

PDF hosted at the Radboud Repository of the Radboud University Nijmegen

The following full text is a publisher's version.

For additional information about this publication click this link.

<http://hdl.handle.net/2066/203419>

Please be advised that this information was generated on 2021-05-19 and may be subject to change.



Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights

Withdrawing nationality as a measure to combat terrorism: a human rights-compatible approach?♦

Report*

Rapporteur: Ms Tineke STRIK, Netherlands, Socialists, Democrats and Greens Group

A. Draft resolution

1. The Parliamentary Assembly recalls its [Resolution 1989 \(2014\)](#) on access to nationality and the effective implementation of the European Convention on Nationality, [Resolution 1840 \(2011\)](#) on human rights and the fight against terrorism, [Resolution 2091 \(2016\)](#) on foreign fighters in Syria and Iraq, [Resolution 2090 \(2016\)](#) on combating international terrorism while protecting Council of Europe standards and values and [Resolution 2190 \(2017\)](#) on prosecuting and punishing the crimes against humanity or even possible genocide committed by Daesh.

2. The Assembly recalls that Council of Europe member States possess a legitimate sovereign right to guarantee security on their territory, but that our democratic societies can only be protected effectively by ensuring that such anti-terrorism measures abide by the rule of law. As the deprivation of nationality in the context of counter-terrorism strategies is a drastic measure which can be extremely socially divisive, the measure may be at odds with human rights. In any case, the deprivation of nationality should not be politically motivated.

3. The Assembly recalls that the right to a nationality has been recognised as the “right to have rights” and is enshrined in international legal instruments such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the European Convention on Nationality (ETS No. 166). Although the European Convention on Human Rights (ETS No. 5, hereinafter “the Convention”) does not guarantee it as such, the recent case law of the European Court of Human Rights shows that some aspects of this right are protected under Article 8 of the Convention enshrining the right to respect for private and family life.

4. The Assembly notes that although, under international law, statelessness should be prevented and eliminated, and arbitrary deprivation of nationality should be prohibited, States retain a wide discretion in deciding to whom they can grant nationality and who may be deprived of it. The 1961 United Nations Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness, which so far has been ratified by 32 member States of the Council of Europe, sets out criteria under which a State may provide for the deprivation of nationality. The 1997 European Convention on Nationality further limits the circumstances in which deprivation of nationality may occur; however, this latter convention has so far been ratified by only 21 member States of the Council of Europe.

5. The Assembly is concerned that some states consider nationality as a privilege and not a right. Many States retain the power to deprive of nationality, inter alia, persons whose conduct is seriously prejudicial to the vital interests of the State and/or who voluntarily participate in a foreign military force. Some member States of the Council of Europe have laws which allow withdrawal of nationality from persons who have been

♦ The former title “Withdrawing citizenship as a measure to combat terrorism: a human rights-compatible approach?” was changed in English only by the committee on 13 December 2018.

* Draft resolution and recommendation adopted unanimously by the committee on 13 December 2018.

convicted of terrorist offences and/or are suspected of conducting terrorist activities (e.g. Denmark, France, Netherlands, Switzerland or the United Kingdom). Some of these laws have been adopted quite recently (e.g. Belgium, Norway or Turkey). In some member States, the decision to withdraw citizenship can even be made without a criminal conviction. Such administrative decision may be open to appeal, but without the procedural safeguards of criminal law and mostly without the knowledge and/or presence of the person involved. Such procedures violate basic elements of the rule of law. The Assembly is also concerned at the fact that deprivation of nationality is often used for the sole purpose of allowing expulsion or refusal of re-entry of a person who has or may have been involved in terrorist activities.

6. The Assembly considers that the application of laws such as those mentioned above may raise several human rights concerns. First, it may lead to statelessness. Second, it often implies direct or indirect discrimination against naturalised citizens, contrary to Article 9 of the Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness and Article 5 (2) of the European Convention on Nationality. Third, deprivation of nationality might occur without adequate procedural safeguards, especially if it is decided following administrative proceedings, without any judicial control, thereby raising issues under Articles 6 (right to a fair trial) and 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the Convention. Fourth, in certain circumstances, a deprivation of nationality following a criminal conviction may violate the principle of *ne bis in idem* (Article 4 of Protocol No. 7 to the Convention), if it imposes an additional sentence.

7. The use of nationality deprivation must in any case be applied in compliance with the standards stemming from the Convention and other relevant international legal instruments. Any deprivation of nationality for terrorist activities shall be decided or reviewed by a criminal court, with full respect for all procedural guarantees, shall not be discriminatory and shall not lead to statelessness; it shall have suspensive effect and shall be proportionate to the pursued objective and applied only if other measures foreseen in domestic law would not be efficient. Failure to apply these safeguards may result in deprivation of nationality being arbitrary. Preventive deprivation of nationality, without judicial control, shall be avoided. The deprivation of nationality of a parent shall not lead to the deprivation of the nationality of his/her children.

8. The Assembly also notes that the practice of depriving of their nationality persons involved in terrorist activities (including so-called “foreign fighters”) or suspected of such involvement may lead to an “export of risks”, as those persons may move to or remain in terrorist conflict zones outside Europe. Such practice goes against the principle of international cooperation in combatting terrorism, reaffirmed *inter alia* in United Nations Security Council Resolution 2178 (2014), which aims at preventing foreign fighters from leaving their country, and may expose local populations to violations of international human rights and humanitarian law. It also undermines the State’s ability to fulfil its obligation to investigate and prosecute terrorist offences. In this context, deprivation of citizenship is an ineffective anti-terrorism measure and may even be counter-effective to the goals of counter-terrorism policy.

9. The Assembly therefore calls on the member States of the Council of Europe:

9.1. to review their legislation in the light of international standards prohibiting arbitrary deprivation of nationality, and repeal any laws that would allow it;

9.2. to refrain from adopting new laws that would permit deprivation of nationality that is arbitrary for reasons of *inter alia*, not having a legitimate objective, being discriminatory or disproportionate or because of a lack of procedural or substantive safeguards;

9.3. to ensure that any criteria similar to that of “conduct seriously prejudicial to the vital interests of the State” for involuntary deprivation of nationality uses precise terminology and is accompanied by written (publicly available) guidance as to their scope and interpretation. This guidance must promote narrow interpretation, which takes into account human right standards and the duty to not discriminate or be arbitrary;

9.4. to provide for safeguards against statelessness in their national laws;

9.5. not to discriminate between citizens on the basis of the way in which they have acquired nationality, in order to avoid indirect discrimination against minorities;

9.6. insofar as their legislation allows for deprivation of nationality of persons convicted or suspected of terrorism activities, to review such provisions in light of international human rights obligations, to refrain from applying this measure and to envisage and prioritise wider use of other counter-terrorism measures foreseen in their respective national criminal and other legislation (e.g. travel ban,

surveillance measures or assigned residence order), while respecting human rights and rule of law standards;

9.7 to abolish or refrain from introducing administrative procedures allowing for the withdrawal of citizenship not based on a criminal conviction;

9.8. refrain from depriving minors of their nationality;

9.9. insofar as they have not yet done so, to sign and/ratify the United Nations Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness of 1961 and the European Convention on Nationality of 1997.

