africa: Creating the British Colony of the Gambia," in Jan Záhořík and Linda Piknerová, eds., *Colonialism on the Margins of Africa* (New York: Routledge, 2018), pp. 43-45.
[11] John Milner Gray, *A History of the Gambia* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1940), pp. 298, 301-302, 306; Strych, "A Small Piece of Africa," p. 44.
[12] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[13] "Governor Darling's Commission 1825 (UK)," Documenting a Democracy, Government of Australia (N.D.), Available at: https://www.foundingdocs.gov.au/item-did-41.html.
[14] "Governor Darling's Commission," Government of Australia.
[15] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 136; Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

direct cause of this war. Monsoon rains, disease, and difficult transportation networks made this a difficult fight for the EIC forces. Their victory in December 1825 led to the Treaty of Yandabo, signed on 24 February 1826, in which Arakan, Assam, Manipur, and the Tenasserim coast south of the Salween River were ceded to British India, and Burma was effectively made a British protectorate. Upper Burma would remain a United Kingdom territory until Burma's independence in 1948.[16]

Inadvertent: YES. The war and conquest were at the initiative of the Governor-General of India, Lord Amherst, and were opposed by the government in London.[17]

Risk: NO. Burma was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Burma was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1877.[18]

20. Western Australia (1829/5)

Western Australia was acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation on 2 May 1829. Western Australia was annexed by Charles Fremantle and a detachment of marines aboard the HMS *Challenger*. Colonial Secretary Sir George Murray had received a letter in late 1828 from Captain James Stirling, who had explored Western Australia the previous year, urging the annexation and warning of French interest in the area. Fremantle set sail from the Cape on 10 March 1829. A British military settlement and then a penal colony had been established there in 1826 and 1827, respectively. Stirling arrived on 1 June 1829 as Lieutenant-Governor of the new territory. Western Australia would remain a United Kingdom territory until the independence of Australia in 1942.[19]

---

[16] Moon, *The British Conquest and Dominion of India*, pp. 434-42; "Burma," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 214; "Burma," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, pp. 107-108; "Burma Wars," in Holmes et al., eds., *The Oxford Companion to Military History*; "First Burma War," in Raugh, *The Victorians at War*, pp. 67-69; "Anglo-Burmese Wars," in Peter N. Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), Available at: https://www.oxfordreference.com/; Gott, *Britain's Empire*, pp. 245-250; "First Burmese War," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 187-188.

[17] G. P. Ramachandra, "The Outbreak of the First Anglo-Burmese War," *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Vol. 51, No. 2 (234) (1978), p. 79; Moon, *The British Conquest and Dominion of India*, pp. 434, 441, 443; Stockwell, "British Expansion and Rule in South-East Asia," p. 376.

[18] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

[19] "Western Australia," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 1155-1156; "Western Australia," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, p. 278; "Western Australia," in Graeme Davison, John Hirst, and Stuart Macintyre, eds., *The Oxford Companion to Australian History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), Available at: https://www.oxfordreference.com/; Gott, *Britain's Empire*, pp. 270-271; "Western Australia," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 572; "Instructions to the Admiralty to take formal possession of the western portion of the continent 5 November 1828 (UK)," Documenting a Democracy, Government of Australia (N.D.), Available at: https://www.foundingdocs.gov.au/item-sdid-4.html; "Lieutenant-Governor Stirling's Instructions 30 December 1828 (UK)," Documenting a Democracy, Government of Australia (N.D.), Available at: https://www.foundingdocs.gov.au/item-sdid-5.html; "Lieutenant-Governor Stirling's Proclamation of the Colony 18 June 1829," Documenting a Democracy, Government of Australia (N.D.), Available at: https://www.foundingdocs.gov.au/item-sdid-7.html.

Inadvertent: NO. Stirling had received authorization from London before establishing the colony in Western Australia.[20]

Risk: NO. Western Australia was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Australia was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1871-1872.[21]

21. Falkland Islands (1833/1)

The Falkland Islands (contemporary United Kingdom) were acquired by the United Kingdom via conquest from the Argentine Confederation between 28 November 1832 and 3 January 1833. The islands were conquered by the HMS *Clio* under the command of Commander John James Onslow accompanied by the HMS *Tyne* under Captain Charles Hope. The following year, the British officially appointed a resident for the islands. The Falkland Islands remain a United Kingdom territory to this day.[22]

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. The British Colonial Office and Foreign Office were involved in planning and ordering the conquest.[23]

Risk: NO. The Argentine Confederation was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Argentina was not connected to the global telegraph network before 1873.[24]

22. Aden (1839/1)

Aden (contemporary Yemen) was acquired by the United Kingdom via conquest between 20 November 1838 and 19 January 1839. Aden was conquered by a British East India Company force of 750 under the command of Captain Stafford Bettesworth Haines. After a brief coastal bombardment, British forces landed in the late morning and took the territory. Aden was strategically located at the southern entrance to the Red Sea and had a highly-valuable deep-water port. It was administratively integrated into British India in September 1839 under the Bombay Presidency. Haines would become the first ruler of British Aden, remaining in his post for 15 years. Aden would remain a United Kingdom territory until the independence of Yemen in 1967.[25]

---

[20] "Western Australia," in Davison et al., eds., *The Oxford Companion to Australian History*; Gott, *Britain's Empire*, p. 271; "Instructions to the Admiralty to take formal possession of the western portion of the continent," Government of Australia.
[21] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 136; Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[22] Barry M. Gough, "The British Reoccupation and Colonization of the Falkland Islands, or Malvinas, 1832-1843," *Albion*, Vol. 22, No. 2 (Summer 1990), pp. 270-274; "Falkland Islands," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 419; "Falkland Islands," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 179.
[23] Gough, "The British Reoccupation and Colonization of the Falkland Islands," pp. 270-271.
[24] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 139; Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[25] Harvey Sicherman, *Aden and British Strategy, 1839-1968* (Philadelphia: Foreign Policy Research Institute, 1972), pp. 9-16; R. J. Gavin, *Aden Under British Rule, 1839-1967* (London: Hurst, 1975), pp. 1, 27-37; Z. H. Kour, *The History of Aden, 1839-1872* (London: Frank Cass, 1981), pp. 8-12; "Aden," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British*

Inadvertent: NO. Haines was authorized to acquire Aden by authorities in London, and Foreign Minister Palmerston and Prime Minister Melbourne were aware of the planned conquest.[26]

Risk: NO. Aden was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Aden was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1870.[27]

23. New Zealand (1840/5)

New Zealand was acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation between January and May 1840. New Zealand was annexed by a mission led by Captain William Hobson. The territory as a whole was acquired via the Treaty of Waitangi, an agreement between Hobson and 43 Maori chiefs on 6 February 1840. Over 544 chiefs would eventually sign the treaty, though nearly all signed an imperfectly translated version. A number of important Maori leaders declined to sign the treaty, though it wouldn't matter. Captain Hobson declared New Zealand as British territory on 21 May 1840. New Zealand would remain a United Kingdom territory until its independence in the latter half of the 20th century.[28]

Inadvertent: NO. The Hobson mission was ordered by the British Colonial Office and he had authority to annex the territory.[29]

Risk: NO. New Zealand was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. New Zealand wasn't connected to the global telegraph network until 1876.[30]

24. Hong Kong (1841/1)

Hong Kong was acquired by the United Kingdom via conquest from China on 25 January 1841, during the First Opium War. Hong Kong was conquered by British forces under the command Commodore J. G. Bremer. The United Kingdom formally took possession on 26 January 1841, and the territory was formally ceded to Britain with the Treaty of Nanjing in 1842, the first of the famed "unequal treaties." Hong Kong had long been a destination for British trading ships. Hong Kong

---

Empire, p. 9; "Aden," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, p. 69; "Aden," in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; Gott, *Britain's Empire*, pp. 326-327; "Aden," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 19-20.

[26] Gordon Waterfield, *Sultans of Aden* (London: Murray, 1968), pp. 53-54, 55-56; Gavin, *Aden Under British Rule*, pp. 33-35.

[27] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 136; Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

[28] Raewyn Dalziel, "Southern Islands: New Zealand and Polynesia," in Andrew Porter, ed., *The Oxford History of the British Empire*, Vol. III: *The Nineteenth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 578-582; Brendon, *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire*, pp. 86-93; "Treaty of Waitangi" and "Maoris," both in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World.*

[29] Dalziel, "Southern Islands," p. 578; Brendon, *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire*, p. 92; Gott, *Britain's Empire*, p. 358.

[30] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 136; Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

would remain a United Kingdom territory until it was ceded back to the People's Republic of China in 1997.[31]

Inadvertent: NO. The war and territorial acquisitions were authorized in London in September 1839, and local British agents had some latitude as to what was to be claimed.[32]

Risk: YES. China was a regional power.

Telegraph: NO. Hong Kong was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1871.[33]

25. Chatham Islands (1842/4)

The Chatham Islands (contemporary New Zealand) were acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation on 4 April 1842. This annexation was apparently motivated by a plan of the New Zealand Company in late 1841 to sell the islands to the German Free Cities. The Colonial Office intervened and annexed the islands instead, adding them to the colony of New Zealand. The islands had been a base for sealing and whaling vessels since the late 18th century. The Chatham Islands remained a United Kingdom territory until the independence of New Zealand in the latter half of the twentieth century.[34]

Inadvertent: YES. The Islands were initially claimed by the New Zealand Company without authorization from London.[35]

Risk: NO. The Chatham Islands was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. New Zealand wasn't connected to the global telegraph network until 1876.[36]

---

[31] G. B. Endacott, *A History of Hong Kong* (London: Oxford University Press, 1973), pp. 14-19; K J. P. Lowe, "Hong Kong, 26 January 1941: Hoisting the Flag Revisited," *Journal of the Hong Kong Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Vol. 29 (1989), pp. 8-9; "Anglo-Chinese War" (p. 47) and "Hong Kong" (p. 533), both in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*; Frank Welsh, *A History of Hong Kong* (London: HarperCollins, 1993), pp. 101-109; Steve Tsang, *A Modern History of Hong Kong, 1841-1997* (New York: I.B. Taurus, 2004), pp. 9-12; "Opium War," in Holmes et al., eds., *The Oxford Companion to Military History*; "First China War," in Raugh, *The Victorians at War*; pp. 98-100; "Opium Wars," in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; Gott, *Britain's Empire*, pp. 327-328; "Hong Kong," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 230; "British Invasion of China (Opium War)," in Paul K. Davis, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Invasions and Conquests: From Ancient Times to the Present*, 3rd ed. (Amenia: Grey House Publishing, 2016).
[32] Endacott, *A History of Hong Kong*, pp. 15-16; Welsh, *A History of Hong Kong*, p. 105; Tsang, *A Modern History of Hong Kong*, pp. 10-11.
[33] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 136; Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[34] "Chatham Islands," Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 124-125; Andre Bree, "Australia and the Secretive Exploitation of the Chatham Islands to 1842," *Journal of Australian Studies*, Vol. 41, No. 1 (2017), p. 111.
[35] Sheila Natusch, *Hell or High Water: A German Occupation of the Chatham Islands, 1843-1910* (Christchurch: Pegasus, 1977), pp. 56-57; Patricia Burns, *Fatal Success: A History of the New Zealand Company* (Auckland: H. Reed, 1989), pp. 136, 243.
[36] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 136; Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

26. Natal (1842/5)

Natal (contemporary South Africa) was acquired by the United Kingdom via conquest between April and May 1842. Natal was conquered by a British force of 260 personnel under the command of Captain Thomas Charlton Smith. The operation was ordered by Cape Colony governor George Thomas Napier. The territory was seized in order to secure a valuable port and to stabilize the area south of the Zulu Kingdom. The territory was formally made a British colony in 1843. Natal would remain a United Kingdom territory until the independence of South Africa in 1910.[37]

Inadvertent: NO. The conquest was ordered by Colonial Secretary Lord Russell in August 1841.[38]

Risk: NO. Natal was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. South Africa was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1879.[39]

27. Sind (1843/3)

Sind (contemporary Pakistan) was acquired by the United Kingdom via conquest between late January and 24 March 1843, over the course of the British-Sind War. Sind was conquered by an army of 3,000 personnel of the British East India Company led by Major-General Sir Charles James Napier. The conquest was accomplished primarily as a result of victory in two battles—the Battle of Miani on 17 February 1843, and the Battle of Hyderabad on 24 March 1843. Sind was formally added to British India in August of 1843. Sind would remain a territory of the United Kingdom until the partition of India and the independence of Pakistan in 1947.[40]

Inadvertent: YES. The conquest was at the initiative of Napier and the East India Company, not the British government in London.[41]

Risk: NO. Sind was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

---

[37] John S. Galbraith, *Reluctant Empire: British Policy on the South African Frontier, 1834-1854* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963), pp. 189-192; "Natal," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 781-782; Christopher Saunders and Ian R. Smith, "Southern Africa, 1795-1910," in Andrew Porter, ed., *The Oxford History of the British Empire*, Vol. III: *The Nineteenth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), p. 602; "Boers," in Raugh, *The Victorians at War*, p. 54.

[38] Galbraith, *Reluctant Empire*, p. 191; A. E. Cubbin, "An Exposition of the Clash of Anglo-Voortrekker Interests at Port Natal Leading to the Military Conflict of 23-24 May 1842," *Historia*, Vol. 37, No. 2 (November 1992), p. 60.

[39] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

[40] Moon, *The British Conquest and Dominion of India*, pp. 561-579; "Sind War," Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 1014-1015; "General Sir Charles J. Napier" (p. 243) and "Operations in Sind" (p. 303), both in Raugh, *The Victorians at War*; Gott, *Britain's Empire*, pp. 339-343.

[41] Robert A. Huttenback, *British Relations with Sind, 1799-1843: An Anatomy of Imperialism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1962), ch. 6; John Darwin, "Imperialism and the Victorians: The Dynamics of Territorial Expansion," *The English Historical Review*, Vol. 112, No. 447 (June 1997), p. 625; James, *Raj*, pp. 99-106. See also: Nicholas D. Anderson, *Inadvertent Expansion in World Politics* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2024), Introduction.

Telegraph: NO. India was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1870.[42]

28. Eastern Punjab (1846/2)

Eastern Punjab (contemporary India) was acquired by the United Kingdom via conquest between 13 December 1845 and 15 February 1846, over the course of the First Sikh War. Eastern Punjab was conquered by a force of 17,000 personnel of the British East India Company (EIC) under the command of Lieutenant General Hugh Gough. The war ended with the Treaty of Lahore, with the Sikhs being forced to cede Jammu, Kashmir, and Hazara to the EIC. The Company immediately sold Kashmir to Gulab Singh, the Rajah of Jammu. A British resident was appointed in December of 1846, effectively making the Sikh Kingdom a protectorate of the British Empire. Eastern Punjab would remain a United Kingdom territory until the independence of India in 1947.[43]

Inadvertent: YES. The war was declared by the Governor-General of India, Viscount Hardinge, and Prime Minister Peel was opposed to the conquest.[44]

Risk: NO. The Sikh Kingdom was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. India was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1870.[45]

29. Labuan (1846/12)

The island of Labuan (contemporary Malaysia) was acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation from Brunei on 18 December 1846. The island was annexed by Captain G.R. Mundy of the HMS *Iris*. The Sultan of Brunei formally ceded the island to the United Kingdom the following year. The island was uninhabited at the time of annexation. Lord Aberdeen, the Foreign Secretary, had advocated the annexation of Labuan in March 1845, but he was overruled by other members of the British Cabinet, particularly Board of Trade President William Gladstone. Labuan was made a crown colony in 1848. Responsibility for management of the island was transferred to the British North Borneo Company in January of 1890. Labuan would remain a United Kingdom territory until the independence of Malaysia in 1963.[46]

---

[42] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 127.
[43] Moon, *The British Conquest and Dominion of India*, pp. 596-603; "Punjab," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 912; James, *Raj*, pp. 106-112; "First Sikh War," in Raugh, *The Victorians at War*, pp. 298-300; Gott, *Britain's Empire*, pp. 345-349; "First Sikh War," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 188-189.
[44] Moon, *The British Conquest and Dominion of India*, p. 596; James, *Raj*, pp. 106, 112; Khushwant Singh, *A History of the Sikhs*, Vol. 2: *1839-2004*, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), p. 45.
[45] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 127.
[46] "Labuan," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 645; "Labuan," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, p. 167; Bashiran Begum and Nor Asiah Mohamad, "Labuan: Its Legal History and Land Tenure System," *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Vol. 82, No. 1 (296) (June 2009), pp. 19-24; "Labuan," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 281.

Inadvertent: NO. Captain Mundy was acting under orders from the British Foreign Office from July 1846.[47]

Risk: NO. Brunei was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Malaya was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1871.[48]

30. Xhosa Territory (1847/12)

Xhosa territory between the Orange and the Keiskamma Rivers (contemporary South Africa) was acquired by the United Kingdom via conquest between September and 17 December 1847, over the course of the Seventh Xhosa War (the "War of the Axe"). These territories were conquered by British forces under the orders of Cape Colony governor Lieutenant General Harry G.W. Smith and under the command of General Henry Pottinger. These territories were established as "British Kaffraria." The Xhosa territories would remain a United Kingdom possession until the independence of South Africa in 1910.[49]

Inadvertent: YES. Lieutenant General Smith was acting on his own initiative and without prior approval from London.[50]

Risk: NO. The Xhosa were not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. South Africa was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1879.[51]

31. Orange River Territory (1848/2)

The Orange River Territory (contemporary South Africa) was acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation between December 1847 and 3 February 1848. The territory was annexed by Cape Colony Governor Lieutenant General Harry G.W. Smith. Smith had first settled and established British control at Bloemfontein in 1845, calling the area Transorangia. In February of 1848, Smith formally annexed Transorangia and the Boer Republic of Winburg (territory between the Orange and Vaal Rivers), and it became known as the Orange River Territory. Many Boer settlers were unhappy with the annexation, leading to conflict with British forces. The territory became an

---

[47] Nicholas Tarling, *Britain, the Brookes, and Brunei* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971), pp. 54-55, 57; Begum and Mohamad, "Labuan," p. 22.
[48] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 136; Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[49] Galbraith, *Reluctant Empire*, pp. 214-224; "War of the Ax" (pp. 90-91) and "British Kaffraria" (p. 188), both in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*; Saunders and Smith, "Southern Africa," pp. 601-602; "Cape Frontier Wars, Southern Africa," in Raugh, *The Victorians at War*, p. 80; "British Kaffraria," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 88; Gott, *Britain's Empire*, pp. 377-381.
[50] Galbraith, *Reluctant Empire*, p. 219; Saunders and Smith, "Southern Africa," pp. 601-602; Brendon, *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire*, p. 98.
[51] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

independent Boer Republic in February of 1854, but would be reclaimed by the British in 1900. It would remain a United Kingdom territory until the independence of South Africa in 1910.[52]

Inadvertent: YES. Lieutenant General Smith annexed the territory without orders from London.[53]

Risk: NO. The Orange River Territory was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. South Africa was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1879.[54]

32. Punjab (1849/3)

Punjab (contemporary India) was acquired by the United Kingdom via conquest between 9 November 1848 and 14 March 1849, over the course of the Second Anglo-Sikh War. Punjab was conquered by a British East India Company force of 20,000 led by Lieutenant-General Hugh Gough. The First Anglo-Sikh War had taken place just a few years earlier, in 1845-1846. Difficult terrain and tenacious resistance by the Sikh army made this a formidable challenge for the East India Company. The decisive battle was the Battle of Gujrat, on 21 February 1849. On 29 March, Lord Dalhousie, the Governor-General of India, annexed Punjab. Thereafter, Sikhs became and remained important elements of the Indian Army. Punjab would remain a United Kingdom territory until the independence of India in 1947.[55]

Inadvertent: YES. The annexation of Punjab was Governor-General Dalhousie's decision, and he didn't have approval from London.[56]

Risk: NO. The Sikh Kingdom was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. India was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1870.[57]

---

[52] Galbraith, *Reluctant Empire*, pp. 226-235; Timothy Keegan, "The Making of the Orange Free State, 1846-54: Sub-imperialism, primitive accumulation and state formation," *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (1988), pp. 30-32; "Orange River Colony," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 846-847; "Orange Free State," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, pp. 211-212; Gott, *Britain's Empire*, p. 381; "Orange River Sovereignty," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 387.
[53] Galbraith, *Reluctant Empire*, pp. 226-227, 234, 235, 239-240; Keegan, "The Making of the Orange Free State," p. 31.
[54] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[55] Moon, *The British Conquest and Dominion of India*, pp. 615-618; "Sikh Wars," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 1012; James, *Raj*, pp. 112-118; "Sikh Wars," in Holmes et al., eds., *The Oxford Companion to Military History*; "Battle of Gujerat" (pp. 154-155) and "Second Sikh War" (pp. 300-301), both in Raugh, *The Victorians at War*; "Sikh Wars," in Hodge, ed., *Encyclopedia of the Age of Imperialism*, Vol. 2, pp. 653-654; Gott, *Britain's Empire*, pp. 350-353; "Second Sikh War," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 470-471.
[56] Moon, *The British Conquest and Dominion of India*, p. 618; Darwin, "Imperialism and the Victorians," p. 625; James, *Raj*, p. 118; Singh, *A History of the Sikhs*, Vol. 2, p. 86; "Second Sikh War," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 470-471.
[57] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 127.

33. Lower Burma (1852/12)

Lower Burma (contemporary Myanmar) was acquired by the United Kingdom via conquest between January and 20 December 1852, over the course of the Second Anglo-Burmese War. Lower Burma was conquered by a British East India Company force of 6,000 under the command Commodore George Lambert and Lieutenant-General Henry Godwin. The war was sparked over festering disputes over British trade and commerce in the area, and the Burmese King seeming to violate the Treaty of Yandabo. Commodore Lambert, who had been dispatched by Lord Dalhousie, exceeded his orders to merely investigate, and sparked the war. The British acquired the province of Pegu, as well as other territories, with this conquest. Lower Burma would remain a United Kingdom territory until Burma's independence in 1948.[58]

Inadvertent: YES. Lambert initiated the war and Dalhousie annexed Lower Burma without authority from London.[59]

Risk: NO. Burma was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Burma would not be connected to the global telegraph network until 1877.[60]

34. Keeling (Cocos) Islands (1857/3)

The Keeling (Cocos) Islands (contemporary Australia) were acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation on 31 March 1857. The islands were annexed by Captain Stephen Fremantle of the HMS *Juno*. Fremantle's annexation was in error, as he misinterpreted his orders and annexed the wrong island group (he was supposed to annex the Coco Islands in the Bay of Bengal). A Scottish settler, John George Clunies-Ross, had inhabited the islands since 1827. The Keeling (Cocos) Islands would remain a United Kingdom territory until the independence of Australia in 1942.[61]

Inadvertent: YES. Captain Fremantle's annexation was accidental, so, by definition, inadvertent.[62]

---

[58] Moon, *The British Conquest and Dominion of India*, pp. 629-633; "Burma," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 214; "Burma Wars," in Holmes et al., eds., *The Oxford Companion to Military History*; "Second Burma War," in Raugh, *The Victorians at War*, pp. 69-70; "Anglo-Burmese Wars," in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; Gott, *Britain's Empire*, pp. 417-419; "Second Burmese War," Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 469.
[59] Oliver B. Pollak, "The Origins of the Second Anglo-Burmese War (1852-53)," *Modern Asian Studies*, Vol. 12, No. 3 (1978), pp. 500-501; "Burma," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 214; "Second Burma War," in Raugh, *The Victorians at War*, pp. 69-70; "Anglo-Burmese Wars," in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World.*
[60] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[61] Nicholas Tarling, "The Annexation of the Cocos-Keeling Islands," *Australian Historical Studies*, Vol. 8, No. 32 (1959), pp. 400-404; Margaret Ackrill, "British Imperialism in a Microcosm: The Annexation of the Cocos (Keeling) Islands," London School of Economics, Working Paper No. 18/94 (March 1994), pp. 16-22; "Cocos (Keeling) Islands," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, pp. 120-121; "Cocos (or Keeling) Islands," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 131.
[62] Tarling, "The Annexation of the Cocos-Keeling Islands," pp. 403-404; Ackrill, "British Imperialism in a Microcosm," p. 22.

Risk: NO. The Keeling (Cocos) Islands was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. The Keeling (Cocos) Islands were not connected to the global telegraph network until 1901.[63]

35. Andaman Islands (1858/1)

The Andaman Islands (contemporary India) were acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation on 22 January 1858. The Andamans were annexed by Captain H. Man. The total land area of the Andaman and Nicobar Islands (together) is roughly 6,500 km^2. There had been British penal colonies in the islands in the 18th century. Problems of piracy on and around the islands helped prompt the interest in annexation in 1858. A penal colony was reestablished on Andaman in 1858. The Andaman Islands would remain a United Kingdom territory until the independence of India in 1947.[64]

Inadvertent: NO. The exploration with a view to annexation was ordered by the Court of Directors in London in October 1856.[65]

Risk: NO. The Andaman Islands was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. South Asia was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1870.[66]

36. Kowloon (1860/10)

The Kowloon Peninsula (contemporary China) was acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation from China on 24 October 1860, in the aftermath of the Second Opium War (the "Arrow War"). Kowloon was annexed by the British High Commissioner to China, Lord Elgin, in signing the Convention of Peking on 24 October 1860. British and French forces had rented territory in Kowloon in March 1860 to station their troops and to train during the war. Kowloon would remain

---

[63] "History: Cocos Keeling Islands," Cocos Keeling Islands Visitor Centre, Australian Government (2019), https://www.cocoskeelingislands.com.au/history.

[64] L. P. Mathur, *Kala Pani: History of Andaman & Nicobar Islands, With a Study of India's Freedom Struggle* (Delhi: Eastern Book Corp., 1985), pp. 35-36; "Andaman and Nicobar Islands," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 42-43; "Andaman and Nicobar Islands," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, p. 74; Geoffrey Marston, "The British Acquisition of the Nicobar Islands, 1869: A Possible Example of Abandonment of Territorial Sovereignty," *British Yearbook of International Law*, Vol. 69, No. 1 (1998), pp. 251-252; Clare Anderson, "Colonization, Kidnap, and Confinement in the Andamans Penal Colony, 1771-1864," *Journal of Historical* Geography, Vol. 37, No. 1 (January 2011), pp. 71-72; "Andaman Islands" (pp. 30-31) and "Nicobar Islands" (p. 359), both in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*.

[65] "No. 84: Political Department, No. 37 of 1856, Our Governor-General of India in Council," in M. V. Portman, *A History of our Relations with the Andamanese, Compiled from Histories and Travels, and from the Records of the Government of India*, Vol. I (Calcutta: Office of the Superintendent of Government Printing, India, 1899), p. 205 (see also: pp. 188, 209).

[66] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 127.

a United Kingdom territory until it was ceded back, along with Hong Kong, to the People's Republic of China in 1997.[67]

Inadvertent: NO. Elgin was acting under orders of Foreign Secretary Lord John Russell.[68]

Risk: YES. China was a regional power.

Telegraph: NO. Kowloon was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1871.[69]

37. Sikkim (1861/3)

Sikkim (contemporary India) was acquired by the United Kingdom via conquest between 1 February and 28 March 1861, over the course of the Anglo-Sikkim War. Sikkim was conquered by 2,000 British forces under the command of Lieutenant-Colonel John Cox Gawler. Sikkimese forces didn't put up very stiff resistance. This invasion was, at least in part, to recover British prestige after a failed invasion led by Dr. Archibald Campbell in November of 1860. This conquest was made official by the Treaty of Tumlong, which made Sikkim a protectorate of the British Empire. Britain would formally annex Sikkim in 1888. Sikkim would remain a United Kingdom territory until the independence of India in 1947.[70]

Inadvertent: NO. The conquest of Sikkim was preauthorized in London.[71]

Risk: NO. Sikkim was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. India was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1870.[72]

38. Bahrain (1861/5)

Bahrain was acquired by the United Kingdom via conquest between 18 and 31 May 1861. Bahrain was conquered by a British East India Company force aboard the *Auckland* commanded by Commander James Felix Jones. The acquisition was formalized with the Anglo-Bahraini Treaty of Peace and Friendship on 31 May 1861, which made Bahrain and British protectorate. The conquest was motivated, at least in part, by concerns over Persia or the Ottoman Empire taking over the territory. The treaty was ratified in October 1861. The status of Britain's protectorate was

---

[67] Douglas Hurd, *The Arrow War: An Anglo-Chinese Confusion, 1856-1860* (London: Collins, 1967), pp. 204-206, 239; Jack Beeching, *The Chinese Opium Wars* (London: Hutchinson, 1975), pp. 281-282; "Second China War," in Raugh, *The Victorians at War*, pp. 100-101.
[68] Hurd, *The Arrow War*, p. 204; Endacott, *A History of Hong Kong*, pp. 109-110; Beeching, *The Chinese Opium Wars*, p. 329.
[69] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 136; Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[70] Amar Kaur Jasbir Singh, *Himalayan Triangle: A Historical Survey of British India's Relations with Tibet, Sikkim and Bhutan, 1765-1950* (London: British Library, 1988), pp. 191-197; "Sikkim," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, p. 242; Alex McKay, "'A Difficult Country, a Hostile Chief, and a Still More Hostile Minister': The Anglo-Sikkim War of 1861," *Bulletin of Tibetology*, Vol. 45, No. 2 (2009), pp. 35-43; "Sikkim," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 479-480.
[71] McKay, "'A Difficult Country'," p. 38.
[72] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 127.

strengthened by a further agreement in December of 1880. Bahrain would remain a territory of the United Kingdom until its independence in 1971.[73]

Inadvertent: NO. The conquest was pre-authorized in London by Secretary of State for India, Charles Wood.[74]

Risk: NO. Bahrain was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and did not have any alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Bahrain seems to have not been connected to the global telegraph network even in 1880, and perhaps not until 1901.[75]

39. Lagos (1861/8)

Lagos (contemporary Nigeria) was acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation on 6 August 1861. In 1861, the British took over Lagos Island, Iddo Island, Badagry, Palma, and Leckie, and formed a colony over all of them. The British had bombarded the coast of Lagos ten years earlier, in 1851. The annexation was apparently spurred by French interest in the region. Lagos would remain a territory of the United Kingdom until the independence of Nigeria in 1960.[76]

Inadvertent: NO. The annexation of Lagos was approved by Prime Minister Palmerston and Foreign Minister John Russell in early 1861.[77]

Risk: NO. Lagos was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Lagos was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1886.[78]

40. Southern Bhutan (1865/11)

Southern Bhutan was acquired by the United Kingdom via conquest between late November 1864 and 11 November 1865, over the course of the Duars War. Southern Bhutan was conquered by forces under the command of Brigadiers General Mulcaster and Dunsford and under the orders of

---

[73] J. B. Kelly, *Britain and the Persian Gulf, 1795-1880* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), pp. 525-528; Talal Toufic Farah, *Protection and Politics in Bahrain, 1869-1915* (Beirut: American University of Beirut, 1985), pp. 25-27; "Bahrein," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, pp. 84-85; "Bahrain," in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; "Bahrain," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 49.
[74] Kelly, *Britain and the Persian Gulf*, p. 525.
[75] Abdullah bin Khalid al-Khalifa and Michael Rice, eds., *Bahrain Through the Ages: The History* (London: Kegan Paul, 1991), p. 455; Khalil M. al Muraikhi, *Glimpses of Bahrain from its Past* (Bahrain: Ministry of Information, 1991), p. 206.
[76] Robert Smith, "The Lagos Consulate, 1851-1861: An Outline," *Journal of African History*, Vol. 15, No. 3 (1974), pp. 412-414; Hyam, *Britain's Imperial Century*, pp. 269-270; Anthony G. Hopkins, "Property Rights and Empire Building: Britain's Annexation of Lagos, 1861," *The Journal of Economic History*, Vol. 40, No. 4 (December 1980), pp. 779-780; "Lagos," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, pp. 167-168; "Lagos," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 282.
[77] Smith, "The Lagos Consulate," pp. 412-413; Hyam, *Britain's Imperial Century*, p. 269; Hopkins, "Property Rights and Empire Building," p. 780.
[78] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 137; Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

Viceroy of India John Lawrence. The war broke out after a British envoy, Ashley Eden, was forced by the Bhutanese to sign a treaty ceding territory to Bhutan. The war was brought to a close with the Treaty of Sinchula on 11 November 1865, which formally ceded Southern Bhutan to the United Kingdom. Bhutan as a whole would eventually become a British protectorate, in 1910. Bhutan would remain a United Kingdom territory until the independence of India in 1947.[79]

Inadvertent: NO. The conquest seems to have been pre-authorized by Secretary of State for India, Charles Wood, on 18 July 1864.[80]

Risk: NO. Bhutan was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. South Asia was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1870.[81]

41. Basutoland (1868/3)

Basutoland (contemporary Lesotho) was acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation on 12 March 1868. Basutoland was annexed at the request of the king, Moshoeshoe I, who was threatened by large numbers of Boer settlers in his territory. His appeal was directly to Queen Victoria. This made Basutoland a protectorate of the British Empire. On 11 August 1871, Basutoland was annexed by Cape Colony, becoming an autonomous territory of that colony. It became a crown colony in 1884. Basutoland would remain a United Kingdom territory until the independence of Lesotho in 1966.[82]

Inadvertent: NO. The government in London ordered the annexation.[83]

Risk: NO. Basutoland was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. South Africa was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1879.[84]

---

[79] Mridula Abrol, *British Relations with the Frontier States, 1863-1875* (New Dehil: S. Chand, 1974), pp. 90-105; Shantiswarup Gupta, *British Relations with Bhutan* (Jaipur: Panchsheel Prakashan, 1974), pp. 168-192; Peter Collister, *Bhutan and the British* (London: Serindia Publications, 1987), pp. 119-130; Singh, *Himalayan Triangle*, pp. 313-325; Moon, *The British Conquest and Dominion of India*, pp. 800-801; "Bhutan," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 136; "Bhutan," in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; "Bhutan," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 70.

[80] Gupta, *British Relations with Bhutan*, p. 168; Singh, *Himalayan Triangle*, pp. 318-319.

[81] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 127.

[82] "Basutoland," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 117-118; "Basutoland," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, p. 89; "Basutoland," in Hodge, ed., *Encyclopedia of the Age of Imperialism*, Vol. 1, p. 72; "Basutoland," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 61-62.

[83] "Basutoland," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 117-118; "Basutoland," in Hodge, ed., *Encyclopedia of the Age of Imperialism*, Vol. 1, p. 72; Brendon, *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire*, p. 167.

[84] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

42. Nicobar Islands (1869/3)

The Nicobar Islands (contemporary India) were acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation on 27 March 1869. The Nicobars were annexed by Commander Arthur Morrell of the HMS *Spiteful*. The total land area of the Andaman and Nicobar Islands (together) is roughly 6,500 km^2. There had been British penal colonies on the islands in the 18th century, and a penal colony was reestablished on Andaman in 1858. There had been problems of piracy on and around the islands, which helped prompt the interest in annexation in 1869. There was also some confusion about possible Dutch claims to the Nicobars, though these were worked out with the government of the Netherlands. The Nicobar Islands remained a United Kingdom territory until the independence of India in 1947.[85]

Inadvertent: NO. The annexation was authorized in London on 20 January 1869.[86]

Risk: NO. The Nicobar Islands was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. India was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1870.[87]

43. Griqualand West (1871/10)

Griqualand West (contemporary South Africa) was acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation on 27 October 1871. It was annexed at the request of Nicolas Waterboer, the Griqua chief, after diamonds had been discovered there and there was pressure from Cape Colony and the Boer republics. This made Griqualand West a protectorate of the British Empire. It was made a crown colony on 17 July 1873 (though not effective until 15 October 1880). Griqualand West would remain a United Kingdom territory until the independence of South Africa in 1910.[88]

Inadvertent: NO. The annexation was ordered by the cabinet of Prime Minister William Gladstone.[89]

Risk: NO. Griqualand West was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. South Africa was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1879.[90]

---

[85] "Andaman and Nicobar Islands," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 42-43; "Andaman and Nicobar Islands," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, p. 74; Marston, "The British Acquisition of the Nicobar Islands," pp. 252-262; "Andaman Islands" (pp. 30-31) and "Nicobar Islands" (p. 359), both in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*.
[86] Marston, "The British Acquisition of the Nicobar Islands," p. 260.
[87] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 127.
[88] "Griqualand West," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, pp. 145-146; "Griqualand West," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 218-219; "Griqualand," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 488-489.
[89] Bernard Porter, *The Lion's Share: A Short History of British Imperialism, 1850-1970* (New York: Longman, 1975), 100-101; Brendon, *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire*, p. 167.
[90] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

44. Western Peninsular Malaya (1874/4)

Western Peninsular Malaya (contemporary Malaysia) was acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation in between 20 January and 20 April 1874. The territory of Perak was annexed with a treaty (the Pangkor Treaty) between Rajah Muda Abdullah and Sir Andrew Clarke, governor of the Straits Settlement, on 20 January 1874. This made Perak a British protectorate. The territory of Selangor was annexed with a treaty between Sultan Abdul Samad and Clarke in February 1874, making it a British protectorate. The territory of Negeri Sembilan was annexed with a treaty between Dato' Kelano Sendeng and Clarke on 20 April 1874, making it a British Protectorate (though similar treaties would be signed with other leaders throughout Negeri Sembilan until 1889). On 1 July 1896, these states were incorporated (along with Pahang) into the Federated Malay States. These territories in Western Peninsular Malaya would remain a United Kingdom territory until the independence of Malaysia in 1963.[91]

Inadvertent: YES. Clarke made these annexations without authorization from London.[92]

Risk: NO. Western Peninsular Malaya was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: YES. Malaya was connected to the global telegraph network in 1871.[93]

45. Fiji (1874/9)

Fiji was acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation in September 1874. Fiji was annexed at the request of Australian settlers. The settlers had travelled there in the 1860s to establish cotton plantations, and numbered approximately 2,000 by 1870. A Fijian chieftain, Cakobau, had requested a British protectorate on the advice of a local settler (Consul Pritchard), but was denied. After much conflict over territory and labor, the Australian settlers requested the annexation of the territory to the British government. The annexation itself was negotiated by a government-appointed commissioner, Commodore James Goodenough. With this annexation, Fiji became a crown colony. Fiji would remain a United Kingdom territory until its independence in 1970.[94]

---

[91] W. David McIntyre, *The Imperial Frontier in the Tropics, 1865-75: A Study of British Colonial Policy in West Africa, Malaya and the South Pacific in the Age of Gladstone and Disraeli* (New York: St. Martin's, 1967), pp. 291-299; "Malaya," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, pp. 173-174; Stockwell, "British Expansion and Rule in South-East Asia," pp. 382-383; "British Malaya" (pp. 88-89), "Negeri Sembilan" (pp. 341-342), "Perak" (p. 405), and "Selangor" (pp. 471-472), all in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*.

[92] McIntyre, *The Imperial Frontier in the Tropics*, p. 291; Porter, *The Lion's Share*, p. 68; Hyam, *Britain's Imperial Century*, p. 149; James, *The Rise and Fall of the British Empire*, p. 247; Stockwell, "British Expansion and Rule in South-East Asia," p. 383.

[93] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 136; Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

[94] Ethel Drus, "The Colonial Office and the Annexation of Fiji," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Vol. 32 (1950), pp. 100-109; W. D. McIntyre, "Anglo-American Rivalry in the Pacific: The British Annexation of the Fiji Islands in 1874," *Pacific Historical Review*, Vol. 29, No. 4 (November 1960), pp. 369-371; Hyam, *Britain's Imperial Century*, pp. 339-340; "Fiji," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 431; "Fiji," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, pp. 131-132; Donald Denoon and Marivic Wyndham, "Australia and the Western Pacific," in Andrew Porter, ed., *The Oxford History of the British Empire*, Vol. III: *The Nineteenth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 556-558; "Fiji," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 184-185.

Inadvertent: YES. Commodore Goodenough had not been authorized by London to negotiate the annexation.[95]

Risk: NO. Fiji was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Fiji was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1902.[96]

46. Baluchistan (1876/7)

Baluchistan (contemporary Pakistan) was acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation on 13 July 1876. Baluchistan was annexed with a treaty agreed to between Colonel Robert Groves Sandeman and the Khan of Khalat, Mir Khododad, making Baluchistan a protectorate of the British Empire. In 1887, the territory was made a province of British India. Sandeman would be appointed Agent to the Governor General in Baluchistan. Baluchistan would remain a British territory until the independence of Pakistan in 1947.[97]

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. Sandeman seems to have been acting with the support and authorization of London.[98]

Risk: NO. Baluchistan was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: YES. India was connected to the global telegraph network in 1870.[99]

47. Transvaal (1877/4)

The Transvaal (contemporary South Africa) was acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation on 12 April 1877. The Boer republic was annexed after the discovery of diamond deposits and gold reserves in the area, and to try to restore political stability in the restive republic. Britain would give the Transvaal permission to once again be an independent republic on 16 December 1880, though it would remain a British protectorate. The United Kingdom would ultimately reannex the territory in 1900. The Transvaal would remain a United Kingdom territory until the independence of South Africa in 1910.[100]

---

[95] Drus, "The Colonial Office and the Annexation of Fiji," p. 105; McIntyre, "Anglo-American Rivalry in the Pacific," p. 370; McIntyre, *The Imperial Frontier in the Tropics*, pp. 317, 324, 327-333; Deryck Scarr, *Fragments of Empire: A History of the Western Pacific High Commission, 1877-1914* (Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1967), p. 21; Porter, *The Lion's Share*, p. 69; James, *The Rise and Fall of the British Empire*, p. 248.
[96] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[97] "Baluchistan," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 107-108; "Baluchistan," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, p. 85; Christian Tripodi, "'Good for one but not the other': The 'Sandeman System' of Pacification as Applied to Baluchistan and the North-West Frontier, 1877-1947," *The Journal of Military History*, Vol. 73, No. 3 (July 2009), pp. 776-778; "Baluchistan," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 53-54.
[98] Tripodi, "'Good for one but not the other'," p. 778.
[99] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 127.
[100] "Transvaal," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 1107-1108; "Transvaal," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, pp. 261-262; "The Transvaal," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 531.

Inadvertent: NO. Colonial Secretary Carnarvon and Prime Minister Disraeli ordered the annexation in January 1877.[101]

Risk: NO. The Transvaal was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. South Africa was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1879.[102]

48. Walvis Bay (1878/3)

Walvis Bay (contemporary Namibia) was acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation on 12 March 1878. Walvis Bay was annexed by Commodore Richard C. Dyer of the HMS *Industry*, making it a protectorate of the British Empire. This annexation was for commercial and strategic reasons. The acquisition was 1,124 square kms of territory in total. In 1884, the territory surrounding Walvis Bay became the German imperial territory of South West Africa. In 1885, this territory became part of Cape Colony. Walvis Bay would remain a United Kingdom territory until the independence of South Africa in 1910.[103]

Inadvertent: NO. The annexation of Walvis Bay was ordered by Colonial Secretary Carnarvon.[104]

Risk: NO. Walvis Bay was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. South West Africa wouldn't even have the telegraph in 1884.[105]

49. Xhosa Territory (1878/7)

The Xhosa territory of the Transkei (contemporary South Africa) were acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation in July 1878, in the aftermath of the Ninth Xhosa War. These territories were annexed by the High Commissioner for South Africa and Cape Colony Governor, Henry Bartle Frere. These territories were added to the Cape Colony. The Xhosa territories would remain a United Kingdom territory until the independence of South Africa in 1910.[106]

---

[101] Porter, *The Lion's Share*, pp. 101-102; Hyam, *Britain's Imperial Century*, p. 303; James, *The Rise and Fall of the British Empire*, p. 256; Thomas Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa: White Man's Conquest of the Dark Continent from 1876 to 1912* (New York: Perennial, 2003), pp. 40-42, 43 "The Transvaal," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 531.
[102] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[103] "Walvis Bay," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 1141; Lynn Berat, *Walvis Bay: Decolonization and International Law* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), pp. 30-37; "Walvis Bay," in John J. Grotpeter, *Historical Dictionary of Namibia* (Metuchen: The Scarecrow Press, 1994), pp. 561-562; "Walvis Bay," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, p. 275; "Walvis Bay," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 563-564.
[104] Berat, *Walvis Bay*, p. 36; "Walvis Bay," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 563-564.
[105] J. H. Esterhuyse, *South West Africa, 1880-1894: The Establishment of German Authority in South West Africa* (Cape Town: C. Struik, 1968), p. 52.
[106] John A. Benyon, *Proconsul and Paramountcy in South Africa: The High Commission, British Supremacy, and the Sub-Continent* (Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press, 1980), pp. 149-155; "Xhosa Wars," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 1175; "Transkeian Territories," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, p. 261; Pakenham, *The*

Inadvertent: LIKELY YES. Bartle Frere made the annexation decision without the approval of the Colonial Secretary, Hicks Beach.[107]

Risk: NO. The Xhosa were not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. South Africa was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1879.[108]

50. Afghanistan (1879/5)

The Kingdom of Afghanistan (contemporary Afghanistan and Pakistan) was acquired by the United Kingdom via conquest between 21 November 1878 and May 1879, over the course of the Second Anglo-Afghan War. Territories in Afghanistan were conquered by an Army of the British East India Company under the joint command of Lieutenant General Samuel Browne, Major General Frederick S. Roberts, and Lieutenant General Donald M. Stewart. They had a joint force of 35,500 personnel. Browne's force had occupied the Khyber Pass by December of 1878, and Robert's force occupied the Kurram Valley around the same time. The territories were officially ceded via the Treaty of Gandamak in May 1879. Along with the territories, Afghanistan became a British protectorate. The British pulled out of Kabul in 1880, after the murder of their resident, Louis Cavagnari, though Afghanistan remained a protectorate. Afghanistan would remain a British protectorate until its independence in 1919.[109]

Inadvertent: NO. Prime Minister Benjamin Disraeli and Foreign Minister Lord Salisbury ordered the establishment of a protectorate in August 1878.[110]

Risk: YES. Afghanistan was adjacent to Russian territory in Central Asia, a great power.

Telegraph: NO. Afghanistan was not yet connected to the global telegraph network in 1879.[111]

Scramble for Africa, pp. 50-51; "Cape Frontier Wars, Southern Africa," in Raugh, *The Victorians at War*, p. 80; John Benyon, "Sir (Henry) Bartle Edward Frere, first baronet" and J. P. C. Laband, "Frederic Augustus Thesiger, second Baron Chelmsford," both in David Cannadine, ed., *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), Available at: https://www.oxforddnb.com/.

[107] Clement Francis Goodfellow, *Great Britain and South African Confederation, 1870-1881* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), pp. 158-159.

[108] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

[109] Moon, *The British Conquest and Dominion of India*, pp. 844-856; "Anglo-Afghan Wars," in Holmes et al., eds., *The Oxford Companion to Military History*; "Second Afghan War," in Raugh, *The Victorians at War*, pp. 9-10; "Anglo-Afghan Wars," in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; "Second Afghan War," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 467-468.

[110] Moon, *The British Conquest and Dominion of India*, pp. 846-847; "Second Afghan War," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 467-468; Brendon, *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire*, p. 239.

[111] "Treaty of Gandomark (1879)," in Adamec, *Historical Dictionary of Afghanistan*, p. 216.

51. Zulu Kingdom (1879/9)

The Zulu Kingdom (contemporary South Africa) was acquired by the United Kingdom via conquest between 11 January and 1 September 1879, over the course of the Zulu War. The kingdom was conquered by 16,800 British forces under the command of Lieutenant General Frederick A. Thesiger (later Lord Chelmsford). The war was sparked when the High Commissioner for South Africa, Sir Bartle Frere, unilaterally issued an ultimatum demanding the Zulus disband their army and the militant structure of their society. Frere deliberately and knowingly orchestrated this conflict, in order destroy Zulu military capabilities. He was acting against the colonial secretary's (Lord Carnarvon) strict instructions. This was a difficult fight for the British, with transport and supply problems bogging down the British advance early on. Chelmsford was replaced by Major General Garnet Joseph Wolseley, who arrived for the very end of the conflict. Britain thereafter divided the Zulu Kingdom into thirteen separate chiefdoms, installing a British resident in each, and thereby effectively establishing a protectorate. Britain would fully annex Zululand as a crown colony on 12 June 1887.[112]

Inadvertent: YES. Sir Bartle Frere sparked the Zulu War and eventual annexation without orders from London.[113]

Risk: NO. The Zulu Kingdom was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. South Africa was not connected to the global telegraph network until late October 1879.[114]

52. Egypt (1882/9)

Egypt was acquired by the United Kingdom via conquest between 11 July and 14 September 1882. Egypt was conquered by a British force of approximately 30,000 personnel under the command of Major-General Garnet Joseph Wolsely. The British invasion was a response to the Urabi Revolt, in which Egyptian army officers (led by Ahmad Urabi) combined with a civil society movement (the Misr al-Fatah society) to demand an end to foreign influence in their country. The decisive engagement of this conquest was the Battle of Tel-el-Kebir on 13 September 1882. With this conquest, Egypt was made a de facto British protectorate. Its protectorate status was made official

---

[112] "Zulu Wars" and "Zululand," both in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 1184-1186; "Zululand," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, p. 282; Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa*, pp. 47-59, 62-71, 87-88 "Zulu War," in Holmes et al., eds., *The Oxford Companion to Military History*; "Zulu War," in Raugh, *The Victorians at War*, pp. 351-354; Brendon, *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire*, pp. 187-190; "Zulu War," in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; "Zulu War," in Robert Crowcroft and John Cannon, eds., *The Oxford Companion to British History*, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015), Available at: https://www.oxfordreference.com/; "Zululand" and "Zulu War," both in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 581-584.

