

## CONTENT

### 6 STATISTICS ON ACQUISITION AND LOSS OF NATIONALITY IN EU15 MEMBER STATES

<b>HARALD WALDRAUCH .....</b>	<b>2</b>
6.1 INTRODUCTION .....	2
6.2 AVAILABILITY AND QUALITY OF STATISTICS REGARDING ACQUISITIONS OF NATIONALITY .....	2
6.2.1 <i>Lack of overall statistics regarding acquisitions and losses of nationality</i> .....	2
6.2.2 <i>General problems of availability, accessibility and reliability of statistics</i> .....	3
6.2.3 <i>Automatic acquisitions of nationality</i> .....	5
6.2.4 <i>Acquisitions of nationality at regional or local level</i> .....	7
6.2.5 <i>Acquisitions of nationality abroad and by new immigrants</i> .....	8
6.2.6 <i>Indistinguishable sub-groups</i> .....	11
6.2.7 <i>Recommendations with respect to data collection</i> .....	12
6.3 ACQUISITION OF NATIONALITY: STATISTICAL DEVELOPMENTS .....	14
6.3.1 <i>Total number of acquisitions of nationality after birth</i> .....	14
6.3.2 <i>Explanations for statistical developments of acquisitions of nationality</i> .....	18
6.3.3 <i>Rates of acquisition of nationality</i> .....	23
6.3.4 <i>Acquisitions of nationality by newly immigrated ‘co-ethnics’</i> .....	26
6.3.5 <i>Acquisitions of nationality abroad</i> .....	27
6.3.6 <i>Acquisitions of nationality by former nationality</i> .....	27
6.3.7 <i>Acquisitions of nationality by sex</i> .....	30
6.4 STATISTICS OF CASES OF LOSS OF NATIONALITY .....	32
6.4.1 <i>Available statistics</i> .....	32
6.4.2 <i>Recommendations with respect to data collection</i> .....	35
6.5 ANNEX 1: TABLES ON ACQUISITIONS OF NATIONALITY BY MODE.....	36
6.6 ANNEX 2: STATISTICS OF APPLICATIONS AND DECISIONS .....	44
6.7 REFERENCES .....	47

# 6 STATISTICS ON ACQUISITION AND LOSS OF NATIONALITY IN EU15 MEMBER STATES<sup>1</sup>

## HARALD WALDRAUCH

### 6.1 Introduction

The main aims of NATAC were, firstly, to classify *all* modes of acquisition and loss of nationality in the EU15 states using a general typology, secondly, to compare the legal rules for all these modes and, thirdly, to combine the comparison of rules with a systematic analysis of the statistical importance of the different modes of acquisition and loss of nationality within each state and across all EU15 states. The central questions with respect to the last goal were: how many persons acquire and lose nationality via the various modes in each country? What is the relative statistical importance of each mode in relation to comparable modes in other countries? Lastly, how have the numbers of different modes of acquisition and loss developed over time? The ultimate aim therefore was a total account of all acquisitions and losses of nationality – *ex lege* and non-automatic modes at and after birth – which will allow general statements to be made about the emphasis states put on different, broader types of acquisition and loss of nationality, as well as, eventually, a classification of their nationality regimes.

In Chapters 3 and 4 we only occasionally indicated the importance of certain modes in relation to the total number of acquisitions and losses of nationality in practice, but we did not provide a systematic analysis in this respect – this is the goal of this chapter. We will proceed in two steps in this context: firstly, we will establish which statistics are available in the area of the acquisition and loss of nationality and what their strengths and weaknesses are and, secondly, we will analyse some important statistical trends with respect to the acquisition and loss of nationality. We draw on a number of sources, specifically the country reports by our project partners, statistical data as well as meta-information about the data collected by our correspondents on the basis of a special questionnaire, information gathered directly by the author and the results of the EU-funded project THESIM.<sup>2</sup>

### 6.2 Availability and quality of statistics regarding acquisitions of nationality

Below we will examine the availability of statistics on the acquisition and loss of nationality and the scope of data collection in the countries under consideration. Our main conclusion is that the availability and quality of statistics of acquisition regarding nationality are unsatisfactory in most EU15 states. The reasons for this are summed up below.

#### 6.2.1 Lack of overall statistics regarding acquisitions and losses of nationality

None of the EU15 states produces a total account of all methods of acquiring and/or losing nationality, in which at least the main modes of acquisition and loss can be distinguished. States with highly developed systems of population registers (especially the Nordic states, but

---

<sup>1</sup> I would like to thank Albert Kraler for his comments on this chapter.

<sup>2</sup> In this EU-funded project ‘Towards Harmonised European Statistics of International Migration’ Giambattista Cantisani and Valeria Greco (2006) produced two chapters on the acquisition of nationality, both of which take into account the typology of modes of acquisition of nationality developed for the NATAC project.

also Belgium and the Netherlands) would have most of the relevant information available in these registers, but none actually makes use of this to produce an overall account of flows into and out of the total population of nationals. Given the heightened interest in migration-relevant statistics in Europe in the recent past, this is all the more surprising.

### **6.2.2 General problems of availability, accessibility and reliability of statistics**

Statistics regarding the acquisition of nationality exist in a number of states, but are not accessible at all or not accessible in as much detail as would be needed to conduct meaningful international comparisons. Worse still, data on certain modes of acquisition are not collected at all. Thirdly, some statistics that are available are often of limited use because the relevant meta-information describing the actual content of the statistics (what is actually counted and what is not?) is lacking, superficial or contradictory.

The most problematic case with respect to data accessibility is Greece, where the authorities are very reluctant to publish numbers of acquisitions of nationality because nationality is seen as an extremely sensitive issue. In fact, none of the Greek statistics presented in section 6.3 were published regularly, but were only made available by the Ministry of the Interior to insistent researchers<sup>3</sup>, including the Greek correspondent in our project. Detailed technical information on these statistics is unavailable, however, which leaves room for speculation about the actual content of the data. More importantly, as will be specified in the following sections, it seems that statistics for certain modes of acquisition, even non-automatic acquisition, have never been compiled at all in Greece.

Refused access to data is less of a problem in the other Southern European states (Italy, Portugal and Spain), but statistics on certain non-automatic acquisitions of nationality, especially those for which regional or local authorities are responsible, are also lacking in those countries. In addition, contradictory statistics from different sources or even from one and the same source are a major problem in all three states. As in Greece, the Italian Ministry of the Interior does not often publish statistics on acquisitions of nationality, but the project team managed to gain access to data for some modes of naturalisation. However, these statistics often contradict statistics published by other institutions (national statistical institute, OECD in its SOPEMI reports, EUROSTAT, Caritas) or previously by the Ministry, which raises doubts about their reliability and content. In Portugal, the procedure is not yet complete when the Ministry of the Interior's Foreigners and Borders Service (*Serviço de Estrangeiros e Fronteiras*, SEF) grants naturalisation or accepts a declaration of acquisition of nationality: the acquisition of nationality only becomes effective when a person registers it with the Central Registers Office (*Conservatória dos Registos Centrais*, CRC). Nonetheless, statistics are still produced both by the CRC and the SEF, one counting registrations of acquisitions of nationality and the other counting granted naturalisations and accepted declarations of acquisition of nationality.<sup>4</sup> In addition, the CRC actually produces two different sets of statistics, while the National Statistical Institute publishes statistics as well, which in turn are based on data from the SEF. These four different sets of statistics do not match at all and, due to the lack of detailed meta-information, it is difficult to assess what causes the differences and which statistics to trust. In any case, a differentiation by types of acquisition is limited (at best) to a distinction between naturalisations, declaration by spouses of nationals and other modes of acquisition. In Spain, three institutions publish more or less the same statistics on naturalisations (the Ministry of the Interior, Ministry of Employment and Social Affairs and

---

<sup>3</sup> See especially Baldwin-Edwards (2004).

<sup>4</sup> In general, what we should be interested in are not awards of nationality or accepted declarations per se, or positively completed procedures, but only the number of persons effectively acquiring nationality.

national statistical institute). The statistics from the Ministry of Employment do contain limited technical explanations, but a disaggregation of different modes of naturalisation is not possible in Spain.

Problems with data availability in the other eleven states are limited to certain automatic modes of acquisition (see section 6.2.3), two non-automatic modes in Ireland (section 6.2.4) and acquisitions by persons residing abroad (section 6.2.5). With the exceptions of France (Ministry of Social Affairs, Ministry of Justice), Ireland (Ministry of Justice) and the United Kingdom (Home Office), statistics regarding acquisitions of nationality in these states are published by the national statistical institutes.<sup>5</sup> However, in Ireland, statistics on acquisitions of nationality are only published in a very rudimentary form in the Ministry of Justice's annual report; data series beyond these had to be gathered directly from the Ministry. Besides the shortcomings mentioned above, there are two main problems in these eleven countries. Firstly, meta-information concerning the actual content of the data is often missing, superficial or contradictory.<sup>6</sup> Secondly, the statistics that are freely accessible are often not broken down by modes or at least groups of modes of acquisition of nationality and separately available statistics on various modes of acquisition are often contradictory and/or do not add up to the total number: this is the case in Belgium and the three Nordic countries<sup>7</sup>. Disaggregation of the data by mode of acquisition is possible (or should be according to the information available) in the other ten states, even though statistics have so far only been produced for the most important types of acquisition in Ireland (naturalisations, post-nuptial declarations) and Luxembourg (naturalisations, options), and in the United Kingdom for seven to nine different types (out of a total of more than twenty modes recorded). The most detailed statistics with respect to modes of acquisition of nationality are available for Austria, France, Germany, Luxembourg and the Netherlands, but some of the target groups defined in our typology of modes of acquisition of nationality cannot be distinguished in the statistics for these states<sup>8</sup>. In addition, statistics on acquisitions of nationality by declaration that are available from different sources in France are at times contradictory and the statistics published by the national statistical institute in Luxembourg, which count acquisitions at the date of publication in the official gazette (acquisitions become effective four days after that date), are not as detailed as those from the Ministry of Justice, which count decisions on acquisitions on the day they are signed<sup>9</sup> – but the first record day is in fact legally (more) relevant.

---

<sup>5</sup> But in some states (e.g. Finland: Directorate of Immigration; Luxembourg: Ministry of Justice), the institutions responsible for administering the nationality law publish statistics as well, which at times leads to confusion.

<sup>6</sup> For example, Statistics Denmark provides the following explanation: 'Naturalizations should be understood as every form of acquiring Danish citizenship. Naturalization takes place by law. It is necessary to ask for naturalization, it depends on the judgement in each single case whether or not it is granted. In practice the conditions are set up according to the legal period of stay in the country for the person. [...] Acquiring Danish citizenship can take place in other ways, for instance by declaration or adoption.' (<http://www.dst.dk/HomeUK/Guide/documentation/Varedeklarationer/emnegruppe/emne.aspx?sysrid=757&timepath=2%7C>). The problem here is that the term "naturalization" is used here both for the totality of all acquisitions of nationality as well as for the specific procedure of granting nationality by parliament.

<sup>7</sup> Highly detailed statistics for Sweden were made available to the project team by the Swedish Migration Board. These cannot, however, be exploited fully because of their intransparent complexity. According to information from Statistics Finland provided by email, their statistics cannot be broken down into various modes.

<sup>8</sup> For example, refugees who are naturalised on the basis of the general rules, but with relaxed conditions.

<sup>9</sup> Information provided by email by the Ministry of Justice.

### 6.2.3 Automatic acquisitions of nationality

Available statistics on acquisitions always exclude automatic acquisitions of nationality at birth. In states without *ex lege* acquisition of nationality *iure soli* at birth, statistics approximating the total number of *ex lege* acquisitions *iure sanguinis* at birth (A01)<sup>10</sup> can probably be produced on the basis of general birth statistics: the relevant variables in this respect (nationality of each parent, legitimacy of birth) should be available in all states. However, *ex lege* acquisitions of nationality *iure sanguinis* at birth abroad cannot reasonably be produced because states will not always be aware of the birth of a child to one of their expatriates. Automatic acquisitions of nationality *iure soli* at birth (A02), which are possible (or were until recently) under certain circumstances for children of foreign nationals in Belgium, France, Germany, Ireland (before 2001), the Netherlands, Spain and the United Kingdom, are also usually not counted. The exception in this context is Germany, where separate statistics for acquisitions via this mode are available since its introduction in 2000. A special case in this context is the acquisition of nationality at birth by foundlings, children of stateless persons and children who would otherwise end up stateless (A03). Statistics on how many of these acquisitions occur in each state are also not produced in any EU state, but we can assume that the number will be low in most states.

Due to the lack of readily available statistics on automatic acquisitions of nationality at birth, we will concentrate on modes of acquisition after birth, including modes we classified as non-automatic at birth because they can take place immediately after birth by registration or declaration. But nationality is not only acquired *ex lege* at birth, but occasionally after birth. Events triggering such an *ex lege* acquisition after birth are summarised in Table 6.1.

**Table 6.1: Events triggering *ex lege* acquisitions of nationality after birth (rules in 2004)**

Event	Mode	States
Establishment of filiation or recognition of paternity of a national	A01/A04	All states except the Netherlands
Establishment of filiation or recognition of paternity of a foreign national in the context of <i>iure soli</i> rules	A02/A05	Belgium, France, Germany, Spain, United Kingdom
Legitimation of a child through marriage of the parents	A04	Denmark, Finland
	A09	Austria, Greece, Sweden, United Kingdom
Birth in the country and reaching the age of majority after a certain length of residence in the country	A05a	France
Birth in the country and becoming stateless as a minor	A05a/A23b	Belgium
Adoption by a national	A10	All states except Austria
Adoption by a foreign national under certain circumstances	A05b	Belgium

<sup>10</sup> For an explanation of the codes for the various modes of acquisition of nationality, see section 2.2.1 in Chapter 2. Descriptions of the rules for modes of acquisition in each state can be found in Chapter 3, particularly in the extended version of the comparison of rules of acquisition and in the Excel file 'Acquisition - Overview all countries.xls', which are available on the CD ROM attached to this volume.

Acquisition of nationality by a parent	A14	Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, Sweden
Being a former national and taking up residence in the country (for some time)	A16c+g	Italy
Being a former national and having renounced nationality, which was never registered	A16d	Portugal
Having a particular special nationality status on a certain date	A17h+i	United Kingdom
Receiving a certification of one's status as an ethnic German <i>Spätaussiedler</i> from the former Soviet Union	A19a	Germany
Wrongful presumption of being a national for some time	A20	Spain
Taking up duties as a monk at Mount Athos	A21	Greece
Taking up a position in the state's civil service	A25	Austria, Italy
Taking up a position in the state's military service	A25a+c	Greece

With respect to the coverage of these automatic modes of acquisition of nationality by the statistics, the fifteen states can be grouped into three clusters:

- 1 In Austria, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Portugal, Spain and the United Kingdom, none of the *ex lege* modes of acquisition after birth is counted in the published statistics of acquisitions of nationality (most often called 'naturalisation statistics'). However, estimates exist for some automatic modes of acquisition in these seven states;
- 2 In France, Germany and Greece the statistics cover automatic extensions of naturalisation to minors, but none of the other *ex lege* modes of acquisition (establishment of filiation, recognition of paternity, legitimation, adoption, military service by *homogeneis*<sup>11</sup> in Greece). In Germany, ethnic German *Spätaussiedler* acquiring nationality *ex lege* are not included in the general naturalisation statistics, but they are counted separately; before 2000 *Spätaussiedler* acquired nationality by naturalisation and were therefore included (and identifiable) in the general naturalisation statistics. In France, the number of youths becoming French by *majorité* is estimated annually;
- 3 In the remaining five states – Belgium, Denmark, Finland, the Netherlands and Sweden – national statistical institutes produce statistics on the acquisition of nationality based on the population registers, which cover all modes of acquisition of nationality after birth, including acquisitions by legitimation, adoption, becoming stateless while a minor and by automatic extension of acquisition to minors. However, it is unclear whether acquisitions by establishment of filiation or recognition of paternity are counted in these statistics as well; the exception in this context is the Netherlands, where acquisitions by establishment of filiation still are definitely covered by the statistics on acquisitions of nationality and acquisitions by recognition of paternity were counted before April 2003 (when this mode of *ex lege* acquisition was abolished).

If certain modes always provided for automatic acquisition of nationality and were always excluded from the statistics, the problem would only be one of incomplete counting.

However, the uneven coverage of *ex lege* acquisitions adds the problem of incomparability to

<sup>11</sup> Persons of Greek origin and Greek national consciousness; see the Greek country report for more details.

the problem of incompleteness. To remedy this uneven coverage, we could use estimates of acquisitions via the modes not covered or, conversely, exclude modes that are not counted in some states from the statistics in all states. But, in most cases, no reliable and/or complete estimates of non-covered acquisitions exist and modes of acquisitions that are not counted in some states often cannot be excluded from the statistics in those states in which they are covered because they are not distinguishable. As a result, we end up with statistics that are not comparable because certain modes of acquisition are counted in some states, but not in others.

#### **6.2.4 Acquisitions of nationality at regional or local level**

A similar problem is that even some non-automatic acquisitions of nationality are not always included in the main official statistics on acquisitions of nationality. This mainly concerns grants of nationality or acquisitions via declaratory procedures for which regional or local authorities are responsible.

No such problems exist in nine states. In Finland (Directorate of Immigration), Luxembourg (naturalisations: parliament; options and declarations: Ministry of Justice) and the United Kingdom (Secretary of State), national authorities are responsible for all non-automatic modes of acquisition of nationality and all of these modes are accounted for in the statistics on acquisitions, including those by declaration or registration by children born abroad to certain nationals. In Austria (provincial government) and Germany (authorities vary), regional authorities are in charge of all non-automatic acquisitions of nationality, but all of these acquisitions are entered into the overall statistics compiled by the national statistical institutes. In Belgium and Denmark (parliament), France (Ministry of Social Affairs), the Netherlands (the Queen at the recommendation of the Minister of Alien Affairs and Integration) and Sweden (Migration Board), naturalisations are granted by central authorities, while all or most acquisitions of nationality via declaratory procedures are administered by regional or local agencies (Belgium: registrar, public prosecutor; Denmark: regional authority; France: local courts; Netherlands: Mayor; Sweden: County Administrative Board). All non-automatic modes of acquisition are also covered in the statistics for these states.