B. Draft recommendation

1. Referring to its Resolution (2019) on “Withdrawing nationality as a measure to combat terrorism: a human rights-compatible approach?”, the Parliamentary Assembly recommends that the Committee of Ministers:

1.1. prepare a comparative study on Council of Europe member States’ laws allowing for deprivation of nationality, with special focus on deprivation of nationality as a measure to combat terrorism;

1.2. draft guidelines on the criteria to be set up for the deprivation of nationality and on other counter-terrorism measures that could be used instead of deprivation of nationality.

C. Explanatory memorandum by Ms Strik, rapporteur

1. Introduction

1. The motion for a resolution entitled “Withdrawing citizenship as a measure to combat terrorism: a human rights-compatible approach?” was forwarded to the Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights on 13 October 2017 for report.¹ The committee appointed me as rapporteur at its meeting in Paris on 12 December 2017. During its meeting in Strasbourg, on 26 June 2018, the committee authorised me to send out a questionnaire to national parliaments delegations and to national human rights institutions to gather further information on the state of their legislation concerning the possibility of citizenship withdrawal as a measure to combat terrorism. On 10 September 2018, at the committee meeting in Paris, a hearing took place with the participation of Professor René de Groot, Faculty of Law, University of Maastricht, Netherlands, and Dr. Sandra Krähenmann, Research Fellow, Geneva Academy of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights, Switzerland.

2. The above-mentioned motion for a resolution focuses on the legitimacy and compatibility of citizenship withdrawal with international and European human rights standards on nationality in the context of counter-terrorism strategies of Council of Europe member States. In preventing acts of terrorism on their soil, a number of Council of Europe member States adopt legislation with a view to making it easier to withdraw citizenship from individuals engaged or suspected of involvement in terrorist activities. In some countries, the withdrawal of an individual’s citizenship can even take place without a criminal prosecution and conviction. These practices lead to concerns regarding proportionality, the right to an effective remedy, the obligation to avoid statelessness and, if only dual nationals are affected, to differential treatment amounting to discrimination.

3. Regarding anti-terrorism policy, some basic principles apply on all states, such as the requirement to ensure the investigation and prosecution of terrorism-related crimes as well as the effectiveness of any measure. Furthermore, a counter-terrorism context does not absolve member States from their obligation to respect human rights. Member States possess a legitimate sovereign right to guarantee security on their territory. This right encompasses the taking of effective anti-terrorism measures. Nevertheless, our democratic societies can only be protected effectively by ensuring that such anti-terrorism measures abide by the rule of law. A recent report by Amnesty International² highlights that the withdrawal of citizenship in the context of counter-terrorism strategies can be extremely socially divisive.

4. Therefore, in my report, I will briefly introduce the main international legal instruments relating to the right to a nationality and then focus on the issue of deprivation of nationality as a measure to combat terrorism.

2. The right to a nationality

5. The power of a State to withdraw citizenship needs to be examined in light of the right to a nationality³. Although rules on nationality belong primarily to the domestic legal order, several international legal instruments impose legal obligations aiming to safeguard the right to a nationality. This is, in particular, the case for Article 15 of the [Universal Declaration of Human Rights](#), Article 20 of the [American Convention on Human Rights](#) and Article 4 of the [European Convention on Nationality](#) (ECN). Moreover, a series of international human rights instruments affirm the right of access to a nationality without discrimination and/or the right of children to acquire a nationality: the 1965 [Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination](#), the 1966 [International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights](#), the 1979 [Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women](#) and the 1989 [Convention on the Rights of the Child](#).

6. Article 15 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that everyone has the right to a nationality and prohibits arbitrary deprivation of nationality. Article 4.a) to 4.c) of the European Convention on

¹ Doc. 14375, reference 4328.

² Amnesty International, [Dangerously Disproportionate: the Ever-Expanding National Security State in Europe](#), 2017. See also European Parliamentary Research Service (EPRS), [‘The return of foreign fighters to EU soil: Ex-post evaluation’](#), 2018, p. 41.

³ The terms “citizenship” and “nationality” will be used interchangeably in this report, despite the distinction between the two motions made in certain legal traditions; see, for example, G.-R. de Groot and O. W. Vonk, [International Standards on Nationality Law. Texts, Cases and Materials](#), Wolf Legal Publishers, 2015, pp. 3-4.

Nationality of 1997, which has so far been ratified by twenty-one member States of the Council of Europe,⁴ repeats the message of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as follows: “The rules on nationality of each State Party shall be based on the following principles: a. everyone has the right to a nationality; b. statelessness shall be avoided; c. no one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his or her nationality”.

3. Procedure and safeguards for deprivation of nationality

7. A person may lose his/her nationality either *ex lege*, at the initiative of the individual involved, or at the initiative of the State.⁵ According to the UN Secretary General's reports to the Human Rights Council, a measure of citizenship deprivation taken by a State must meet standards of necessity, proportionality, and reasonableness in order not to be seen as arbitrary. It must be provided by law, serve a legitimate purpose, be proportionate, be the least intrusive measure possible to achieve its legitimate aim, and respect procedural standards of justice that allow for it to be challenged.⁶ In this regard, as a corollary to the right to determine the conditions for the acquisition of nationality, States are duty-bound to avoid statelessness through legislative, administrative and other measures⁷ (see section 4 below).

8. More importantly, Article 8 (4) of the 1961 Convention states that a State shall not exercise a power of deprivation except in accordance with law, which shall provide for the person concerned the right to a fair hearing by a court or other independent body. Similarly, according to the ECN, States shall ensure that decisions relating to the loss of nationality include reasons in writing (Article 11 ECN) and are open to administrative or judicial review in conformity with internal law (Article 12 ECN).

