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claims and provide the means necessary for a decent living. The Dublin System, created by the EU in the 1990s with the intention to shift all responsibilities towards the member states issuing entry documents or failing to prevent illegal border crossings, had broken down. The Eastern European countries to the north, such as the Czech Republic, Poland, and Slovakia, strongly resisted any enactment by the EU of quota-based programs designed to help countries on the periphery through relocation or resettlement.


3 See, e.g., Jeffrey Marcus, An Escalating Crisis and an Intensiﬁcation Search for Solutions, N.Y. TIMES, Sept. 1, 2015, at A6. On the responsibilities created by the Dublin System for the member states on the periphery of the European Union and the member states in which the application for asylum has already been eventually lodged, see Case C-490/16, A.S. v. Republika Slovenia, ECLI:EU:C:2017:585 (July 26, 2017). On the distributive effects of the Dublin System, see also Daniel Fröhlich, Zuständigkeitsverteilung im Gemeinsamen Europäischen Asylsystem [Allocation of Responsibilities under the Common European Asylum System], ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR GESETZEBILDUNG [ZG] 215, 221-226 (2016) (emphasizing the particular burden to be shouldered by southern and southeastern European countries, given the geographical direction and the direction of most of the migratory movements toward the E.U.).

4 See, e.g., James Kantor, E.U. Nations Urged to Accept 160,000 Migrants, N.Y. TIMES, Sept. 10, 2015, at A1; Rick Lyman, Eastern Europe Ballooning at Aid for Migrants, N.Y. TIMES, Sept. 13, 2015, at A1 (quoting a source stressing that the refugees were culturally different and not used to living in Eastern Europe: “[This wave of refugees from another continent . . . has no precedent, so people don’t know what to think.”) For the legal background of the debate see Commission Recommendation (EU) 2015/914, 2015 O.J. (L 148) 32 (proposing a European resettlement scheme); Council Decision 2015/1523, 2015 O.J. (L 239) 146 (establishing provisional measures in the area of international protection for the benefit of Italy and Greece, involving the relocation of 40,000 persons and the setup of a relocation procedure based on voluntary indications by member states regarding the number of applicants who could be relocated swiftly to their territories); Council Decision 2015/1661, 2015 O.J. (L 248) 80 (establishing provisional measures in the area of international protection for the benefit of Italy and Greece, involving the relocation of 120,000 persons under a quota system, the decision was adopted by majority vote only, with the Czech Republic, Hungary, Romania, and the Slovak Republic voting against). The legality of Council Decision 2015/1661 has been contested before the ECJ by Hungary and the Slovak Republic. The ECJ (Grand Chamber) dismissed the appeals. Cases C-645/15 and C-647/15, Slovak Republic and Hungary v. Council of the European Union, ECLI:EU:C:2017:631 (Sept. 6, 2017).
1. INTRODUCTION

A. "Refugee Crisis"

In the summer and fall of 2017, the time of writing this article, Germany was in the wake of what had been termed the “Flüchtlingskrise” (refugee crisis) in 2015.1 The unfolding of the refugee crisis was intensely covered by the media as it took place. Some pictures of the coverage still stick in mind: In the summer and the fall of 2015, hundreds of thousands of desperate people—men, women, children—literally marched through parts of Europe to escape dire circumstances, such as civil war in Syria and unrest and insecurity in Afghanistan, Iraq, or Iran. Many people simply walked for miles and miles along railway tracks leading northwest, to the Balkan countries, after surviving a very dangerous crossing-over from Turkey to Greece.2 The German media called the passage through southeastern Europe the “Balkan route” or the “Western Balkans route.”3 After the refugees had left Greece, they proceeded to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Serbia, then to Hungary (or Croatia and Slovenia), Austria, and, eventually, Germany.4

Clearly, the refugees expected the European Union (EU) to help. But many EU member states were reluctant to give in to that expectation. The countries most affected by the crisis—Germany, Hungary, Italy—offered little support in the summer of 2015.5 Hungary even turned to outright hostility in the fall of 2015.6 Greece, Hungary, and Italy were happy to see the refugees move on, even though EU law demanded that they evaluate the refugees’ claims and provide the means necessary for a decent living.7 The Dublin System, created by the EU in the 1990s with the intention to shift all responsibilities towards the member states issuing entry documents or failing to prevent illegal border crossings,8 had broken down.9 The Eastern European countries to the north, as such as the Czech Republic, Poland, and Slovakia, strongly resisted any enactment by the EU of quota-based programs designed to help countries on the periphery through relocation or resettlement.10

