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DEDICATION

This paper is dedicated to my family, who took the chance to immigrate to a land unknown, and naturalized as U.S. citizens, so that I may have the opportunity to be where I am today.
As long as I live, I will never forget that day 21 years ago when I raised my hand and took the oath of citizenship. Do you know how proud I was? I was so proud that I walked around with an American flag around my shoulders all day long.

~ Arnold Schwarzenegger
The American citizen identity is a dynamic idea without a clear definition. The naturalization process acts like a standard between non citizens and citizens. This paper attempts to see if the excluding characteristics found in the forms used in the naturalization process have an impact on the kinds of immigrants that are naturalized.

The paper details the changes made to the naturalization forms from the early 1900s to current and the exclusions that are a result of those changes. The paper then compares those exclusions to data collected on the types of immigrants naturalized throughout 18th and 19th century. The paper concludes that the exclusions in the forms are reflected in the trends of the naturalizations, thus proving that the forms do impact the identity of the ideal American.

Exclusions such as illiteracy, political allegiances and race are most clearly supported by the data. This study sheds light on how seemingly small parts of policy implementation--such as the way questions are stated--can have a large impact on the naturalization rates and the formation of the American identity.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

My research will investigate how bureaucratic forms influence the naturalizations of immigrants in the United States. Specifically, I will look at the questions asked on the forms as a way in which naturalization policy is implemented. Specifically, I will look at the questions on the forms that categorize immigrants. Do these categorizations include or exclude certain immigrants in a way that would be expected given the political atmosphere and world events occurring at the time that the changes were made? I plan to extend my research beyond an analysis of the history of the ever-changing immigration policies, and look into the practical application of these policies, in the presentation of the wording of the questions asked on the specific form used for naturalization--the N-400, Application for Naturalization. I hope to explore the influence of the bureaucratic forms as a way of encouraging or discouraging immigrants independent of the policy originally written. I want to investigate if the form changes encourage or discourage certain kinds of immigrants, in effect creating a de facto form of the immigration quotas of 1924.

I hypothesize that bureaucratic implementation of immigration policies, specifically the questions on the forms used to apply for citizenship entice and deter certain groups of immigrants, as opposed to the alternative hypothesis that the immigration trends influence the policies created.

In order to study immigration policies, one must first understand why people are immigrating in the first place. There are multiple competing economic and political theories that exist regarding the draw that the United States has on attracting migrants. In this section, I will explore the theories that attempt to explain economic forces that propel immigration. The second section outlines a prevailing political theory of immigration policy in the United States through a description of the development of the modern United States immigration policy. The changes in the immigration policies have been categorized by most scholars by the level of restriction placed on immigrants. This allows for a more generalizable theoretical model, and creates an opportunity for further research into the micro changes in
policy. It is from this that I draw the foundation of my project. Thirdly, I will explore the literature that is focused upon the discord between policy and implementation and its effects on immigration policy. Lastly, I will explain my project, and how it will attempt to explain these holes in the literature.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

ECONOMIC THEORIES

The research into the history of United States immigration policy is incredibly difficult to obtain, given that US immigration data is not vigorously maintained and protected by national security (Calavita, 1989; Levine, Hill, & Warren, 1985; Warren & Kraly, 1985). Most of the research has focused on case studies and explanatory framework through which trends are observed and explained (Calavita; Levine et al.; Warren & Kraly). Transition from here to why you are moving towards what can be called “economic theories”

There are four prevailing types of economic theories that attempt to explain immigration. The dominant view is that immigration to the United States follows a neoclassical economic model, where migrants follow wages, and migrate to places where they can earn higher wages. This theory was propagated mostly by Fleiser (1963) who examined the case of Puerto Rico, and the migrants who moved to the United States presumably for higher wages. Later, in the updating of the study, Castillo-Freeman and Freeman (1992) observed what seemed to challenge the Fleiser study in that the minimum wage implemented in Puerto Rico meant that wages in Puerto Rico and the United States became equal, yet people migrated at much higher rates after the equalization of wages. This failure of the model to predict the migration from Puerto Rico allowed for the challenging of the neoclassical model that immigration is influenced by wage differentials, and seemed to have been abandoned in favor for what Massey (1988) and Massey et al. (1994) calls the new economics of migration.

The new economics of migration model argues that migration is a by-product of failures in market which leave potential migrants with no reasonable alternatives to advance their well-being. The idea is that people move in order to get higher returns on their labor, and spread an individual household’s available labor force across different markets in order to diversify their potential earnings. This theory is different from neoclassical theory in several ways, such as adding explanatory power to a variety of migrants, not just those lured
by wage differentials. It also more thoroughly explains the diversification of the migrant household across different markets, and does not rely on the assumptions of perfect markets (Massey et al., 1998). The problems with this theory is that when it was studied empirically by Stark and Taylor (1991) “relative deprivation” was understood as a predictor of migration in line with the new economics of migration. While it held true in their study that the wage differential explained some migration (neoclassical model) the variable of relative deprivation did not explain migration when it was applied to internal or international destinations besides the United States. The third model offers an attempt to resolve the problems with the explanatory problems of the new economics of migration.

The third theoretical model, segmented market theory was originally presented by Piore (1977) as an economic model applied to migration. It posits that there is a segmented labor market, created by deficiencies in the capitalist system, where two levels of workers are created. The two groups of workers are treated and compensated differently. This theory explains that as natives move into higher levels of work, the tier below is left without labor, thus creating a draw for immigrant labor. Taylor (1992) explains that this structure is reinforced by immigration policies that create barriers to advancement by migrants. The difficulty in making this theory fully explanatory is the inability to operationalize and categorize where the dividing line is between the two groups. There are very few studies that expand upon this through empirical testing, although it is often cited and was intensely studied in the 1980s. Even current research seems to suggest that there is a segmented market (Huntington, 2004a, 2004b), but with little empirical evidence other then claims and ad hoc explanations.

This theory was extrapolated to attempt to explain the creation and development of ethnic enclaves. Portes and Bach (1981) developed an empirical study on segmented market theory and discovered through their study of Mexican and Cuban immigrant populations that there is evidence that immigrants are segmented and frozen into a secondary labor market, only being able to move out of it once they acquire English skills and US work experience. This indicates that the separation of labor markets and the preference for those immigrants who are assimilated. Unfortunately, this theory does not actually explain much in terms of actual pull factors of immigration. It makes claims to the treatment of migrants within the United States, and their ability to operate within the economic structure. Yet the assumption
that there are vacancies created in the secondary market by the presumed movement is not fully explained in the literature.