This leaves us with five states, where certain non-automatic modes of acquisition of nationality are not included in the available statistics or not counted at all. Two modes are not covered in the statistics in Ireland: this concerns the reacquisition of nationality by declaration by former nationals who were born on the island of Ireland (A16) and acquisitions *iure soli* which, since 2001 require an act ‘that only an Irish citizen is entitled to do’ (e.g. applying for a passport, or enrolling as a voter).<sup>12</sup> Therefore, available statistics on the acquisition of nationality only cover all forms of naturalisation and – until November 2005 – acquisitions of nationality by declaration by spouses of Irish nationals (A08a); the Minister of Justice is responsible for both types of acquisition, except for post-nuptial declarations made abroad, which are handled by Irish consulates. But the biggest gaps in the statistics on non-automatic acquisitions of nationality exist in the four Southern European states:

- Available statistics in Italy only cover discretionary naturalisations on the basis of Article 9 of the law (A05b, A06, A10b+c, A12a, A18, A22-A24, A25a) and naturalisations of spouses of nationals based on Article 5 (A08); the ultimate decisions in these cases are

---

<sup>12</sup> The failure to include these semi-automatic acquisitions *iure soli* in Ireland in statistics on acquisitions of nationality after birth is acceptable, however, because persons who are entitled to perform such an act but have not yet done so have the same rights as Irish nationals; as soon as they make use of any citizens’ rights they become nationals themselves. It therefore makes more sense to include these persons in statistics of acquisitions at birth.

made by the President of the Republic and the Minister of the Interior respectively. By contrast, acquisitions by declaration by former nationals (A16a-b, A16d-f), their descendants (A12b+c) and other groups of persons (A05a, A09b, A21, A25b), which have to be made before the local registrar, are not included in these statistics. Data on acquisitions of nationality by declaration seem to exist, but they have so far not been published;<sup>13</sup>

- The statistics in Spain only cover acquisitions ‘by residence’ (i.e. regular naturalisations: A05b, A06, A08, A09b, A12b+c, A18, A19, A21, A22) and naturalisations under exceptional circumstances (A16b, A27); the responsible authorities for these two types of naturalisation are the Ministry of Justice (residence) and the government as a whole (exceptional granting). But, again, no statistics are available on acquisitions of nationality by option (for which judges in charge of local civil registers are responsible) by former nationals (A16a), their descendants (A12a) and other less important groups of persons (A05a, A09a, A10b, A21); it seems that such statistics have never been compiled;
- The situation is more complicated in Portugal. Data published by the CRC seem to cover all naturalisations (A06, A18, A19, A24), acquisitions of nationality by declaration made by spouses of Portuguese nationals (A08) and certain other modes of declaratory acquisition by children of nationals (A09, A10b). Other acquisitions by declaration, however, which must be addressed to the local registries or consulates abroad, do not seem to be taken into account in these statistics: this concerns the acquisitions *iure soli* by persons born in Portugal (A02=A05) or *iure sanguinis* by persons born abroad to Portuguese parents (A01c=A04) and declaratory reacquisitions by former nationals (A16a-c);
- Finally, the availability of statistics is most confusing in Greece. The main statistics cover naturalisations of *homogeneis*<sup>14</sup> and *allogeneis* (i.e. those who are not *homogeneis*) granted by the Minister of Interior on the basis of Article 5 of the law (A05, A06, A08, A19a, A22, A23, A24b) as well as their children (A14). In particular, these statistics do not include two important modes of acquisition by persons with Greek ancestry, which are administered by regional authorities, i.e. the acquisition of nationality by ‘definition’<sup>15</sup> by persons who can prove Greek ancestors (A12) and the naturalisation of Pontian Greeks from the former Soviet Union (A19c). In this volume, we can publish statistics of acquisitions by Pontian Greeks via any of these two modes for the first time, but statistics for a number of other modes targeting *homogeneis* residing abroad (A19b), former Greek nationals (A16a-d) and smaller groups of persons (A04, A24a, A25b) are still lacking.

To summarise, the main groups not covered fully or not at all in the statistics on acquisitions of nationality in Ireland and the four Southern European states are former nationals and persons with an ethnic, cultural or descent-based affinity to the country. But the available information suggests that these groups often make up the bulk of persons acquiring nationality.

### **6.2.5 Acquisitions of nationality abroad and by new immigrants**

The statistics in some states are also incomplete because they do not include some or all acquisitions of nationality by persons residing abroad. In addition to children of nationals

---

<sup>13</sup> Information provided to the author by Guido Tintori, FIERI.

<sup>14</sup> See footnote **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

<sup>15</sup> This is a retroactive mode of acquisition by persons who can prove that an ancestor was registered on the municipal rolls of a Greek municipality or community.

born abroad who become nationals *iure sanguinis*, nationality can sometimes be acquired even – or only – in cases of residence abroad by the persons summarised in Table 6.2:

**Table 6.2: Persons who may acquire nationality after birth abroad (rules 2004)**

Group of persons	Mode	States
Children of nationals born abroad upon registration or declaration at a consulate or other authority	A01/A04	Belgium, Finland, Ireland, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom
Children born in the country (non-automatic <i>ius soli</i> )	A02/A05	Ireland, Portugal, United Kingdom
Children of nationals upon legitimation	A04/A09	Austria, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Sweden, United Kingdom
Children of nationals upon establishment of filiation and/or recognition of paternity	A04/A09	All states
Children of nationals acquiring nationality in some other way	A04/A09	Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Greece, Ireland, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom
Spouses of nationals	A08	Austria, Denmark, France, Germany, Ireland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom
Children adopted by nationals	A10	All states except Austria
Children of foreign nationals to whom the acquisition of nationality is extended	A14	Austria, Belgium, Luxembourg
Former nationals	A16	All states except Belgium and Denmark
Persons descended from former or deceased nationals or with a cultural affinity to the country	A12/A19	Germany, Greece, Ireland, Portugal, Spain
Persons with a special nationality status	A17b-i	United Kingdom
Persons presumed nationals for some time	A20	Belgium, France
Persons with other affinities to the state	A21	Austria, Germany, Italy
Persons with special achievements for the country	A24	Austria, France, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Portugal
Persons in the respective state's service	A25	France, Ireland, United Kingdom
Persons who acquire nationality under exceptional circumstances or for special reasons	A27	Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom

Acquisitions of nationality abroad by most of these persons will be rare but, at least in some states, the acquisition of nationality by children or spouses of nationals, by former nationals, by persons descended from nationals or by persons with some other cultural affinity will represent a sizable proportion of all acquisitions. However, in the statistics in Belgium, the Netherlands and the three Nordic states, which are produced on the basis of the population registers, nobody acquiring nationality abroad is counted. By contrast, in the statistics for all

other states, acquisitions of at least some persons living outside the respective country will be included, but they can only be specified in the minority of cases. In the statistics available for non-automatic modes in Ireland and Luxembourg, acquisitions of nationality abroad seem to be included, but they cannot be distinguished. The statistics in the United Kingdom count acquisitions by persons residing in a foreign country as well but, apart from the large group of residents of Hong Kong, none of them can be discerned in the published data.

The situation is again most complex in Southern Europe. The modes of naturalisation covered by the basic statistics in Greece all require residence in the country; it is not clear whether the available statistics of acquisitions by descendants of Greeks and by Pontians from the former Soviet Union include persons residing abroad. In any case, statistics for the major modes also or exclusively aimed at persons living outside Greece, i.e. former nationals (A16a-d) and *homogeneis* residing abroad (A19b), are lacking altogether. Secondly, available statistics in Italy and Portugal will include only very few, if any, persons who are naturalised abroad because of their achievements for the country (Italy: A24) or under exceptional circumstances (Spain: A16b, A27). Numbers for the various modes, however, which allow for very easy acquisition of nationality abroad by children of former nationals in Spain (A12a) and by former nationals (A16a+e) and persons born in areas of the former Austro-Hungarian empire and their children (A21) in Italy are not available. At least we have overall numbers of declaratory acquisitions by former nationals (A16h) and their (grand)children (A12d) in Italy for 1992-1997, but how many of these persons actually resided abroad is also unclear. Thirdly, we do not know whether the statistics available in Portugal contain any acquisitions abroad by naturalisation (especially by persons with Portuguese ancestry or persons belonging to a Portuguese community: A19) or by declaration by spouses of Portuguese nationals (A08). In any case, as mentioned in the previous section, no statistics exist for acquisitions by simple declaration by former nationals (A16a-d), who do not need to have their domicile in Portugal.

The only three countries in which acquisitions of nationality by persons residing outside the territory of the state are included in the statistics *and* can be identified within them (at least for some years) are Austria, France and Germany; however, the statistics available in France, in which acquisitions abroad are identifiable, do not include the large group of children to whom the acquisition of nationality is extended.

The inability to identify acquisitions of nationality abroad is also problematic for another reason. A common indicator for the liberality of states' regimes of nationality acquisition is the so-called 'naturalisation rate', i.e. the number of naturalisations in a given year divided by the foreign resident population at the beginning of that year. However, leaving more fundamental concerns aside,<sup>16</sup> international comparisons of naturalisation rates on the basis of available data can be misleading. Firstly, not just 'naturalisations', but *all* modes of acquisition after birth should be taken into account in this context because certain groups of persons who can only acquire nationality by naturalisation in some states may be able to become nationals by declaration or even *ex lege* in others. However, as we saw in previous sections, statistics on acquisitions of nationality are incomplete in the majority of states. Secondly – and this brings us back to this section's topic – acquisitions of nationality by persons residing abroad should not be taken into account when calculating these indicators. However, besides Belgium, the Netherlands and the Nordic states, where the statistics do not

---

<sup>16</sup> The fact that children of foreign nationals acquire nationality *ex lege* at birth in some states, while they can acquire it only after birth in others, leads to a problematic bias into international comparisons of 'naturalisation rates'. In addition, there are many more variables that influence 'naturalisation rates' besides the liberality or restrictiveness of states' nationality laws and administrative practices, including the duration of residence of foreign residents, motives of immigration, intentions to stay in the country, the nationalities of foreign residents and their rights in the country, political or economic developments in the country of origin, and familial, emotional, economic or other attachments to the country of origin; see also Waldrauch/Çınar (2002:268ff).

contain any acquisitions abroad, persons acquiring nationality abroad can only be excluded from the statistics in Austria, France and Germany. Thirdly, in principle we should exclude from the statistics not only persons acquiring nationality abroad before calculating these rates, but also persons who were not resident at the beginning of the year and acquired nationality upon or immediately after entering the country. However, statistics that can be broken down by duration of residence or in which numbers for modes of acquisition aimed at new immigrants persons are given separately are only available in one form or another in France, Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom.

### **6.2.6 Indistinguishable sub-groups**

In addition to the exact legal basis for acquisition, the country of residence of the person in question and his or her duration of residence, the available statistics on acquisitions of nationality often also lack other important break variables:

- Previous nationality: the available statistics cannot be disaggregated by the person's previous nationality in Greece or Ireland. Reasonably detailed statistics on former nationality are available in all other states, although in Italy the respective statistics could not be acquired from the Ministry directly and are not available for 2003 or 2004;
- Country of birth: whether persons acquiring nationality after birth were born in the country or abroad is interesting for the purposes of being able to compare the effects of *ius soli* regulations among countries. However, information on whether or not the person was born in the country or abroad is only available for the overall statistics in Austria and Finland. In France, a differentiation by country of birth is at least possible for all acquisitions except minors to whom acquisition is extended; for Belgium, statistics that can be broken down by country of birth could only be obtained for persons acquiring nationality by naturalisation (but not by declaration or otherwise);
- Region or province of residence: the region or province where the persons in question reside can be relevant for studying regional differences with respect to the administrative practices of granting nationality. However, the available statistics are broken down by this variable only in Austria (province), Belgium (province, district), Germany (federal state) and Sweden (region, municipality); in Greece, the statistics on naturalisations or acquisitions by definition by Pontian Greeks can be disaggregated by region and prefecture;
- Retention of former nationality: whether or not persons lose their previous nationality will mostly be of interest for states that normally require that the previous nationality be renounced before nationality can be acquired. Statistics of this kind could only be obtained for a few years for Germany (2000-2003) and the Netherlands (1996, 2001). However, estimates about the retention of former nationality also exist in Denmark. In Austria, this information is not available;
- Sex: interestingly, statistics broken down by the central variable 'sex' have not been published and/or are not available in Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Spain or the United Kingdom; in Belgium, separate numbers for men and women can only be produced for acquisitions by naturalisation;

## 6.2.7 Recommendations with respect to data collection

It should be obvious by this point that statistics regarding acquisitions of nationality are in desperate need of improvement.<sup>17</sup> We would like to make a few recommendations concerning possible ways to improve the situation, both for the sake of having statistics of a high quality within states, and to increase the international comparability of statistics.

The highest level of comparability of statistics could be achieved if states introduced a *centralised overall account of all acquisitions of nationality*. This should include acquisitions at birth and after birth, *ex lege* acquisitions (some states call these ‘attributions of nationality’) and non-automatic acquisitions requiring certain actions by a public authority and/or the persons concerned, awards administered at the national as well as at the regional or local level or by consular missions abroad, and acquisitions by persons with residence in the country as well as by persons residing abroad.<sup>18</sup> In addition, statistics should also cover establishments of nationality, i.e. procedures in which the authorities determine that a person who was treated as a foreign national up to this point in fact holds nationality (e.g. because new information becomes available, such as that the person is descended from a national) and which mostly have retroactive effect. There are two reasons for counting establishments of nationality of this kind as well: firstly, they have the same effect as acquisitions ‘proper’ because a person who was viewed as not holding nationality is a national *ex post*; and, secondly, whereas persons in one state may only have to have their nationality determined, persons in other states in exactly the same situation may have to undergo an official acquisition procedure. The next- best solution would be to count all non-automatic and automatic acquisitions after birth, including those by declaration, notification or similar, immediately after birth. In other words, this would mean that only *ex lege* acquisitions at birth *iure sanguinis* or *iure soli* would not be counted in the statistics.

All central, regional, local and/or consular authorities responsible for making decisions with respect to awards of nationality or that register acquisitions or establish that persons are in fact nationals should have an *obligation to report persons effectively acquiring nationality to a central authority*. This and – to avoid confusion – only this authority, preferably the national statistical institute, then collates and publishes overall statistics. In states where existing statistics on acquisitions or ‘changes into nationality/citizenship’ are produced on the basis of population registers, these overall accounts of all forms of acquisition can build on the existing statistics, but they do have to be supplemented by *ex lege* acquisitions of nationality at birth and acquisitions abroad. The recording of automatic acquisitions *iure sanguinis* abroad will always be incomplete because consular missions will not always find out about the birth of a child. But, unless all forms of *ex lege* acquisition by persons with residence abroad are replaced by non-automatic modes of acquisition by declaration, registration, notification or naturalisation, this problem cannot be solved.

The *units counted* should be persons actually acquiring nationality, not administrative procedures or cases or oaths taken. The *date of counting* should be the day when nationality is effectively acquired, and not – if different – the date when the authority makes the decision or when the person takes an oath or registers the acquisition of nationality. This also means that awards of nationality that are conditional upon the persons meeting certain conditions, especially renunciation of their previous nationality or registration of the acquisition with the central registry, should not be counted in the statistics in the year of granting, but when nationality is effectively acquired. For persons whose status as a national is established after

---

<sup>17</sup> Quality and comparability have repeatedly come under fire in the past: see e.g. Salt et al. (2000:163f).

<sup>18</sup> This last recommendation is not shared by Cantisani and Greco (2006b). The reason for this is that their main concern is the usability of statistics on acquisitions of nationality for the purposes of studies concerning issues of migration and the foreign population, whereas we are interested in the acquisition of nationality as such.

having been previously viewed as a foreign national as well as persons acquiring nationality retroactively via other modes, both the date of the administrative decision and the date as of which the person in question is legally viewed as having been a national should be recorded.

Finally, it is of the utmost importance that *certain characteristics be recorded*. The most important of these is 1) the exact article in the law on which acquisition is based, including possible sub-articles (paragraphs, points, sub-sections, etc.), or regulations in administrative guidelines, circulars, decrees that were relevant to the acquisition of nationality by the person concerned.<sup>19</sup> Furthermore, 2) the date on which the acquisition of nationality becomes effective and, for cases of retroactive acquisition or establishment of nationality, 3) the date when the decision on the person's nationality status is made (even if, legally speaking, the person has already been treated as a national since a certain date in the past) should also be registered. Further indispensable variables to be recorded are 4) the country of residence (at least domestic or foreign), 5) the previous nationality, 6) the country of birth (at least domestic or foreign), 7) the duration of residence (according to legal regulations), 8) the sex and 9) the age (better still, date of birth) of the person concerned. In federal states or states where local or regional authorities are (at least partially) responsible for decisions on nationality matters, 10) the region or province where the person resides or where his/her case is decided should also be registered. In states that do require that persons renounce their foreign nationality before they can become nationals, 11) whether or not the person was allowed to retain his or her previous nationality should also be recorded. Finally, to allow for an analysis of the duration of acquisition procedures, non-automatic modes of acquisition should also record 12) when the person actually applied for naturalisation or made a declaration (or similar) of acquisition of nationality.

The institution collecting the statistics should publish detailed statistics, broken down into these variables. In addition, non-aggregated, micro-level data on acquisitions of nationality should be made available to researchers for in-depth analysis. Irrespective of whether only aggregate statistics or also micro-level data is made available, detailed technical meta-information on the content of the datasets is crucial in order to interpret and analyse it.

In addition, the transparency of acquisition procedures would be significantly improved if not only statistics on acquisition of nationality, but also separate *statistics on nationality procedures* were produced.<sup>20</sup> Such statistics could be used to gain additional information on the average duration of procedures, backlogs of applications/declarations and the number of and reasons for denied applications/declarations. Statistics of this kind are currently available (in varying degrees of detail) in only five states (see section 6.3.2). Again, what should be counted in these statistics are not procedures, but persons whose applications for nationality or declarations of acquisition of nationality have been decided (positively or negatively) in a given year or are still pending. The variables to be recorded would be more or less the same as those in acquisition statistics, except that the exact article of acquisition would be the article based on which the application or declaration is made. In addition, when acquisitions are denied, the reasons for the denial should also be recorded and, for acquisitions dependent on the loss of the previous nationality, not only the date of the final award should be registered, but also the date of the provisional award, which is still dependent on loss of the previous nationality: this would allow us to gain insights into the actual duration procedures of release from nationality in the countries of origin.

---

<sup>19</sup> For example, the acquisition may be based on the general rules for naturalisation, but the duration of residence is reduced on the basis of a special clause because the person is a recognised refugee.

<sup>20</sup> Technically, both types of information can be produced by a single sufficiently sophisticated data management system. Data management systems used to process asylum applications and to produce detailed asylum statistics in countries such as the Netherlands or Germany could serve as a model.

All the recommendations above were made with a view to improving statistics on nationality acquisition as such. However, as the European Union has acknowledged in various documents,<sup>21</sup> nationality is also an important instrument for integration. In order to test whether naturalisation actually has an effect on socio-economic integration, sufficient information about the past and present socio-economic situations of persons acquiring nationality is necessary. Studies in this context could best be carried out on the basis of register data (population registers, if possible linked to registers containing information on employment, education, etc.). In any case, such registers should contain all the variables listed above, as well as information about the past residence status of those involved. Such register-based data could then be used to calculate even more accurate rates of acquisition of nationality because the number of acquisitions could be related to the number of foreign nationals actually qualifying for acquisition on the basis of their residence status and duration of residence.<sup>22</sup>

### **6.3 Acquisition of nationality: statistical developments**

After this necessarily lengthy methodological introduction, we now turn to the actual numbers of persons acquiring nationality and their development over time. Since no statistics on acquisitions of nationality at birth are available for most countries, we concentrate on acquisitions of nationality after birth. We thus look firstly at statistics for the total number of acquisitions after birth and rates of acquisitions of nationality. Subsequently, we will try to break down the total numbers by modes of acquisition, by former nationality and by sex. Finally, we turn to statistics for the retention of previous nationality in states where its loss is normally required before nationality can be acquired. Due to a lack of space, we refrain from any analysis of other sub-groups or break variables (especially age and duration of residence).