1 See, e.g., Marc Brost et al., Jetzt prüft die Politik auf die Wirklichkeit [Now, Politics Checks Reality], Die Zeit, Aug. 27, 2015, at 2; Anthony Faola, European Refugee System Overwhelmed, WASH. POST, Apr. 22, 2015, at A01.
4 Id.
5 See, e.g., Andre Taubitz, Zuhause für 60.000 Menschen gesucht: EU-Kommission will Flüchtlinge aus Syrien vertreiben, um Italien und Griechenland zu entlasten [A Home for 60.000 Migrants Sought. Commission of the EU Wants to Remove Syrian Refugees to Ease the Burden on Italy and Greece], DIE WELT, May 25, 2015, at 6.
9 See, e.g., Jeffrey Marcus, An Escalating Crisis and an Intensifying Search for Solutions, N.Y. TIMES, Sept. 1, 2015, at A6. On the responsibilities created by the Dublin System for the member states on the periphery of the European Union and the member states in which the application for asylum has been eventually lodged, see Case C-490/16, A.S. v. Republika Slovenija, ECLI:EU:C:2017:585 (July 26, 2017). On the distributive effects of the Dublin System, see also Daniel Fröhlich, Zuständigkeitsallokation im Gemeinsamen Europäischen Asylsystem [Allocation of Responsibilities under the Common European Asylum System], ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR GESETZGEVUNG [ZG] 215, 221-22 (2016) (emphasizing the particular burden to be shouldered by southern and southeastern European countries, given the whereabouts and the direction of most of the migratory movements toward the EU).
10 See, e.g., James Kanter, E.U. Nations Urged to Accept 160,000 Migrants, N.Y. TIMES, Sept. 10, 2015, at A1; Rick Lyman, Eastern Europe Battling for Aid for Migrants, N.Y. TIMES, Sept. 13, 2015, at A1 (quoting a source stressing that the refugees were culturally different from the people living in Eastern Europe: “[T]his wave of refugees from another continent . . . has no precedent, so people don’t know what to think.”) For the legal background of the debate see Commission Recommendation (EU) 2015/914, 2015 O.J. (L 148) 32 (proposing a European resettlement scheme); Council Decision 2015/1523, 2015 O.J. (L 239) 146 (establishing provisional measures in the area of international protection for the benefit of Italy and Greece, involving the relocation of 40,000 persons and the setup of a relocation procedure based on voluntary indications by member states regarding the number of applicants who could be relocated swiftly to their territories); Council Decision 2015/1601, 2015 O.J. (L 248) 80 (establishing provisional measures in the area of international protection for the benefit of Italy and Greece, involving the relocation of 120,000 persons under a quota system; the decision was adopted by majority vote only, with the Czech Republic, Hungary, Romania, and the Slovak Republic voting against). The legality of Council Decision 2015/1601 has been contested before the ECJ by Hungary and the Slovak Republic. The ECJ (Grand Chamber) dismissed the appeals. Cases C-645/15 and C-647/15, Slovak Republic and Hungary v. Council of the European Union, ECLI:EU:C:2017:631 (Sept. 6, 2017).
Within a few weeks, Germany had become the country of choice for most of the refugees reaching European soil. In mid-August 2015, German officials expected the number of incoming refugees to reach 800,000 by the end of the year—a number without precedent. At the end of August 2015, a deserted truck carrying the decayed bodies of seventy-one people, suspected to be illegal migrants, was found close to Austria’s eastern border. The truck had been passing through Hungary before entering Austrian territory. Federal Chancellor Angela Merkel was “deeply shaken by the news.” At that point in time, Germany had already decided to allow any Syrian refugee reaching Germany to apply for asylum, i.e., it no longer relied on Greece, Hungary, or Austria regarding the processing of asylum applications under the Dublin System. On September 5, 2015, against the background of persistent violent protests orchestrated by right-wingers, Angela Merkel decided to relinquish border controls altogether, a measure that lasted de facto well into the spring of 2016. In the summer of 2016, the Balkan route was basically sealed off again. Turkey had agreed to resume stricter border controls in March 2016 (promising to stop crossings over to the Greek islands).