[113] G. N. Sanderson, "The European Partition of Africa: Coincidence or Conjuncture," *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, Vol. 3, No. 1 (1974), p. 27; Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa*, p. 58; "Zulu War," in Holmes et al., eds., *The Oxford Companion to Military History*; Brendon, *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire*, p. 187; "Zulu War," Crowcroft and Cannon, eds., *The Oxford Companion to British History*; "Zululand" and "Zulu War," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 581-584.

[114] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

on 18 December 1914. Egypt would remain a United Kingdom territory until its independence in 1922.[115]

Inadvertent: NO. Prime Minister Gladstone planned and ordered the invasion with his cabinet.[116]

Risk: YES. Egypt was a regional power.

Telegraph: YES. Egypt was connected to the global telegraph network in 1858-1859.[117]

53. Papua (1884/11)

Papua (contemporary Papua New Guinea) was acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation between 4 April 1883 and 6 November 1884. It was initially annexed by Henry M. Chester on the orders of Thomas McIlwraith, the governor of Queensland, on 4 April 1883. McIlwraith cabled London asking for permission to annex the territory in February and March of 1883, but didn't wait for a reply before taking action. The Secretary of State for the Colonies, Edward Henry Stanley (earl of Derby), initially refused the territory, on the grounds that a colonial governor had no authority to annex territory. His mind changed when it was agreed that Queensland would administer and pay for the territory. Fear of potential German involvement with the territory also pressured the British change. It was initially a protectorate, but was annexed as a crown colony on 4 September 1888, when it was named British New Guinea. Papua would remain a United Kingdom territory until its independence in 1975.[118]

Inadvertent: YES. Thomas McIlwraith ordered the annexation without authorization from London.[119]

Risk: NO. Papua was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

---

[115] Afaf Lutfi Al-Sayyid-Marsot, "The British Occupation of Egypt from 1882," in Andrew Porter, ed., *The Oxford History of the British Empire*, Vol. III: *The Nineteenth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 652-654; "Egyptian and Sudanese Campaigns," in Holmes et al., eds., *The Oxford Companion to Military History*; "Arabi Rebellion," in Raugh, *The Victorians at War*, pp. 18-21; "Egypt," in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; "Egypt," in John L. Esposito, ed., *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Islamic World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), Available at: https://www.oxfordreference.com/; "Egypt," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 169-170; "British Occupation of Egypt," in Davis, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Invasions and Conquests*.

[116] Porter, *The Lion's Share*, pp. 98; James, *The Rise and Fall of the British Empire*, p. 272; Al-Sayyid-Marsot, "The British Occupation of Egypt," p. 654; Ronald Hyam, "The Primacy of Geopolitics: The Dynamics of British Imperial Policy, 1763-1963," *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, Vol. 27, No. 2 (1999), p. 253; "Arabi Rebellion," in Raugh, *The Victorians at War*, p. 20.

[117] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, pp. 124-125; Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

[118] C. R. Moore, "Queensland's Annexation of New Guinea in 1883," *Journal of the Royal Historical Society of Queensland*, Vol. 12, No. 1 (1984), pp. 39-45; "Papua New Guinea," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 863; "Papua," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, p. 213; Denoon and Wyndham, "Australia and the Western Pacific," pp. 557, 559; "Papua New Guinea," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 393-394.

[119] John M. Ward, *British Policy in the South Pacific (1786-1893): A Study of British Policy in the South Pacific Islands Prior to the Establishment of Governments by the Great Powers* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1976), p. 317; Moore, "Queensland's Annexation of New Guinea," pp. 27, 39; Denoon and Wyndham, "Australia and the Western Pacific," p. 559; "Papua New Guinea," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 393-394.

Telegraph: NO. The closest telegraph station at the time of acquisition was in Cooktown, Australia.[120]

54. Bechuanaland (1885/9)

Bechuanaland (contemporary Botswana) was acquired by the United Kingdom via conquest between 23 March and 30 September 1885. In March 1885, the United Kingdom declared a protectorate over the territory. Out of concern of a potential Boer-German alliance, parliament authorized a 4,000 strong army under the command of Charles Warren to take a number of adjacent territories (including Goshen and Stellaland) in early 1885. The territory was split in two on 30 September of 1885, with the north being ruled as a protectorate and the south as a crown colony. Bechuanaland would remain a United Kingdom territory until the independence of Botswana in 1966.[121]

Inadvertent: NO. The initial protectorate was declared and the Warren mission dispatched by Prime Minister Gladstone.[122]

Risk: NO. Bechuanaland was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Botswana was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1890.[123]

55. Upper Burma (1885/11)

Upper Burma (contemporary Myanmar) was acquired by the United Kingdom via conquest between 15 and 28 November 1885, over the course of the Third Anglo-Burmese War. Upper Burma was conquered by a British force of approximately 9,000 under the command of Major General Harry Pendergrast. The war broke out when Upper Burma fined British traders for the illegal export of teak, leading the East India Company to issue an ultimatum that would have made Upper Burma a protectorate. Resistance to the British conquest was mild. Upper Burma was formally annexed and added to British Burma on 1 January 1886, and became a province of British India on 26 February 1886. This ended the Burmese monarchy. Upper Burma proved a difficult territory to administer, with fierce resistance leading to a brutal pacification campaign lasting until 1890. Upper Burma would remain a United Kingdom territory until Burma's independence in 1948.[124]

---

120 James Sinclair, *Uniting a Nation: The Postal and Telecommunication Services of Papua New Guinea* (Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1984), pp. 3-4.

121 "Bechuanaland," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 120-121; "Bechuanaland," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, pp. 90-91; "Bechuanaland," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 64.

122 James, *The Rise and Fall of the British Empire*, p. 260; Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa*, pp. 217, 379; Brendon, *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire*, p. 192.

123 "British South Africa Company (BSACO)," in Fred Morton, Jeff Ramsay, and Part Themba Mgadla, *Historical Dictionary of Botswana*, 4th ed. (Lanham: The Scarecrow Press, 2008), p. 63.

124 Ernest C. T. Chew, "The Fall of the Burmese Kingdom in 1885: Review and Reconsideration," *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, Vol. 10, No. 2 (September 1979), pp. 373-374; Moon, *The British Conquest and Dominion of India*, pp. 882-884; "Burma," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 215-216; "Burma," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, p. 107; Stockwell, "British Expansion and Rule in South-East Asia," pp. 389-390; "Burma Wars," in Holmes et al., eds., *The Oxford Companion to Military History*; "Third Burma War," in Raugh, *The Victorians at War*, pp. 70-71; "Anglo-Burmese Wars," in Stearns, eds., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; "Third Burmese War," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 521-522.

Inadvertent: NO. The conquest received authorization in London.[125]

Risk: NO. Burma was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: YES. Burma was connected to the global telegraph network in 1877.[126]

56. Somaliland (1887/7)

Somaliland (contemporary Somalia) was acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation between mid-1884 and 20 July 1887, when Somaliland was declared a British protectorate and became known as British Somaliland. Between 1884 and 1886, Britain concluded treaties with a number of Somali chiefs and occupied the port of Zeila, Berbera, and Bulhar. The government of India administered the territory. Somaliland remained a United Kingdom territory until its independence in 1960.[127]

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. Prime Minister Gladstone and the Foreign Office authorized the annexation beforehand.[128]

Risk: NO. Somaliland was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: LIKELY YES. Somalia seems to have been connected to the global telegraph network around 1875.[129]

57. New Hebrides (1887/11)

New Hebrides (contemporary Vanuatu) was jointly acquired by the United Kingdom and France via annexation on 16 November 1887. Vanuatu was annexed through the Anglo-French Naval Commission, intended to protect British and French subjects. This effectively made Vanuatu a joint protectorate of the two great powers. The territory was settled by British traders (1840s), missionaries (1850s) and planters (1860s), and by French merchants (1880s). The territory became a formal condominium in 1906. New Hebrides would remain a joint France-United Kingdom territory until the independence of Vanuatu in 1980.[130]

---

[125] Chew, "The Fall of the Burmese Kingdom," p. 373; Stockwell, "British Expansion and Rule in South-East Asia," p. 390; Brendon, *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire*, p. 242.
[126] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[127] "British Somaliland," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 195-196; Abdi Ismail Samatar, *The State and Rural Transformation in Northern Somalia, 1884-1986* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989), pp. 30-31; "British Somaliland," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, p. 105; I. M. Lewis, *A Modern History of the Somali: Nation and State in the Horn of Africa*, 4th ed. (Oxford: James Currey, 2002), pp. 45-49; "British Somaliland," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 92.
[128] Samatar, *The State and Rural Transformation in Northern Somalia*, p. 30.
[129] "Egypt," in Mohamed Haji Mukhtar, *Historical Dictionary of Somalia*, New ed. (Lanham: Scarecrow Press, 2003), p. 111.
[130] Scarr, *Fragments of Empire*, pp. 206-208; D.P. O'Connell, "The Condominium of the New Hebrides," *The British Yearbook of International Law*, No. 43 (1968-1969), pp. 72-75; "Anglo-French Condominium of New Herbides," in Olson

Inadvertent: NO. The British Colonial Office and Prime Minister were involved in the annexation plans.[131]

Risk: NO. New Hebrides was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers. And France cooperated with the United Kingdom in this acquisition.

Telegraph: NO. There were no telegraph stations in the South Pacific until 1902.[132]

58. Maldives (1887/12)

The Maldives were acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation on 12 December 1887. The prospect of a French base being established on the islands helped prompt the British move. A domestic dispute led to turmoil on the islands, which also encouraged the sultan, Mohamed Mueenuddin II, to agree to British protection. This made the Maldives a protectorate of the British Empire, though the sultan was left to govern the territory domestically in accordance with Islamic law. The Maldives would remain a United Kingdom territory until its independence in 1965.[133]

Inadvertent: UNKNOWN.

Risk: NO. The Maldives was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: UNKNOWN.

59. Sarawak (1888/3)

Sarawak (contemporary Malaysia) was acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation on 17 March 1888, making it a protectorate of the British Empire. This move was apparently prompted by concern over other colonial powers stepping in and annexing the territory themselves. A protectorate over Sarawak had been considered briefly in 1860. Sarawak had been ruled by a series of "white Rajas" of the British Brooke family since September of 1841. Sarawak would remain a United Kingdom territory until the independence of Malaysia in 1963.[134]

---

and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 804-806; "New Hebrides," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, p. 191; "New Herbides," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 348-349.

[131] Robert H. McIlroy, *The New Hebrides and the Emergence of a Condominium* (New York, 1951), pp. 63-65; Scarr, *Fragments of Empire*, p. 207.

[132] Jeffrey K. Lyons, "The Pacific Cable, Hawai'i, and Global Communication," *The Hawaiian Journal of History*, Vol. 39 (2005), p. 42.

[133] "Maldives," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 713; "Maldive Islands," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, p. 174; "Maldive Islands," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 311-312.

[134] "Sarawak," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 982-983; "Sarawak," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, p. 236; "Sarawak," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 463-464.

Inadvertent: NO. The British Foreign Office and Colonial Office ordered the annexation.[135]

Risk: NO. Sarawak was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: YES. Malaya was connected to the global telegraph network in 1871.[136]

60. North Borneo (1888/5)

North Borneo (contemporary Malaysia) was acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation on 12 May 1888. The British North Borneo Company received concessions from the rulers of Borneo in 1878. In 1881, the U.K. government had granted a charter to brothers Alfred and Edward Dent of the Company. The Company received international recognition with the Madrid Protocol of 1885, between Britain, Germany, and Spain. North Borneo became a British protectorate. North Borneo would remain a United Kingdom territory until the independence of Malaysia in 1963.[137]

Inadvertent: YES. The British North Borneo Company acquired the territory without permission from the government in London.[138]

Risk: NO. Borneo was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: YES. Malaya was connected to the global telegraph network in 1871.[139]

61. Pahang (1888/8)

Pahang (contemporary Malaysia) was acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation on 24 August 1888, making it a protectorate of the British Empire. The murders of British citizens in Pahang in January and February 1888 led Straits Settlements Governor, Cecil Clementi Smith, to pressure the sultan, Ahmad Muadzam Shah, to accept British protectorate status. The agreement was mediated by the Sultan of Johore. Pahang was rumored to be rich in natural resources, increasing interest in the territory. On 1 July 1896 Pahang was incorporated into the Federated Malay States. Pahang would remain a United Kingdom territory until the independence of Malaysia in 1963.[140]

---

[135] Steven Runciman, *The White Rajahs: A History of Sarawak from 1841 to 1946* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960), p. 191; Joan Rawlins, *Sarawak: 1839 to 1963* (London: Macmillan, 1965), pp. 118-119.
[136] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 136; Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[137] "British North Borneo," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 191-192; "British North Borneo," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, p. 104; "British North Borneo," in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; "British North Borneo," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 89-90.
[138] L. R. Wright, *The Origins of British Borneo* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970), p. 142-144; Tarling, *Britain, the Brookes, and Brunei*, pp. 237-239; Ranjit Singh, *Brunei, 1839-1983: The Problems of Political Survival* (Singapore: Oxford University Press, 1984), pp. 67-69; Graham Saunders, *A History of Brunei* (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1994), pp. 87-88.
[139] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 136; Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[140] Eunice Thio, "The Extension of British Control to Pahang," *Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Vol. 30, No. 1 (177) (1957), pp. 70-73; J. de Silva, "British Relations with Pahang, 1884-1895," *Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Vol. 35, No. 1, Vol. 197 (1962), pp. 14-18; W. Linehan, *A History of Pahang* (Kuala Lumpur:

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. The Colonial Office ordered the annexation.[141]

Risk: NO. Pahang was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: YES. Malaya was connected to the global telegraph network in 1871.[142]

62. Brunei (1888/9)

Brunei was acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation on 17 September 1888, making it a protectorate of the British Empire. The annexation was formalized by treaty between the Straits Settlements Governor Frederick Weld and the sultan, Hashim Jalilul Alam Aqamaddin. In the run-up to the annexation, Brunei was at risk of being partitioned between Sarawak and North Borneo, leading the sultan to appeal directly to Queen Victoria in 1887. The United Kingdom government was also concerned about intervention by Germany or France. A resident was officially sent to Brunei in 1906. Brunei would remain a United Kingdom territory until its independence in 1984.[143]

Inadvertent: NO. The annexation was authorized in London.[144]

Risk: NO. Brunei was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: YES. Malaya was connected to the global telegraph network in 1871.[145]

63. Cook Islands (1888/9)

The Cook Islands were acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation on 27 September 1888, making them a protectorate of the British Empire. The islands were annexed by the acting Vice-Consul in Rarotonga, Richard Exham. This move was apparently motivated by threats of French imperialism in the area, as well as a direct petition from a local chief. New Zealand had also pressed the British for annexation of these islands. British missionaries had been on the islands since 1821. The islands were fully annexed as a colony, dependent on New Zealand, on 8 October 1900. The Cook Islands would remain a United Kingdom territory until their independence in 1965.[146]

Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1973), pp. 120-126; Aruna Gopinath, *Pahang 1880-1933: A Political History* (Kuala Lumpur: Council of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1991), pp. 92-94; "Pahang," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 390-391.

[141] Thio, "The Extension of British Control to Pahang," pp. 71-72.

[142] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 136; Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

[143] Singh, *Brunei*, pp. 67-73; "Brunei," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 205-206; Saunders, *A History of Brunei*, pp. 91-92; "Introduction" (pp. 13-14) and "Treaty of Protection, 1888" (p. 119), both in D. S. Ranjit Singh and Jatswan S. Sidhu, *Historical Dictionary of Brunei Darussalam* (Lanham: The Scarecrow Press, 1997); "Brunei," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 98-99.

[144] Tarling, *Britain, the Brookes, and Brunei*, pp. 384-387; Singh, *Brunei*, p. 72; Saunders, *A History of Brunei*, p. 92.

[145] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 136; Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

[146] R. P. Gilson, "Negotiations Leading to British Intervention in Rarotonga (Cook Islands)," *Historical Studies: Australia and New Zealand*, Vol. 7, No. 25 (1955), pp. 65-66; "Cook Islands," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the*

Inadvertent: NO. The Colonial Office authorized the annexation beforehand.[147]

Risk: NO. The Cook Islands was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. There were no telegraph stations in the South Pacific until 1902.[148]

64. Rhodesia (1890/9)

Rhodesia (contemporary Zimbabwe and Zambia) was acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation and conquest between February 1888 and 13 September 1890. Rhodesia was annexed and conquered by the British South African Company (BSAC) under the leadership of Cecil Rhodes. Matabeleland came under British control in February 1888. In October 1888, the British named the whole area Zambesia. In 1889, the BSAC was officially given a royal charter. The British flag was raised over Mashonaland on 13 September 1890, establishing a British protectorate over the core of what would become British Rhodesia. On 23 January 1894, additional Matabele territories were added to Mashonaland protectorate, after a war between the Matabele and BSAC forces. In May 1895, North and South Zambesia merged to form Rhodesia Protectorate. In 1900, the large protectorate was split into three colonies—North Western Rhodesia, Northern Rhodesia, and Southern Rhodesia. Rhodesia would remain a United Kingdom territory until the independence of Zambia in 1964 and of Zimbabwe in 1980.[149]

Inadvertent: YES. Rhodes' initial acquisitions in Rhodesia, and many subsequent acquisitions, were taken without authorization from London.[150]

Risk: NO. Rhodesia was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Rhodesia was only connected to the global telegraph network in June 1889, after the British South Africa Company began to acquire territory there.[151]

British Empire, p. 331; "Cook Islands," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, p. 122; "Cook Islands," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 144-145.

147 Gilson, "Negotiations Leading to British Intervention in Rarotonga," p. 66; Richard Gilson, *The Cook Islands, 1820-1950*, Edited by Ron Crocombe (Wellington: Victorian University Press, 1980), pp. 59-60; Grant R. Simpson, "Wallerstein's World-Systems Theory and the Cook Islands: A Critical Examination," *Pacific Studies*, Vol. 14, No. 1 (November 1990), p. 78.

148 Lyons, "The Pacific Cable," p. 42.

149 Robert A. Huttenback, *The British Imperial Experience* (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), pp. 104-109; "Matabele War of 1893," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 731; "Rhodesia," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, pp. 225-226; Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa*, pp. 380-392, 490-495; "British South African Company" (pp. 93-94), "Matabele Wars" (pp. 320-321), and Cecil John Rhodes" (pp. 436-437), all in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*.

150 Huttenback, *The British Imperial Experience*, pp. 105-106; H. L. Wesseling, *Divide and Rule: The Partition of Africa, 1880-1914*, Translated by Arnold J. Pomerans (Westport: Praeger, 1996), pp. 294-295; Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa*, pp. 381, 382, 385, 386, 493; Brendon, *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire*, p. 195; Muriel Evelyn Chamberlain, *The Scramble for Africa*, 3rd ed. (New York: Longman, 2010), p. 76.

151 "Telegraphs," in Steven C. Rubert and R. Kent Rasmussen, *Historical Dictionary of Zimbabwe*, 3rd ed. (Lanham: The Scarecrow Press, 2001), p. 322.

65. Zanzibar (1890/11)

Zanzibar was acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation on 4 November 1890. Zanzibar was annexed as part of the Heligoland-Zanzibar Treaty with Germany, making it a protectorate of the British Empire. Since 1862, Zanzibar had been within Britain's sphere of influence. There was some resistance to the annexation, which lasted until 1896. Zanzibar would remain a United Kingdom territory until its independence in 1963.[152]

Inadvertent: NO. British Prime Minister Lord Salisbury approved the annexation in May 1889.[153]

Risk: NO. The territory was acquired via treaty with Germany.

Telegraph: YES. Zanzibar was connected to the global telegraph network in 1879.[154]

66. Nyasaland (1891/2)

Nyasaland (contemporary Malawi) was acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation between 21 September 1889 and 1 February 1891, making it a protectorate of the British Empire. British missionaries had begun to settle the area in 1861, following David Livingstone's visit in 1859. Acting British consul John Buchanan declared the shire highlands area a British protectorate on 21 September 1889. Cecil Rhodes had personally funded the expenses for annexation treaty-making with local chiefs. The Protectorate was extended to include all of Nyasaland in February 1891. The area became known as the British Central African Protectorate on 22 February 1893. Nyasaland would remain a United Kingdom territory until the independence of Malawi in 1964.[155]

Inadvertent: NO. Prime Minister Lord Salisbury planned and ordered the annexation in May 1889.[156]

Risk: NO. Nyasaland was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Nyasaland was connected to the global telegraph network in late 1895.[157]

---

[152] "Zanzibar," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 1182; "Zanzibar," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, p. 281; "Heligoland-Zanzibar Treaty," in Hodge, ed., *Encyclopedia of the Age of Imperialism*, Vol. 1, p. 317; "Heligoland-Zanzibar Treaty" (pp. 227-228) and "Zanzibar" (pp. 577-578), both in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*.

[153] Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa*, p. 356; Brendon, *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire*, p. 203.

[154] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 137; Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

[155] "Nyasaland," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 831-832; "Nyasaland," in Stewart, ed., *The British Empire*, p. 209; Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa*, pp. 354-356; "Nyasaland," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 378-379.

[156] Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa*, p. 355; Brendon, *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire*, pp. 200-201.

[157] C. D. Twynam, "The Telegraph in British Central Africa," *The Nyasaland Journal*, Vol. 6, No. 2 (July 1953), p. 53.

67. Trucial States (1892/3)

The Trucial States (contemporary United Arab Emirates) were acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation between 6 and 9 March 1892, making these territories a protectorate of the British Empire. Britain's interest was primarily in the protection of sea lanes leading to and from India, and to forestall the influence of France, Russia, and the Ottoman Empire. The Trucial States would remain a United Kingdom territory until the independence of the United Arab Emirates in 1968.[158]

Inadvertent: UNKNOWN. The Government of India preauthorized the treaty, but it isn't clear what role London played.[159]

Risk: NO. The Trucial States were not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: YES. The Trucial States were connected to the global telegraph network as early as 1864.[160]

68. Gilbert and Ellice Islands (1892/9)

The Gilbert and Ellice Islands (contemporary Kiribati and Tuvalu) were acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation between 27 May (Gilbert) and 10 September (Ellice) 1892. The islands were annexed by Captain E.H.M. Davis of the HMS *Royalist* (Gilbert) and Captain H.W.S. Gibson of the HMS *Curaçao* (Ellice), making them a protectorate of the British Empire. An 1886 agreement with Germany had put these islands within the United Kingdom's sphere of interest. Germany had urged the British to declare a protectorate in July of 1891, but the Colonial Office was not then interested. The prospect of Germany's own annexation of the islands eventually drove the annexation decision. British explorers first sighted the islands in the 18th century. Missionaries were the first Westerners to stay long on the islands, where they found many converts. The Gilbert and Ellice Islands remained United Kingdom territories until the independence of Tuvalu in 1978 and of Kiribati in 1979.[161]

Inadvertent: NO. The annexation was ordered by the Colonial Office in January 1892.[162]

---

158 Kelly, *Britain and the Persian Gulf*, pp. 834-836; Donald Hawley, *The Trucial States* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1970), pp. 137-139; Muhammad Morsy Abdullah, *The United Arab Emirates: A Modern History* (London: Croom Helm, 1978), pp. 23-26; Frauke Heard-Bey, *From Trucial States to United Arab Emirates: A Society in Transition* (London: Longman, 1982), pp. 293-294; Abdullah Omran Taryam, *The Establishment of the United Arab Emirates, 1950-85* (London: Croom Helm, 1987), pp. 9-10; "Trucial States," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, p. 264; "Trucial States," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 534; Michael Quentin Morton, *Keepers of the Golden Shore: A History of the United Arab Emirates* (London: Reaktion Books, 2016), p. 68.

159 John G. Lorimer, *Gazetteer of the Persian Gulf, Oman, and Central* Arabia, Vol. I: Historical, Pt. I (Calcutta: Superintendent Government Printing, 1915), pp. 738-739; Abdullah, *The United Arab Emirates*, p. 25.

160 Hawley, *The Trucial States*, p. 137.

161 Scarr, *Fragments of Empire*, pp. 253-254, 257; Barrie Macdonald, *Cinderellas of the Empire: Towards a History of Kiribati and Tuvalu* (Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1982), pp. 66-70; "Gilbert and Ellice Islands Colony," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 466-467; "Gilbert and Ellice Islands," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, p. 138; "Gilbert and Ellice Islands," Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 204-205.

162 Scarr, *Fragments of Empire*, pp. 253-254; Macdonald, *Cinderellas of the Empire*, pp. 67-68, 70.

Risk: NO. The Gilbert and Ellice Islands were not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. There were no telegraph stations in the South Pacific until 1902.[163]

69. Southern Solomon Islands (1893/3)

The Southern Solomon Islands were acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation on 15 March 1893, making them a protectorate of the British Empire. The southern islands include Malaita, Morovo, Guadalcanal, and San Cristoval, and their surrounding islets. The British declared the protectorate in an effort to impose peace between locals and recruiters (known as "blackbirders") looking for labor. There was also concern over potential annexation by the French. The Northern Solomon Islands would be acquired by the United Kingdom through a treaty with Germany in 1899. The Solomons would remain a United Kingdom territory until their independence in 1978.[164]

Inadvertent: NO. The Colonial Secretary ordered the annexation in December 1892.[165]

Risk: NO. The Solomon Islands were not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. There were no telegraph stations in the South Pacific until 1902.[166]

70. Uganda (1893/4)

Uganda was acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation on 1 April 1893. Uganda was annexed by Captain Frederick Lugard of the Imperial British East Africa Company. An Anglo-German agreement (Heligoland-Zanzibar) on 1 July 1890 had put Uganda into Britain's sphere of influence. Problems of trade, disease, and conflict cropped up in the territory, leading Lugard to travel to London to persuade Prime Minister William Gladstone to declare a protectorate. When Gladstone demurred, Lugard joined antislavery and missionary groups to put pressure on the government. On 1 April 1893 it was declared a provisional protectorate of the British Empire, and it would become a full protectorate on 11 April 1894, taking the name Uganda. The kingdom of Bunyoro was added to it on 30 June 1896, along with Ankole, Busoga, and Toro. Uganda would remain a United Kingdom territory until its independence in 1962.[167]

---

[163] Lyons, "The Pacific Cable," p. 42.
[164] W. P. Morrell, *Britain in the Pacific Islands* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960), pp. 343-346; Scarr, *Fragments of Empire*, pp. 254-255; Judith A. Bennett, *Wealth of the Solomons: A History of a Pacific Archipelago* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1987), pp. 104-106; "British Solomon Islands Protectorate," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 193-194; "Solomon Islands," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, p. 243; "British Solomon Islands," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 91.
[165] Morrell, *Britain in the Pacific Islands*, p. 344; Scarr, *Fragments of Empire*, pp. 254-255.
[166] Lyons, "The Pacific Cable," p. 42.
[167] "Uganda," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 1115; "Uganda," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, pp. 265-266; Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa*, pp. 413-433; "Uganda," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 537-538.

Inadvertent: NO. The British government ordered the annexation.[168]

Risk: NO. Uganda was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Uganda was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1900.[169]

71. Pondoland (1894/3)

Pondoland (contemporary South Africa) was acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation on 17 March 1894, making it part of Cape Colony. Pondoland was annexed by Cape Colony Prime Minister Cecil Rhodes. A protectorate had been established over some coastal territories in Pondoland in January 1885. The annexation was effective 25 September 1894. Pondoland would remain a United Kingdom territory until the independence of South Africa in 1910.[170]

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. Rhodes seems to have gotten authorization from London.[171]

Risk: NO. The Xhosa were not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: YES. South Africa was connected to the global telegraph network in late October 1879.[172]

72. Bunyoro Kingdom (1894/4)

The Bunyoro Kingdom (contemporary Uganda) was acquired by the United Kingdom via conquest between November 1893 and April 1894. It was conquered, along with Ankole, Busoga, and Toro, by a force of 15,000 under the command of Lieutenant-Colonel Henry Edward Colvile, adding it to the protectorate of Uganda. These additions to the existing protectorate created the basis for the modern state of Uganda. Colvile was awarded the Brilliant Star of Zanzibar, second class, for this acquisition. The conquest was approved by the Foreign Office in London in 1896. The Bunyoro Kingdom would remain a United Kingdom territory until the independence of Uganda in 1962.[173]

---

168 P. L. McDermott, *British East Africa, or IBEA: A History of the Formation and Work of the Imperial British East Africa Company* (London: Chapman & Hall, 1893), pp. 115-116; Edward Reginald Vere-Hodge, *Imperial British East Africa Company* (London: Macmillan, 1960), pp. 45-46.
169 "Chronology," in M. Louise Pirouet, *Historical Dictionary of Uganda* (Metuchen: The Scarecrow Press, 1995), p. xviii.
170 Sarah Gertrude Millin, *Rhodes* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1933), pp. 72, 228-231; William Beinart, *The Political Economy of Pondoland, 1860-1930* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), p. 35; Brian Roberts, *Cecil Rhodes: Flawed Colossus* (London: Hamilton, 1987), pp. 190-192; Robert I. Rotberg and Miles F. Shore, *The Founder: Cecil Rhodes and the Pursuit of Power* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), pp. 460-464; "Xhosa Wars," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 1175; "Pondoland," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, p. 217.
171 J. G. McDonald, *Rhodes: A Life* (London: P. Allen & Co., 1928), p. 66.
172 Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
173 Kenneth Ingham, *The Making of Modern Uganda* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1958), pp. 58-63; Edward I. Steinhart, *Conflict and Collaboration: The Kingdoms of Western Uganda, 1890-1907* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977), pp. 62-70; "Uganda," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 1115; "Uganda," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, pp. 265-266; Shane Doyle, *Crisis & Decline in Bunyoro: Population and Environment in Western Uganda, 1860-1955* (London: The British Institute in Eastern Africa, 2006), pp. 80-82; H. M. Vibart and M. G. M. Jones, "Sir Henry Edward

Inadvertent: NO. Colvile had instructions from Foreign Minister Rosebery allowing him to establish a protectorate in the area.[174]

Risk: NO. The Bunyoro Kingdom was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Uganda was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1900.[175]

73. Ashanti Kingdom (1896/1)

The Ashanti Kingdom (contemporary Ghana) was acquired by the United Kingdom via conquest between December 1895 and 17 January 1896, over the course of the Third Anglo-Ashanti War. The kingdom was conquered by the Ashanti Expeditionary Force of approximately 2,600 under the command of Colonel Francis Scott. Prior to the outbreak of the war, the Ashanti Kingdom had rejected British offers of protectorate status in 1888 and 1894. An Ashanti assembly traveled to London in March 1895 to appeal directly to the government to avoid war. The protectorate was formally established on 24 August 1896. The Kingdom would become a crown colony on 1 January 1902. The Ashanti Kingdom would remain a United Kingdom territory until the independence of Ghana in 1957.[176]

Inadvertent: NO. Colonial Secretary Chamberlain ordered the conquest.[177]

Risk: NO. The Ashanti Kingdom was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: YES. The Gold Coast was connected to the global telegraph network in 1885.[178]

74. Sierra Leone (part) (1896/8)

The Sierra Leone hinterlands were acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation on 24 August 1896. The hinterlands were made a protectorate of the British Empire. Two commissioners, George Garrett and Thomas Alldridge, were dispatched around the territory to make protection treaties with

---

Colvile," in Cannadine, ed., *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*; "Uganda," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 537-538.

[174] A. D. Roberts, "The 'Lost Counties' of Bunyoro," *The Uganda Journal*, Vol. 26, No. 2 (September 1962), p. 194; Michael Twaddle, *Kakungulu and the Creation of Uganda, 1868-1928* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 1993), p. 96; D. A. Low, *Fabrication of Empire: The British and the Uganda Kingdoms, 1890-1902* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 186-187.

[175] Pirouet, *Historical Dictionary of Uganda*, p. xviii.

[176] "Ashanti (Asante) Wars," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 79-80; "Ashanti," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, p. 77; Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa*, pp. 507, 513; "Ashanti Expedition," in Raugh, *The Victorians at War*, p. 30; "Ashanti Wars," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 40-41.

[177] Michael Crowder, *West Africa Under Colonial Rule* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1968), pp. 128, 150; John D. Hargreaves, *West Africa Partitioned*, Vol. II: *The Elephants and the Grass* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985), pp. 214-215; Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa*, p. 507; Brendon, *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire*, p. 206.

[178] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 137; Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

local chiefs beginning in 1890. This move inland was motivated, in part, by French activity in the area. Sierra Leone proper had been a colony since 1791. Sierra Leone would remain a United Kingdom territory until its independence in 1961.[179]

Inadvertent: NO. The British Colonial Office approved the annexations in 1890.[180]

Risk: NO. Sierra Leone was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: YES. Sierra Leone had been connected to the global telegraph network since 1885.[181]

75. Weihaiwei (1898/5)

Weihaiwei (contemporary China) was acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation on 24 May 1898. The Chinese port on the Shandong Peninsula was annexed and ultimately leased from China for an indefinite term. China's defeat in the Sino-Japanese War (1894-1895) sparked a scramble for concessions among the great powers to which Weihaiwei would fall victim. Britain's ambassador to China first proposed leasing the port in February 1898, but he would be rebuffed by the government of Lord Salisbury. Yet just weeks later, on 25 March, news of Russian advances in the area prompted the cabinet in London to change its stance, ordering the British navy to Weihaiwei. The British flag was raised at the port on 24 May 1898. The formal lease agreement was signed on 1 July 1898. Weihaiwei would remain a United Kingdom territory until it was returned to China in 1930.[182]

Inadvertent: NO. The British cabinet approved the annexation on 25 March 1898.[183]

Risk: YES. China was a regional power and had an alliance with Russia, a great power.[184]

---

[179] Crowder, *West Africa Under Colonial Rule*, pp. 153-155; "Sierra Leone," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 1010; "Sierra Leone," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, pp. 239-240; "Chronology" (p. xx) and "Introduction" (p. xxvi), both in Magbaily C. Fyle and Cyril P. Foray, *Historical Dictionary of Sierra Leone*, New ed. (Lanham: Scarecrow Press, 2006); "Sierra Leone," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 478.

[180] "Lord Knutsford, Secretary of State, Confidential dispatch to the Officer administering the Government of Sierra Leone, of 1 January 1890," in Christopher Fyfe, *Sierra Leone Inheritance* (London: Oxford University Press, 1964), pp. 203-205.

[181] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 137; Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

[182] I. H. Nish, "The Royal Navy and the Taking of Weihaiwei, 1898-1905," *The Mariner's Mirror*, Vol. 54, No. 1 (1968), pp. 39-54; Pamela Atwell, *British Mandarins and Chinese Reformers: The British Administration of Weihaiwei (1898-1930) and the Territory's Return to Chinese Rule* (Hong Kong: Oxford University Press, 1985), pp. 4-12; Clarence B. Davis and Robert J. Gowen, "The British at Weihaiwei: A Case Study in the Irrationality of Empire," *The Historian*, Vol. 63, No. 1 (2000), pp. 88-92; Robert Nield, *China's Foreign Places: The Foreign Presence in China in the Treaty Port Era* (Hong Kong: HKU Press, 2015), pp. 260, 271.

[183] Nish, "The Royal Navy and the Taking of Weihaiwei," pp. 45-46; Atwell, *British Mandarins and Chinese Reformers*, p. 8; Davis and Gowen, "The British at Weihaiwei," p. 91.

[184] Alliance Treaty Obligations and Provisions (ATOP) ID: 1395; Correlates of War (COW) Alliance ID: 76. See: ATOP v5.1. Brett Ashley Leeds, Jeffrey M. Ritter, Sara McLaughlin Mitchell, and Andrew G. Long, "Alliance Treaty Obligations and Provisions, 1815-1944," *International Interactions*, Vol. 28, No. 3 (2002), pp. 237-260. Available at: http://www.atopdata.org/; Formal Alliances (v4.1). Douglas M. Gibler, *International Military Alliances, 1648-2008* (Washington: CQ Press, 2009). Available at: https://correlatesofwar.org/.

Telegraph: YES. China was connected to the global telegraph network in 1871.[185]

76. New Territories (1898/6)

The New Territories (contemporary China) were acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation from China on 9 June 1898. The New Territories were annexed by a convention between the United Kingdom and China that resulted in a 99-year lease of the territories, expanding the boundaries of British Hong Kong. Interest in the New Territories was prompted by the scramble for China that occurred after China's loss in the Sino-Japanese War (1894-1895), and French, Russian, and Japanese acquisitions in the area. British occupation of the New Territories initially sparked significant resistance from the local population. Britain's formal occupation began in April 1899. The New Territories would remain a United Kingdom territory until Hong Kong was returned to China in 1997.[186]

Inadvertent: NO. Prime Minister Lord Salisbury and Acting Foreign Minister Balfour were involved in the lease negotiations.[187]

Risk: YES. China was a regional power and had an alliance with Russia, a great power.[188]

Telegraph: YES. China was connected to the global telegraph network in 1871.[189]

77. Sudan (1898/9)

Sudan was acquired by the United Kingdom via conquest between March 1896 and 2 September 1898. Sudan was conquered by a joint British and Egyptian force of 26,000 under the command of Major General Horatio Herbert Kitchener. The conquest of Sudan was part of an attempt to create a chain of colonies "from Cairo to Cape Town," the value of which had been promoted by the consul-general in Egypt, Evelyn Baring. The British were also concerned to protect the Nile's headwaters, and were responding to public pressure to avenge General Gordon, the British consul who had been murdered in 1885. The conquest occurred in three phases. First, in September of 1896, the province of Dongola was conquered. Second, the Egyptian Army occupied Berber in September of 1897. The third phase was the conquest of Omdurman and Khartoum. The decisive battle of this conquest was the Battle of Omdurman against the Mahdist forces on 2 September 1898. This was a long-term operation, with 230-mile railway being established in the process. The Anglo-French Fashoda Crisis would occur during this operation. Sudan was ruled as a British-

[185] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 115; Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[186] Endacott, *A History of Hong Kong*, pp. 260-263; Welsh, *A History of Hong Kong*, pp. 321-334; Tsang, *A Modern History of Hong Kong*, pp. 36-38; John M. Carroll, *A Concise History of Hong Kong* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2007), pp. 67-70; Nield, *China's Foreign Places*, p. 127.
[187] Peter Wesley-Smith, *Unequal Treaty, 1898-1997: China, Great Britain and Hong Kong's New Territories* (Hong Kong: Oxford University Press, 1980), pp. 30-31; Welsh, *A History of Hong Kong*, pp. 320, 322, 323.
[188] ATOP ID: 1395; COW ID: 76.
[189] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 115; Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

Egyptian condominium from January 1899 onward, though, in reality, the British were in control. Sudan would remain a United Kingdom territory until its independence in 1955.[190]

Inadvertent: NO. The conquest was ordered by the cabinet in London in March 1896.[191]

Risk: NO. Sudan was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: YES. Sudan was connected to the global telegraph network by 1875, if not earlier.[192]

78. Kuwait (1899/1)

Kuwait was acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation on 23 January 1899, making it a protectorate of the British Empire. The protectorate status was enacted by a treaty between the British government and Sheik Mubarak al Sabah, who was apparently driven to sign the treaty for fear that the Ottoman Empire would annex his territory. The British were also interested in protecting the sea lanes to India from Ottoman interference. The protectorate relationship was reaffirmed and formalized with the outbreak of World War I in November 1914. Kuwait would remain a United Kingdom territory until its independence in 1961.[193]

Inadvertent: NO. The annexation was approved by Prime Minister and Foreign Minister Lord Salisbury.[194]

Risk: NO. Kuwait was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Kuwait seems to have not been connected to the global telegraph network until after 1912.[195]

---

[190] "Battle of Omdurman," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 840-841; "Sudan," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, p. 253; "Battle of Omdurman" (pp. 256-257) and "Reconquest of the Sudan" (pp. 279-281), both in Raugh, *The Victorians at War*; "Battle of Omdurman" (pp. 384-385) and "The Sudan" (pp. 508-509), both in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*.

[191] James, *The Rise and Fall of the British Empire*, p. 282; "Battle of Omdurman" (pp. 384-385) and "The Sudan" (pp. 508-509), both in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*.

[192] Mandour el Mahdi, *A Short History of the Sudan* (London: Oxford University Press, 1965), p. 77; P.M. Holt and M. W. Daly, *The History of Sudan: From the Coming of Islam to the Present Day*, 3rd ed. (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1979), p. 82; "Kassala" (p. 260) and "El-Obeid (Al-Ubayyad)" (p. 335), both in Robert S. Kramer, Richard A. Lobban Jr., and Carolyn Fluehr-Lobban, *Historical Dictionary of the Sudan*, 4th ed. (Lanham: The Scarecrow Press, 2013).

[193] H. R. P. Dickson, *Kuwait and her Neighbors* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1956), pp. 136-137; Briton Cooper Busch, "Britain and the Status of Kuwayt, 1896-1899," *Middle East Journal*, Vol. 21, No. 2 (Spring 1967), pp. 187-198; "Kuwait," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 641; "Kuwait," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, p. 166; "Kuwait," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 280-281.

[194] Busch, "Britain and the Status of Kuwayt," p. 195; Hugh Arbuthnot, Terence Clark, and Richard Muir, *British Missions Around the Gulf, 1575-2005: Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Oman* (Kent: Global Oriental, 2008), p. 175.

[195] Julia Ashtiany, *The Arabic Documents in the Archives of The British Political Agency Kuwait, 1904-1949* (London: India Office Library and Records, 1982), pp. 29-30.

79. Nigeria (1900/3)

Nigeria was acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation and conquest between 1883 and 1 March 1900, making it a protectorate of the British Empire. To some extent this acquisition was driven by imperial competition, especially with France. The acquisitions began with George Goldie of the Royal Niger Company, who began signing treaties with local chiefs in the area in 1883. In 1885, his company received a charter from the British government, though this would be revoked in 1899, when the British government took over the territory. Frederick Lugard was made the high commissioner after the British took over, and he undertook a number of conquests on his own initiative. By 15 March 1903, the conquest of the area was complete. In 1914, this territory would be united with Southern Nigeria to form the Colony of Nigeria. Nigeria would remain a United Kingdom territory until the independence of Nigeria in 1960.[196]

Inadvertent: YES. The initial acquisitions by George Goldie, and many subsequent acquisitions, including by Lugard, did not have authorization from London.[197]

Risk: NO. Nigeria was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Nigeria was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1886, the year after the initial annexation.[198]

80. Orange Free State (1900/5)

The Orange Free State (contemporary South Africa) was acquired by the United Kingdom via conquest between 11 February and 31 May 1900, over the course of the Second Boer War. It was conquered by 60,000 British forces under the command of Frederick Roberts. The capital, Bloemfontein, was captured on 13 March 1900. The territory was officially made a colony of the British Empire with the Treaty of Vereeniging, which ended the war on 31 May 1902. In May 1910, it was merged with other territories to form the independent Union of South Africa.[199]

Inadvertent: NO. The cabinet in London ordered this conquest on 8 September 1899.[200]

Risk: NO. The Orange Free State was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

---

[196] Robert Heussler, *The British in Northern Nigeria* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968), pp. 14-20; "Nigeria," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 812; "Northern Nigeria," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, p. 203; John Flint, "Sir George Dashwood Taubman Goldie," in Cannadine, ed., *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*; "Northern Nigeria," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 371.
[197] Crowder, *West Africa Under Colonial Rule*, p. 133; "Northern Nigeria," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, p. 203; Brendon, *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire*, pp. 201-202; Flint, "Sir George Goldie," in Cannadine, ed., *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*; "Northern Nigeria," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 371.
[198] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 137; Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[199] "Orange Free State," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, pp. 211-212; Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa*, pp. 573-575; "Second Boer War," in Holmes et al., eds., *The Oxford Companion to Military History*; "Second Boer War," in Raugh, *The Victorians at War*, pp. 51-53; "Orange River Colony," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 386-387.
[200] Byron Farwell, *The Great Boer War* (London: A. Lane, 1977), p. 36; Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa*, p. 560.

Telegraph: YES. South Africa was connected to the global telegraph network in 1879.[201]

81. Tonga (1900/5)

Tonga was acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation on 18 May 1900. Tonga was annexed with a "Treaty of Friendship" between the Kingdom of Tonga and the United Kingdom, making it a protectorate of the British Empire. This was in part motivated by a concern over German influence on the islands. British missionaries had been operating on the islands since the 1820s. The U.S. also had a prior naval basing agreement with the Tongan government, thought they hadn't yet begun to establish a base there. In January 1905 a formal adviser to the monarch was appointed, with Britain taking a more active role in domestic Tongan affairs. Tonga would remain a United Kingdom territory until its independence in 1970.[202]

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. Prime Minister Salisbury and Colonial Minister Chamberlain were involved in planning and ordering the annexation.[203]

Risk: NO. Tonga was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. There were no telegraph stations in the South Pacific until 1902.[204]

82. Transvaal (1900/9)

The Transvaal (contemporary South Africa) was acquired by the United Kingdom via conquest between 11 February and 1 September 1900, over the course of the Second Boer War. It was conquered by 35,000 British forces under the command of Frederick Roberts. It had previously been annexed by Britain in 1877, but became an independent republic in 1880. Gold was discovered in the territory in 1886, leading to an influx of English prospectors (*Uitlanders*), leading to conflicts with the existing Boer settlers. Cecil Rhodes plotted the Jameson Raid in 1895, in a vain attempt to spark an Uitlander uprising. The territory was officially made a colony of the British Empire with the Treaty of Vereeniging, which ended of the war on 31 May 1902. In May 1910, it was merged with other territories to form the independent Union of South Africa.[205]

Inadvertent: NO. The cabinet in London ordered this conquest on 8 September 1899.[206]

---

[201] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[202] W. P. Morell, *Britain in the Pacific Islands* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960), pp. 327-329; Scarr, *Fragments of Empire*, pp. 109-110; P. M. Kennedy, "Britain and the Tongan Harbours, 1898-1914," *Historical Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 58 (1972), pp. 257-263; "Tonga," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 1102-1103; "Tonga," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, p. 260; "Tonga," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 527-528.
[203] Kennedy, "Britain and the Tongan Harbours," pp. 258-259, 261.
[204] Lyons, "The Pacific Cable," p. 42.
[205] "Anglo-Boer War, 1899-1902" (pp. 45-46) and "Transvaal" (pp. 1107-1108), both in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*; "Transvaal," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, p. 262; Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa*, pp. 573-575; "Second Boer War," in Raugh, *The Victorians at War*, pp. 51-53; "Boer Wars" (pp. 74-75) and "The Transvaal" (p. 531), both in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*.
[206] Farwell, *The Great Boer War*, p. 36; Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa*, p. 560.

Risk: NO. The Transvaal was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: YES. South Africa was connected to the global telegraph network in 1879.[207]

83. Ocean Island (1901/9)

Ocean Island (contemporary Kiribati) was acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation on 28 September 1901. It was annexed by Captain Reginald Tupper of the HMS *Pylades*. The British may have been motivated by a desire to prevent other powers from claiming the island. In May 1900, Albert Ellis of the British Pacific Islands Company had negotiated an extraction treaty with locals, and in August his company had begun mining guano. Ocean Island was added to the colony of the Gilbert and Ellice Islands in January of 1916.[208]

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. The Pacific Islands Company had authorization from the Colonial Office in London to acquire the territory.[209]

Risk: NO. Ocean Island was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. There were no telegraph stations in the South Pacific until 1902.[210]

84. Swaziland (1902/5)

Swaziland (contemporary Eswatini) was acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation on 31 May 1902, making it a protectorate of the British Empire. Britain and the Boer republic of the Transvaal had feuded over Swaziland for a few years, signing agreements to recognize its independence in 1881 and 1884. An agreement in 1894 ceded Swaziland to the Transvaal. After the Anglo-Boer War, the acquisition of the Transvaal through the Treaty of Vereeniging meant that the United Kingdom also acquired Swaziland as a protectorate. The annexation was made official in June 1903. Swaziland would remain a territory of the United Kingdom until its independence in 1968.[211]

Inadvertent: NO. The cabinet in London ordered the conquest of the Transvaal on 8 September 1899, which ultimately led to the annexation.[212]

---

[207] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[208] Scarr, *Fragments of Empire*, pp. 270-271; Macdonald, *Cinderellas of the Empire*, pp. 94-98; "Ocean Island," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, p. 210; "Ocean Island," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 383; Katerina Martina Teaiwa, *Consuming Ocean Island: Stories of People and Phosphate from Banaba* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2015), pp. 42-47.
[209] Scarr, *Fragments of Empire*, pp. 270, 335n78-81.
[210] Lyons, "The Pacific Cable," p. 42.
[211] "Swaziland," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 1075; J. S. M. Matsebula, *A History of Swaziland* (Cape Town: Longman Penguin Southern Africa, 1988), pp. 176-177; "Swaziland," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, pp. 254-255; "Swaziland," in Henry Louis Gates, Jr. and Kwame Anthony Appiah, eds., *Encyclopedia of Africa* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), Available at: https://www.oxfordreference.com/; "Swaziland," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 512-513.
[212] Farwell, *The Great Boer War*, p. 36; Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa*, p. 560.