9. Problems concerning involuntary loss of citizenship, especially in relation to undesirable behaviour, have recently been examined by various experts and in different fora, resulting in certain valuable recommendations. For example, the EU-funded Involuntary Loss of European Citizenship project drafted Guidelines in 2015 (“[ILEC Guidelines 2015](#)”). These Guidelines recommend that loss of nationality due to undesirable behavior (e.g. acts seriously prejudicial to the vital interests of the State or foreign military service) may only occur if the following conditions are fulfilled: a) the person would not become stateless; b) there has been an explicit decision by competent authorities; c) “the unacceptable character of the undesirable behaviour of the person involved should be proven beyond any reasonable doubt. Such behavior should constitute a crime and a criminal court should have imposed a sanction” (Guideline IV.3).

10. The “Tunis Conclusions” state that the prohibition of arbitrary deprivation of nationality is now a norm of international law.⁸ Referring to Article 8 (4) of the 1961 Convention, they state that “where criminal conduct is alleged, it is strongly advisable that deprivation of nationality only occur following a two-step process, logically beginning with a finding of guilt by a criminal court. A decision by the competent authority (preferably a court) on deprivation of nationality would follow”. As regards nationality deprivation on the basis of conduct seriously prejudicial to the vital interests of the State (Article 8(3)(a)(ii) of the 1961 Convention), this exception establishes a very high threshold for deprivation of nationality resulting in statelessness. The term “seriously prejudicial” means that the person is capable of negatively impacting the State, and “vital interests” sets a “considerably higher threshold than “national interests”, as confirmed by the *travaux préparatoires*. The exception does not cover criminal offences of a general nature; but acts of treason and espionage – depending on their interpretation in domestic law – may be considered to fall within the scope of this exception. The person’s acts must be inconsistent with the “duty of loyalty” to the State of nationality. It is important to note that “the experience of some States indicates that governments do not benefit from rendering individuals stateless through the application of this exception, in particular because it may be difficult in practice to expel the persons concerned”.⁹

⁴ These are: Albania, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Luxembourg, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovak republic, Sweden, the former Yugoslav republic of Macedonia and United Kingdom, see at: https://www.coe.int/en/web/conventions/full-list/-/conventions/treaty/166/signatures?p_auth=zOKcPPEJ

⁵ The terminology used to name the act or conditions under which a person would cease to be a national of a given State varies. For the purposes of this report, the term “deprivation” will be used to refer to acts of State authorities by which a person is stripped of his/her nationality. It covers both *ex lege* loss and an active decision to withdraw.

⁶ UN Human Rights Council, Human Rights and Deprivation of Nationality, Reports by the Secretary-general of 19 December 2011 and 19 December 2013, respectively A/HRC/19/43 and A/HRC/25/28.

⁷ See Guidance Note of the Secretary-General: The United Nations and Statelessness of 28 June 2011, p. 3.

⁸ Based on discussions on the interpretation of the 1961 Convention that took place at an expert meeting convened by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in Tunis in 2013.

⁹ Paragraphs 27 and 69 of the Tunis Conclusions.

11. According to a 2013 report of the UN Secretary General, many States allow deprivation of nationality in response to acts seriously prejudicial to the vital interests of State, but the way in which this ground is expressed in domestic law varies significantly. Some States require a criminal conviction for a crime or offence which endangers the security of the State, while others “allow nationality to be withdrawn if this is deemed to be in the public interest, conducive to the public good or justified by national security considerations”.¹⁰ Due to the growing concern about terrorism, some States have expanded the powers of deprivation of nationality for crimes against nationality or in the public interest, or have made more active use of existing powers. States’ broad discretion in determining when to deprive a person of their nationality entails a risk that the prohibition of arbitrary deprivation of nationality may not be respected.

12. Article 9 of the 1961 Convention forbids deprivation from any person or group of persons of their nationality on racial, ethnic, religious or political grounds. Similarly, Article 5 ECN provides that states’ rules on nationality “shall not contain distinctions or include any practice which amount to discrimination on the grounds of sex, religion, race, colour or national or ethnic origin” (paragraph 1) and that states parties “shall be guided by the principle of non-discrimination between its nationals, whether they are nationals by birth or have acquired its nationality subsequently” (paragraph 2).

4. The prohibition on causing statelessness

13. The main international legal instruments against statelessness are the 1954 [Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons](#) and the 1961 [Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness](#). The latter is binding on 71 States, including 32 Council of Europe member States¹¹. The Council of Europe has a strong track record in this field, in particular, the European Convention on Nationality and the [Convention on the Avoidance of Statelessness in relation to State Succession](#)¹². Article 1 of the 1954 Convention has established the definition of statelessness, which, according to the International Commission of Law, should be considered as definition of customary international law. Member States are therefore obliged to use the definition of a stateless person as “a person who is not considered as a national by any State under the operation of its law”.

14. It is important to note that citizenship deprivation leading to statelessness is not *per se* arbitrary and contrary to international law¹³, despite the prohibition included in Article 8 (1) of the 1961 Convention and the provisions of Articles 4 b) and 7 (3) ECN. In particular, a person may be deprived of nationality if the latter has been obtained by misrepresentation or fraud (Article 8 (2) b). Moreover, some Contracting States declared their retention of the right to deprive of nationality already existing in national law at the time of signature, ratification or accession to the 1961 Convention, on one or more of the three additional grounds. Article 8 paragraph 3a) allows this in situations where, “inconsistently with his duty of loyalty to the Contracting State” the person has rendered services to or received emoluments from another State, in disregard of an express prohibition by the Contracting State (sub-paragraph (i)) or has conducted himself in a manner seriously prejudicial to the vital interests of the State (sub-paragraph (ii))¹⁴. Article 8 (3) b) also allows the deprivation of nationality if “the person has taken an oath, or made a formal declaration, of allegiance to another State, or given definite evidence of his determination to repudiate his allegiance to the Contracting State”.

15. Article 7 (1) ECN provides grounds for involuntary deprivation of nationality, including acquisition of nationality by means of fraudulent conduct, false information or concealment of any relevant fact attributable to the application (sub-paragraph (b)), voluntary service in a foreign military force (sub-paragraph (c)), conduct seriously prejudicial to the vital interests of the State Party (sub-paragraph (d)) or lack of genuine link between the State Party and a national habitually residing abroad (sub-paragraph (e)). Article 7 (2) ECN regulates the situation of children, who may lose nationality if their parents lose it except in cases covered by subparagraphs c) and d) of paragraph 1. If one of their parents retains the nationality, the child shall not lose it. The Convention on the Rights of the Child, and, in particular, its Article 8 in conjunction with Articles 2 and

¹⁰ A/HRC/25/28, 19 December 2013, paragraph 13.