#### **6.3.1 Total number of acquisitions of nationality after birth**

When looking at the overall statistics on acquisitions of nationality, we have to bear in mind what the statistics actually contain and what they do not contain. In order to be able subsequently to calculate rates of acquisition of nationality (i.e. what are often, but misleadingly, called ‘naturalisation rates’), the available statistics are broken down as far as possible by whether the acquisition occurred in that country or abroad; we also report separately acquisitions by persons who immigrated shortly beforehand and *ex lege* acquisitions that are not normally included in the statistics. But, as can be seen from the explanations in Table 6.4 and the notes to Table 6.3 itself, we can only partly meet these standards. For Belgium, Denmark, Finland, the Netherlands and Sweden, the only statistics available are those for all acquisitions of nationality after birth (*ex lege* or non-automatic) by

---

<sup>21</sup> ‘Naturalisation is a strategy, which can help to promote integration and which Member States should consider when granting residence to immigrants and refugees. The Commission welcomes the relaxation of the conditions to be fulfilled by applicants for nationality which has taken place in a number of Member States in recent years.’ Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Council and the Committee of the Regions on immigration, integration and employment, COM (2003) 336 final, Brussels, 3 June 2003, p. 22 (section 3.4). See also the ‘Common Basic Principles for Immigrant Integration Policy in the European Union’ (JHA Council, 14615/04 (Press 321), 19 November 2004), especially the sixth principle: ‘Access for immigrants to institutions, as well as to public and private goods and services, on a basis equal to national citizens and in a non-discriminatory way is a critical foundation for better integration.’

<sup>22</sup> For a methodological discussion of such a cohort based approach from a demographic perspective see Perrin (2006).

persons with residence in the country. For France, Luxembourg, the United Kingdom, as well as Germany before 2000, acquisitions abroad can only partly be identified, but the available statistics in these countries at least cover all non-automatic acquisitions of nationality and, for some non-automatic modes, statistics or at least estimates exist. The main problem with respect to the statistics in Greece, Ireland, Italy, Portugal and Spain is that they do not even cover all non-automatic modes of acquisition, let alone *ex lege* acquisitions and, in four of these states, some acquisitions abroad may be included in the statistics, but cannot be separately identified. The only country where numbers for acquisitions abroad can easily be given for any year is Austria, but the available statistics do not cover automatic modes.

Due to the differences in the size of the foreign population in the EU15 states, it obviously makes little sense to compare absolute numbers of acquisitions of nationality. But how have the numbers developed over time? If we concentrate on the statistics in section 1 of Table 6.3 and take 1985 or 1986 as the base<sup>23</sup>, we can conclude that the biggest changes have occurred in Germany: naturalisations of foreign nationals who are not ethnic Germans increased more than thirteen-fold from 1985 to 2000! After 2000, which was the first year in which the new nationality law was in force and in which native-born minors could also apply for easy naturalisation under a transitional regulation, the numbers dropped again, but were still more than nine times higher in 2004 than in 1985. After Germany, the most significant changes occurred in Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland and Spain, where the number of acquisitions of nationality after birth were six to seven times higher in 2000 or later than in 1985 or 1986. However, whereas the number of acquisitions increased more or less steadily until 2003 in Austria and Spain, the development was much more volatile in the other three states with peaks in 1985, 1992 and 2000/2001 in Belgium, in 2000 and 2002 in Denmark, and in 1999 and 2004 in Finland. Naturalisations in Italy quintupled between 1985 and 2003, whereas in the Netherlands acquisitions of nationality increased by almost 350 per cent between 1986 and 1996, but they have dropped almost steadily ever since. With the number of acquisitions ‘only’ at best tripling after 1985/1986, the changes were less marked in the remaining states; with the exception of Sweden, the highest number of persons acquiring nationality in these states was also observed in 2000 or later, as in most countries. France and Luxembourg experienced the least variation, with the number of acquisitions never reaching double the figure for 1985 in any year since then.

---

<sup>23</sup> For Belgium and the Netherlands, 1986 was used as the base year because in both states the number of acquisitions was unusually high in 1985, when more inclusive nationality laws entered into force. Ireland is excluded from this comparison because statistics including post-nuptial declarations are available only from 1997 onwards.

**Table 6.3: Acquisitions of nationality after birth 1985-2004**

	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	
<b>Section 1: Acquisitions of nationality after birth: acquisitions abroad excluded where possible</b>																					
<b>AUT</b>	7,308	8,060	6,616	7,314	7,305	8,980	11,137	11,656	14,131	15,275	14,366	15,627	15,792	17,786	24,678	24,320	31,731	36,011	44,694	41,645	
<b>BEL</b>	83,421	9,621	9,638	8,376	8,797	8,657	8,457	46,368	16,376	25,787	26,129	24,581	31,687	34,034	24,196	61,980	62,982	46,417	33,709	34,754	
<b>DEN</b>	3,310	3,623	3,765	3,747	3,258	3,028	5,490	5,118	5,136	5,767	5,266	7,289	5,487	10,277	12,478	19,323	11,892	16,662	6,583	14,976	
<b>FIN</b>	1,138	1,111	1,173	1,063	1,504	899	1,236	876	839	651	668	981	1,439	4,017	4,730	2,977	2,720	3,049	4,526	6,880	
<b>FRA</b>	82,700	76,300	56,900	74,000	79,582	85,951	92,359	92,831	92,993	124,083	89,570	107,160	113,283	120,650	144,102	145,886	123,967	124,341	140,652	N/A	
<b>GER</b>	13,894	14,030	14,029	16,660	17,742	20,237	27,295	42,110	51,898	61,709	71,981	86,356	82,913	106,790	143,267	185,489	176,320	152,327	136,851	123,132	
<b>GRE</b>	1,609	1,204	2,216	1,571	1,217	1,090	886	1,204	1,804	324	3,717	1,404	2,314	2,479	1,965	1,007	1,774	2,141	1,896	N/A	
<b>IRE</b>	253	271	545	333	299	179	188	150	133	175	355	226	1,305	1,569	1,438	1,143	2,431	2,817	3,993	3,784	
<b>ITA</b>	2,582	3,867	2,953	4,673	4,151	4,045	4,148	4,395	5,065	6,613	7,445	8,823	9,787	12,013	11,334	9,555	10,380	10,681	13,444	11,934	
<b>LUX</b>	589	570	500	762	604	748	582	609	678	739	802	779	749	631	549	684	496	754	785	941	
<b>NED</b>	34,671	18,758	19,258	9,114	28,730	12,794	29,112	36,237	43,069	49,448	71,444	82,687	59,831	59,173	62,093	49,968	46,667	45,321	28,799	26,173	
<b>POR</b>	875	476	76	861	1,412	846	1,139	1,706	1,177	1,704	1,221	1,098	N/A	N/A	1,620	1,981	2,704	2,541	2,463	N/A	
<b>SPA</b>	3,710	5,121	9,085	8,137	5,918	7,033	3,752	5,280	8,411	7,801	6,756	8,435	10,311	13,177	16,384	11,998	16,743	21,810	26,556	N/A	
<b>SWE</b>	20,498	20,695	19,958	17,966	17,552	16,770	27,663	29,326	42,659	35,084	31,993	25,552	28,867	46,502	37,777	43,474	36,399	37,792	33,222	28,893	
<b>UK</b>	53,765	45,872	64,876	64,584	117,129	57,271	58,642	42,243	45,791	44,033	40,516	43,069	37,010	53,934	54,902	82,210	90,295	120,145	125,535	140,790	
<b>Section 2: Acquisitions of nationality after birth: acquisitions by newly-immigrated ethnic Germans and Greeks</b>																					
<b>GER</b>	21,019	22,616	23,781	30,123	50,794	81,140	114,335	136,894	147,545	197,461	241,625	216,474	195,749	184,541	104,939	95,615	98,484	91,416	72,885	59,093	
<b>GRE</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	72	1,693	10,106	11,328	20,628	15,597	10,747	10,850	4,878	6,479	11,167	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
<b>Section 3: Acquisitions of nationality after birth: acquisitions abroad</b>																					
<b>AUT</b>	1,180	1,955	1,496	918	1,165	218	257	264	271	995	943	616	482	535	354	325	349	371	418	529	
<b>FRA</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2,418	2,549	2,615	2,469	2,007	2,258	2,842	2,780	3,003	3,111	3,422	4,140	3,581	3,752	3,988	N/A	
<b>GER</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,199	1,778	2,220	3,880	4,021	
<b>ITA</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	163,756						N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>LUX</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	27	21	19	15	16	15	10	13	11	9	7	
<b>UK</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	41,758	5,872	25,709	5,511	3,285	2,728	726	350	365	200,000	175	85	

**Notes to section 1:** see Table 6.4 below.

**Notes to section 2:** *Germany:* Naturalisations (1985-1999) and *ex lege* acquisitions (since 2000) by ethnic German (*Spätaussiedler*) from the former Soviet Union. Numbers for 1999 do not include *ex lege* acquisitions by *Spätaussiedler* from August to December. *Greece:* Acquisitions by Pontian Greeks from the former Soviet Union by definition or naturalisation.

**Notes to section 3:** *Austria:* Acquisitions by naturalisation, declaration or notification abroad. *France:* Acquisitions by naturalisation, reintegration or declaration abroad, excluding *ex lege* extensions of acquisition of nationality to minor children abroad. *Germany:* Naturalisations abroad (2000-2003). *Italy:* Acquisitions abroad by simple declaration by former nationals and their children or grandchildren in the years 1992-1997. Numbers for other acquisitions abroad or by new immigrants, esp. by former nationals, are not available. *Luxembourg:* Acquisitions by naturalisation or declaration by former nationals (numbers may include persons with residence in Luxembourg). *United Kingdom:* British citizenship granted in Hong Kong (1993-2001, 2003-2004) and estimate of British Overseas Territories Citizens who became British citizens *ex lege* on 26 February 2002. *Other countries:* no data available.

**Sources:** France: Ministry of Social Affairs; Germany: national statistical institute, Federal Administrative Office (*Spätaussiedler*); Greece: Ministry of the Interior; Italy: Ministry of the Interior, Ministry of External Affairs (acquisitions abroad); Ireland: Ministry of Justice, Equality and Law Reform; Portugal: Central Registers Office; Spain: Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs; United Kingdom: Home Office; all other states: national statistical institutes.

**Table 6.4: Explanation of data in section 1 of Table 6.3**

	Acquisitions covered	Acquisitions abroad: covered or not covered?	Acquisitions not covered	
			<i>Ex lege</i> acquisitions	Non-automatic acquisitions
<b>AUT</b>	Naturalisations, declarations & notifications	Acquisitions abroad excluded	By legitimation, establishment of filiation, recognition of paternity or taking up office at an Austrian university	Naturalisations & acquisitions by declaration or notification abroad
<b>BEL</b>	All (non-)automatic acquisitions after birth	Not included	All acquisitions abroad	All acquisitions abroad
<b>DEN</b>	All (non-)automatic acquisitions after birth	Not included	All acquisitions abroad	All acquisitions abroad
<b>FIN</b>	All (non-)automatic acquisitions after birth	Not included	All acquisitions abroad	All acquisitions abroad
<b>FRA</b>	Acquisitions by naturalisation, declaration, reintegration (reacquisition) & by reaching majority (estimates for 1985-1993 & 1998)	Known acquisitions abroad excluded (1989-2003), but some children to whom acquisition is extended may still be included	By establishment of filiation, recognition of paternity, adoption	None
<b>GER</b>	Naturalisations, ex. (Spät)Aussiedler (1985-1999)	Acquisitions abroad since 2000 excluded	By adoption, establishment of filiation, recognition of paternity, & ex lege acquisitions by (Spät)Aussiedler from former Soviet Union (since 2000)	Naturalisations abroad since 2000 & by (Spät)Aussiedler from former Soviet Union before 2000
<b>GRE</b>	Naturalisations based on Article 5	Not included (naturalisations based on Art. 5 require residence)	By legitimation, establishment of filiation, recognition of paternity, adoption, taking vows as monk at Mount Athos or through military service	Acquisitions by definition, declaration or option by former nationals & their descendants; naturalisations by Pontian Greeks or other <i>homogeneis</i> or for special achievements
<b>IRE</b>	1997-2004: naturalisations & post-nuptial declarations; 1985-1996: only naturalisations	Included	By adoption, establishment of filiation, recognition of paternity	Acquisitions iure soli, re-acquisitions by former nationals born in Ireland & 1985-1996 post-nuptial declarations
<b>ITA</b>	Naturalisations based on Articles 5 & 9	Few naturalisations abroad of persons with special achievements may be included	By adoption, establishment of filiation, recognition of paternity, extension of acquisition to children, residence by former nationals or entering public service	By declaration by former nationals, their descendants & other groups of persons
<b>LUX</b>	Naturalisations & options; 1985-1992: incl. co-naturalised children	Few naturalisations abroad of persons with special achievements may be included	By adoption, establishment of filiation, recognition of paternity & since 1993 extension of acquisition to minor children	Re-acquisitions by former nationals by naturalisation or declaration
<b>NED</b>	All (non-)automatic acquisitions after birth	Not included	All acquisitions abroad	All acquisitions abroad
<b>POR</b>	Naturalisations, declarations by spouses of nationals & by certain children of nationals	Declarations abroad by spouses & naturalisations abroad for achievements may be included	By adoption, establishment of filiation, recognition of paternity & if renunciation was never registered	Declarations by children of nationals born abroad, by children born in Portugal & by former nationals
<b>SPA</b>	Acquisitions by residence & naturalisation	Few naturalisations abroad in exceptional situations may be included	By adoption, establishment of filiation, recognition of paternity after 10 years as presumed national	By option by former nationals, their descendants & other groups of persons
<b>SWE</b>	All (non-)automatic acquisitions after birth	Not included	All acquisitions abroad	All acquisitions abroad
<b>UK</b>	Naturalisations & registrations	Included, but not by residents of Hong Kong	By legitimation, establishment of filiation, recognition of paternity, adoption & by persons with certain special nationality statuses at certain points in time	Acquisitions of British citizenship by residents of Hong Kong

### **6.3.2 Explanations for statistical developments of acquisitions of nationality**

How can we explain the rising numbers of acquisitions of nationality? There are three main explanatory factors: firstly, the growing inclination of foreign residents to acquire nationality (for whatever reasons), resulting in rising numbers of applications or declarations of acquisition of nationality; secondly, legal changes that liberalise access to nationality; and, thirdly, administrative reforms that speed up procedures (e.g. providing more staff or streamlining administrative operations). It is difficult to test the influence of increasing numbers of applications and declarations on the actual acquisitions of nationality, especially given that the data in question are very scarce: in fact only Finland, Ireland, the Netherlands, Portugal and the United Kingdom have application/declaration statistics but, in all cases, these statistics are only available for a limited number of years (see the tables in section 6.6). In addition, due to the fact that administrative procedures take some time, increased numbers of applications and declarations normally only have a delayed influence on the statistics for actual acquisitions – but the duration of the procedures can vary and even the average duration is usually unknown.

In general, regardless of whether foreign residents are eligible for naturalisation or make a declaration of nationality acquisition usually only after some years of residence and that administrative procedures take some time, it is nevertheless plausible that a growing foreign population will lead to higher numbers of acquisitions of nationality – unless access to nationality is deliberately made more difficult. In addition, in most states an increase in the foreign population has in fact been associated with surging figures for acquisitions of nationality: the correlation between the number of foreign residents and acquisitions of nationality in Austria, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Ireland<sup>24</sup>, Italy, Portugal, Spain and the United Kingdom is between 0.74 and 0.97 (error probability: 0.000). The correlation is slightly lower in Sweden (0.63) and the Netherlands (0.60), but still highly significant (error probability below 0.00). In other words, even if governments have intended to restrict acquisitions of nationality in these eleven states, the sheer fact that more foreign nationals met the conditions of eligibility and applied for acquisition of nationality led to an increase in the number of acquisitions. By contrast, the correlation between the foreign population and acquisitions of nationality in Luxembourg is not significant (correlation: 0.39; error probability: 0.09), which indicates that deliberate efforts to keep the number of acquisitions as low as possible, despite a growing foreign population, played an important role in this country. In Belgium, no significant relation between the two statistics exists (correlation: 0.13; error probability: 0.60), which points to the importance of other explanatory factors, especially efforts to reduce the number of foreign residents by giving them nationality. In France,<sup>25</sup> the relationship is actually the reverse (correlation: -0.88; error probability: 0.000), which leads us to conclude that the acquisition of nationality in France outweighs foreign population growth by immigration and births. As a result of the poor quality and scarcity of statistics on the foreign population in Greece, no correlation could be calculated for this country. But, on the basis of the available information,<sup>26</sup> we can safely say that the foreign population has increased in Greece, as in other Southern European states, since the mid 1980s. The absence of a correlation between the stock of foreign population and

---

<sup>24</sup> Due to incomplete data, the correlation for Ireland could only be calculated for the years 1997-2004.

<sup>25</sup> Due to the fact that statistics on the foreign population only exist for the years in which censuses have been conducted (1982, 1990, 1999), we extrapolated the values for the years in between. The stock of foreign residents for the years after 1999 could not be estimated, which is why these years were not taken into account.

<sup>26</sup> See, for example, Baldwin-Edwards and Kyriakou (2004:3 ff.).

naturalisations of foreign residents is therefore plausible because the figures have actually fallen since the mid 1990s. This result fits the interpretation in the Greek country report that Greece in fact pursues a ‘non naturalisation policy’.

Much more interesting from a political point of view, though, is the question: What influence did policy changes have on the number of acquisitions of nationality by foreign residents? Did administrative reforms play a role as well? The balance is mixed in this respect. In a few states, major reforms of nationality law had a significant impact on the statistics:<sup>27</sup>

- As intended, the reforms in Belgium in 1984, 1991 and 2000 all increased the number of acquisitions. After the reform of 1984, however, the figures only went up to a peak of more than 83,000 in 1985 because tens of thousands of children of dual-national couples became Belgians simultaneously. Between 1986 and 1991, however, the numbers remained consistently at about 8,500 because the legal conditions and administrative barriers (fees, long procedures) for becoming Belgian were still high. By contrast, the 1991 and 2000 reforms, which facilitated nationality acquisition for the second and third (1991) and then for the first generation of immigrants (2000), had more lasting effects: in the first years after the reforms, the numbers peaked again at 46,000 and 63,000, but the subsequent decline did not bring the statistics down to pre-reform levels. The new right to become Belgian by declaration after seven years of residence accounted for about one third of all acquisitions after 2001, whereas naturalisations not only decreased in absolute terms, but their share of all acquisitions plummeted from 33 per cent in 1998 to 12 per cent in 2003, but then rose again to 19 per cent in 2004 (see Table 6.11).<sup>28</sup> The new residence-based declaration also seems to have had a lasting impact on most other declaratory modes of acquisition, where numbers also declined. The exception to this rule is acquisition by declaration by spouses of persons who are or who become nationals: their share has risen from 7 per cent in 2001 to almost 15 per cent in 2004;
- The introduction of the requirement that proof of knowledge of the language and society be demonstrated by certificates in Denmark in 2002 also had the intended effect of reducing the number of acquisitions of nationality, which had reached a high of more than 19,000 in 2000. In 2003, i.e. the first full year in which the new rules were in force, only about 6,500 acquired Danish nationality, because many cases had been put on hold until applicants had passed the necessary exams and because many more applications were refused on the grounds of a lack of knowledge of language and society (see Table 6.24). The number of acquisitions rose again to about 15,000 in 2004, which was mainly due to delayed acquisitions by persons who had to attend courses first. It can be expected, though, that in the years to come the tougher requirements will keep the number of naturalisations – which, together with extensions of naturalisations to children, make up the bulk of all acquisitions of nationality after birth (see Table 6.12) – below pre-2002 levels.
- The first sharp increase in the figures for acquisitions of nationality in Finland, from about 1,000 in 1996 to more than 4,000 in 1998, was mainly the result of the influx of immigrants (mainly refugees) in the early 1990s: they had met the residence requirements for naturalisation in 1995-1996 and their applications were finally decided in 1998 and 1999 (the average processing time being three years). But the second major shift in the statistics was clearly caused by a policy change: in mid-2003, Finland unconditionally accepted multiple nationality. Acquisitions of nationality by foreign residents in Finland increased by almost 50 per cent to approx. 4,500 in 2003 and further surged to almost

<sup>27</sup> See also the sections on statistical developments in the country reports in this context.