Risk: NO. Swaziland was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: YES. Swaziland was connected to the global telegraph network in the late 1880s.[213]

85. Northern Peninsular Malaya (1909/7)

The Northern Peninsular Malayan states of Perils, Kedah, Kelantan, and Terengganu (contemporary Malaysia) were acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation from Siam on 9 July 1909, making them a protectorate of the British Empire. The four states were acquired when Siam ceded them to the United Kingdom as a result of a treaty. These four states, along with Johor, were later organized as the Unfederated Malay States. Northern Peninsular Malaya would remain a United Kingdom territory until the independence of Malaysia in 1963.[214]

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. British Foreign Minister Sir Edward Grey was involved in the negotiations.[215]

Risk: NO. Siam was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: YES. Malaya was connected to the global telegraph network in 1871.[216]

86. Bhutan (1910/1)

Bhutan was acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation on 8 January 1910. Bhutan was annexed with a treaty, making the territory a protectorate of the British Empire. The treaty was negotiated by political officer C. A. Bell. The annexation was motivated, in part, by concerns over Chinese activities in the region. The United Kingdom had acquired Southern Bhutan in 1865, in the aftermath of the Duars War. Bhutan would remain a United Kingdom territory until the independence of India in 1947.[217]

Inadvertent: NO. The Foreign Office in London ordered the annexation beforehand.[218]

Risk: NO. Bhutan was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

---

213 "Albert Bremer" (p. 36) and "Mbekelweni" (p. 183), both in Alan R. Booth, *Historical Dictionary of Swaziland*, 2nd ed. (Lanham: The Scarecrow Press, 2000).
214 Ira Klein, "Britain, Siam and the Malay Peninsula, 1906-1909," *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 12, No. 1 (1969), pp. 119-136; "Malaya," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, p. 174; David K. Wyatt, *Thailand: A Short History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), pp. 191-192; Chris Baker and Pasuk Phongpaichit, *A History of Thailand* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), p. 64.
215 Klein, "Britain, Siam and the Malay Peninsula," pp. 132-134.
216 Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 136; Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
217 Collister, *Bhutan and the British*, pp. 165-172; Singh, *Himalayan Triangle*, pp. 349-354; "Bhutan," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 137; "Bhutan," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 70.
218 Collister, *Bhutan and the British*, p. 167; Singh, *Himalayan Triangle*, p. 352.

Telegraph: LIKELY NO. Bhutan seems to have only been connected to the global telegraph network in the 1960s.[219]

87. Johor (1914/5)

Johor (contemporary Malaysia) was acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation in May 1914, making it a protectorate of the British Empire. The annexation was negotiated by D. G. Campbell, a local British administrator on the island. It would eventually become one of the Unfederated Malay States. Johor would remain a United Kingdom territory until the independence of Malaysia in 1963.[220]

Inadvertent: NO. The British Colonial Secretary approved the annexation beforehand.[221]

Risk: NO. Johor was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: YES. Malaya was connected to the global telegraph network in 1871.[222]

88. Togoland (1914/8)

Togoland (contemporary Togo) was acquired by the United Kingdom via conquest from Germany between 8 and 31 August 1914, in the early months of the First World War. Togoland was conquered by a joint British-French force. Germany had few forces there, so resistance was mild. The conquest took just under three weeks. The territory was at first ruled as a condominium with France, but was split up in December 1916, with Britain retaining part of what is now Ghana. The United Kingdom would retain its portion of Togoland until the independence of Ghana in 1957.[223]

Inadvertent: YES. The conquest was at the initiative of local commanders, without orders from London.[224]

---

[219] George L. Harris et al., *Area Handbook for Nepal, Bhutan, and Sikkim*, 2nd ed. (Washington: Foreign Area Studies of the American University, 1973), p. lix; Karma Phuntsho, *The History of Bhutan* (London: Haus, 2013), p. 438.
[220] Keith Sinclair, "The British Advance in Johore, 1885-1914," *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Vol. 40, No. 1 (211) (July 1967), pp. 107-109; "Johor," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 609; "Malaya," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, p. 174; Simon C. Smith, "Conflict and Collaboration: Britain and the Sultan Ibrahim of Johore," *Indonesia and the Malay World*, Vol. 36, No. 106 (November 2008), p. 348; "Johore," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 261.
[221] Sinclair, "The British Advance in Johore," p. 109; Eunice Thio, *British Policy in the Malay Peninsula, 1880-1910* (Singapore: University of Malaya Press, 1969), pp. 251-252.
[222] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 136; Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[223] "Togoland," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 1101; "Togoland," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, p. 259-260; "Campaigns in Africa," in Spencer C. Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of World War I: A Political, Social, and Military History* (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2005), p. 41; "British Togoland," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 94-95.
[224] Christopher M. Andrew and A. S. Kanya-Forstner, *France Overseas: The Great War and the Climax of French Imperial Expansion* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1981), 61; Hew Strachan, *The First World War in Africa* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), pp. 13-14; Elizabeth Greenhalgh, *The French Army and the First World War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), p. 118.

Risk: YES. Togoland was Germany's territory, a great power.

Telegraph: YES. Togoland was connected to the global telegraph network in 1911.[225]

89. Kamaran Island (1915/6)

Kamaran Island (contemporary Yemen) was acquired by the United Kingdom via conquest from the Ottoman Empire on 9 June 1915. Kamaran Island was conquered by the British 109th Infantry aboard *Empress of Russia*. It was administered from the nearby protectorate of Aden. This acquisition was motivated, at least in part, by concern that Italy may try to take the island. The option of occupying the island was turned down in 1914, due to concerns that it would interfere with pilgrims' travels. Turkey would surrender all claims to the island with the Treaty of Lausanne on 24 July 1923. Kamaran Island would remain a United Kingdom territory until the independence of Yemen in 1967.[226]

Inadvertent: NO. The British Foreign Office was involved in the planning for the conquest.[227]

Risk: YES. The Ottoman Empire was a regional power and had an alliance with Germany, a great power.[228]

Telegraph: YES. Aden was connected to the global telegraph network in 1870.[229]

90. Cameroon (1916/1)

Cameroon was acquired by the United Kingdom via conquest from Germany between 25 August 1914 and January 1916, over the course of the First World War. Cameroon was conquered by a joint British-Belgian-French force of 18,000. German resistance was significant. The territory was first ruled as a condominium with France, but was split up in March 1916. Britain retained approximately one-fifth of the territory, a western portion bordering Nigeria, which was governed from Lagos. This territory was approximately 88,200 square kilometers. The United Kingdom's portion of Cameroon would remain their territory until the independence of Nigeria in 1960 and of Cameroon in 1961.[230]

---

[225] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[226] John Baldry, "British Naval Operations against Turkish Yaman, 1914-1919," *Arabica*, T. 25, Fasc. 2 (June 1978), pp. 163-164; "Aden" (p. 69) and "Kamaran Island" (p. 164), both in Stewart, *The British Empire*; "Kamaran Island," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 263-264.
[227] John Baldry, "Anglo-Italian Rivalry in Yemen and 'Asīr, 1900-1934," *Die Welt des Islams*, Vol. 17, No. ¼ (1976-1977), pp. 161-162; Baldry, "British Naval Operations against Turkish Yaman," p. 156.
[228] ATOP ID: 2005; COW ID: 93.
[229] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 136; Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[230] "British Cameroon," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 169; "Cameroons," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, pp. 108-109; "Campaigns in Africa," in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWI*, p. 41; "British Cameroons," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 80-81.

Inadvertent: NO. The British cabinet authorized the Cameroon campaign in advance.[231]

Risk: YES. Cameroon was Germany's territory, a great power.

Telegraph: YES. Cameroon was connected to the global telegraph network in 1911.[232]

91. Tanganyika (1916/10)

Tanganyika (contemporary Tanzania) was acquired by the United Kingdom via conquest between November 1914 and 9 October 1916, over the course of the First World War. Tanganyika conquered by a joint British-Belgian force, including 12,000 British forces. The territory was divided between the parties, with Britain retaining what is now Tanzania. In January 1920, the territory would become the Tanganyika Mandate. Tanganyika would remain a United Kingdom territory until the independence of Tanzania in 1961.[233]

Inadvertent: NO. The conquest was preauthorized by the cabinet in London.[234]

Risk: YES. Tanganyika was Germany's territory, a great power.

Telegraph: YES. Tanganyika was connected to the global telegraph network in 1890.[235]

92. Qatar (1916/11)

Qatar was acquired by the United Kingdom via annexation from the Ottoman Empire on 3 November 1916, making it a protectorate of the British Empire. It was acquired via treaty signed by political resident Percy Cox and Sheik Abdullah ibn Jassim Al Thani. The United Kingdom was given a window of opportunity with World War I, where it was opposed to the Ottoman Empire and Qatar sided with Britain. Qatar would remain a United Kingdom territory until its independence in 1971.[236]

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. The Foreign Office in London authorized Cox to negotiate the treaty of protection.[237]

---

[231] Byron Farwell, *The Great War in Africa, 1914-1918* (New York: Norton, 1986), p. 37; Peter J. Yearwood, "Great Britain and the Repartition of Africa, 1914-19," *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, Vol. 18, No. 3 (1990), p. 319.
[232] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[233] "Tanganyika," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, p. 255; "Campaigns in Africa," in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWI*, p. 42; "Tanganyika," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 515; "British Invasion of East Africa," in Davis, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Invasions and Conquests*.
[234] Yearwood, "Great Britain and the Repartition of Africa," p. 319; Strachan, *The First World War in Africa*, pp. 105-106.
[235] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[236] Rosemary Said Zahlan, *The Creation of Qatar* (London: Croom Helm, 1979), pp. 59-61; "Qatar," in Stewart, *The British Empire*, p. 220; "Qatar," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 421-422; "Qatar," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 913; Allen J. Fromherz, *Qatar: A Modern History* (Washington: Georgetown University Press, 2012), pp. 66-67.
[237] Habibur Rahman, *The Emergence of Qatar: The Turbulent Years, 1627-1916* (New York: Routledge, 2005), p. 225.

Risk: YES. The Ottoman Empire was a regional power and had an alliance with Germany, a great power.[238]

Telegraph: LIKELY NO. It seems that Qatar was not connected to the global telegraph network at the time of acquisition.[239]

93. Palestine (1917/12)

Palestine was acquired by the United Kingdom via conquest from the Ottoman Empire between 31 October and 9 December 1917, over the course of the First World War. It was conquered by a British force of 80,000 under the command of Major General Edmund Allenby. Palestine became a British League of Nations Mandate in July 1922. Palestine would remain a United Kingdom territory until the end of the British mandate and the creation of the State of Israel in 1948.[240]

Inadvertent: NO. The British cabinet was involved in the planning for the conquest of Palestine.[241]

Risk: YES. The Ottoman Empire was a regional power and had an alliance with Germany, a great power.[242]

Telegraph: YES. Palestine had its first telegraph station in 1865, so was very likely connected to the global telegraph network by 1917.[243]

94. Transjordan (1918/9)

Transjordan (contemporary Jordan) was acquired by the United Kingdom via conquest from the Ottoman Empire between 18 and 25 September 1918, near the end of the First World War. Transjordan was conquered by British forces under the command of Major General Edmund Allenby during the Battle of Amman. Transjordan was officially acquired by the United Kingdom with a treaty and post-war conference in San Remo, Italy in April 1920. Transjordan would remain a United Kingdom territory until the independence of Jordan in 1946.[244]

Inadvertent: NO. It was approved by the cabinet as part of the Palestine and Syria campaign.[245]

---

[238] ATOP ID: 2005; COW ID: 93.
[239] Zahlan, *The Creation of Qatar*, pp. 61, 146.
[240] "Palestine," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 392-393; "Palestine and Syria, Land Campaign," in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWI*, pp. 890-891.
[241] James, *The Rise and Fall of the British Empire*, p. 364; "Palestine and Syria, Land Campaign," in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWI*, pp. 890-891.
[242] ATOP ID: 2005; COW ID: 93.
[243] Jacob de Haas, *History of Palestine: The Last Two Thousand Years* (New York: Macmillan, 1934), p. 426; David Kushner, *Palestine in the Late Ottoman Period: Political, Social and Economic Transformation* (Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1986), p. 53.
[244] "Transjordan," in Olson and Shadle, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 1106; "Battle of Amman" (p. 98) and "Transjordan Campaign, 1918" (pp. 1171-1173), both in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWI*; "Transjordan," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 530.
[245] James, *The Rise and Fall of the British Empire*, p. 364; "Palestine and Syria, Land Campaign," in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWI*, pp. 890-891.

Risk: YES. The Ottoman Empire was a regional power and had an alliance with Germany, a great power.[246]

Telegraph: YES. It seems likely that Jordan was connected to the global telegraph network by 1910 at the latest.[247]

95. Iraq (1918/10)

Iraq was acquired by the United Kingdom via conquest from the Ottoman Empire between 7 November 1914 and 30 October 1918, over the course of the Mesopotamia Campaign during the First World War. Iraq was conquered by British forces under the command, first, of General John Nixon, and second, of General Stanley Maude. This was a very difficult conquest for the British forces, involving long distances and straining supply systems. The decisive engagement of the conquest was the Battle of Baghdad in March 1917. Iraq would remain a United Kingdom territory until its independence in 1932.[248]

Inadvertent: NO. The British cabinet was involved in planning and ordering the conquest.[249]

Risk: YES. The Ottoman Empire was a regional power and had an alliance with Germany, a great power.[250]

Telegraph: YES. Iraq was connected to the global telegraph network in 1861.[251]

96. Eritrea (1941/3)

Eritrea was acquired by the United Kingdom via conquest from Italy between 19 January and 27 March 1941, over the course of the Second World War. Eritrea was conquered by British forces under the command of Major General William Platt as part of Britain's East Africa Campaign. Eritrea would remain a United Kingdom territory until September 1952, when the UN, pressured by the U.S., ordered it to relinquish the territory to Ethiopian control.[252]

---

246 ATOP ID: 2005; COW ID: 93.
247 Kamal S. Salibi, *The Modern History of Jordan* (London: I. B. Taurus, 1993), p. 40.
248 "Mesopotamian Theater," in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWI*, pp. 780-783; "Iraq," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, p. 250; "British Invasion of Mesopotamia," in Davis, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Conquests and Invasions*.
249 Charles Townshend, *Desert Hell: The British Invasion of Mesopotamia* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2011), pp. 141-143; Rosie Llewelyn-Jones, "The British Raj and the British Mandate in Iraq," *Asian Affairs*, Vol. 46, No. 2 (2015), p. 274.
250 ATOP ID: 2005; COW ID: 93.
251 Yakup Bektas, "The Sultan's Messenger: Cultural Constructions of Ottoman Telegraphy, 1847-1880," *Technology and Culture*, Vol. 41, No. 4 (October 2000), p. 683; Soli Shahvar, "Tribes and the Telegraph in Lower Iraq: The Muntafiq and the Baghdad-Basrah Telegraph Line of 1863-65," *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol. 39, No. 1 (January 2003), p. 94.
252 "East Africa Campaign," in Spencer C. Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of World War II: A Political, Social, and Military History* (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2004), p. 468; "East African Campaign," in I. C. B. Dear and M. R. D. Foot, eds., *The Oxford Companion to World War II* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), Available at: https://www.oxfordreference.com/; "Eritrea," in Panton, *Historical Dictionary of the British Empire*, pp. 175-176.

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. War Secretary Anthony Eden was involved in planning the East African Campaign in October 1940.[253]

Risk: YES. Eritrea was Italy's territory, a great power.

Telegraph: YES. Eritrea was connected to the global telegraph network in March 1887.[254]

[253] "East African Campaign," in Dear and Foot, eds., *The Oxford Companion to WWII*; Andrew Stewart, *The First Victory: The Second World War and the East Africa Campaign* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016), p. 106.
[254] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

France

97. Nosy Boraha (1819)

Nosy Boraha (alt. Île Sainte Marie, contemporary Madagascar) was acquired by France via annexation in 1819. It was annexed by Sylvain Roux accompanied by French military forces. The island was used as a post for reconnaissance of the Indian Ocean. France had been ceded the island in 1750, but abandoned it shortly thereafter. Nosy Boraha would remain a French territory until the independence of Madagascar in 1960.[1]

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. Nosy Boraha was annexed on the orders of French King Louis XVIII.[2]

Risk: NO. Nosy Boraha was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Madagascar was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1895.[3]

98. Algeria Coast (1830/7)

The Algerian coast was acquired by France via conquest from the Ottoman Empire between 14 June and 5 July 1830, during the French Occupation of Algiers. Coastal Algeria was conquered by 635 ships carrying 34,184 French forces under the command of General Louis-Auguste de Bourmont. The proximate cause of the conquest was the local Ottoman dey striking the French consul with a fly swatter in April 1827. A deeper cause for the invasion was diversionary in nature, with French King Charles X hoping to distract from his maladministration at home. French forces landed at Sidi Ferruch and managed to take Algiers a few weeks later. French forces began to move inland, and faced fierce resistance from Arab forces and Berber tribes, which would last for decades. France would initially make little headway and signed the Treaty of Tafna in May 1837 with Abd al-Qadir, ceding to him sovereignty over western Algeria, and retaining only its coastal territories. French holdings in Algeria would ultimately total 1.87 million km^2. The entirety of Algeria's territory was not occupied until 1847, and the country would not be completely pacified until 1881. In 1848, Algeria was divided into three French departments, making it officially part of France. France would retain Algeria until its independence in 1962.[4]

---

[1] Jacques Stern, *The French Colonies, Past and Future* (New York: Didier, 1944), pp. 179-181; Robert Aldrich, *Greater France: A History of French Overseas Expansion* (New York: Macmillan, 1996), p. 61.
[2] Stern, *The French Colonies*, p. 181.
[3] Bill Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018," History of the Atlantic Cable & Undersea Communications (2021), Available at: https://atlantic-cable.com/Cables/CableTimeLine/index.htm.
[4] Mary E. Townsend, *European Colonial Expansion Since 1871* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott, 1941), pp. 123-124; Raymond Betts, *Tricouleur: The French Overseas Empire* (London: Gordon & Cremonesi, 1978), pp. 55-60; Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 24-29; Frederick Quinn, *The French Overseas Empire* (Westport: Praeger, 2000), pp. 121-123; "French Conquest of Algeria (1830-57)" and "Abd al-Qadir," both in Richard Holmes et al., eds., *The Oxford Companion to Military History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), Available at: https://www.oxfordreference.com/; Barnett Singer and John Langdon, *Cultured Force: Makers and Defenders of the French Colonial Empire* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2004), pp. 47-49, 62-63; "Empire and Imperialism" (subentry: "The French Colonial Empire," "Expansion Under the July Monarchy (1830-1848)"), in Peter N. Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), Available at: https://www.oxfordreference.com/; "Algeria" and "Abd al-Qadir," both in Henry Louis Gates, Jr. and Kwame Anthony Appiah, eds., *Encyclopedia of Africa* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), Available at:

Inadvertent: NO. The invasion of the Algerian coast was ordered by King Charles X.[5]

Risk: YES. The Ottoman Empire was a regional power.

Telegraph: NO. France and Algeria were not connected by telegraph until 1870.[6]

99. Nosy Be (1840)

Nosy Be (contemporary Madagascar) was acquired by France via annexation in 1840. Nosy Be was annexed by a French naval commander who persuaded a local chief to cede the island to France. The island totaled 290 km^2 in land area. Nosy Be was added to the French colony of Madagascar in 1896. Nosy Be would remain a French possession until Madagascar's independence in 1960.[7]

Inadvertent: YES. The annexation was made by Réunion governor, Admiral Anne Chrétien Louis de Hell, not leadership in Paris.[8]

Risk: NO. Nosy Be was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Madagascar was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1895.[9]

100. Mayotte Island (1841/4)

Mayotte Island (contemporary France) was acquired by France via annexation on 25 April 1841. It was annexed by French naval commander Passot. The French were apparently motivated by British naval competition in the Indian Ocean. The signing of the treaty with local chief Andriansouli on Mayotte established the island as a protectorate of the French empire. Mayotte had a population of approximately 3,300 at the time, and a territorial area of 373 km^2. The annexation was made official on 13 June 1843. By 1909, all of the Comoros Islands were French protectorates, and in 1912 they were added to the French colony of Madagascar. The entire archipelago totaled approximately 2,050

---

https://www.oxfordreference.com/; "Abdel-Kader," in Emmanuel K. Akyeampong and Henry Louis Gates, Jr., eds., *Dictionary of African Biography* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), Available at: https://www.oxfordreference.com/; Martin Evans, *Algeria: France's Undeclared War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 7-9; Bruce Vandervort, "French Conquest of Algeria (1830-1847)," in Gordon Martel, ed., *The Encyclopedia of War* (Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), Available at: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/book/10.1002/9781444338232.

[5] Townsend, *European Colonial Expansion*, p. 124; Aldrich, *Greater France*, p. 26; Evans, *Algeria*, p. 9; Vandervort, "French Conquest of Algeria."

[6] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

[7] Robert Aldrich and John Connell, *France's Overseas Frontier: Départements et Territoires d'Outre-Mer* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992), p. 50; Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 61-62; "Nosy Be (Big Island)," in Philip M. Allen and Maureen Covell, *Historical Dictionary of Madagascar* (Lanham: Scarecrow Press, 2005), pp. 193-194; Iain B. Walker, *Islands in a Cosmopolitan Sea: A History of the Comoros* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2019), p. 82.

[8] Arthur Stratton, *The Great Red Island* (New York: Scribner, 1964), p. 113; "French Empire," in Carl Cavanaugh Hodge, ed., *Encyclopedia of the Age of Imperialism*, Vol. 1 (Westport: Greenwood Press, 2007), p. 241; Allen and Covell, *Historical Dictionary of Madagascar*, p. 194.

[9] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

km^2. France would retain Comoros until its independence in 1974, thereafter only retaining Mayotte, which is now a French Department.[10]

Inadvertent: YES. The annexation was ordered by Réunion governor, Admiral de Hell, not leadership in Paris.[11]

Risk: NO. Mayotte was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. There were no telegraph connections in the area until 1879, in Mozambique.[12]

101. Côte d'Ivoire Coast (1842/2)

Coastal territories in Côte d'Ivoire were acquired by France via annexation on 10 February 1842. These territories were annexed by French naval Captain Édouard Bouët-Willaumez. With this annexation, France gained two tracts of territory: contemporary Assinie and Grand Bassam. In the decades that followed, the French continued to expand their territory by concluding treaties with other coastal communities. After the crushing loss in the Franco-Prussian war in 1871, France turned control of the territory over to a French merchant, Arthur Verdier. In 1893, France declared Côte d'Ivoire a full-fledged colony, though it was not until 1918 that France secured the entire territory. In 1895, Côte d'Ivoire was incorporated into French West Africa. France would retain Côte d'Ivoire until its independence in 1960.[13]

Inadvertent: NO. The annexation of the Côte d'Ivoire coast was ordered by the Naval Minister Admiral Duperré in Paris.[14]

Risk: NO. Côte d'Ivoire was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Côte d'Ivoire was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1885.[15]

---

[10] Townsend, *European Colonial Expansion*, pp. 132-133; "Mahoré," in Martin Ottenheimer and Harriet Ottenheimer, *Historical Dictionary of the Comoro Islands* (Metuchen: Scarecrow Press, 1994), pp. 51-53; Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 63-64; Michel Bourlaud, "Mayotte la Francaise," in Jean-Pierre Rioux, ed., *Dictionnaire de la France Coloniale* (Paris: Flammarion, 2007), p. 372; "Comoros," in Gates and Appiah, eds., *Encyclopedia of Africa*; Walker, *Islands in a Cosmopolitan Sea*, pp. 85-86.
[11] Aldrich, *Greater France*, p. 63; "French Empire," in Hodge, ed., *Encyclopedia of the Age of Imperialism*, Vol. 1, p. 241; Béringer Hugues "De la colonie au département d'outre-mer: l'évolution institutionnelle de Mayotte dans la France," *Outre-mers*, Vol. 99, No. 374-375 (2012), p. 12n5.
[12] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[13] Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 41-42; "Ivory Coast," in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; "Côte d'Ivoire," in Gates and Appiah, eds., *Encyclopedia of Africa*; "Chronology" (p. xl), "Introduction" (p. 10), and "Louis Édouard Bouët-Willaumez" (p. 125), all in Cyril K. Daddieh, *Historical Dictionary of Côte d'Ivoire (the Ivory Coast)*, 3rd ed. (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2016).
[14] Stern, *The French Colonies*, p. 164; Robert J. Mundt, *Historical Dictionary of the Ivory Coast (Côte d'Ivoire)* (Metuchen: Scarecrow Press, 1987), p. 5; "Côte d'Ivoire," in Gates and Appiah, eds., *Encyclopedia of Africa*; Daddieh, *Historical Dictionary of Côte d'Ivoire*, p. 10.
[15] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

102. Marquesas Islands (1842/5)

The Marquesas Islands were acquired by France via annexation on 1 May 1842. The Marquesas were annexed by French naval commander Abel Aubert du Petit-Thouars, making the islands a protectorate of the French Empire. Du Petit-Thouars had advocated for their acquisition since at least 1838. The islands total 1,049 km^2 in land area. In 1880 the islands were made a French colony when they were organized, along with other islands territories, as the French Oceanic Establishments (Établissements français d'Océanie). The islands were later organized as French Polynesia. The Marquesas remain a French territory to this day.[16]

Inadvertent: NO. The government of French King Louis-Philippe I issued the annexation orders.[17]

Risk: NO. The Marquesas Islands was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. France's first overseas telegraph connection wasn't until 1851, in Dover.[18]

103. Tahiti and the Eastern Society Islands (1842/8)

Tahiti and the Eastern (Windward) Society Islands were acquired by France via annexation in August 1842. These islands were annexed by French naval commander Abel Aubert du Petit-Thouars, resulting in the establishment of a French protectorate. Dupetit-Thouars landed and linked up with the local French consul on the island, and they both demanded rights for French citizens and missionaries on the island. Britain had important influence on the island, particularly through a local missionary, George Pritchard. The acquisition led to a crisis between London and Paris. Paris would only sign off on the protectorate in April 1843. These islands total 1,590 km^2 in land area. France had first claimed the islands in 1768, but never followed up on the claim. Resistance to the French acquisition lasted several years. In June 1880, France fully annexed the island along with neighboring islands, organizing them as the French Oceanic Establishments (Établissements français d'Océanie). In 1887, an agreement with Britain gave France the remaining (Leeward) Society Islands. The islands were later organized as part of French Polynesia. Tahiti and the Society Islands remain a French territory to this day.[19]

Inadvertent: YES. Du Petit-Thouars was acting on his own initiative, without orders from Paris.[20]

---

[16] Robert Aldrich, *The French Presence in the South Pacific, 1842-1940* (Baskingstoke: Macmillan, 1990), pp. 21-22; Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 69-71; "Marquesas Islands," in *Oxford World Encyclopedia* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), Available at: https://www.oxfordreference.com/.

[17] C.W. Newbury, "The Administration of French Oceania, 1842-1906" (Doctoral Dissertation, Australian National University, 1956), p. 54; Mark Berg, "French Military Rule in the Marquesas, 1842-1890," Unpublished manuscript, University of Hawaii (Fall 1983), pp. 2-3; Aldrich, *The French Presence in the South Pacific*, p. 21; John Dunmore, *Visions & Realities: France in the Pacific, 1695-1995* (Waikanae: Heritage Press, 1997), p. 180.

[18] Anton A. Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications* (Hoboken: Wiley-Interscience, 2003), pp. 129, 602.

[19] Aldrich, *The French Presence in the South Pacific*, pp. 19-24; Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 69-71; Dunmore, *Visions & Realities*, pp. 181-184; "Society Islands" and "French Polynesia," in *Oxford World Encyclopedia*.

[20] Newbury, "The Administration of French Oceania," pp. 64-65; C.M. Andrew and A.S. Kanya-Forstner, "Centre and Periphery in the Making of the Second French Colonial Empire, 1815-1920," *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, Vol. 16, No. 3 (1988), pp. 13-14; Aldrich, *The French Presence in the South Pacific*, pp. 22-23; Stephen Henningham, *France and the South Pacific: A Contemporary History* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1992), p. 4; Aldrich, *Greater*

Risk: NO. Tahiti was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. France's first overseas telegraph connection wasn't until 1851, in Dover.[21]

104. Gabon Coast (1843/6)

The Gabon coast was acquired by France via annexation 18 June 1843. It was annexed by Commandant Félix de Monléon aboard the *Zèbre*. French Captain Édouard Bouët-Willaumez had secured a number of territories on the Gabonese coast through treaties with local chiefs from 1839 to 1842, culminating in this annexation. France would acquire the remainder of what is now Gabon with the expeditions of Savorgnan de Brazza between 1875 and 1885. Gabon and Congo were made an official French colony in 1886. Gabon was made part of French Equitorial Africa in 1910. Gabon remained a French territory until its independence in 1960.[22]

Inadvertent: LIKELY YES. Captain Édouard Bouët-Willaumez's initial annexations were carried out without orders from Paris.[23]

Risk: NO. Gabon was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Gabon was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1885.[24]

105. Tuamotu Islands (1844)

The Tuamotu Islands were acquired by France via annexation in 1844. The islands became a protectorate of the French Empire. In 1880 they were made a colony and consolidated, along with other island territories, into the French Oceanic Establishment (Établissements français d'Océanie).

France, p. 86; Dunmore, *Visions & Realities*, p. 181; Quinn, *The French Overseas Empire*, p. 116; "French Empire," in Hodge, ed., *Encyclopedia of the Age of Imperialism*, Vol. 1, p. 241.

[21] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, pp. 129, 602.

[22] Henri Brunschwig, *French Colonialism, 1871-1914: Myths and Realities* (London: Pall Mall Press, 1966), pp. 43-45; Henry H. Bucher, Jr., "The Village of Glass and Western Intrustion: An Mpongwe Reponse to the American and French Presence in the Gabon Estuary: 1842-1845," *The International Journal of African Historical Studies*, Vol. 6, No. 3 (1973), pp. 384-385; David K. Patterson, *The Northern Gabon Coast to 1875* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), pp. 90-95; Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 51-55; Quinn, *The French Overseas Empire*, p. 154; "Chronology" (pp. xxix-xxx) and "Édouard Bouët-Willaumez" (pp. 45-46), in David E. Gardinier and Douglas A. Yates, *Historical Dictionary of Gabon*, 3rd ed. (Lanham: Scarecrow Press, 2006); "Pierre Savorgnan di Brazza," in David Buisseret, ed., *The Oxford Companion to World Exploration* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), Available at: https://www.oxfordreference.com/; "Gabon" and "Libreville, Gabon," in Gates and Appiah, eds., *Encyclopedia of Africa*.

[23] Patterson, *The Northern Gabon Coast*, pp. 91-92, 95.

[24] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

The islands were later organized as French Polynesia. The Tuamotus remain French territory to this day.[25]

Inadvertent: UNKNOWN.

Risk: NO. The Tuamotu Islands was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. France's first overseas telegraph connection wasn't until 1851, at Dover.[26]

106. Algeria (1847/12)

France acquired Algeria via conquest from the Ottoman Empire between May 1841 and December 1847, over the course of the First Franco-Algerian War (1839-1847) as well as the Franco-Moroccan War (1844). Algeria was conquered by over 100,000 forces under the command of French General Thomas-Robert Bugeaud. France had first acquired the coastal region of Algeria in July 1830. In November 1839, the forces of Abd al-Qadir rose up against the French once again, and began attacks on Algiers. Bugeaud was assigned to Algeria in 1840, and in May 1841 he launched his campaign to defeat al-Qadir. The French decisively defeated a Moroccan army at the Battle of Isly in August 1844, and would defeat Qadir's forces as well by December 1847. French holdings in Algeria would ultimately total 1.87 million km^2. The entirety of Algeria would not be completely pacified until 1881. In 1848, Algeria was divided into three French departments, making it officially part of France. France would retain Algeria until its independence in 1962.[27]

Inadvertent: NO. Bugeaud was acting on orders from King Louis Philippe I.[28]

Risk: YES. The Ottoman Empire was a regional power.

Telegraph: NO. Algeria was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1870.[29]

---

[25] Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 70-71; "French Polynesia," in *Oxford World Encyclopedia*; "Tuamotu Archipelago," in John Everett-Heath, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of World Place Names*, 5th ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2019), Available at: https://www.oxfordreference.com/.
[26] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, pp. 129, 602.
[27] Townsend, *European Colonial Expansion*, pp. 123-124; Betts, *Tricouleur*, pp. 55-60; Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 24-29; Quinn, *The French Overseas Empire*, pp. 121-123; "French Conquest of Algeria (1830-57)" and "Abd al-Qadir," in Holmes et al., eds., *The Oxford Companion to Military History*; Singer and Langdon, *Cultured Force*, pp. 47-49, 62-63; "Algeria," in Hodge, ed., *Encyclopedia of the Age of Imperialism*, Vol. 1, p. 25; "Empire and Imperialism" (subentry: "The French Colonial Empire", "Expansion Under the July Monarchy (1830-1848)"), in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; "Algeria" and "Abd al-Qadir," in Gates and Appiah, eds., *Encyclopedia of Africa*; "Abdel-Kader," in Akyeampong and Gates, eds., *Dictionary of African Biography*; Vandervort, "French Conquest of Algeria"; Evans, *Algeria*, pp. 13-14.
[28] Henri Amédéé Le Lorgne, comte d'Ideville, *Memoirs of Marshal Bugeaud, from his Private Correspondence and Original Documents, 1784-1849*, Vol. 1, Translated by Charlotte M. Yonge (London: Hurst and Blackett, 1884), p. 346; Jack B. Ridley, "Mashal Bugeaud, the July Monarchy and the Question of Algeria, 1841-1847: A Study in Civil-Military Relations," (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1970), p. 11; Abdelmajid Hannoum, *Violent Modernity: France in Algeria* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010), p. 19.
[29] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

107. Guinea Coast (1849/4)

The Guinea coast was acquired by France via annexation on 5 April 1849. The Guinea coast's annexation established the region as a protectorate of the French Empire, to be administered from neighboring French Senegal. France would acquire the remainder of Guinea in 1881, and would make the territory a French colony in 1891. Guinea would remain a French territory until its independence in 1958.[30]

Inadvertent: UNKNOWN.

Risk: NO. Guinea was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Guinea was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1885.[31]

108. New Caledonia and the Loyalty Islands (1853/9)

New Caledonia and the Loyalty Islands were acquired by France via annexation on 24 September 1853. The islands were annexed by French Rear-Admiral Auguste Febvrier-Despointes. They were first discovered by France by Jules Sébastien César Dumont d'Urville in 1827. Rear-Admiral Febvrier-Despointes was apparently motivated by concerns that the British were moving into the area. New Caledonia would be an important penal colony for France, where tens-of-thousands of prisoners were shipped from the 1860s to the 1890s. The islands total 18,575 km^2 in territorial area. France claimed the Loyalty islands along with New Caledonia, but it would take until 1864-65 for France to establish effective control of them. In 1946, New Caledonia became an overseas French territory, a status it retains to this day.[32]

Inadvertent: NO. Admiral Febvrier-Despointes was acting on orders from Emperor Napoleon III.[33]

Risk: NO. New Caledonia was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. New Caledonia was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1893.[34]

---

[30] Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 38-39; "Guinea," in Gates and Appiah, eds., *Encyclopedia of Africa*.
[31] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[32] Aldrich, *The French Presence in the South Pacific*, pp. 25-26; Aldrich, *Greater France*, p. 71; Dunmore, *Visions & Realities*, pp. 188-189; "New Caledonia," in Thomas Benjamin, ed., *Encyclopedia of Western Colonialism since 1450*, Vol. 2 (Farmington Hills: MacMillan, 2007), p. 844; Denise Fisher, *France in the South Pacific: Power and Politics* (Canberra: Australian National University Press, 2013), p. 27; "Loyalty Islands," in Everett-Heath, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of World Place Names*.
[33] Stern, *The French Colonies*, p. 213; Martyn Lyons, *The Totem and the Tricolour: A Short History of New Caledonia since 1774* (Kensington: New South Wales University Press, 1986), pp. 42-43; Dunmore, *Visions & Realities*, p. 188; "New Caledonia," in Benjamin, ed., *Encyclopedia of Western Colonialism*, Vol. 2, p. 844.
[34] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

109. Senegal (part) (1860/9)

Part of Senegal was acquired by France via conquest between January 1855 and 10 September 1860, over the course of the French-Tukolor War. Senegal was partly conquered by forces under the command of General Louis Léon César Faidherbe. France had established a trading post at Dakar in the 18th century and began building forts in the Casamance region in the early 19th. At the urging of local Bordeaux merchants, the new governor of the area, General Faidherbe, began moving inland in January 1855. Faidherbe's forces fought the Walo in February 1855, the Trarza in April 1855, and Dakar was formally annexed in May 1857. The fort at Medine, established in 1855, was sieged from April to July 1857, with Faidherbe leading the army that eventually broke the siege. On 10 September 1860, Umar Tall agreed to a treaty, establishing French control over much of Senegal. France would acquire more territory in the area between 1883 and 1886, and establish a formal protectorate in 1890. French West Africa was established in 1895, and Dakar was made its capital in 1902. Senegal would remain a part of French West Africa until its independence in 1960.[35]

Inadvertent: YES. General Faidherbe acted on his own initiative, without orders from Paris.[36]

Risk: NO. Senegal was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Senegal was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1883.[37]

110. Obock (1862/3)

The port of Obock (contemporary Djibouti) was acquired by France via annexation on 4 March 1862. Obock was initially annexed by French explorer Henri Lambert in 1859, who claimed the territory for France. Yet Napoleon III would decline Lambert's offer, leaving him alone in charge of the territory. Lambert was killed that same year by a local rival, which led the French to send representatives to investigate the murder in 1862. On this visit they signed a treaty with local authorities, ceding Obock to the French Empire in exchange for 5,500 gold francs. There was some concern over British influence in the area. Obock would become the capital of the larger colony of

---

[35] Townsend, *European Colonial Expansion*, pp. 113-117; A. S. Kanya-Forstner, *The Conquest of the Western Sudan: A Study in French Military Imperialism* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1969), pp. 28-42; Leland C. Barrows, "Faidherbe and Senegal: A Critical Discussion," *African Studies Review*, Vol. 19, No. 1 (April 1976), pp. 99-110; Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 36-38; Quinn, *The French Overseas Empire*, pp. 155-158; Thomas Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa: White Man's Conquest of the Dark Continent from 1876 to 1912* (New York: Perennial, 2003), pp. 166-167; Trevor R. Getz, *Slavery and Reform in West Africa: Toward Emancipation in Nineteenth-Century Senegal and the Gold Coast* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2004), pp. 86-89; Singer and Langdon, *Cultured Force*, pp. 95-108, 119-123; "Senegal," in Hodge, ed., *Encyclopedia of the Age of Empire*, Vol. II, pp. 644-645; "Empire and Imperialism" (subentry: "The French Colonial Empire," "Imperialism under Napoleon III (1852–1870)"), in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; "Senegal," in Gates and Appiah, eds., *Encyclopedia of Africa*; "Louis Léon César Faidherbe," in Akyeampong and Gates, eds., *Dictionary of African Biography*; Singer Barnett, "Louis Faidherbe (1818-1889)," in Martel, ed., *The Encyclopedia of War*.

[36] Kanya-Forstner, *The Conquest of the Western Sudan*, pp. 30-33; Getz, *Slavery and Reform in West Africa*, pp. 87-88; Hodge, ed., *Encyclopedia of the Age of Empire*, Vol. II, p. 645; "Louis Léon César Faidherbe," in Akyeampong and Gates, eds., *Dictionary of African Biography*.

[37] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

French Somaliland when it was acquired in 1884. French Somaliland remained a French colony until its independence in 1977.[38]

Inadvertent: YES. Henri Lambert was acting on his own initiative and Paris was initially opposed to the annexation.[39]

Risk: NO. Obock was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Obock was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1889.[40]

111. Eastern Cochinchina (1862/6)

Eastern Cochinchina (contemporary Vietnam) was acquired by France via conquest from Annam between September 1858 and 5 June 1862, over the course of the First Franco-Vietnamese War. Eastern Cochinchina was conquered by 2,500 French forces aboard 14 ships under the command of Vice Admiral Charles Rigault de Genouilly. French missionaries and traders had visited the region since the 18th century. The initial invasion was aided by Spanish troops, though they would not see it through to the end. By February 1859, French forces had occupied Saigon. The French signed a treaty with Emperor Tu Duc in June 1862 which ceded Saigon, the Island of Côn Dao, and three provinces to the French Empire. France would add the three northern provinces in 1867, completing its acquisition of Cochinchina and making it a French colony. In 1887, Cochinchina was consolidated along with other territories into French Indochina. French Indochina would remain a part of the French Empire until France's withdrawal in 1954.[41]

Inadvertent: NO. Emperor Napoleon III ordered the invasion in November 1857.[42]

---

[38] Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 57-60; "Introduction" (p. xxvi), "Henri Lambert" (p. 70), and "Obock" (p. 84), all in Daoud A. Alwan and Yohanis Mibrathu, *Historical Dictionary of Djibouti* (Lanham: Scarecrow Press, 2000); Colette Dubois, "Djibouti et la Corne de l'Afrique," in Rioux, ed., *Dictionnaire de la France Coloniale*, pp. 301-307; "Djibouti," in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; "Djibouti," in Gates and Appiah, eds., *Encyclopedia of Africa*.

[39] Henri Brunschwig, "Une Colonie Inutile: Obock (1862-1888)," *Cahiers D'études Africaines*, Vol. 8, No. 29 (1968), pp. 36, 38, 39; Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 57-58; Alwan and Mibrathu, *Historical Dictionary of Djibouti*, p. 70; "French Empire," in Hodge, ed., *Encyclopedia of the Age of Imperialism*, Vol. 1, p. 242.

[40] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

[41] Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 73-78; Quinn, *The French Overseas Empire*, pp. 135-140; "Indochina," in Joel Mokyr, ed., *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Economic History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), Available at: https://www.oxfordreference.com/; "Vietnam," "Cochin China," and "Empire and Imperialism" (subentry: "The French Colonial Empire", "Imperialism under Napoleon III (1852–1870)"), all in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*.

[42] Thomas E. Ennis, *French Policy and Developments in Indochina* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936), p. 36; John F. Cady, *The Roots of French Imperialism in Eastern Asia* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1954), pp. 211, 215; Stephen H. Roberts, *The History of French Colonial Policy, 1870-1925* (London: Frank Cass & Co., 1963), pp. 421-422; Milton E. Osborne, *The French Presence in Cochinchina and Cambodia: Rule and Response (1859-1905)* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1969), p. 29; Aldrich, *Greater France*, p. 76; Quinn, *The French Overseas Empire*, p. 138; Pierre Brocheux and Daniel Hémery, *Indochina: An Ambiguous Colonization, 1858-1954*, Translated by Ly Lan Dill-Klein (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2009), p. 24; Michael P.M. Finch, *A Progressive Occupation?: The Gallieni-Lyautey Method and Colonial Pacification in Tonkin and Madagascar, 1885-1900* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), p. 75.

Risk: NO. Annam was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Saigon was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1871.[43]

112. Cambodia (1863/8)

Cambodia was acquired by France via annexation from Siam on 11 August 1863. Cambodia was annexed by French Admiral Pierre-Paul de la Grandière. French missionaries had been active in Cambodia since the 18th century. Since that time, Cambodia had been in a loose protectorate relationship with the neighboring Kingdom of Siam. When a succession dispute broke out after the death of the local king, the French backed his son, Norodom, which resulted in the establishment of a protectorate over Cambodia. In 1867, France ceded Cambodia's western provinces of Battambang and Siem Riep to Thailand, though they would be regained in 1907. In 1887, Cambodia was consolidated along with other territories into French Indochina. French Indochina would remain a part of the French Empire until France's withdrawal in 1954.[44]

Inadvertent: YES. Admiral de la Grandière was acting on his own, without orders from Paris.[45]

Risk: NO. Cambodia was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. There were no telegraph connections in the area until 1871, in Saigon.[46]

113. Western Cochinchina (1867/6)

Western Cochinchina (contemporary Vietnam) was acquired by France via annexation from Annam between 19 and 25 June 1867. Western Cochinchina was annexed by French Admiral Pierre-Paul de la Grandière. France had been in possession of eastern Cochinchina since 1862. In June 1867, de la Grandière annexed the remaining three provinces of Cochinchina, completing its colonization of Cochinchina. In 1887, Cochinchina was consolidated along with other territories into French Indochina. French Indochina would remain a part of the French Empire until France's withdrawal in 1954.[47]

---

[43] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[44] R. Stanley Thompson, "The Establishment of the French Protectorate over Cambodia," *The Far Eastern Quarterly*, Vol. 4, No. 4 (August 1945), pp. 313-340; Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 78-80; Quinn, *The French Overseas Empire*, p. 142; John A. Tully, *France on the Mekong: A History of the Protectorate of Cambodia, 1863-1953* (Lanham: University Press of America, 2002), pp. 2-3, 15-19; "Indochina," in Mokyr, ed., *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Economic History*; "Cambodia," in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*.
[45] Thompson, "The Establishment of the French Protectorate over Cambodia," pp. 331, 333, 335; Cady, *The Roots of French Imperialism in Eastern Asia*, pp. 275-276; Andrew and Kanya-Forstner, "Centre and Periphery in the Making of the Second French Colonial Empire," pp. 13-14; Tully, *France on the Mekong*, pp. 2-3; Brocheux and Hémery, *Indochina*, p. 26.
[46] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[47] Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 73-78; Quinn, *The French Overseas Empire*, pp. 141, 147; "Vietnam," in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*.

Inadvertent: YES. Admiral de la Grandière was acting on his own initiative, without orders from Paris.[48]

Risk: NO. Annam was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Saigon was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1871.[49]

114. Rapa Iti (1867/4)

Rapa Iti was acquired by France via annexation on 27 April 1867. The annexation was declared by French naval captain A. Quentin aboard the warship *Latouche Tréville*, who had been dispatched by the governor of French Tahiti, La Roncière, making the island a protectorate of the French Empire. The annexation was encouraged by British activity and interest on the island. Rapa had a population of approximately 120 at the time of annexation. Rapa was made a fully colony in March 1881. Rapa Iti was later organized under French Polynesia. Rapa Iti remains a French territory to this day.[50]

Inadvertent: UNKNOWN.

Risk: NO. Rapa Iti was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. There were no telegraph stations in the South Pacific until 1902.[51]

115. Gabon (1880/6)

Gabon was acquired by France via annexation in June 1880. Gabon was annexed by the famed Italian-French explorer Pierre Savorgnan de Brazza. France's first territorial holdings in Gabon were acquired between 1839 and 1843. French Navy Captain Bouët-Williaumez founded Libreville as an enclave for freed slaves in 1849. Gabon and neighboring Congo saw a number of expeditions by Savorgnan de Brazza between 1875 and 1885. Franceville was founded when Savorgnan de Brazza planted the French flag there in June 1880. On this expedition, de Brazza also claimed neighboring Congo for the French Empire. The French claim of Gabon was authorized with the Berlin Conference of 1884-1885. Gabon and Congo were established as a colony in April 1886. The French divided Gabon into development concessions and sold them to private companies, with

---

[48] Andrew and Kanya-Forstner, "Centre and Periphery in the Making of the Second French Colonial Empire," p. 14; Aldrich, *Greater France*, p. 78; Quinn, *The French Overseas Empire*, p. 141; Singer and Langdon, *Cultured Force*, p. 127.
[49] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[50] Angus Ross, *New Zealand Aspirations in the Pacific in the Nineteenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964), pp. 67-68; F. Allan Hanson, *Rapan Lifeways: Society and History on a Polynesian Island* (Prospect Heights: Waveland Press, 1970), pp. 33-37; Aldrich, *The French Presence in the South Pacific*, pp. 23-24; Dunmore, *Visions & Realities*, p. 203.
[51] Jeffrey K. Lyons, "The Pacific Cable, Hawai'i, and Global Communication," *The Hawaiian Journal of History*, Vol. 39 (2005), p. 42.

disastrous consequences for the Gabonese population. Gabon was made part of French Equatorial Africa in 1910. Gabon remained a French territory until its independence in 1960.[52]

Inadvertent: YES. De Brazza was acting on his own authority, without orders from Paris. He was only authorized to establish scientific stations in the region.[53]

Risk: NO. Gabon was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Gabon was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1885.[54]

116. Congo (1880/9)

Congo (contemporary Republic of the Congo) was acquired by France via annexation on 10 September 1880. Congo was annexed by the famed Italian-French explorer, Pierre Savorgnan de Brazza. De Brazza was sent on a series of expeditions up the Ogowe River between 1875 and 1885, and on his second expedition he obtained a treaty of protection from the chief of the Batéké people, Makoko, on 10 September 1880. This gained for France the bulk of what would officially become French Congo just two years later in November 1882. France may have been motivated to authorize this acquisition because of the conflict in Egypt. On this expedition, de Brazza also claimed neighboring Gabon for the French Empire. The Berlin Conference of 1884-1885 would authorize France's acquisition. Congo and Gabon were established as a colony in April 1886. The French divided Congo into development concessions and sold them to private companies, with disastrous consequences for the Congolese people. French Congo would become part of French Equatorial Africa in 1910. Congo would remain a French territory until its independence in 1960.[55]

---

[52] Brunschwig, *French Colonialism*, pp. 43-45; Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 51-55; "Pierre Savorgnan di Brazza," in Buisseret, ed., *The Oxford Companion to World Exploration*; "Brazza," in Rioux, *Dictionnaire de la France Coloniale*, p. 122; "Gabon" and "Libreville, Gabon," both in Gates and Appiah, eds., *Encyclopedia of Africa*.