The fourth theory is the World Systems Theory, which is closely related to globalization. It explains that as capitalism spreads around the world, and becomes the dominating economic model, and penetrates markets, it forces people to migrate to urban areas, away from farming and into the global market economy. This migration is made easier by new transportation technologies. This movement is focused into certain key cities, where the demand for skilled and unskilled labor is insatiable and feeds upon itself. This constant need and continual migration of people into these cities creates a seeming vacuum of migration toward certain cities by all kinds of migrants (Massey, 1988). These immigrants then set up immigrant networks which perpetuate the migration to those cities. The evidence that is relied upon to support this theory is mostly explanatory, but there are some circumstantial evidence presented which seems to support the theory, such as rates of new immigrants to certain US cities as opposed to rural areas (Rambaut, 1991). The World Systems theory is generally accepted as one of the more prevailing views, and I consider it the most explanatory. Although not infallible, the theory lacks concrete evidence, it seems to be supported by observed trends, as opposed to quantitative analysis of data.

Portes (1978) articulated that economics influences immigration policy above all. He indicates that in a capitalist system, increases in the number of immigrant allows for easier exploitation of those immigrants, which makes them more ideal for the capitalist structure. This argument follows logically the prescription set by the migration theorists, in that an increasing demand for labor places demands on a political system to create an immigration policy that responds to this demand.

There are many questions which are left unanswered such as are the countries which are receiving and demanding this immigrant labor, influencing who comes through their immigration policies? Or are their immigration policies influenced by who is already migrating? Are you actually saying that none of the theories that you have discussed so far actually do this?
POLITICAL THEORIES

Given the economic theories, the role of policies influence on immigration provide interesting comparative theories (Johnson, 2007; King, 2005; Zolberg, 2006). The theories I believe are most relevant to my study are those which looked specifically at different periods of immigration policies, and how the changing of policies influenced the immigration flows. The changes of the policies limit and ease migration of certain groups, both explicitly and implicitly.

The immigration system in the United States has been drastically changed several times, from the first policy in 1790, which was mostly a list of requirements for immigrants, including good moral character and good health, to the current system of visas for every letter of the alphabet. Pickus (2005) explains the three different eras of immigration policy: This first period was extremely exclusionary and restrictive, with outright bans such as the Alien and Sedition Act of 1798, and the Chinese exclusion act. The second era (1903-1924), was more progressive as the industrialization of the United States created a demand for labor. The third era, Pickus calls the modern era, (1924-present) is characterized by the confusion that is experienced in immigration policy implementation, in its dual role as both a protector of the American identity, and the maintenance of the land of immigrants’ own imagined identity (Hull, 1985; Piore, 1978).

The Immigration Act of 1924, for example, instituted quotas on immigrants based upon their race or country of origin. The quota was based upon the percentage of immigrants from countries who were already naturalized in the United States. The quota instituted a numerical figure restricting certain groups who had smaller percentages already in the United States, and encouraging those with larger numbers. This policy favored immigrants from the UK, Germany and Ireland, who already had large numbers of immigrants in the United States, thus allowed for a larger percentage of immigration by people of that descent. (Pickus, 2005; Zolberg, 2006).

The literature addresses the different changes in immigration policy, but does not address how specific bureaucratic actions and implementations of the policy, such as the forms have impacted the movements. This is where the idea for my paper arose, in an attempt to find an impact on immigration from the micro level--the form changes- and not just the macro policy changes as explained by Pickus (2005).
BUREAUCRATIC FORMS AND THEIR IMPACT ON THE IMMIGRATION PROCESS

In order to distinguish the role of the bureaucratic forms on the process, it is essential to understand the roles that the bureaucratic actors play in influencing the implementation of policy. A cursory glance at the bureaucratic structure through the State Department or USCIS website reveals a labyrinth of bureaucratic rules and administrative melee. The Code of Federal Regulation, within which the immigration codes are recorded, contains vague language and contradictory rules, with little guidance. Due to the ambiguity of US immigration policy often times what is written in the policy is not what is actually practiced by bureaucrats. For example, it is written nowhere in the Code of Federal Regulations that to be naturalized, one must not be a polygamist. However, it is one of the questions on the form. This is due to the ambiguity in CFR8 §316.4, which simply states that one is required to apply using the form N-400, as provided by the United States Citizenship and Immigration Service. This ambiguity causes a disconnect between the law and the forms because no clear directives. This is well debated and researched by scholars (Bach, 1978; Calavita, 1989). It is important to understand why there is difference between policy and implementation and understand why it exists prior to testing the resulting impact of the implementation.

Calavita (1989) hypothesizes that perhaps it is not individual actors and instead that the very fractured nature of the United States federalist system contributes to the discord. She concludes that it is important to look at the individuals involved in this process because of the selective enforcement of immigration law that seems haphazard and arbitrary, which seems to undermine the grand claims and wording of the immigration policy that is written and the immigration policy that is implemented. This disharmony changes the outcome of the immigration policy, and begs the question, who is influencing immigration policy if it is seemingly so arbitrarily applied?

In addition to the imprecise and ambiguous nature of the implementation of immigration policy, Bustamante (2008) documented cases of immigration law being blatantly violated by bureaucrats, which underscored the ability for the immigration policy to be clear (Bustamante). The literature disagrees regarding the cause of this disconnect between policy and implementation. According to Loescher and Scanlan (1986) the confusion of implementation begins with divisions that exist within the policy-makers
themselves. Loescher and Scanlan (1986) divide political actors into three types (1) restrictionists, (2) humanitarians, (3) political pragmatists. The restrictionists believe that immigration to the United States should be limited. The humanitarians see the debate from the side of the individual immigrant, and believe that he has human rights that supersede the barriers of the immigration law, and believe it should be more immigrant friendly because of this. The most influential group is the political pragmatists, who are individuals whose opinions are based on what is politically advantageous at the time. These three types of political actors each influence the writing of the policy, and what results is a policy which is often contradictory, vague and without clear implementation guidelines.

Hull (1985) argues that instead of three groups of political actors, it is ideology plays a central role in the determination of immigration policies. She explains that the discrepancies in policies towards immigrants are often worsened by contradictions and disconnect between legislation, court decisions, and the practice of administrative agencies. Hull hypothesizes that this is due to a reconciling between Americans benign self image as accepting of immigrants and the nativism that has pervaded immigration laws. Calavita (1989) counters this by arguing that perhaps it is not individual actors and instead that the very fractured nature of the United States federalist system contributes to the discord.