¹¹ These are: Albania, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine and the United Kingdom.

¹² ETS No. 200.

¹³ S. Mantru, ‘Terrorist’ citizens and the human right to nationality, *Journal of Contemporary European Studies* 2018, vol. 26, no 1, p. 30.

¹⁴ Austria, Belgium, Georgia, Ireland Lithuania and the United Kingdom have made reservations concerning Article 8 (3) of the 1961 Convention.

3, can be read as restricting any deprivation of nationality from children as a result of the behavior of the parents, whether a parent retains the nationality or not.

16. According to Article 7 (3) ECN, it is possible to deprive a person of his citizenship with the result that he/she would become stateless only in cases where the nationality has been acquired through fraud. In other cases, withdrawal of citizenship is not allowed, if the person would become stateless. Deprivation of citizenship in cases of dual or multiple nationals is only allowed if the conduct is seriously prejudicial to the vital interests of the State Party. Below this threshold, revoking nationality is not allowed. The referral to ‘conduct’ clarifies that an individual assessment must take place and that application to categories of persons is prohibited. cannot lead to withdrawal of citizenship, if the person would become stateless. In such cases, it may be invoked only in cases of dual or multiple nationals. The [Explanatory report to the ECN](#) (paragraph 67) furthermore suggests that this ground for deprivation of nationality is not automatically established in cases relating to terrorism. It explains that the wording “conduct seriously prejudicial to the vital interests of the State Party” includes treason and other activities directed against the vital interests of the State concerned (for example work for a foreign secret service) but would not include criminal offences of a general nature, however serious they might be. Despite these limitations, terrorist acts as provided for by domestic legislation of some EU Member States take many different forms.¹⁵ Interestingly, the ECN does not include two grounds mentioned in Article 8 (3)(a)(i) and 8(3)(b) of the 1961 Convention, i.e. receiving prohibited emoluments from another State and taking an oath or making a formal declaration of allegiance to another State, and the Explanatory Report to the ECN remains silent on this point. This may be interpreted as excluding these two types of behaviour from the scope of “a conduct seriously prejudicial to the vital interests of the State Party”. According to Professor de Groot, national legislation allows for deprivation of citizenship on the latter ground in 22 Council of Europe member States, including seven States which have ratified the ECN.

5. Case law of the European Court of Human Rights

17. Although the right to a nationality is not as such guaranteed by the European Convention on Human Rights (“the Convention” or “ECHR”) or its Protocols, the European Court of Human Rights (“the Court”) has observed that an arbitrary denial of citizenship might in certain circumstances raise an issue under Article 8 of the Convention because of the impact of such a denial on the private life of the individual.¹⁶ In the judgment *Mennesson v. France*, the Court recalled that nationality is an element of a person’s identity and the worrying uncertainty faced by the two of the four applicants (who were children born from a cross-border surrogacy) as to the possibility of obtaining recognition of French nationality was liable to have negative repercussions on the definition of their personal identity¹⁷. In the case of *Ramadan v. Malta*¹⁸, concerning the loss of nationality acquired via marriage, the Court stressed that an arbitrary revocation of citizenship could raise an issue under Article 8 of the Convention. However, in this case the deprivation of nationality was not considered arbitrary since it had a legal basis, respected procedural grounds and its effects were not deemed serious enough, since the applicant continued his life in Malta despite losing nationality. In the case of *K2 v. United Kingdom*, the Court examined the issue of citizenship deprivation in the context of terrorism and nationality security considerations. It declared the application inadmissible as being manifestly ill-founded, since the measures in question had respected the procedural safeguards required under Article 8. It also noted that the applicant would not be left stateless by the loss of UK citizenship, as he subsequently acquired Sudanese citizenship. It is also worth mentioning the elements of the due process ‘test’ that the Court set out, e.g. in para. 50 of the *K2* judgment: “In determining arbitrariness, the Court has had regard to whether the revocation was in accordance with the law; whether it was accompanied by the necessary procedural safeguards, including whether the person deprived of citizenship was allowed the opportunity to challenge the decision before courts affording the relevant guarantees; and whether the authorities acted diligently and swiftly (see *Ramadan v. Malta*, cited above, §§ 86-89)”. The Court is now examining cases concerning revocation of French citizenship in April 2015 of a few individuals who had been convicted for terrorism-related acts.¹⁹

18. Interestingly, the issue of unlawful discrimination between Danish citizens of Danish ethnic origin and Danish citizens of other ethnic origin was examined by the Court in the case *Biao v. Denmark* under Article

¹⁵ University of Amsterdam, Migration Law Clinic, The legality of revocation of Dutch nationality of dual nationals involved in terrorist organisations, July 2018, p. 27. The report refers *inter alia* to the UK Terrorism Act of 2006.

¹⁶ *Karassev v. Finland*, application no. 31414/96, decision of 12 January 1999 and *Genovese v. Malta*, application no. 53124/09, judgment of 11 October 2011.

¹⁷ *Mennesson v. France*, application no. 65192/11 judgment of 26 June 2014.

¹⁸ *Ramadan v. Malta*, application no. 76136/12, judgment of 21 June 2016.

¹⁹ *Ghoumid v. France*, application no. 52273 and four other similar applications, communicated on 23 May 2017.

14 of the Convention, which prohibits discrimination²⁰. The Court found a violation of Article 14 ECHR read in conjunction with Article 8, due to the Danish authorities' refusal to grant family reunification to the applicant's wife, who was a naturalised Danish citizen; the refusal was due to the application of an "attachment requirement", which was only available to persons who had held Danish citizenship for at least 28 years. The Court found that the "28-year rule" had an indirect discriminatory effect, since it favoured Danish nationals of Danish ethnic origin. In doing so, the Court referred, *inter alia*, to Article 5(2) ECN.