[53] Robert Stanley Thomson, *Fondation de L'Etat Independent Congo: Un chaptire de l'histoire du partage de l'Afrique* (Bruxelles: Office de publicité, 1933), pp. 77, 79; Brunschwig, *French Colonialism*, pp. 45-48; C. W. Newbury and A. S. Kanya-Forstner, "French Policy and the Origins of the Scramble for West Africa," *The Journal of African History*, Vol. 10, No. 2 (April 1969), p. 270; Thomas F. Power, Jr., *Jules Ferry and the Renaissance of French Imperialism* (New York: Octagon Books, 1977), pp. 86-87; H. L. Wesseling, *Divide and Rule: The Partition of Africa, 1880-1914*, Translated by Arnold J. Pomerans (Westport: Praeger, 1996), pp. 93, 95, 97; Quinn, *The French Overseas Empire*, p. 158; "Congo (Brazzaville)," in Stearns ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; Mieke van der Linden, *The Acquisition of Africa (1870-1914)* (London: Brill, 2016), p. 144; Steven Press, *Rogue Empires: Contracts and Conmen in Europe's Scramble for Africa* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2017), p. 112.

[54] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

[55] Townsend, *European Colonial Expansion*, pp. 118-119; Brunschwig, *French Colonialism*, pp. 43-49; Richard West, *Brazza of the Congo: European Exploration and Exploitation of French Equatorial Africa* (London: Cape, 1972), pp. 102-110; Power, *Jules Ferry*, pp. 84-88; Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 51-55; Quinn, *The French Overseas Empire*, pp. 158-159; Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa*, pp. 143-148; "Pierre Savorgnan di Brazza," in Buisseret, ed., *The Oxford Companion to World Exploration*; "Congo (Brazzaville)," in Stearns ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; Edward Berenson, *Heroes of Empire: Five Charismatic Men and the Conquest of Africa* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010), pp. 54-61; "Republic of the Congo" and "Brazzaville, Republic of the Congo," both in Gates and Appiah, eds., *Encyclopedia of Africa*; Press, *Rogue Empires*, pp. 108-114.

Inadvertent: YES. De Brazza was acting on his own authority, without orders from Paris. He was only authorized to establish scientific stations in the region.[56]

Risk: NO. Congo was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. There were no telegraph stations in the area until 1885, in Angola and Gabon.[57]

117. Gambier Islands (1881/2)

The Gambier (alt. Mangareva) Islands were acquired by France via annexation on 21 February 1881. The islands were annexed by French Governor of Tahiti Isodore Chessé, making them a colony of the French Empire. France had first been offered a protectorate over the islands by local chiefs in 1844, though France declined. They were ultimately consolidated, along with other island territories, into the French Oceanic Establishment (Établissements français d'Océanie). The annexation was apparently influenced by German and American activity in the region. The islands were later organized as part of French Polynesia. The Gambier Islands remain French territory to this day as part of French Polynesia.[58]

Inadvertent: UNKNOWN. The annexation was at Governor Chessé's initiative, but it is unclear what role leaders in Paris played.[59]

Risk: NO. The Gambier Islands was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. There were no telegraph stations in the South Pacific until 1902.[60]

118. Tunisia (1881/5)

Tunisia was acquired by France via conquest from the Ottoman Empire between mid-April and 12 May 1881, over the course of the Franco-Tunisian War. Tunisia was conquered by 38,000 troops under the command of French Generals Forgemol de Bostquenard and Breart. France, along with other European powers, had developed economic ties with Tunisia through the 19th century. France had had its future control of Tunisia approved at the Berlin Conference of 1878, though it would

---

[56] Thomson, *Fondation de L'Etat Independent Congo*, pp. 77, 79; Brunschwig, *French Colonialism*, pp. 45-48; Newbury and Kanya-Forstner, "French Policy and the Origins of the Scramble for West Africa," p. 270; Power, *Jules Ferry*, pp. 86-87; Wesseling, *Divide and Rule*, pp. 93, 95, 97; Quinn, *The French Overseas Empire*, p. 158; "Congo (Brazzaville)," in Stearns ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; Van der Linden, *The Acquisition of Africa*, p. 144; Press, *Rogue Empires*, p. 112.

[57] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

[58] Paul Deschanel, *Les intérêts français dans l'océan Pacifique* (Paris: Berger-Levrault, 1888), pp. 68-71; Power, *Jules Ferry*, p. 77; Aldrich, *The French Presence in the South Pacific*, p. 24; Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 70-71; Dunmore, *Visions & Realities*, p. 203; "Gambier Islands," in Everett-Heath, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of World Place Names*; "French Polynesia," in *Oxford World Encyclopedia*.

[59] Power, *Jules Ferry*, p. 77; Dunmore, *Visions & Realities*, p. 203. Chessé did travel to Gambier on the orders of Naval and Colonial Minister Jauréguiberry, though his specific orders are unclear. See: Deschanel, *Les intérêts français dans l'océan Pacifique*, p. 68.

[60] Lyons, "The Pacific Cable," p. 42.

not act on this for a few years. In March 1881, an intervention by Tunisian tribesmen into neighboring French-controlled Algeria provided a pretext for invasion, which occurred mid-April 1881. France was also motivated by Italian interest in the area. On 12 May 1881, the local Ottoman bey was forced to sign the secret Bardo Treaty, making Tunisia a protectorate of the French Empire. French Tunisia was approximately 155,000 km^2. Pacification of the entire territory would take another year to complete. Tunisia would remain a French protectorate until its independence in 1956.[61]

Inadvertent: NO. The conquest and protectorate were ordered by Prime Minister Jules Ferry in April 1881.[62]

Risk: YES. The Ottoman Empire was a regional power.

Telegraph: YES. Tunisia was first connected to the global telegraph network in 1866.[63]

119. Western Society Islands (1881/5)

The Western (Leeward) Society Islands were acquired by France via annexation and treaty on 25 May 1881. The Western Society Islands were annexed by French Governor of Tahiti Isodore Chessé. France had acquired Tahiti and the Eastern (Windward) Society Islands in 1842. In 1847, France and Britain agreed that the Leeward Islands would remain neutral and independent. An abortive attempt had been made to annex these islands by the governor in Tahiti in March 1880. The protectorate treaty was signed the following May. In October 1887, Britain and France signed an agreement that gave control over the islands to France. The islands were later organized as part of French Polynesia.[64]

Inadvertent: NO. The annexation was ordered by the French cabinet in Paris.[65]

Risk: YES. The annexation was in violation of an agreement with the United Kingdom, a great power.

Telegraph: NO. There were no telegraph stations in the South Pacific until 1902.[66]

---

[61] Townsend, *European Colonial Expansion*, pp. 124-127; Roberts, *The History of French Colonial Policy*, pp. 260-266; Brunschwig, *French Colonialism*, pp. 55-58; James J. Cooke, *New French Imperialism, 1880-1910: The Third Republic and Colonial Expansion* (Hamden: Archon, 1973), pp. 17-18; Power, *Jules Ferry*, pp. 32-72; Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 28-31; Quinn, *The French Overseas Empire*, pp. 127-129; Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa*, pp. 113-122; "French Conquest of Tunisia (1881-1911)," in Holmes et al., eds., *The Oxford Companion to Military History*; "Tunisia," in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; "Tunisia," in Gates and Appiah, eds., *Encyclopedia of Africa*.

[62] Townsend, *European Colonial Expansion*, p. 127; Stern, *The French Colonies*, pp. 134-135; Roberts, *The History of French Colonial Policy*, p. 264; Brunschwig, *French Colonialism*, p. 55; Cooke, *New French Imperialism*, p. 17; Power, *Jules Ferry*, pp. 49-51; Andrew and Kanya-Forstner, "Centre and Periphery in the Making of the Second French Colonial Empire," pp. 17-19; Quinn, *The French Overseas Empire*, p. 128; Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa*, p. 115.

[63] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

[64] C. W. Newbury, "Aspects of French Policy in the Pacific, 1853-1906," *Pacific Historical Review*, Vol. 27, No. 1 (1958), pp. 50-53; Power, *Jules Ferry*, pp. 75-77; Aldrich, *The French Presence in the South Pacific*, pp. 19-24, 77-79; Dunmore, *Visions & Realities*, pp. 201-203.

[65] Newbury, "Aspects of French Policy in the Pacific," pp. 51-52; Power, *Jules Ferry*, p. 77.

[66] Lyons, "The Pacific Cable," p. 42.

120. Guinea (1881/7)

Guinea was acquired by France via annexation between 1880 to July 1881. Guinea was annexed by French military surgeon Dr. Jean Bayol, making it a protectorate of the French Empire. France had acquired coastal territorial holdings in Guinea in 1849. In July 1881, Dr. Bayol signed two treaties with local chiefs in Futa Jallon, one recognizing French control over the coast, the second a protectorate over Futa Jallon itself (though, the French version reportedly differed from the Arabic version). In 1891, Guinea was made a full French colony. French occupation of the territory was not effective until 1896. France would retain Guinea until its independence in 1958.[67]

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. Dr. Bayol received orders from authorities in Paris to annex Guinea on 12 March 1881.[68]

Risk: NO. Guinea was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Guinea was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1885.[69]

121. Southern French Sudan (1883/2)

Southern French Sudan (contemporary Mali) was acquired by France via conquest on 1 February 1883. Southern French Sudan was conquered by French forces under the command of Lieutenant General Gustave Borgnis-Desbordes, with the capture of the city of Bamako, as part of their campaign against Mandinka warrior Samori Touré. French explorers had first visited the area, particularly Timbuktu, in 1828. It wasn't until 1887 that the French and Touré signed a treaty of peace. The remainder of what would become French Sudan belonged to the Tukolor Empire, which wouldn't be defeated until 1893. French Sudan became part of French West Africa in 1895. France's hold on this territory would remain tenuous for much of its imperial history. French Sudan would remain a part of the French Empire until Mali's independence in 1960.[70]

Inadvertent: YES. Lieutenant General Desbordes was acting on his own initiative, against explicit orders from Paris.[71]

Risk: NO. The Mandinka Empire was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

---

[67] John D. Hargreaves, *Prelude to the Partition of West Africa* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1963), pp. 267-271; Michael Crowder, *West Africa Under Colonial Rule* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1968), pp. 94-95; Power, *Jules Ferry*, p. 83; Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 38-39; Martin A. Klein, *Slavery and Colonial Rule in French West Africa* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 147; "Guinea" and "Conakry, Guinea," in Gates and Appiah, eds., *Encyclopedia of Africa*.

[68] Hargreaves, *Prelude to the Partition of West Africa*, p. 268.

[69] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

[70] Kanya-Forstner, *The Conquest of the Western Sudan*, pp. 87-94; Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 42-46; Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa*, pp. 169-179; "Mali" in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; "Mali" and "Bamako, Mali," both in Gates and Appiah, eds., *Encyclopedia of Africa*.

[71] Kanya-Forstner, *The Conquest of the Western Sudan*, pp. 88-93; Andrew and Kanya-Forstner, "Centre and Periphery in the Making of the Second French Colonial Empire," p. 20; Quinn, *The French Overseas Empire*, p. 158; Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa*, p. 178.

Telegraph: NO. French Sudan wouldn't have a connection to the global telegraph network until 1903.[72]

122. Porto-Novo (1883/4)

Porto-Novo (contemporary Benin) was acquired by France via annexation in April 1883. This annexation, which had been requested by the local king, made Porto-Novo a protectorate of the French Empire. France had had a short-lived and never-ratified protectorate from 1863 to 1865, which was cancelled by a local king. Another local ruler at Port-Novo had requested a French protectorate in 1879, citing the immanence of a British takeover, but was rebuffed by the French Foreign Office. In 1894, Porto-Novo was added to the new French Colony of Dahomey. In 1904, these territories were added to French West Africa, administered from Dakar, Senegal. France would retain Dahomey until the independence of the Republic of Dahomey in 1960.[73]

Inadvertent: NO. The annexation was planned and ordered by Naval Minister Jauréguiberry and Foreign Minister Freycinet in April 1882.[74]

Risk: NO. Dahomey was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Dahomey was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1885.[75]

123. Tonkin (1883/8)

Tonkin (contemporary Vietnam) was acquired by France via conquest between 25 April 1882 and 25 August 1883, over the course of the Third Franco-Vietnamese War. Tonkin was conquered by approximately 10,000 French forces under the command of Admiral Amédée Courbet. On 25 April 1882, French naval officer Henri Rivière seized and held Hanoi with a force of around 600, sparking the conflict that would ultimately result in the Tonkin protectorate. In the summer of 1883, France bombarded and landed forces at Hué, ultimately coercing the Vietnamese into signing a treaty on 25 August 1883, which established a protectorate over Annam and Tonkin. The initial treaty was never ratified by the French government, but a follow-up treaty the following year would be. The conquest of Tonkin helped spark the Sino-French War, which would end with China's recognition of France's protectorate with the Treaty of Tientsin, in June 1885. In 1887, Tonkin was consolidated along with

---

[72] Javier Márquez Quevedo, "Telecommunications and Colonial Rivalry: European Telegraph Cables to the Canary Islands and Northwest Africa, 1883-1914," *Historical Social Research*, Vol. 35, No. 1 (2010), p. 112.
[73] C. W. Newbury, *The Western Slave Coast and its Rulers: European Trade and Administration Among the Yoruba and Adja-Speaking Peoples of South-Western Nigeria, southern Dahomey and Togo* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961), pp. 68-71, 105-108; Boniface I. Obichere, *West African States and European Expansionism: The Dahomey-Niger Hinterland, 1885-1898* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971), p. 29; "Benin," in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; "Porto-Novo, Benin" and "Benin," both in Gates and Appiah, eds., *Encyclopedia of Africa*.
[74] Newbury, *The Western Slave Coast*, pp. 107-108; Hargreaves, *Prelude to the Partition of West Africa*, pp. 296-297; Kanya-Forstner, *The Conquest of the Western Sudan*, p. 103; Newbury and Kanya-Forstner, "French Policy and the Origins of the Scramble for West Africa," p. 269.
[75] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

other territories into French Indochina. French Indochina would remain a part of the French Empire until France's withdrawal in 1954.[76]

Inadvertent: YES. Commander Henri Rivière was acting on his own initiative in conquering Tonkin, without orders from Paris.[77]

Risk: NO. Annam was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Tonkin was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1884.[78]

124. Annam (1883/8)

Annam (contemporary Vietnam) was acquired by France via conquest between 25 April 1882 and 25 August 1883, over the course of the Third Franco-Vietnamese War. Annam was conquered by approximately 10,000 French forces under the command of Admiral Amédée Courbet. On 25 April 1882, French naval officer Henri Rivière seized and held Hanoi with a force of around 600, sparking the conflict that would ultimately result in the Annam protectorate. In the summer of 1883, France bombarded and landed forces at Hué, ultimately coercing the Vietnamese into signing a treaty on 25 August 1883, which established a protectorate over Annam and Tonkin. The initial treaty was never ratified by the French government, but a follow-up treaty the following year would be. The conquest of Annam helped spark the Sino-French War, which would end with China's recognition of France's protectorate with the Treaty of Tientsin, in June 1885. In 1887, Annam was consolidated along with other territories into French Indochina. French Indochina would remain a part of the French Empire until France's withdrawal in 1954.[79]

Inadvertent: YES. Commander Henri Rivière was acting on his own initiative in conquering Tonkin, without orders from Paris.[80]

Risk: NO. Annam was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

---

[76] Roberts, *The History of French Colonial Policy*, pp. 424-427; Power, *Jules Ferry*, pp. 157-164, 166; Kim Munholland, "Admiral Jauréguiberry and the French Scramble for Tonkin, 1879-83," *French Historical Studies*, Vol. 11, No. 1 (Spring 1979), pp. 81-107; Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 80-81; "Vietnam," in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; Finch, *A Progressive Occupation?*, pp. 77-78.

[77] Charles Baude de Maurceley, *Le Commandant Rivière et l'expédition du Tonkin* (Paris: P. Ollendorff, 1884), p. 131; Ennis, *French Policy and Developments in Indochina*, p. 48; Lloyd E. Eastman, *Throne and Mandarins: China's Search for a Policy During the Sino-French Controversy, 1880-1885* (Taipei: Rainbow Bridge Book Co., 1967), p. 50; Henry McAleavy, *Black Flags in Vietnam: The Story of a Chinese Intervention* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1968), p. 190; "Henri Rivière (1827-1883)," in Bruce M. Lockhart and William J. Duiker, *Historical Dictionary of Vietnam*, 3rd ed. (Lanham: Scarecrow Press, 2006), pp. 305-306. For a detailed examination, see Nicholas D. Anderson, *Inadvertent Expansion in World Politics* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2024), Chapter 5.

[78] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

[79] Roberts, *The History of French Colonial Policy*, pp. 424-427; Power, *Jules Ferry*, pp. 157-164, 166; Munholland, "Admiral Jauréguiberry and the French Scramble for Tonkin"; Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 80-81; "Vietnam," in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; Finch, *A Progressive Occupation?*, pp. 77-78.

[80] Maurceley, *Le Commandant Rivière*, p. 131; Ennis, *French Policy and Developments in Indochina*, p. 48; Eastman, *Throne and Mandarins*, p. 50; McAleavy, *Black Flags in Vietnam*, p. 190; "Rivière," in Lockhart and Duiker, *Historical Dictionary of Vietnam*, pp. 305-306. For a detailed examination, see Anderson, *Inadvertent Expansion*, Ch. 5.

Telegraph: NO. Annam was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1884 (at Hue).[81]

125. French Somaliland (1885/3)

French Somaliland (contemporary Djibouti) was acquired by France via annexation on 26 March 1885. French Somaliland was annexed by French Obock governor Léonce Lagarde. France had gained its first territorial holdings in the area with the acquisition of the port of Obock in March 1862. In 1885, France obtained the remainder of French Somaliland when it signed a treaty with Issa chiefs on the Gulf of Tadjoura, making it part of the colony of French Somaliland. Somaliland remained a French colony until the independence of Djibouti in 1977.[82]

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. It seems that the cabinet in Paris was involved in planning and ordering the annexation[83]

Risk: NO. Somaliland was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Obock was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1889.[84]

126. Madagascar (1885/12)

Madagascar was acquired by France via conquest between April 1883 and 17 December 1885, over the course of the First Franco-Madagascan War. Madagascar was conquered by a French force of a few hundred under the command of Admiral Pierre. France had long had relations with Madagascar, acquiring a number of its coastal islands beginning in 1819. A property dispute in 1883 served as a pretext for a French blockade and invasion, leading to the establishment of a partial protectorate. Relations would continue to be strained, and a second war would break out in 1894, leading to the island's full colonization the following year. Madagascar has a territorial area of 587,040 km^2. Madagascar would remain a French colony until its independence in 1960.[85]

Inadvertent: NO. Prime Minister Duclerc and the cabinet were involved in the planning and ordering of the conquest.[86]

---

[81] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[82] Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 57-60; "Ambado" (p. 13) and "Issa Treaties" (p. 114), both in Alwan and Mibrathu, *Historical Dictionary of Djibouti*; Dubois, "Djibouti et la Corne de l'Afrique," in Rioux, ed., *Dictionnaire de la France Coloniale*, p. 302; "Djibouti," in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; "Djibouti" and "Djibouti, Djibouti," both in Gates and Appiah, eds., *Encyclopedia of Africa*.
[83] Brunschwig, "Une Colonie Inutile," p. 45.
[84] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[85] Roberts, *The History of French Colonial Policy*, pp. 379-382; Power, *Jules Ferry*, pp. 116-129; Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 60-63; Quinn, *The French Overseas Empire*, pp. 151-153; "Franco-Malagasy War, 1883-1885" (pp. 121-122), "Franco-Malagasy War, 1895" (pp. 122-123), "François de Mahy" (p. 163), "Protectorate of 1885" (p. 214), and "Protectorate of 1895" (p. 214), all in Allen and Covell, *Historical Dictionary of Madagascar*; "Madagascar," in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; "Madagascar," in Gates and Appiah, eds., *Encyclopedia of Africa*; Finch, *A Progressive Occupation?*, pp. 169-171.
[86] Power, *Jules Ferry*, pp. 121-122, 128-129; Andrew and Kanya-Forstner, "Centre and Periphery in the Making of the Second French Colonial Empire," p. 17; Allen and Covell, *Historical Dictionary of Madagascar*, pp. 121-122.

Risk: NO. Madagascar was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Madagascar was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1895.[87]

127. Comoros Islands (1886/4)

The Comoros islands of Ngazidja (Grand Comore), Nzwani (Anjouan), and Mwali (Mohéli) were acquired by France via annexation between January and 26 April 1886. The Comoros Islands were annexed by the Commandant of Mayotte, Gerville-Réache, making them a protectorate of the French Empire. France acquired the first Comoros island of Mayotte in 1841, and had had influence on the other islands since at least 1843. The Berlin Conference of 1884 and 1885 had placed the Comoros Islands within France's sphere of influence. The annexation was motivated, at least in part, by German interests in the area. Local authorities on the islands, in some cases influenced by French merchants, requested the annexation to officials in French Mayotte. By 1909, all of the Comoros Islands were French protectorates, and in 1912 they were added to the French colony of Madagascar. The territorial area of Ngazidja is 1,146 km^2, that of Nzwani is 424 km^2, and that of Mwali 211 km^2. The entire Comoros archipelago totaled approximately 2,050 km^2. France would retain Comoros until its independence in 1974, thereafter only retaining Mayotte.[88]

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. The annexation of Ngazidja was approved by the French Foreign Ministry in 1885.[89]

Risk: NO. The Comoros Islands was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: LIKELY NO. Neighboring Madagascar was only connected to the global telegraph network in 1895.[90]

128. Senegal (1886/10)

Senegal was acquired by France via conquest between 1883 and October 1886. France had first established a trading post at Dakar in the 18th century, and acquired interior territory in the late 1850s. In 1883, France began building a rail line that would run through the Kajor Kingdom, leading to conflict with local ruler, Lat Jor. The conflict led to Lat Jor's expulsion from Kajor and his ultimate defeat in the battle of Dekele on 26 October 1886. Following the annexation of Kajor,

---

[87] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[88] Malyn Newitt, *The Comoro Islands: Struggle Against Dependency in the Indian Ocean* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1984), pp. 29, 31-32, 34-35; Townsend, *European Colonial Expansion*, pp. 132-133; "Léon Humblot" (pp. 42-44), "Mwali" (pp. 60-62), "Ngazidja" (pp. 63-64), and "Nzwani" (pp. 65-66), all in Ottenheimer and Ottenheimer, *Historical Dictionary of the Comoro Islands*; Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 63-64; Dunmore, *Visions & Realities*, p. 196; "Comoros," in Gates and Appiah, eds., *Encyclopedia of Africa*; Walker, *Islands in a Cosmopolitan Sea*, pp. 91-101, 104-105.
[89] Barbara D. Dubins, "A Political History of the Comoro Islands, 1795-1886," (Doctoral Dissertation, Boston University, 1972), pp. 229-230.
[90] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

France controlled most of modern Senegal. In 1890, France formally declared a protectorate over the territory. French West Africa was established in 1895, and Dakar was made its capital in 1902. Senegal would remain a part of French West Africa until its independence in 1960.[91]

Inadvertent: NO. The rail line and conquest were planned and ordered by leaders in Paris.[92]

Risk: NO. Senegal was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: YES. Senegal was connected to the global telegraph network in 1883.[93]

129. Wallis and Futuna Islands (1887/4)

Wallis and Futuna Islands (contemporary France) were acquired by France via annexation in April 1887, making them a protectorate of the French Empire. French Catholic missionaries began traveling to the islands in the 1830s. They were highly successful in converting the locals, giving these missionaries a virtual theocracy on the islands. Missionaries regularly requested a French protectorate over the ensuing decades, though France repeatedly declined. The eventual annexation was partly motivated by British and German activity in the area. The protectorate over Wallis was established in 1886, and that over Futuna in April 1887. In 1913, the islands became a French colony. The islands total 142 km^2 in land area. Wallis and Futuna remain part of France to this day.[94]

Inadvertent: NO. The annexation decision and orders originated with leaders in Paris.[95]

Risk: NO. Wallis and Futuna Islands were not great powers or regional powers, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. There were no telegraph stations in the South Pacific until 1902.[96]

130. New Hebrides (1887/11)

New Hebrides (contemporary Vanuatu) was jointly acquired by France and the United Kingdom via annexation on 16 November 1887. French and British missionaries and merchants had traveled to the islands since the early 1800s. Irish-French citizen and merchant John Higginson bought title to

---

[91] Kanya-Forstner, *The Conquest of the Western Sudan*, pp. 106-112; Power, *Jules Ferry*, pp. 78-80; "Chronology" (pp. 28-30), "Lat Jor Ngone Latir Jop" (pp. 165-169), "Kajor" (pp. 173-174), and "Railroads" (pp. 224-226), all in Andrew F. Clark and Lucie Colvin Phillips, *Historical Dictionary of Senegal* (Metuchen: Scarecrow Press, 1994); "Senegal," in Gates and Appiah, eds., *Encyclopedia of Africa*.

[92] Kanya-Forstner, *The Conquest of the Western Sudan*, pp. 106, 108; Clark and Phillips, *Historical Dictionary of Senegal*, pp. 28-30.

[93] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

[94] Aldrich, *The French Presence in the South Pacific*, pp. 27-28, 95-96; Aldrich, *Greater France*, p. 71; Fisher, *France in the South Pacific*, p. 32; "Wallis and Futuna," in Christopher Riches and Peter Stalker, *A Guide to the Countries of the World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016), Available at: https://www.oxfordreference.com/.

[95] Aldrich, *The French Presence in the South Pacific*, p. 96; Paul De Deckker, "France in the Pacific: Colonial Administration and Policy," *The New Pacific Review*, Vol. 2, No. 1 (December 2003), p. 61.

[96] Lyons, "The Pacific Cable," p. 42.

approximately one-third of the territory on the islands, and he advocated for a French takeover. Local British nationals campaigned their government to the same end. The Navy sent Admiral du Petit-Thouars to New Hebrides in October 1878 to ascertain whether annexation or a protectorate was worthwhile, and he recommended against it. France briefly occupied the island in 1886. New Hebrides was acquired through the Anglo-French Naval Commission of 16 November 1887, intended to protect French and British subjects. This effectively made it a joint protectorate of the two great powers. The territory became a formal condominium in 1906. The islands making up New Hebrides total 12,189 km^2 in land area. The condominium over New Hebrides persisted until the independence of Vanuatu in 1980.[97]

Inadvertent: NO. Leaders in Paris were involved in the negotiations and the territory was annexed by treaty between the French and British governments.[98]

Risk: NO. New Hebrides was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. There were no telegraph stations in the South Pacific until 1902.[99]

131. Côte d'Ivoire (1889/1)

Côte d'Ivoire was acquired by France via annexation between 1887 and January 1889. In 1887, Arthur Verdier, the first French resident in Côte d'Ivoire, hired explorer, Marcel Treich-Leplène, to map the Niger River basin. At the same time, the French government sent Lieutenant Louis-Gustave Binger into Côte d'Ivoire's interior. They separately secured a series of treaties, and jointly declared the interior of Côte d'Ivoire a protectorate of the French Empire in January 1889. In 1893, France made Côte d'Ivoire a colony, though it was not until 1918 that it secured the entire territory. In 1895, Côte d'Ivoire was incorporated into French West Africa. Local Muslim Mandinka warrior Samori Touré resisted French expansion until his defeat in 1898. France would retain Côte d'Ivoire until its independence in 1960.[100]

Inadvertent: NO. Lieutenant Binger's annexation was on the orders of Minister of Foreign Affairs Flourens and Colonial Secretary De la Porte.[101]

Risk: NO. Côte d'Ivoire was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

---

[97] Roberts, *The History of French Colonial Policy*, pp. 531-534; Aldrich, *The French Presence in the South Pacific*, pp. 28-31, 77; Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 71-72; Dunmore, *Visions & Realities*, pp. 196-199; Nic Maclellan and Jean Chesneaux, *After Moruroa: France in the Pacific* (New York: Ocean Press, 1998), pp. 59-60; "Vanuatu (formerly New Hebrides)," in Anne Kerr and Edmund Wright, eds., *Oxford Dictionary of World History*, 3rd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015), Available at: https://www.oxfordreference.com/.

[98] Aldrich, *The French Presence in the South Pacific*, pp. 227-231; Dunmore, *Visions & Realities*, p. 198.

[99] Lyons, "The Pacific Cable," p. 42.

[100] Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 41-42; "Ivory Coast," in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; "Côte d'Ivoire," in Gates and Appiah, eds., *Encyclopedia of Africa*; "Louis-Gustave Binger" (p. 112) and "Marcel Triech-Laplene" (p. 463), in Daddieh, *Historical Dictionary of Côte d'Ivoire*.

[101] Louis Gustave Binger, *Du Niger au Golfe de Guinée par le Pays de Kong et le Mossi* (Paris: Hachette, 1892), p. 2; Thomas J. Bassett, *The Peasant Cotton Revolution in West Africa: Côte d'Ivoire, 1880-1995* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001), p. 30; "Côte d'Ivoire," in Gates and Appiah, eds., *Encyclopedia of Africa*.

Telegraph: YES. Côte d'Ivoire was connected to the global telegraph network in 1885.[102]

132. Northern French Sudan (1893/4)

Northern French Sudan (contemporary Mali) was acquired by France via conquest between April 1890 and April 1893. French explorers had first visited the area, particularly Timbuktu, in 1828. France had acquired the southern area of what would become French Sudan in 1883. In April 1890, 3,600 forces under the command of Lieutenant Colonel Louis Archinard launched a successful offensive against Tukulor forces in Ségou. By 1892, the French claimed the region as the colony of French Sudan, and in April 1893 the Tukulor Empire collapsed. In February 1894, French forces under Lieutenant Colonel Eugène Bonnier took Timbuktu. French Sudan became part of French West Africa in 1895. France's hold on this territory would remain tenuous for much of its imperial history. French Sudan would remain a part of the French Empire until Mali's independence in 1960.[103]

Inadvertent: YES. Lieutenant Colonel Archinard's initial conquests were launched without the approval of the French government in Paris, and much of the subsequent expansion was also unauthorized.[104]

Risk: NO. The Tukulor Empire was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. French Sudan wouldn't have a connection to the global telegraph network until 1903.[105]

133. Laos (1893/10)

Laos was acquired by France via conquest in October 1893, over the course of the Franco-Siamese War. At this time the loosely-organized Kingdom of Luang Phrabang (Laos) was a vassal state to Thailand. A treaty of protection was signed between Laos and French government official Auguste Pavie in April of 1889, though Thailand would strenuously object, culminating in open war in the summer of 1893. With France's victory, Thailand was forced to cede its vassal kingdom to the French, fully establishing a French protectorate over Laos. In 1897, Laos was added to French Indochina. France would extend its territorial control over Laotian territories west of the Mekong

---

[102] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[103] Kanya-Forstner, *The Conquest of the Western Sudan*, pp. 174-195; Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 42-46; Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa*, pp. 360-370; "Mali," in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; "Mali" and "Bamako, Mali," both in Gates and Appiah, eds., *Encyclopedia of Africa*.
[104] Kanya-Forstner, *The Conquest of the Western Sudan*, pp. 177, 178, 184, 185, 194; Douglas Porch, *The Conquest of the Sahara* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1984), pp. 136-138; Hargreaves, *Prelude to the Partition of West Africa*, pp. 41, 219; Klein, *Slavery and Colonial Rule in French West Africa*, pp. 89, 91; Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa*, pp. 361, 364, 367, 369; Pascal J. Imperato and Gavin H. Imperato, *Historical Dictionary of Mali*, 4th ed. (Lanham: Scarecrow Press, 2008), pp. lxxxi, 18, 42-43.
[105] Quevedo, "Telecommunications and Colonial Rivalry," p. 112.

River in 1907. Laos would remain a French protectorate, with the exception of a short period under Japanese rule during WWII, until the withdrawal of French forces in 1954.[106]

Inadvertent: NO. Auguste Pavie received authorization from Paris before he annexed Laos.[107]

Risk: NO. Laos was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: YES. Laos was connected to the global telegraph network in March 1890.[108]

134. Dahomey (1894/1)

Dahomey (contemporary Benin) was acquired by France via conquest between October 1892 and January 1894, over the course of the Second Franco-Dahomeyan War. Dahomey was conquered by 2,000 forces under the command of Colonel Alfred-Amedée Dodds. The French had fought a war with Dahomey only two years earlier. The precipitating event for this conquest was a Dahomey raid of the Wheme valley. The Fon of Dahomey put up significant resistance, though ultimately, they inflicted few French casualties. This conquest made Dahomey a colony of the French Empire, with Contonou as its administrative capital. It took until 1902 for France to fully pacify the territory. In 1904, these territories were added to French West Africa, administered from Dakar, Senegal. France would retain Dahomey until Benin's independence in 1960.[109]

Inadvertent: NO. Colonel Dodds' conquest was authorized by leaders in Paris on 10 April 1892.[110]

Risk: NO. Dahomey was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: YES. Dahomey was connected to the global telegraph network in 1885.[111]

---

[106] Patrick J. N. Tuck, "Auguste Pavie and the Exploration of the Mekong Valley, 1886-95," *Terrae Incognitae*, Vol. 14, No. 1 (1982), pp. 41-60; Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 81-82; Martin Stuart-Fox, *A History of Laos* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 20-29; Peter Simms and Sanda Simms, *The Kingdoms of Laos: Six Hundred Years of History* (Richmond: Curzon, 1999), pp. 155-160, 204-210; Quinn, *The French Overseas Empire*, pp. 149-150; "Laos," in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; "Franco-Siamese Treaty of 1893" (pp. 112-113), "'Paknam Incident'" (p. 247), and "Auguste Pavie" (pp. 250-251), all in Martin Stuart-Fox, *Historical Dictionary of Laos*, 3rd ed. (Lanham: Scarecrow Press, 2008).

[107] Tuck, "Auguste Pavie and the Exploration of the Mekong Valley," p. 56; Martin Stuart-Fox, "The French in Laos, 1887-1945," *Modern Asian Studies*, Vol. 29, No. 1 (1995), p. 118.

[108] M. L. Manich, *History of Laos, Including the History of Lannathai, Chiengmai* (Bangkok: Chalermnit, 1992), p. 226.

[109] Obichere, *West African States and European Expansionism*, pp. 95-121; John D. Hargreaves, *West Africa Partitioned*, Vol. II: *The Elephants and the Grass* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985), pp. 163-173; Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 40-41; "Dahomey Expedition (1892-4)," in Holmes et al., eds., *The Oxford Companion to Military History*; "Benin," in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; "Benin" and "Early Kingdom of Dahomey," both in Gates and Appiah, eds., *Encyclopedia of Africa*.

[110] C. W. Newbury, "The Development of French Policy on the Lower and Upper Niger, 1880-98," *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 31, No. 1 (March 1959), pp. 25-26; C. W. Newbury, "A Note on the Dahomey Protectorate," *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute*, Vol. 29, No. 2 (April 1959), p. 148; Brunschwig, *French Colonialism*, p. 103; Obichere, *West African States and European Expansionism*, p. 102; Hargreaves, *West Africa Partitioned*, Vol. II, pp. 97, 172.

[111] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

135. Ubangi-Shari (1894/8)

Ubangi-Shari (contemporary Central African Republic) was acquired by France via annexation between 1891 and August 1894. France and Belgium signed an agreement in April 1887, putting the Ubangi-Shari area within France's sphere of influence. The first French military post in the area was established by Albert and Michel Dolisie at the Ubangi and Mpoko rivers in June 1889. An expedition led by Paul Crampel in 1890-1891 secured treaties of protection with a number of local chiefs. A number of other concurrent and follow-up expeditions took place, including those of Alfred Fourneau, Victor Liotard, Jean Dybowski, Casimir Maistre, and François Clozel. All this exploration sparked a major diplomatic incident between France and Belgium in March 1893. France declared the area a colony in August 1894 after signing a treaty with Belgian Congo, and began the military occupation of the territory after the Fashoda Crisis in 1898. Like in other parts of French Equatorial Africa, the French divided the territory up into concessions for lease to private companies, with disastrous consequences for the local population. In 1910 Ubangi-Shari was added to French Equatorial Africa. Ubangi-Shari would remain a French territory until the independence of the Central African Republic in 1960.[112]

Inadvertent: YES. Paul Crampel's expedition was ordered in secret by Colonial Under-Secretary Eugène Etienne, without the authorization of the cabinet.[113]

Risk: NO. Ubangi-Shari was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Ubangi-Shari was not connected to the global telegraph network until 1906 at the earliest.[114]

136. Upper Volta (1896/9)

Upper Volta (contemporary Burkina Faso) was acquired by France via conquest on 5 September 1896. Upper Volta was conquered by 250 troops under the command of Paul Voulet and Jean-Marie Chanoine, taking Ouagadougou by force from the Mossi tribe. The territory was visited in February 1888 by the explorer Louis Binger who, while claiming to be unimpressed with the territory, was rebuffed by the Mossi when he requested a French protectorate in the area. Binger managed to secure a protectorate over Kong, in the southern Volta region. In 1895 the French defeated Zara warriors to occupy Bobo-Diaoulasso. The conquest of Ouagadougou in 1896 made it a military

---

[112] Aldrich, *Greater France*, p. 55; "Chronology" (p. xxvi), "Bangassou Incident" (pp. 16-17), "Pierre Savorgnan de Brazza" (pp. 34-35), "François Clozel" (p. 42), "Comite de L'Afrique Francaise (French Africa Committee)" (p 44), "Paul Crampel" (pp. 51-52), "Michel Dolisie" (p. 66), "Jean Dybowski" (p. 67), "Fourneau (Mission)" (pp. 78-79), "Victor Liotard" (pp. 120-121), "Casimir Maistre" (pp. 124-125), all in Pierre Kalck, *Historical Dictionary of the Central African Republic*, 3rd ed. (Lanham: Scarecrow Press, 2005); "Central African Republic" and "Bangui, Central African Republic," both in Gates and Appiah, eds., *Encyclopedia of Africa*; "Introduction" (pp. 24-28), "Bangassou" (p. 97), "Pierre Paul François Camille Savorgnan de Brazza" (p. 144), "Comité de L'Afrique Française (CAF)/French Africa Committee" (p. 171), "Michel Gustave Henri Dolisie" (p. 229), and "Upper Ubangi" (p. 624), all in Richard Bradshaw and Juan Fandos-Ruis, *Historical Dictionary of the Central African Republic*, New ed. (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2016).
[113] Hargreaves, *West Africa Partitioned*, Vol. II, pp. 23-24; Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa*, p. 361; "Paul Crampel," in Kalck, *Historical Dictionary of the Central African Republic*, pp. 51-52; "Comité de L'Afrique Française (CAF)/French Africa Committee," in Bradshaw and Fandos-Ruis, *Historical Dictionary of the Central African Republic*, p. 171.
[114] "Telecommunications," in Bradshaw and Fandos-Ruis, *Historical Dictionary of the Central African Republic*, p. 598.

territory of the French Empire. In 1904 it was added to the colony of Haut-Sénégal-Niger. In 1932, Upper Volta was dissolved and would thereafter be administered from Côte d'Ivoire. It would remain a French territory until the independence of Upper Volta in 1960.[115]

Inadvertent: UNKNOWN.

Risk: NO. Upper Volta was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Upper Volta was not likely connected to the global telegraph network until 1910.[116]

137. Guangzhouwan (1898/4)

Guanzhouwan (contemporary China) was acquired by France via annexation between February and 22 April 1898. Its acquisition was the result of pressure put on China by the great powers to open itself up for trade and diplomacy. A French warship landed in the territory in February 1898 and the French flag was raised on 22 April. There was little official resistance, though some from the public. It was leased for 99 years and administered from French Indochina. French Guangzhouwan totaled 1,300 km^2 in area. France would retain this lease until it was invaded by Japan in February 1943. After the Second World War, Guanzhouwan would return to China.[117]

Inadvertent: NO. French Foreign Minister Gabriel Hanotaux was involved in the decision to annex Guanzhouwan.[118]

Risk: YES. China was a regional power and had an alliance with Russia, a great power.[119]

Telegraph: YES. China was connected to the global telegraph network in 1871.[120]

---

[115] Hargreaves, *West Africa Partitioned*, Vol. II, pp. 220-221; Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 42-43; Pierre Englebert, *Burkina Faso: Unsteady Statehood in West Africa* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1996), pp. 18-20; "Charles Paul Jules Chanoine" (p. 25) and "Paul Gustave Lucien Voulet" (p. 146), both in Daniel M. McFarland and Lawrence Rupley, *Historical Dictionary of Burkina Faso* (Lanham: Scarecrow Press, 1998); "Burkina Faso," in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; "Burkina Faso," and "Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso," both in Gates and Appiah, eds., *Encyclopedia of Africa*.
[116] "Chronology," in McFarland and Rupley, *Historical Dictionary of Burkina Faso*, p. xxxvii.
[117] Hosea B. Morse, *The International Relations of the Chinese Empire*, Vol. III: *The Period of Subjection, 1894-1911* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1918), pp. 112-113; Stanley F. Wright, *Hart and the Chinese Customs* (Belfast: Queen's University, 1950), p. 688; Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 82-83; Robert A. Bickers, *The Scramble for China: Foreign Devils in the Qing Empire, 1800-1914* (London: Allen Lane, 2011), p. 331; Bert Becker, "France and the Gulf of Tonkin Region: Shipping Markets and Political Interventions in South China in the 1890s," *Cross Currents e-Journal*, No. 16 (September 2015), p. 44n3; Robert Nield, *China's Foreign Places: The Foreign Presence in China in the Treaty Port Era* (Hong Kong: HKU Press, 2015), pp. 151-153; Bert Becker, "French Kwang-Chow-Wan and British Hong Kong: Politics and Shipping, 1890s-1920s," in James R. Fichter, ed., *British and French Colonialism in Africa, Asia and the Middle East: Connected Empires across the Eighteenth to the Twentieth Centuries* (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019), pp. 184-191.
[118] Wright, *Hart and the Chinese Customs*, p. 688; Becker, "French Kwang-Chow-Wan and British Hong Kong," p. 190.
[119] Alliance Treaty Obligations and Provisions (ATOP) ID: 1395; Correlates of War (COW) Alliance ID: 76. See: ATOP v5.1. Brett Ashley Leeds, Jeffrey M. Ritter, Sara McLaughlin Mitchell, and Andrew G. Long, "Alliance Treaty Obligations and Provisions, 1815-1944," *International Interactions*, Vol. 28, No. 3 (2002), pp. 237-260. Available at: http://www.atopdata.org/; Formal Alliances (v4.1). Douglas M. Gibler, *International Military Alliances, 1648-2008* (Washington: CQ Press, 2009). Available at: https://correlatesofwar.org/.
[120] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 115; Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

138. Niger (1899/9)

Niger was acquired by France via conquest in September 1899. Niger was conquered by 1,700 forces under the command of Lieutenant Meynier. France's move into Niger was partly motivated by competition with Britain for the West African interior and partly by a desire for valuable resources. The first effort to acquire the territory was the mission of Captain Cazémajou, who was sent out in 1897 to acquire a protectorate, only to be killed in May 1898. The second effort, by the Mission Afrique Centrale, was launched in January 1899 and was initially headed by Paul Voulet and Jean-Marie Chanoine. This was a brutal campaign, which led to thousands of local deaths, and countless violations of British territory in the area. The Ministry of Colonies decided to court-martial Voulet and Chanoine for their actions, and sent Lieutenant Colonel Klobb and Lieutenant Meynier to replace them. The ensuring firefight led to the death of Klobb, Voulet, and Chanoine. Zinder, the capital of the Damagaram Empire, was seized by Meynier in September 1899. Niger was initially established as a military territory on 20 December 1900, and would not become a colony until 1922. Niger was not fully pacified until 1908. It would remain part of the French Empire until its independence in 1960.[121]

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. The conquest of Niger was planned and ordered by leaders in Paris.[122]

Risk: NO. Niger was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Niger was first connected to the global telegraph network in 1909.[123]

139. Chad (1900/4)

Chad was acquired by France via conquest in April 1900, over the course of the Conquest of Chad. Chad was conquered by French forces under the command of François Lamy. A number of French organizations sponsored expeditions to conquer new territory in the area, reaching Lake Chad for the first time in 1897. France acquired this territory by defeating the forces of Sudanese slave-raider, Rabih Zubayr, for control of the Chadian kingdoms of Bagirmi and Bornu. The decisive engagement of this conquest was the Battle of Kousseri on 22 April 1900, where both Rabih and Lamy were killed in action. Chad became a French colony and, in 1910, it was added to French Equatorial Africa. It took until 1919 for France to pacify the territory in its entirety. Chad would remain a French colony until its independence in 1960.[124]

---

[121] Finn Fuglestad, *A History of Niger, 1850-1960* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), pp. 54-62; Porch, *The Conquest of the Sahara*, pp. 181-197; Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 46-47; "Niger," in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; "Niger" and "Zinder, Niger," in Gates and Appiah, eds., *Encyclopedia of Africa*; "Chronology" (p. xxvii), "Colonie du Niger" (pp. 128-129), "French Occupation" (pp. 238-239), and "Mission Afrique Centrale-Tchad" (pp. 236-237), all in Abdourhmane Idrissa and Samuel Decalo, *Historical Dictionary of Niger* (Lanham: Scarecrow Press, 2012); Benedetta Rossi, *From Slavery to Aid: Politics, Labour, and Ecology in the Nigerien Sahel, 1800-2000* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015), p. 109.

[122] Fuglestad, *A History of Niger*, pp. 50-51, 54, 56-57, 208n125.

[123] Marc Carlier, *Méharistes du Niger: Contribution à l'Histoire des Unités Montées à Chameau du Territoire Nigérien: 1900 à 1962* (Paris: L'Harmattan, 2000), p. 129.

[124] Porch, *The Conquest of the Sahara*, pp. 198-207; Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 55-57; Wesseling, *Divide and Rule*, pp. 213-218; "Kousseri" (p. 257) and "Territoire Militaire des Pays et Protectorats du Tchad" (p. 411), in Samuel Decalo, *Historical Dictionary of Chad*, 3rd ed. (Lanham: Scarecrow Press, 1997); Mario J. Azevedo, *Roots of Violence: A History of War*

Inadvertent: YES. The expeditions for Lake Chad were secretly organized by Colonial Under-Secretary Eugène Etienne, without the authorization of the cabinet.[125]

Risk: NO. Chad was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Chad was connected to the global telegraph network in 1910 at the earliest.[126]

140. Eastern Morocco (1904/6)

Part of eastern Morocco was acquired by France via conquest in June 1904. Part of eastern Morocco was conquered by forces under the command of General Louis Hubert Gonsalve Lyautey. With this conquest, French forces acquired the Moroccan oasis of Ras-el-Ain, arguing such a step was necessary to protect the Algerian border. Lyautey referred to Ras-el-Ain as "Berguent" in order to confuse his superiors in Paris and conceal his insubordination. France would gain further territorial holdings in 1907, before establishing a protectorate over the entirety of Morocco in 1912. It would take France until 1934 to pacify the entire territory. Morocco would remain a French protectorate until its independence in 1956.[127]

Inadvertent: YES. General Lyautey was acting on his own initiative, without the authorization of Paris.[128]

Risk: NO. Morocco was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: YES. France and Morocco were connected by the telegraph in 1859.[129]

---

in Chad (Australia: Gordon and Breach, 1998), pp. 66-70; "Chad," in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; Marielle Debos, "Chad 1900-1960," in J. Sémelin, ed., *Online Encyclopedia of Mass Violence* (Paris: Presses de Sciences Po, 2009), pp. 2-3; "Chad," in Gates and Appiah, eds., *Encyclopedia of Africa*.

[125] Porch, *The Conquest of the Sahara*, pp. 146, 161; Douglas Porch, "Bugeaud, Gallieni, and Lyautey: The Development of French Colonial Warfare," in Peter Paret, ed., *Makers of Modern Strategy: From Machiavelli to the Nuclear Age* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), p. 402; Wesseling, *Divide and Rule*, pp. 213-214; Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa*, pp. 362, 453.

[126] Jean Malval, *Essai de Chronologie Tchadienne, 1707-1940* (Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1974), pp. 78, 154.

[127] Edmund Burke, *Prelude to Protectorate in Morocco: Precolonial Protest and Resistance, 1860-1912* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976), p. 76; Betts, *Tricouleur*, p. 25; Douglas Porch, *The Conquest of Morocco* (New York: Knopf, 1982), pp. 133-136; William A. Hoisington, *Lyautey and the French Conquest of Morocco* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995), pp. 24-27; Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 32-33; Singer and Langdon, *Cultured Force*, pp. 194-5, 197; William Thomas Dean III, "Marshal Louis Hubert Lyautey," in Martel, ed., *The Encyclopedia of War*, p. 1.

[128] Burke, *Prelude to Protectorate in Morocco*, p. 76; Porch, *The Conquest of Morocco*, pp. 133-134; Hoisington, *Lyautey and the French Conquest of Morocco*, p. 25; Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 32-33, 86.