<sup>28</sup> Another reason for this seems to have been a more restrictive policy of naturalisation: the percentage of declined applications reached all time highs of 41% and 26% in 2003 and 2004 (see Table 6.23).

6,900 in 2004.<sup>29</sup> The raising of the residence requirement for naturalisation from five to six years, which also occurred in 2003, therefore seems to have been of little practical importance;

- Germany facilitated naturalisation by long-term residents and foreign youths in 1991 and 1993 and both reforms left their mark on the statistics: naturalisations of non-ethnic German foreign nationals more than tripled from approx. 20,000 in 1990 to almost 62,000 in 1994 and increased steadily after that to 143,000 in 1999. The new nationality law that came into force in 2000 further boosted the number of naturalisations but a large share of this increase was due to a transitional entitlement to naturalisation for native-born foreign minors that was limited to the year 2000. After that, the figures decreased again and, in 2003, returned to pre-1999 levels but they are still well above the level of 1998 and earlier. The importance of residence-based naturalisations based on entitlement (excluding those of (*Spät*)*Aussiedler*) clearly increased after 1999: their share rose from an average of around 40 per cent in the 1990s to 66 per cent in 2004 (see Table 6.14);
- The first main liberalisation of Luxembourg's nationality law in late 1986 (option to acquire nationality for spouses of nationals, reduction of minimum age for naturalisation from 25 to eighteen) only led to a temporary increase in acquisitions of nationality to about 750 in 1988 and 1990 (from 500-590 in 1985-1987). The reform of 2001, which reduced the minimum residence requirement for naturalisation from ten to five years (the condition of proof of a basic knowledge of Luxembourgish, however, was introduced at the same time), had a more substantial effect: between 2001 and 2004, acquisitions of nationality almost doubled and reached an all-time high of 941. But, despite the shorter residence conditions, the share of naturalisations among all acquisitions of nationality after birth has only changed little with the reform: they still make up only around 45 per cent of all acquisitions in the statistics, with the rest mainly being acquisitions by option (see Table 6.18). It remains to be seen whether the planned abolition of the required renunciation of a foreign nationality before being able to become a Luxembourg national will have a more dramatic impact;
- The Netherlands is the only state for which we can test the impact both of reforms that liberalised the acquisition of nationality and reforms that made it more difficult. The abolition of the condition that previous nationality be renounced before naturalisation in late 1991 clearly increased the number of acquisitions of nationality: the highest number of acquisitions of Dutch nationality, i.e. 83,000, occurred in 1996, which was an increase of more than 400 per cent compared to 1990. The reintroduction of the requirement that a foreign nationality be given up before naturalisation in 1997 had a certain negative impact on the number of acquisitions of nationality, but did not reduce it to pre-1991 levels because the new rules provided for more exceptions. However, the impact on applicants from states where renunciation of nationality is in principle possible (e.g. Turkey), was considerable, whereas it was zero for nationals of states that make renunciation of nationality practically impossible (e.g. Morocco). The introduction of the naturalisation test in April 2003 had a much more dramatic effect: even though the new law was in force for only nine months of 2003, acquisitions of nationality dropped by more than 16,000, or 36 per cent, in that year and, due to the drastically reduced number of applications for naturalisations (see Table 6.28), the decline can be expected to be even more dramatic from 2004 onwards. The share of naturalisations in all acquisitions also fell below 90 per cent for the first time since the late 1980s and the share for acquisitions by option increased to 12 per cent (see Table 6.19).

---

<sup>29</sup> In addition, what is not represented in the statistics is the fact that in 2003 and 2004 a large number of former Finnish nationals made declarations to reacquire nationality from abroad (transitional mode A16e).

In a few other states, reforms did not have the expected or intended impact or no clearly discernable effect at all on the statistics for acquisitions of nationality by foreign residents:

- The reform of Austria's nationality law that came into force in 1999 brought about new (language skills) or tightened (integrity and good character) conditions for naturalisation and aimed to restrict naturalisations of applicants with less than ten years of residence. However, from 1998 to 1999, naturalisations increased by about 7,000 to 24,700 and rose even further after that to a high of 45,000 in 2003. The share of facilitated naturalisations that are independent of a family member becoming or already being an Austrian national did in fact fall from 15 per cent in 1998 to less than 4 per cent in 2003 and 2004 (see Table 6.10).<sup>30</sup> But the total number of naturalisations nevertheless rose further because most foreign nationals had already resided in Austria for more than ten years at that time or were family members of those who had: the share of regular naturalisations after ten years of residence (mode A06a) rose from an average of 24 per cent in 1995-1999 to a maximum of 35 per cent in 2003 and the share of co-naturalised children (A14) increased from 33 per cent to 38 per cent. In 2004, naturalisation figures started to decline again, which is mainly the result of two facts: most foreign nationals who meet the general conditions and intended to naturalise already seem to have become nationals and Austria has received high numbers of immigrants in recent years,<sup>31</sup> most of whom are family members of (naturalised) Austrians or nationals of EEA states; these two groups either do not meet the conditions yet (family members) or mostly do not plan to naturalise because they have a relatively good legal status anyway (EEA nationals);
- The numbers of naturalisations in Greece have not been significantly influenced by legislative changes: the only two major reforms since 1985 that could leave a mark on the available statistics, i.e. raising the residence requirement from eight to ten years in 1993 and the possible exemption of spouses of Greek nationals from the condition of ten years of residence in 1997, did not have any traceable effect on the statistics (especially bearing in mind that procedures in Greece may take years or even decades). The statistics have been rather erratic over the past two decades, with annual figures fluctuating between 300 (1994) and 3,700 (1995). This leads us to conclude that the number of naturalisations depends more on administrative practices that are not easily discernible to outsiders. In any case, we can add that more than 50 per cent of all persons becoming nationals via the few modes of naturalisation covered by the statistics were of Greek descent (*homogeneis*) during the 1980s and 1990s. Only since 1998 have *allogeneis* made up 54 per cent to 79 per cent of all naturalised foreign residents (see Table 6.15);
- The rules for acquisition of nationality by naturalisation or declaration in Ireland remained more or less unchanged until 2002, when the right of spouses of Irish nationals to become Irish by declaration was abolished. After that, only spouses who married before 2002 still held this right until November 2005. However, the numbers of post-nuptial declarations actually increased steadily from 1,400 in 2001 to a peak of almost 2,500 in 2004. Even though we lack reliable information in this respect, this boost in the number of declarations can most probably be explained by the fact that eligible persons want to make use of the right to acquire nationality before it is abolished. In parallel, the number of naturalisations increased much more steeply from between 100-400 in the late 1990s to 1,000-1,700 annually since 2001, which also led to an increase in their share of all acquisitions represented in the statistics from 10-30 per cent in 1997-2000 to 35-47 per cent in 2001-2004 (see Table 6.16). A reason for the sharp increase in naturalisations between 2000 and 2001 is not just the fact that applications surged around this time (see

<sup>30</sup> Facilitated independent naturalisations are modes A05a, A06b, A16a, A18, A21a+b, A22 and A24a+b.

<sup>31</sup> The average annual migratory balance of foreign nationals was 9,800 between 1995 and 1998, increased to 23,500 in the years 1999 to 2001, and surged to 55,000 in 2002-2004.

Table 6.27), but also that procedures were streamlined and additional staff provided in 2001;<sup>32</sup>

- The reform of Italy's nationality law in 1992, which raised the residence requirement for regular naturalisation from five to ten years, did not reduce the number of acquisitions of nationality in the years that followed.<sup>33</sup> On the contrary, from 4,400 in 1992, the figures rose almost steadily in the years that followed and reached their peak of almost 13,500 in 2003. But it must be added that, vis-à-vis persons with no family or cultural ties to the country, Italy also follows a policy of keeping naturalisations to a minimum. This is expressed in the available statistics: only since 2003 have naturalisations by foreign nationals who are not related to Italians made up 16 per cent of all naturalisations, while for most of the period since 1985, around 90 per cent of all naturalised aliens were spouses of Italians (see Table 6.17). The increase in naturalisations was thus caused mainly by applicants married to Italians. Together with the broad administrative discretion of the Minister of the Interior, the tougher residence requirement may therefore have contributed to curbing naturalisations despite the growing foreign population. It has to be pointed out again that a large proportion of acquisitions of nationality by former nationals and their descendants, including many by persons with residence in Italy, are not covered in the statistics (see Table 6.4 for details);
- In Sweden, the main reform since 1985 of relevance to naturalisation – this represents the vast majority of acquisitions of nationality after birth (see Table 6.21) – was the reform of 2001, which permitted the retention of a foreign nationality when acquiring Swedish nationality. One could have expected this relaxation of the rules to increase the number of acquisitions, but the reverse happened: from 43,500 in 2000, numbers fell to below 29,000 in 2004; without the extra personnel provided to reduce the backlog of cases in 2002 the decrease might even have been more marked. In any case, as can be deduced from Table 6.30, a stricter practice of dealing with applications for naturalisation was not responsible for the declining numbers of acquisitions of nationality: the percentage of refused applications for naturalisation has remained more or less unchanged since 2001. One effect of the new law was that, because of the extended possibilities for various groups of persons to acquire nationality by notification (partly on the basis of transitional rules), the share of this type of acquisition rose from around 1 per cent in 2000 to more than 10 per cent in 2002 and 2003 (the effect abated slightly in 2004).

The effects of changes in the law in France had mixed results. The reform that came into force in 1994 was intended to limit the acquisition of nationality by youths born in France by replacing the *ex lege* acquisition upon reaching majority age with an entitlement to become French by declaration. In addition, it tightened the conditions for spouses of nationals to acquire nationality by declaration. The average number of acquisitions of nationality after birth not only increased from 95,500 in 1993 to an average of 114,000 in 1994-1998, but the share of spouses of nationals among all persons acquiring nationality also increased slightly. The only expected effect was that the share of youths born in France out of all persons acquiring nationality dropped slightly to an average of 34 per cent in 1994-1998, whereas it had previously been at 39 per cent (see Table 6.13). Together with the reintroduction of the automatic acquisition of nationality on reaching majority age by the Socialist government in September 1998, additional rights to become French by declaration for native-born youths – even as minors – were introduced. But the combined share of these modes of acquisition only reached pre-1994 levels in 1999, subsequently to drop clearly below even 1994-1998 levels. The reason for this was that the share of naturalisations by adults (27 per cent in 1999, 30-31

---

<sup>32</sup> Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform, Annual Report 2001, p. 56.

<sup>33</sup> With that same reform, the acceptance of multiple nationality was finally enshrined in the law but, in practice, the retention of a foreign nationality upon naturalisation in Italy was already possible before then.

per cent thereafter), of *ex lege* extensions to minor children (from 14 per cent to 15-18 per cent) and, since 2000, of spouses' acquisitions of nationality by declaration (from 16 per cent to 17-21 per cent) gained in relative importance. This may also have to do with the fact that the percentage of declined applications for acquisition of nationality by decree (naturalisation and reintegration) dropped considerably from 32 per cent in 1997 to 22 per cent in 2000 and 2001 (see Table 6.26).

In Spain and the United Kingdom, no major reforms of nationality laws have occurred since 1985 that could have left their mark (yet) on the available statistics for acquisitions of nationality by foreign residents: for Spain, this is due to the fact that reforms over the past two decades mainly concerned acquisitions by option or declaration by former nationals and descendants of (former) nationals, which are not covered by the available statistics; and in the United Kingdom reforms before 2002 mainly concerned persons with special nationality statuses residing outside the country; the main change of the 2002 reform with respect to naturalisation requirements, i.e. the need to pass a test on knowledge of life in the United Kingdom, will only become effective in late 2005. In any case, the number of acquisitions of nationality covered by the available statistics in both states has been considerable since the turn of the century. In the United Kingdom, this increase in the absolute number of non-automatic acquisitions of nationality left the distribution of different types of acquisition relatively unchanged: the only minor changes that can be discerned are a relative increase in the importance of residence-based naturalisations (from 38 per cent in 1997-1999 to around 45 per cent thereafter) and a slight decrease in the share of naturalisations by spouses of nationals (from 33 per cent to around 30 per cent in the same period) (see Table 6.22).

Finally, due to the confusing variety of statistics in Portugal, the content of which is not completely clear, as well as the erratic upward and downward movements of the various statistics, no reliable statement can be made about this country.

### **6.3.3 Rates of acquisition of nationality**

We will now calculate rates of acquisitions of nationality, i.e. rates that are normally but misleadingly called 'naturalisation rates'. However, we exclude Greece here because not only are the statistics on acquisitions incomplete but, more importantly, reliable data on the stock of the foreign population is lacking. The acquisition rates presented for Ireland, Italy, Portugal and Spain have to be interpreted with extreme caution because the available statistics on acquisitions in these states do not cover important modes after birth (see Table 6.4). The rates in these countries will therefore be higher than those given in Table 6.5. In Belgium, the Netherlands and the Nordic states, the statistics cover all acquisitions of nationality after birth by foreign nationals residing in the country; the number of acquisitions of nationality by persons who were not residents at the beginning of the year (which should in principle be excluded before calculating the rates) can be assumed to be negligible. In the remaining states, acquisitions abroad can be excluded completely (Austria) or partly (France, Germany and the United Kingdom) or they will be very low (Luxembourg). In Germany (*Spät*)*Aussiedler* becoming nationals shortly after immigration can be excluded from the statistics and, in the four remaining states, the phenomenon of acquisition by newcomers can again be assumed to be negligible (also because procedures often take months or even years). With the exception of minor children to whom the acquisition of nationality has been extended in Luxembourg since 1993, all quantitatively important modes of acquisition of nationality are counted in these five states.

Only in six of the fourteen states compared has the general trend over the past twenty years been one of increasing acquisitions rates (see Table 6.5): this is true for:

- Austria and Germany, where the rates increased almost steadily, even if at different levels;

- Denmark and Sweden, where the growth was less linear, but if the averages for five-year periods are compared, still more or less steady;
- Belgium, where the general trend was only interrupted repeatedly by statistical outliers after reforms of the nationality law (1985, 1991, 2000); and
- France, even though the rates since 2000 are tainted with a certain degree of uncertainty because we could only guess the stock of the foreign population for these years.

Since 2000, average acquisition rates in these states have ranged from 2.1 per cent in Germany to 7.6 per cent in Sweden, with the other four states taking the middle ground of approx. 4 per cent to 5.5 per cent. It is interesting to note in this context that although its rules of naturalisation are now clearly more liberal than those of Austria, Germany's naturalisation rates since 2000 have remained well behind those of its southern neighbour (4.9 per cent). Even though no statistics are available for both states in this respect, it is unlikely that the difference is due to a higher rate of denied applications in Germany. The explanation will therefore have to be sought at the level of foreign residents' intentions to naturalise, but this cannot be done here.

Apart from the uncertain case of France, the rates in the five other states in this group have fallen over the past one to three years (and most can be expected to fall still further) from the peaks of the early 2000s, caused by certain saturation effects (as in Austria), the abating of initially strong effects of liberalising reforms of nationality laws, as in Belgium and Germany, or by tougher requirements for nationality acquisition, as in Denmark.

**Table 6.5: Rates of nationality acquisition 1985-2004**

	AUT	BEL	DEN	FIN	FRA	GER	IRE	ITA	LUX	NED	POR	SPA	SWE	UK
1985	2.5%	9.3%	3.1%	6.8%	2.3%	0.3%	N/A	N/A	0.6%	6.2%	N/A	N/A	5.1%	3.5%
1986	2.7%	1.1%	3.1%	6.5%	2.1%	0.3%	N/A	0.9%	0.6%	3.4%	0.6%	2.1%	5.2%	2.7%
1987	2.1%	1.1%	2.9%	6.8%	1.6%	0.3%	N/A	0.7%	0.5%	3.4%	0.1%	3.2%	4.9%	3.6%
1988	2.3%	1.0%	2.8%	5.9%	2.0%	0.4%	N/A	0.9%	0.7%	1.5%	1.0%	2.5%	4.3%	3.5%
1989	2.1%	1.0%	2.3%	8.0%	2.2%	0.4%	N/A	0.6%	0.6%	4.6%	1.5%	1.6%	4.0%	6.4%
1990	2.2%	1.0%	2.0%	4.2%	2.4%	0.4%	N/A	0.8%	0.7%	2.0%	0.8%	2.8%	3.6%	3.2%
1991	2.4%	0.9%	3.4%	4.7%	2.6%	0.5%	N/A	0.5%	0.5%	4.2%	1.1%	1.3%	5.6%	3.4%
1992	2.1%	5.0%	3.0%	2.3%	2.6%	0.7%	N/A	0.5%	0.5%	4.9%	1.5%	1.5%	5.9%	2.4%
1993	2.3%	1.8%	2.9%	1.8%	2.7%	0.8%	N/A	0.5%	0.6%	5.7%	1.0%	2.1%	8.5%	2.3%
1994	2.3%	2.8%	3.1%	1.2%	3.6%	0.9%	N/A	0.7%	0.6%	6.3%	1.4%	1.8%	6.9%	2.2%
1995	2.1%	2.8%	2.7%	1.1%	2.6%	1.0%	N/A	0.8%	0.6%	9.4%	0.8%	1.5%	6.0%	2.0%
1996	2.3%	2.7%	3.3%	1.4%	3.2%	1.2%	N/A	0.9%	0.6%	11.4%	0.7%	1.7%	4.8%	2.2%
1997	2.3%	3.5%	2.3%	1.9%	3.4%	1.1%	1.1%	0.9%	0.5%	8.8%	N/A	1.9%	5.5%	1.9%
1998	2.6%	3.8%	4.1%	5.0%	3.6%	1.4%	1.4%	1.0%	0.4%	8.7%	N/A	2.2%	8.9%	2.6%
1999	3.6%	2.7%	4.9%	5.6%	4.4%	2.0%	1.3%	0.9%	0.4%	9.4%	0.9%	2.3%	7.6%	2.5%
2000	3.5%	6.9%	7.5%	3.4%	(4.5%)	2.5%	1.0%	0.8%	0.4%	7.7%	1.0%	1.5%	8.9%	3.7%
2001	4.5%	7.3%	4.6%	3.0%	(3.9%)	2.4%	1.9%	0.7%	0.3%	7.0%	1.3%	1.9%	7.6%	3.9%
2002	4.9%	5.5%	6.2%	3.1%	(3.9%)	2.1%	1.9%	0.8%	0.5%	6.6%	1.1%	2.0%	7.9%	4.6%
2003	5.9%	4.0%	2.5%	4.4%	(4.5%)	1.9%	1.8%	0.9%	0.5%	4.1%	1.0%	2.0%	7.0%	4.7%
2004	5.4%	4.0%	5.5%	6.4%	N/A	1.7%	1.4%	0.8%	0.5%	N/A	N/A	N/A	6.3%	4.9%
Ø 85-89	2.3%	2.7%	2.8%	6.8%	2.0%	0.3%	N/A	0.8%	0.6%	3.8%	0.8%	2.4%	4.7%	3.9%
Ø 90-94	2.3%	2.3%	2.9%	2.9%	2.8%	0.6%	N/A	0.6%	0.6%	4.6%	1.2%	1.9%	6.1%	2.7%
Ø 95-99	2.6%	3.1%	3.4%	3.0%	3.4%	1.3%	1.3%	0.9%	0.5%	9.5%	0.8%	1.9%	6.5%	2.2%
Ø 00-03/4	4.9%	5.5%	5.3%	4.0%	(4.2%)	2.1%	1.6%	0.8%	0.4%	6.3%	1.1%	1.8%	7.6%	4.4%

**Note:** Rates calculated as quotient of acquisitions of nationality by persons residing in the country and the foreign population at the beginning of the year. Rates for France in the years 2000-2003 are based on estimated population stocks. For interpretation of rates in Ireland, Italy, Portugal and Spain, see the text. *Statistics on acquisitions of nationality used:* data from section 1, Table 6.3.