6. Case-law of the Court of Justice of the European Union

19. Whereas the rules for the acquisition of nationality do not fall under the scope of European Union law, the rules on the withdrawal of the Union citizenship do. In its judgment of 2 March 2010 in the case of *Rottmann v. Freistaat Bayern*²¹, the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) specified that the situation of a citizen of the European Union becoming stateless as a result of withdrawal of his nationality comes within the ambit of European Union law. In fact, the person concerned would thus lose the status of citizen of the European Union, conferred by Article 20 of the [Treaty on the functioning of the European Union](#), which is intended to be the fundamental status of nationals of the member States. Concerning the examination of the criterion of proportionality, the CJEU ruled that it is for the national court to taken into consideration the potential consequences that such a decision entails for the person concerned and, if relevant, for his family, with regard to the loss of the rights inherent in citizenship of the European Union. In this respect, it is necessary to establish, in particular, whether this decision is justified in relation to the gravity of the offence committed, to the lapse of time between the naturalisation decision and the withdrawal decision and to whether it is possible for that person to recover his original nationality.

7. National legislation on citizenship withdrawal, with focus on withdrawal for terrorist offences

20. In order to collect additional information on the deprivation of nationality as a measure to combat terrorism, I sent a questionnaire to national parliaments delegations through the European Parliament Research Service (EPRS) and to national human rights institutions (NHRI) thanks to the help of the European Network of NHRI (ENNHRI). I have received replies from twenty-seven member States: Albania, Andorra, Austria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. Four NHRI also replied to my questionnaire: the French National Consultative Commission on Human Rights, the Greek National Commission for Human Rights, the Slovak National Centre for Human Rights and the Ombudsman of Ukraine.

21. The questionnaire consisted of the following questions:

- i. *In what situation(s) does your legislation permit the withdrawal of citizenship?*
- ii. *Does the decision to withdraw a person's citizenship depend on how long he/she has been a citizen or how (i.e. by birth, naturalisation, marriage, etc.) the citizenship was acquired? If so, what arguments have been given for the different treatment between different categories of citizens?*
- iii. *Is it possible to withdraw a person's citizenship if that person would become stateless as a result?*
- iv. *If your legislation permits the withdrawal of citizenship for terrorism-related offences or other serious offences, what is the procedure for withdrawal? Please specify the role of the criminal procedure, if applicable.*
- v. *If your legislation does not currently permit the withdrawal of citizenship for the above reasons, is there any pending legislative amendment that would allow such a withdrawal?*

22. Concerning the **first question**, it appears from the answers to the questionnaire that some States do not allow the withdrawal of citizenship if it is against a person's will. Hence, it is only possible to lose citizenship by renunciation and/or by right of choice (in Croatia, Czech Republic, Poland, in Slovak Republic – with some exceptions, in Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and, to some extent, in

²⁰ *Biao v. Denmark*, application no. 38590/10, judgment of 24 May 2016.

²¹ Case C-135/08, paragraphs 55 and 56.

Portugal). The Constitutions of Croatia, the Czech Republic, Poland and the Slovak Republic clearly stipulate that a citizen can lose his/her citizenship only upon his/her request.

23. Other member States allow involuntary withdrawal of citizenship for various reasons foreseen in their legislation such as: acquisition of another State's citizenship (Austria, Andorra, Estonia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Lithuania, Latvia, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Slovak Republic and Ukraine, as well as Spain under certain circumstances), residence abroad (Greece and the Netherlands); servicing voluntarily in the armed forces or military organisation of another State and/or carrying out services for a foreign country against the interest of the State of nationality (Andorra, Austria, Estonia, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Latvia, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey and Ukraine), refusal to service in the State's military forces (France) or intentionally providing false information or concealing the facts that apply to the conditions for the acquisition of citizenship when certifying or during naturalisation (Belgium, Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain and Ukraine). Some States also allow deprivation of citizenship for other acts prejudicial to State security: Cyprus, in cases of "showing disloyalty", "disgracing the Republic" or engaging in illegal trade with the enemy in times of war, and Latvia and Slovenia, in cases of activities aimed at reversing the constitutional order.

24. In a few member States, it is possible to withdraw citizenship because of a person's criminal offence: in **Cyprus**, for "hideous crimes, involving moral obscenity"; or in **Slovenia**, if the person is a "persistent perpetrator of criminal offences prosecuted *ex officio* and of offences against the public order".

25. In the **Netherlands, Belgium, France, Switzerland** and **Turkey** withdrawal of citizenship may occur if the person has committed a serious offence, including a terrorist one.

26. In **Norway**, following a recent amendment to the Nationality Act, as of January 2019, it will be possible to withdraw the nationality of a citizen who "has conducted himself or herself in a manner seriously prejudicial to the vital interests of the state", i.e. has been convicted of crimes such as genocide, crime against humanity, war crimes, violation of national interests or terrorist or terrorism related acts, if those offences are punishable by more than six years imprisonment.

27. The parliaments and/or NHRI of some States that allow involuntary loss of citizenship have clearly indicated that their national legislation does not permit the withdrawal of citizenship for terrorism-related offences (Albania, Andorra, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Slovak Republic, Spain and Ukraine) or for any offences (Hungary).

28. As regards the **second question**, some replies from member States that allow involuntary loss of citizenship indicated that, in general, the decision to withdraw citizenship does not depend on how it was acquired (Andorra, Austria, Cyprus, Germany, Greece, Latvia, Switzerland and Turkey). According to others, the way in which citizenship was acquired may have some relevance in this context (Norway and Spain). In Belgium, Estonia, France and Luxembourg, it is possible to deprive only naturalized citizens of citizenship, and not citizens by birth. No explanation was provided for this differentiation.

29. Some delegations replied that the decision on citizenship deprivation does not depend on how long the person has been a citizen of a given State (Germany, Greece, the Netherlands, Slovenia, Norway and Turkey). However, an exception to this rule is often applied in cases of naturalization by fraud (e.g. Germany, Hungary and Latvia). In Cyprus, if the person has been sentenced to imprisonment for "hideous crimes" during the ten years following the acquisition of citizenship, it may be withdrawn.

30. Concerning the **third question**, most replies indicated that it is not possible to withdraw a person's citizenship if that person would become stateless as a result (e.g. Belgium, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway and Switzerland). However, the legislation of some member States allows deprivation of nationality even if the person would become stateless, in particular if the citizenship was acquired due to fraud or the decision on naturalisation was invalid (Belgium, Germany, Latvia, Norway and the Netherlands).

31. The **Turkish** reply indicated that Turkish Citizenship Law includes the principle that "Everyone should have citizenship". However, there is no regulation regarding statelessness when the conditions for the loss of citizenship are fulfilled, except in the case of loss of Turkish citizenship through exercise of the right of choice. The **Hungarian** delegation has stated that one of the principles of the Act on Hungarian Citizenship is to reduce cases of statelessness; however, "statelessness is not an exclusion factor".