[129] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

141. Southern Mauritania (1905/4)

Southern Mauritania was acquired by France via both annexation and conquest between December 1902 and April 1905. Southern Mauritania was annexed and conquered by French colonial official Xavier Coppolani. Coppolani used a combination of alliances, coercive threats, his deep knowledge of the region, and, ultimately, military force, to secure a French protectorate over Southern Mauritania from the rulers of Trarza (1902), Brakna (1904), and Tagant (1905). Primed to move onto Northern Mauritania, Coppolani was assassinated in Tagant in May 1905. Efforts to secure Northern Mauritania faltered until 1909, and France would not pacify the territory until the 1930s. France would administer the north and the south separately, and they would only be unified with Mauritania's independence in 1961.[130]

Inadvertent: NO. Coppolani was acting on orders from the cabinet in Paris.[131]

Risk: NO. Mauritania was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: LIKELY YES. Neighboring St. Louis, Senegal had been connected in 1883 and much of the West African coast had been connected by 1885.[132]

142. Casablanca and Eastern Morocco (1907/8)

Casablanca and Eastern Morocco were acquired by France via conquest between March and August 1907, during the Overthrow of Abd El-Aziz. Casablanca and Eastern Morocco were conquered by forces under the command of Generals Louis Hubert Gonsalve Lyautey and Antoine Drude. The French-British Entente Cordiale of 1904 had France recognize Britain's free hand in Egypt while gaining the same for France in Morocco. Germany Kaiser Wilhelm II's visit to and declaration of support for Moroccan independence sparked the First Moroccan Crisis of 1905 and 1906, which resulted in a French recognition of Moroccan independence. In 1907, France would gain the area around Casablanca on the north coast, as well as Oujda, a large area in the east on the Algerian border. Casablanca was subjected to a punishing coastal bombardment before the invasion. Morocco in its entirety would become a French protectorate in March 1912, thought it would take France until 1934 to pacify the entire territory. Morocco would remain a French protectorate until its independence in 1956.[133]

---

130 Aldrich, *Greater France*, p. 48; "Xavier Coppolani," in Anthony G. Pazzanita, *Historical Dictionary of Mauritania*, 3rd ed. (Lanham: Scarecrow Press, 2008), pp. 145-147; "Mauritania," and "Coppolani, Xavier," in Gates and Appiah, eds., *Encyclopedia of Africa*.

131 Crowder, *West Africa Under Colonial Rule*, p. 108; David Robinson, "France as a Muslim Power in West Africa," *Africa Today*, Vol. 46, No. 3/4 (Autumn 1999), p. 117; "Xavier Coppolani," in Pazzanita, *Historical Dictionary of Mauritania*, p. 145.

132 Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

133 Townsend, *European Colonial Expansion*, pp. 129-132; Roberts, *The History of French Colonial Policy*, pp. 550-557; Hoisington, *Lyautey and the French Conquest of Morocco*, pp. 22-31; Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 31-35; Quinn, *The French Overseas Empire*, pp. 129-131; "French Conquest of Morocco (1907-34)," in Holmes et al., eds., *The Oxford Companion to Military History*; Singer and Langdon, *Cultured Force*, pp. 198-199; "Morocco," and "Empire and Imperialism" (subentry: "The French Colonial Empire," "The French Empire Under the Third Republic (1870-1940)"), both in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; Berenson, *Heroes of Empire*, pp. 197-199, 207; "Morocco," in Gates and Appiah, eds., *Oxford Encyclopedia of Africa*.

Inadvertent: NO. Lyautey and Drude were acting under orders from Prime Minister Georges Clemenceau.[134]

Risk: YES. These occupations were in violation of an agreement with Germany in March 1906 over Moroccan independence.

Telegraph: YES. France and Morocco were connected by the telegraph in 1859.[135]

143. Northern Mauritania (1909/7)

Northern Mauritania was acquired by France via conquest between 9 January and 28 July 1909, over the course of the Anti-Foreign Revolt. Northern Mauritania was conquered by French forces under the command of Colonel Heri Joseph Eugène Gouraud. Gouraud launched this campaign in January 1909 with an attack on the Sahrawi forces of Cheik Ma Al-Ainin at Atar. After months of trading territory, Gouraud secured a major victory over Al-Ainin on 28 July 1909. Pacification of Mauritania would not be complete until the 1930s. France would administer the north and the south separately, and they would only be unified with Mauritania's independence in 1961.[136]

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. Colonel Gouraud was acting under orders from the French government.[137]

Risk: NO. Mauritania was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: LIKELY YES. Neighboring St. Louis, Senegal had been connected in 1883 and much of the West African coast had been connected by 1885.[138]

144. Morocco (1912/3)

Morocco was acquired by France via conquest between May 1911 and 30 March 1912, over the course of the French-Berber War. Morocco was conquered by a French force of 7,500. France had begun its territorial acquisitions in Morocco in 1904, and had chipped away at Moroccan territory since. An armed uprising in 1911 led France to occupy Fez in May, which itself led Germany to send the SMS *Panther* to port of Agadir, sparking the Agadir Crisis. The resolution of this crisis effectively gave France free rein in Morocco, which led to a treaty of protectorate on 30 March 1912. According to a November 1912 agreement, Spain would control the mountainous northeast area of

---

[134] Burke, *Prelude to Protectorate in Morocco*, p. 92; Hoisington, *Lyautey and the French Conquest of Morocco*, pp. 30-31; Gershovich, *French Military Rule in Morocco: Colonialism and its Consequences* (London: Frank Cass, 2000), p. 50; Berenson, *Heroes of Empire*, p. 198.
[135] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[136] Aldrich, *Greater France*, p. 48; "Adrar Campaign (1909)" (pp. 25-26), "Henri Gouraud" (pp. 230-231), and "Cheikh Ma El-Ainin" (pp. 305-306), all in Pazzanita, *Historical Dictionary of Mauritania*; "Mauritania," in Gates and Appiah, eds., *Encyclopedia of Africa*.
[137] Pazzanita, *Historical Dictionary of Mauritania*, p. 25.
[138] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

Morocco. It would take France until 1934 to pacify the entire territory. Morocco would remain a French protectorate until its independence in 1956.[139]

Inadvertent: NO. The initial intervention was approved by the cabinet in Paris on 23 April 1911.[140]

Risk: YES. The initial intervention was in violation of an agreement with Germany in March 1906 over Moroccan independence.

Telegraph: YES. France and Morocco were connected by the telegraph in 1859.[141]

145. Togoland (1914/8)

Togoland (contemporary Togo) was acquired by France via conquest from Germany between 6 and 26 August 1914, in the opening days of the First World War. Togoland was conquered by a joint British-French force of 750 (158 French, 592 British). Togoland had been a German protectorate since 1884. Germany had no forces in Togo, and so resistance was minimal. The French occupation of Little Popo was the first occupation of German territory by an allied army in the war. The territory was divided between British (west) and French (east) administrative areas in 1916, and Britain's portion was officially awarded to France as a League of Nations Mandate in July 1922. Togoland would remain a territory of the French Empire until the independence of the Togolese Republic in 1960.[142]

Inadvertent: YES. The conquest of Togoland was at the initiative of commanders in the field, not according to orders from Paris.[143]

Risk: YES. Togoland was Germany's territory, a great power.

---

[139] Townsend, *European Colonial Expansion*, pp. 129-132; Roberts, *The History of French Colonial Policy*, pp. 550-557; Hoisington, *Lyautey and the French Conquest of Morocco*, pp. 36-38; Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 31-35; Quinn, *The French Overseas Empire*, pp. 129-131; "French Conquest of Morocco (1907-34)," in Holmes et al., eds., *The Oxford Companion to Military History*; Singer and Langdon, *Cultured Force*, pp. 201-203; "Morocco" and "Empire and Imperialism" (subentry: "The French Colonial Empire," "The French Empire Under the Third Republic (1870-1940)"), both in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; Berenson, *Heroes of Empire*, p. 209; "Morocco," in Gates and Appiah, eds., *Encyclopedia of Africa*.

[140] Rom Landau, *Moroccan Drama, 1900-1955* (San Francisco: American Academy of Asian Studies, 1956), p. 65; Burke, *Prelude to Protectorate in Morocco*, pp. 168-169; Porch, *The Conquest of Morocco*, pp. 220-221; Andrew and Kanya-Forstner, "Centre and Periphery in the Making of the Second French Colonial Empire," pp. 25-26; Gershovich, *French Military Rule in Morocco*, pp. 54-55.

[141] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

[142] Jean Suret-Canale, *French Colonialism in Tropical Africa, 1900-1945* (New York: Pica Press, 1971), pp. 144-145; Christopher M. Andrew and A. S. Kanya-Forstner, *France Overseas: The Great War and the Climax of French Imperial Expansion* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1981), p. 61; Byron Farwell, *The Great War in Africa, 1914-1918* (New York: Norton, 1986), pp. 24-30; Aldrich, *Greater France*, pp. 49-50; "Campaigns in Africa," in Spencer C. Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of World War I: A Political, Social, and Military History* (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2005), p. 41; "Togo," in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; "Togo," in Gates and Appiah, eds., *Encyclopedia of Africa*.

[143] Andrew and Kanya-Forstner, *France Overseas*, p. 61; Hew Strachan, *The First World War in Africa* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), pp. 13-14; Elizabeth Greenhalgh, *The French Army and the First World War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), p. 118.

Telegraph: YES. Togoland was connected to the global telegraph network in 1911.[144]

146. Cameroon (1916/1)

Cameroon was acquired by France via conquest between February 1915 and January 1916, over the course of the First World War. Cameroon was conquered by a joint British-Belgian-French force of 13,000, the French forces being under the command of Joseph Aymerich. Cameroon had been a German protectorate, and then colony, since 1884. Most of Cameroon was officially awarded to France as a League of Nations Mandate in July 1922, while Britain gained a narrow slice of territory in the west. Cameroon would remain a French territory until its independence in 1960.[145]

Inadvertent: YES. The invasion of Cameroon was at the initiative of local French commanders, without orders from Paris.[146]

Risk: YES. Cameroon was Germany's territory, a great power.

Telegraph: YES. Cameroon was connected to the global telegraph network in 1911.[147]

147. Alsace-Lorraine (1918/11)

Alsace-Lorraine (contemporary France) was acquired by France via annexation from Germany in the aftermath of the First World War. Alsace-Lorraine had been French territory until it was lost to Prussia in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-71. At the outbreak of WWI, France engaged in an offensive into the territories that would ultimately end in a stalemate that persisted until the end of the war. Within weeks of the armistice on 11 November 1918, French troops had occupied Strasbourg and Metz, and France formally annexed the territory on 22 November 1918. Alsace-Lorraine was reannexed to Germany in the summer of 1940, but it would return to French control in 1945 and it remains a part of France today.[148]

Inadvertent: NO. France's war plans (Plan XVII) had as their central objective an offensive that would recover Alsace-Lorraine.[149]

Risk: YES. Alsace-Lorraine was Germany's territory, a great power.

Telegraph: YES. France and Germany were connected by telegraph as early as 1852.[150]

---

144 Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
145 Suret-Canale, *French Colonialism in Tropical Africa*, pp. 144-145; Aldrich, *Greater France*, p. 49; "Campaigns in Africa," in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWI*, p. 41; "Cameroon," in Gates and Appiah, eds., *Encyclopedia of Africa*; Greenhalgh, *The French Army and the First World War*, pp. 118-119.
146 Strachan, *The First World War in Africa*, pp. 30-31; Greenhalgh, *The French Army and the First World War*, pp. 118-119.
147 Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
148 "Alsace and Lorraine" (pp. 93-94) and "Invasion of Lorraine (August 1914)" (pp. 711-712), both in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWI*; "Alsace-Lorraine," in I. C. B. Dear and M. R. D. Foot, eds., *The Oxford Companion to World War II* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), Available at: https://www.oxfordreference.com/.
149 Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWI*, p. 711.
150 "Pre-1865 International Telegraph Agreements," The International Telecommunication Union (2022), Available at: http://handle.itu.int/11.1004/020.2000/s.139.

148. Lauenberg (1864/7)

Lauenberg (contemporary Germany) was acquired by Prussia via conquest from Denmark between 23 December 1863 and 18 July 1864, over the course of the Second Schleswig War. Lauenberg was conquered by a joint Prussian-Austrian force of 12,000. Denmark would cede all rights to this territory on 1 August 1864. Prussia's acquisition was made official with the Prussian-Austrian Gastein Convention of 14 August 1865. Prussia ultimately paid Austria 2.5 million Danish taler for Lauenberg. Lauenberg would later be incorporated into the Prussian province of Schleswig-Holstein.[1]

Inadvertent: NO. Bismarck's aim in planning the war was to annex Schleswig, Holstein, and Lauenberg.[2]

Risk: YES. Lauenberg was Denmark's territory, a regional power.

Telegraph: YES. The telegraph was used during the Second Schleswig War.[3]

149. Schleswig (1864/7)

Schleswig (contemporary Germany) was acquired by Prussia via conquest from Demark between 21 December 1863 and 18 July 1864, over the course of the Second Schleswig War. Schleswig was conquered by a joint Prussian-Austrian force of 12,000. Denmark would cede all rights to this territory on 1 August 1864. The territories would be jointly administered by Prussia and Austria under the Gastein Convention of 14 August 1865. Under this agreement, Schleswig was under Prussian control whereas Holstein was under Austrian control. This agreement held until the outbreak of the Austro-Prussian War two years later. Thereafter, Schleswig-Holstein would be a Prussian province.[4]

Inadvertent: NO. Bismarck's aim in planning the war was to annex Schleswig, Holstein, and Lauenberg.[5]

Risk: YES. Schleswig was Denmark's territory, a regional power.

Telegraph: YES. The telegraph was used during the Second Schleswig War.[6]

---

[1] "Gastein Convention," in Wilfried Fest, ed., *Dictionary of German History, 1806-1945* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1978), p. 52; Norman Rich, *Great Power Diplomacy, 1814-1918* (Boston: McGraw-Hill, 1992), pp. 194-198; Christopher M. Clark, *Iron Kingdom: The Rise and Downfall of Prussia, 1600-1947* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006), pp. 523-533; Dennis E. Showalter, *The Wars of German Unification*, 2nd ed. (New York: Bloomsbury, 2015), pp. 113-129.
[2] Clark, *Iron Kingdom*, p. 526; Showalter, *The Wars of German Unification*, pp. 116-117.
[3] Michael Embree, *Bismarck's First War: The Campaign of Schleswig and Jutland, 1864* (Solihull: Helion, 2006), p. 70.
[4] "Gastein Convention" (p. 52) and "Schleswig-Holstein" (pp. 139-140), both in Fest, ed., *Dictionary of German History*; Rich, *Great Power Diplomacy*, pp. 194-198; Clark, *Iron Kingdom*, pp. 523-533; Showalter, *The Wars of German Unification*, pp. 113-129.
[5] Clark, *Iron Kingdom*, p. 526; Showalter, *The Wars of German Unification*, pp. 116-117.
[6] Embree, *Bismarck's First War*, p. 70.

150. Hanover (1866/6)

Hanover (contemporary Germany) was acquired by Prussia via conquest between 15 and 29 June 1866, over the course of the Austro-Prussian War. Hanover was conquered by forces of the Prussian Army under the command of Field Marshall Helmuth Karl Bernard Graf von Moltke ("the elder"). Hanover had fatefully aligned with Austria in this war. The Hanoverian forces surrendered to Prussian forces at Langensalza on 29 June 1866. The decisive engagement of this war as a whole was the Battle of Königgrätz, on 3 July 1866. The war was settled with the peace agreements of Nikolsburg (26 July) and Prague (23 August). The Prussian king sent a law to parliament annexing Hanover on 16 August 1866, which was decreed on 20 September 1866. Hanover would become a Prussian province.[7]

Inadvertent: NO. The conquest was ordered by King Wilhelm I and the annexation ordered by both Prime Minister Bismarck and the king.[8]

Risk: YES. Hanover had an alliance with Austria, a great power.[9]

Telegraph: YES. Germany and Austria had an extensive telegraph network by 1850.[10]

151. Holstein (1866/8)

Holstein (contemporary Germany) was acquired by Prussia via conquest from Austria between 9 June and August 1866, over the course of the Austro-Prussian War. Holstein was conquered by forces of the Prussian Army under the command of Field Marshall Helmuth Karl Bernard Graf von Moltke ("the elder"). Holstein had been jointly held by both Austria and Prussia under the Gastein Convention of August 1865, though it had been primarily administered by Austria. The decisive engagement of this war as a whole was the Battle of Königgrätz on 3 July 1866. The peace agreements of Nikolsburg (26 July) and Prague (23 August) would authorize the conquest. After this acquisition, Schleswig-Holstein would become a Prussian province.[11]

---

[7] "Königgrätz (Sadowa)" (p. 83), "Langensalza" (p. 88), and "Seven Weeks' (Austro-Prussian) War" (pp. 143-144), all in Fest, ed., *Dictionary of German History*; Rich, *Great Power Diplomacy*, pp. 199-206; Geoffrey Wawro, *The Austro-Prussian War: Austria's War with Prussia and Italy in 1866* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 75-81; "Austro-Prussian War" and "Battle of Königgrätz (Battle of Sadowa) (1866)," both in Richard Holmes et al., eds., *The Oxford Companion to Military History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), Available at: https://www.oxfordreference.com/; Clark, *Iron Kingdom*, pp. 531-546; "Austro-Prussian War," in Peter N. Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), Available at: https://www.oxfordreference.com/.

[8] Rich, *Great Power Diplomacy*, p. 206; Wawro, *The Austro-Prussian War*, p. 75.

[9] Alliance Treaty Obligations and Provisions (ATOP) ID: 1020; Correlates of War (COW) Alliance ID: 3. See: ATOP v5.1. Brett Ashley Leeds, Jeffrey M. Ritter, Sara McLaughlin Mitchell, and Andrew G. Long, "Alliance Treaty Obligations and Provisions, 1815-1944," *International Interactions*, Vol. 28, No. 3 (2002), pp. 237-260. Available at: http://www.atopdata.org/; Formal Alliances (v4.1). Douglas M. Gibler, *International Military Alliances, 1648-2008* (Washington: CQ Press, 2009). Available at: https://correlatesofwar.org/.

[10] "Pre-1865 International Telegraph Agreements," The International Telecommunication Union (2022), Available at: http://handle.itu.int/11.1004/020.2000/s.139.

[11] "Königgrätz (Sadowa)" (p. 83), "Langensalza" (p. 88), and "Seven Weeks' (Austro-Prussian) War" (pp. 143-144), all in Fest, ed., *Dictionary of German History*; Rich, *Great Power Diplomacy*, pp. 199-206; "Austro-Prussian War" and "Battle of Königgrätz (Battle of Sadowa) (1866)," both in Holmes et al., eds., *The Oxford Companion to Military History*; Clark, *The Iron Kingdom*, pp. 527, 534, 542; "Austro-Prussian War," in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*.

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. The invasion was discussed between and ordered by Prussian Prime Minister Otto von Bismarck and King Wilhelm I.[12]

Risk: YES. Holstein was Austria's territory, a great power.

Telegraph: YES. Germany and Austria had an extensive telegraph network by 1850.[13]

152. Frankfurt (1866/8)

Frankfurt (contemporary Germany) was acquired by Prussia via conquest between 16 June and August 1866, over the course of the Austro-Prussian War. Frankfurt was conquered by forces of the Prussian Army under the command of Field Marshall Helmuth Karl Bernard Graf von Moltke ("the elder"). The decisive engagement of this war as a whole was the Battle of Königgrätz on 3 July 1866. The war was settled with the peace agreements of Nikolsburg (26 July) and Prague (23 August). The Prussian king sent a law to parliament annexing Frankfurt on 16 August 1866, which was decreed on 20 September 1866. Frankfurt became part of the Prussian province of Hesse-Nassau.[14]

Inadvertent: NO. The annexation was ordered by Prime Minister Bismarck and King Wilhelm I.[15]

Risk: YES. Frankfurt had allied with Austria in the war, a great power.

Telegraph: YES. Germany and Austria had an extensive telegraph network by 1850.[16]

153. Hesse-Kassel (1866/8)

Hesse-Kassel, or the Electorate of Hesse (contemporary Germany), was acquired by Prussia via conquest between 16 June and August 1866, over the course of the Austro-Prussian War. Hesses-Kassel was conquered by forces of the Prussian Army under the command of Field Marshall Helmuth Karl Bernard Graf von Moltke ("the elder"). The decisive engagement of this war as a whole was the Battle of Königgrätz, on 3 July 1866. The war was settled with the peace agreements of Nikolsburg (26 July) and Prague (23 August). The Prussian king sent a law to parliament annexing Hesse-Kassel on 16 August 1866, which was decreed on 20 September 1866. Hesse-Kassel became part of the Prussian province of Hesse-Nassau.[17]

---

[12] Wawro, *The Austro-Prussian War*, p. 44.
[13] "Pre-1865 International Telegraph Agreements," The International Telecommunication Union (2022), Available at: http://handle.itu.int/11.1004/020.2000/s.139.
[14] "Königgrätz (Sadowa)" (p. 83), "Langensalza" (p. 88), and "Seven Weeks' (Austro-Prussian) War" (pp. 143-144), all in Fest, ed., *Dictionary of German History*; Rich, *Great Power Diplomacy*, pp. 199-206; "Austro-Prussian War" and "Battle of Königgrätz (Battle of Sadowa) (1866)," both in Holmes et al., eds., *The Oxford Companion to Military History*; Clark, *Iron Kingdom*, pp. 527, 542; "Austro-Prussian War," in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*.
[15] Rich, *Great Power Diplomacy*, p. 206.
[16] "Pre-1865 International Telegraph Agreements," The ITU.
[17] "Königgrätz (Sadowa)" (p. 83), "Langensalza" (p. 88), and "Seven Weeks' (Austro-Prussian) War" (pp. 143-144), all in Fest, ed., *Dictionary of German History*; Rich, *Great Power Diplomacy*, pp. 199-206; Wawro *The Austro-Prussian War*, pp. 75-77; "Austro-Prussian War" and "Battle of Königgrätz (Battle of Sadowa) (1866)," both in Holmes et al., eds., *The Oxford Companion to Military History*; Clark, *Iron Kingdom*, pp. 527, 542; "Austro-Prussian War," in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*.

Inadvertent: NO. The invasion and annexation were ordered by Prime Minister Bismarck and King Wilhelm I.[18]

Risk: YES. Hesse-Kassel had an alliance with Austria, a great power.[19]

Telegraph: YES. Germany and Austria had an extensive telegraph network by 1850.[20]

154. Nassau (1866/8)

Nassau (contemporary Germany) was acquired by Prussia via conquest between 16 June and August 1866, over the course of the Austro-Prussian War. Nassau was conquered by forces of the Prussian Army under the command of Field Marshall Helmuth Karl Bernard Graf von Moltke ("the elder"). The decisive engagement of this war as a whole was the Battle of Königgrätz on 3 July 1866. The war was settled with the peace agreements of Nikolsburg (26 July) and Prague (23 August). The Prussian king sent a law to parliament annexing Nassau on 16 August 1866, which was decreed on 20 September 1866. Nassau became part of the Prussian province of Hesse-Nassau.[21]

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. The annexation was ordered by Prime Minister Bismarck and King Wilhelm I.[22]

Risk: YES. Nassau had allied with Austria in the war, a great power.

Telegraph: YES. Germany and Austria had an extensive telegraph network by 1850.[23]

155. Alsace and Lorraine (1871/1)

Alsace and Lorraine (contemporary France) were acquired by Prussia via conquest from France in January 1871, over the course of the Franco-Prussian War. An armistice was signed on 28 January 1871. The war was officially brought to a close with the Treaty of Frankfurt on 10 May 1871, where France agreed to forfeit Alsace and Lorraine. Alsace-Lorraine would become an independent territory of the German Empire until they were annexed by France at the end of World War I in 1918.[24]

---

[18] Rich, *Great Power Diplomacy*, p. 206; Wawro *The Austro-Prussian War*, p. 75.
[19] ATOP ID: 1020; COW ID: 3.
[20] "Pre-1865 International Telegraph Agreements," The ITU.
[21] "Königgrätz (Sadowa)" (p. 83), "Langensalza" (p. 88), and "Seven Weeks' (Austro-Prussian) War" (pp. 143-144), all in Fest, ed., *Dictionary of German History*; Rich, *Great Power Diplomacy*, pp. 199-206; "Austro-Prussian War" and "Battle of Königgrätz (Battle of Sadowa) (1866)," both in Holmes et al., eds., *The Oxford Companion to Military History*; Clark, *Iron Kingdom*, pp. 527, 542; "Austro-Prussian War," in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*.
[22] Rich, *Great Power Diplomacy*, p. 206.
[23] "Pre-1865 International Telegraph Agreements," The ITU.
[24] "Alsace-Lorraine" (pp. 2-3), "Franco-Prussian War of 1870-71" (p. 46), and "Peace of Frankfurt" (p. 47), all in Fest, ed., *Dictionary of German History*; Rich, *Great Power Diplomacy*, pp. 212-216; "Franco-Prussian War (1870-1)," in Holmes et al., eds., *The Oxford Companion to Military History*; Clark, *Iron Kingdom*, pp. 546-554; "Treaty of Frankfurt (10 May 1871)," in Anne Kerr and Edmund Wright, eds., *Oxford Dictionary of World History*, 3rd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015), Available at: https://www.oxfordreference.com/.

Inadvertent: NO. Prime Minister Bismarck strongly advocated for the conquest of these territories.[25]

Risk: YES. Alsace and Lorraine were France's territory, a great power.

Telegraph: YES. France and the Germanic States were connected by telegraph by 1852.[26]

156. South West Africa (1884/4)

South West Africa (contemporary Namibia) was acquired by Germany via annexation between April 1883 and 7 August 1884. A German tobacco merchant and gun trader, Adolph Lüderitz, built a trading station at Angra-Pequena in April 1883, and began buying land and signing treaties with local chiefs. By August, he had acquired a vast amount of territory. In August 1883, Bismarck agreed to provide Lüderitz consular support, but not establish a German protectorate. On 8 April 1884, a year after Lüderitz's arrival in South West Africa, Bismarck ordered these territories to be taken under German protection, at least in part due to fears of British interest in the territory. On 7 August 1884, sailors aboard the German corvette *Elizabeth* officially raised the German flag over this territory. German South West Africa ultimately totaled 835,100 km^2 and, in 1884, had a population of approximately 200,000. South West Africa became a German protectorate and would remain so until it was invaded by the British Dominion of South Africa in July 1915, during the First World War.[27]

Inadvertent: YES. Lüderitz's initial territorial acquisitions had not been pre-authorized by Berlin, and Chancellor Otto von Bismarck only approved the annexations after-the-fact.[28]

Risk: NO. South West Africa was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

---

[25] Rich, *Great Power Diplomacy*, p. 215; Clark, *Iron Kingdom*, p. 553.

[26] "Pre-1865 International Telegraph Agreements," The ITU.

[27] Mary E. Townsend, *European Colonial Expansion Since 1871* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott, 1941), pp. 166-168; Agatha Ramm, *Germany, 1789-1919: A Political History* (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1967), p. 357; J. H. Esterhuyse, *South West Africa, 1880-1894: The Establishment of German Authority in South West Africa* (Cape Town: C. Struik, 1968), pp. 38-42, 46-62; Hajo Holborn, *A History of Modern Germany, 1840-1945* (New York: A.A. Knopf, 1969), p. 245; Woodruff D. Smith, *The German Colonial Empire* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1970), p. 35; A. J. P. Taylor, *Germany's First Bid for Colonies, 1884-1885: A Move in Bismarck's European Policy* (New York: Norton, 1970), pp. 23-56; Lewis H. Gann and Peter Duignan, *The Rulers of German Africa, 1884-1914* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1977), p. 18; "German Southwest Africa" (pp. 54-55) and "Adolph Lüderitz" (p. 93), both in Fest, ed., *Dictionary of German History*; Gordon A. Craig, *Germany, 1866-1945* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), pp. 120-121; Richard A. Voeltz, "The European Economic and Political Penetration of South West Africa, 1884-1892," *The International Journal of African Historical Studies*, Vol. 17, No. 4 (1984), pp. 623-624; H. L. Wesseling, *Divide and Rule: The Partition of Africa, 1880-1914*, Translated by Arnold J. Pomerans (Westport: Praeger, 1996), pp. 282-284; Thomas Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa: White Man's Conquest of the Dark Continent from 1876 to 1912* (New York: Perennial, 2003), pp. 201-208; "Empire and Imperialism" (subentry: "The German Colonial Empire"; "German Southwest Africa" & Table 1), in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; Steven Press, *Rogue Empires: Contracts and Conmen in Europe's Scramble for Africa* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2017), pp. 134-154.

[28] Esterhuyse, *South West Africa*, pp. 47-48; Holborn, *A History of Modern Germany*, p. 245; Smith, *The German Colonial Empire*, p. 35; Taylor, *Germany's First Bid for Colonies*, pp. 23-24; Gann and Duignan, *The Rulers of German Africa*, p. 18; "Adolph Lüderitz," in Fest, ed., *Dictionary of German History*, p. 93 Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa*, p. 206; Press, *Rogue Empires*, p. 148.

Telegraph: NO. The closest telegraph station was at Cape Town, approximately 920 km down the coast.[29]

157. Togoland (1884/7)

Togoland (contemporary Togo) was acquired by Germany via annexation between 4 and 6 July 1884. A German explorer and imperial official, Gustav Nachtigal, hoisted the German flag there in May 1884, claiming Togo as a territory of the Germany Empire. German palm merchants and missionaries had been active in the area since 1847. Local German merchants had apparently appealed to the government in Berlin to intervene in the early 1880s to no avail. German Togoland would ultimately total 87,200 km^2. A series of treaties were signed from 4 to 6 July 1884, formalizing Togoland's status as a protectorate of the German Empire, and it would remain so until it was invaded by a joint British-French force in August 1914, during the First World War.[30]

Inadvertent: YES. Chancellor Otto von Bismarck had ordered Nachtigal to establish a protectorate over Cameroon on 19 May 1884, not Togoland.[31]

Risk: NO. Togoland was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. The Nachtigal had to cable back to Berlin from Madeira, a Portuguese territory off the coast of Morocco.[32]

158. Kamerun (1884/7)

Kamerun (contemporary Cameroon) was acquired by Germany via annexation on 14 July 1884. A German explorer and imperial official, Gustav Nachtigal, hoisted the German flag there in May 1884, claiming Kamerun as a territory of the Germany Empire. The treaty that secured the German protectorate was signed with Duala chiefs shortly before it was to be annexed. Karmerun would eventually total 495,600 km^2. Kamerun would become a German colony, and would remain so until

---

[29] Esterhuyse, *South West Africa*, p. 52.
[30] Townsend, *European Colonial Expansion*, pp. 170-172; Ramm, *Germany, 1789-1919*, pp. 358-359; Smith, *The German Colonial Empire*, pp. 35-36; Arthur J. Knoll, *Togo Under Imperial Germany, 1884-1914: A Case Study in Colonial Rule* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1976), pp. 18-23; Craig, *Germany, 1866-1945*, pp. 121-122; "Gustav Nachtigal" (p. 103) and "Togo" (pp. 158-159), both in Fest, ed., *Dictionary of German History*; "Gustav Nachtigal," in David Buisseret, ed., *The Oxford Companion to World Exploration* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), Available at: https://www.oxfordreference.com/; "Togo," in Carl Cavanaugh Hodge, ed., *Encyclopedia of the Age of Imperialism*, Vol. 2 (Westport: Greenwood Press, 2007), pp. 699-700; "Empire and Imperialism" (subentry: "The German Colonial Empire"; "Togo and Cameroon" & Table 1), in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; "Togo," in Henry Louis Gates, Jr. and Kwame Anthony Appiah, eds., *Encyclopedia of Africa* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), Available at: https://www.oxfordreference.com/.
[31] Knoll, *Togo Under Imperial Germany*, pp. 20, 22, 23, 171n26; "Togo," in Hodge, ed., *Encyclopedia of the Age of Imperialism*, Vol. 2, p. 699.
[32] Arthur J. Knoll and Hermann J. Hiery, eds., *The German Colonial Experience: Select Documents on German Rule in Africa, China, and the Pacific, 1884-1914* (Lanham: University Press of America, 2010), pp. 31, 515n25.

it was invaded by a joint British-Belgian-French force between February 1915 and January of 1916, during the First World War.[33]

Inadvertent: NO. Chancellor Otto von Bismarck had ordered Nachtigal to establish the protectorate over Kamerun on 19 May 1884.[34]

Risk: NO. Kamerun was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Nachtigal had to report back via cable from Madeira, a Portuguese territory off the coast of Morocco.[35]

159. New Britain and Northeastern New Guinea (1884/11)

New Britain and Northeastern New Guinea (contemporary Papua New Guinea) were acquired by Germany via annexation on 16 November 1884. The New Guinea Company, a chartered company formed by prominent German bankers Adolf von Hansemann and Gerson von Bleichröder, had an interest in the territory in the early 1880s. They had requested a German charter and occupation from Bismarck in November 1880, but were denied. In early 1884 they had launched a secret enterprise to acquire the territory, but approached Bismarck with it after he made a major speech on colonialism in June 1884. Bismarck did not sanction the mission immediately, though he would in August of 1884. German warships *Elizabeth* and *Hyäne* raised the German flag over the territories on 3 November 1884. The company was given an official imperial charter on 17 May 1885. On 7 October 1898, the German government took over administration from the company, making German New Guinea a colony of the German Empire. German New Guinea would ultimately total 240,000 km^2. It would remain in German hands until it was occupied by Australian forces with the outbreak of World War I in 1914.[36]

Inadvertent: NO. Bismarck ordered the annexation on 19 August 1884, before any territory had been claimed by local agents.[37]

---

[33] Ramm, *Germany, 1789-1919*, pp. 358-359; Smith, *The German Colonial Empire*, pp. 35-36; Craig, *Germany, 1866-1945*, pp. 121-122; "The Cameroons" (pp. 24-25) and "Gustav Nachtigal" (p. 103), both in Fest, ed., *Dictionary of German History*; "Gustav Nachtigal," in Buisseret, ed., *The Oxford Companion to World Exploration*; "Empire and Imperialism" (subentry: "The German Colonial Empire"; "Togo and Cameroon" & Table 1), in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World.*

[34] Ramm, *Germany, 1789-1919*, 358; Smith, *The German Colonial Empire*, p. 35; Knoll, *Togo Under Imperial Germany*, p. 23; Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa*, pp. 201, 207; Sebastian Conrad, *German Colonialism: A Short History* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012), p. 42.

[35] Knoll and Hiery, eds., *The German Colonial Experience*, pp. 31, 515n25.

[36] Marjorie Jacobs, "Bismarck and the Annexation of New Guinea," *Historical Studies: Australia and New Zealand*, Vol. 5, No. 17 (1951), pp. 14-26; Smith, *The German Colonial Empire*, pp. 108-109; "German New Guinea," in Fest, ed., *Dictionary of German History*, p. 54; Stewart Firth, *New Guinea Under the Germans* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1982), pp. 12-17; P. G. Sack, "Protectorates and Twists: Law, History and the Annexation of German New Guinea," *The Australian Yearbook of International Law*, Vol. 10, No. 1 (1987), pp. 31-46; "Empire and Imperialism" (subentry: "The German Colonial Empire"; "The Pacific Colonies and Kiaochow" & Table 1), in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; Charles Stephenson, *Germany's Asia-Pacific Empire: Colonialism and Naval Policy, 1885-1914* (Woodbridge: Boydelll Press, 2009), p. 4.

[37] Jacobs, "Bismarck and the Annexation of New Guinea," pp. 19-22; Sack, "Protectorates and Twists," pp. 32-39 (esp. p. 37).

Risk: NO. New Britain and Northeastern New Guinea was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers. The United Kingdom had interests in New Guinea, but the annexation decision was taken in consultation with the United Kingdom.[38]

Telegraph: NO. Cables notifying Berlin were sent on 17 December 1884 from Cooktown, Australia, approximately 1,600 km away.[39]

160. East Africa (1885/5)

East Africa (contemporary Burundi, Rwanda, and Tanzania) was acquired by Germany via annexation in May 1885. 28-year-old Dr. Karl Peters, a German national and philosophy Ph.D., negotiated a series of treaties with local chiefs in February of 1885, putting the territory under the protection of the Society for German Colonization, an organization he founded. German East Africa would ultimately total 995,000 km^2. Peters then founded the German East Africa Company to administer the territory, engaging in expansion and heavy-handed rule, eventually prompting an armed uprising in 1888-1889. East Africa became an official protectorate of the German Empire on 1 January 1891, and would remain so until it was invaded by a joint British-Belgian force between November of 1914 and October 1916, during the First World War.[40]

Inadvertent: YES. Peters was acting on his own initiative, being told on 3 October 1884 that he could expect no support from the German government.[41]

Risk: NO. East Africa was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. East Africa was first connected to the global telegraph network in 1890, at Dar es Salaam.[42]

---

[38] Sack, "Protectorates and Twists," p. 36.
[39] Sack, "Protectorates and Twists," p. 46.
[40] Mary E. Townsend, *The Rise and Fall of Germany's Colonial Empire, 1884-1918* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1930), pp. 131-136; Townsend, *European Colonial Expansion*, pp. 26-27, 173-174; Smith, *The German Colonial Empire*, pp. 32-33, 36-37; Craig, *Germany, 1866-1945*, p. 122; "German East Africa" (p. 54), "Kolonialverein" (pp. 82-83), and "Carl Peters" (p. 117), all in Fest, ed., *Dictionary of German History*; H. P. Meritt, "Bismarck and the German Interest in East Africa, 1884-1885," *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 21, No. 1 (1978), pp. 97-106; Wesseling, *Divide and Rule*, pp. 140-143; Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa*, pp. 284-285, 290-294; Arne Perras, *Carl Peters and German Imperialism, 1856-1918: A Political Biography* (New York: Clarendon Press, 2005), pp. 51-53, 55-65; "Karl Peters," in Buisseret, ed., *The Oxford Companion to World Exploration*; "Empire and Imperialism" (subentry: "The German Colonial Empire"; "German East Africa" & Table 1), in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*.
[41] Townsend, *The Rise and Fall of Germany's Colonial Empire*, p. 132; Townsend, *European Colonial Expansion*, pp. 26-27; Smith, *The German Colonial Empire*, p. 32; Craig, *Germany, 1866-1945*, p. 122; Fest, ed., *Dictionary of German History*, p. 117; Meritt, "Bismarck and the German Interest in East Africa," pp. 97, 102; Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa*, p. 291; Perras, *Carl Peters and German Imperialism*, p. 65; "Carl Peters Describes his Problems in Founding a Colony," in Knoll and Hiery, eds., *The German Colonial Experience*, p. 66; Conrad, *German Colonialism*, p. 50; Press, *Rogue Empires*, p. 217. For a detailed examination, see Nicholas D. Anderson, *Inadvertent Expansion in World Politics* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2024), Chapter 7.
[42] Bill Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018," History of the Atlantic Cable & Undersea Communications (2021), Available at: https://atlantic-cable.com/Cables/CableTimeLine/index.htm.

161. Wituland (1885/5)

Wituland (contemporary Kenya) was acquired by Germany via annexation in May 1885. The initial territorial acquisition was negotiated by Clemens and Gustav Denhardt of the German Tana Company on 8 April 1885. The Denhardt brothers had requested government support in 1882, but were refused. With private consortium funds, they then bought a strip of territory from the Sultan of Witu, giving them full sovereign rights there. The remainder of Wituland would become a German protectorate on 27 May 1885. In 1888, this territory was put under the control of German East Africa. Germany would cede Wituland to Britain with the Heligoland-Zanzibar Treaty of 1 July 1890.[43]

Inadvertent: YES. The Denhardt brothers purchased Wituland with private funds and without German government support or authorization.[44]

Risk: NO. Wituland was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Kenya was first connected to the global telegraph network in 1890, at Mombasa.[45]

162. Marshall Islands (1885/10)

The Marshall Islands were acquired by Germany via annexation on 15 October 1885. They were annexed by personnel aboard the German warship *Nautilus*. Since the 1860s, German merchants had been active there in the copra and coconut oil trade, and in 1878 they secured trading rights on Jaluit Atoll via treaty with local chiefs. The annexation decision was prompted by concerns of an impending claim by Spain. The islands would ultimately be administered by the Jaluit Company. These islands totaled approximately 400 km^2. The islands would remain a protectorate of the German Empire until the Japanese invaded in October 1914, at the beginning of the First World War.[46]

Inadvertent: NO. While local German firms pressured the government into the annexation, they did not secure any territory beforehand.[47]

---

[43] Townsend, *The Rise and Fall of Germany's Colonial Empire*, pp. 115, 131, 137-139; Townsend, *European Colonial Expansion*, p. 173; "Heligoland-Zanzibar Treaty," in Fest, ed., *Dictionary of German History*, p. 65; Marguerite Ylvisaker, "The Origins and Development of the Witu Sultanate," *The International Journal of African Historical Studies*, Vol. 11, No. 4 (1978), pp. 683-684.

[44] Townsend, *The Rise and Fall of Germany's Colonial Empire*, p. 131; Townsend, *European Colonial Expansion*, p. 173.

[45] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

[46] William Churchill, "Germany's Lost Pacific Empire," *Geographical Review*, Vol. 10, No. 2 (August 1920), p. 88; Townsend, *The Rise and Fall of Germany's Colonial Empire*, pp. 150-152; Firth, *New Guinea Under the Germans*, p. 18; Francis X. Hezel, *The First Taint of Civilization: A History of the Caroline and Marshall Islands in Pre-Colonial Days, 1521-1885* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1983), pp. 298-306; Wilhelm Fabricius, *Nauru, 1888-1900*, Translated and Edited by Dymphna Clark and Stewart Firth (Canberra: Australian National University, 1992), 173-174; Frances X. Hezel, *Strangers in Their Own Land: A Century of Colonial Rule in the Caroline and Marshall Islands* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1995), pp. 45-48; Stephenson, *Germany's Asia-Pacific Empire*, pp. 6, 60.

[47] Stewart Firth, "German Firms in the Western Pacific Islands, 1857-1914," *The Journal of Pacific History*, Vol. 8 (1973), p. 24; Firth, *New Guinea Under the Germans*, p. 18; Hezel, *The First Taint of Civilization*, p. 304; Fabricius, *Nauru*, pp. 173-174.

Risk: NO. The Marshall Islands was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. The first telegraph stations in the South Pacific region wouldn't be established until 1903 (Guam) and 1905 (Yap).[48]

163. Northern Solomon Islands (1886/10)

The Northern Solomon Islands were acquired by Germany via annexation on 28 October 1886. On 10 April 1886, Germany and the United Kingdom had signed a treaty, formally dividing their respective spheres of influence in the Western Pacific. The New Guinea Company urged Germany to act quickly, out of concern that Europeans may make acquisitions in the area. On 28 October the commander of the SMS *Adler* declared the Northern Solomons (Buka, Bougainville, the Shortlands, Choiseul, Ysabel, and smaller islands) a German protectorate. The New Guinea Company was granted a charter for the islands on 13 December 1886. In November 1899, by treaty, Germany ceded all but Buka and Bougainville to the U.K. via treaty. Buka and Bougainville would become part of German New Guinea until they were invaded by Australian military forces in September of 1914, in the opening weeks of the First World War.[49]

Inadvertent: NO. While local German firms pressured the government, they did not secure any territory beforehand.[50]

Risk: NO. The Solomon Islands was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. The first telegraph stations in the South Pacific region wouldn't be established until 1903 (Guam) and 1905 (Yap).[51]

164. Nauru (1888/10)

Nauru was acquired by Germany via conquest on 2 October 1888. It was conquered by a force of 36 aboard the German gunboat *SMS* Eber. Its conquest took place two years after Germany and the United Kingdom had agreed upon their respective spheres of influence in in the Pacific, placing Nauru just on the German side of the divide. On 6 May 1887, German traders in the Marshall Islands asked whether Nauru could be made a protectorate of the German Empire. The protectorate was approved on 21 October 1887, and the Kaiser proclaimed the protectorate on 16 April 1888.

---

[48] Hezel, *Strangers in Their Own Land*, pp. 109-110; Jeffrey K. Lyons, "The Pacific Cable, Hawai'i, and Global Communication," *The Hawaiian Journal of History*, Vol. 39 (2005), p. 42; Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[49] Firth, *New Guinea Under the Germans*, p. 18; Peter Sack, "German Colonial Rule in the Northern Solomons," in Anthony J. Regan and Helga M. Griffin, eds., *Bougainville Before the Conflict* (Acton: Australian National University Press, 2005), pp. 77-78.
[50] Stewart G. Firth, "The New Guinea Company, 1885-1899: A Case of Unprofitable Imperialism," *Historical Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 59 (1972), p. 361; Firth, *New Guinea Under the Germans*, p. 18; Sack, "German Colonial Rule in the Northern Solomons," p. 77.
[51] Hezel, *Strangers in Their Own Land*, pp. 109-110; Lyons, "The Pacific Cable," p. 42; Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

Nauru was approximately 21 km^2 in territorial extent, with a population of 1,294 in 1889. The landing Germans arrested 12 chiefs until they were able to confiscate all weapons on the island, then released them. Nauru became part of the Marshall Islands protectorate, and would remain so until Australian forces invaded in the early months of the First World War in 1914.[52]

Inadvertent: NO. The request came from merchants in the Marshall Islands, but they hadn't secured any territory beforehand, and conquest order came from Chancellor Bismarck (21 October 1887) and Kaiser Wilhelm I (25 October 1887).[53]

Risk: NO. Nauru was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and had no alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. The first telegraph stations in the South Pacific region wouldn't be established until 1903 (Guam) and 1905 (Yap).[54]

165. Shandong Peninsula (1898/3)

The Shandong Peninsula (contemporary China) was acquired by Germany via conquest from China between 14 November 1897 and 6 March 1898. The Shandong Peninsula was conquered by 717 forces under the command of Rear Admiral Otto von Diederichs aboard the *Kaiser*. The naval force landed on 14 November 1897 in response to the killing of German missionaries in the area, and faced no resistance. Germany then negotiated a treaty with China, signed on 6 March 1898, which included a 99-year lease of the territory as well as rail and mining concessions. This conquest nearly sparked a diplomatic crisis with the Russian Empire, which had had a fleeting claim on the territory a few years earlier. The Kaiser attempted to recall the order of conquest, though his message would arrive too late, and Diederichs reported that reversal was impossible. The port of Tsingtao would become an important trading center and naval base. This holding was unique in that it was run by the Germany Navy, not the Colonial Department, and the navy had advocated hard for this acquisition. The total area of Germany's holding was approximately 500 km^2. Germany would lose the territory with Japan's invasion between September and November of 1914, during the First World War.[55]

Inadvertent: NO. Kaiser Wilhelm II ordered the invasion on 8 November 1897.[56]

Risk: YES. China was a regional power and had an alliance with Russia, a great power.[57]

---

[52] Nancy Viviani, *Nauru: Phosphate and Political Progress* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1970), pp. 20-23; Fabricius, *Nauru*, pp. 170-172, 175-177, 180-182, 184-185, 187-189, 196, 205-206, 208-213; Stephenson, *Germany's Asia-Pacific Empire*, p. 6.
[53] Viviani, *Nauru*, p. 22; Fabricius, *Nauru*, 188-189.
[54] Hezel, *Strangers in Their Own Land*, pp. 109-110; Lyons, "The Pacific Cable," p. 42; Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[55] Townsend, *The Rise and Fall of Germany's Colonial Empire*, pp. 187-189; Smith, *The German Colonial Empire*, pp. 111-115; Craig, *Germany, 1866-1945*, p. 305; "Kiaochow," in Fest, ed., *Dictionary of German History*, p. 80; "Empire and Imperialism" (subentry: "The German Colonial Empire"; "The Pacific Colonies and Kiaochow" & Table 1), in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; Stephenson, *Germany's Asia-Pacific Empire*, pp. 17-30.
[56] Townsend, *The Rise and Fall of Germany's Colonial Empire*, p. 187; Stephenson, *Germany's Asia-Pacific Empire*, p. 19.
[57] ATOP ID: 1395; COW ID: 76.

Telegraph: YES. China was connected to the global telegraph network in 1871.[58]

166. Western Samoa (1899/12)

Western Samoa (contemporary Samoa) was acquired by Germany via annexation on 2 December 1899. It was annexed to Germany through the Tripartite Convention, a treaty between Germany, the U.S., and the United Kingdom. A local Hamburg coconut and cotton firm, Johan Cesar Godfrey & Son, overthrew the Samoan government in 1887 with the backing of the German consulate. In December 1888, the Germany government claimed territory in Apia Harbor on the island of Upolu, which sparked a crisis and nearly a war with Britain and the United States. A hurricane in March 1889 cooled tensions between the three powers, and led to the Treaty of Berlin in June 1889, in which the three powers agreed to protect Samoan independence. This agreement would ultimately break down, leading to the 1899 Tripartite Convention, in which Germany acquired the Samoan islands of Upolu, Savaii, Apolima, and Manono, and the United States acquired Tutuila and Manua. Western Samoa became a protectorate of the German Empire, and had an area of 2,570 km^2. Western Samoa remained part of the German Empire until in invasion of New Zealand in August of 1914, in the opening weeks of the First World War.[59]

Risk: NO. While there were competing claims with the U.S. and the United Kingdom, the actual acquisition was facilitated by treaty with these two great powers.

Inadvertent: NO. The Tripartite Convention was an agreement between the governments, with the Kaiser's direct involvement.[60]

Telegraph: NO. The first telegraph stations in the South Pacific region wouldn't be established until 1903 (Guam) and 1905 (Yap).[61]

167. Austria (1938/3)

Austria was acquired by Germany via conquest on 12 March 1938. Prior to the invasion, there was fairly broad support in both Germany and Austria in favor of what became known as "Anschluss" or the "joining" of the two states. In July of 1934 an attempted coup in Austria by Austrian and German Nazi forces had failed, putting off unification for a few years. Planning for the invasion was conducted in November 1937, and memorialized in the infamous "Hossbach Memorandum." After the occupation, a plebiscite was held in April of 1938, with 99.7 percent of votes cast favoring

---

[58] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[59] Townsend, *The Rise and Fall of Germany's Colonial Empire*, pp. 198-201; Joseph Waldo Ellison, "The Partition of Samoa: A Study in Imperialism and Diplomacy," *The Pacific Historical Review*, Vol. 9, No. 3 (September 1939), pp. 267-287; P. M. Kennedy, "Bismarck's Imperialism: The Case of Samoa," *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 15, No. 2 (June 1972), pp. 262-283; Paul M. Kennedy, *The Samoan Tangle: A Study of Anglo-German-American Relations, 1878-1900* (Dublin: Irish University Press, 1974), pp. 189-239; "Samoa," in Fest, ed., *Dictionary of German History*, p. 137; "Empire and Imperialism" (subentry: "The German Colonial Empire"; "The Pacific Colonies and Kiaochow"), in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; Stephenson, *Germany's Asia-Pacific Empire*, pp. 56-57.
[60] Ellison, "The Partition of Samoa," p. 282; Kennedy, *The Samoan Tangle*, pp. 189-239.
[61] Hezel, *Strangers in Their Own Land*, pp. 109-110; Lyons, "The Pacific Cable," p. 42; Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."