11 See, e.g., Alison Smale, Migrants Race North as Hungary Builds a Fence, N.Y. TIMES, Aug. 25, 2015, at A1 (quoting a source describing Germany as the refugees’ “promised land.”); see also, Karten Kannholz & Daniel Friedrich Sturm, Regierung vorschlägt jetzt mit 80.000 Flüchtlingen (Government Expects the Number of Refugees to Reach 80,000), DIE WELT, Aug. 20, 2015, at 1.; see also, Anthony Faiola, Decayed Bodies Found in Truck, WASH. POST, Aug. 28, 2015, at A01; Marcus, supra note 9.
12 See Marcus, supra note 9.
13 Editorial Board, A Refugee Tragedy in Austria, N.Y. TIMES, Aug. 28, 2015, at A22.
14 Melissa Eddy, Merkel Tries to Counter Backlash Against Migrants as Violence Flares, N.Y. TIMES, Aug. 27, 2015, at A06.
15 Anthony Faiola & Stephanie Kirchner, Merkel Seeks to Calm Anti-Refugee Fury, WASH. POST, Aug. 27, 2015, at A08.
16 Rick Lyman, Azemina Harkocis & Alison Smale, Migrants Cross Austria Border from Hungary, N.Y. TIMES, Sept. 5, 2015, at A01.
18 For details on the so-called “EU-Turkey deal,” see Council of the EU Press Release 144/16, EU-Turkey Statement (Mar. 18, 2016). For a legal assessment of the “deal,” see Rainer Hoffmann & Adela Schmidt, Die Erklärung EU-Türkei vom 18.3.2016 aus rechtlicher Perspektive [The EU-Turkey Statement of March 18, 2016, from a Legal Perspective], NUSS ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR VERSÄUERUNGSMERTZ [NWZ] 743, 744 (2016). The legality of the EU-Turkey Statement has been challenged under Article 263 of the Consolidated Version of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, June 7, 2016 O.J. (C) 202/47 (hereinafter TFEU), before the General Court of the EU. The General Court held that the statement could not be seen as an act attributable to an institution of the EU as required by art. 263 TFEU. Case T-193/16, NG v. European Council, ECLI:EU:T:2017:129. The case is now pending before the ECJ.
19 See, e.g., Sewell Chan, Balkan Nations Block Migrants’ Path to Europe, N.Y. TIMES, Mar. 10, 2016, at A07.
21 See Eddy, supra note 16.
22 See, e.g., Melissa Eddy, Attacks on German Women Inflame Debate on Migrants, N.Y. TIMES, Jan. 6, 2016, at A01.
24 Eddy, supra note 24 (quoting German officials saying that the men had “a ‘North African or Arabic appearance’”)
25 See, e.g., Alison Smale et al., Cologne Attacks Highlight Clash Among Cultures, N.Y. TIMES, Jan. 15, 2016, at A01.
26 See Anthony Faiola, Germany Targets a Surge ofPiracy, WASH. POST, Jan. 7, 2016, at A01; Alison Smale et al., 18 Asylum Seekers Tied to Attacks in Germany, N.Y. TIMES, Jan. 9, 2016, at A06.

The countries along the Balkan route started closing their borders. Many refugees turned again to the much more dangerous route that leads from Northern Africa (often from Libya) to Italy, the so-called Mediterranean route.

B. Public Opinion Turns

In mid-August 2015, public opinion sided with Angela Merkel when she responded to verbal attacks in the small town of Heidenau in Eastern Germany, saying “There is no tolerance for those who are not willing to help where legal and human help is required.” A few months later, public opinion had changed. The change was triggered by events taking place in Cologne on New Year’s Eve 2015 and by ensuing events also involving crimes supposedly committed by non-nationals whose presence was covered by the legal regime governing asylum applicants.

On the last day of 2015, the square between the railway station and the dome of Cologne was the venue of massive sexual assaults on women. More than 1,000 complaints were filed afterwards. The assaults were orchestrated by young men, allegedly, many of the young men had come to Germany from Northern Africa or the Middle East. The men attacked women in groups, forming circles around the women; this left the women and their male companions helpless and humiliated. Authorities soon tied the attacks to Algerians, Moroccans, Syrians, Iraqis, and Iranians, some of whom had recently arrived in Germany and registered as asylum seekers. Shortly before Christmas 2016, a heavy truck hijacked by a Tunisian national was driven into one of Berlin’s most popular Christmas markets, leaving twelve people dead and
Within a few weeks, Germany had become the country of choice for most of the refugees reaching European soil. In mid-August 2015, German officials expected the number of incoming refugees to reach 800,000 by the end of the year—a number without precedent. At the end of August 2015, a deserted truck carrying the decayed bodies of seventy-one people, suspected to be illegal migrants, was found close to Austria’s eastern border. The truck had been passing through Hungary before entering Austrian territory. Federal Chancellor Angela Merkel was “deeply shaken by the news.” At that point in time, Germany had already decided to allow any Syrian refugee reaching Germany to apply for asylum, i.e., it no longer relied on Greece, Hungary, or Austria regarding the processing of asylum applications under the Dublin System. On September 5, 2015, against the background of persistent violent protests orchestrated by right-wingers, Angela Merkel decided to relinquish border controls altogether, a measure that lasted de facto well into the spring of 2016. In the summer of 2016, the Balkan route was basically sealed off again. Turkey had agreed to resume stricter border controls in March 2016 (promising to stop crossings over to the Greek islands).