32. As regards the **fourth question**, the following information has been provided concerning the **procedure for citizenship withdrawal in case of terrorism-related offences** (Belgium, France, the

Netherlands, Norway, Switzerland and Turkey) or other serious offences (Cyprus and Slovenia). **Austria** has indicated that it was possible to deprive of citizenship persons joining foreign military forces or volunteering for an organised combatant group taking part in violent conflicts abroad; the deprivation of citizenship is decided following an administrative procedure.

33. In **Belgium**, according to Articles 23.1 and 23.2 of the Belgian Nationality Code, since July 2015, the deprivation of nationality may be imposed as an ancillary penalty if a person has been convicted of a terrorist offence and sentenced to at least five years of imprisonment. The decision is taken by the *Cour d'appel* at the request of the prosecutor. It may be appealed in the same way as the main sentence, according to the Criminal Procedure Code, and becomes enforceable once the deprivation of nationality has been listed in the civil status register.

34. In **Cyprus**, it is possible to deprive a person of his/her nationality because of commission of a "hideous crime" on the basis of a decision of the Council of Ministers.

35. In **France**, a person convicted of a terrorist offence can be deprived of his/her citizenship if the facts on which the conviction was based occurred before the acquisition of nationality or not later than fifteen years after it (Article 25-1 of the Code civil). According to Article 61 of the Decree No. 93-1362 of 30 December 1993, the person must be notified of the legal and factual grounds justifying the deprivation of nationality. He/she has one month to make his/her observations. After the expiry of that deadline, the Government may declare, by a decree and following the opinion of the State Council (*Conseil d'Etat*), that the person is deprived of French nationality. That decision can be appealed before the State Council.²²

36. In **the Netherlands**, withdrawal of citizenship for terrorist activity can occur in two instances: after final conviction for certain terrorist offences or if a citizen appears to have joined a terrorist organization abroad that is deemed to pose a threat to national security. In the first case, the decision is taken by the competent minister, who must first inform the person concerned of his/her intention to revoke his/her citizenship and allow them the opportunity to make submissions before the decision is made. Subsequently, the decision may be appealed either in an administrative objection procedure or before a court. The length of sentence is of limited importance to the minister. In the second case, i.e. that of "apparent membership to a terrorist organisation abroad", the withdrawal of citizenship does not require a criminal conviction. This procedure is applicable if the person has left the Dutch territory and on the basis of his/her behavior it is beyond reasonable doubt that he/she subscribes to the ideals of a terrorist organisation appearing on a list drawn up by the minister and so far included only Islam-related organisations, intends to join that organisation and has acted on its behalf. Citizenship withdrawal must be in the interests of national security. The person concerned will not be informed in advance of a pending decision to revoke his/her citizenship, because the government's aim is to prevent the return of such people to the Netherlands. He/she will be entitled to directly appeal to an administrative court. The appeal has to be filed within four weeks after a decision was taken and published. The court will perform a "marginal" (i.e. procedural) review, mostly in the absence of the person concerned. This deprivation procedure without the condition of a criminal conviction can be applied to persons aged 16 or older.²³

37. In **Slovenia**, according to Article 26 of the Act on the Citizenship of the Republic of Slovenia, a person who is a "persistent perpetrator of criminal offences prosecuted *ex officio* and of offences against the public order", may be deprived of his/her citizenship. The deprivation of citizenship is decided by the competent administrative body and may be appealed to the Minister of Interior, and then to the Administrative Court.

38. In **Switzerland**, the deprivation of citizenship may be decided after a criminal conviction, although in some cases the latter is not necessary (e.g. if the criminal proceedings could not result in a conviction due to lack of international cooperation and lack of evidence from abroad). The procedure is launched by the *Secrétariat d'Etat aux Migrations* (SEM), who hears the person concerned, before taking its decision on deprivation of nationality. The decision can then be appealed before the administrative court within 30 days from its notification.

²² After the November 2015 Paris attacks, President Hollande proposed an amendment to the Constitution in order to allow the deprivation of nationality for dual nationals born as French nationals, but this proposal was not followed. See also Venice Commission, Opinion No. 838/2016 on the draft constitutional law on "protection of the nation" of France, CDL-AD(2016)006 and our Committee's opinion on the report of the Committee on Political Affairs and Democracy on "Combating international terrorism while protecting Council of Europe standards and values", rapporteur for opinion: Mr Pierre-Yves Le Borgn' (France, SOC), Doc. 13960.

²³ Statute Law of February 10, 2017, Amending the Dutch Nationality Act in Connection with the Withdrawal of Dutch Citizenship in the Interest of National Security.

39. In **Turkey**, following amendment of the Turkish Citizenship Law in 2017, it became possible to withdraw citizenship on the basis of crimes related to terrorism and other serious crimes. Accordingly, citizens against whom an investigation before the prosecutor or a criminal procedure before a court is pending for the crimes enumerated in the Turkish Penal Code and who are unable to be contacted because of their presence in a foreign country, shall be notified to the Ministry within one month from the date of the hearing before the prosecutor or the court. If they do not return within three months despite the announcement made by the Ministry of Interior, they may lose their Turkish citizenship by a decision of the President of the Republic.

40. In **Norway**, according to a new section of the Norwegian Nationality Act that will enter into force in 2019, it will be possible to deprive of their nationality persons convicted of terrorist offences punishable by more than six years imprisonment. Such a decision can be taken after a criminal conviction.

41. As regards the **fifth question**, most replies indicated that no legislative changes are envisaged by the national parliaments. However, in Finland, Germany and Portugal, there have been some proposals to modify nationality laws in order to introduce a possibility of withdrawing citizenship of persons with multiple nationality who have been convicted of terrorist offences. In the Czech Republic, in 2016, the leader of the Freedom and Direct Democracy (SPD) movement tried to launch a discussion on changing the Constitution in order to enable the withdrawal of citizenship from convicted terrorists, but his proposal has not been pursued.