The policy that is created by politicians, the policy imagined by ideologues, restrictionists and pragmatists (Loescher & Scanlan, 1986) and the forms that result from the bureaucrats are often very different. This creates a disconnect between what is written and what is applied (Bach, 1978; Calavita, 1989). The question that arises from this is, how big of an effect does this discord have on immigrant movements?

The policy, in its unclear and vague form is given to the bureaucratic actors for implementation. It is often just a skeleton of ideas, numbers, quotas and year requirements without actually having specific instruction or guidelines. This gives the bureaucratic actors much more autonomy than in other types of policies. Immigration policy bureaucrats even publicly release memorandums\(^1\) which outline how they will choose to interpret the law for

---

\(^1\) It should be noted that the memoranda carry a disclaimer that they are simply guidelines and can be followed at the bureaucrats discretion.
that year. From this autonomy, the questions and format of the forms are produced, along with administrative decisions regarding exclusion and inclusion.

This paper does not attempt to reconcile these questions regarding the disconnect between policy and implementation, and instead looks ahead at exactly what questions were written and looks at the exclusionary aspects of those questions, and what this means in terms of bureaucratic influence on the naturalization process. Effectively, I am looking at the impact that the bureaucrats forms have on the naturalization rates, independent of bureaucratic intent or legislative intent. I believe that once the effects of the forms are researched, it allows for further study to resolve disharmony between policy and implementation.

**A BRIEF HISTORY OF NATURALIZATION IN THE UNITED STATES**

I will here describe the historical timeline for the N-400 form which will provide a context to understand the changes that were made to the forms.

The naturalizing of citizens into this culture has had different inclusions and exclusions throughout the history of the United States. Noah Pickus (2005) outlines the history of naturalization as an actualization of nationalist ideas as existing in three distinct eras of American History. The first era, the founding and the early republic of the United States, was a time in which restrictions on immigration and the exclusion of new immigrants who were not of protestant white descent was viewed as a natural progression from the new nationalism that was developing. This first period, Pickus observes was extremely exclusionary and restrictive, with outright bans such as the Alien and Sedition Act of 1798.

This era saw the first legislation of immigration, the Act of March 26, 1790 which listed requirements for immigrants who had been in the United States for two years, and additionally one year within the state to which they are claiming as their residence. In addition, naturalization applicants had to be free, white, posses “good moral character,” swear to an oath of allegiance, and file a petition asking for them to be considered a United States citizens, and privy to all the rights and benefits that come with that distinction. With the Act of January 29, 1795, the requirements were tightened, and naturalization applicants were required to be a resident in the United States for five years, declare publicly their intent
to become a citizen and renounce all ties with other governments three years before their application to become a citizen.

Two years later, Congress passed a law amending the previous law, entitled Naturalization Act of June 18, 1798. This new set of regulations mandated that anyone who originated from a country with which the United States was actively at war was forbidden US citizenship. It also raised the requirement of time spent in the United States to 14 years, from the previous five year requirement. This act was passed mostly as a reactionary measure to international tensions at the time, and was quickly rewritten in the Act of April 14, 1802. In the new act, the requirements were simultaneously more relaxed, and more exclusionary. The residency requirement of 14 years was reverted back to five years, and the applicant was now required to record his entry into the United States with the clerk of the court, who would record biographic information, such as place of intended settlement and nation of allegiance, as well as identifying characteristics, such as age and hair color. It also required that when the applicant submitted his petition, he was required to produce two witnesses who could verify his claims (presumably including his claims about good moral character). These requirements show some of the extremely exclusionary aspects of the law created; both directly (such as the white requirement) and the indirect (being able to have witnesses who would attest in court to your good moral character).

The second era was the progressive era (1903-1924), where there was a relaxing of the exclusionary policies and there was the beginning of an opening up of the exclusionary language. Pickus (2005) observes that some people begin to see national identity and immigration closely interlinked and people were more open to the idea of assimilation as opposed to outright exclusion. Zolberg (2006) embellishes this with more historical aspects of immigration policy, namely, the existence of policy before the 1900s and how that created an “us” versus “them” in the United States. He illustrates how immigration policy was used as an effective way to design an American identity by allowing certain immigrants and discouraging or outright banning others.

This discouragement blended with outright discrimination is seen in the legislation that emerges in this era. The Naturalization Act of June 27, 1906 created what is most clearly the precursor to the system in place today. It created standard forms and fees for naturalization applications and created a Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization. This
new bureaucratization of the immigration and naturalization in the country allowed for clearer standards for those desiring to be US citizens. Most strikingly, is that for the first time, the applicant was required to have a proficiency of English. The first Naturalization procedures were as follows: an immigrant had to display that he/she had a bona fide intention of becoming a United States citizen through residing permanently in the United States and renouncing all allegiances to other nations. Then, the immigrant was required to wait 2-7 years, after which they could then petition to the court for citizenship. During their hearing in front of the judge they were required to present two affidavits from persons attesting to their residence in the United States and their claims of possessing good moral character. After the hearing, the judge would adjudicate that the petition was approved, denied or would ask to return with more information. This process was complicated and time consuming, but allowed for a more clear path to citizenship then before because of the more bureaucratic way in which it was written as policy. The creation of the forms was done entirely by bureaucrats, and adjudications were made by judges and bureaucrats.

The third era that Pickus (2005) discusses is the modern era, when many more restrictive policies were implemented specifically focused around an idea of nationalism. The policies essentially consisted of two opposing views: first that the American Identity needs to maintain European heritage, culture and homogeneity and second that the American Identity is actually a collection of ideas about universal values that are applicable to all and can be taught.

The infamous Immigration Act of 1924 (for example) instituted quotas not just on new immigrants, but also on the immigrants applying for citizenship. It created a quota for applicants for citizenship, based upon the percentage of immigrants from countries who were already naturalized in the United States. Effectively, this policy created a quota that created a number restricting certain groups who had smaller percentages already in the United States, and encouraging those with larger numbers. This policy favored immigrants from the UK, Germany and Ireland, who already had large numbers of immigrants in the United States, thus allowed for a larger percentage of naturalizations by people of that descent. This legislation demonstrates the boundaries that have been drawn around the definition of what an American is, by excluding those without those imagined characteristics.
1952 ushered in big changes for the United States Immigration Policy. They included the Act of 1952, which made immigrants subject to the will of the Secretary of Labor determining that their area of labor was greatly needed. This favored highly skilled immigrants over low skilled labor. In 1965, lawmakers amended the Act of 1952 abandoning the quota system that had been in place since 1924. Instead it implemented separate numerical limits for eastern and western hemisphere immigrants. The western Hemisphere immigrants were given priority status to the eastern hemisphere. The IMMACT, the immigration act enacted in 1990 brought about more divisions in immigrant group making it easier for highly specialized labor to easily flow into the United States, and making it much more difficult for low skilled labor.