Anschluss. Austria would remain German territory until a Soviet-Bulgarian invasion at the end of the Second World War in 1945.[62]

Inadvertent: NO. Führer Adolf Hitler planned the invasion and the planning was memorialized in the "Hossbach Memorandum" on 5 November 1937.[63]

Risk: YES. Austria was a regional power, and bordered and had an alliance with Italy, a great power.[64]

Telegraph: YES. Germany and Austria had an extensive telegraph network by 1850.[65]

168. Sudetenland (1938/9)

The Sudetenland (contemporary Czech Republic) was acquired by Germany via annexation from Czechoslovakia on 29 September 1938. Roughly 3.2 million Germans living in the northern mountain regions of Czechoslovakia aspired to be included in the German state. Since at least November 1937, Führer Adolf Hitler had been planning on invading Czechoslovakia to secure his objectives of overturning the Treaty of Versailles ("Revisionspolitik") and achieving "living space" for German nationals ("Lebensraum"). A conference was held in Munich that concluded with an agreement between Britain, France, Italy, and Germany, forcing Czechoslovakia to cede the Sudetenland to Germany. The terms of the agreement went into effect on 10 October 1938. The Sudetenland would remain a German territory until the end of the Second World War in 1945[66]

Inadvertent: NO. Führer Adolf Hitler planned the annexation, it was memorialized in the "Hossbach Memorandum," it was agreed to at an international conference, and Hitler gave the final order.[67]

Risk: YES. Czechoslovakia was a regional power and had alliances with France and the Soviet Union, two great powers.[68]

---

[62] "Anschluss" (pp. 3-4) and "Hossbach Minutes" (p. 71), both in Fest, ed., *Dictionary of German History*; "Austria" (pp. 158-159) and "The Hossbach Memorandum" (pp. 1782-1785), in Spencer Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of World War II: A Political, Social, and Military History* (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2004); "Nazi Occupation of Austria," in Paul K. Davis, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Invasions and Conquests: From Ancient Times to the Present*, 3rd ed. (Amenia: Grey House Publishing, 2016).

[63] "Hossbach Minutes," in Fest, ed., *Dictionary of German History*, p. 71; "The Hossbach Memorandum," in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWII*, pp. 1782-1785.

[64] ATOP ID: 2335; COW ID: 155. Though, note that Italy concurrently had an alliance with Germany (ATOP ID; 2395; COW ID: 164).

[65] "Pre-1865 International Telegraph Agreements," The ITU.

[66] "Hossbach Minutes" (p. 71), "Munich Agreement" (p. 103), "Revisionspolitik" (p. 131), and "Sudeten Germans (Sudetendeutsche)" (p. 154), all in Fest, ed., *Dictionary of German History*; "Czechoslovakia" (p. 409) and "Munich Conference and Preliminaries (1938)" (pp. 1031-1033), both in Tucker ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWII*; "Czechoslovakia," "Munich Agreement," and "Sudetenland," all in I. C. B. Dear and M. R. D. Foot, eds., *The Oxford Companion to World War II* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), Available at: https://www.oxfordreference.com/.

[67] "Hossbach Minutes," in Fest, ed., *Dictionary of German History*, p. 71; "Munich Conference and Preliminaries (1938)" (pp. 1032-1033) and "The Hossbach Memorandum" (1782-1785), both in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWII*; "Munich Agreement," in Dear and Foot, eds., *The Oxford Companion to WWII*.

[68] ATOP IDs: 2120, 2140, 2365; COW IDs: 115, 120, 160.

Telegraph: YES. Czechoslovakia had been connected to the global telegraph network since the mid-19th century.[69]

169. Bohemia and Moravia (1939/3)

Bohemia and Moravia (contemporary Czech Republic) was acquired by Germany via conquest from Czechoslovakia between 15 and 16 March 1939. Czech president Hemil Hacha was summoned to Berlin on 15 March 1939 and forced to sign a communique with the Germans, putting his country "in the hands of the Führer of the German Reich." The acquisition of Bohemia and Moravia was part of the broader occupation and partitioning of Czechoslovakia. Bohemia and Moravia became a protectorate of the German Empire, and would remain so until Germany's surrender at the end of World War II in 1945.[70]

Inadvertent: NO. Führer Adolf Hitler planned the conquest and it was memorialized in the "Hossbach Memorandum."[71]

Risk: YES. Czechoslovakia was a regional power and had an alliance with the Soviet Union, a great power.[72]

Telegraph: YES. Czechoslovakia had been connected to the global telegraph network since the mid-19th century.[73]

170. Slovakia (1939/3)

Slovakia was acquired by Germany via annexation from Czechoslovakia between 15 and 16 March 1939. On 14 March 1939, Nazi-supported Slovak leader and Catholic priest Jozef Tiso declared Slovakia's independence from the rest of Czechoslovakia. Slovakia then signed a "Treaty of Protection of the Slovak State by the German Reich," subordinating Slovakia's foreign and military policy to Germany. The acquisition of Slovakia was part of the broader occupation and partitioning of Czechoslovakia. Slovakia became a client state of the German Empire, and would remain so until Germany's surrender at the end of World War II in 1945.[74]

Inadvertent: NO. Führer Adolf Hitler planned the annexation and it was memorialized in the "Hossbach Memorandum."[75]

---

[69] "Communications," in Jiří Hochman, *Historical Dictionary of the Czech State* (Lanham: Scarecrow Press, 1998), p. 41.
[70] "Bohemia-Moravia," in Fest, ed., *Dictionary of German History*, pp. 18-19; "Czechoslovakia" (p. 409) and "Munich Conference and Preliminaries (1938)" (p. 1033), both in Tucker ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWII*; "Czechoslovakia," in Dear and Foot, eds., *The Oxford Companion to WWII*.
[71] "Hossbach Minutes," in Fest, ed., *Dictionary of German History*, p. 71; "Munich Conference and Preliminaries (1938)" (pp. 1032-1033) and "The Hossbach Memorandum" (1782-1785), both in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWII*.
[72] COW ID: 160.
[73] "Communications," in Hochman, *Historical Dictionary of the Czech State*, p. 41.
[74] "Czechoslovakia" (p. 409) and "Munich Conference and Preliminaries (1938)" (p. 1033), both in Tucker ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWII*; "Czechoslovakia" and "Slovakia," both in Dear and Foot, eds., *The Oxford Companion to WWII*.
[75] Hossbach Minutes," in Fest, ed., *Dictionary of German History*, p. 71; "Munich Conference and Preliminaries (1938)" (pp. 1032-1033) and "The Hossbach Memorandum" (1782-1785), both in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWII*.

Risk: YES. Czechoslovakia was a regional power and had an alliance with the Soviet Union, a great power.[76]

Telegraph: YES. Czechoslovakia had been connected to the global telegraph network since the mid-19th century.[77]

171. Klaipedia (1939/3)

Klaipedia, or the Memel Territory, was acquired by Germany via annexation from Lithuania on 23 March 1939. This territory was part of East Prussia before WWI, after which it was put under French administration, only to be seized by Lithuania in 1923. It would remain in German hands until the end of WWII in 1945, when it was returned to Lithuania, which was then part of the Soviet Union.[78]

Inadvertent: NO. The German government demanded that Lithuania hand over Memel on 19 March 1939.[79]

Risk: YES. Lithuania had an alliance with the Soviet Union, a great power.[80]

Telegraph: YES.

172. Western Poland (1939/10)

Western Poland was acquired by Germany via conquest from Poland between 1 September and 5 October 1939, in the opening days of the Second World War. It was conquered by 54 divisions of the German Army under the command of Generals Fedor von Bock and Gerd von Rundstedt. The invasion plan was known as Fall Weiss (Case White). The invasion was initially set for 26 August 1939, was called off on 25 August, and then reordered on 31 August 1939 for the very next day. That evening an incident was orchestrated on the Polish-German border, which would serve as a pretext for the invasion, which commenced with air attacks at 4:30AM on 1 September. This campaign provided the Wehrmacht the first opportunity to test out its blitzkrieg strategy. The Poles put up stiff resistance to the invading German forces. The Soviets invaded from the east on 17 September 1939 and the two powers would divide Poland to the east of what had been originally agreed to in the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact. Germany acquired the western Polish provinces of Silesia, Pomorze, Poznań, most of Łódź, and parts of Warsaw, Cracow, and Kielce with this invasion, and decreed them as the Reichsgau Wartheland on 8 October 1939. These territories totaled approximately 90,000 km^2. Other parts of German-occupied Poland were put under military

[76] COW ID: 160.
[77] "Communications," in Hochman, *Historical Dictionary of the Czech State*, p. 41.
[78] "Memelland," in Fest, ed., *Dictionary of German History*, p. 99; "Lithuania," in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWII*, p. 903; "Lithuania" and "Memelland," in Dear and Foot, eds., *The Oxford Companion to WWII*.
[79] Holborn, *A History of Modern Germany*, p. 789; Craig, *Germany, 1866-1945*, p. 709.
[80] ATOP ID: 2185; COW ID: 129.

occupation and known as the "General Government." Germany would retain Western Poland until the Soviet invasion in July 1944.[81]

Inadvertent: NO. The partition of Poland was agreed to in the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact and Führer Adolf Hitler ordered the invasion with directive "No. 1" on 31 August 1939.[82]

Risk: YES. Poland was a regional power and had alliances with France, Russia, and the United Kingdom, three great powers.[83]

Telegraph: YES.

173. Croatia (1941/4)

Croatia was acquired by Germany via conquest from Yugoslavia between 6 and 10 April 1941, over the course of the Second World War. The conquest of Croatia was part of the broader Axis invasion and partition of Yugoslavia, known as Operation Retribution. Croatia was made an independent state under fascist leadership on 10 April 1941, which was effectively a joint protectorate of both Italy and Germany until Italy's surrender in September 1943. Germany maintained its protectorate relationship with Croatia until the end of World War II in 1945.[84]

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. Führer Adolf Hitler issued directive "No. 25" for the invasion of Yugoslavia on 27 March 1941.[85]

Risk: YES. Yugoslavia was a regional power and was allied with Italy and the Soviet Union, two great powers.[86]

Telegraph: YES.

174. Northern Slovenia (1941/4)

Northern Slovenia was acquired by Germany via conquest between 6 and 17 April 1941, over the course of the Second World War. The conquest of Northern Slovenia was part of the broader Axis

---

[81] "Danzig" (p. 33), "Generalgouverment" (p. 53), and "Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact" (p. 133), all in Fest, ed., *Dictionary of German History*; "German-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact (23 August 1939)" (pp. 576-566), "Poland, Role in the War" (p. 1198), and "Poland Campaign (1939)" (pp. 1201-1205), all in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWII*; "Poland," "Polish Campaign," "Nazi-Soviet Pact," "Fall Weiss," and "Raid on Gleiwitz Radio Station," all in Dear and Foot, eds., *The Oxford Companion to WWII*; "Nazi Conquest of Poland," in Davis, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Invasions and Conquests*.
[82] "Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact," in Fest, ed., *Dictionary of German History*, p. 133; "German-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact (23 August 1939)" (p. 576) and "Poland Campaign (1939)" (pp. 1201, 1203), both in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWII*.
[83] ATOP IDs: 2060, 2135, 2240, 2295, 2440; COW IDs: 104, 119, 148, 174.
[84] "Croatia" (pp. 399-400), "Yugoslavia" (pp. 1677-1679), and "Yugoslavia Campaign (1941)" (pp. 1680-1681), all in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of World War II*; "Yugoslavia," in Dear and Foot, eds., *The Oxford Companion to WWII*.
[85] "Yugoslavia Campaign (1941)," in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWII*, p. 1680.
[86] ATOP IDs: 2405, 2520; COW IDs: 166, 190. Though, note that both Italy and the Soviet Union had concurrent alliances with Germany.

invasion and partition of Yugoslavia, known as Operation Retribution. Slovenia remained a German territory until Germany's surrender at the end of the Second World War in 1945.[87]

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. Führer Adolf Hitler issued directive "No. 25" for the invasion of Yugoslavia on 27 March 1941.[88]

Risk: YES. Yugoslavia was a regional power and was allied with Italy and the Soviet Union, two great powers.[89]

Telegraph: YES.

[87] "Yugoslavia Campaign (1941)" (pp. 1680-1681) and "Yugoslavia" (pp. 1677-1678), both in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWII*; "Yugoslavia," in Dear and Foot, eds., *The Oxford Companion to WWII*.
[88] "Yugoslavia Campaign (1941)," in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWII*, p. 1680.
[89] ATOP IDs: 2405, 2520; COW IDs: 166, 190. Though, note that both Italy and the Soviet Union had concurrent alliances with Germany.

Austria(-Hungary)

175. Kraków (1846/3)

Kraków (contemporary Poland) was acquired by Austria via conquest between 20 February and 3 March 1846, during the Kraków Revolt. The invasion was a result of an uprising of citizens of the Free City of Kraków, advocating for an independent Polish national government. Russia and Prussia would also take part in this intervention. Austrian locals in neighboring Galacia put down the insurrection as it spread into their province, massacring hundreds, even thousands, in the process. The territory was approximately 1,100 km^2. As a result of an Austrian-Russian treaty on 16 November 1846, Kraków would become part of the Austrian province of Galacia.[1]

Inadvertent: NO. Plans for the conquest were discussed between Russian Tsar Nicholas I and Austrian Chancellor Klemens von Metternich in January 1846.[2]

Risk: YES. Kraków bordered Prussia and Russia, two great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Austria's first international telegraphic connection was with Germany in 1849.[3]

176. Holstein (1864/7)

Holstein (contemporary Germany) was acquired by Austria via conquest from Denmark between 21 January and 18 July 1864, over the course of the Second Schleswig War. It was conquered by a joint Austrian-Prussian force of 12,000. Denmark would cede all rights to this territory on 1 August 1864. The territories would be jointly administered by Austria and Prussia under the Gastein Convention of 14 August 1865. Under this agreement, Holstein was under Austrian control whereas Schleswig was under Prussian control. This agreement held until the outbreak of the Austro-Prussian War two years later, when Prussia would take Holstein from Austria.[4]

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. The conquest of Schleswig-Holstein was part of Prussian-Austrian war planning.[5]

Risk: YES. Holstein was Denmark's territory, a regional power.

---

[1] Stefan Kieniewicz, "The Free State of Cracow, 1815-1846," *The Slavonic and East European Review*, Vol. 26, No. 66 (November 1947), pp. 70, 82-87; Norman Davies, *God's Playground: A History of Poland*, Vol. II (Oxford: Clarendon, 1981), 336-338; "Cracow, Uprising of 1846," in George J. Lerski, *Historical Dictionary of Poland, 966-1945* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1996), pp. 90-91; Pieter M. Judson, *The Habsburg Empire: A New History* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2016), pp. 157-159.
[2] Kieniewicz, "The Free State of Cracow," pp. 82-83.
[3] "The Earliest International Telegraph Agreements," The International Telecommunication Union (2022), Available at: http://handle.itu.int/11.1004/020.2000/s.139.
[4] "Gastein Convention" (p. 52) and "Schleswig-Holstein" (pp. 139-140), both in Wilfried Fest, ed., *Dictionary of German History, 1806-1945* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1978); Norman Rich, *Great Power Diplomacy, 1814-1918* (Boston: McGraw-Hill, 1992), pp. 194-198; Christopher M. Clark, *Iron Kingdom: The Rise and Downfall of Prussia, 1600-1947* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006), pp. 523-533; Dennis E. Showalter, *The Wars of German Unification*, 2nd ed. (New York: Bloomsbury, 2015), pp. 113-129; A. Wess Mitchell, *The Grand Strategy of the Habsburg Empire* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2018), pp. 292-293.
[5] Showalter, *The Wars of German Unification*, pp. 116-117.

Telegraph: YES. The telegraph was used during the Second Schleswig War.[6]

177. Bosnia-Herzegovina (1878/7)

Bosnia-Herzegovina was acquired by Austria-Hungary via conquest from the Ottoman Empire between 29 July and 20 October 1878, during the Austrian-Bosnian War. Bosnia-Herzegovina was conquered by 82,000 forces under the command of General Joseph von Philippović. The territory was "assigned" to Austria-Hungary at the Congress of Berlin in June and July 1878. The Austro-Hungarian forces met fierce, though sporadic, resistance. The territory was approximately 51,200 km^2. Bosnia-Herzegovina would be formally annexed only decades later, after the Bosnian Crisis of 1908, in the run-up to the First World War. Bosnia-Herzegovina would remain an Austro-Hungarian territory until the end of the First World War in 1918.[7]

Inadvertent: NO. Austria-Hungary agreed to the conquest at the Congress of Berlin in June and July 1878.[8]

Risk: YES. Bosnia-Herzegovina was the Ottoman Empire's territory, a regional power

Telegraph: YES. Bosnia-Herzegovina was connected to the global telegraph network in 1860.[9]

---

[6] Michael Embree, *Bismarck's First War: The Campaign of Schleswig and Jutland, 1864* (Solihull: Helion, 2006), p. 70.
[7] A. J. P. Taylor, *The Habsburg Monarchy, 1809-1918: A History of the Austrian Empire and Austria-Hungary* (London: Hamilton, 1951), pp. 152-154; Alan Sked, *The Decline and Fall of the Habsburg Empire, 1815-1918*, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 2001), pp. 247-251; "Bosnia-Hercegovina" (pp. 432-433) and "Congress of Berlin" (pp. 448-449), both in Eric Roman, *Austria-Hungary and the Successor States: A Reference Guide from the Renaissance to the Present* (New York: Facts on File, 2003); John Schindler, "Defeating Balkan Insurgency: The Austro-Hungarian Army in Bosnia-Hercegovina, 1878-82," *Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol. 27, No. 3 (2004), pp. 529-536; "Bosnia, Austrian Occupation, 1878," in Richard C. Hall, ed., *War in the Balkans: An Encyclopedic History from the Fall of the Ottoman Empire to the Breakup of Yugoslavia* (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2012), pp. 40-41; Judson, *The Habsburg Empire* (2016), pp. 329-330.
[8] Taylor, *The Habsburg Monarchy*, p. 153; Sked, *The Decline and Fall of the Habsburg Empire*, pp. 248-249; Hall, ed., *War in the Balkans*, p. 40.
[9] Ante Čuvalo, *Historical Dictionary of Bosnia and Herzegovina* (Lanham: Scarecrow Press, 2007), p. xxxi.

Italy

178. Venetia (1866/8)

Venetia (contemporary Italy) was acquired by Italy via annexation from Austria by way of France in August 1866, in the aftermath of the Austro-Prussian War. Italy had long claimed Venetia from Austria, and entered the war on 8 April 1866 with an interest in acquiring it. Italy entered with a force of approximately 200,000, attacking across Lombardy toward Venetia. Yet the Italian military performed poorly, with the army suffering a major defeat at Custoza in June and the navy at Lissa in July. Yet as an ally of a victorious Prussia, Italy received Venetia from the French, who had received it from the Prussians as a token of gratitude for their aid in the war. The French Emperor, Napoleon III, had promised in 1859 to help "unify Italy from the Alps to the Adriatic."[1]

Inadvertent: NO. The acquisition of Venetia was a condition for Italy entering the war, King Emanuele II ordered the invasion, and Prime Minister Ricasoli oversaw the campaign.[2]

Risk: YES. Venetia was Austria's territory, a great power.

Telegraph: YES. Italy was connected to the rest of Europe as early as 1854.[3]

179. Papal States (1870/9)

The Papal States (contemporary Italy) was acquired by Italy via conquest between 11 and 20 September 1870, during the Franco-Prussian War. The Papal States was conquered by Italian forces under the command of Raffaele Cadorna. At the outbreak of the war, France had to withdraw its forces that had been defending the Papal States, creating the opportunity for Italy to invade. Italy had launched earlier, failed efforts to take Rome in the summer of 1862 and in October and November in 1867. On 30 June 1871 Rome became the capital of Italy, leaving only the Vatican City independent.[4]

Inadvertent: NO. King Emanuele II and Prime Minister Lanza were involved in planning the invasion, and the operation was ordered by Lanza.[5]

Risk: NO. The Papal States was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and did not have any alliances with great powers.

---

[1] "War of 1866," in Frank Coppa, ed., *Dictionary of Modern Italian History* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1985) pp. 444-445; "Italian Independence Wars (1821-70)," "Austro-Prussian War," and "Battles of Custoza (1848, 1866)," all in Richard Holmes et al., eds., *The Oxford Companion to Military History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), Available at: https://www.oxfordreference.com/; "Austro-Prussian War," in Peter N. Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), Available at: https://www.oxfordreference.com/; Denis Mack Smith, *Modern Italy: A Political History* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997), pp. 72-77.

[2] Arthur James Whyte, *The Evolution of Modern Italy* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1950), p. 155; "War of 1866," in Coppa, ed., *Dictionary of Modern Italian History*, p. 444.

[3] Anton A. Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications* (Hoboken: Wiley-Interscience, 2003), p. 129.

[4] Whyte, *The Evolution of Modern Italy*, pp. 176-181; Smith, *Modern Italy*, pp. 85-89; "Italian Independence Wars (1821-70)," in Holmes et al., eds., *The Oxford Companion to Military History*; "Risorgimento," in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*.

[5] Whyte, *The Evolution of Modern Italy*, p. 177; Smith, *Modern Italy*, pp. 88-89.

Telegraph: YES. Italy was connected to the rest of Europe as early as 1854.[6]

180. Assab (1882/7)

Assab (contemporary Eritrea) was acquired by Italy via annexation on 5 July 1882. The Red Sea port of Assab had been acquired from local sultans by the Italian Rubattino Shipping Company, through two purchases in November 1869 and March 1870. The initial interest in Assab was spurred by the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869. It July 1882 the port was ceded to the government in Rome to become an Italian colony. Assab would remain an Italian territory until a British invasion in 1941 during World War II.[7]

Inadvertent: NO. The initial purchase in 1869 was authorized by the Italian government.[8]

Risk: NO. Eritrea was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and did not have any alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Eritrea was connected to the global telegraph network in March 1887.[9]

181. Massawa (1885/2)

Massawa (contemporary Eritrea) was acquired by Italy via conquest on 5 February 1885. Massawa was conquered by a four-ship convoy under the command of Colonel Tancredi Saletta. The locals in Massawa initially did not resist Italy's occupation. Italy's colonial capital in Eritrea was initially located in Massawa, until it was moved to Asmara in 1900. This acquisition was driven in part by concerns that British and French colonial holdings would crowd the Italians out of North Africa. Italy had come to a secret agreement with Britain, which permitted the Italians to take over the port. Massawa would remain an Italian territory until a British invasion in 1941 during World War II.[10]

Inadvertent: NO. Foreign Minister Mancini was deeply involved in planning for the conquest.[11]

Risk: NO. Eritrea was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and did not have any alliances with great powers.

---

[6] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 129.
[7] *The Italian Colonial Empire: with Chapters on the Dodecanese and Albania*, Information Department Papers No. 27 (London: The Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1940), p. 9; Christopher Hollis, *Italians in Africa* (London: H. Hamilton, 1941), pp. 35-36; "Assab (Denkel)," in Tom Killion, *Historical Dictionary of Eritrea* (Lanham: Scarecrow Press, 1998), p. 100.
[8] *The Italian Colonial Empire*, p. 9; Hollis, *Italians in Africa*, p. 35.
[9] Bill Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018," History of the Atlantic Cable & Undersea Communications (2021), Available at: https://atlantic-cable.com/Cables/CableTimeLine/index.htm.
[10] C. J. Lowe and F. Marzari, *Italian Foreign Policy, 1870-1940* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975), pp. 35-39; Thomas Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa: White Man's Conquest of the Dark Continent from 1876 to 1912* (New York: Perennial, 2003), pp. 471-472; "Massawa, Eritrea," in Henry Louis Gates, Jr. and Kwame Anthony Appiah, eds., *Encyclopedia of Africa* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), Available at: https://www.oxfordreference.com/; Giuseppe Finaldi, *A History of Italian Colonialism, 1860-1907: Europe's Past Empire* (New York: Routledge, 2017), pp. 49-51.
[11] Lowe and Marzari, *Italian Foreign Policy,* pp. 37-38; Finaldi, *A History of Italian Colonialism*, pp. 48-49.

Telegraph: NO. Eritrea was connected to the global telegraph network in March 1887.[12]

182. Somaliland (1889/5)

Somaliland (contemporary Somalia) was acquired by Italy via annexation between March and May 1889. Somaliland was annexed via treaty between Italy and the sultanates of Obbia (in March) and Mijjertein (in May) in 1889, making them protectorates of the Italian Empire. These treaties were negotiated by Vincenzo Filonardi, a clove merchant and Italian consul at Zanzibar. Filonardi would become the first governor of Italian Somaliland, with his company as the primary administrative body for the territory. Britain ceded the ports of Benadir to Italy in November of 1889, though it would take until July 1893 for them to actually change hands. The Italian government would assume direct control of Somaliland in 1905, and would declare Somalia an Italian colony in 1908. Britain would cede the area around the port of Kismayu (Trans-Juba) to Italy in 1924. Italy faced resistance to its rule in these colonies until 1927. Britain had a protectorate over the northwestern portion of Somalia from 1887. Somaliland would remain an Italian territory until a British invasion in 1941 during World War II.[13]

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. Prime Minister Crispi ordered the annexation and establishment of a protectorate in January 1889.[14]

Risk: NO. Somaliland was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and did not have any alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: YES. Somalia may have been connected to the global telegraph network around 1875.[15]

183. Eritrea (1889/8)

Eritrea was acquired by Italy via annexation and conquest between 2 May and August 1889. Italian diplomat Pietro Antonelli negotiated and signed the Treaty of Wichale with Ethiopian emperor Menelik II on 2 May 1889, which granted Italy control over the remainder of what would eventually become Eritrea in exchange for modern rifles and Italian government loans. The Italian text of the treaty, though not the Ahmaric text, additionally granted Italy a protectorate over all of Ethiopia, though Menelik II later rejected this. The signing of the treaty was followed by the conquest of Asmara by Italian forces under the command of General Antonio Baldissera in August 1889. Disputes over Eritrea and Ethiopia would ultimately lead to a war that Italy would lose at the decisive Battle of Adowa in March 1896. This preserved the independence of Ethiopia. Eritrea

[12] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[13] Robert L. Hess, *Italian Colonialism in Somalia* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966), pp. 24-30; "Somalia," in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; Finaldi, *A History of Italian Colonialism*, pp. 185-187.
[14] Hess, *Italian Colonialism in Somalia*, p. 25.
[15] "Egypt," in Mohamed Haji Mukhtar, *Historical Dictionary of Somalia*, New ed. (Lanham: Scarecrow Press, 2003), p. 111.

would be declared an Italian colony in 1890. Eritrea would remain an Italian territory until a British invasion in 1941 during World War II.[16]

Inadvertent: NO. Antonelli had been authorized to secure the protectorate beforehand by Prime Minister Crispi.[17]

Risk: NO. Eritrea was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and did not have any alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: YES. Eritrea was connected to the global telegraph network in March 1887.[18]

184. Libya (1912/3)

Libya was acquired by Italy via conquest from the Ottoman Empire between 29 September 1911 and March 1912, over the course of the Italo-Turkish War of 1911-1912. Libya was conquered by approximately 80,000 Italian forces. The invasion was, in part, motivated by growing British and French influence in the area. Italy manufactured a crisis with the Ottoman Empire in order to justify the war, accusing them of arming Arab Bedouins and threatening local Italian businesses. On 26 September 1911, Italy sent an ultimatum to the sultan demanding the Ottoman-controlled provinces of Cyrenaica and Tripolitania. When this was refused, Italy declared war three days later. Tripoli was seized in October 1911 and the annexation of the territory was declared on 5 November. The war was brought to an end by the Treaty of Ouchy on 15-18 October 1912. Italy would face organized resistance in these territories until the early 1930s. This war featured the first use of reconnaissance and bombing by airplane. Libya was made a full-fledged colony in 1934. The estimated population total for this area was between 750,000 and 1.1 million. In 1939, the coastal area of Libya was made a province of Italy itself. Libya would remain an Italian territory until an Allied invasion in 1943 during World War II.[19]

Inadvertent: NO. Foreign Minister San Giuliano, Prime Minister Giolitti, and King Umberto were all involved in the planning, and Italy formally declared war before the invasion.[20]

Risk: YES. The Ottoman Empire was a regional power.

---

[16] Lowe and Marzari, *Italian Foreign Policy*, pp. 57-61, 65-68; Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa*, pp. 472-486; "Battle of Adowa (1896)," in Holmes et al., eds., *The Oxford Companion to Military History*; "Menelik II" and "Asmara, Eritrea," in Gates and Appiah, eds., *Encyclopedia of Africa*; Finaldi, *A History of Italian Colonialism*, pp. 74-76, 93-96.
[17] Lowe and Marzari, *Italian Foreign Policy*, p. 57; Finaldi, *A History of Italian Colonialism*, p. 94.
[18] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[19] Lowe and Marzari, *Italian Foreign Policy*, pp. 116-118; R. J. B. Bosworth, *Italy, The Least of the Great Powers: Italian Foreign Policy Before the First World War* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979), pp. 135-195; "Treaty of Ouchy," in Coppa, ed., *Dictionary of Modern Italian History*, p. 304; Norman Rich, *Great Power Diplomacy, 1814-1918* (Boston: McGraw-Hill, 1992), pp. 423-425; Smith, *Modern Italy*, pp. 241-249; "Italo-Turkish War (1911-1912)," in Holmes et al., eds., *The Oxford Companion to Military History*; "Italo-Turkish War," in Spencer C. Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of World War I: A Political, Social, and Military History* (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2005), p. 593; Ciro Paoletti, *A Military History of Italy* (Westport: Praeger, 2008), pp. 133-135; "Libya," in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; "Libya," in Gates and Appiah, eds., *Encyclopedia of Africa*; "Italian Occupation of Libya," in Paul K. Davis, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Invasions and Conquests: From Ancient Times to the Present*, 3rd ed. (Amenia: Grey House Publishing, 2016).
[20] Lowe and Marzari, *Italian Foreign Policy*, pp. 116-117; Bosworth, *Italy, The Least of the Great Powers*, p. 160; Smith, *Modern Italy*, p. 244; "Italian Occupation of Libya," in Davis, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Invasions and Conquests*.

Telegraph: YES. Libya was first connected to the global telegraph network in 1861.[21]

185. Dodecanese Islands (1912/5)

The Dodecanese (Aegean) Islands (contemporary Greece) were acquired by Italy via conquest from the Ottoman Empire between 22 April and 16 May 1912, over the course of the Italo-Turkish War of 1911-1912. The Dodecanese were conquered by 10,000 Italian forces under the command of Admiral Viali. Italy manufactured a crisis with the Ottoman Empire in order to justify the war. On 26 September 1911, Italy sent an ultimatum to the sultan demanding Ottoman-controlled provinces in Libya. When this was refused, Italy declared war three days later. The Dodecanese Islands were seized in order to pressure the Ottomans to bring an end to the war. The only island where there was any Turkish resistance was on Rhodes. Italy promised to return the islands in the Treaty of Ouchy on 18 October 1912, though this promise would be revoked with the outbreak of WWI. The Dodecanese remained Italian territory until its surrender in World War II in 1943.[22]

Inadvertent: NO. Foreign Minister San Giuliano was involved in planning the invasion in March 1912, and he sought the approval of the Austrian foreign minister in advance.[23]

Risk: YES. The Dodecanese Islands were the Ottoman Empire's territory, a regional power.

Telegraph: YES. Crete was first connected to the global telegraph network in 1858.[24]

186. Sazan Island and Vlore (1914/10)

Sazan Island and port of Vlore (contemporary Albania) were acquired by Italy via conquest on 29 October 1914, in the opening months of the First World War. Sazan was conquered by Italian Marines. The Italian Cabinet was opposed to this conquest, but it was pushed by Prime Minister Antonio Salandra. Italy's retention of Vlore would be promised to it in the secret Treaty of London on 26 April 1915, as a condition for Italy entering the war on the side of the Entente. However, Italy did not retain Vlore after the Treaty of Versailles, though it would retain Sazan Island until its surrender in World War II in 1943.[25]

---

[21] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[22] Lowe and Marzari, *Italian Foreign Policy*, pp. 118-119; Bosworth, *Italy, The Least of the Great Powers*, pp. 187, 300-306; P. J. Carabott, "The Temporary Italian Occupation of Dodecanese: A Prelude to Permanency," *Diplomacy & Statecraft*, Vol. 4, No. 2 (1993), pp. 288-291; "Italo-Turkish War," in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWI*, p. 593; Paoletti, *A Military History of Italy*, p. 135.
[23] W. David Wrigley, "Germany and the Turco-Italian War, 1911-1912," *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, Vol. 11, No. 3 (May 1980), p. 329; David G. Herrmann, "The Paralysis of Italian Strategy in the Italian-Turkish War, 1911-1912," *The English Historical Review*, Vol. CIV, No. CCCCXI (April 1989), p. 352; Carabott, "The Temporary Italian Occupation of Dodecanese," p. 289.
[24] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[25] Lowe and Marzari, *Italian Foreign Policy*, pp. 142-143; "Albania" (p. 77) and "Treaty of London (26 April 1915)" (p. 710), both in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWI*.

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. Prime Minister Salandra and Foreign Ministers San Giuliano and Sonnino were involved in the planning for these conquests.[26]

Risk: NO. Albania was not a great power or regional power, was not adjacent to any great powers or their territory, and did not have an alliance with a great power.

Telegraph: YES. Italy and Valona were first connected by telegraph in 1859.[27]

187. Albania (1918/11)

Albania was acquired by Italy via conquest between May 1916 and November 1918, over the course of the First World War. Albania was made a protectorate of the Italian Empire. This conquest was, in part, driven by Italian fears of a potential Greek invasion. Italy began to withdraw from Albania in May 1920, and would retain only Sazan Island by September 1920.[28]

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. Foreign Minister Sonnino declared the protectorate.[29]

Risk: NO. Albania was not a great power or regional power, was not adjacent to any great powers or their territory, and did not have an alliance with a great power.

Telegraph: YES. Italy and Albania were first connected by telegraph in 1859.[30]

188. Austro-Hungarian Territories (1918/11)

Italy gained the Austro-Hungarian territories of South Tyrol, Trentino, Fruil, and the Austrian Littoral, including Trieste and Istria (all contemporary Italy) via conquest from Austria-Hungary between 24 October and 3 November 1918, in the final days of the First World War. These territories were conquered by 52 Italian divisions under the command of General Armando Diaz. These territories were acquired during the final push on the Italian Front with the Austro-Hungarian Empire, during the decisive Battle of Vittorio Veneto. The Austro-Hungarian army collapsed, and asked for an armistice on 3 November 1918. Italy would be awarded these territories permanently at the Treaty of Saint-Germain in 1919.[31]

Inadvertent: NO. Prime Minister Orlando was involved in the planning for the offensive and ordered the invasion on 19 October 1918.[32]

---

[26] Lowe and Marzari, *Italian Foreign Policy*, pp. 142-143.
[27] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[28] Smith, *Modern Italy*, pp. 272-273, 276-277; "Albania," in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWI*, p. 77.
[29] Smith, *Modern Italy*, p. 273.
[30] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[31] "Armando Diaz" (p. 356), "Italian Front" (p. 592), "Treaty of Saint-Germain (1919)" (pp. 1035-1036), and "Battle of Vittorio Veneto (24 October-4 November 1918)" (p. 1228), all in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWI*; Mark Thompson, *The White War: Life and Death on the Italian Front, 1915-1919* (New York: Basic Books, 2009), pp. 354-364; John Gooch, *The Italian Army and the First World War* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), pp. 293-301.
[32] Thompson, *The White War*, pp. 354-355; Gooch, *The Italian Army and the First World War*, pp. 286-293.

Risk: YES. Austria-Hungary was a great power.

Telegraph: YES. Italy was connected to the rest of Europe as early as 1854.[33]

189. Zara (1918/11)

Zara (contemporary Croatia) was acquired by Italy via conquest from Austria-Hungary in November 1918, at the end of the First World War. Zara was conquered by Italian forces under the command of Admiral Enrico Millo. The acquisition of Zara was part of the broader Italian seizure of the Dalmatian Coast. The Dalmatian Coast had been promised to Italy in the secret Treaty of London in 1915 as a condition for its entry into the war. With the Treaty of Versailles, Italy was only allowed to keep Zara, which became an Italian province. The territory was returned to Croatia in 1947.[34]

Inadvertent: NO. The Dalmatian Coast was promised to Italy in the Treaty of London in 1915.[35]

Risk: YES. Zara was Austria-Hungary's territory, a great power.

Telegraph: YES. Zara was connected to the global telegraph network in, or likely before, 1894.[36]

190. Ethiopia (1936/5)

Ethiopia (Abyssinia) was acquired by Italy via conquest between 3 October 1935 and 5 May 1936, over the course of the Second Italo-Ethiopian War. Ethiopia was conquered by 210,500 Italian and colonial forces under the command of Generals Rodalfo Graziani and Pietro Badoglio. The pretext for the invasion was the "Wal Wal Incident" of December 1934, where Italian and Ethiopian forces clashed well-within Ethiopian territory. The invasion and Italy's use of chemical weapons was condemned and Italy was sanctioned by the League of Nations, though there was little the body could do to halt the advance. Britain and France declared neutrality, which was a benefit to Italy, given its material and technological superiority over Ethiopia. General Badoglio was first made Viceroy of the territory, then Duke. This acquisition would lead Prime Minister Benito Mussolini to declare the Italian Empire united as Italian East Africa. Local resistance to the invasion continued until the British invaded to oust the Italians in 1941.[37]

---

[33] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 129.
[34] "Dalmatia," in Coppa, ed., *Dictionary of Modern Italian History*, pp. 111-112; Thompson, *The White War*, pp. 31, 367; "Treaty of London (26 April 1915)," in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWI*, pp. 709-710.
[35] Thompson, *The White War*, p. 31; "Treaty of London (26 April 1915)," in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWI*, pp. 709-710.
[36] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[37] "Ethiopia," in Coppa, ed., *Dictionary of Modern Italian History*, pp. 143-144; James H. Burgwyn, *Italian Foreign Policy in the Interwar Period, 1918-1940* (Westport: Praeger, 1997), pp. 125-127; Smith, *Modern Italy*, pp. 385-388 "Italian Invasion of Abyssinia (Ethiopia) (1935-6)" and "WWII Campaign in Abyssinia (Ethiopia) (1941)," both in Holmes et al., eds., *The Oxford Companion to Military History*; "Italian Invasion of Ethiopia," in David Dabydeen et al., eds., *The Oxford Companion to Black British History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), Available at: https://www.oxfordreference.com/; "Abyssinia," "Marshal Pietro Badoglio," "Marshal Rodolfo Graziani," and "East African Campaign," all in I. C. B. Dear and M. R. D. Foot, eds., *The Oxford Companion to World War II* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), Available at: https://www.oxfordreference.com/.

Inadvertent: NO. The invasion of Ethiopia happened on Prime Minister Benito Mussolini's orders.[38]

Risk: YES. Ethiopia was a regional power.

Telegraph: YES. The telegraph was established in Ethiopia in the 1890s.[39]

191. Albania (1939/4)

Albania was acquired by Italy via conquest between 7 and 10 April 1939. Albania was conquered by 22,000 Italian forces, making it a protectorate of the Italian Empire. On 16 April 1939, Italian King Immanuel III accepted the Albanian crown and a puppet regime was installed there. Italy was motivated, at least in part, by a concern that, if they did not attack, Hitler might. While the initial invasion was only met with light resistance, Italy would face non-stop resistance in Albania throughout the war. Italy would retain this protectorate until its surrender to the Allied forces in September 1943, when Germany would take over the territory.[40]

Inadvertent: NO. Prime Minister Mussolini and Foreign Minister Ciano were involved in the planning and decision to invade.[41]

Risk: NO. Albania was not a great power or regional power, was not adjacent to any great powers or their territory, and did not have an alliance with a great power.

Telegraph: YES. Italy and Albania were first connected by telegraph in 1859.[42]

192. Croatia (1941/4)

Croatia was acquired by Italy via conquest from Yugoslavia between 6 and 10 April 1941, over the course of the Second World War. Croatia was conquered by Italian forces of the 2nd Army. The conquest of Croatia was part of the broader Axis invasion and partition of Yugoslavia. Croatia was made an "independent" state under fascist leadership on 10 April 1941, which was effectively a joint protectorate of both Italy and Germany, until Italy's surrender in September 1943.[43]

---

[38] Lowe and Marzari, *Italian Foreign Policy*, p. 283; Smith, *Modern Italy*, p. 386.
[39] "Menilek II," in Chris Prouty and Eugene Rosenfeld, *Historical Dictionary of Ethiopia* (Metuchen: Scarecrow Press, 1981), p. 130.
[40] Lowe and Marzari, *Italian Foreign Policy*, pp. 326-331; Burgwyn, *Italian Foreign Policy*, pp. 188-191; Smith, *Modern Italy*, pp. 398-399; "Albania, Role in War," in Spencer Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of World War II: A Political, Social, and Military History* (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2004), p. 82; "Albania," in Dear and Foot, eds., *The Oxford Companion to WWII*; Paoletti, *A Military History of Italy*, p. 166; "Italian Conquest of Albania," in Davis, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Invasions and Conquests*.
[41] Lowe and Marzari, *Italian Foreign Policy*, p. 327; Denis Mack Smith, *Mussolini's Roman Empire* (New York: Viking Press, 1976), pp. 151-152; Burgwyn, *Italian Foreign Policy*, p. 189; Smith, *Modern Italy*, p. 398; "Albania, Role in War," in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWII*, p. 82; "Italian Conquest of Albania," in Davis, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Invasions and Conquests*.
[42] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[43] "Croatia" (pp. 399-400), "Yugoslavia" (p. 1678), and "Yugoslavia Campaign (1941)" (pp. 1680-1681), all in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of World War II*; Davide Rodogno, *Fascism's European Empire: Italian Occupation During the Second World War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 93-99 James H. Burgwyn, *Empire on the Adriatic: Mussolini's Conquest of Yugoslavia, 1941-1943* (New York: Enigma, 2005), pp. 35-40.

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. Prime Minister Mussolini, Foreign Minister Ciano, and King Emmanuelle III were all involved in planning the invasion and Mussolini gave the final order.[44]

Risk: YES. Yugoslavia was a regional power, and was allied with the Soviet Union, a great power.[45]

Telegraph: YES.

193. Ljubljana (1941/4)

Ljubljana (contemporary Slovenia) was acquired by Italy via conquest from Yugoslavia between 6 and 17 April 1941, over the course of the Second World War. Ljubljana was conquered by Italian forces of the 11th Army Corps of the 2nd Army under the command of General Mario Robotti. The conquest of Ljubljana was part of the broader Axis invasion and partition of Yugoslavia. On 17 April 1941, Germany informed Italy which territories it would be annexing, leaving what would become the Province of Ljubljana to Italy. A July 1941 census estimated a population of 339,751. Ljubljana remained an Italian territory until Italy's surrender in the war in September 1943.[46]

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. Prime Minister Mussolini began planning for the invasion of Yugoslavia in July 1940 and gave the final order.[47]

Risk: YES. Yugoslavia was a regional power and was allied with the Soviet Union, a great power.[48]

Telegraph: YES.

194. Kosovo (1941/4)

Kosovo was acquired by Italy via conquest from Yugoslavia between 6 and 17 April 1941, over the course of the Second World War. Kosovo was conquered by Italian forces of the 2nd Army. The conquest of Kosovo was part of the broader Axis invasion and partition of Yugoslavia. Italian-occupied Kosovo would be added to the Italian protectorate of Albania on 10 July 1941. Kosovo would remain an Italian territory until its surrender in the war in September 1943.[49]

---

[44] Burgwyn, *Empire on the Adriatic*, pp. 18, 25-27, 37, 41.
[45] Alliance Treaty Obligations and Provisions (ATOP) ID: 2520; Correlates of War (COW) Alliance ID: 190. See: ATOP v5.1. Brett Ashley Leeds, Jeffrey M. Ritter, Sara McLaughlin Mitchell, and Andrew G. Long, "Alliance Treaty Obligations and Provisions, 1815-1944," *International Interactions*, Vol. 28, No. 3 (2002), pp. 237-260. Available at: http://www.atopdata.org/; Formal Alliances (v4.1). Douglas M. Gibler, *International Military Alliances, 1648-2008* (Washington: CQ Press, 2009). Available at: https://correlatesofwar.org/.
[46] "Yugoslavia" (p. 1678) and "Yugoslavia Campaign (1941)" (pp. 1680-1681), both in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of World War II*; Rodogno, *Fascism's European Empire*, pp. 82-84; Burgwyn, *Empire on the Adriatic*, pp. 43-45; Jozo Tomasevich, *War and Revolution in Yugoslavia, 1941-1945: Occupation and Collaboration* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001), pp. 94-95.
[47] Burgwyn, *Empire on the Adriatic*, pp. 18, 25-27.
[48] ATOP ID: 2520; COW ID: 190.
[49] Tomasevich, *War and Revolution in Yugoslavia*, p. 149; "Yugoslavia" (p. 1678) and "Yugoslavia Campaign (1941)" (pp. 1680-1681), both in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWII*.

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. Prime Minister Mussolini began planning for the invasion of Yugoslavia in July 1940 and gave the final order.[50]

Risk: YES. Yugoslavia was a regional power and was allied with the Soviet Union, a great power.[51]

Telegraph: YES.

195. Dalmatian Coast (1941/4)

The Dalmatian coast of Yugoslavia (contemporary Croatia) was acquired by Italy via conquest from Yugoslavia between 6 and 27 April 1941, over the course of the Second World War. The Dalmatian coast was conquered by Italian forces of the 2nd Army. The conquest of the Dalmatian Coast was part of the broader Axis invasion and partition of Yugoslavia. The annexation of this area was officially announced in June 1941. The Dalmatian territories were added to Italy's preexisting Province of Zara to create the Governate of Dalmatia. The population of the governate was estimated to be 380,100 in 1940. The Dalmatian coast remained an Italian territory until Italy's surrender in the war in September 1943.[52]

Inadvertent: NO. Prime Minister Mussolini began planning for the invasion of Yugoslavia in July 1940 and gave the final order.[53]

Risk: YES. Yugoslavia was a regional power and was allied with the Soviet Union, a great power.[54]

Telegraph: YES.

196. Montenegro (1941/4)

Montenegro was acquired by Italy via conquest from Yugoslavia between 6 and 27 April 1941, over the course of the Second World War. Montenegro was conquered by 76,800 forces of the Italian 14th Army Corps of the 2nd Army. The conquest of Montenegro was part of the broader Axis invasion and partition of Yugoslavia. The territory was ultimately established as the Governate of Montenegro, a puppet kingdom that was a protectorate of Italy. Significant resistance by communist "Partisans" would continue throughout the war. Montenegro remained an Italian territory until Italy's surrender in the war in September 1943.[55]

---

[50] Burgwyn, *Empire on the Adriatic*, pp. 18, 25-27.
[51] ATOP ID: 2520; COW ID: 190.
[52] Tomasevich, *War and Revolution in Yugoslavia*, pp. 131-132; "Yugoslavia" (p. 1678) and "Yugoslavia Campaign (1941)" (pp. 1680-1681), both in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWII*; Burgwyn, *Empire on the Adriatic*, pp. 32-34; Rodogno, *Fascism's European Empire*, pp. 73-82; Paoletti, *A Military History of Italy*, pp. 174-175.
[53] Burgwyn, *Empire on the Adriatic*, pp. 18, 25-27, 34; Rodogno, *Fascism's European Empire*, p. 78.
[54] ATOP ID: 2520; COW ID: 190.
[55] Tomasevich, *War and Revolution in Yugoslavia*, pp. 138-139; Davide Rodogno, "Italian Soldiers in the Balkans: The Experience of the Occupation (1941-43)," *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans*, Vol. 6, No. 2 (2004), pp. 127-128; "Yugoslavia" (p. 1678-1679) and "Yugoslavia Campaign (1941)" (pp. 1680-1681), both in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWII*; Burgwyn, *Empire on the Adriatic*, pp. 41-43; Rodogno, *Fascism's European Empire*, pp. 99-103; Paoletti, *A Military History of Italy*, pp. 174-175.

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. Prime Minister Mussolini began planning for the invasion of Yugoslavia in July 1940 and gave the final order.[56]

Risk: YES. Yugoslavia was a regional power and was allied with the Soviet Union, a great power.[57]

Telegraph: YES.

[56] Burgwyn, *Empire on the Adriatic*, pp. 18, 25-27.
[57] ATOP ID: 2520; COW ID: 190.

197. Erevan and Nakhichevan Khanates (1828/2)

The Khanates of Erevan and Nakhichevan (contemporary Armenia and Azerbaijan) were acquired by Russia via conquest from Persia in February 1828, over the course of the Russo-Persian War of 1826-1828. These khanates were conquered by Russian forces under the command of General I. F. Paskevich between May 1827 and February 1828. The war started when Persian forces under Abbas Mirza invaded the Russian Caucasus region without declaring war. Russia prevailed, and the territories were officially ceded to Russia with the Treaty of Turkmanchai. With the exception of a brief period during the Russian Civil War (1917-1920), Erevan and Nakhichevan would remain Russian territory until the independence of Armenia and Azerbaijan in 1991.[1]

Inadvertent: NO. Russian war plans included the conquest of these territories, and Tsar Nicholas I gave the invasion orders to Paskevich.[2]

Risk: YES. Persia was a regional power.