42. As regards certain member States which have not replied to my questionnaire, I have obtained information from other sources. According a document of the EPRS²⁴, there are other member EU States which allow deprivation of citizenship of persons who have committed serious crimes against the State (Bulgaria and in Denmark), acted against the State's constitutional order and institutions (Denmark), showed disloyalty by act or speech (Malta and Ireland) and, more generally, acted against national interests (Romania and the United Kingdom). In Bulgaria, Ireland and Malta, these grounds may be invoked only in respect of withdrawing nationality from naturalised citizens. Another study revealed that under the **Bulgarian** Citizenship Act, it is possible to deprive of his/her citizenship a naturalised citizen if he/she has been convicted of "severe crime against the Republic", but only if he/she is abroad and would not become stateless.²⁵ In **Denmark**, deprivation of citizenship in cases of dual citizenship is possible for persons convicted of a terrorism-related offence, including the ancillary offences of preparation, incitement, and recruitment.²⁶ In the **United Kingdom**, Section 40 of the 1981 [British Nationality Act](#) ('BNA') allows for deprivation of citizenship where the Home Secretary has considered it to be 'conducive to the public good' and if it would not lead to statelessness. However, following the 2014 Immigration Act, the Secretary of State may deprive a person of citizenship if he/she is a naturalised citizen, "has conducted him or herself in a manner which is seriously prejudicial to the vital interests of the United Kingdom, any of the Islands, or any British overseas territory", and if there are "reasonable grounds for believing that the person is able, under the law of a country or territory outside the United Kingdom, to become a national of such a country or territory" (Section 40 (4a) BNA). Conduct considered "seriously prejudicial to the vital interests of the UK" is a higher test than "conducive to the public good" but covers national security and those who take up arms against British or allied forces. The Home Secretary is empowered to deprive a person of British citizenship without it being contingent on a criminal conviction. His/her decisions are subject to judicial review and in case of national security concerns they are decided by a special court – the Special Immigration Appeals Commission – and involve a partially secret procedure.

8. The Assembly's previous work

43. The Assembly has long experience in nationality-related matters, as shown recently by [Resolution 1989 \(2014\)](#) on access to nationality and the effective implementation of the European Convention on Nationality of 9 April 2014. In this Resolution, it expressed its regret regarding the low number of ratifications of the ECN by member States and called on all the member States concerned to sign and/or ratify it.

44. In its [Resolution 1840 \(2011\)](#) on human rights and the fight against terrorism, the Assembly considered that terrorism should be dealt with primarily by the criminal justice system, with its inbuilt and well-tested fair trial safeguards to protect the presumption of innocence and the right to liberty of all. It underlined that coercive administrative measures used for preventive purposes should be of limited duration,

²⁴ EPRS, Acquisition and loss of citizenship in EU Member States. Key trends and issues, July 2018, p. 7.

²⁵ European Commission and European Migration Network, [Ad-Hoc Query on Revoking Citizenship on Account of Involvement in Acts of Terrorism or Other Serious Crimes](#), Compilation produced on 26 August 2014, pp. 3 and 7-9.

²⁶ Danish Criminal Code, Chapter 13.

applied only as a last resort and be subject to strict conditions, including minimum requirements regarding evidence and judicial or appropriate political oversight.²⁷

45. In its report on foreign fighters in Syria and Iraq of January 2016, the Committee on Political Affairs and Democracy (rapporteur Mr Dirk van der Maelen, Belgium, SOC) underlined that measures to revoke citizenship do not appear to work as deterrence and might even have an opposite effect.²⁸ Similarly, in a report on “Combating international terrorism while protecting Council of Europe standards and values”, the same committee’s rapporteur Mr Tiny Kox (Netherlands, UEL) argued “against laws stripping dual nationals of their European citizenship as this could create discrimination among the citizens of a European country, between those who hold dual nationality and those who do not”. In his view, if such a measure was applied to all nationals, it would lead to statelessness and would not “dissuade any would-be suicide bomber”²⁹.

9. Conclusions and proposals

46. Under international law, the right to nationality is generally considered as “the right to have rights”, and therefore as a human right. Statelessness should be avoided and arbitrary deprivation of nationality is prohibited. However, deprivation of nationality per se is not totally precluded. The 1961 Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness, ratified by 32 member States of the Council of Europe, allows it on certain grounds, even if the person would become stateless. The ECN limits these grounds and stipulates that deprivation of nationality leading to statelessness is only acceptable in cases of fraudulent acquisition of nationality, but this convention was ratified by only 21 out of the 47 member States of the Council of Europe. Many States concerned by the threat of terrorism such as Belgium, France and the United Kingdom have not ratified it. Bearing in mind the dangers stemming from the sometimes extensive grounds for citizenship deprivation, some States, mainly in central Europe, possibly due to their historical experience with authoritarian regimes, do not provide for such a possibility.

47. Many other States maintain a general ground for deprivation of nationality for serving in a foreign military force and/or due to various forms of a behavior ‘seriously prejudicial to the vital interests of the state’. Certain States explicitly provide for the possibility of deprivation of nationality of citizens who participated or might have participated in terrorist activities (Belgium, Denmark, France, Turkey, Switzerland and the United Kingdom) and some of them allow it even if a person would become stateless (Turkey and the United Kingdom). The withdrawal of citizenship might be either reactive, i.e. following a criminal conviction (e.g. in Denmark, Belgium or France), or preventive, i.e. by an administrative measure based on the participation of the person concerned in a terrorist organisation (in the Netherlands, Turkey and in the UK). A distinction amounting to (indirect) discrimination is often made between those who are citizens at birth and those who have acquired citizenship later in life: in some States, only the latter may be deprived of nationality (Belgium, France, Luxembourg and the UK). Moreover, the practice of certain States shows that they may withdraw the citizenship of dual-citizens convicted or suspected of acts of terrorism: this practice has been reported in the Netherlands, where citizenship withdrawal is often used as a counter-terrorist measure against dual citizens of Moroccan or Turkish origin, and would amount to indirect discrimination between mono- and dual-citizens on the basis of national origin or race. Very often such citizens have dual nationality because they are not allowed to renounce their parents’ nationality under the legislation of the other State of citizenship (e.g. Morocco), despite the lack of a strong connection with that country of nationality.³⁰ Thus, there is a trend toward inscribing citizenship withdrawal powers within legal frameworks designed to counter terrorism. Some States have recently adopted new legislation to allow greater discretion in withdrawing citizenship from persons who might be involved in terrorist activities (e.g. Belgium, Netherlands, Turkey or, very recently, Norway). Others, like Switzerland, started applying relevant provisions of old laws on deprivation of citizenship to cases of conduct considered seriously detrimental to the State’s vital interests.³¹

48. Academics have criticised the use of deprivation of nationality as a measure to combat terrorism, especially if it leads to statelessness.³² Several human rights concerns may be raised in this context: discrimination against naturalized citizens; indirect discrimination on the basis of origin, race or religion; lack of an effective remedy (especially in the context of preventive deprivation, when there is no judicial remedy or the court’s control is limited); the right to a fair trial and to procedural guarantees stemming from Article 6 ECHR (especially if there is restricted access to file in criminal proceeding due to State security reasons or if

²⁷ Adopted on 6 October 2011, paragraph 6.