*Statistics on foreign population used:* France: census data for 1990 and 1999, extrapolations for other years; Finland, Italy: data from national statistical institute, estimates for 2004; Ireland: Labour Force Survey data (see SOPEMI reports), census data for 2003, estimate for 2004; Spain, Portugal: statistics on residence permits from Ministry of the Interior, estimates for some years; United Kingdom: Labour Force Survey data (see SOPEMI reports); all other states: data from national statistical institutes.

The development in the other four states with more or less complete acquisition statistics differed considerably. With values between 6 per cent and 7 per cent, acquisition rates in Finland were higher in the late 1980s than in any other state, because the foreign population was still very small at that time. Following significant immigration in the 1990s, acquisition rates dropped to below 2 per cent, only to rise steeply again from 1998 onwards when the new immigrants began to meet the requirements for naturalisation. The latest reform of mid-2003 further boosted the acquisition rates and, among the EU15 states, Finland had the highest rate in 2004 (6.4 per cent). Acquisition rates in the Netherlands peaked in the mid 1990s, when applicants for naturalisation no longer had to renounce their foreign nationality: with 11.4 per cent in 1996, the Netherlands had the highest rate for all years among all states. Albeit with some delay, the reintroduction of the renunciation requirement in 1997 (even with many exceptions) lowered acquisition rates. The reform of early 2003 further reduced the rate to 4.1 per cent and the rate can be expected to have declined even further in 2004 and will continue to decline in 2005. The development moved in the opposite direction in the United Kingdom: there, average acquisition rates declined from almost 4 per cent in the late 1980s to around 2.5 per cent in the 1990s, only to rise again since 2000. However, it remains to be seen whether the introduction of tests of knowledge of life in Britain in November 2005 will influence acquisition rates. In Luxembourg, acquisition rates remained practically unchanged at the very low level of around 0.5 per cent from the mid-1980s onwards; if minor children to whom the acquisition of nationality is extended *ex lege* were included in the statistics from 1993

onwards, the rates would still not be much higher. The latest reform of the law in 2001 also had practically no influence. An important explanatory factor for this very low rate, at least since Treaty of Amsterdam came into force, is the fact that between 85 per cent and 90 per cent of foreign residents in Luxembourg are nationals of other EU15 states who have a very good legal status under community law: their acquisition rates are also very low in other EU15 states.

We now look at the rates in states with incomplete statistics, which can be expected to be somewhat underestimated. The rates for Ireland since 1997 peaked in 2001 to 2003 at slightly less than 2 per cent, but declined again in 2004. In Italy, the rates based on available statistics for naturalisations have remained almost constant since 1985 within a range of 0.5-1.0 per cent. Portugal's acquisition rates have been rather erratic, but reached a level of 1.5 per cent only in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Finally, the annual percentage of foreign nationals who naturalised in Spain was highest in the late 1980s, with an average of 2.4 per cent. Since then, however, the average rates calculated over five-year periods have remained relatively constant at a level of slightly below 2 per cent, even if the rates repeatedly rose again for some years (including 2000-2003), only to fall again thereafter.

#### **6.3.4 Acquisitions of nationality by newly immigrated 'co-ethnics'**

New immigrants who are defined by the respective states as having the same ethno-cultural background as the majority population, were not taken into account when calculating nationality acquisition rates. As was described in Chapter 3 of this volume, the two states with special programmes facilitating the return of ethnic diasporas, especially from the Soviet Union, are Germany and Greece.

Apart from *ex lege* acquisitions of nationality from August to December 1999, Germany has more or less complete statistics for naturalisations (before August 1999) and *ex lege* acquisitions of ethnic German *Aussiedler* and later *Spätaussiedler* from the former Soviet Union (see section 2, Table 6.3). Even before the end of communism in Eastern Europe, which brought about a massive increase in 'returns' of (*Spät*)*Aussiedler*, and definitely after 1989, naturalisations of ethnic Germans almost immediately after their immigration clearly outnumbered naturalisations by long-term resident foreign nationals of non-German background: from 1985 to 1998, between 60 per cent (1985) and 81 per cent (1991) of all naturalisations in Germany concerned (*Spät*)*Aussiedler*; their total number in that period was 1.664 million, compared to 628,000 by foreign residents. Since 2000, in particular, the acquisition of nationality by newly-immigrated ethnic Germans has decreased considerably to levels below 100,000 annually and even below 60,000 in 2004, which meant a drop in their share of all acquisitions of nationality after birth to about one third.

Greece has special rules for naturalisation or acquisition of nationality by 'definition' for persons of Greek Orthodox descent (*homogeneis*) who reside in or outside Greece. In addition, like Germany, since 1989 Greece has actively promoted the 'return' of persons of Greek origin from countries formerly belonging to the Soviet Union (Pontian Greeks), who can apply for naturalisation to the regional authorities as soon as they have immigrated to Greece. About 103,500 persons acquired nationality this way from 1989 to 1999, with the highest annual number being 10,600 in 1993. Except in 1989, their number was much higher than naturalisations by foreign residents: if we add these two types of naturalisations, those by Pontians made up between 61 per cent (1990) and 98 per cent (1994). If we take into account the fact that, among naturalisations of foreign residents in Greece, a large percentage also concerns *homogeneis* (see Table 6.15) and that there are numerous other modes of acquisition not covered by the statistics, mainly targeted at ethnic Greeks, then it becomes obvious that acquisitions of nationality by *allogeneis* are fairly exceptional in Greece.

### **6.3.5 Acquisitions of nationality abroad**

In most cases for which data is available, acquisitions of nationality after birth by persons residing abroad make up only a small percentage of all acquisitions (see section 3, Table 6.3). In France, since the late 1980s only 2 per cent to 4 per cent of all acquisitions have occurred abroad, mainly by spouses of nationals and former nationals. Between 2000 and 2003, no more than roughly 1 per cent of all naturalisations in Germany (excluding those of *Spätaussiedler*) concerned persons with residence abroad and not until 2004 did this percentage rise to 3 per cent; this includes various groups of former nationals and persons with special connections to Germany. In Luxembourg, the share of naturalisations and acquisitions by declaration of former nationals, which are the only modes that do not require residence in the country, have also never exceeded 4 per cent since 1994. After the change of *ius sanguinis* rules in Austria in 1983, children of Austrian mothers could acquire nationality by simple declaration, even if they resided abroad and this increased the percentage of acquisitions abroad to between 11 per cent and 20 per cent before 1989. Since then, acquisitions abroad (spouses or children of nationals, former nationals) have usually only accounted for 1 per cent or 2 per cent, the exception being the years 1994 to 1998, when reacquisition of nationality by persons who fled Austria during Nazi rule was also opened up to those who kept their residence abroad.

In the only other two states, for which statistics are at least partially available, acquisitions abroad have been very significant in certain years. A certain percentage of persons residing abroad comparable to that reported for the four states discussed above will also be contained in the general statistics on nationality granted in the United Kingdom. More importantly, in the mid 1990s, awards of British Citizenship to residents of Hong Kong have occasionally amounted to almost half of all non-automatic acquisitions of nationality but, since 2000, their share has dropped to below 1 per cent. Furthermore, in February 2002 an estimated 200,000 British Overseas Territories Citizens residing in these territories acquired British Citizenship *ex lege*. Between 1992 and 1997, Italy allowed former nationals residing abroad and their children and grandchildren to reacquire nationality by declaration: about 164,000 persons made use of this right, which dwarfs the 42,000 naturalisations of foreign residents during the same period. Persons born before July 1920 in areas belonging to the former Austro-Hungarian Empire and their children could also acquire nationality by declaration for five years after 2000, but no statistics exist for this mode of acquisition.

As was demonstrated in section 6.2.5, acquisition of nationality abroad via certain modes is also possible in most other states for which no statistics are available. Especially in the Southern European states, which make the acquisition of nationality abroad especially easy for former nationals and their descendants, these acquisitions will in many cases outnumber acquisition in the country.

### **6.3.6 Acquisitions of nationality by former nationality**

Where do persons acquiring nationality originate? As can be seen from Table 6.6, the backgrounds of persons acquiring nationality among the thirteen EU15 states for which statistics are available are highly diverse. At 85 per cent and 78 per cent respectively, Austria and Luxembourg had the highest percentage of persons with a European background – including Turkey – among those acquiring nationality in the last year for which statistics are available (1999 to 2004). In Finland and Germany (excluding *Spätaussiedler*), between 60 per cent and 65 per cent also originate from European countries whereas, in all other states, Europeans only make up less than half of all persons acquiring nationality, even if they are still the largest group in Denmark, Italy and Sweden, at 40 per cent to 45 per cent. The lowest

share of Europeans among persons becoming nationals can be found in Portugal and Spain, with percentages of about 5 per cent, as well as in France and the United Kingdom, with shares of 13 per cent and 14 per cent. Except for Luxembourg, where they make up almost two thirds, nationals of EU15 states are only a small minority among persons acquiring nationality in all EU15 states.

Africans represent an absolute majority of persons acquiring nationality in Belgium (51 per cent) and France (67 per cent), a relative majority in the Netherlands (30 per cent) and the second biggest group in Portugal (44 per cent), Spain and the United Kingdom (32 per cent each). In Sweden and the United Kingdom, the largest group acquiring nationality after birth, at around 40 per cent, are persons originating from Asia; in Denmark, Finland and Germany they are the second largest group with a proportion of between 22 per cent and 30 per cent. Lastly, in Portugal and Spain, between 48 per cent and 54 per cent of new nationals come from American states according to the available statistics; in Italy, their percentage is slightly below 30 per cent while in all other states Americans make up less than 9 per cent of all persons acquiring nationality.

Has this composition of continents of origin changed over time? When we compare the statistics for the latest and the earliest year available, the most obvious trend is the decline of the share of EU15 nationals among persons acquiring nationality: in Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland and Spain, their share has even dropped between twenty and 38 percentage points over a period of eight to twenty years. Europeans in general have increased their share among persons acquiring nationality in Austria and Denmark, whereas, in Belgium, France and Spain their percentage has declined steeply since the mid-1980s or early 1990s. Besides the trend among EU15 nationals, the most obvious development was the expansion of the share of Africans among new nationals: in Belgium, Denmark, France, Portugal, Spain and the United Kingdom their proportion has increased between ten and 40 percentage points over the last one to two decades and, in all other states, their share has risen slightly or remained more or less the same. Lastly, the trend with respect to Asians and Americans is less clear: the share of Americans among persons acquiring nationality has increased by more than five percentage points in two states (Italy and Spain) and decreased by the same margin in two others (the Netherlands and Portugal); the proportion of Asians has risen in two states by more than five points (Finland and Sweden) and has declined by the same margin in five states (Austria, Denmark, France, Italy and the Netherlands).

**Table 6.6: Acquisitions of nationality by continent of previous nationality**

	AUT	BEL	DEN	FIN	FRA	GER	ITA	LUX	NED	POR	SPA	SWE	UK
<b>Earliest year avail.</b>	<b>1985</b>	<b>91-93</b>	<b>1985</b>	<b>1990</b>	<b>1985</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>1995</b>	<b>1994</b>	<b>1990</b>	<b>1996</b>	<b>1985</b>	<b>1994</b>	<b>1992</b>
Europe	74.9%	62.2%	37.3%	61.6%	46.8%	64.3%	44.2%	81.8%	28.7%	5.5%	33.8%	46.0%	12.4%
EU15/EEA	36.6%	47.6%	23.7%	41.3%	N/A	2.4%	5.4%	74.4%	N/A	3.8%	31.6%	N/A	5.3%
Rest (incl. Turkey)	38.3%	14.6%	13.6%	20.4%	N/A	61.9%	38.8%	7.4%	N/A	1.6%	2.1%	N/A	7.1%
Africa	3.2%	27.0%	11.9%	7.8%	26.1%	6.5%	16.1%	11.1%	30.9%	18.9%	6.2%	9.4%	14.9%
Asia	14.8%	3.8%	43.9%	12.8%	22.2%	26.5%	16.9%	5.0%	21.3%	1.3%	11.2%	30.9%	46.2%
America	4.1%		5.0%	9.7%	3.9%	1.0%	22.6%	2.0%	16.9%	74.2%	47.9%	7.3%	10.8%
Oceania	0.3%	7.0%	0.5%	0.4%		0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	3.5%
Other*	2.9%		1.3%	7.7%	1.0%	1.7%	0.1%	0.2%	2.1%	0.0%	0.8%	6.3%	12.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Latest year avail.</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2004</b>
Europe	85.0%	32.2%	43.0%	64.7%	12.9%	61.7%	46.5%	77.6%	24.5%	5.3%	5.9%	40.9%	14.3%
EU15/EEA	0.5%	9.6%	3.1%	4.0%	N/A	4.1%	3.0%	62.0%	5.2%	3.5%	3.1%	14.8%	3.0%
Rest (incl. Turkey)	84.5%	22.6%	39.3%	60.7%	N/A	57.6%	43.5%	15.6%	19.3%	1.7%	2.8%	26.1%	11.3%
Africa	4.9%	50.5%	20.2%	6.2%	66.8%	8.9%	15.9%	9.4%	29.9%	44.2%	32.1%	8.5%	32.1%
Asia	8.4%	5.7%	30.4%	22.0%	14.8%	25.5%	8.7%	10.0%	14.5%	1.8%	7.5%	40.3%	40.3%
America	1.2%		2.8%	3.5%	5.5%	2.6%	28.7%	2.1%	7.7%	48.5%	54.3%	6.5%	8.6%
Oceania	0.0%	11.6%	0.1%	0.5%		0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	0.4%	3.3%
Other*	0.4%		3.6%	3.1%	0.1%	1.3%	0.0%	0.8%	23.0%	0.0%	0.2%	3.4%	1.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Note:** \* stateless, unknown, unclear; for Belgium including refugees, for United Kingdom including persons with special nationality statuses (except Gibraltarans, who are included in EU15).

*Basis for calculation of data:* FRA: acquisitions excluding *ex lege* extensions of acquisition to children and upon reaching majority; GER: excluding (*Spät*)*Aussiedler*; ITA: statistics from the Ministry of the Interior that do not match the statistics given in Table 6.3; LUX: statistics published directly by the Ministry of Justice (and not by the national statistical institute); POR: statistics from the Foreigners and Borders Service (rather than the Central Registers Office); UK: excluding residents of Hong Kong. GRE, IRE: no data available. All other states: statistics contained in section 1 of Table 6.3.

Which are the most important single nationalities? Table 6.7 contains all nationalities that are among the two largest groups for the last five-year period (Italy: 2002) for which data are available in any of the thirteen states (all except Greece and Ireland) for which statistics exist. Only three nationalities have been among the top two in more than one state during that period: Moroccans are among the two most numerous groups of origin acquiring nationality in Belgium, France, Italy, the Netherlands and Spain, with percentages between 6 per cent and 37 per cent, as well as Turks in Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Germany and the Netherlands, with figures between 11 per cent and 41 per cent, and nationals of Bosnia-Herzegovina in Austria, Denmark and Sweden, with proportions between 12 per cent and 16 per cent. Only in three EU15 states is none of these three nationalities among the top two most numerous groups of origin: these are Luxembourg, where persons of Italian and Portuguese backgrounds are the two largest groups of persons acquiring nationality, Portugal, where Brazilians and Venezuelans are quantitatively the most important, and the United Kingdom, where the relative majority of new citizens come from India and Pakistan.

It is also interesting to note that the thirteen states differ considerably with respect to the concentration of the states of origin of persons acquiring nationality. In Belgium, the two largest groups of origin have a combined share of 59 per cent and in Austria, France, Germany and Portugal, the two most numerous groups add up to between 41 per cent and 47 per cent. By contrast, the distribution of nationalities of origin is much more diverse in some other states. This is especially true for Italy and the United Kingdom, where the two largest groups account for only 12 per cent and 19 per cent of all persons acquiring nationality.

**Table 6.7: Most important (former) nationalities of persons acquiring nationality**

	AUT	BEL	DEN	FIN	FRA	GER	ITA	LUX	NED	POR	SPA	SWE	UK
Albania	0.5%	N/A	0.0%	0.1%	N/A	0.4%	<b>6.6%</b>	0.4%	0.1%	N/A	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%
Algeria	0.1%	1.9%	0.3%	<b>10.8%</b>	<b>20.2%</b>	0.3%	N/A	0.2%	0.3%	N/A	0.6%	0.2%	0.9%
Bosnia-Herz.	<b>16.3%</b>	N/A	<b>11.5%</b>	1.2%	N/A	1.8%	N/A	1.1%	4.1%	N/A	0.2%	<b>14.3%</b>	1.0%
Brazil	0.1%	N/A	0.3%	0.2%	N/A	0.2%	5.6%	0.3%	0.5%	<b>22.7%</b>	2.1%	0.3%	0.3%
India	1.7%	0.7%	0.9%	0.8%	N/A	0.7%	N/A	0.7%	0.5%	N/A	1.6%	0.4%	<b>9.1%</b>
Iraq	0.7%	N/A	7.8%	6.1%	N/A	1.3%	N/A	0.5%	5.0%	N/A	0.4%	<b>12.6%</b>	2.2%
Italy	0.0%	5.3%	0.1%	0.1%	1.0%	0.7%	—	<b>16.4%</b>	0.5%	N/A	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%
Morocco	0.2%	<b>36.8%</b>	1.9%	1.1%	<b>22.3%</b>	2.7%	<b>5.8%</b>	1.4%	<b>25.6%</b>	N/A	<b>17.9%</b>	0.5%	0.6%
Pakistan	0.5%	0.5%	2.6%	0.4%	N/A	1.2%	N/A	0.3%	0.5%	N/A	0.5%	0.3%	<b>10.1%</b>
Peru	0.1%	N/A	0.2%	0.2%	N/A	0.2%	2.8%	0.3%	0.1%	N/A	<b>13.1%</b>	0.7%	0.1%
Portugal	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%	0.0%	3.7%	0.2%	N/A	<b>20.5%</b>	0.3%	—	3.1%	0.1%	0.3%
Russia	0.4%	N/A	0.5%	<b>27.8%</b>	N/A	2.6%	4.1%	0.5%	0.8%	N/A	0.4%	1.6%	0.9%
Serbia-M./Yug.	16.1%	N/A	0.0%	2.1%	2.2%	<b>4.9%</b>	1.7%	2.3%	1.8%	N/A	0.1%	6.5%	2.5%
Turkey	<b>31.1%</b>	<b>21.8%</b>	<b>16.1%</b>	2.9%	5.5%	<b>41.3%</b>	N/A	0.7%	<b>10.5%</b>	N/A	0.1%	5.1%	4.8%
Venezuela	0.0%	N/A	0.1%	0.0%	N/A	0.1%	2.0%	0.0%	0.1%	<b>18.7%</b>	1.9%	0.1%	0.1%
Other	32.7%	32.5%	57.5%	46.1%	45.1%	41.8%	77.8%	54.8%	49.3%	58.6%	57.7%	57.0%	66.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Note:** *Period of reference:* AUT, DEN, FIN, GER, LUX, SWE, UK: 2000-2004; BEL: 1998-2002; FRA, NED, POR, SPA: 1999-2003; ITA: 2002. Data for Greece and Ireland are not available. Percentages printed in bold type indicate the two largest groups in the respective state.