11 See e.g., Alison Smale, Migrants Race North as Hungary Builds a Fence, N.Y. TIMES, Aug. 25, 2015, at A1 (quoting a source describing Germany as the refugees’ “promised land.”)
12 See e.g., Kaspar Kunzholz & Daniel Friedrich Sturm, Regierung reagiert jetzt mit 800.000 Flüchtlingsgefangen (Government Expects the Number of Refugees to Reach 800,000), DIE WELT, Aug. 20, 2015, at 1.
13 See e.g., Anthony Fauci, Decayed Bodies Found in Truck, WASH. POST, Aug. 28, 2015, at A01; Marcus, supra note 9.
14 See Marcus, supra note 9.
15 Editorial Board, A Refugee Tragedy in Austria, N.Y. TIMES, Aug. 28, 2015, at A22.
16 Melissa Eddy, Merkel Tries to Counter Backlash Against Migrants as Violence Flares, N.Y. TIMES, Aug. 27, 2015, at A06.
17 Anthony Fauci & Stephanie Kerchner, Merkel Seeks to Calm Anti-Refugee Fury, WASH. POST, Aug. 27, 2015, at A08.
18 Rick Lyman, Austria’s Frustrations With Migrants Drive It Toward Germany, N.Y. TIMES, Sept. 5, 2015, at A01.
20 For details on the so-called “EU-Turkey deal,” see Council of the EU Press Release 144/16, EU-Turkey Statement (Mar. 18, 2016). For a legal assessment of the deal, see Rainer Hoffmann & Adela Schmidt, Die Erklärung EU-Türkei vom 18.3.2016 aus rechtlicher Perspektive [The EU-Turkey Statement of March 18, 2016, from a Legal Perspective], NÜCHE ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR VERWALTUNGSGERICHTE [NWZ] 743, 744 (2016). The legality of the EU-Turkey Statement has been challenged under Article 288 of the Consolidated Version of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, June 7, 2016, 2016 O.J. (C 202) 47 (hereinafter TFEU), before the General Court of the EU. The General Court held that the statement could not be seen as an act attributable to an institution of the EU as required by art. 288 TFEU. Case T-193/16. NG v. European Council, ECLI:EU:T:2017:129. The case is now pending before the ECJ.
21 See e.g., Sewell Chan, Balkan Nations Block Migrants’ Path to Europe, N.Y. TIMES, Mar. 10, 2016, at A07.
22 See e.g., James McAuley, Death Toll Mounts in Mediterranean, WASH. POST, June 5, 2016, at A09.
23 See Eddy, supra note 16.
24 See e.g., Melissa Eddy, Attacks on German Women Inflame Debate on Migrants, N.Y. TIMES, Jan. 6, 2016, at A01.
26 Eddy, supra note 24 (quoting German officials saying that the men had “a ‘North African or Arabic’ appearance.”)
27 See, e.g., Alison Smale et al., Cologne Attacks Highlight Clash Among Cultures, N.Y. TIMES, Jan. 15, 2016, at A01.
28 See Anthony Fauci, Germany Targets a Surge of Pirates, WASH. POST, Jan. 7, 2016, at A01; Alison Smale et al., 18 Asylum Seekers Tied to Attacks in Germany, N.Y. TIMES, Jan. 9, 2016, at A06.
forty-eight injured. The driver had entered Germany in the summer of 2015, after having spent some time in Italy. He applied for asylum in the spring of 2016. In the early morning of December 25, 2016, the ensuing manhunt across Europe ended at a bus station in Northern Milan, where the suspect was asked to show his papers and was eventually shot dead after he opened fire. Between the end of December 2015 and the end of December 2016, Germany was the site of numerous crimes. To give but a few examples: In July 2016, media reported an attack committed by a young refugee (initially thought to be an Afghan national, then believed to be a Pakistani national) who injured several passengers in a local train close to Wuerzburg with an ax and a knife. Media also reported a suicide bomb initiated by a twenty-seven-year-old Syrian close to the entrance of an open-air music festival in Southern Germany (Ansbach), wounding fifteen people. In October 2016, law enforcement officers discovered explosives in the apartment of a Syrian refugee in Chemnitz who was, so the stories ran, set to attack a Berlin airport; the suspect hung himself in police custody shortly after his arrest. From October through December 2016, the attention of the media was then again drawn to the rape and murder of a nineteen-year-old medical student volunteering for a private aid organization. Eventually, in early December 2016, an Afghan migrant was arrested as a suspect in the case. The Afghan had been convicted of attempted murder in Greece before his arrival in Germany; German officials had no knowledge of the conviction. On the night of December 25, 2016, a group of seven youths ages fifteen to twenty-one years old, mainly from Syria, set a homeless person resting in a Berlin underground station on fire; all of them had recently registered as refugees.