²⁸ Doc. 13937 of 8 January 2016, paragraph 66.

²⁹ Doc. 13958 of 26 January 2016, para 36.

³⁰ UN Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, Amicus Brief presented before the Dutch Immigration and Naturalisation Service, 23 October 2018.

³¹ S. Krähenmann, *Foreign Fighters under International Law*, Academy Briefing No. 7, Geneva Academy of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights, 2014.

³² G.-R. de Groot and O. W. Vonk, *supra* note 3, p. 32.

the person is abroad) and the principle of *ne bis in idem* if the decision is based on a previous criminal conviction (Article 4 of Protocol No. 7 to ECHR). If deprivation of nationality is a ground for expulsion, it may also raise issues under Article 3 ECHR if the person may be sent to a country where he/she would face torture or inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. It may be problematic under Article 8 ECHR, enshrining the right to respect for private and family life. In the opinion of the International Law Commission, the deprivation of nationality for the 'sole purpose' of expulsion is 'abusive, indeed arbitrary' within the meaning of Article 15 (2) of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.³³ Deprivation of nationality also interferes with the enjoyment of political rights (including the right to vote) and a range of socio-economic rights, including the right to work, social security, adequate housing, health, etc. Preventive deprivation of nationality, decided without a court decision, is particularly controversial. The deprivation of nationality of a parent may also lead to deprivation of the nationality of children and should be avoided, especially if the child risks becoming stateless. The best interests of the child shall be a primary consideration, in line with Article 3 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Child. Since in many States it is only possible to withdraw citizenship of dual- or multiple-nationals, there is also a risk of a "race" between the States concerned in order to be quicker than the other State in depriving an individual of citizenship. This 'race' also sets the risk of lowering the due process guarantees.

49. Deprivation of nationality may also provoke the "export of risks", as a convicted or supposed terrorist deprived of his/her nationality may permanently join the "international army of terrorists", by either travelling to or remaining in conflict zones such as those in Syria or Iraq. Therefore, the risk is shifted from a European country to the conflict zone and might be more difficult to be erased. Such practice goes against the principle of international cooperation, established in various UN resolutions, and, in particular, in the Security Council [Resolution 2178 \(2014\)](#)³⁴, which aims at preventing foreign fighters from leaving their country, and regional instruments (such as, for example, the Convention on the Prevention of Terrorism of 2005 and its Additional Protocol³⁵). It can also make more difficult or impossible the monitoring and prosecution of such people. Therefore, States neglect and escape their obligation to investigate and prosecute terrorist offences at the cost of a durable and worldwide security. National security is only protected in the short-term and the main threat is moved abroad, exposing local populations to violations of international human rights and humanitarian law.

50. It is not always clear what is the purpose of citizenship deprivation in the context of combating terrorism. Where this measure is applied on the basis of criminal conviction, it is mainly aimed at the person's punishment. Where it is preventive, the prevented risk is "exported". This raises doubts about the proportionality of nationality deprivation as a counter-terrorism measure and States should consider using other measures. If the person is under criminal investigation, the competent court should consider the application of adequate provisional measures (e.g. travel ban, arrest, house arrest, electronic surveillance, etc.) and the nature of the sentence to be imposed. A prison sentence, coupled with adequate ancillary penalties (such as the ban to exercise certain rights), may be sufficient in certain cases. Outside the context of criminal proceedings, some States facing terrorist threats (e.g. France, Netherlands or the UK) use certain administrative measures for preventive purposes. There is a large range of such anti-terrorism measures available: travel bans, control orders, assigned residence orders, area restrictions, social benefits stripping, etc. Although some of these measures are also controversial, they may be preferable alternatives to citizenship deprivation if used in compliance with human rights standards.³⁶

51. Human rights law makes clear that there is a right to a nationality and a prohibition of arbitrary deprivation of nationality that places significant limitations on the freedom of states to conceive of or treat citizenship as a privilege. In light of this international law prohibition. The resurgence of State powers as regards deprivation of nationality of persons suspected of involvement in terrorist activities is highly problematic. Loyalty to the State not only plays a role in decisions on granting nationality, but continues to be an important factor in assessing the individual's behaviour afterwards. In some States, conduct that is "disloyal" to the State, including terrorist activities, may lead to revocation of nationality.³⁷ That increases the risk of marginalisation and alienation of dual nationals or naturalised citizens, who might feel that they are

³³ UN, International Law Commission, Draft articles on the expulsion of aliens, 2017, Article 8 and commentary to it.

³⁴ Adopted on 24 September 2014.

³⁵ ETS Nos 196 and 217.

³⁶ B. Boutin, Administrative Measures against Foreign Fighters. In Search of Limits and Safeguards, International Centre for Counter-Terrorism – the Hague, December 2016.

³⁷ S. Krähenmann, The Challenge of 'Foreign Fighters' to the Liberal International Legal Order, in 'How international law works in times of crisis', edited by George Ulrich and Ineta Ziemele, Oxford University Press, forthcoming (2019).

treated as second-class citizens. This might eventually provoke radicalisation or even sympathy to terrorist organisations.

52. To conclude, there are several arguments against deprivation of nationality in general. Nevertheless, States retain this power and some of them have expanded their use of this measure in the fight against terrorism. In the light of the above-mentioned human rights and other considerations, the deprivation of nationality should not occur on grounds of terrorist activities. Nevertheless, those States whose legislation allows it must ensure that the deprivation of nationality is not arbitrary. In particular, it should be decided or reviewed by a criminal court, with full respect for all procedural guarantees, should not be discriminatory and should not lead to statelessness. It should be proportionate to the pursued objective and applied only if other measures foreseen in domestic law are not sufficient. The notion of “conduct seriously prejudicial to the vital interests” must be interpreted narrowly and be based on an individual assessment, and national security interests should be carefully weighed against human rights. Terrorism is indeed a serious threat to our societies, but we should not sacrifice our values because of it. Furthermore, deprivation of citizenship is not an effective measure to combat terrorism and may even be counter-effective to the goals of counter-terrorism policy.