Telegraph: NO. Russia wouldn't have international telegraph connections until 1854.[3]

198. Moldavia and Wallachia (1829/8)

The Danubian Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia, as well as the Danube Delta (all contemporary Romania), were acquired by Russia via conquest from the Ottoman Empire between 26 April 1828 and 28 August 1829, over the course of the Russo-Turkish War of 1828-1829. These territories were conquered by the Russian Second Army under the command of Field Marshall Wittgenstein. Tsar Nicholas I himself participated in this conquest. The war was brought to a close with the Treaty of Adrianople on 28 August 1829. Russia gained de facto protectorate status over the Principalities, which it would retain until its loss in the Crimean War in 1856.[4]

Inadvertent: NO. These acquisitions were part of Russia's war objectives, and there was a formal declaration of war, ordered by Tsar Nicholas I.[5]

Risk: YES. The Ottoman Empire was a regional power.

---

[1] "Iranian-Russian Wars of the Nineteenth Century" (vol. 14, pp. 234-236), "Russian-Iranian War of 1826-1828" (vol. 32, pp. 197-199), and "Treaty of Turkmanchai" (vol. 40, pp. 97-98), all in Joseph L. Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History* (Gulf Breeze: Academic International Press, 1976-2000).
[2] "Russian-Iranian War" (vol. 32, p. 198) and "Treaty of Turkmanchai" (vol. 40, p. 98), both in Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*; Alexander Bitis, *Russia and the Eastern Question: Army, Government and Society, 1815-1833* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 235-236.
[3] Anton A. Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications* (Hoboken: Wiley-Interscience, 2003), p. 109.
[4] Hugh Seton-Watson, *The Russian Empire, 1801-1917* (London: Oxford University Press, 1967), pp. 299-301; "Treaty of Adrianople (1829)" (vol. 1, pp. 38-41) and "Russian-Turkish War of 1828-1829" (vol. 32, pp. 197-199), both in Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*; W. Bruce Lincoln, *Nicholas I: Emperor and Autocrat of all the Russias* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1978), pp. 122-130.
[5] W. E. D. Allen and Paul Muratoff, *Caucasian Battlefields: A History of the Wars on the Turco-Caucasian Border, 1828-1921* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953), p. 23; "Russian-Turkish War," in Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*, vol. 32, p. 198.

Telegraph: NO. Russia wouldn't have international telegraph connections until 1854.[6]

199. Amur Region (1850/8)

The territory on the left (north) bank of the Amur River (contemporary Russia) was acquired by Russia via annexation from China on 1 August 1850. The territory was annexed by the explorer Gennadii Ivanovich Nevelskoi when he raised the Russian flag at Cape Kuegdo in the Amur region. Nevelskoi had been sent on an expedition by the governor-general of Eastern Siberia, Nikolai Nikolaevich Muraviev-Amursky, in 1848. Nevelskoi's claims were carried out in opposition to the government in St. Petersburg. Muraviev vigorously defended his subordinate in communications with Tsar Nicholas I, and Nicholas ultimately approved his actions. Nevelskoi would be removed from his post in 1856. Muraviev was rewarded with the title, the Count of Amur. The Russian acquisition was formalized with the Treaty of Aigun with China on 28 May 1858. The Amur region remains part of Russia to this day.[7]

Inadvertent: YES. Muraviev and Nevelskoi were acting on their own initiative, without orders from St. Petersburg.[8]

Risk: YES. China was a regional power and had an alliance with the United Kingdom, a great power.[9]

Telegraph: NO. Russia wouldn't have a telegraph connection between St. Petersburg and its Far East (Vladivostok) until 1871.[10]

---

[6] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 109.

[7] T. C. Lin, "The Amur Frontier Question between China and Russia, 1850-1860," *Pacific Historical Review*, Vol. 3, No. 1 (March 1934), pp. 7-8; George Alexander Lensen, *The Russian Push Toward Japan: Russo-Japanese Relations, 1697-1875* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1959), pp. 272-278; Peter S. H. Tang, *Russian Expansion into the Maritime Province: The Contemporary Soviet and Chinese Communist Views* (Washington: Research Institute on the Sino-Soviet Bloc, 1962), pp. 9-10; "Aigun Treaty of 1858" (vol. 1, p. 65), "Amur Expedition of 1849-1855" (vol. 1, pp. 203-204), "Gennadii Ivanovich Nevel'skoi" (vol. 24, p. 173), "Nikolai Nikaloaevich Murav'ev-Amurskii" (vol. 50, pp. 173-175), and "Nikolaevsk-Na-Amure" (vol. 50, p. 225), all in Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*; John L. Evans, *The Russo-Chinese Crisis: N.P. Ignatiev's Mission to Peking, 1859-1860* (Newtonville: Oriental Research Partners, 1987), p. viii; Patrick G. March, *Eastern Destiny: Russia in Asia and the North Pacific* (Westport: Praeger, 1996), pp. 124-125; Sharyl Corrado, "A Land Divided: Sakhalin and the Amur Expedition of G.I. Nevel'skoi, 1848-1855," *Journal of Historical Geography*, Vol. 45 (July 2014), p. 77.

[8] Lin, "The Amur Frontier Question," p. 8; Tang, *Russian Expansion into the Maritime Province*, pp. 9-10; "Amur Expedition" (vol. 1, p. 203), "Nevel'skoi," (vol. 24, p. 173), and "Murav'ev-Amurskii" (vol. 50, p. 174), all in Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*; John J. Stephan, *Sakhalin: A History* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), pp. 49-50; March, *Eastern Destiny*, pp. 124-125; S. C. M. Paine, *Imperial Rivals: China, Russia, and their Disputed Future* (Armonk: M.E. Shape, 1996), pp. 37-39; John L. Evans, *Russian Expansion on the Amur, 1848-1860: The Push to the Pacific* (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen, 1999), pp. 59, 62-63; Corrado, "A Land Divided," p. 77.

[9] Alliance Treaty Obligations and Provisions (ATOP) ID: 1118. See: ATOP v5.1. Brett Ashley Leeds, Jeffrey M. Ritter, Sara McLaughlin Mitchell, and Andrew G. Long, "Alliance Treaty Obligations and Provisions, 1815-1944," *International Interactions*, Vol. 28, No. 3 (2002), pp. 237-260. Available at: http://www.atopdata.org/.

[10] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 128.

200. Ussuri Region (1852/summer)

The Ussuri region (contemporary Russia) was acquired by Russia via annexation from China in the summer of 1852. The Ussuri region was annexed by Russian personnel under the direction of Gennadii Ivanovich Nevelskoi, when he raised the Russian flag and placed guns in a number of locations throughout the region. The territory would officially become part of the Russian Empire by the Treaty of Peking, signed with China on 14 November 1860. From May 1858, the territory was jointly administered as a condominium between Russia and China as a result of the Treaty of Aigun. With this treaty, Russia gained approximately 997,000 km^2 of territory from China. The Peking treaty was negotiated and signed by Nikolai Pavlovich Ignatyev, who was a mere 28-years old at the time. The Ussuri Region remains part of Russia to this day.[11]

Inadvertent: YES. Nevelskoi was acting without orders from St. Petersburg, and Tsar Nicholas I only ordered the annexation of the Ussuri Region in April 1853.[12]

Risk: YES. China was a regional power.

Telegraph: NO. Russia wouldn't have a telegraph connection between St. Petersburg and its Far East (Vladivostok) until 1871.[13]

201. Ak-Mechet (1853/7)

Ak-Mechet (contemporary Kazakhstan) was acquired via conquest by Russia from the Khanate of Kokand between 2 and 28 July 1853. Ak-Mechet was conquered by 2,167 Russian military forces under the command of General Vasili Alekseevich Perovskii, the Governor-General of Orenburg. The conquest was prompted by Kokadian attacks on Russian territory, though Perovskii also favored aggressive action in the region. The fort built there would be named Fort Perovsk. The conquest of Ak-Mechet marked the end of a decades-long process of conquest through the establishment of lines of forts over the Kazakh steppe, that had begun in 1824. With the exception of a brief period during the Russian Civil War (1917-1920), Ak-Mechet would remain a Russian possession until the independence of Kazakhstan in 1991.[14]

---

[11] "Nikolai Pavlovich Ignat'ev" (vol. 14, p. 126) and "Treaty of Peking" (vol. 51, pp. 127-136), both in Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*; R. K. I. Quested, *Sino-Russian Relations: A Short History* (Oxfordshire: Routledge, 2005), p. 74-76; Paine, *Imperial Rivals*, pp. 84-91; Corrado, "A Land Divided," p. 77.

[12] Lensen, *The Russian Push Toward Japan*, pp. 282-283; Tang, *Russian Expansion into the Maritime Province*, pp. 10-11; "Nevel'skoi," (vol. 24, p. 173) and "Murav'ev-Amurskii" (vol. 50, p. 174), both in Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*; Paine, *Imperial Rivals*, pp. 40, 42-43; Evans, *Russian Expansion on the Amur*, pp. 73-75; Corrado, "A Land Divided," p. 77.

[13] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 128.

[14] Richard A. Pierce, *Russian Central Asia, 1867-1917: A Study in Colonial Rule* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1960), pp. 18-19; Seton-Watson, *The Russian Empire*, p. 296; "Russian Acquisition of Kokand" (vol. 17, p. 95), "Vasilii Alexseevich Perovskii" (vol. 27, p. 205), in Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*; March, *Eastern Destiny*, pp. 139-140; Seymour Becker, *Russia's Protectorates in Central Asia: Bukhara and Khiva, 1865-1924* (New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2004), pp. 13-14; "Almaty," in Didar Kassymova at al., eds., *Historical Dictionary of Kazakhstan* (Lanham: Scarecrow Press, 2012), pp. 51-52; Alexander Morrison, *The Russian Conquest of Central Asia: A Study of Imperial Expansion, 1814-1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021), pp. 130-137.

Inadvertent: NO. Ak-Mechet was conquered with the authorization of War Minister V. A. Dolgorukov and Tsar Nicholas I in St. Petersburg in January 1853.[15]

Risk: NO. The Khanate of Kokand was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and did not have any alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Russia wouldn't have a telegraph connection to Central Asia until 1873.[16]

202. Sakhalin (1853/10)

Sakhalin Island (contemporary Russia) was acquired by Russia via annexation on 3 October 1853. The island was annexed by the explorer Gennadii Ivanovich Nevelskoi, when he raised the Russian flag at Tomari on the west coast of Southern Sakhalin. Nevelskoi had been sent on an expedition by the governor-general of Eastern Siberia, Nikolai Nikolaevich Muraviev-Amurskii, in 1848. The island would be formally recognized as a joint possession of the Russian Empire and Japan with the Treaty of Shimoda in February of 1855. Russia would ultimately gain all of the island with the Treaty of St. Petersburg in 1875, then lose the southern half of the island (below 50 degrees) in the Russo-Japanese War.[17]

Inadvertent: NO. St. Petersburg sent orders to Nevelskoi to occupy Sakhalin on 23 April 1853, which he received on 23 July 1853.[18]

Risk: YES. Japan was a regional power.

Telegraph: NO. Russia wouldn't have a telegraph connection between St. Petersburg and its Far East (Vladivostok) until 1871.[19]

203. Vernyi (1854/2)

Vernyi (contemporary Kazakhstan) was acquired via annexation by Russia from the Khanate of Kokand in February 1854. Vernyi was annexed by Russian forces who had made their way from Omsk in Western Siberia to the site of Vernyi between 1850 and February 1854, establishing a string of forts along the way. The founding of the town of Vernyi marked the end of a decades-long expansion into the Kazakh steppe, which had begun in 1824. With the exception of a brief period

---

[15] Alexander Morrison, "'Nechto eroticheskoe', 'Courir après l'ombre'? – Logistical Imperatives and the Fall of Tashkent," *Central Asian Survey*, Vol. 33, No. 2 (2014), pp. 154-155; Morrison, *The Russian Conquest of Central Asia*, pp. 130-132.

[16] Becker, *Russia's Protectorates in Central Asia*, pp. 72-73, 111, 349n46.

[17] Lensen, *The Russian Push Toward Japan*, pp. 272-291; Stephan, *Sakhalin*, pp. 49-53; "Amur Expedition of 1849-1855" (vol. 1, pp. 203-204), "Nevel'skoi" (vol. 24, p. 173), "Sakhalin" (vol. 33, pp. 35-38), "Treaty of Shimoda" (vol. 34, pp. 229-232), and "Murav'ev-Amurskii" (vol. 50, pp. 173-175), all in Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*; Corrado, "A Land Divided," pp. 78-80.

[18] Lensen, *The Russian Push Toward Japan*, pp. 280-283; Tang, *Russian Expansion into the Maritime Province*, p. 10; Stephan, *Sakhalin*, p. 51; Evans, *Russian Expansion on the Amur*, pp. 74-75, 83.

[19] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 128.

during the Russian Civil War (1917-1920), Vernyi would remain in Russian hands until the independence of Kazakhstan in 1991.[20]

Inadvertent: NO. Vernyi was conquered with the authorization of St. Petersburg.[21]

Risk: NO. The Khanate of Kokand was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and did not have any alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Russia wouldn't have a telegraph connection to Vernyi until 1873.[22]

204. Chimkent (1864/9)

Chimkent (contemporary Kazakhstan) was acquired by Russia via conquest from the Khanate of Kokand between 19 and 21 September 1864. Chimkent was conquered by 1,700 Russian forces under the command of Lieutenant Colonel Mikhail Grigorievich Cherniaev. Cherniaev had attempted to take Chimkent in July the previous year, but withdrew, claiming he had only engaged in "reconnaissance." Cherniaev was rewarded for this acquisition, receiving the St. George Cross (3rd class) from the Emperor and a promotion to major general. This acquisition, along with a failed attack on Tashkent a few months later, prompted Russian Foreign Minister Aleksandr Mikhailovich Gorchakov to write his famous "memorandum" in November 1864, pledging that Russia would expand no further than Chimkent. With the exception of a brief period during the Russian Civil War (1917-1920), Chimkent would remain a Russian territory until the independence of Kazakhstan in 1991.[23]

Inadvertent: YES. Cherniaev was acting without orders from St. Petersburg.[24]

Risk: NO. The Khanate of Kokand was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and did not have any alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Russia wouldn't have a telegraph connection to Central Asia until 1873.[25]

---

[20] Pierce, *Russian Central Asia*, pp. 18-19; Seton-Watson, *The Russian Empire*, p. 296; "Russian Acquisition of Kokand" (vol. 17, p. 95) and "Perovskii" (vol. 27, p. 205), both in Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*; March, *Eastern Destiny*, pp. 139-140; Becker, *Russia's Protectorates in Central Asia*, pp. 13-14.
[21] Morrison, "'Nechto eroticheskoe'," pp. 154-155; Morrison, *The Russian Conquest of Central Asia*, pp. 179-180.
[22] Becker, *Russia's Protectorates in Central Asia*, pp. 72-73.
[23] David MacKenzie, *The Lion of Tashkent: The Career of General M. G. Cherniaev* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1974), pp. 38-44; "Mikhail Grigor'evich Cherniaev" (vol. 6, p. 238), "Alexsandr Mikhailovich Gorchakov" (vol. 13, pp. 43-44), "Russian Acquisition of Kokand" (vol. 17, p. 96), and "Chimkent" (vol. 47, pp. 188-189), all in Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*; Becker, *Russia's Protectorates in Central Asia*, pp. 17-18; Morrison, *The Russian Conquest of Central Asia*, pp. 231-234.
[24] David MacKenzie, "Expansion in Central Asia: St. Petersburg vs. the Turkestan Generals," *Canadian Slavic Studies*, Vol. 3, No. 2 (Summer 1969), pp. 292-293; MacKenzie, *The Lion of Tashkent*, pp. 41-43; "Cherniaev" (vol. 6, p. 238) and "Russian Acquisition of Kokand" (vol. 17, p. 96), both in Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*; Morrison, *The Russian Conquest of Central Asia*, p. 233. For a detailed examination, see Nicholas D. Anderson, *Inadvertent Expansion in World Politics* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2024), Chapter 4.
[25] Becker, *Russia's Protectorates in Central Asia*, pp. 72-73, 111, 349n46.

205. Tashkent (1865/6)

Tashkent (contemporary Uzbekistan) was acquired by Russia via conquest from the Khanate of Kokand between late April and 17 June 1865. Tashkent was conquered by 1,300 Russian forces under the command of military governor of the Turkestan region, Major General Mikhail Grigorievich Cherniaev. Cherniaev had approached Tashkent the previous October, but withdrew without success, claiming it had been a "reconnaissance" mission. This prompted the Russian Foreign Minister Aleksandr Mikhailovich Gorchakov to write his famous "memorandum" in November 1864, pledging that Russia would expand no further than it had in Central Asia. After the successful conquest, Cherniaev became known as the "lion of Tashkent." Cherniaev was removed from his post and recalled to St. Petersburg in March of 1866. With the exception of a brief period during the Russian Civil War (1917-1920), Tashkent would remain a Russian territory until the independence of Uzbekistan in 1991.[26]

Inadvertent: YES. Cherniaev was acting without orders from St. Petersburg.[27]

Risk: NO. The Khanate of Kokand was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and did not have any alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Russia wouldn't have a telegraph connection to Tashkent until 1873.[28]

206. Khujand (1866/5)

Khujand (contemporary Tajikistan) was acquired by Russia via conquest from the Khanate of Bukhara on 24 May 1866. Khujand was conquered by 3,600 Russian forces under the command of Lieutenant General Dmitrii Ilyich Romanovskii, the military governor of Turkestan. With the exception of a brief period during the Russian Civil War (1917-1918), Khujand would remain a Russian territory until the independence of Tajikistan in 1991.[29]

Inadvertent: YES. Romanovskii was acting without orders from St. Petersburg.[30]

---

[26] Pierce, *Russian Central Asia*, pp. 22-23; Mackenzie, "Expansion in Central Asia," pp. 296-300; MacKenzie, *The Lion of Tashkent*, pp. 44-47, 54-59; "Cherniaev" (vol. 6, p. 238), "Russian Acquisition of Kokand" (vol. 17, p. 97), "Nikolai Adreevich Kryzhanovskii" (vol. 18, pp. 128-129), and "Tashkent" (vol. 54, pp. 15-16), all in Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*; David MacKenzie, "The Conquest and Administration of Turkestan, 1860-85," in Michael Rywkin, ed., *Russian Colonial Expansion to 1917* (New York: Mansell, 1988), pp. 215-216; Hélène Carrère d'Encausse, "Systematic Conquest," in Edward Allworth, ed., *Central Asia: 130 Years of Russian Dominance, A Historical Overview* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1994), pp. 132-139; Becker, *Russia's Protectorates in Central Asia*, pp. 18-20, 26-30; Morrison, *The Russian Conquest of Central Asia*, pp. 243-250.

[27] Pierce, *Russian Central Asia*, p. 23; Seton-Watson, *The Russian Empire*, p. 442; MacKenzie, *The Lion of Tashkent*, pp. 47-48, 53-54, 60; "Cherniaev" (vol. 6, p. 238) and "Russian Acquisition of Kokand" (vol. 17, p. 97), both in Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*; d'Encausse, "Systematic Conquest," pp. 132-133; Becker, *Russia's Protectorates in Central Asia*, pp. 18, 27, 30; Morrison, *The Russian Conquest of Central Asia*, pp. 243-244. For a detailed examination, see Anderson, *Inadvertent Expansion*, Ch. 4.

[28] Becker, *Russia's Protectorates in Central Asia*, pp. 111, 349n46.

[29] Pierce, *Russian Central Asia*, p. 24; "Russian Acquisition of Kokand" (vol. 17, p. 97), "Dmitrii Il'ich Romanovskii" (vol. 31, pp. 151-152), "Leninabad" (vol. 49, p. 222), all in Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*; Becker, *Russia's Protectorates in Central Asia*, pp. 33-34.

[30] Romanovskii," in Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*, vol. 31, pp. 151-152; Becker, *Russia's Protectorates in Central Asia*, p. 33; A. M. Malikov, "The Russian Conquest of the Bukharan Emirate: Military and

Risk: NO. The Khanate of Bukhara was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and did not have any alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Russia wouldn't have a telegraph connection to Central Asia until 1873.[31]

207. Khanate of Bukhara (1868/6)

The Khanate of Bukhara (contemporary Uzbekistan) was acquired by Russia via conquest between 30 April and 2 June 1868. Bukhara was conquered by 4,200 Russian forces under the command of General Konstantin Petrovich von Kaufman, the Governor General of Turkestan. In the months running up to the conquest, von Kaufman had been in border demarcation negotiations with the Emir of Bukhara. The decisive engagement was the conquest of Samarkand. Kaufman was initially asked by St. Petersburg to return Samarkand to Bukhara, but he refused. He would eventually be awarded the St. George Cross (3rd class) for his exploits. A treaty with the Emir of Bukhara made Bukhara a protectorate of the Russian Empire. With the exception of a brief period during the Russian Civil War (1917-1920), Bukhara would remain a Russian territory until the independence of Uzbekistan in 1991.[32]

Inadvertent: YES. Von Kaufman was acting against explicit orders from St. Petersburg to avoid any further conquest in the region.[33]

Risk: NO. The Khanate of Bukhara was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and did not have any alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Russia wouldn't have a telegraph connection to Bukhara until 1876.[34]

208. The Khanate of Khiva (1873/7)

The Khanate of Khiva (contemporary Uzbekistan) was acquired by Russia via conquest between March and 15 July 1873. Khiva was conquered by 12,300 Russian forces under the command of General Konstantin Petrovich von Kaufman, the Governor General of Turkestan. The Russo-Khivan Treaty of 12 August 1873 made Khiva a protectorate of the Russian Empire. Von Kaufman exceeded his mandate in occupying a great deal of Khivan territory. Russia had twice previously tried

---

Diplomatic Aspects," *Central Asian Survey*, Vol. 33, No. 2 (2014), p. 185; Shoshana Keller, *Russia and Central Asia: Coexistence, Conquest, Convergence* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2019), p. 102; Morrison, *The Russian Conquest of Central Asia*, p. 272.

[31] Becker, *Russia's Protectorates in Central Asia*, pp. 72-73, 111, 349n46.

[32] Pierce, *Russian Central Asia*, pp. 26-27; "Bukhara Khanate" (vol. 5, pp. 233-234), "Konstantin Petrovich Kaufman" (vol. 16, pp. 68-69), and "Samarkand" (vol. 52, p. 213), all in Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*; MacKenzie, "The Conquest and Administration of Turkestan," pp. 217-220; Becker, *Russia's Protectorates in Central Asia*, pp. 39-42; Malikov, "The Russian Conquest," pp. 187-190.

[33] Gali Oda Tealakh, "The Russian Advance in Central Asia and the British Response," (Doctoral Dissertation, Durham University, 1991), pp. 99-100; Becker, *Russia's Protectorates in Central Asia*, pp. 36, 41; Evgeny Sergeev, *The Great Game, 1856-1907: Russo-British Relations in Central and East Asia* (Washington: Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 2013), p. 115; Keller, *Russia and Central Asia*, pp. 101-102; Morrison, *The Russian Conquest of Central Asia*, p. 283.

[34] Becker, *Russia's Protectorates in Central Asia*, pp. 111, 349n46.

to conquer Khiva, but failed. Turmoil followed in the years after it became a protectorate, and many advocated for outright colonization, but St. Petersburg rebuffed them. With the exception of a brief period during the Russian Civil War (1917-1919), Khiva would remain a Russian territory until the independence of Uzbekistan in 1991.[35]

Inadvertent: NO. The conquest of Khiva was approved by St. Petersburg in late 1872.[36]

Risk: NO. The Khanate of Khiva was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and did not have any alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: NO. Russia wouldn't even have a telegraph connection in neighboring Samarkand until 1876.[37]

209. Khanate of Kokand (1876/2)

The Khanate of Kokand (contemporary Kazakhstan) was acquired via conquest by Russia between August 1875 and 19 February 1876. Kokand was conquered by sixteen infantry companies of Russian forces under the command of General Konstantin Petrovich von Kaufman, the Governor General of Turkestan. Von Kaufman's forces occupied Makham, Kokand city, Margelan, and, in early 1876, Andizhan, effectively controlling the entirety of what was left of the khanate. Kokand was formally annexed into the Russian Empire on 19 February 1876. The conquest was partly motivated by disturbances that began as early as 1873, but were in full swing by 1875. With the exception of a brief period during the Russian Civil War (1917-1919), Kokand would remain a Russian territory until the independence of Uzbekistan in 1991.[38]

Inadvertent: YES. The initial conquests were made on Von Kaufman's own authority, without orders from St. Petersburg.[39]

Risk: NO. The Khanate of Kokand was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and did not have any alliances with great powers.

---

[35] Pierce, *Russian Central Asia*, pp. 29-34; "Kaufman" (vol. 16, p. 69), "Russian Acquisition of Khiva" (vol. 16, pp. 144-148), and "Perovskii" (vol. 27, pp. 204-205), all in Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*; MacKenzie, "The Conquest and Administration of Turkestan," pp. 223-225; Becker, *Russia's Protectorates in Central Asia*, pp. 71-76.

[36] A. Lobanov-Rostovsky, *Russia and Asia* (Ann Arbor: George Wahr, 1951), p. 158; Pierce, *Russian Central Asia*, p. 29; Seton-Watson, *The Russian Empire*, p. 443; Peter Morris, "The Russians in Central Asia, 1870-1887," *The Slavonic and European Review*, Vol. 53, No. 133 (October 1975), pp. 524-525; "Russian Acquisition of Khiva," in Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*, vol. 16, pp. 146-147; MacKenzie, "The Conquest and Administration of Turkestan," p. 223; Becker, *Russia's Protectorates in Central Asia*, pp. 69, 71-72; Keller, *Russia and Central Asia*, p. 103; Morrison, *The Russian Conquest of Central Asia*, p. 309.

[37] Becker, *Russia's Protectorates in Central Asia*, pp. 111, 349n46.

[38] Pierce, *Russian Central Asia*, pp. 34-37; Seton-Watson, *The Russian Empire*, p. 443; "Kaufman" (vol. 16, p. 69), "Russian Acquisition of Kokand" (vol. 17, p. 97), "Kokand Uprising of 1874-76" (vol. 17, p. 98), all in Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*; MacKenzie, "The Conquest and Administration of Turkestan," p. 225; d'Encausse, "Systematic Conquest," pp. 145-147; Becker, *Russia's Protectorates in Central Asia*, pp. 89-90.

[39] Pierce, *Russian Central Asia*, p. 35; Morris, "The Russians in Central Asia," p. 531; Morrison, *The Russian Conquest of Central Asia*, pp. 389-390.

Telegraph: NO. Russia wouldn't have a telegraph connection to Kokand until 1876, and this conquest began in August 1875.[40]

210. Batum and Kars (1878/1)

Batum and Kars (contemporary Turkey and Georgia) were acquired by Russia via conquest from the Ottoman Empire between 24 April 1877 and 31 January 1878, over the course of the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-1878. Batum and Kars were conquered by 100,000 Russian forces under the command of Grand Duke Mikhail Nikolaevich. These acquisitions were solidified with the Treaty of San Stefano, signed between Turkey and Russia on 3 March 1878. Kars had previously been a Russian territory, gained from Turkey in 1828, but it was lost during the Crimean War, in 1855. Kars would remain a Russian possession until it was returned to Turkey toward the end of World War I. Batum would remain a Russian territory until Georgia's independence from the Soviet Union in 1989.[41]

Inadvertent: NO. The acquisition of Batum and Kars was part of Russian war planning.[42]

Risk: YES. The Ottoman Empire was a regional power.

Telegraph: YES. The Ottoman Empire had been connected to the global telegraph network since 1853, and Georgia was connected to the global telegraph network in 1863.[43]

211. Southern Bessarabia (1878/7)

Southern Bessarabia (contemporary Moldova and Ukraine) was acquired by Russia via annexation from Romania on 13 July 1878, in the immediate aftermath of the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-1878. Bessarabia had been invaded and occupied by Russia five times between 1711 and 1812. Bessarabia was a territory of the Russian Empire between 1812 and 1856, until one-third of Russia's Bessarabian territory (in the south) was lost to Romania in the settlement of the Crimean War. Through the Berlin Congress of 1878, Romania was pressured into awarding Russia Southern Bessarabia. Southern Bessarabia returned to Romania during the Russian Civil War (1917-1920).[44]

---

[40] Becker, *Russia's Protectorates in Central Asia*, pp. 111, 349n46.
[41] "Russian Attempts to Acquire Kars" (vol. 16, pp. 40-41), "Russian Turkish War of 1877-1878" (vol. 32, pp. 203-204), "Treaty of San Stefano" (vol. 33, pp. 94-96), and "Batumi" (vol. 47, p. 65), all in Weiczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*.
[42] Allen and Muratoff, *Caucasian Battlefields*, pp. 114-15, 201-203; Barbara Jelavich, "Great Britain and the Russian Acquisition of Batum, 1878-1886," *The Slavonic and Eastern Review*, Vol. 48, No. 110 (January 1970), p. 46.
[43] Yakup Bektas, "The Sultan's Messenger: Cultural Constructions of Ottoman Telegraphy, 1847-1880," *Technology and Culture*, Vol. 41, No. 4 (October 2000), p. 673; Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 109; Alexander Mikaberidze, *Historical Dictionary of Georgia*, 2nd ed. (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015), p. 166.
[44] "Berlin Congress of 1878" (vol. 4, pp. 48, 50, 55), "Russian Relations with Bessarabia" (vol. 4, pp. 84-86), "Russian Turkish War of 1877-1878" (vol. 32, p. 204), and "Bessarabia" (vol. 47, pp. 80-81), all in Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*.

Inadvertent: NO. The acquisition of Bessarabia was part of Russian war planning, and was revealed by the Russian government to Austria-Hungary in March 1877.[45]

Risk: YES. Romania was a regional power.

Telegraph: YES. Bucharest was connected to the global telegraph network in 1855.[46]

212. Geok Tepe (1881/1)

Geok Tepe (contemporary Turkmenistan) was acquired by Russia via conquest between mid-July 1880 and 12 January 1881. Geok Tepe was conquered by 11,000 Russian military forces under the command of General Mikhail Dmitrievich Skobelev. Resistance by the Turkmen forces was fierce. Many civilians were killed in the conquest of Geok Tepe, which led Skobelev to be coolly received by Alexander II when he returned to St. Petersburg. Russian forces under General Lomakin had attempted but failed to take Geok Tepe nearly two years earlier. Geok Tepe became part of the Transcaspia Oblast in May of 1881. Geok Tepe would remain a Russian territory until the independence of Turkmenistan in 1991.[47]

Inadvertent: NO. General Skobelev was acting on orders from Tsar Alexander II and War Minister Dmitry Miliutin.[48]

Risk: NO. The Turkmens in Geok Tepe were not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and did not have any alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: YES. The Turkmenistan Caspian coast was connected to the global telegraph network in 1879.[49]

213. Merv (1884/3)

Merv (contemporary Turkmenistan) was acquired by Russia via annexation in March 1884. Mikhail Cherniaev, who was then the Governor-General of Turkestan, had earlier pushed for its annexation, but was rejected by St. Petersburg. Local Russian forces under General A.V. Komorov engaged in numerous military demonstrations in order to intimidate the Turkmens of Merv. The annexation

---

[45] B. H. Sumner, *Russia and the Balkans, 1870-1880* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937), pp. 173, 176; Jelavich, "Great Britain and the Russian Acquisition of Batum," p. 46; "Berlin Congress," in Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*, vol. 4, p. 48.
[46] Bektas, "The Sultan's Messenger," p. 674.
[47] Morris, "The Russians in Central Asia," pp. 532-533; "Mikhail Dmitrievich Skobelev," in Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*, vol. 35, pp. 168-169; MacKenzie, "The Conquest and Administration of Turkestan," p. 226; Pierce, *Russian Central Asia*, pp. 39-42.
[48] Pierce, *Russian Central Asia*, p. 41; MacKenzie, "The Conquest and Administration of Turkestan," p. 226; Mehmet Saray, *The Turkmens in the Age of Imperialism: A Study of the Turkmen People and Their Incorporation into the Russian Empire* (Ankara: Turkish Historical Printing House, 1989), p. 182; d'Encausse, "Systematic Conquest," pp. 147-148; Becker, *Russia's Protectorates in Central Asia*, p. 100; Morrison, *The Russian Conquest of Central Asia*, pp. 450-451.
[49] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 112.

was then negotiated by Colonel Alikhanov in early 1884. Merv would remain a Russian territory until the independence of Turkmenistan in 1991.[50]

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. The annexation of Merv may have been authorized as early as June 1882.[51]

Risk: NO. The Turkmens of Merv were not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and did not have any alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: YES. The Turkmenistan Caspian coast was connected to the global telegraph network in 1879.[52]

214. Panjdeh (1885/3)

Panjdeh (contemporary Turkmenistan) was acquired by Russia via conquest on 30 March 1885. The Russian conquest sparked a crisis with Britain, almost leading to war between the two great powers. Panjdeh was officially awarded to Russia with the Anglo-Russian Convention of 10 September 1885, which formally delineated the Russian-Anglo/Afghan border. Panjdeh would remain a Russian territory until the independence of Turkmenistan in 1991.[53]

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. A special conference in St. Petersburg decided to move the frontier from Merv to Panjdeh in December 1884.[54]

Risk: YES. Panjdeh, as part of Afghanistan, was a United Kingdom protectorate, a great power.

Telegraph: YES. The Turkmenistan coast was connected to the global telegraph network in 1879.[55]

215. The Liaodong Peninsula (1897/12)

The Liaodong Peninsula (contemporary China) was acquired by Russia via annexation from China in December 1897. The Liaodong Peninsula was annexed when it was seized by the Russian Far Eastern Fleet. The Peninsula would be formally leased from China on 15 March 1898. With this lease, Russia also gained the rights to connect the Chinese Eastern Railway to the territory. It would remain a Russian territory until Russia's loss in the Russo-Japanese War in 1905.[56]

---

[50] Morris, "The Russians in Central Asia," pp. 532-534; MacKenzie, "The Conquest and Administration of Turkestan," p. 230; d'Encausse, "Systematic Conquest," pp. 148-149; Becker, *Russia's Protectorates in Central Asia*, pp. 100-102.
[51] Morrison, *The Russian Conquest of Central Asia*, p. 466.
[52] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 112.
[53] "Afghanistan Crisis of 1885" (vol. 1, p. 49), "Anglo-Russian Convention of 1885" (vol. 1, p. 233), and "Penjdeh Incident" (vol. 27, pp. 149-154), all in Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*.
[54] Sergeev, *The Great Game*, p. 204.
[55] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 112.
[56] "Chinese Eastern Railway" (vol. 7, p. 50) and "Chinese-Russian Relations to 1917" (vol. 7, p. 61), both in Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*; March, *Russia in Asia and the North Pacific*, pp. 168-169.

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. Tsar Nicholas II and Foreign Minister Mikhail Muraviev were involved in the annexation decision.[57]

Risk: YES. China was a regional power.

Telegraph: YES. Russia was first connected to China by telegraph in 1872.[58]

216. Northern Manchuria (1900/11)

Northern Manchuria (contemporary China) was acquired by Russia via conquest from China between 9 July and 30 November 1900, during the Boxer Rebellion in China. Manchuria was conquered by nearly 200,000 Russian forces under the command of Admiral Evgenii Ivanovich Alekseev, chief of the Russian Pacific Fleet. Russia would begin withdrawing from Manchuria in April 1902, but its withdrawal plan stalled and it retained northern Manchuria. Russia would retain northern Manchuria until its loss in the Russo-Japanese War in 1905.[59]

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. The conquest was ordered by War Minister Aleksey Kuropatkin.[60]

Risk: YES. China was a regional power.

Telegraph: YES. Russia was first connected to China by telegraph in 1872.[61]

217. Eastern Belarus (1918/12)

Eastern Belarus was acquired by the Soviet Union via conquest from Belarus between November and December 1918, over the course of the Russian Civil War. The conquest of Eastern Belarus was part of the Soviets' westward and southward offensive at the end of World War I. Russia initially acquired the entirety of Belarus, which had been a part of the Russian Empire until the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, in March of that year. However, after the Russo-Polish War of 1920-1921, the Peace of Riga on 18 March 1921 divided Belarus, leaving only the eastern portion to the Soviet Union. Eastern Belarus would remain a Soviet territory until the independence of Belarus in 1991.[62]

---

[57] March, *Russia in Asia and the North Pacific*, p. 168.
[58] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, pp. 128, 136; Eiichi Itoh, "The Danish Monopoly on Telegraph in Japan: A Case Study of an Unequal Communication System in the Far East," *Keio Communications Review*, No. 29 (2007), pp. 88-89.
[59] "Evgenii Ivanovich Alekseev" (vol. 1, pp. 106-107), "Russian Reaction to Boxer Rebellion" (vol. 5, p. 161), and "Chinese-Russian Relations to 1917" (vol. 7, p. 61), all in Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*; March, *Russia in Asia and the North Pacific*, pp. 170-172.
[60] March, *Russia in Asia and the North Pacific*, p. 170.
[61] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, pp. 128, 136; Eiichi Itoh, "The Danish Monopoly on Telegraph in Japan," pp. 88-89.
[62] "Riga Treaty of 1921," in Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*, vol. 31, pp. 90-93; "Russo-Polish war," in Richard Holmes et al., eds., *The Oxford Companion to Military History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), Available at: https://www.oxfordreference.com/; "Ukraine, Role in War and Revolution in," in Spencer C. Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of World War I: A Political, Social, and Military History* (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2005), pp. 1194-1195; Richard Pipes, *The Formation of the Soviet Union: Communism and Nationalism, 1917-1923*, Revised ed. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997), pp. 152-154; "Treaty of Brest-Litovsk (1918)" (p. 284), "Treaty of Riga

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. Commissar for Military and Naval Affairs Leon Trotsky discussed the westward offensive on 9 November 1918.[63]

Risk: YES. Belarus had been occupied by Germany, another great power.

Telegraph: YES. Russia was connected to central Europe by telegraph in the 1850s.[64]

218. Eastern Ukraine (1920/3)

Eastern Ukraine was acquired by the Soviet Union via conquest from Ukraine between January 1919 and March 1920, over the course of the Russian Civil War. Soviet forces took Kiev in early February 1919 and took the Black Sea port of Odessa at the end of March. An earlier invasion, in January 1918, had been reversed just twenty days later in February 1918 by German and Austro-Hungarian forces. Eastern Ukraine would remain a Soviet territory until the independence of Ukraine 1991.[65]

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. Soviet forces were ordered into Ukraine by Commissar for Military and Naval Affairs Leon Trotsky.[66]

Risk: YES. Ukraine had been occupied by Germany, another great power.

Telegraph: YES. Russia was connected to Ukraine by telegraph in 1855.[67]

219. Azerbaijan (1920/4)

Azerbaijan was acquired by the Soviet Union via conquest between 27 and 28 April 1920, over the course of the Russian Civil War. Azerbaijan was conquered by the Soviet 11th Red Army under the command of General A. M. Gekker. The Red Army entered Azeri territory on 27 April and marched on the capital without firing a shot. The Soviets acted in concert with communist forces within Azerbaijan, who essentially staged a simultaneous coup. Resistance and rebellion would emerge after the annexation, but would be thoroughly stamped out by the end of June 1920. Azerbaijan would remain a Soviet territory until its independence in 1991.[68]

Inadvertent: NO. The conquest of Azerbaijan was planned by the Red Army High Command and ordered by Lenin in March 1920.[69]

(1921) (p. 284), "World War I (1914-1921)" (pp. 312-313), all in Vitali Silitski and Jan Zaprudnik, *Historical Dictionary of Belarus*, 2nd ed. (Lanham: Scarecrow Press, 2007).

[63] William Henry Chamberlin, *The Russian Revolution, 1917-1921*, Vol. II (New York: Macmillan, 1935), p. 122.

[64] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 109.

[65] W. Bruce Lincoln, *Red Victory: A History of the Russian Civil War* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1989), pp. 305-307, 313-316, 327-328; Pipes, *The Formation of the Soviet Union*, pp. 142-148.

[66] Lincoln, *Red Victory*, p. 313.

[67] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 109.

[68] Lincoln, *Red Victory*, p. 458; Pipes, *The Formation of the Soviet Union*, pp. 225-229; "Azerbaijan," in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWI*, pp. 163-164.

[69] Lincoln, *Red Victory*, p. 458; Pipes, *The Formation of the Soviet Union*, p. 224.

Risk: NO. Azerbaijan was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and did not have any alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: YES. Russia was connected to Azerbaijan by telegraph in 1868.[70]

220. Armenia (1920/12)

Armenia was acquired by the Soviet Union via conquest between 29 November and 2 December 1920, over the course of the Russian Civil War. Armenia was conquered by the Soviet Red Army's 11th Army under the command of General A. M. Gekker. The conquest was carried out in concert with communist forces in Armenia. The Soviets and Armenian government signed a treaty on 2 December 1920, which formalized Soviet control over the territory. Armenia would remain a Soviet territory until its independence in 1991.[71]

Inadvertent: NO. The conquest of Armenia was planned by the Red Army High Command and ordered by Lenin in March 1920, then reordered by Lenin and Stalin in November 1920.[72]

Risk: NO. Armenia was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and did not have any alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: YES. Russia was connected to Armenia by telegraph in 1865.[73]

221. Georgia (1921/3)

Georgia was acquired by the Soviet Union via conquest between 16 February and 18 March 1921, over the course of the Russian Civil War. Georgia was acquired via conquest by the Soviet 11th Red Army under the command of A. M. Gekker. The invasion was supported by the Soviet 13th Red Army under the command of General Budenny and the Soviet 9th Red Army under the command of General Levandovskii. The total invading force was approximately 100,000. The conquest was preceded by the fomenting of a communist uprising in Georgia from 11 to 12 February 1921. There was some resistance to the invasion, though it was ultimately ineffective. Turkish troops conquered Batum in western Georgia during this conquest, though they would later relinquish it. This acquisition was formalized with a Soviet-Turkish treaty in March 1921. Georgia would remain a Soviet territory until its independence in 1991.[74]

Inadvertent: NO. The conquest of Georgia was planned by the Red Army High Command and ordered by Lenin in March 1920, then again in January and February 1921.[75]

---

[70] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 112.
[71] Lincoln, *Red Victory*, p. 459; Pipes, *The Formation of the Soviet Union*, pp. 229-234.
[72] Lincoln, *Red Victory*, p. 458; Pipes, *The Formation of the Soviet Union*, pp. 224, 232.
[73] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 112.
[74] "Georgians," in Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*, vol. 12, pp. 139-140; Lincoln, *Red Victory*, p. 459-461; Pipes, *The Formation of the Soviet Union*, pp. 234-241.
[75] Lincoln, *Red Victory*, p. 458; Pipes, *The Formation of the Soviet Union*, pp. 224, 237.

Risk: NO. Georgia was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and did not have any alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: YES. Russia was connected to Georgia by telegraph in 1863.[76]

222. Estonia (1939/9)

Estonia was acquired by the Soviet Union via annexation on 28 September 1939, at the outset of World War II. By 17 June 1940, Estonia had been fully occupied by the Soviets. The plan for the annexation was devised as part of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact between the Soviet Union and Germany, which put Estonia under the Soviet sphere of influence. Under the terms of the treaty, the Soviet Union stationed 25,000 troops in Estonia. Estonia was formally admitted to the Soviet Union on 6 August 1940. Germany would come to occupy the majority of Estonia by August 1941, but the Soviets returned in February 1944, and Estonia would not see independence until August 1991.[77]

Inadvertent: NO. The annexation was devised as part of the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact, and was negotiated by General Secretary Joseph Stalin and Foreign Minister Vyacheslav Molotov.[78]

Risk: NO. Estonia was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and did not have any alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: YES.

223. Eastern Poland (1939/10)

Eastern Poland was acquired by the Soviet Union via conquest from Poland between 17 September and October 1939, at the outset of World War II. Eastern Poland was conquered by 39 divisions of the Soviet Red Army under the joint command of General M. P. Kovalev and General Semen Timoshenko. The plan for the invasion was devised as part of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact between the Soviet Union and Germany, dividing the territory along the "Curzon Line." Germany would occupy Eastern Poland when it invaded the Soviet Union in June of 1941, but the Soviets regained the territory between July 1944 and August 1945. The Soviet acquisition was formalized with the Potsdam Conference. These territories were added to the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Belarussian Soviet Socialist Republic. They would remain under Soviet control until the independence of Ukraine, Belarus, Lithuania, and Latvia in 1991.[79]

---

[76] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, p. 109; Mikaberidze, *Historical Dictionary of Georgia*, p. 166.
[77] "Soviet Acquisition of Estonia," in Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*, vol. 10, pp. 241-245; "Estonia" (pp. 496-497) and "German-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact" (pp. 576-577), both in Spencer C. Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of World War II: A Political, Social, and Military History* (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2004).
[78] "Soviet Acquisition of Estonia," in Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*, vol. 10, p. 242; "Nazi-Soviet Pact," in I. C. B. Dear and M. R. D. Foot, eds., *The Oxford Companion to World War II* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), Available at: https://www.oxfordreference.com/.
[79] "Soviet-Polish Relations since 1917," Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*, vol. 36, pp. 224-226; "German-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact" (pp. 576-577), "Poland, Role in the War" (pp. 1198-1200), "Poland Campaign" (pp. 1204-1205), "Poland-East Prussia Campaign" (pp. 1206-1207), and "Potsdam Conference" (pp. 1209-1211), all in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWII*.

Inadvertent: NO. The invasion of Eastern Poland was devised as part of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact.[80]

Risk: YES. Poland was a regional power and was allied with France and the United Kingdom, two great powers.[81]

Telegraph: YES.

224. Latvia (1939/10)

Latvia was acquired by the Soviet Union via annexation in October 1939. Latvia was acquired via annexation and treaty on 5 October 1939, at the outset of World War II. The Soviets fully occupied Latvia in June 1940. The plan for the annexation was devised as part of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact between the Soviet Union and Germany, which put Latvia under the Soviet sphere of influence. The treaty allowed for the stationing of 25,000 Soviet troops in Latvia. On 5 August 1940, Latvia was formally admitted into the Soviet Union. The Germans would come to occupy Latvia in June 1941, but the Soviets reestablished control in October 1944. Latvia would remain a Soviet territory until its independence in 1991.[82]

Inadvertent: NO. The invasion of Latvia was devised as part of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, and General Secretary Joseph Stalin and Foreign Minister Vyacheslav Molotov were involved in the planning.[83]

Risk: NO. Latvia was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and did not have any alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: YES.

225. Lithuania (1939/10)

Lithuania was acquired by the Soviet Union via annexation on 10 October 1939, at the outset of World War II. In June 1940, the Soviet Army entered Lithuania and carried out subversive activities, arresting opponents, subverting the electoral process, and bringing a communist government to power there. The plan for the annexation was devised as part of a follow-up agreement to the

---

[80] "German-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact," in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWII*, p. 577; "Nazi-Soviet Pact," in Dear and Foot, eds., *The Oxford Companion to WWII*.
[81] ATOP IDs: 2060, 2135, 2440; Correlates of War (COW) Alliance IDs: 104, 119, 174. See: Formal Alliances (v4.1). Douglas M. Gibler, *International Military Alliances, 1648-2008* (Washington: CQ Press, 2009). Available at: https://correlatesofwar.org/.
[82] "Soviet Annexation of Latvia," in Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*, vol. 19, pp. 55-59; "German-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact" (pp. 576-577), "Latvia" (pp. 865-866), and "Northeast European Theater" (p. 1102), all in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of World War II*.
[83] "Soviet Annexation of Latvia," in Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*, vol. 19, p. 56; "German-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact," in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWII*, p. 577; "Nazi-Soviet Pact," in Dear and Foot, eds., *The Oxford Companion to WWII*.

Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact between the Soviet Union and Germany, which put Lithuania within the Soviet sphere of influence. On 5 August 1940, Lithuania was formally admitted into the Soviet Union. Germany would occupy Lithuania in June 1941, but the Soviets reestablished control in October 1944. Lithuania would remain under Soviet control until its independence in 1991.[84]

Inadvertent: NO. The annexation of Lithuania was devised as part of a follow-on agreement to the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, and General Secretary Joseph Stalin was involved in the planning.[85]

Risk: NO. Lithuania was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and did not have any alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: YES.

226. Finnish Territories (1940/3)

Finnish territories, including the Karelian Isthmus (contemporary Russia), were acquired by the Soviet Union via conquest from Finland between 30 November and 12 March 1940, during the Finnish-Soviet "Winter War" during World War II. The Finnish territories were conquered by an initial force of 20 divisions of the Soviet Red Army. Finland had been part of the Russian Empire from 1809 to 1917. The Soviets gained 41,000 km^2 of Finnish territory in the Moscow Peace Treaty of 12 March 1940, ending the war. Finland would regain these territories when fighting resumed between the two sides between June 1941 and September 1944, after the German invasion of the Soviet Union. However, the Soviets ultimately prevailed, and regained the territories by September 1944. These territories remain part of Russia to this day.[86]

Inadvertent: NO. The invasion order came directly from General Secretary Joseph Stalin, who also drew up the invasion plan.[87]

Risk: YES. Finland was a regional power.

Telegraph: YES.

---

[84] "Soviet Annexation of Lithuania," in Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*, vol. 20, pp. 69-76; "German-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact" (pp. 576-577), "Lithuania" (p. 903), and "Northeast European Theater" (p. 1102), all in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWII*.