Against that background, anti-immigrant sentiments gained strength. Surveys showed that, in the minds of many people, the refugee crisis and terrorism seemed closely intertwined; people feared that the presence of refugees would increase the likelihood of terrorism in the country. A new political party representing and fueling those fears entered the scene forcefully in 2016: Alternative für Deutschland (AfD). In the national elections taking place in September 2017, the AfD cast 12.6% of the votes.

C. Lawmakers Respond

German lawmakers did not stand idle in 2016, as the country went through a period of insecurity and discontent. The lawmakers—assembly in the Bundestag and the Bundesrat—responded to the attacks of 2016 by amending the German Penal Code, the law regarding expulsion, and the asylum law; the new provisions inserted into the Penal Code in November 2016 accounted for the assaults in Cologne on New Year’s Eve 2015. The provisions of the German Aufenthaltsrechtsgesetz (Auflengrecht), the Residence Act, regarding

35 See, e.g., Peter Ising, Er rifft „Allahu akbar“ and Stach sofort zu [He Shouted “Allahu akbar” and Started Hitting], Die Welt, July 20, 2016, at 4; Melissa Eddy, Police Kill As Wiedler on Train in Germany, N.Y. Times, July 19, 2016, at A07.
36 Melissa Eddy, Suicide Bomber in Germany Pledged Loyalty to ISIS, Officials Say, N.Y. Times, July 26, 2016, at A10.
37 See Melissa Eddy, Germans Seize Bomb Plot Suspect in Raids, N.Y. Times, Oct. 11, 2016, at A09; Alison Smale, Suicide in Jail Plot Scrutinized on Officials in Germany, N.Y. Times, Oct. 14, 2016, at A06.
39 Id.
40 See, e.g., Claudia Becker & Michael Behrendt, Sie waren nicht betroffen über das, was passiert ist [They Didn’t Care About What Had Happened], Die Welt, Dec. 28, 2016, at 28.
forty-eight injured. The driver had entered Germany in the summer of 2015, after having spent some time in Italy. He applied for asylum in the spring of 2016. In the early morning of December 25, 2016, the ensuing manhunt across Europe ended at a bus station in Northern Milan, where the suspect was asked to show his papers and was eventually shot dead after he opened fire. Between the end of December 2015 and the end of December 2016, Germany was the site of numerous crimes. To give but a few examples: In July 2016, media reported an attack committed by a young refugee (initially thought to be an Afghan national, then believed to be a Pakistani national) who injured several passengers in a local train close to Wuerzburg with an ax and a knife. Media also reported a suicide bomb initiated by a twenty-seven-year-old Syrian close to the entrance of an open-air music festival in Southern Germany (Ausbach), wounding fifteen people. In October 2016, law enforcement officers discovered explosives in the apartment of a Syrian refugee in Chemnitz who was, so the stories ran, set to attack a Berlin airport; the suspect hung himself in police custody shortly after his arrest. From October through December 2016, the attention of the media was time and again drawn to the rape and murder of a nineteen-year-old medical student volunteering for a private aid organization. Eventually, in early December 2016, an Afghan migrant was arrested as a suspect in the case. The Afghan had been convicted of attempted murder in Greece before his arrival in Germany; German officials had no knowledge of the conviction. On the night of December 25, 2016, a group of seven youths ages fifteen to twenty-one years old, mainly from Syria, set a homeless person resting in a Berlin underground station on fire; all of them had recently registered as refugees.