**Source:** ITA: Ministry of the Interior, cited in SOPEMI report; LUX: Ministry of Justice; POR: national statistical institute; other states: see Table 6.6.

### 6.3.7 Acquisitions of nationality by sex

Statistics on the sex of persons acquiring nationality are only available for about half of all EU15 states: no such statistics could be obtained for Belgium, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Spain or the United Kingdom. In most states for which statistics are available, clear trends are discernible; unfortunately, space does not allow us to investigate the reasons behind these trends further. In any case, the most common trend is a feminisation of acquisitions of nationality: men had a clear majority among persons acquiring nationality for most of the 1980s and 1990s in Denmark, Finland, France and the Netherlands (see Table 6.8). Since the turn of the century, however, women have represented more than half of all new nationals in these states: with 54 per cent and 59 per cent respectively in 2004. Denmark and Finland have the highest surplus of females. Sweden already had a slight majority of women acquiring nationality in 1998 but, since then, this has increased to almost 55 per cent in 2004.

**Table 6.8: Share of women among persons acquiring nationality 1985-2004**

	AUT	DEN	FIN	FRA	GER		NED	POR	SWE
					Foreigners	All			
1985	47.4%	47.7%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	44.7%	N/A	N/A
1986	47.4%	48.4%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	43.2%	N/A	N/A
1987	48.8%	46.8%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	45.8%	N/A	N/A
1988	48.7%	47.2%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	43.6%	N/A	N/A
1989	50.8%	47.1%	N/A	46.7%	N/A	N/A	42.9%	N/A	N/A
1990	51.1%	46.6%	46.3%	47.5%	N/A	N/A	44.5%	N/A	N/A
1991	49.9%	40.1%	48.3%	48.1%	N/A	50.0%	46.0%	N/A	N/A
1992	50.6%	40.8%	53.1%	48.6%	N/A	N/A	46.6%	N/A	N/A
1993	52.0%	42.6%	53.9%	48.7%	N/A	N/A	47.8%	N/A	N/A
1994	51.6%	43.6%	49.9%	48.7%	N/A	50%	47.3%	N/A	N/A
1995	52.0%	43.4%	47.9%	48.4%	51.6%	51.1%	47.2%	N/A	N/A
1996	53.0%	45.6%	51.1%	50.0%	51.3%	51.1%	47.1%	52.6%	N/A
1997	52.8%	47.6%	47.4%	49.7%	48.5%	49.8%	47.9%	51.9%	N/A
1998	52.0%	46.8%	48.0%	49.0%	N/A	51%	47.9%	N/A	50.9%
1999	50.5%	47.0%	47.5%	48.8%	N/A	51.4%	47.1%	48.0%	52.0%
2000	50.4%	49.3%	51.4%	50.5%	47.7%	N/A	48.5%	N/A	51.2%
2001	49.5%	50.5%	50.1%	51.2%	48.0%	49.4%	49.9%	45.8%	53.7%
2002	49.2%	50.9%	51.9%	51.4%	48.4%	49.8%	50.9%	44.0%	54.7%
2003	50.0%	54.1%	56.7%	50.7%	48.1%	49.4%	51.8%	45.7%	54.5%
2004	49.8%	53.5%	58.4%	N/A	49.2%	50.1%	N/A	N/A	54.7%

**Note:** Data are not available for states not included in the table.

*Basis for calculation of data:* GER 'Foreigners': naturalisations of foreign nationals (data from section 1, Table 6.3); GER 'all': naturalisations of foreign nationals plus acquisitions of ethnic Germans from former Soviet Union (sum of sections 1 and 2 of Table 6.3); SWE: data for 1998 and 1999 from Swedish Migration Board (rather than national statistical institute). Other states: see Table 6.6.

No clear-cut trend is evident in Austria or Germany. In the late 1980s in Austria, a small majority of new nationals were men, whereas the opposite was true for much of the 1990s. But, since 1999, the distribution of the sexes among persons acquiring nationality after birth is practically even. In the mid-1990s in Germany, between 51 per cent and 52 per cent of all foreign nationals of non-German descent who gained access to nationality were women but, since then, marginally more men have become German. When *Spätaussiedler* are included in the calculation, though, the share of men and women has been more or less equal for most of the years for which data is available. Finally, Portugal is the only state for which the available statistics indicate a clear trend towards more men acquiring nationality: in 1996, around 53 per cent of all new nationals were still women in this country but between 2001 and 2003, 54 per cent to 56 per cent were men.

## 6.4 Statistics of cases of loss of nationality

### 6.4.1 Available statistics

In section 1.2 we analysed the manifold problems with respect to the availability and quality of statistics on the acquisition of nationality. However, these problems pale in comparison to those in the area of loss of nationality. Leaving aside the special case of ‘losses’ of nationality by death, no statistics whatsoever in this context exist in Austria, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Portugal or Spain – at least, no such statistics have ever been published. No loss statistics could be obtained for Denmark or Finland either, although statistics on losses of nationality by persons with residence in the country that are produced on the basis of the population registers should at least be available from the national statistical institutes.

This leaves us with six states for which at least some statistics on losses of nationality are available, but even these statistics have fairly serious shortcomings. For Belgium, the only figures available are the total numbers of persons residing in the country who have lost nationality in the years 1988 to 2003: the numbers were between 20 and 116 annually (see Table 6.9). However, additional losses of nationality abroad, especially by persons acquiring a foreign nationality (L05a-c) or by persons born abroad who have stayed outside Belgium for ten years (L02), are not covered by these statistics. According to information from the Belgian Foreign Ministry, information collected by consular missions on cases of loss of nationality abroad is transferred to the Ministry of Justice but the Justice department has so far not produced statistics on the basis of this information.

For the Netherlands, only overall statistics of all residents in the country who lost nationality could be procured. Since the mid-1980s, their numbers have increased from about 35 to between 170 and 200 (since 2001). In addition, the Immigration and Naturalisation Service collects statistics on withdrawals of nationality because of fraud during a procedure to acquire nationality (L9: since April 2003) or because of the failure to renounce a foreign nationality after becoming Dutch (L10). However, the only available information in this respect is that 55 persons were deprived of their nationality in 2004 because of fraud and 17 (102 in 2002) because of the failure to renounce a foreign nationality. Again, losses of nationality by persons residing abroad, especially following ten years of residence abroad (L02), or because of the acquisition of a foreign nationality (L05a-e), are not counted.

For Sweden and the United Kingdom, the only statistics available for some years concern renunciations of nationality: in Sweden between seventeen and 91 persons annually renounced nationality after 1997, whereas, in the United Kingdom, about 620 to 1,170 persons per year gave up British Citizenship during the period 1987 to 1997 and in 2003. More interesting statistics on withdrawals of nationality in the United Kingdom on the grounds of acts seriously prejudicial to vital state interests (L07), fraud (L09) or on the grounds of certain serious crimes (L08: until 2002) and on *ex lege* lapses of nationality by foreign-born Swedish nationals upon attaining the age of 22 (L02) are lacking.

Loss of nationality in Greece occurs by renunciation (L01a-f), which requires the consent of the government in most cases, or by withdrawal in order to take up public service in a foreign state (L03/L04), acquisition of a foreign nationality (L05), actions against Greek interests abroad (L07) and, until 1998, following departure from Greece ‘with no intention to return’ (L02). However, statistics only exist for some of these modes. Until its abolition, the last of these reasons for deprivation of nationality was by far the most important: between 1985 and 1997 alone, more than 5,300 *allogeneis* lost their nationality in this way. But, between 1955 and 1998, the Greek authorities actually withdrew nationality from approx.

60,000 persons in total, most of them belonging to ethnic minorities.<sup>34</sup> Withdrawal for reasons of actions against Greek interests abroad is relatively infrequent by comparison: ‘only’ 38 persons lost their nationality on the basis of this regulation between 1990 and 2000 (the only years for which statistics are available). Finally, data also exist for one of six modes of renunciation, i.e. releases from nationality of persons who reside abroad and can prove they no longer have genuine links to Greece (L01c). For most of the years since 1990, only between six and 65 persons annually lost their Greek nationality in this way but, in 2001, this was the case for 356 persons – this seems to be proof of the fact that release from nationality in Greece very much depends on the discretion of the authorities.

Finally, France is the only state with statistics on losses of nationality that cover most modes. Apart from the ‘loss’ of nationality by foundlings and persons born stateless, when it is established that they do in fact hold a foreign nationality, the only mode of loss not covered by the statistics and for which numbers only exist for very few states (1998: 383; 1999:169) are *ex lege* lapses of nationality in cases where acquisition concerns the nationality of a state that has signed the 1963 Strasbourg Convention (L05). Among the other modes of loss, releases from (L01a) and renunciations of nationality (L01b-f) are the most frequent: in the late 1980s, between 360 and 850 persons lost French nationality this way but, since 1990, these numbers have declined considerably, sometimes to below 40 persons per year. By contrast, withdrawals of nationality because the acquisition of nationality was based on fraud (L09) or false information (L15) and in particular following five decades of residence abroad (L02), service to a foreign state (L03/L04), crimes against the state (L07a+b) or certain other crimes (L08a+b) were much rarer until 1993. But, between 1994 and 1997, about 40 to 50 persons and – since 2001 – roughly 30 annually were deprived of nationality for these reasons.

---

<sup>34</sup> See section 2.3 in the Greek country report.

**Table 6.9: Loss of nationality 1985-2004**

	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
<b>Belgium</b>																				
<b>Losses by persons with residence – total</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	36	29	45	39	60	28	21	20	29	89	116	77	102	101	103	76	N/A
<b>France</b>																				
<i>Release from nationality by decree (L01a)</i>	N/A	487	434	251	186	106	40	30	23	22	23	18	34	33	39	52	29	26	70	N/A
<i>Renunciation by declaration; of which:</i>	N/A	361	254	219	179	96	111	46	41	69	13	75	64	94	102	117	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>Minors: nationals iure sanguinis by birth abroad (L01c) or ius soli (L01d) or due to parent becoming national (L01e)</i>	N/A	76	29	36	20	27	29	20	21	30	11	29	16	12	22	21	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>Adults: persons residing abroad &amp; acquiring a foreign nationality (L01b+f)</i>	N/A	279	220	182	143	58	63	26	20	39	2	46	48	82	80	96	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>Other reasons (unclear)</i>	N/A	6	5	1	16	11	19	0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
<i>Withdrawal by decree; of which due to:</i>	4	4	7	7	11	17	13	7	21	52	42	51	46	16	5	17	29	30	28	N/A
<i>Acquisition of nationality by fraud (L09) or based on false information (L15)</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	15	13	5	21	50	42	51	46	16	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>50 years residence abroad (L02), foreign civil service (L03/L04), crimes against the state (L07a), acts in favour of a foreign state (L07b), misconduct in office (L08a), 5-year prison sentence (L08b: until 08/1998)</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	N/A	852	695	477	376	219	164	83	85	143	78	144	144	143	146	186	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Greece</b>																				
<i>Renunciation: residence abroad, declaration of no genuine links to Greece, dependent on acceptance by government (L01c)</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6	15	16	10	23	32	28	47	65	38	26	356	37	N/A	N/A
<i>Withdrawal: leaving Greece with “no intention to return” (L02; abolished 1998)</i>	476	1,524	684	539	110	464	628	219	194	139	148	120	89	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
<i>Withdrawal: actions against Greek interests abroad (L07)</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	12	6	2	1	4	1	5	4	0	3	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Netherlands</b>																				
Losses by men with residence	20	23	26	27	35	36	33	51	63	54	74	67	75	51	37	88	117	123	112	N/A
Losses by women with residence	17	12	6	11	15	13	26	16	18	14	49	63	51	38	27	64	82	76	58	N/A
<b>Losses by persons with residence – total</b>	37	35	32	38	50	49	59	67	81	68	123	130	126	89	64	152	199	199	170	N/A
<b>Sweden</b>																				
<i>Release from nationality, unconditional</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	15	13	21	14	26	31	37
<i>Release from nationality, conditional</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	7	5	3	3	31	43	54
<b>Release from nationality (L01) – total</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	22	18	24	17	57	74	91
<b>United Kingdom</b>																				
<b>Renunciations of nationality (L01)</b>	N/A	N/A	1,169	865	902	701	996	864	754	704	666	626	856	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	755	N/A

**Note:** *Scope of statistics:* Belgium, Netherlands: all modes of loss of nationality by persons residing in the country but none by persons residing abroad; France: all modes of loss, except *ex lege* loss due to acquisition of a foreign nationality abroad; Sweden, United Kingdom: renunciations of nationality but not withdrawals or *ex lege* lapses; Greece: various modes of renunciation (L01a+b, d-f), withdrawals because of civil or military service for a foreign state (L03/L04) or because of acquisition of a foreign nationality (L05) are not covered. For states not represented in this table, no statistics were available.

**Source:** Belgium, the Netherlands: national statistical institute; France: Ministry of Justice; Greece: Ministry of the Interior; Sweden: Migration Board; UK: Home Office.

#### **6.4.2 Recommendations with respect to data collection**

Statistics on persons losing nationality are in even greater need of improvement than statistics on acquisitions. How could this be achieved?

A major problem in this context is the fact that most states provide for modes of loss of nationality that become effective automatically when certain conditions are met, e.g. if the person resides abroad for long periods of time (L02), enters the civil service (L03) or military of a foreign state (L04), acquires a foreign nationality (L05) or chooses to retain a foreign nationality rather than the nationality of the state in question (L06), or if the person's parents lose nationality (L11), the paternity/maternity by a national is annulled (L13) or if it is established that persons who acquired nationality as foundlings or stateless children do in fact hold a foreign nationality (L14). Keeping track of these *ex lege* lapses of nationality is very difficult, if not impossible, especially if the persons concerned reside abroad. An important recommendation would therefore be to turn all *ex lege* modes of loss into modes of withdrawal of nationality. This would serve two purposes: firstly, to improve the concerned persons' legal position because withdrawals of nationality can be fought with legal means whereas this is mostly not the case for *ex lege* lapses; and, secondly, this would enormously facilitate data collection.

Even if this recommendation is not heeded, however, certain possible ways of improving the availability and quality of statistics in this area do exist. In terms of acquisitions of nationality, a *central overall account of all modes of loss of nationality* should be set up, which could also cover overall reductions in the citizenry by death. If deaths are included in these statistics, then they could be combined with overall statistics for all acquisitions of nationality to produce a complete account of flows into and out of the community of all nationals. In any case, the statistic should cover renunciations, releases from nationality that require the consent of a public authority, *ex lege* lapses and withdrawals of nationality, as well as annulments of acquisitions of nationality. The reasons for including the last mode of 'loss', despite the fact that the persons concerned are treated subsequently as never having been a national, are similar to the reasons for regarding establishments of the status of national as acquisitions: firstly, an annulment of acquisition in one state may be a withdrawal in other states; and, secondly, the effects of a lapse or withdrawal and an annulment of acquisition are similar, i.e. a person who has been treated as a national for some time is no longer a national.

Again, all the authorities responsible for withdrawing nationality or registering *ex lege* losses of nationality should be obliged to report persons who have effectively lost their nationality to a central authority (e.g. the national statistical institute), which then produces consolidated statistics of all known cases of loss of nationality. *Units of counting* are again persons (not procedures or cases or declarations of renunciation of nationality) and the date of counting is the day on which the loss of nationality becomes legally valid or, in cases of annulment of acquisition, the day on which the authority's decision on the annulment becomes legally effective.

Finally, the characteristics to be registered for each person concerned are 1) the exact legal basis for the loss, 2) the effective date of the loss, 3) the country of residence, 4) the country of birth (at least: in that country or abroad), 5) sex, 6) age and, 7) whether or not the person ends up stateless.<sup>35</sup> Last but not least, if regional or local authorities are responsible for the deprivation of nationality, 8) the region or province responsible for making the decision to withdraw nationality or annulling its acquisition should also be recorded.

---

<sup>35</sup> However, most states will probably be very reluctant to collect information in this respect.

## 6.5 Annex 1: Tables on acquisitions of nationality by mode

Data on acquisitions of nationality in the tables presented below are broken down as far as possible by mode of acquisition and/or article of the law on which they are based. With the exception of a few modes of acquisition in residual categories that were grouped together in order to reduce the size of the tables, separate values for modes that are combined in single lines in these tables are generally not available.

**Table 6.10: Austria: acquisitions of nationality after birth by mode 1985-2004**

Mode	1985-89	1990-94	1995-99	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
<i>Declaration</i> : children born to Austrian mothers before 09/1983 (A04: applications until 1988)	24.7%	0.3%	—	—	—	—	—	—
<i>Granting</i> : persons born in Austria (since 1999) (A05a)	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.7%	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%
<i>Granting</i> : residence in Austria, of which:	15.7%	22.6%	24.0%	32.9%	36.3%	38.7%	39.6%	37.7%
<i>Granting, discretion</i> : 10 years residence (A06a)	14.4%	22.0%	21.4%	24.4%	29.1%	33.0%	35.1%	33.1%
<i>Granting, discretion</i> : 6 years residence, effective integration (since 1999) (A06b)	—	—	1.2%	5.6%	4.5%	2.8%	1.0%	1.0%
<i>Granting, entitlement</i> : 30 years residence (A06c)	1.2%	0.6%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%	1.0%	1.0%
<i>Granting, entitlement</i> : 15 years residence, effective integration (since 1999) (A06d)	—	—	0.9%	2.5%	2.3%	2.4%	2.4%	2.6%
<i>Granting</i> : spouses of nationals (A08a-c)	12.3%	14.4%	14.1%	10.3%	8.5%	7.2%	6.6%	8.6%
<i>Granting</i> : children of nationals; <i>Declaration</i> : children of university professors (A09b+c)	2.5%	2.6%	2.4%	1.6%	1.5%	1.9%	2.5%	3.6%
<i>Extension of granting</i> to spouses (A13a-d)	7.9%	9.8%	12.0%	13.3%	12.6%	11.9%	10.8%	9.8%
<i>Extension of granting</i> to minor children (A14a-c, e)	20.9%	31.7%	33.2%	34.6%	37.0%	37.8%	37.7%	37.2%
<i>Granting/notification</i> : various former nationals (A16a-e)	0.9%	2.0%	1.5%	0.4%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%
<i>Granting</i> : EEA nationals (since 1999) (A18)	—	—	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%
<i>Granting</i> : persons with special (before 1999) or other special reasons (since 1999), persons who fled Austria during Nazi rule (A21a-b)	14.6%	16.2%	11.6%	3.5%	2.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.1%
<i>Granting</i> : refugees (since 1999) (A22)	—	—	0.6%	2.6%	1.3%	1.0%	1.3%	1.3%
<i>Granting</i> : persons born stateless in Austria (A23/A05b)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<i>Granting</i> : persons with special achievements (A24a+b)	0.5%	0.5%	0.4%	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%
<b>Total – %</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Total – absolute figures (annual averages for periods)</b>	<b>8,663</b>	<b>12,637</b>	<b>18,236</b>	<b>24,645</b>	<b>32,080</b>	<b>36,382</b>	<b>45,112</b>	<b>42,174</b>

**Note:** Percentages refer to acquisitions of nationality in Austria or abroad (see Table 6.3).

*Modes of acquisition after birth not covered:* *Ex lege* acquisitions by establishment of filiation or recognition of paternity (A01), legitimation (A09a), being a foundling (A05c) or having been born stateless (A05d) before 09/1983, extension of acquisition by legitimation to minor children (A14d), or commencement of employment as university professor (A25).