[85] "Soviet Annexation of Lithuania," in Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*, vol. 20, p. 69; "German-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact," in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWII*, p. 577; "Nazi-Soviet Pact," in Dear and Foot, eds., *The Oxford Companion to WWII*.

[86] "Finnish-Russian War of 1939-1940" (vol. 11, pp. 162-166) and "Finnish-Russian War of 1941-1944" (vol. 11, pp. 166-170), both in Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*; "Finland, Role in War" (pp. 515-516), "Finnish-Soviet War (Winter War)" (pp. 517-519), and "Finnish-Soviet War (Continuation War)" (pp. 519-520), in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWII*; "Finnish–Soviet war, also known as the 'Winter War'," in Dear and Foot, eds., *The Oxford Companion to WWII*.

[87] "Finnish-Soviet War (Winter War)," in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWII*, p. 517; "Finnish–Soviet war, also known as the 'Winter War'," in Dear and Foot, eds., *The Oxford Companion to WWII*.

227. Bessarabia and Northern Bukovina (1940/6)

Bessarabia and Northern Bukovina (contemporary Moldova) were acquired by the Soviet Union via annexation on 28 June 1940, over the course of World War II. Bessarabia had been part of the Russian Empire between 1812 and 1917. Bessarabia was considered within the Soviet sphere of influence in the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact of 23 August 1939. Germany and Italy played a role in pressuring Romania to accede to Soviet demands over the territory. These territories would become the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic. Romania reconquered the territory between 2 and 26 July 1941, after the German invasion of the Soviet Union. However, the Soviets reconquered the territory in August and September of 1944. These territories would remain under Soviet control until Moldova's independence in 1991.[88]

Inadvertent: NO. The annexation of Bessarabia and Northern Bukovina was devised as part of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact.[89]

Risk: YES. Romania was a regional power, and was allied to France, a great power.[90]

Telegraph: YES.

228. Ruthenia (1945/6)

Ruthenia (parts of contemporary Ukraine, Slovakia, and Poland) was acquired by the Soviet Union via conquest from Hungary between October 1944 and 29 June 1945, in the closing months of World War II. At the time of the conquest, Ruthenia, part of Czechoslovakia, was under the occupation of Hungarian forces, who had invaded in 1939. The Soviets had control of Ruthenia by November 1944. An agreement with Czechoslovakia on 29 June 1945 officially ceded Ruthenia to the Soviet Union. Ruthenia remained a territory of the Soviet Union until the independence of Ukraine in 1991.[91]

Inadvertent: NO. Stalin was involved in the planning for the conquest of Ruthenia, and Soviet leaders shared their plans with Czechoslovakia in May 1944.[92]

Risk: YES. Hungary was a regional power.

Telegraph: YES.

---

[88] "Russian Relations with Bessarabia" (vol. 4, pp. 86-87), "Bessarabia" (vol. 47, p. 81), and "Bukovina" (vol. 47, p. 154), all in Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*; "German-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact" (pp. 576-577), "Romania, Army" (pp. 1289-1290), "Romania, Role in War" (pp. 1291-1292), and "Romania Campaign" (pp. 1293-1294), all in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWII*.

[89] "German-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact," in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWII*, p. 577; "Nazi-Soviet Pact," in Dear and Foot, eds., *The Oxford Companion to WWII*.

[90] ATOP ID: 2160; COW ID: 124.

[91] "Ruthenia," in Dear and Foot, eds., *The Oxford Companion to WWII*; Milan Hauner, "We Must Push Eastwards!' The Challenge and Dilemmas of President Beneš after Munich," *Journal of Contemporary History*, Vol. 44 No. 4 (October 2009), pp. 637, 653-655; Peter Pastor, "Hungarian and Soviet Efforts to Possess Ruthenia, 1938-1945," *The Historian*, Vol. 81, No. 3 (2019), pp. 416-424.

[92] Hauner, "We Must Push Eastwards!'," p. 653; Pastor, "Hungarian and Soviet Efforts to Possess Ruthenia," p. 417.

229. Southern Sakhalin (1945/8)

Southern Sakhalin (contemporary Russia) was acquired by the Soviet Union via conquest between 9 and 23 August 1945, in the closing days of World War II. Sakhalin was conquered by 35,000 forces of the 16th Soviet Army under the command of Major General A. A. D'iakonov. The conquest of Sakhalin was part of the Soviet Union's broader August 1945 Far Eastern Campaign. Sakhalin was initially claimed by Russia in 1852, and its southern half had been lost to Japan in 1905, after the Russo-Japanese War. Sakhalin remains Russian territory to this day.[93]

Inadvertent: NO. The conquest of Southern Sakhalin was planned by General Secretary Joseph Stalin at the Yalta Conference in February 1945.[94]

Risk: YES. Southern Sakhalin was Japan's territory, a great power.

Telegraph: YES.

230. Kuril Islands (1945/9)

The Kuril Islands (contemporary Russia) were acquired by the Soviet Union via conquest between 18 August and 1 September 1945, in the closing days of World War II. The Kurils were conquered by the Soviet 101st Infantry Division under the command of Major General A. R. Gnechko. This was a difficult, albeit short-lived, conquest, involving an amphibious landing and stiff Japanese resistance. Japan renounced its claims to the Kuril Islands after the war. The islands were formally declared to be Soviet territory on 20 September 1945. The Kurils total 36 islands, comprising 15,600 km^2 of territorial area. The Kurils had been a Japanese possession since the Treaty of St. Petersburg, in May 1875. The Kuril Islands are under Russian control to this day, though some are disputed by Japan.[95]

Inadvertent: NO. The conquest of the Kurils was planned by General Secretary Joseph Stalin at the Yalta Conference in February 1945.[96]

Risk: YES. The Kuril Islands were Japan's territory, a great power.

Telegraph: YES.

---

[93] Stephan, *Sakhalin*, pp. 142, 146-155; "Sakhalin Military Operation of 1945," in Wieczynsky, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*, vol. 33, pp. 38-39.
[94] Stephan, *Sakhalin*, p. 144; March, *Russia in Asia and the North Pacific*, p. 224; "Yalta Conference," in Peter N. Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), Available at: https://www.oxfordreference.com/.
[95] "Russian and Soviet Relations with Kurile Islands" (vol. 18, pp. 177-181) and "Kurile Landing Operation of 1945" (vol. 18, p. 182), both in Wieczynski, ed., *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*; "Manchuria Campaign," in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWII*, p. 940.
[96] March, *Russia in Asia and the North Pacific*, p. 224; "Yalta Conference," in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World.*

231. Crimea (2014/3)

Crimea was acquired by Russia from Ukraine between 27 February and 16 March 2014. Crimea was acquired via conquest by Russian forces between 27 February and 16 March 2014. The invasion was prompted by large-scale popular protests that had begun in late 2013, when an agreement for closer ties to the European Union was scuttled by the pro-Russian government. Pro-Russian activists (possibly Russian soldiers in disguise) took over key government buildings in Crimea, and armed personnel in unmarked uniforms occupied military targets throughout the peninsula. On 1 March the Russian parliament approved President Putin's request to commit troops to Crimea. Crimea was formally incorporated into the Russian Federation on 18 March 2014.[97]

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. President Vladimir Putin claims to have personally directed the invasion.[98]

Risk: YES. Ukraine is a regional power.

Telegraph: YES.

[97] "Russian Invasion of Ukraine," in Paul K. Davis, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Invasions and Conquests: From Ancient Times to the Present*, 3rd ed. (Amenia: Grey House Publishing, 2016); Andrew Bowen, "Coercive Diplomacy and the Donbas: Explaining Russian Strategy in Eastern Ukraine," *Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol. 42, No. 3-4 (2019), pp. 312-343.
[98] Michael Birnaum, "Putin was surprised at how easily Russia took control of Crimea," *The Washington Post* (15 March 2015), https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/europe/putin-was-surprised-at-how-easily-russia-took-control-of-crimea/2015/03/15/94b7c82e-c9c1-11e4-bea5-b893e7ac3fb3_story.html.

China

232. Tibet (1950/10)

Tibet (contemporary China) was acquired by China via conquest between 7 and 26 October 1950, during the Third Sino-Tibetan War. Tibet was conquered by 80,000 forces of the People's Liberation Army. Tibet had declared its independence from China in late 1911, with the fall of the Qing Dynasty. In May 1951, China and Tibet signed the "17-Point Agreement for the Peaceful Liberation of Tibet." With this agreement, Tibet was made a semi-autonomous region (known as Xizang) within the People's Republic of China, a status it retains today.[1]

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. Chairman Mao Zedong ordered the preparations for the invasion in December 1949 and issued the final order for invasion.[2]

Risk: NO. Tibet was not a great power or regional power, did not neighbor any great powers, and did not have any alliances with great powers.

Telegraph: YES.

233. Dachen Islands (1955/2)

The Dachen Islands (contemporary China) were acquired by China via conquest from Taiwan between 18 January and 26 February 1955, during the Offshore Islands War. The islands were conquered by 10,000 forces of the People's Liberation Army under the command of General Zhang Aiping. Zhang's forces first took Yijiangshan Island on 18 January, and then moved onto the remainder of the Dachen Islands in the days that followed. These islands had been under the control of the Kuomintang of Taiwan, who were greatly outnumbered in this offensive. Beginning in September 1954, these islands were subjected to heavy shelling and bombardment by PLA forces. The Eisenhower administration seriously considered the use of nuclear weapons in response to China's actions. The islands were added to the territory of the People's Republic of China.[3]

Inadvertent: NO. Chairman Mao Zedong was involved in the invasion planning and gave the final order in January 1955.[4]

Risk: YES. Taiwan was a regional power and had an alliance with the United States, a great power.[5]

---

[1] Melvyn C. Goldstein, *A History of Modern Tibet*, Vol. I (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), pp. 690-696; Melvyn C. Goldstein, *The Snow Lion and the Dragon: China, Tibet, and the Dalai Lama* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), pp. 43-48; "Tibet (Xizang)," in Xiaobing Li, ed., *China at War: An Encyclopedia* (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2012), pp. 459-460; Lezlee Brown Halper and Stefan Halper, *Tibet: An Unfinished Story* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), pp. 97-99.

[2] Goldstein, *The Snow Lion and the Dragon*, pp. 44-45.

[3] Gordon H. Chang and He Di, "The Absence of War in the U.S.-China Confrontation over Quemoy and Matsu in 1954-1955: Contingency, Luck, Deterrence," *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 98, No. 5 (December 1993), pp. 1511-1515; "Battle of Yijiangshan (January 1955)," in Li, ed., *China at War*, pp. 518-519.

[4] Chang and Di, "The Absence of War in the U.S.-China Confrontation," p. 1512; Li, ed., *China at War*, p. 519; Michael M. Sheng, "Mao and China's Relations with the Superpowers in the 1950s: A New Look at the Taiwan Strait Crises and the Sino-Soviet Split," *Modern China*, Vol. 34, No. 4 (2008), pp. 484-485.

[5] ATOP ID: 3270; COW ID: 240.

Telegraph: YES.

234. Paracel Islands (1974/1)

The Paracel Islands (also known as Xisha and Hoàng Sa) were acquired by China via conquest between 17 and 18 January 1974. The islands were conquered by forces of the People's Liberation Army and Navy under the command of Wei Mingsen. South Vietnam had been in control of these islands since the departure of the French two decades earlier. The islands had been disputed between the two governments, and the dispute escalated when the two governments exchanged counter-claims in late 1973 and early 1974. Vietnam initiated the conflict on 16 January by shelling one of the China-claimed islands, leading China to deploy attack submarines. The naval battle that ensued was short (just 1 hour and 37 minutes), leaving China in control of the islands. Today, these islands are the subject of a territorial dispute between China, Taiwan, and Vietnam.[6]

Inadvertent: NO. Defense Minister Ye Jiangying, Premier Zhou Enlai, and Chairman Mao Zedong were all involved in the planning and ordering the conquest.[7]

Risk: YES. The Paracel Islands were under the control of South Vietnam, a regional power.

Telegraph: YES.

[6] "Spratly and Paracel Islands" (pp. 426-427) and "Xisha Islands Defensive Campaign (1974)" (pp. 502-503), both in Li, ed., *China at War*; Toshi Yoshihara, "The 1974 Paracels Sea Battle: A Campaign Appraisal," *Naval War College Review*, Vol. 69, No. 2 (2016), pp. 46-50.
[7] Li, ed., *China at War*, pp. 502-503; Yoshihara, "The 1974 Paracels Sea Battle," p. 52.

Japan

235. Ryukyu Kingdom (1872)

The Ryukyu Kingdom was acquired by Japan via annexation in 1872. It was annexed when the Japanese government unilaterally declared the islands to be a domain (*han*) and assumed full responsibility for them. Up until that point, the Ryukyu Kingdom had been a semi-independent vassal state of Satsuma domain in Japan. The Kingdom was abolished with the introduction of the Prefectural system in Japan in 1879. The Ryukyu Islands, now Okinawa Prefecture, remain part of Japan to this day.[1]

Inadvertent: NO. The annexation decision was made by the central government in Tokyo.[2]

Risk: YES. China, a regional power, had a competing claim due to historic tributary relations.

Telegraph: NO. Even the main Japanese islands wouldn't be fully connected with telegraph stations until 1875.[3]

236. Bonin Islands (1875/11)

The Bonin (Ogawasara) Islands were acquired by Japan via annexation in late November 1875. The central government in Tokyo declared the annexation. They had been the subject of an earlier, unsuccessful annexation attempt in 1862. The Bonin Islands, now the Ogasawara Subprefecture, remain part of Japan to this day.[4]

Inadvertent: NO. The annexation decision was made by the central government in Tokyo.[5]

Risk: NO. The Bonin Islands were not a great power or regional power, were not adjacent to the territory of another great power, and did not have an alliance with a great power.

Telegraph: NO. By this point the main Japanese islands had only just been fully connected by telegraph stations.[6]

---

[1] Akira Iriye, "Japan's Drive to Great-Power Status," in Marius B. Jansen, ed., *The Cambridge History of Japan*, Vol. 5: *The Nineteenth Century* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 741-744; "Ryūkyū kizoku mondai," "Okinawa," and "琉球藩," in *JapanKnowledge Lib Encyclopedia* (Tokyo: NetAdvance Inc., 2020), Available at: https://japanknowledge.com/.

[2] Iriye, "Japan's Drive to Great-Power Status," p. 741; "Okinawa," in Peter N. Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), Available at: https://www.oxfordreference.com/.

[3] Daqing Yang, "Telecommunication and the Japanese Empire: A Preliminary Analysis of Telegraphic Traffic," *Historical Social Research*, Vol. 35, No. 1 (2010), p. 68.

[4] Lionel Berners Cholmondeley, *The History of the Bonin Islands from the Year 1827 to the Year 1876, and of Nathaniel Savory* (London: Constable & Co., 1915), pp. 164-171; Robert D. Eldridge, *Iwo Jima and the Bonin Islands in U.S.-Japan Relations: American Strategy, Japanese Territory, and the Islanders In-Between* (Quantico: Marine Corps University Press, 2014), pp. 28-32; "Ogasawara Islands" and "小笠原諸島," both in *JapanKnowledge Lib*.

[5] Eldridge, *Iwo Jima and the Bonin Islands*, p. 30; "Ogasawara Islands," in *JapanKnowledge Lib*.

[6] Yang, "Telecommunication and the Japanese Empire," p. 68.

237. Pescadores Islands (1895/3)

The Pescadores (or Penghu) Islands (contemporary Taiwan) were acquired by Japan via conquest from China in March 1895, over the course of the First Sino-Japanese War. The Pescadores were conquered by an expeditionary force of the Imperial Japanese Army under the command of Colonel Hishijima from 23 to 26 March 1895. The Chinese forces put up little resistance. The Pescadores remained a Japanese possession until its September 1945 surrender in World War II.[7]

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. The conquest of the Pescadores was ordered by Prime Minister Itō Hirobumi.[8]

Risk: YES. The Penghu Islands were China's territory, a regional power.

Telegraph: NO. Taiwan and Japan were first connected by telegraph in 1897.[9]

238. Taiwan (1895/4)

Taiwan was acquired by Japan via annexation from China on 17 April 1895, in the aftermath of the First Sino-Japanese War. Taiwan was ceded to Japan as a result of the Treaty of Shimonoseki, which ended war. However, Taiwan's population resisted Japan's annexation, leading to Japan's armed conquest of the island, led by Major General Kitashirakawa. Resistance to the conquest was significant. Taiwan remained a Japanese possession until its September 1945 surrender in World War II.[10]

Inadvertent: NO. The annexation of Taiwan was demanded by Prime Minister Itō Hirobumi.[11]

Risk: YES. Taiwan was China's territory, a regional power.

Telegraph: YES. Japan and Taiwan were first connected by telegraph in 1887.[12]

---

[7] James W. Davidson, *The Island of Formosa, Past and Present: History, Peoples, Resources, and Commercial Prospects* (London: MacMillan & Co., 1903), pp. 266-268; Edward I-te Chen, "Japan's Decision to Annex Taiwan: A Study of Ito-Mutsu Diplomacy, 1894-95," *The Journal of Asian Studies*, Vol. 37, No. 1 (November 1977), pp. 64-65; Mark R. Peattie, "The Japanese Colonial Empire, 1895-1945," in Peter Duus, ed., *The Cambridge History of Japan*, Vol. 6: *The Twentieth Century* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 225

[8] Chen, "Japan's Decision to Annex Taiwan," pp. 64-65.

[9] Anton A. Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications* (Hoboken: Wiley-Interscience, 2003), p. 115.

[10] Chen, "Japan's Decision to Annex Taiwan," pp. 62, 64-67, 71-72; Iriye, "Japan's Drive to Great Power Status," pp. 766-767, 769; Peattie, "The Japanese Colonial Empire," p. 225, 229-230; Edward J. Drea, *Japan's Imperial Army: Its Rise and Fall, 1853-1945* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2009), p. 91.

[11] Chen, "Japan's Decision to Annex Taiwan," pp. 64-65; "Sino-Japanese War of 1894-1895" and "Treaty of Shimonoseki," both in *JapanKnowledge Lib*.

[12] Daqing Yang, "Submarine Cables and the Two Japanese Empires," in Bernard Finn and Daqing Yang, eds., *Communications Under Seas: The Evolving Cable Network and its Implications* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2009), pp. 232-233.

239. Southern Sakhalin (1905/7)

Southern Sakhalin was acquired by Japan via conquest from Russia between 7 and 31 July 1905, over the course of the Russo-Japanese War. Sakhalin was conquered by forces of the 13th Division of the Imperial Japanese Army under the command of Major General Haraguchi. Russian forces on the island put up moderate resistance. With the Treaty of Portsmouth, which ended the war on 5 September 1905, Japan was officially awarded the southern half of the island (south of the 50th parallel). Japan would rename the territory "Karafuto," and govern it until 1947, when it was ceded to the Soviet Union.[13]

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. The decision to carry out the conquest of Sakhalin was adopted by Imperial Headquarters in March 1905.[14]

Risk: YES. Sakhalin was Russia's territory, a great power.

Telegraph: YES. Sakhalin was connected to the global telegraph network by July 1890 at the latest.[15]

240. Korea (1905/9)

Korea was acquired by Japan via annexation in September 1905, in the aftermath of the Russo-Japanese War. At the outbreak of hostilities, Japan and Korea signed a "Protocol" of cooperation on 23 February 1904, allowing Japanese forces to undertake operations on Korean territory. Japan formally won acceptance of its exclusive rights to Korea with the Treaty of Portsmouth, ending the war, on 5 September 1905. Korea became a formal Japanese protectorate on 18 November 1905 through the "Korean-Japanese Convention." Korea became a Japanese colony in August 1910. Korea would remain a Japanese possession until its surrender in World War II in 1945.[16]

Inadvertent: NO. The cabinet of Prime Minister Katsura Tarō decided on annexation in May 1905.[17]

Risk: YES. Korea bordered Russia, a great power.

Telegraph: YES. Japan and Korea were connected by the telegraph in 1884.[18]

---

[13] John A. White, *The Diplomacy of the Russo-Japanese War* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964), pp. 223-224; W.G. Beasley, *Japanese Imperialism, 1894-1945* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), pp. 83-84; Peattie, "The Japanese Colonial Empire," p. 226; John J. Stephan, *Sakhalin: A History* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), pp. 78-81; "Sakhalin," *JapanKnowledge Lib*.

[14] White, *The Diplomacy of the Russo-Japanese War*, p. 224.

[15] Anton Chekhov, *The Island: A Journey to Sakhalin*, Translated by Luba and Michael Terpak (New York: Washington Square Press, 1967), pp. 28, 48, 86, 98, 103, 332.

[16] Beasley, *Japanese Imperialism*, pp. 86-90; Iriye, "Japan's Drive to Great Power Status," pp. 774-777, 781; Peattie, "The Japanese Colonial Empire," pp. 224-227; Marius B. Jansen, *The Making of Modern Japan* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000), pp. 441-445; "Annexation of Korea," "Russo-Japanese War," "Katsura-Taft Agreement," and "Korean-Japanese Convention of 1905," all in *JapanKnowledge Lib*.

[17] Beasley, *Japanese Imperialism*, p. 86; Jansen, *The Making of Modern Japan*, p. 442.

[18] Yang, "Submarine Cables and the Two Japanese Empires," p. 231.

241. Liaodong Peninsula (1905/9)

The Liaodong Peninsula (contemporary China) was acquired by Japan via conquest from Russia between May 1904 and September 1905, over the course of the Russo-Japanese War. It was conquered by the Imperial Japanese Army under the command of Marshall Oyama Iwao. Four main armies partook in the conquest. General Kuroki's First Army of 45,000 crossed into Manchuria from Korea on 5 May 1904. General Oku's Second Army of 35,000 landed on the Liaodong Peninsula, also on 5 May 1904. General Nogi Marusuke's Third Army of 60,000 took Port Arthur in January 1905. And the Fourth Army landed at Lagushan in June 1904. The territory was officially awarded to Japan with the Treaty of Portsmouth, which ended the war on 5 September 1905. The Peninsula would become known as the Kwantung Leased Territory, and would remain a Japanese possession until its surrender in World War II in 1945.[19]

Inadvertent: NO. The cabinet of Prime Minister Katsura Tarō decided on war in February 1904.[20]

Risk: YES. The Liaodong Peninsula was occupied by Russia, a great power.

Telegraph: YES. Japan and China were connected by the telegraph in 1871.[21]

242. Mariana Islands (1914/10)

The Mariana Islands (contemporary United States) were acquired by Japan via conquest from Germany in October 1914, in the early months of World War I. The Marianas were conquered by the Imperial Japanese Navy's First South Seas Squadron under the command of Admiral Yamaya Tanin between 3 and 19 October 1914. The islands were acquired without resistance. The Marianas would remain a Japanese possession until the U.S. invasion in August 1944, during the Second World War.[22]

---

[19] Beasley, *Japanese Imperialism*, pp. 78-84; Iriye, "Japan's Drive to Great Power Status," pp. 774-777; Peattie, "The Japanese Colonial Empire," p. 226; Jansen, *The Making of Modern Japan*, pp. 439-440; "Russo-Japanese War (1904-5)," in Richard Holmes et al., eds., *The Oxford Companion to Military History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), Available at: https://www.oxfordreference.com/; "Russo-Japanese War," in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; Drea, *Japan's Imperial Army*, pp. 105-109; "Japanese Invasion of Manchuria (1904) (Russo-Japanese War)," in Paul K. Davis, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Invasions and Conquests: From Ancient Times to the Present*, 3rd ed. (Amenia: Grey House Publishing, 2016); "Russo-Japanese War," *JapanKnowledge Lib*.

[20] Iriye, "Japan's Drive to Great Power Status," pp. 775-776; Jansen, *The Making of Modern Japan*, p. 439.

[21] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, pp. 113, 115.

[22] David C. Purcell, "Japanese Expansion in the South Pacific, 1890-1935" (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1967), pp. 89-90; Ian H. Nish, *Alliance in Decline: A Study in Anglo-Japanese Relations, 1908-1923* (London: Athlone Press, 1972), pp. 143-144; Morinosuke Kajima, ed., *The Diplomacy of Japan*, Vol. III: *First World War, Paris Peace Conference, Washington Conference* (Tokyo: Kajima Institute of International Peace, 1980), p. 181; Mark R. Peattie, "The Nan'yō: Japan in the South Pacific, 1885-1945," in Ramon H. Myers and Mark R. Peattie, eds., *The Japanese Colonial Empire, 1895-1945* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), pp. 181-185; Mark R. Peattie, *Nan'yō: The Rise and Fall of the Japanese in Micronesia, 1885-1945* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1988), pp. 41-44; J. Charles Schenking, "Bureaucratic Politics, Military Budgets and Japan's Southern Advance: The Imperial Navy's Seizure of Micronesia in the First World War," *War in History*, Vol. 5, No. 3 (1998), pp. 320-323; Frederick R. Dickinson, *War and National Reinvention: Japan in the Great War, 1914-1919* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999), pp. 76-77; "Japan, Army" (p. 607) and "Pacific Islands Campaign" (p. 882), both in Spencer C. Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of World War I: A Political, Social, and Military History* (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2005).

Inadvertent: YES. The naval task force was specifically instructed by the cabinet not to acquire German islands, and the Naval General Staff independently overrode this decision.[23]

Risk: YES. The Mariana Islands were Germany's territory, a great power.

Telegraph: LIKELY YES. The American Mariana island of Guam was connected to the global telegraph network in 1903.[24]

243. Marshall Islands (1914/10)

The Marshall Islands were acquired by Japan via conquest from Germany in October 1914, in the early months of World War I. The Marshalls were conquered by the Imperial Japanese Navy's First South Seas Squadron under the command of Admiral Yamaya Tanin between 3 and 19 October 1914. The islands were acquired without resistance. The Marshalls would remain a Japanese possession until the U.S. invasion in February 1944, during the Second World War.[25]

Inadvertent: YES. The naval task force was specifically instructed by the cabinet not to acquire German islands, and the Naval General Staff independently overrode this decision.[26]

Risk: YES. The Marshall Islands were Germany's territory, a great power.

Telegraph: LIKELY YES. There were telegraph stations in Guam since 1903 and in Yap since 1905.[27]

244. Caroline Islands (1914/10)

The Caroline Islands (contemporary Micronesia) were acquired by Japan via conquest from Germany in October 1914, in the early months of World War I. The Carolines were conquered by the Imperial Japanese Navy's First South Seas Squadron under the command of Admiral Yamaya Tanin between 3 and 19 October 1914. The islands were acquired without resistance. The Carolines would remain a Japanese possession until its withdrawal during World War II in February 1944.[28]

---

[23] Peattie, *Nan'yō*, pp. 42-43; Schenking, "Bureaucratic Politics, Military Budgets and Japan's Southern Advance," pp. 321-322.
[24] Jeffrey K. Lyons, "The Pacific Cable, Hawai'i, and Global Communication," *The Hawaiian Journal of History*, Vol. 39 (2005), p. 42.
[25] Purcell, "Japanese Expansion in the South Pacific," pp. 89-90; Nish, *Alliance in Decline*, pp. 143-144; Kajima, ed., *The Diplomacy of Japan*, Vol. III, p. 181; Peattie, "The Nan'yō," pp. 181-185; Peattie, *Nan'yo*, pp. 41-44; Dickinson, *Japan in the Great War*, pp. 76-77; Schenking, "Bureaucratic Politics, Military Budgets and Japan's Southern Advance," pp. 320-323; "Japan, Army" (p. 607) and "Pacific Islands Campaign" (p. 882), both in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWI*.
[26] Peattie, *Nan'yō*, pp. 42-43; Schenking, "Bureaucratic Politics, Military Budgets and Japan's Southern Advance," pp. 321-322.
[27] Lyons, "The Pacific Cable," p. 42; Bill Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018," History of the Atlantic Cable & Undersea Communications (2021), Available at: https://atlantic-cable.com/Cables/CableTimeLine/index.htm.
[28] Purcell, "Japanese Expansion in the South Pacific," pp. 89-90; Nish, *Alliance in Decline*, pp. 143-144; Kajima, ed., *The Diplomacy of Japan*, Vol. III, p. 181; Peattie, "The Nan'yō," pp. 181-185; Peattie, *Nan'yo*, pp. 41-44; Dickinson, *Japan in the Great War*, pp. 76-77; Schenking, "Bureaucratic Politics, Military Budgets and Japan's Southern Advance," pp. 320-323; "Japan, Army" (p. 607) and "Pacific Islands Campaign" (p. 882), both in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWI*.

Inadvertent: YES. The naval task force was specifically instructed by the cabinet not to acquire German islands, and the Naval General Staff independently overrode this decision.[29]

Risk: YES. The Caroline Islands were Germany's territory, a great power.

Telegraph: YES. The Caroline island of Yap was connected to the global telegraph network in 1905.[30]

245. Shandong Peninsula (1914/11)

The Shandong (or Shantung) Peninsula (contemporary China) was acquired by Japan via conquest from Germany between 2 September and 7 November 1914, over the course of World War I. The peninsula was conquered by an Imperial Japanese Army force under the command of Lieutenant-General Kamio Mitsuomi and the Imperial Japanese Navy's Second Fleet. Japanese forces were supported in the conquest by British forces. In this conquest, Japan conducted the first-ever naval-launched air raids. German troops there put up a stiff, but ultimately futile, resistance. Japan retained the Shandong Peninsula until it was returned to China under Nine-Power Treaty of 1922.[31]

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. The Japanese cabinet decided on 15 August 1914 to issue an ultimatum to Germany to hand over the Shandong Peninsula or face war, which they did on 23 August.[32]

Risk: YES. The Shandong Peninsula was Germany's territory, a great power.

Telegraph: YES. Japan and China were connected by the telegraph in 1871.[33]

246. Northern Sakhalin (1920/5)

Northern Sakhalin (contemporary Russia) was acquired by Japan via conquest from Russia between 21 April and late May 1920, during the Siberian Intervention. It was conquered by a force of at least 7,000 personnel of the Imperial Japanese Army and Navy. The slaughter of approximately 700 Japanese nationals on 25 May 1920 at Nikolayevsk, near the mouth of the Amur River in Russia, was used as a pretext to justify an annexation that was already well under way. Japan would return Northern Sakhalin when it established diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union in January of 1925. All Japanese troops were evacuated by May of that year.[34]

---

[29] Peattie, *Nan'yō*, pp. 42-43; Schenking, "Bureaucratic Politics, Military Budgets and Japan's Southern Advance," pp. 321-322.
[30] Glover, "Cable Timeline: 1850-2018."
[31] Nish, *Alliance in Decline*, pp. 132-135; Beasley, *Japanese Imperialism*, p. 114; Ikuhiko Hata and Alvin D. Coox, "Continental Expansion, 1905-1941," in Peter Duus, ed., *The Cambridge History of Japan*, Vol. 6: *The Twentieth Century* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 279-280; Peattie, "The Japanese Colonial Empire," pp. 227-228; "Seige of Qingdao" (pp. 953-955), "Japan, Air Service" (p. 606), "Japan, Army" (p. 607), and "Japan, Navy" (p. 610), all in Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of WWI*; "World War I," in *JapanKnowledge Lib*.
[32] Nish, *Alliance in Decline*, pp. 122-123, 125.
[33] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, pp. 113, 115.
[34] Stephan, *Sakhalin*, pp. 97-108; "Sakhalin" and "Nikolaevsk Incident," both in *JapanKnowledge Lib*.

Inadvertent: NO. The conquest of Northern Sakhalin was directed by the central government in Tokyo.[35]

Risk: YES. Northern Sakhalin was Russia's territory, a great power.

Telegraph: YES. Sakhalin was connected to the global telegraph network before 1913.[36]

247. Manchuria (1932/2)

Manchuria (contemporary China) was acquired by Japan via conquest from China between September 1931 to February 1932, over the course of the Second Sino-Japanese War. It was conquered by the Kwantung Army led by General Honjō Shigeru, and supported by the Korea Army led by General Hayashi Senjūrō. The operation was planned and executed by Lieutenant Colonel Ishiwara Kanji and Colonel Itagaki Seishirō of the Kwantung Army. The Japanese puppet state Manchukuo was set up in February 1932, and remained a Japanese dependency until Japan's surrender at the end of World War II in 1945.[37]

Inadvertent: YES. The conquest was planned and executed independently by the Kwantung Army in Manchuria.[38]

Risk: YES. Manchuria was China's territory, a regional power, and it bordered Russia, a great power.

Telegraph: YES. Japan and China were connected by the telegraph in 1871.[39]

248. Jehol Province (1933/3)

Jehol Province (contemporary China) was acquired by Japan via conquest from China between 1 January and 4 March 1933, over the course of the Second Sino-Japanese War. It was conquered by the Kwantung Army, on the pretext of guaranteeing the protection of Japanese Manchukuo. After an initial skirmish on 1 January 1933, the Kwantung Army issued an ultimatum on 23 February to hand over the province. When it was not forthcoming, the army invaded and cleared Jehol against minimal resistance by 4 March. Jehol was formally awarded to Japan in the Tanggu Truce of 31 May 1933. Jehol remained a Japanese territory until its surrender at the end of World War II in September 1945.[40]

---

[35] Stephan, *Sakhalin*, p. 99; "Nikolaevsk Incident," in *JapanKnowledge Lib*.
[36] Jorma Ahvenainen, *The Far Eastern Telegraphs: The History of Telegraphic Communications between the Fear East, Europe, and America Before the First World War* (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1981), pp. 201-203.
[37] Beasley, *Japanese Imperialism*, pp. 188-197; Hata and Coox, "Continental Expansion," pp. 294-298; Jansen, *The Making of Modern Japan*, pp. 580-586; "Manchurian Incident," in Stearns, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern World*; "Japanese Invasion of China" and "Japanese Invasion of Manchuria (1931)," both in Davis, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Invasions and Conquests*; "Manchurian Incident" and "Liutiaohu Incident," both in *JapanKnowledge Lib*.
[38] Beasley, *Japanese Imperialism*, pp. 192-193; Hata and Coox, "Continental Expansion," pp. 294-295; Jansen, *The Making of Modern Japan*, p. 581. For a detailed examination, see Nicholas D. Anderson, *Inadvertent Expansion in World Politics* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2024), Chapter 6.
[39] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, pp. 113, 115.
[40] James B. Crowley, *Japan's Quest for Autonomy: National Security and Foreign Policy, 1930-1938* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966), pp. 183-185; Christopher G. Thorne, *The Limits of Foreign Policy: The West, the League and the Far*

Inadvertent: NO. The cabinet of Prime Minister Saitō Makoto authorized the attack on Jehol in late December 1932.[41]

Risk: YES. Jehol Province was China's territory, a regional power.

Telegraph: YES. Japan and China were connected by the telegraph in 1871.[42]

249. Inner-Mongolia (1937/11)

Inner-Mongolia (contemporary China) was acquired by Japan via conquest from China between mid-August and November 1937, in the opening months of the Third Sino-Japanese War. It was conquered by the joint forces of the 11th Infantry Brigade of the China Garrison Army and the Provisional Group of the Kwantung Army. The Kwantung Army had unsuccessfully tried to acquire these territories, using mainly proxy forces, in October and November 1936. These territories would be amalgamated by Japan into a puppet state known as Mengjiang (Mengkukuo). Inner Mongolia would remain a Japanese territory until its surrender in World War II in 1945.[43]

Inadvertent: NO. The general offensive in northern China was ordered by the cabinet of Prime Minister Konoe Fumimaro on 11 July 1937.[44]

Risk: YES. Inner Mongolia was China's territory, a regional power.

Telegraph: YES. Japan and China were connected by the telegraph in 1871.[45]

250. North China (1938/3)

North China (contemporary China) was acquired by Japan via conquest from China between late 1935 and March 1938, up to and over the course of the Third Sino-Japanese War. It was conquered by the North China Army under the command of General Terauchi Hisaichi. In late 1935, some of these territories had been organized into the "East Hebei Anticommunist Autonomous Government," a Japanese puppet government. In December 1937, after an invasion by the North China Area Army, some more of these territories were organized into the "Provisional Government of the Republic of China," a second Japanese puppet government. The "East Hebei Anticommunist

---

Eastern Crisis of 1931-1933 (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1972), pp. 328-329; Beasley, *Japanese Imperialism*, pp. 199-200; Alvin D. Coox, *Nomonhan: Japan Against Russia, 1939*, Vol. I (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1985), pp. 67-68; "Tanggu Truce," in *JapanKnowledge Lib*.

[41] Crowley, *Japan's Quest for Autonomy*, p. 184; Beasley, *Japanese Imperialism*, p. 200.

[42] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, pp. 113, 115.

[43] Ishiwari Heizo, *China Area Operations Record, July 1937-November 1941*, Revised ed., Japanese Monograph No. 70 (United States Army Headquarters, Japan, 1958), pp. 4-6; Crowley, *Japan's Quest for Autonomy*, pp. 348-349; James Boyd, "In Pursuit of an Obsession: Japan in Inner Mongolia in the 1930s," *Japanese Studies*, Vol. 22, No. 3 (2002), pp. 294-302; "Japanese Invasion of China," in Davis, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Invasions and Conquests*; "Sino-Japanese War of 1937-1945," in *JapanKnoweldge Lib.*

[44] Ishiwari, *China Area Operations Record*, p. 4; Crowley, *Japan's Quest for Autonomy*, pp. 330-331; Herbert P. Bix, *Hirohito and the Making of Modern Japan* (New York: Perennial, 2001), pp. 318-323.

[45] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, pp. 113, 115.

Autonomous Government" was made part of this second puppet government. In March 1938, after an invasion by the Central China Expeditionary Army, the rest of these territories were organized into the "Reform Government of the Republic of China," a third Japanese puppet government. On 30 March 1940, both of these territories were amalgamated into the "Reorganized National Government of the Republic of China," led by Wang Jingwei. North China remained a Japanese territory until Japan's September 1945 surrender in World War II.[46]

Inadvertent: NO. The general offensive in northern China was ordered by the cabinet of Prime Minister Konoe Fumimaro on 11 July 1937.[47]

Risk: YES. North China was China's territory, a regional power.

Telegraph: YES. Japan and China were connected by the telegraph in 1871.[48]

251. Hainan (1939/12)

Hainan (contemporary China) was acquired by Japan via conquest from China between 10 February and December 1939, over the course of the Third Sino-Japanese War. It was conquered by the 21st Army's Formosa Mixed Brigade, with support from the Imperial Japanese Navy. Chinese forces did resist the Japanese conquest, and the interior of Hainan would never be fully pacified. Japan retained Hainan until its surrender at the end of World War II in September 1945.[49]

Inadvertent: NO. The invasion of Hainan was ordered by Imperial General Headquarters.[50]

Risk: YES. Hainan was China's territory, a regional power.

Telegraph: YES. Japan and China were connected by the telegraph in 1871.[51]

252. French Indochina (1941/7)

French Indochina (contemporary Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos) was acquired by Japan via conquest from France between September 1940 and July 1941, over the course of World War II. Japan had stationed troops in north French Indochina as a result of an agreement with Vichy France in September 1940, though it used force to attain that agreement. Its occupation of the south in July 1941 completed its control of the territory, effectively supplanting the French. Indochina was made

[46] Crowley, *Japan's Quest for Autonomy*, pp. 340-341, 349; "Wang Chingwei" and "China" (3b), both in I. C. B. Dear and M. R. D. Foot, eds., *The Oxford Companion to World War II* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), Available at: https://www.oxfordreference.com/; "Japanese Invasion of China," in Davis, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Invasions and Conquests*; "Sino-Japanese War of 1937-1945," "East Hebei (Hopeh) Anticommunist Autonomous Government," "Provisional Government of the Republic of China," "Reform Government of the Republic of China," "Reorganized National Government of the Republic of China," all in *JapanKnowledge Lib*.
[47] Crowley, *Japan's Quest for Autonomy*, pp. 330-331; Bix, *Hirohito and the Making of Modern Japan*, pp. 318-323.
[48] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, pp. 113, 115.
[49] Ishiwari, *China Area Operations Record*, pp. 60-61; R. T. Phillips, "The Japanese Occupation of Hainan," *Modern Asian Studies*, Vol. 14, No. 1 (1980), pp. 93-98; "Hainan Island," in Dear and Foot, eds., *The Oxford Companion to WWII*.
[50] Ishiwari, *China Area Operations Record*, pp. 60-61; Phillips, "The Japanese Occupation of Hainan," p. 95.
[51] Huurdeman, *The Worldwide History of Telecommunications*, pp. 113, 115.

part of Japan's "Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere," and was retained until Japan's surrender at the end of World War II in September 1945.[52]

Inadvertent: NO. Japan's initial move into French Indochina was based on an agreement between Tokyo and Vichy France, and the Konoe government ordered the later extension.[53]

Risk: YES. Indochina was France's territory, a great power.

Telegraph: YES.

253. Guam (1941/12)

Guam (contemporary United States) was acquired by Japan from the United States between 9 and 11 December 1941. It was acquired via conquest by 5,500 members of the Imperial Japanese Navy's South Seas Detachment. Japan retained Guam until the U.S. invasion in July and August 1944.[54]

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. The Guam conquest was under the control of Imperial General Headquarters.[55]

Risk: YES. Guam was the U.S.'s territory, a great power.

Telegraph: YES.

254. Hong Kong (1941/12)

Hong Kong (contemporary China) was acquired by Japan via conquest from the United Kingdom between 8 and 24 December 1941, over the course of World War II. Hong Kong was conquered by the Twenty-Third Army's Thirty-Eighth Division of the Imperial Japanese Army under the command of Lieutenant-General Sado Tadayoshi. Significant resistance was mounted by the British, Indian, Scottish, and Canadian troops in the territory, leading to 2,754 Japanese casualties. Hong Kong was to be made part of Japan's "Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere." Hong Kong remained a Japanese territory until its surrender at the end of World War II in 1945.[56]

---

[52] Beasley, *Japanese Imperialism*, pp. 230-231; Alvin D. Coox, "The Pacific War," in Peter Duus, ed., *The Cambridge History of Japan*, Vol. 6: *The Twentieth Century* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 325-328; "French Indo-China," in Dear and Foot, eds., *The Oxford Companion to WWII*; Jeremy A. Yellen, *The Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere: When Total Empire Met Total War* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2019), pp. 48, 51, 69-70; "Greater East Asia Coprosperity Sphere" and "Japanese Occupation of Indochina," both in *JapanKnowledge Lib*.

[53] Beasley, *Japanese Imperialism*, pp. 230-231; Yellen, *The Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere*, pp. 51, 69-70.

[54] Coox, "The Pacific War," p. 349; "Battle for Guam," in Spencer Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of World War II: A Political, Social, and Military History* (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2004), pp. 645-647; "Guam," in Dear and Foot, eds., *The Oxford Companion to WWII*; "Guam," in *JapanKnowledge Lib*.

[55] Coox, "The Pacific War," p. 349.

[56] Ishiwari Heizo, *Army Operations in China, December 1941-December 1943*, Japanese Monograph No. 71 (United States Army Headquarters, Japan, March 1956), pp. 37-48; Beasley, *Japanese Imperialism*, pp. 234-235; Coox, "The Pacific War," p. 347; "Fall of Hong Kong," in Richard Holmes et al., eds., *The Oxford Companion to Military History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), Available at: https://www.oxfordreference.com/; "Hong Kong," in Dear and Foot, eds., *The Oxford Companion to WWII*; Yellen, *The Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere*, pp. 75, 76.

Inadvertent: NO. The conquest of Hong Kong was ordered by Imperial General Headquarters on 1 December 1941.[57]

Risk: YES. Hong Kong was the United Kingdom's territory, a great power.

Telegraph: YES.

255. Malaya (1942/2)

Malaya (contemporary Malaysia) was acquired by Japan via conquest from the United Kingdom between 9 December 1941 and 15 February 1942, over the course of World War II. Malaya was conquered by an Imperial Japanese Army force led by Lieutenant General Yamashito Tomoyuki and an Imperial Japanese Navy force led by Vice Admiral Ozawa Jisaburō. Total Japanese forces numbered 60,000. This conquest occurred concurrently with the Battle of the South China Sea, in which the Japanese navy defeated the British Far Eastern Fleet. The British suffered a crushing defeat on land as well. Malaya would become part of Japan's "Greater East Asian Co-Prosperity Sphere." Malaya would remain a Japanese territory until Japan's surrender at the end of World War II in 1945.[58]

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. The conquest of Malaya was approved by Prime Minister Tōjō Hideki on 5 November 1941.[59]

Risk: YES. Malaya was the United Kingdom's territory, a great power.

Telegraph: YES.

256. Burma (1942/3)

Burma (contemporary Myanmar) was acquired by Japan via conquest from the United Kingdom between 14 December 1941 and 15 March 1942, over the course of World War II. It was conquered by the Imperial Japanese Army's Fifteenth Army under the command of Lieutenant-General Iida Shōjirō, with the support of the Imperial Japanese Airforce. Japan was interested in cutting off the so-called "Burma Road," a supply route for Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist forces in China. British Imperial forces (mostly Burmese, Chinese, Chins, Gurkhas, Kachins, Karens, Nagas, and Africans) put up significant resistance. They undertook the longest fighting retreat in the history of the British Army during this conquest. Burma would become part of Japan's "Greater East Asian Co-Prosperity

[57] Ishiwari, *Army Operations in China*, pp. 37-38.
[58] Beasley, *Japanese Imperialism*, pp. 234-235; Coox, "The Pacific War," pp. 336-337, 345; "Malayan Campaign" and "Fall of Singapore," both in Dear and Foot, eds., *The Oxford Companion to WWII*; "Japanese Conquest of Singapore and Malaya," in Davis, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Invasions and Conquests*; Yellen, *The Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere*, pp. 48, 75, 76; "Malayan Campaign" and "Battle of South China Sea," both in *JapanKnowledge Lib*.
[59] Coox, "The Pacific War," pp. 335-336.

Sphere." Japan would retain Burma until it was ousted by British and American forces in May 1945.[60]

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. The conquest of Burma was ordered by Imperial General Headquarters.[61]

Risk: YES. Burma was the United Kingdom's territory, a great power.

Telegraph: YES.

257. Philippines (1942/5)

The Philippines was acquired by Japan via conquest from the United States between 8 December 1941 and 6 May 1942, over the course of World War II. The Philippines was conquered by the Fourteenth Japanese Army under the command of Lieutenant General Honma Masaharu. The conquest was preceded by the Eleventh Japanese Air Fleet's attack on Clark Field, comprising 108 bombers and 84 fighter-escorts, destroying half of America's air power in the Philippines. The American and Philippine forces put up resistance that was ultimately futile, leaving General Douglas MacArthur to flee to Australia, vowing to return. The Philippines would become part of Japan's "Greater East Asian Co-Prosperity Sphere." Japan would retain the Philippines until the U.S. invasion in 1944 and Japan's ultimate surrender at the end of World War II in 1945.[62]

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. The conquest of the Philippines was approved by Prime Minister Tōjō Hideki on 5 November 1941.[63]

Risk: YES. The Philippines was the U.S.'s territory, a great power.

Telegraph: YES.

258. Dutch East Indies (1942/10)

The Dutch East Indies (contemporary Indonesia) were acquired by Japan via conquest from the Netherlands between 20 December 1941 and October 1942, over the course of World War II. The East Indies were conquered by the Sixteenth Army under the command of Lieutenant-General Iwamura Hitoshi. The conquest occurred concurrently with the Battle of Java Sea, where the Imperial Japanese Navy defeated a joint British, Dutch, American, and Australian force. Dutch East

---

[60] Coox, "The Pacific War," pp. 348-349; "Burma Campaign," in Holmes et al., eds., *The Oxford Companion to Military History*; "Burma Campaign" and "Burma Road," both in Dear and Foot, eds., *The Oxford Companion to WWII*; "Japanese Invasion of Burma," in Davis, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Invasions and Conquests*; Yellen, *The Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere*, p. 48; "Greater East Asia Coprosperity Sphere," in *JapanKnowledge Lib*.

[61] Coox, "The Pacific War," pp. 348-349.

[62] Beasley, *Japanese Imperialism*, pp. 234-235; Coox, "The Pacific War," pp. 346-347; "Philippines Campaigns," "Philippines," "Lt-General Homma Masaharu," and "Attack on Clark Field," all in Dear and Foot, eds., *The Oxford Companion to WWII*; "Japanese Invasion of the Philippines," in Davis, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Invasions and Conquests*; Yellen, *The Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere*, pp. 48, 116-117; "Greater East Asia Coprosperity Sphere," and "Philippines and Japan," both in *JapanKnowledge Lib*.

[63] Coox, "The Pacific War," pp. 335-336.

Indies forces put up significant resistance, aided by American, Australian, and British forces, but were ultimately overrun. Most of the Dutch forces surrendered on 8 March 1942, however resistance continued on Borneo and Celebes until October 1942. The Dutch East Indies would become part of Japan's "Greater East Asian Co-Prosperity Sphere." Japan retained the Dutch East Indies until its surrender at the end of World War II in 1945.[64]

Inadvertent: LIKELY NO. The conquest of the Dutch East Indies was approved by Prime Minister Tōjō Hideki on 5 November 1941 and ordered by Imperial General Headquarters in late December 1941.[65]

Risk: YES. The Dutch East Indies was the Netherlands' territory, a regional power.

Telegraph: YES.

[64] Beasley, *Japanese Imperialism*, pp. 234-235; Coox, "The Pacific War," pp. 347-348; "Netherlands East Indies" and "Battle of Java Sea," both in Dear and Foot, eds., *The Oxford Companion to WWII*; "Japanese Invasion of Dutch East Indies," in Davis, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Invasions and Conquests*; Yellen, *The Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere*, p. 48; "Greater East Asia Coprosperity Sphere," in *JapanKnowledge Lib*.
[65] Coox, "The Pacific War," pp. 335-336, 347.