The sweeping change brought about by the Patriot act reorganized the immigration and naturalization service into the United States Citizenship and Immigration Service (hereafter, “USCIS”), the Immigration and Customs Enforcements (hereafter, “ICE”), and the Customs and Border Protection (hereafter, the “CBP”). It also took immigration out from underneath the purview of the Department of Justice and placed under the new Department of Homeland Security. This change brought about a new way of looking at immigrants, in that it was a matter of national security. It also divided up the different aspects of immigration—most importantly separating enforcement from visa granting. However, the separation leaves little communication between the departments, thus limiting the effectiveness, and allowing bureaucrats to essentially act simultaneously as enforcement and implementers (American Immigration Lawyers Association, 2003).

These different eras provide a framework through which the idea of inclusion and exclusion of immigrants through naturalization can be viewed. The question of who is and who is not an American is not a new idea, and has been debated by policy makers and scholars alike. I argue that the actual boundary of the constructed American identity is drawn at the most basic level of naturalization—the application that the immigrant must use to apply for it. The demands placed on potential citizens in order to apply for citizenship demonstrate the boundaries of acceptance into the American identity. The exclusion of certain kinds of immigrants forms the American identity in opposition to what is not American. Wæver, Buzan, Kelstrup, and Lemaitre (1993) conceptualized the idea of “societal security” as “the sustainability, within acceptable conditions for evolution, of traditional patterns of language,
culture, association, and religious and national identity and custom.” The idea is that the state is responsible to protect a vision of what a country and its citizens believe they are, and that the threat comes from change to that idea. Thus, immigration is a direct threat to this possible change in identity. The influx of individuals with different patterns of language, culture, etc. is a direct threat to the citizens of the receiving country sense of identity. It is the obligation of the state to address this threat (perceived or real) because of its obligations to the citizens of its state.

From Wæver’s theory, I draw my argument that the perceived threat of immigrants is the motivation behind the form questions. While the legislation has been well researched, I will look instead at the forms, and see what changes in the bureaucratic forms have affected the immigration flows.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

My project will start with a survey of the changes in the N-400 form. I have chosen to focus on naturalization because although immigration policy can be narrowed down to three categories of immigrants: workers, family unification, and humanitarian, the presumed eventual goal is citizenship. I will test what the bureaucratic effects are on naturalization rates by looking at the changes made in the forms by decade. Then, I will look at immigration rates and naturalization rates in the United States from 1820 to 2009. I will attempt to find the “average immigrants” chance of being admitted into the United States each decade and becoming naturalized. I will do this by looking at the percentage of naturalization petitions approved, controlling for total naturalization petitions applied. Then, I will compare this to country data, which will be broken down and analyzed by looking at number of naturalized individuals from each region or birth/former allegiance. If the null hypothesis is true, then there should be no statistically significant difference between the “average immigrant” and an immigrant from any given country. However, if there are differences, I will look to the survey of changes, and see if any changes to the form happened at the same time as this statistical deviation. I am hoping to find that the questions do influence the naturalization rates, and that there is a de facto preference of certain immigrants over others, by basis of their country of origin/birth, similar to those implemented in 1924.

The intention of my methodology was to examine different versions of the form N-400, the naturalization form, used by the Immigration and Naturalization Service in a small scale longitudinal study. I was able to access to the National Archived Records Administration in Laguna Niguel, where I perused through the entire naturalization records

---

2 From 1923 to 1949 the data on naturalizations was collected as country of birth. From 1949-currently, the statistics are recorded as categorized by country of former allegiance. I have compiled them together for ease of studying the data, but on a larger scale study, this would have to be taken into account.

3 Except, of course, during the years of 1924-, when the quota system was in place that set certain countries preferences over others.
for the United States District Court in Tuscan, Arizona. I photocopied a sample form from each year from the years 1921 to 1991. I was also independently, through my previous employer, able to get copies of the 2001 form and the current (2009) form.

For the decades 1920 through 1980, the forms that I have chosen to analyze are the collection of forms that had to be submitted to the district court in Tuscan with the application for naturalization. In the later decades, I did not include other documents required for application, because they are extraneous to the actual naturalization application themselves (for example, I-94 cards which are used to determine continuous presence in the United States, identification documents, such as drivers licenses, and medical examination forms. This decision was made because the later forms were compounded to include much of this information within the application form itself, so I decided to only use the basic naturalization form for the later decades in my study. As part of the larger study, I hope to look more carefully at the host of requirements required for each decade, supporting documentation and supplemental forms such as the N-360 which establishes relationship used for sponsorship of an immediate relative or the N-600 which is for adopted children.

The data regarding historical trend were procured through extensive conversation and contact with Mr. John Simansky, at the Office of Immigration Statistics in Washington, DC. and Mr. Zack Wilske at the United States Citizenship and Immigration Service Historian’s Office. They assisted me in acquiring data files from the Yearbook of immigration Statistics dating 1970-current, including the copies of the blank N-400 forms and the US bureau of Immigration Annual Report of the Commissioner General of Immigration to the Secretary of Labor, which contained the earlier PDF scans of data tables to 1920 to 1970, which I then transcribed to a data file.

The amount of data collected, and the changes to the forms show drastic change between the decades, and although I plan on covering the major changes in my analysis, a list of all the changes would extend beyond the scope of this smaller scale study. Therefore, I have included a copy of each of the forms in the appendix to this paper, for those who are curious.
CHAPTER 4

EXAMINATION OF N-400

ANALYSIS

The form of analysis that I will use in this paper is content analysis of the forms. I will note differences between the forms and major changes made in the questions and requirements that specifically address exclusion of certain groups. The major changes will be noted, as well as minor changes which would have a major impact on the exclusion of certain groups. Although there have been standardized forms since 1906, I am limiting this smaller scale study on forms from 1920-current, because the access to the older forms was not available. I have arranged the forms by decade, followed by a description of the changes and explanation of the potentially exclusionary aspects and implications of such changes.

1920s Forms

The application for naturalization in the 1920s required three separate forms. First, the certification of arrival was required to be filed prior to the application for naturalization. It is a certification from the immigration service and the Department of Labor that the alien was admitted into permanent residence to the United States. The point of this document is to certify the arrival of the alien so that the length of time requirement could be verified. This document asks for basic information about the immigrant such as port of entry, manner of arrival, name and date.