**Table 6.11: Belgium: acquisitions of nationality after birth by mode 1996-2004**

Mode	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
<i>Ex lege</i> : native-born minors becoming stateless (A03a/A05a/ A23b) or adopted by native-born foreign nationals (A05b)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.3%
<i>Declaration</i> : minors born in Belgium after 10 years residence by parents, if younger than 12 (A02b/A05c)	12.2%	7.1%	5.3%	6.8%	2.0%	0.8%	0.6%	0.7%	0.6%
<i>Declaration</i> , age 18: persons born in Belgium (A05d)	24.4%	17.3%	14.3%	19.2%	5.2%	5.6%	6.7%	8.0%	5.9%
<i>Option</i> , age 18-22: persons born abroad to (former) nationals (A04a/A12), born in Belgium to foreign nationals (A05e), raised in Belgium (A07) or adopted by national (A10e)	4.6%	2.9%	2.3%	3.0%	1.1%	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%
<i>Declaration</i> : 7 years residence (A06a: since 05/2000)	—	—	—	—	N/A	32.3%	33.7%	36.4%	29.4%
<i>Naturalisation</i> : 3 (before 05/2000: 5) years residence (A06b). Incl. facilitated naturalisations of refugees (A22) & stateless persons (A23)	19.8%	30.4%	32.7%	23.9%	17.0%	16.9%	17.9%	12.1%	19.0%
<i>Option</i> : spouses of persons who are (A08a+b) or become nationals (A13a+b)	11.2%	8.6%	9.3%	15.0%	10.7%	6.8%	9.4%	13.7%	14.6%
<i>Declaration</i> : adults born abroad if one parent is a national at time of declaration (A09)	—	—	—	—	n.a.	1.0%	2.0%	2.9%	3.2%
<i>Ex lege / declaration</i> : minors adopted by nationals (A10a-d)	2.0%	0.7%	0.5%	0.9%	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%
<i>Ex lege</i> : extension of acquisition to minor children (A14)	17.4%	24.4%	25.2%	18.1%	30.2%	31.8%	26.5%	22.7%	23.9%
<i>Other acquisitions</i> : option for former nationals (A16) & persons treated as nationals for 10 years (A20), other unclear modes. 2000 also: A06a and A09 (see above)	8.4%	8.6%	10.4%	13.1%	33.5%	4.0%	2.5%	2.7%	2.6%
<b>Total – %</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Total – absolute figures (annual averages for periods)</b>	<b>24,581</b>	<b>31,687</b>	<b>34,034</b>	<b>24,196</b>	<b>61,980</b>	<b>62,982</b>	<b>46,417</b>	<b>33,709</b>	<b>34,754</b>

**Note:** Modes of acquisition after birth not covered: None.

**Table 6.12: Denmark: acquisitions of nationality after birth by mode 1997-2004**

Mode	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
<i>Naturalisation</i> : 9 years residence (before 2002: 7) (A06); Incl. facilitated naturalisations by children of Danish mothers (A04b) or unmarried Danish fathers (A04c), native-born stateless minors (A05/A23b), persons who came before age 15 (A07a) or were educated in Denmark (A07b), spouses of nationals (A08), children of naturalised nationals (A09) or adopted by nationals (A10b+c), descendants of nationals (A12), former nationals by birth (A16b), Nordic nationals (A18c), 'Danish-minded' persons from Southern Slesvig (A19), refugees (A22) & stateless persons (A23a); of which:								
Unconditional	49.8%	51.9%	49.9%	51.5%	50.4%	53.8%	51.1%	55.6%
Conditional upon prior loss of foreign nationality	39.0%	38.9%	38.5%	40.2%	39.4%	44.2%	41.8%	45.9%
<i>Extension of naturalisation</i> to children (A14a)	10.8%	13.0%	11.4%	11.3%	11.0%	9.6%	9.3%	9.7%
<i>Declarations</i> ; of which:	35.9%	41.8%	38.1%	39.9%	40.3%	41.3%	33.4%	36.5%
Nordic nationals by birth (A18a; since 05/2004), aged between 18-23: all foreign nationals (A07c; until 04/2004) or Nordic nationals (A18b; since 05/2004)	14.3%	6.3%	12.0%	8.6%	9.3%	4.8%	15.5%	7.9%
Former Danish nationals by birth (A16a)	14.1%	6.2%	12.0%	8.6%	9.2%	4.8%	15.5%	7.8%
Former Danish nationals by birth (A16a)	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Total – %</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Total – absolute figures</b>	<b>4,122</b>	<b>10,797</b>	<b>13,360</b>	<b>17,425</b>	<b>9,352</b>	<b>18,628</b>	<b>7,318</b>	<b>10,295</b>

**Note:** Data used is from the Ministry of Refugees, Immigrants and Integration and derived from naturalisation laws; it is different from the statistics contained in Table 6.3. Persons who are granted conditional naturalisation will not necessarily acquire nationality.

Modes of acquisition after birth not covered: *Ex lege* acquisition by establishment of filiation or recognition of paternity (A01), legitimation (A04a) or adoption (A10a).

**Table 6.13: France: acquisitions of nationality after birth by mode 1985-2003**

Mode	1985-92	1993	1994-98	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
<i>Ex lege</i> : persons born in France, majority (A05a)	26.1%	23.4%	0.7%	7.5%	5.7%	4.6%	4.1%	3.3%
<i>Declaration</i> : youths born in France, aged between 16-21 (1994-08/1998) (A05d)	—	—	26.7%	—	—	—	—	—
<i>Declaration</i> : minors born in France, of which:	18.0%	16.0%	17.3%	16.3%	17.4%	18.8%	20.6%	21.4%
Between ages 13-16 (A05b)	25.8%	24.4%	27.9%	27.0%	30.3%	30.9%	30.0%	30.1%
Between ages 16-18 (A05c: since 1998); until 2000: incl. declarations according to pre-1994 rules	3.5%	4.5%	4.9%	4.4%	4.9%	4.5%	4.5%	5.4%
<i>Naturalisation</i> : adults after 5 years residence (A06); Incl. facilitated naturalisations by spouses (A08b) & children of nationals (A09b), co-naturalised spouses (A13) & adult children (A14b), nationals of former French territories (A18) or Francophone states (A19), persons who studied in France (A21), refugees (A22), stateless persons (A23), persons with special achievements (A24a-c) or in civil service (A25a+b)	12.9%	13.8%	14.2%	14.4%	16.4%	15.2%	15.6%	17.8%
<i>Naturalisation or reintegration</i> of minors or <i>ex lege</i> extension to minors, of which:	<i>n.a.</i>	13.3%	13.5%	13.6%	15.5%	14.3%	14.4%	16.4%
<i>Naturalisation</i> (A09a, A14a)	<i>n.a.</i>	0.5%	0.7%	0.8%	0.9%	0.9%	1.1%	1.3%
<i>Reintegration</i> (A16a, A14a)	11.8%	16.0%	6.3%	28.8%	23.9%	24.4%	23.6%	20.3%
<i>Declaration</i> : spouses of nationals (A08a)	—	—	1.0%	13.1%	11.7%	13.2%	14.4%	13.2%
<i>Reintegration</i> (reacquisition): adults (A16a)	<i>n.a.</i>	0.0%	1.3%	15.6%	12.2%	11.2%	9.3%	7.1%
<i>Other declarations</i> , of which:	<i>n.a.</i>	16.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Minors taken into care in France (A07) or after simple adoption (A10b)	2.0%	2.0%	2.1%	1.6%	1.4%	1.5%	1.7%	1.7%
Various groups of former nationals (A16b-d)	<i>n.a.</i>	0.2%	0.4%	0.4%	0.5%	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>
Persons regarded as nationals for 10 years (A20)	<i>n.a.</i>	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>
<b>Total – %</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Total – absolute figures (annual averages for periods)</b>	<b>81,338</b>	<b>95,500</b>	<b>113,748</b>	<b>147,524</b>	<b>150,026</b>	<b>127,548</b>	<b>128,093</b>	<b>144,640</b>

**Note:** Percentages for *ex lege* acquisitions upon reaching majority (mode A05a) for 1985-1993 and 1998 based on estimates. Percentages refer to acquisitions of nationality in France or abroad (see Table 6.3). *Modes of acquisition after birth not covered: Ex lege* acquisitions by establishment of filiation or recognition of paternity (A01+A02) or adoption (A10a). —

**Table 6.14: Germany: acquisitions of nationality after birth by mode 1992-2004**

Mode	1992-93	1994-96	1997-99	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
<b>Including acquisitions by (Spät)Aussiedler</b>								
<i>Naturalisation, entitlement: ius soli, transitional rule 2000 (A05)</i>	—	—	—	7.1%	8.5%	1.8%	0.3%	0.2%
<i>Naturalisation, entitlement: 8 years (before 2000: 15) residence (A06a); until 1994: incl. co-naturalised spouses (A13) &amp; children (A14b); since 2000: incl. facilitated naturalisations by EU nationals (A18) &amp; refugees (A22b)</i>	10.3%	10.0%	15.5%	28.9%	31.7%	37.6%	41.7%	45.3%
<i>Naturalisation, discretion: after 8 (before 2000: 10) years residence (A06b); Incl. facilitated naturalisations: spouses of nationals (A08: before 2000), some ethnic Germans (A19c), persons treated as nationals (A20), refugees (A22a), stateless (A23), persons with special achievements (A24), in public service (A25a) or whose naturalisation is in public interest (A27) (A19c-A27: since 2000)</i>	11.4%	6.5%	8.9%	5.5%	3.7%	3.6%	3.6%	3.4%
<i>Naturalisation, entitlement: youths who attended school in Germany (A07: before 2000)</i>	3.2%	4.2%	6.5%	4.1%	1.9%	1.1%	0.5%	0.3%
<i>Naturalisation, entitlement: spouses of nationals (A08)</i>	—	—	—	4.5%	4.6%	4.9%	5.3%	5.8%
<i>Naturalisation, discretion: co-naturalised spouses (A13) &amp; minor children (A14a)</i>	—	4.4%	9.8%	15.0%	13.1%	12.7%	12.4%	11.0%
<i>Ex lege extension of naturalisation to minor children (A14b: since 2000)</i>	—	—	—	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%
<i>Naturalisation, discretion/entitlement: former nationals (A16a-c) &amp; their descendants (A12) (both since 2000)</i>	—	—	—	0.4%	0.6%	0.9%	1.8%	2.1%
<i>Entitlement to naturalisation (A19d; until 07/1999) or ex lege acquisition (A19a; since 2000) by ethnic German (Spät)Aussiedler</i>	75.2%	74.9%	59.3%	33.9%	35.6%	37.2%	34.1%	31.7%
<i>Naturalisation, discretion/entitlement: other ethnic Germans (A19e-g), persons living abroad with special ties (A21) or in public service (A25b), certain refugees (A22c) &amp; stateless persons (A23b)</i>	—	—	—	0.4%	0.5%	0.7%	0.5%	0.5%
<b>Total – %</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Total – absolute figures (annual averages for periods)</b>	<b>189,724</b>	<b>291,869</b>	<b>272,733</b>	<b>282,303</b>	<b>276,582</b>	<b>245,963</b>	<b>213,616</b>	<b>186,246</b>
<b>Excluding acquisitions by (Spät)Aussiedler</b>								
A05	—	—	—	10.8%	13.1%	2.8%	0.5%	0.2%
A06a & A13, A14b, A18, A22b	41.4%	41.5%	39.6%	43.8%	49.2%	59.9%	63.3%	66.4%
A06b & A08 (before 2000), A19c, A20, A22a, A23, A24, A25a, A27 (all: since 2000)	45.8%	36.5%	27.9%	8.3%	5.7%	5.7%	5.5%	4.9%
A07 (before 2000)	12.8%	15.3%	16.9%	6.2%	3.0%	1.8%	0.7%	0.4%
A08	—	—	—	6.8%	7.2%	7.8%	8.0%	8.5%
A13, A14a (since 1994)	—	6.7%	15.6%	22.6%	20.3%	20.1%	18.9%	16.1%
A14b (since 2000)	—	—	—	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%
A16a-c, A12 (both since 2000)	—	—	—	0.6%	1.0%	1.4%	2.7%	3.1%
A19e-g, A21, A22c, A23b, A25b (all since 2000)	—	—	—	0.6%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%
<b>Total – %</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Total – absolute figures (annual averages for periods)</b>	<b>47,004</b>	<b>73,349</b>	<b>110,990</b>	<b>186,688</b>	<b>178,098</b>	<b>154,547</b>	<b>140,731</b>	<b>127,153</b>

**Note:** Percentages refer to acquisitions in Germany or abroad, incl. ethnic Germans (see Table 6.3).

*Modes of acquisition after birth not covered:* Ex lege acquisitions by legitimation (A09: before 07/1998), adoption (A10) and by ethnic Germans on 1 August 1999 (A19b); acquisitions by declaration by children legitimised, acknowledge or recognised by German father (A09: since 07/1998).

**Table 6.15: Greece: acquisitions of nationality after birth by mode 1985-2003**

Mode	1985-89	1990-94	1995-99	2000	2001	2002	2003
<i>Naturalisation</i> , non-Greek origin (allogeneis): 10 years residence (A06). Incl. facilitated naturalisations by persons born in Greece (A05), spouses of nationals with common child (A08a), spouses of Greek diplomats (A08b), refugees (A22), stateless persons (A23) or Olympic athletes (A24b)	18.3%	32.0%	47.4%	53.9%	61.1%	79.2%	72.2%
<i>Naturalisation</i> , Greek origin ( <i>homogeneis</i> ): no minimum duration of residence (A19a)	81.7%	68.0%	52.6%	46.1%	38.9%	20.8%	27.8%
<b>Total – %</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Total – absolute figures (annual averages for periods)</b>	<b>1,563</b>	<b>1,062</b>	<b>2,376</b>	<b>1,007</b>	<b>1,774</b>	<b>2,141</b>	<b>1,896</b>

**Note:** *Modes of acquisition after birth not covered: Ex lege* acquisitions by establishment of filiation or recognition of paternity (A01), legitimation (A09), adoption (A10), taking orders as a monk at Mount Athos (A21) or entering the Greek army (A25a+c); non-automatic acquisitions by option by children born to Greek fathers before 07/1982, definition by persons with Greek ancestors (A12), declaration (A16a+c) or option (A16b+d) by former nationals, naturalisation of *homogeneis* residing abroad (A19b) or by Pontian Greeks from the former Soviet Union (A19c), honorary granting (A24a) or by option by volunteer *homogeneis* serving in the Greeks (A25b). Unclear coverage: *ex lege* extension of acquisition to minor children (A14).

**Table 6.16: Ireland: acquisitions of nationality after birth by mode 1997-2004**

Mode	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
<i>Naturalisation</i> : 5 years residence (A06). Incl. facilitated naturalisations by spouses of nationals (A08b), children of naturalised nationals (A09), persons of Irish descent or associations (A19), refugees (A22), stateless persons (A23), persons in civil service abroad (A25) or investing in Ireland (A26: until 1998)	22.5%	22.4%	28.9%	10.9%	41.6%	47.3%	41.7%	35.3%
<i>Post-nuptial declaration</i> : spouses of nationals (A08a)	77.5%	77.6%	71.1%	89.1%	58.4%	52.7%	58.3%	64.7%
<b>Total – %</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Total – absolute figures</b>	<b>1,305</b>	<b>1,569</b>	<b>1,438</b>	<b>1,143</b>	<b>2,431</b>	<b>2,817</b>	<b>3,993</b>	<b>3,784</b>

**Note:** *Modes of acquisition after birth not covered: ex lege* acquisitions by establishment of filiation or recognition of paternity (A01+A02) and adoption (A10); and non-automatic acquisitions through an ‘act that only an Irish citizen can do’ (A02=A05), registration of children born abroad to nationals (A04), declaration by former nationals born on island of Ireland (A16) and by naturalisation as a token of honour by the President (A24).

**Table 6.17: Italy: acquisitions of nationality after birth by mode 1985-2004**

Mode	1985-89	1990-94	1995-99	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
<i>Naturalisation</i> : 10 years residence (until 1992: 5) (A06); Incl. facilitated naturalisations by persons born in Italy (A05b), adults adopted by nationals (A10b+c), descendants of nationals (A12a), EU nationals (A18), refugees (A22), stateless persons (A23), persons with achievements (A24) & in civil service (A25a)	10.0%	9.6%	11.7%	15.0%	10.4%	8.8%	15.8%	16.3%
<i>Naturalisation</i> : spouses of nationals (A08)	90.0%	90.4%	88.3%	85.0%	89.6%	91.2%	84.2%	83.7%
<b>Total – %</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Total – absolute figures (annual av. for periods)</b>	<b>3,645</b>	<b>4,853</b>	<b>9,880</b>	<b>9,555</b>	<b>10,380</b>	<b>10,681</b>	<b>13,444</b>	<b>11,934</b>

**Note:** *Modes of acquisition after birth not covered: ex lege* acquisitions by establishment of filiation or recognition of paternity (A09a), adoption (A10a), extension of acquisition to minors (A14) and by establishing or having residence for one year in Italy as a former national (A16c+g); non-automatic acquisitions by declaration by persons born in Italy (A05a), adults after establishment of filiation or recognition of paternity (A09b), descendants of nationals (A12b+c), former nationals (A16a-b, A16d-f) and persons born before 07/1920 in Austro-Hungarian Empire and their descendants (A21).

**Table 6.18: Luxembourg: acquisitions of nationality after birth by mode 1994-2004**

Mode	1994-96	1997-99	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
<i>Naturalisation</i> : 5 years residence (before 2001: 10) (A06). Incl. facilitated naturalisations by co-naturalised spouses (A13b), refugees (A22) & persons with special achievements (A24)	36.7%	35.8%	44.4%	41.8%	47.9%	43.8%	44.4%
<i>Option</i> , of which:	34.1%	30.9%	28.9%	26.6%	24.1%	29.3%	34.6%
Persons born in Luxembourg (A05)	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%
Youths educated in Luxembourg (A07)	16.5%	23.2%	20.8%	21.9%	20.9%	16.0%	12.1%
Spouses of nationals (A08) or spouses of persons acquiring nationality by option (A13a)	8.9%	6.7%	4.2%	5.7%	5.3%	9.0%	7.3%
Adult children of persons becoming nationals by option (A14b)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%
Minors adopted by nationals who do not lose foreign nationality <i>ex lege</i> (A10b), descendants of former nationals (A12)	0.6%	1.1%	0.3%	1.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.7%
<i>Naturalisation</i> : former nationals (A16a)	0.5%	0.6%	0.1%	0.6%	0.6%	0.4%	0.0%
<i>Declaration</i> : women who lost nationality by marriage before 07/1975 (A16b)	2.7%	1.8%	1.3%	2.1%	0.7%	0.8%	0.8%
<b>Total – %</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Total – absolute figures (annual averages for periods)</b>	<b>709</b>	<b>661</b>	<b>692</b>	<b>474</b>	<b>826</b>	<b>721</b>	<b>840</b>

**Note:** Percentages based on data different from those in Table 6.3 with respect to the date of counting.  
*Modes of acquisition after birth not covered:* *Ex lege* acquisitions by establishment of filiation or recognition of paternity (A01), adoption (A10a) and extension of acquisition of nationality to minor children (A14a).