Against that background, anti-immigrant sentiments gained strength. Surveys showed that, in the minds of many people, the refugee crisis and terrorism seemed closely intertwined; people feared that the presence of refugees would increase the likelihood of terrorism in the country. A new political party representing and fueling those fears entered the scene forcefully in 2016: Alternative für Deutschland (AfD). In the national elections taking place in September 2017, the AfD cast 12.6% of the votes.

C. Lawmakers Respond

German lawmakers did not stand idle in 2016, as the country went through a period of insecurity and discontent. The lawmakers—assisted in the Bundestag and the Bundesrat—responded to the attacks of 2016 by amending the German Penal Code, the law regarding expulsion, and the asylum law; the new provisions inserted into the Penal Code in November 2016 accounted for the assaults in Cologne on New Year’s Eve 2015. The provisions of the German Aufenthaltsgebet (Asylum), the Residence Act, regarding

34 Elisabetta Povoledo et al., Berlin Manhunt Ends in Gunfire in Italian Plaza, N.Y. TIMES, Dec. 24, 2016, at A01.
35 See, e.g., Peter Ising, Er rief “Allahu akbar” and Started Hitting, Die Welt, July 20, 2016, at 4; Melissa Eddy, Police Kill As Wieder on Train in Germany, N.Y. TIMES, July 19, 2016, at A07.
36 Melissa Eddy, Suicide Bomber in Germany Pledged Loyalty to ISIS, Officials Say, N.Y. TIMES, July 26, 2016, at A10.
37 See Melissa Eddy, Germans Seize Bomb Plot Suspect in Raid, N.Y. TIMES, Oct. 11, 2016, at A09; Alison Smale, Suicide in Jail Puts Scrutiny on Officials in Germany, N.Y. TIMES, Oct. 14, 2016, at A06.
39 Id.
40 See, e.g., Claudia Becker & Michael Behrendt, Sie waren nicht betroffen / aber das war passiert / [They Didn’t Care About What Had Happened], Die Welt, Dec. 28, 2016, at 28.
expulsion, were amended twice in 2016 in order to expand the powers of authorities with respect to the deportation of non-nationals who had committed crimes, be they asylum seekers or not. The amendments to the Asylgesetz (AsylG), the Asylum Act, were partly a reversal of the policies implemented by a coalition government between Conservatives (CDU/CSU) and Social Democrats (SPD) that was formed following the national elections in September 2013. Under the 2013 coalition’s contract, Social Democrats were bound to add a number of Balkan states to the list of “safe countries of origin” (and thus to open the door to fast-track procedures for applicants coming from those countries). The Conservatives agreed to an upgrading of the legal status of asylum seekers who had good chances of being granted some form of protection. The list of safe countries of origin annexed to the AsylG was indeed quickly amended in the fall of 2014. The ban on the employment of asylum seekers and non-nationals, whose stays were merely tolerated, was also quickly reduced to a period covering the first three months of residence (formerly, employment was prohibited for twelve months). Eventually, in December 2014, the restrictions on the free movement of asylum seekers was tied to a period of three months following their entry (prior to that, there was no time limit attached to the obligation to stay within the administrative district of the authority responsible for assessing the asylum application). This step-by-step policy of making the status of an “asylum seeker” less onerous came to a halt in 2015. For designated classes of asylum seekers, the status became more precarious than ever. In October 2015, Annex II of the AsylG, naming the countries deemed to be safe countries of origin, was once more amended, with a view to extending the applicability of the fast-track procedure. In March 2016, lawmakers created special facilities for the processing of applicants eligible for fast-track procedures—in particular, asylum seekers coming from safe countries of origin. Applicants eligible for fast-track procedures were obliged to remain in the designated facilities until the authority responsible for the decision-making had reached its decision on the case (due within one week’s time after the lodging of the application). The thrust of the March 2016 amendment was to speed up decision-making and removal from the country.