The second document was a declaration of intention, which asks that the alien swear an oath to God that they do not practice polygamy and with “good faith” declare that they wish to be an American Citizen and live in the United States. It also requires that the alien renounce all “allegiance and fidelity to any prince, potentate, state or sovereignty, and particularly to [a blank line] of whom I am now a subject.” Curiously, the form is pre-printed in the personal description stating that one’s color is “white” and then requires the immigrant to fill in other characteristics, such as hair color, eye color and other distinctive marks. This is indicative of the exclusion of nonwhites to apply for citizenship. It has an option to
explain “complexion,” and the documents I found had been filled with the complexion descriptions of fair, white, and dark.

The third document required is the interrogatories in depositions of witnesses, which were sworn affidavits of American citizens who would testify to the continuous residence of the alien, the conduct of the alien as one with “good moral character” and that the alien is not a polygamist, nor an anarchist. The requirement is that two American citizens attest to these qualities of the immigrant. Additionally, they had to attest that the alien has been “attached to the principles of the constitution of the United States and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States” and whether they would recommend the alien for citizenship.

The fourth document is the actual petition for citizenship, the precursor to the form N-400--form 2204, which basically restates and reaffirms what is sworn to in the other documents, and presents it on a one page application signed and sealed by the deputy clerk of the court. It asks again for country born, occupation, race, date that declaration of intention was filed, date of arrival, lawful entry status, which ship they arrived on, and which particular country’s allegiance they are renouncing so that they may become a citizen of the united states.

The exclusionary aspects are blatant, such as the exclusion of atheists, non-whites and polygamists. There are also the secondary and indirect ways in which people are excluded, such as the exclusion of those who do not know two US citizens who would be willing to attest to their good moral character. This would seemingly exclude people who are not assimilated into the United States culture. In addition, it draws attention to those immigrants who are not working, did not arrive by boat (such as Mexicans and Canadians) and those who did not enter lawfully.

**1930s Forms**

The forms in the 1930s resemble the 1920 forms in the continuing requirement of the certification of arrival, declaration of intention, witness declaration, and petition for citizenship. The requirement of the declaration of intention was eliminated for certain aliens, such as those who had lived in the United States for a period longer than 14 years. The most noticeable change was on the petition for citizenship form, which now required a photo to be
attached with the application and removed pre-printed “white” in the color section, and was replaced with a blank space to be filed out by the immigrant.

The citizenship petition required a separate form containing an oath of allegiance which simultaneously required a renouncement of all allegiances (including a blank space to specify specifically which state they were renouncing their allegiances too) and included and an oath to support and defend the constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic and ending with the phrase SO HELP ME GOD. This oath was required to be sworn to in front of a clerk of the court, signed and dated prior to the submission of the petition for citizenship. On the petition for citizenship itself, there is again the oath of allegiance and the fill in space for one to write in the specific king or leadership that they were renouncing in order to gain United States Citizenship.

This form is much more inclusionary than its predecessor in that it does exclude those who are not white, yet it is still exclusionary for those who are not assimilated and those who do not believe in God. Asking ones race turned up interesting responses, as all the forms I saw were indicative of “white” as their color, the race section was varied, Magyar, Scotch, Polish. It seems that the lack of consistency in the forms allows for bureaucratic discretion in exclusionary power, and leaves the immigrant unsure of his or hers chances of being accepted. What is clear, however, is that the exclusions based on race are highlighted by this form, and those who do not fit the preconceived idea of an American were excluded from citizenship.

1940s Forms

The naturalization petitions were renamed the N-405 forms, yet took the same characteristics and question from the 1930 predecessor. The requirements were consistent with the previous editions such as the same certificate of arrival, description and port of entry questions. However, there were some changes that both increased and decreased exclusionary aspects and allowed for great bureaucratic implementation. Firstly, the declaration of intention for the first time had a list of requirements and outlined the process required of the new citizens. Such requirements are “not less than two or more then seven years after the date of the original of this declaration was made, and after you have lived in the United Sates for at least six months, you may file a petition for naturalization. You will
not be notified...to file such a petition.” The paragraphs continue on to require applicants to study the principles of the constitution because they will then be required by “the judge of the naturalization court” to show that they have adequate knowledge. This requirement also is reflected on the new naturalization petition which requires that petitioners swear that they speak English. It also requires the petitioner to “be well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States” but with no explanation as to what that means exactly.

The form maintained the same oath of allegiance from the previous form and the requirement of the sworn affidavits of two American citizen witnesses to attest to the good moral character and good disposition to the principles of the United States. This maintains the exclusion of immigrants who live in immigrant enclaves or otherwise do not have contact with American citizens willing to state in open court and under the penalty of perjury that the immigrant is of good moral character and good disposition to the principles of the United States.

Additionally, the form differs from the previous form in that it broke down the personal description category into color and complexion and followed by another question regarding race. Within my research, I located documents of four individuals, one from Scotland, one from France and two from Mexico. All four of these applicants had indicated white both on the color and race questions, yet for the color question the Scottish woman indicated fair the man from France indicated medium and the Mexican women indicated dark. This indicates a difference in qualification from the current form (to be discussed later) which allows for a separate category which qualifies Mexicans not as white but as a new category that they indicate as “Latino.”

1950s Forms

The Petition for Naturalization was modified again in 1952, with the most noticeable difference being the requirements that one be able to read, write and speak English. This is extremely exclusionary given that the United Nations published that year that 44% of the world’s population was illiterate. Certain countries and regions, such as South America, Africa and Asia had much higher rates of illiteracy, thus excluding those regions much more then the Europeans or Eastern Europeans.
The changes in 1952 also required that an immigrant qualify that they have not for the preceding 10 years been affiliated with any “section, subsidiary, branch affiliate, or subdivision that are prohibited by the Immigration and Nationality Act.” This excluded groups such as anarchists or communists. The implications of this are that it essentially excluded any people coming from communist states who still had ties to their home country. It also shows that the definition of an American has been contracted to not include communists. This was a reactionary measure to growing suspicions of communists and threats from the Cold War tensions, and it is interesting that even having associations to groups that are banned, essentially bars an alien from naturalization.

This form also has a section that persons are required to list all times that they have been absent from the United States for periods of six months or longer, and explain the way in which they left and returned (via boat, foot, etc.). In addition, it requires them to swear that they have resided continuously in the United States for the five years prior to the naturalization form being filed. This is exclusionary in that it makes it difficult for anyone who traveled extensively at the time. It draws attention to their application, and could potentially prohibit them for citizenship. It limits the abilities of people to be able to visit their family or conduct business in their home country in order to become a citizen of the United States, because any time left over six months could disqualify their citizenship.