**Table 6.19: The Netherlands: acquisitions of nationality after birth by mode 1985-2003**

Mode	1985-89	1990-94	1995-99	2000	2001	2002	2003
<i>Naturalisation</i> , of which :	65.2%	93.4%	94.3%	91.9%	91.6%	92.4%	88.2%
<i>Naturalisation</i> : 5 (A06a) or 10 years residence (A06b). Incl. facilitated naturalisations by spouses/partners of nationals (A08b+c), former nationals (A16b) or in special situations (A27); since 04/2003 also by adults recognised (A09e) or adopted by nationals (A10b), & refugees (A23b)	43.4%	58.8%	61.6%	61.7%	63.8%	63.8%	62.6%
<i>Extension of naturalisation</i> to minor children (A14b)	21.9%	34.6%	32.7%	30.2%	27.8%	28.6%	25.5%
<i>Options</i> , of which:	29.8%	4.4%	3.8%	4.6%	5.0%	4.9%	11.8%
Persons born in the Netherlands (A05)	2.0%	3.9%	3.7%	4.5%	4.9%	4.7%	n.a.
Children of Dutch mothers 1985-88 (A04)	26.9%	—	—	—	—	—	—
Others: persons who lost Dutch nationality by residence abroad (transitional 2001-03) or marriage (A16c+d), persons who have been stateless since birth (A23a), other vague groups; also since 04/2003: persons aged 65+ (A06c) & spouses of nationals with 15 years residence (A08a), persons resident since age 4 (A07), minors recognised or legitimated by national (A09d+f), minor children of persons acquiring nationality by option (A14a), former nationals (A16a)	0.9%	0.5%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	n.a.
<i>Ex lege acquisition</i> by recognition (A09b) or legitimation by national (A09c: both only before 04/2003) or establishment of filiation (A09a)	—	—	1.0%	1.6%	1.6%	1.6%	0.9%
<i>Ex lege</i> : minors adopted by nationals (A10a)	5.0%	2.2%	0.9%	1.9%	1.9%	1.1%	2.4%
<b>Total – %</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Total – absolute figures (annual averages for periods)</b>	<b>22,106</b>	<b>34,142</b>	<b>67,046</b>	<b>49,968</b>	<b>46,667</b>	<b>45,321</b>	<b>27,881</b>

**Note:** Percentages refer to acquisitions of nationality in the Netherlands (see Table 6.3).  
*Modes of acquisition after birth not covered:* none (except acquisitions abroad).

**Table 6.20: Portugal: acquisitions of nationality after birth by mode 1999-2003**

Mode	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
<i>Naturalisation</i> : 10 years residence (A06). Incl. facilitated naturalisations by nationals of Lusophone states (A18), former nationals, persons with Portuguese ancestors or affiliations abroad (A19) & persons who have rendered services to state (A24)	37.2%	31.8%	44.3%	38.1%	43.6%
<i>Declaration</i> : spouses of nationals (A08)	41.5%	43.4%	29.1%	33.5%	30.3%
<i>Other forms of acquisition</i> : unclear	21.4%	24.9%	26.6%	28.4%	26.0%
<b>Total – %</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Total – absolute figures</b>	<b>1,620</b>	<b>1,981</b>	<b>2,704</b>	<b>2,541</b>	<b>2,463</b>

**Note:** Percentages calculated on the basis of (see Table 6.3).

*Modes of acquisition after birth not covered:* *Ex lege* acquisitions by establishment of filiation or recognition of paternity (A01+A02) or adoption (A10a); unclear which non-automatic acquisitions are not covered.

**Table 6.21: Sweden: acquisitions of nationality after birth by mode 1998-2004**

Mode	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
<i>Naturalisation</i> : 5 years residence (A06). Incl. facilitated naturalisations by spouses of nationals (A08), co-naturalised children (A14b), former nationals (A16b), Nordic nationals (A18a), refugees (A22), stateless persons (A23a), persons with special achievements (A24; before 07/2001) or special reasons (A27; since 07/2001), of which:	98.2%	97.7%	97.8%	92.6%	88.4%	85.7%	92.0%
unconditional	79.6%	83.4%	86.8%	89.3%	88.4%	85.7%	92.0%
conditional, i.e. on loss of previous nationality	18.7%	14.4%	10.9%	3.3%	0.0%	—	—
<i>Notification</i> , of which:	0.8%	1.0%	1.0%	6.1%	11.6%	14.3%	8.0%
Children born to Swedish fathers out of wedlock: in Sweden or abroad (before 07/2001) or only abroad (since 07/2001) (A04a/A01b)	0.9%	1.3%	1.3%	1.5%	0.6%	—	—
Children born out of wedlock in Sweden to Swedish fathers before 07/2001 (2 years from 07/2001) (A04b)	—	—	—	0.7%	1.0%	0.8%	—
Minors after 5 years residence or persons with residence since age 13 aged 18-20 (A07a-b/A23b+d)	0.8%	1.0%	1.0%	0.8%	—	—	—
Minors after 5 years residence (A07a/A23b)	—	—	—	0.7%	2.4%	2.8%	3.0%
Persons resident since age 13 aged 18-20 (A07b/A23d)	—	—	—	1.4%	2.6%	2.5%	2.6%
Persons who lost nationality due to acquisition of a foreign nationality before 07/2001 (2 years from 07/2001)	—	—	—	2.3%	4.8%	7.3%	0.9%
Others: children born stateless in Sweden under age 5 (A05/A23c), former nationals who lived for 10 years in Sweden while minors (A16a), minors adopted before 07/2001 under the age of 12 (A10b: 07/2001-06/2003)	—	—	—	0.1%	0.2%	0.3%	0.4%
<b>Total – %</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Total – absolute figures</b>	<b>41,663</b>	<b>34,785</b>	<b>40,976</b>	<b>30,173</b>	<b>35,430</b>	<b>31,078</b>	<b>24,709</b>

**Note:** Percentages based on data from Swedish Migration Board, not data from the national statistical institute contained in Table 6.3. Persons who were granted conditional naturalisation before 07/2001 may not have actually acquired nationality.

*Modes of acquisition after birth not covered:* *Ex lege* acquisitions by establishment of filiation or recognition of paternity (A01), legitimation (A09) or adoption (A10a: since 07/2001); acquisitions by notification by Nordic nationals who are former nationals (A16c) or on the basis of residence (A18b).

**Table 6.22: United Kingdom: acquisitions of nationality after birth by mode 1987-2004**

Mode	1987-91	1992-96	1997-99	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
1) <i>Acquisition by residence</i> , of which:	61.8%	43.6%	42.9%	42.5%	44.0%	49.1%	43.8%	45.5%
<i>Naturalisation</i> : 5 years residence (A06) or service abroad (A25)	N/A	N/A	38.1%	40.5%	42.0%	47.9%	43.8%	45.5%
<i>Registration</i> : special nationals with 5 years residence (A17a: entitlement) or service abroad (A17b/A25b: discretion) (from 2003 both counted under pt. 4 below); until 1990: certain nationals of Commonwealth states (A18)	N/A	N/A	4.8%	2.0%	2.1%	1.2%	N/A	N/A
2) <i>Acquisition by marriage</i> , of which:	24.1%	33.4%	32.8%	33.4%	31.7%	28.6%	30.2%	28.7%
<i>Naturalisation</i> : spouses of nationals (A08a)	N/A	N/A	32.7%	33.4%	31.7%	28.6%	30.2%	28.7%
<i>Registration</i> : persons married to nationals (A08b) or former nationals (A12) since before 1983 (from 2003 all counted under pt. 4 below)	N/A	N/A	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	N/A	N/A
3) <i>Registration of minors</i> , of which:	13.2%	21.4%	23.2%	23.3%	23.6%	21.9%	24.2%	21.5%
<i>Entitlement</i> : Minors born in UK if parent settles or becomes a national (A05: entitlement), or if person spent first 10 years of life in UK (A05b: discretion)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	10.9%	9.3%
<i>Discretion</i> : any minor child (A14/A27)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	12.7%	11.7%
<i>Entitlement</i> : children born abroad to nationals 'by descent' within 1st year of life (A01c/A04a) or after 3 years residence (A04b); until 2002: certain children of British fathers born abroad 1983-1987 (A04d)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.6%	0.5%
4) <i>Other registrations</i> : stateless person born in UK (A05c/A23a), former nationals (A16a-d), Gibraltarians (A17d); since 2003 also: certain persons born 1961-83 to nationals (A04c), special nationals with no other nationality (A17c), some groups mentioned under points 1 & 2 above (A08b, A12, A17a, A17b/A25b)	0.9%	1.6%	1.2%	0.8%	0.7%	0.3%	1.8%	4.2%
<b>Total – %</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Total – absolute figures (annual averages for periods)</b>	<b>72,500</b>	<b>43,131</b>	<b>48,615</b>	<b>82,210</b>	<b>90,295</b>	<b>120,148</b>	<b>125,530</b>	<b>140,795</b>

**Note:** Percentages refer to acquisitions of nationality excluding those by residents of Hong Kong (A17e-g) and by British Overseas Territories Citizens in February 2002 (A17i) (see Table 6.3).

*Other modes of acquisition after birth not covered:* *Ex lege* acquisitions by establishment of filiation or recognition of paternity (A01+A02), legitimation (A09), adoption (A10) and by certain children of nationals born abroad between 1969 and 1983.

## 6.6 Annex 2: Statistics of applications and decisions

**Table 6.23: Belgium: Decisions on applications for naturalisation**

	Decisions			
	Granted	Refused	Total	Refused in %
1985-86	2,371	91	2,462	4%
1986-87	2,099	83	2,182	4%
1987-88	2,355	142	2,497	6%
1988-89	1,669	110	1,779	6%
1989-90	1,747	138	1,885	7%
1990-91	2,114	227	2,341	10%
1991-92	2,420	262	2,682	10%
1992-93	2,381	84	2,465	3%
1993-94	2,938	230	3,168	7%
1994-95	4,655	218	4,873	4%
1995-96	4,842	219	5,061	4%
1996-97	10,167	813	10,980	7%
1997-98	11,780	824	12,604	7%
1998-99	4,472	1,180	5,652	21%
1999-00	10,611	1,518	12,129	13%
2000-01	10,755	1,758	12,513	14%
2001-02	8,484	1,370	9,854	14%
2002-03	4,222	2,962	7,184	41%
2003-04	6,716	2,421	9,137	26%

Source: Belgian Parliament.

**Table 6.24: Denmark: Decisions on applications for naturalisation**

		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Decisions	Naturalisation granted	11,759	15,925	8,484	17,727	6,184	9,485
	Naturalisation refused	1,200	1,983	1,978	2,537	4,240	3,265
	Total decisions	12,959	17,908	10,462	20,264	10,424	12,750
	Not granted in %	9%	11%	19%	13%	41%	26%
Reasons for refusals	Missing declarations on loyalty, crimes committed, debts, social benefits received	—	—	—	5%	6%	5%
	Unwilling to renounce foreign nationality	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
	Residence lacking or too short	6%	11%	12%	38%	17%	18%
	Too young	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%
	Crimes committed	30%	26%	25%	22%	11%	17%
	Public debt payable	19%	8%	14%	8%	3%	5%
	Lack of knowledge of Danish language/society	45%	42%	39%	20%	59%	50%
	Shelved cases	0%	11%	9%	7%	3%	4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	

Source: Danish Parliament.

**Table 6.25: Finland: Applications and declarations and decisions**

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Applications for naturalisation	602	744	614	753	1,340	1,686	2,431	3,353	2,837	2,239	2,323	1,933	2,499	2,630	2,004
Decisions on applications	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,153	3,731	3,892	2,622	2,339	3,018	3,039	4,659
Declarations of nationality	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	283	317	378	429	343	436	480	539	2,053	2,515
Decisions on declarations	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	362	446	495	613	1,479	2,504

**Note:** Decisions refer to cases, not persons.

**Source:** Directorate of Immigration.

**Table 6.26: France: Decisions on applications for naturalisation or reintegration**

	Decisions			
	Granted	Refused	Total	Refused in %
1985	29,610	2,694	32,304	8%
1986	23,058	4,151	27,209	15%
1987	17,854	2,331	20,185	12%
1988	19,013	3,358	22,371	15%
1989	22,862	5,874	28,736	20%
1990	24,289	6,934	31,223	22%
1991	26,887	7,590	34,477	22%
1992	26,997	9,177	36,174	25%
1993	27,582	9,806	37,388	26%
1994	33,882	10,702	44,584	24%
1995	28,826	11,867	40,693	29%
1996	41,175	14,698	55,873	26%
1997	42,014	19,326	61,340	32%
1998	40,450	18,445	58,895	31%
1999	46,344	18,811	65,155	29%
2000	52,825	15,134	67,959	22%
2001	45,159	12,384	57,543	22%
2002	44,152	13,488	57,640	23%
2003	51,401	17,366	68,767	25%

Source: Ministry of Social Affairs.

**Table 6.27: Ireland: Applications and declarations received and decisions made**

	Naturalisations					Post-nuptial declarations				
	Appli- cations	Decisions				Received	Decisions			
		Granted	Refused	Total	Ref. in %		Accepted	Refused	Total	Ref. in %
1985	247	253	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1986	378	271	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1987	566	545	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1988	415	333	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1989	272	299	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1990	373	179	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1991	649	188	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1992	474	150	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1993	256	133	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1994	284	175	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1995	296	355	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1996	348	226	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1997	650	294	68	362	19%	1,052	1,011	10	1021	1%
1998	588	352	31	383	8%	1,230	1,217	5	1222	0%
1999	739	416	79	495	16%	1,242	1,022	4	1026	0%
2000	1,004	125	57	182	31%	1,293	1,018	4	1022	0%
2001	1,431	1,012	8	1020	1%	1,502	1,419	6	1425	0%
2002	3,574	1,332	109	1441	8%	1,978	1,485	4	1489	0%
2003	3,580	1,664	179	1843	10%	2,369	2,329	0	2329	0%
2004	4,074	1,335	779	2114	37%	2,747	2,449	1	2450	0%

Source: Ministry of Justice, Equality and Law Reform.

**Table 6.28: The Netherlands: Applications for naturalisation and decisions made**

	Applications	Decisions	
		Granted (incl. after appeal)	Refused in %
2000	36,780	N/A	N/A
2001	32,520	N/A	N/A
2002	38,685	32,600	10%
2003	36,965	27,700	12%
2004	19,340	28,900	19%

**Note:** Numbers before 2004 do not include co-applicant minor children. The actual number of persons applying for naturalisation will have been about 50% higher.

**Source:** Immigration and Naturalisation Directorate.

**Table 6.29: Portugal: Applications for naturalisation and decisions made**

	Applications	Decisions			
		Granted	Refused	Total	Refused in %
1999	1,036	584	156	740	21%
2000	1,464	1,142	209	1,351	15%
2001	1,946	956	135	1,091	12%
2002	7,300	2,456	482	2,938	16%
2003	3,628	2,043	456	2,499	18%
2004	4,925	1,413	403	1,816	22%

**Source:** Ministry of the Interior's Foreigners and Borders Service

**Table 6.30: Sweden: Decisions on applications for naturalisation**

	Decisions					Reasons for refusals			
	Granted (adults)	Refused	Closed for other reasons	Total	Not granted in %	Unclear identity	Residence too short	No respectable life	Other reasons
2001	19,845	2,291	1,540	23,676	16%	37%	21%	41%	0%
2002	21,893	2,482	477	24,852	12%	32%	24%	39%	5%
2003	18,032	2,624	482	21,138	15%	46%	18%	30%	6%
2004	15,109	1,890	395	17,394	13%	35%	19%	36%	10%

**Source:** Swedish Migration Board.

**Table 6.31: United Kingdom: Applications for acquisition of nationality by naturalisation or registration and decisions made**

	Applications	Decisions			
		Granted	Refused	Total	Refused in %
1987	295,447	64,876	5,693	70,569	8%
1988	33,137	64,584	5,272	69,856	8%
1989	31,449	117,129	8,801	125,930	7%
1990	32,569	57,271	9,149	66,420	14%
1991	35,279	58,642	8,985	67,627	13%
1992	38,068	42,243	9,253	51,496	18%
1993	42,682	45,793	8,041	53,834	15%
1994	48,277	44,033	5,855	49,888	12%
1995	53,391	40,516	5,032	45,548	11%
1996	61,800	43,069	4,770	47,839	10%
1997	66,000	37,010	4,747	41,757	11%
1998	68,030	53,934	3,750	57,684	7%
1999	67,400	54,902	3,995	58,897	7%
2000	62,475	82,210	6,785	88,995	8%
2001	109,005	90,295	9,530	99,825	10%
2002	115,500	120,145	8,455	128,600	7%
2003	147,435	125,535	10,480	136,015	8%
2004	135,085	140,790	13,745	154,535	9%

**Source:** Home Office, research, development and Statistics Directorate.

## 6.7 References

- Baldwin-Edwards, M. (2004), 'Immigration into Greece 1990-2003 - A Southern European Paradigm?', paper prepared for the European Population Forum, Geneva, Switzerland, 12-14 January 2004.
- Baldwin-Edwards, M. & G. Kyriakou (2004), *Statistical Data On Immigrants In Greece: An Analytic Study Of Available Data And Recommendations For Conformity With European Union Standards*. Final Report, revised version. Mediterranean Migration Observatory, UEHR, Panteion University.
- Cantisani, G. & V. Greco (2005a), *Registration of acquisition of citizenship*, in: M. Poulain, N. Perrin & A. Singleton (eds): *THESIM. Towards Harmonised European Statistics on International Migration*, 167-178. Louvain-la-Neuve: UCL-Presses Universitaires de Louvain,
- Cantisani, G. & V. Greco (2005b), *Statistics on acquisition of citizenship*, in: M. Poulain, N. Perrin & A. Singleton (eds): *THESIM. Towards Harmonised European Statistics on International Migration*, 261-270. Louvain-la-Neuve: UCL-Presses Universitaires de Louvain,
- Perrin, N. (2006), *A Cohort Approach to Acquisition of Citizenship Statistics*, in: M. Poulain, N. Perrin & A. Singleton (eds): *THESIM. Towards Harmonised European Statistics on International Migration*, 321-336. Louvain-la-Neuve: UCL-Presses Universitaires de Louvain,.
- Salt, J., J. Clarke & S. Schmidt (2000), *Patterns and Trends in International Migration in Western Europe*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Waldrauch, H. & D. Çınar (2003), 'Staatsbürgerschaftspolitik und Einbürgerungspraxis in Österreich', in H. Fassmann & I. Stacher (eds.), *Österreichischer Migrations- und Integrationsreport. Demographische Entwicklungen – sozioökonomische Strukturen – rechtliche Rahmenbedingungen*, 261-283. Klagenfurt: Drava. Also available at: [www.demokratiezentrum.org](http://www.demokratiezentrum.org).