Yet there is another side to German politics regarding asylum seekers, a policy that is less noticed by the public. Under German statutory law, asylum seekers are entitled to social benefits while staying on German soil. The main legal source defining the access to and the substance of what is termed the “Existenzminimum” (subsistence minimum) is the Asylbewerberleistungsgesetz (AsylBlG), the Asylum Seekers’ Benefits Act. Ensuring social benefits for asylum seekers through statutory law is, however, not merely an act of discretion for which German lawmakers may or may not opt. Under the German constitution (GG), it is incumbent on parliament to make a provision with respect to securing the subsistence minimum. Article 1 of the GG reads: “Human dignity is inviolable. To respect and protect it shall be the duty of all state authority.” According to a recent judgment of the
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\(^{45}\) Gesetz zur erleichterten Ausweisung von straffälligen Ausländern und zum erweiterten Auschluss der Flüchtlingsanforderung bei straffälligen Asylbewerbern [Act to Facilitate the Deportation of Non-Nationals who Committed a Crime and to Exclude Asylum Seekers from Refugee Status when They Committed a Crime], Mar. 11, 2016, BGBl. I at 394 (art. 1) (Ger.); Fünfzigste Gesetz zur Änderung des Strafgesetzbuches, supra note 42, at art. 2.


\(^{49}\) Id. at 109.
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\(^{51}\) On the acquisition of the status as an “asylum seeker” and the peculiar concept of an unlawful yet tolerated presence in the country, see infra Part II.E.i and ii.

\(^{52}\) Gesetz zur Einstufung weiterer Staaten, supra note 50, at art. 2.
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\(^{56}\) Id.


\(^{58}\) GRUNDGESETZ FÜR DIE BUNDESDRUCKGEBENSCHEIT DEUTSCHLAND [GG] [BASIC LAW], translation at https://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/englisch_gg/

\(^{59}\) Id. at art. 1(1).
pending the decision-making and the time thereafter.67 In general, social benefits are the only means available to the asylum seekers for securing a living.68 Part III deals with the statutory law implementing the constitutional right to a subsistence minimum. I shall first describe what I call the “general regime” for the provision of the subsistence minimum, a regime applicable to all cases that are not covered by the particular regime.69 Then I shall give an outline of the particular regime, the regime exclusively designed for asylum seekers and non-nationals whose stays are merely tolerated.70 Part IV elaborates on the differences between the general and the particular regime,71 mainly from the angle of the right to the respect of human dignity, enshrined in Article 1(1) of the GG,72 but also from the angle of EU law,73 in particular Directive 2015/33, laying down the standards member states must comply with when they admit asylum seekers into their territories.74 I shall argue the provisions defining the asylum seekers’ benefits are inconsistent with the human dignity clause of the German constitution and with the standards laid down by the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU (the Charter).75 It will be seen, though, that my case against the recent changes regarding the asylum seekers’ benefits is easier to make from the perspective of the GG than it is from the perspective of EU law. Part V summarizes my findings.

II. REFUGEE CRISIS: NUMBERS, FACTS, AND LEGAL FRAMEWORKS

A. Applications for Asylum

The first year that signaled the numbers of non-nationals seeking international protection were on the rise was 2014. In 2014, the total number of applications for asylum reached almost 203,000.76 That was nearly double the total in 2013.77 In 2014, the main countries of origin of the applicants

69 See infra Part III.A.
70 See infra Part III.B.
71 See infra Part III.C.
72 See infra Part IV.A.
73 See infra Part IV.B.
74 See infra Part IV.C.
76 See generally Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, 2016 O.J. (C 202) 393 [hereinafter Charter] (cataloguing certain political, civil, economic and social rights).
78 In 2013, the number of applications lodged was 127,023. Id.
Bundesverfassungsgericht (BVerfG), the Federal Constitutional Court, the dignity clause of the GG is deemed to imply a state duty to provide a subsistence minimum (and a corresponding individual right) when individuals are not able to provide for themselves. On July 18, 2012, the BVerfG held that the constitutional right to be provided with a subsistence minimum and the corresponding duty of the state were not preserved for certain classes of long-term residents, and should be extended to non-nationals seeking protection in Germany as well. Some provisions of the AsylbLG, adopted in 1993, were declared unconstitutional because lawmakers had failed to fulfill the constitutional promise. Late in 2014, lawmakers responded to the criticism voiced by the BVerfG, inter alia, by upgrading the benefits for asylum seekers. In 2015 and 2016, at the height of the crisis, the benefits to be accorded to asylum seekers were the subject of major changes, all of which introduced further conditions for eligibility and other curtailments. These conditions and curtailments are the focus of this Article.

D. Preview

This Article comes in three parts. Part II of the Article presents numbers and facts. Throughout the crisis peaking in 2015 and 2016, parliamentary decision-making was informed by numbers and facts, such as the numbers of applications lodged, the numbers of the decisions granting protection and the form of protection, or the case load pending before the Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge (BAMF), the Federal Office for Asylum and Migration. Those numbers mattered. Part II also gives details on the legal framework for the processing of asylum applications and the legal status of the claimants.