The oath of allegiance in the new form also requires that one swears to bear arms, perform noncombatant services or perform work of national importance. The immigrant must swear to fight for the United States, which in essence could exclude those whose home countries were having tensions with the United States, such as the USSR, and limits their ability to naturalize. Basically, in applying for naturalization an alien must in the same statement renounce all ties to their former country and agree to fight against that very country, should the United States require them to. This is different than just renouncing because it is an oath to commit treason against your home country, to which a potential US citizen may still have ties, should the United States require them to. This raises the bar of requirement on the immigrants who wish to naturalize.
1960s Forms

The main revision made on the 1961 form is the addition of the category of marriage petitions. It allowed people to file for citizenship on the basis of marriage to a United States Citizen abroad, who was in certain professions as qualified by the immigration and nationality act, to be naturalized even though they were not actually present in the United States for the five years preceding the filing of the form. The remainder of the form is the same as the 1950s form. The only notable difference in the form is the addition of requiring those who hold titles of nobility in other countries to renounce that nobility in order to naturalize as a United States Citizen. For example, a British Citizen with the noble distinction of “Sir” must renounce it prior to naturalization. A title of nobility is often a sign of distinction that is either inherited or earned, and to require someone to renounce that honor is excluding anyone who holds that honor in high regard.

1970s Forms

In 1970, form N-405 was re-designed to have less question regarding the aliens personal history (as the previous forms had) and instead includes a second page with a long list of declarations that the alien must swear to before submitting the petition. These declarations include the requirement that the alien have not been a conscientious objector or refused to serve in the armed services during any declared war or undeclared war that the United States was involved in. They also were required to have been discharged honorably from the military and have served in the army regardless of immigration status. Essentially, this is saying that they, if asked to serve in a military, they served honorably in the armed forces and had not refused to fight for a country that they could not have had an oath to fight for. It also adds the requirement that an alien, in addition to being able to read, write and speak English, understand the “fundamentals of history, and of the principles and form of the United States Government.”

These additions came during a time of great instability in the United States, with great disagreement over the military presence in Vietnam. It is interesting to note that at a time in Unites States history that saw such civic disobedience and dissent, new citizens were required to swear that they were not going to question the United States government on these issues. In addition, they had to swear that they would not refuse to fight or conscientiously
object to fighting. In addition it could exclude an immigrant who had refused to fight for an oppressive totalitarian government, and had sought and gained asylum in the United States. Given the draft in place at the time, these people were essentially guaranteed that if naturalized and drafted, they would have to fight, or have the possibility of losing their citizenship.

What this seems to indicate, is that the United States only wished to allow those who would be obedient immigrants to be citizens, and ones who would not question the government, or the war. This is extremely exclusionary, because it excludes anyone, for example, who would not fight because of religious ground no matter what the cause, or whose home country the United States could be at war with. This is very different from the previous, more relaxed versions of the form, which were exclusionary based on race. It is important to note that there are very little race, color, or descriptive colors on the 1970 version of the form. It is a polar opposite of the previous forms, one which highlights the groups that the United States did not want to naturalize--political decedents.

1980s Forms

The changes in the 1980s forms were mostly organizational to make the form clearer, with no change in regard to the language of inclusion and exclusion. What did change was the world situation surrounding the form. Given the restriction on political decedents, we would expect the Russian and Eastern European Immigrants who wish to naturalize to feel the full force of the restriction.

1990s Forms

The Form in 1990 was drastically different in appearance to the previous editions in that it is written more in a letter form with 15 declarations similar to those in the previous forms (such as not being an anarchist, polygamist, conscientious objector, been of good moral character, and understanding of the history and form of the United States Government) but it also removed the witness requirement from the form and instead required that the petitioner be examined by an examiner who would test them and verify that they understood what they were swearing too with the document. They could also use this opportunity to test the validity of the claims that this person was making (such as their ability to speak English and know the history of the United States.). This increases the exclusionary nature of those
individuals who are illiterate, because they were required not only be able to read, write and speak English, but now they are required to be able to answer correctly and convincingly questions by an interviewer, regarding their ability to speak English and understand the fundamentals of the U.S. government. This seems to have the potential to exclude those immigrants who have had little education, or experience with interrogations and interviews.

**2001 Form**

The Immigration and Naturalization Service’s 2001 form was completely redesigned so that instead of filling in blanks or swearing to declarations, the petitioner is asked question by question to agree or disagree to the questions asked. This change indicates a complication of the system, making it more intimidating and also allows for more ways in which people can be excluded. For example, it limits the categories in which some aliens can be admitted (such as the race options being White, Asian or Pacific Islander, Black, American Indian or Alaskan Native, or unknown) and allows for expands the ability to exclude people such as questions regarding an aliens character and personal history (there are 16 questions regarding good moral character which could be perceived as a way to define moral character--except that it includes a question such as “have you ever been a habitual drunkard” or “have you ever committed a crime or offense for which you were not arrested?” These questions can be used to exclude people for a more miniscule category, and removes the ability for someone to swear that they have good moral character, and instead excludes based on what the United States has defined as good moral character. It is a change from one swearing that they have good moral character to asking specific questions with which they can disqualify and exclude individuals.

In terms of group membership, it qualifies the groups that it excludes directly, with questions such as “have you ever been a member of or in any way associated (either directly or indirectly) with a communist party, any other totalitarian party or a terrorist organization?” This is also exclusionary towards many groups because of the ambiguity of the questions. For example, is a separatist movement, such as the people in Kosovo, who are considered a terrorist group by the Serbians, but not by the United States, a terrorist organization?

This form also removes the exclusionary aspect of atheism from the form. This is interesting to note because it remained on the form until this draft of the form. Previously a
petitioner could not have even associated with atheists in order to be considered for citizenship. The inclusion of atheists with this form perhaps indicates acceptance and tolerance of more religious views. Another interesting point to note is the elimination of polygamist as an exclusionary questions, and instead, the inclusion of the question “have you ever been married to more than one person at the same time?” While seemingly inclusionary in that it does not direct exclude polygamists, it is actually more exclusionary because it could theoretically include people whose divorces abroad are not recognized by the United States, who remarry in the United States. It is a question that allows them to expand the definition of Polygamist and further exclude anyone they feel is violating the American view of marriage.

In sum, the 2001 form (which was released prior to the attacks on September 11th, 2001) is indicative of the new wave of contraction in the United States identity, due to the influx of new immigrants that the economic prosperity of the 1990s attracted, and then the subsequent collapse of that prosperity brought about a desire to contract those that would be included into the United States Identity.

**Current Form (2009)**

In 2003, the USCIS then became the agency with jurisdiction over naturalizations and surprisingly, it used almost the identical form that was used by the INS in 2001. The current form is identical in all the questions with the exception of the addition of a race category of Latino and African American. This form also included the question “Are you Latino?” If this question is marked yes, it does not mean that one is excluded, but the application is flagged for closer review. This is indicative of the continued contraction of variance in the naturalized citizens because of their race. This restrictionist behavior closely resembles the forms of the 1920s, where race was the main focus of the application. It raises the question if the future of naturalizations is to restrict the races of those who want to be United States Citizens.

---

4 I am not sure if the addition of “African American” was implemented in an attempt at political correctness, or simply oversight, but the inclusion of such a category is quite ironic and almost trivial, given that it is a form for naturalization as an American citizen. How one can apply to naturalize as an American when they are racially an American, is perplexing, and could be an interesting point of research.
The continued usage of the highly exclusionary form indicates the continued contraction of the boundaries of the United States identity in the modern era. It is possible to predict that the form will continue to be restrictive insofar as the economy and national security remain in the peak of national interest, and it remains to be seen in what way the new exclusionary mechanisms will be shaped.

**HYPOTHESIS TESTING**

Upon close examination of the forms I found that the exclusionary aspects of the groups could be laid out into three distinct periods of exclusion. The early 1900s to 1940s can be aggregated as the first period. During this period, the exclusions were mostly based upon race, due to the pre-printed answer of “white” to the race questions, as well as requiring renouncing prior allegiances and requiring two US citizens to attest to an immigrants “good moral character.” These requirements and questions mostly excluded immigrants from immigrant communities, non-whites, and those with strong ties to their former countries.

I noticed that during the second period from 1940 to 1980, most of the exclusions were based upon politics. This is distinguished by the adding of the communist and other political questions and requirements such as requiring permanent residents to swear to take arms, exclusions of conscientious objectors, etc. This excluded immigrants from countries that were at political odds with the United States.

The third period is the current form, from 1980 on, and I believe is mostly characterized by a return to the exclusion based on race. This is due to the multitude of race questions and the sheer intimidation of the length of the form which was modified added post 1980. In addition, the adding of questions regarding terrorism and totalitarianism are other questions which *de facto* exclude individuals from certain countries.

I will next test whether these periods of changes in the forms correspond to the number of people actually naturalized during those periods and if the exclusionary aspects of the forms actually did correspond to exclusions of individuals from those countries that the questions are trying to exclude.

---

5 I must clarify at this point, that this observation is pulled strictly from the addition of the questions on the forms, which are crafted by bureaucrats not mandated by policy.
CHAPTER 5

DATA ANALYSIS

I first looked at the general trend of approvals and denials of all naturalization applications. Figure 1 shows my hypothesis correct, that there is a contraction in the 1920s following the restrictive 1924 legislation then slow expansion through the 1980s. This expansion is followed by a drastic contraction in the 1990s.

![Graph showing trend of naturalizations approved and denied from 1900 to 2000.](image)


My hypothesis must be further tested to see if there are certain groups who are being excluded or included and do not follow this same pattern found in the average. I first looked at the bigger picture to see if there are certain groups who were naturalized at higher than what would be expected from the above normal rates. What I found was that most countries were being either blatantly excluded or included, and only recently has that trend evened out with slight variations of increased exclusions.

To find this data, I took the number of Naturalized New Citizens by region of birth/country of former allegiance for each decade divided by the total naturalized for that decade. I then divided that by the total percentage of immigrants from that region for the previous decade. I used the previous decade immigration data so as to account for the time
lapse between when an immigrant migrated and when they applied for citizenship (anywhere from five years to 14 years depending on the decade). I could not get per country data on naturalizations petition filed and denied, due to national security issues. Also, several historical data on naturalizations of citizens from select countries, such as Russia and former Soviet Union, some African nations and several South American nations was restricted entirely due to national security reasons.6

Table 1 shows some interesting conclusions. I’ve highlighted countries whose naturalizations were higher than expected. This would indicate an inclusion brought about by the naturalization forms and process. In the 1920s, as I predicted, the restriction of “white” excluded a lot of groups. The group listed as the Middle East includes Turkey, which drastically influenced the result. In the 1930s, the restrictions on those who did not believe in God are apparent in the still low rates from Asia and South East Asia, whose main religions at the time were not Christian.

| Table 1. Regions Whose Immigrants Were Naturalized as US Citizens Compared to Average Naturalized Petitions |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Africa | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.52 | 0.58 | 3.01 | 3.34 | 2.45 | 2.56 | 2.25 |
| Asia | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.65 | 0.24 | 1.80 | 1.99 | 1.16 | 0.84 | 0.67 |
| Canada | 0.00 | 0.16 | 0.45 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.42 | 0.74 | 0.88 |
| Caribbean | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.16 | 0.57 | 0.70 | 1.15 | 1.40 | 0.89 | 1.36 |
| Central America | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.39 | 0.41 | 0.78 | 1.30 | 1.03 | 1.12 |
| Eastern Europe (incl Russia) | 6.07 | 5.03 | 3.02 | 11.66 | 6.69 | 6.36 | 2.71 | 4.36 | 1.59 |
| Europe | 0.90 | 1.05 | 0.47 | 0.78 | 0.91 | 0.77 | 0.63 | 0.59 | 0.31 |
| Mexico | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Middle East | 2.70 | 1.89 | 2.43 | 0.21 | 0.97 | 1.22 | 1.04 | 0.69 | 6.57 |
| Oceania | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| South America | 0.03 | 0.37 | 1.69 | 0.47 | 0.69 | 0.64 | 1.09 | 0.91 | 1.02 |
| South East Asia | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.29 | 0.72 | 3.05 | 2.86 | 1.52 | 1.51 | 2.24 |

A score of x>1 indicates Naturalizations were higher than expected given immigration rates for the previous decade. Original data was courtesy of the source. Source: Office of Immigration Statistics and Department of Homeland Security. (2010). United States Citizenship and Immigration Service. Washington, DC: Historian’s Office.

6 I realize that this is a crude way of doing this research, but I am hoping to expand upon this project, at which point, hopefully, more accurate data can be obtained, and more efficient statistical techniques can be used.
In the 1940s, the requirement of speaking English seems to not have excluded as many as I initially thought. It is also interesting to note that the racial restrictions on South Americans, Mexicans and immigrants from the Caribbean and Asia increased drastically given that the form no longer included the requirement of being “White.” There still however was the quota system in effect, which limited the number of immigrants from these regions. Therefore although those immigrants who were present in the United States were able to naturalized, the limited new immigration of individuals from those regions still restricted their naturalization numbers.

The only region that received extra preference was Eastern Europe, but that is because of the outlier of those who were born in Poland, who had left the Russian part of Poland and migrated to other eastern European nations to then settle in the United States. There was also a large influx of Polish Jews and others escaping World War II, who were not given preference before 1948, but were given leniency in large numbers after 1948.

In the 1950s, the most obvious impact of the form change is the literacy requirement. All regions naturalization rates dropped during that time, indicative of the lack of education throughout most of the world. According to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), published in 1952, literacy rates around the world with the exception of the developed European countries were quite low. Please see Tables 2 and 3 exerted from the report.

The global literacy rate has been declining due to United Nations efforts and mandatory schooling, what was interesting to see was how similarly structured the literacy rate was as opposite the global immigration and naturalization rate (see Figure 2). This indicates that there is another layer of exclusion that I did not hypothesize, which is the exclusion of the non-literate after 1948. As more people became literate around the world, the more access they had to the naturalization process (see Figure 3).

The changes to the forms in the early 1960s did not change much, and therefore did not have much effect on naturalizations. However, the abandonment of the quota system and the removal of the racial qualifications on the naturalization form caused a surge in naturalizations and immigration from countries that had been excluded previously. Figure 4 shows the surge in nonwhite (all regions except European, Eastern European and Middle
Table 2. Percentage of Literates, Semi-Literates and Illiterates in the Total Population as Specified Age Levels, in 12 Countries: Various Census Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Census year</th>
<th>Age level years</th>
<th>Percentage of persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Able to read and write</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>10 and over</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>10 and over</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>5 and over</td>
<td>82.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>5 and over</td>
<td>89.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>10 and over</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>10 and over</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newfoundland</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>10 and over</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>10 and over</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>15 and over</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>15 and over</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>15 and over</td>
<td>69.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>15 and over</td>
<td>84.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>7 and over</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>6 and over</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>6 and over</td>
<td>68.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>6 and over</td>
<td>84.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>6 and over</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India (selected States)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baroda</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>5 and over</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochin</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>5 and over</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>5 and over</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaipur</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>5 and over</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jammu and Kashmir</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>5 and over</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mysore</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>5 and over</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>10 and over</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Eastern) and Figure 5 shows the dramatic increase in Asian immigration after the dropping of the quota system, which had historically discriminated against those of Asian origin.

The 1970s continued the trend from the 1960s, and increasing numbers of historically discriminated against groups were more positively approved (see Table 1) then they had been
Table 3. Computation of illiteracy rates for Total Population, 10 Years Old and Over, Including and Excluding Persons of Literacy Unspecified, in Six Selected Countries: Latest Census Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Census year</th>
<th>No. of persons of literacy unspecified</th>
<th>Percentage of illiteracy computed on total population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Including literacy unspecified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>86,886</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>91,560</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>378,623</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>316,429</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>211,681</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union of South Africa (Native population)</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>118,996</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


in the past, especially those from African Countries, Asian Countries and Caribbean Countries.

At the time that the form was changed to exclude communists, (1950s), the Soviet Union was engaged in a Cold War with the United States, but it did not affect naturalizations


in a noticeable way. However, in the 1970s there was an increase in immigrants from Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. This trend continued into the current times. What is interesting to note is that the number of naturalizations of Russian and Eastern European Immigrants dropped significantly. I was not allowed, due to National Security, able to see the exact numbers by country of those who were naturalized from the Soviet Union during that time, but the information that I was able to obtain indicated that while the Naturalizations were being approved at a higher rate for those who were not white, it was being decreased for those whose countries were not in the favor of the United States. See Figure 6 for a representation of the changes in Eastern European and Russian Naturalization.


The 1990s presented the biggest change and impacted Naturalization rates the most. The form became a 14 page inquisition that included the same exclusions as before for polygamists and illiterates, but additionally, those individuals from Asia, Middle East and South America, had their naturalizations approved at a lower then average rate (see Table 1). There was a drastic contraction of the number of approvals of Mexicans (see Figure 7), and a contraction of total average approvals (see Figure 1). These exclusions continued into the 2000, when groups such as those who had been previously associated with a
totalitarian government, who had ever been a child soldier, a prostitute\textsuperscript{7}, been involved in a terrorist\textsuperscript{8} organization, were additionally excluded.


\textsuperscript{8} Please note that the USCIS adjudicator’s handbook is exceedingly vague regarding what is a terrorist group. It instructs the adjudicators to look on the internet and FBI databases to see if a group is listed. Such groups as Kosovo liberation groups, Basque independent movements and even animals rights groups are included on the FBI terrorist lists. This appears to be an expansion of exclusionary categories, without being explicitly discriminatory.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it seems that the data supports my general hypothesis that the forms actually do influence the naturalization process through different exclusionary language on the naturalization forms and throughout the naturalization process in order to shape new Americans to be a model American Citizenry. I also demonstrated through further testing, that these did indeed follow the three different periods that I had previously hypothesized. In the early part of the century the preference was for white individuals to become new American citizens. During the 1950s through the early 1990s there was a shift to exclude political adversaries and the restrictions on non-whites were lifted, which allowed large numbers of ethnic non whites to naturalize, and they did in large numbers.

However, contrary to my prediction, in the post-1980s period there was a marked decline in the percentage of naturalizations approved in general, and most of the exclusions came from both racial and political roots. What seems to have actually happened is that in the third period, exclusion is based not upon race or politics, but instead, a staked version of all the previous forms and other new exclusions as well. It is as if they have staked the forms with new exclusionary language without removing the previous ones, which is why, for example, there is still anarchist questions alongside racial questions. In addition, the data shows this with the decreased overall approval rate of naturalization application. It seems that the third period is not characterized by a resurgence of racial exclusions, as I had previously thought, but instead is distinguished as a period of generalized exclusion.

In the United States, the naturalization process is the most exclusionary as it ever has been, which is troubling to see in an era of globalization. The demand for immigrant labor is consistent as the US population gets older. Yet as Wæver et al. (1993) predicted, the desire to protect the society security, the perception of the down-home American citizen prevails in the actions of those implementing policy. It will be interesting to see the changes that will be made and if the bureaucrats continue to restrict or if they will begin to loosen as the economy demands it. It would also be fascinating to explore further study of forms and the
naturalization process in other countries, such as the European Union and Australia, both receiving large amounts of immigrants. It would be interesting to look at the ways other countries have approached protecting their societal security through bureaucratic forms and immigration policy. Globalization has made immigration easier, thus this study opens the possibility to further study the effects of bureaucratic forms in curtailing those immigration flows.
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