A. Applications for Asylum

The first year that signaled the numbers of non-nationals seeking international protection were on the rise was 2014. In 2014, the total number of applications for asylum reached almost 203,000. That was nearly double the total in 2013. In 2014, the main countries of origin of the applicants pending the decision-making and the time thereafter. In general, social benefits are the only means available to the asylum seekers for securing a living. Part III deals with the statutory law implementing the constitutional right to a subsistence minimum. I shall first describe what I call the “general regime” for the provision of the subsistence minimum, a regime applicable to all cases that are not covered by the particular regime. Then I shall give an outline of the particular regime, the regime exclusively designed for asylum seekers and non-nationals whose stays are merely tolerated. Part IV elaborates on the differences between the general and the particular regime, mainly from the angle of the right to the respect of human dignity, enshrined in Article 1(1) of the GG, but also from the angle of EU law, in particular Directive 2015/333, laying down the standards member states must comply with when they admit asylum seekers into their territories. I shall argue the provisions defining the asylum seekers’ benefits are inconsistent with the human dignity clause of the German constitution and with the standards laid down by the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU (the Charter). It will be seen, though, that my case against the recent changes regarding the asylum seekers’ benefits is easier to make from the perspective of the GG than it is from the perspective of EU law. Part V summarizes my findings.

II. REFUGEE CRISIS: NUMBERS, FACTS, AND LEGAL FRAMEWORKS

A. Applications for Asylum

The first year that signaled the numbers of non-nationals seeking international protection were on the rise was 2014. In 2014, the total number of applications for asylum reached almost 203,000. That was nearly double the total in 2013. In 2014, the main countries of origin of the applicants.
were Syria, closely followed by the Balkan region (Serbia, Kosovo, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and Albania), again followed by Eritrea, Afghanistan, and Iraq.87 In 2015, the total number of asylum applications lodged with the responsible authority, the BAMF, was about 480,000.79 That number was, in fact, not unique. Germany had a similar experience in 1992, when the number of applications lodged reached 440,000.80 Before 1992 and thereafter, numbers were much lower.81 In 2015, when numbers reached a first peak, the main countries of origin were, again, Syria and countries of the Balkan region; Afghanistan and Iraq had climbed upward in the list of the top ten countries of origin and surpassed Eritrea.82 In 2016, the numbers were unique. The number of applications lodged reached the threshold of 745,000.83 However, the increase in 2016 was not so much due to new cross-border movements. In early 2016, borders along the Balkan route were sealed again.84 The increase rather indicated that many refugees who had entered Germany in 2015 had not been able to lodge their application in 2015.85 In 2015, the BAMF had already been overwhelmed.86 The top ten countries of origin remained the same: Syria, Afghanistan, Iraq, and Iran ranked highest.87 Yet, the countries of the Balkan region had basically disappeared from the ranking,88 a striking effect of the amendments to the AsylG, listing the Balkan countries among the countries deemed safe countries of origin and the ensuing applicability of fast-track procedures.89

B. Protection Granted

The chances for asylum seekers from Syria, Afghanistan, Iraq, or Iran to receive protection were quite high throughout the crisis, from 2014 through 2016. For Syrian claimants, the protection rate was almost 100%; from 2012 until the fall of 2014, Syrian nationals were regularly granted subsidiary protection.89 In November 2014, the policy changed.90 For the rest of 201491 and in 2015,92 asylum seekers from Syria were granted the legal status provided for by the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees,93 or formal “refugee status,” even without being called in for a personal hearing.94 In March 2016, personal hearings resumed.95

Following March 2016, many asylum seekers from Syria were granted subsidiary protection again.96 The differences between those two kinds of protection seem subtle, yet the consequences are palpable. Under the AsylG, “international protection” can be either protection through “refugee status” or

87 Id.
80 To give but a few examples: in 1990, the total was 193,000; in 1988, it was 103,000; in 1986, it was 99,700. Id. In 1994, the total was 127,000; in 1996, it was 149,000; in 1998, it was 143,500; in 2000, it was 117,700; in 2008, it was 28,000. Id.
81 BUNDESMEMT Dec. 2015, supra note 79, at 2. The total number of the applications lodged by Syrian nationals was 162,510; the total number of the applications lodged by nationals from a country of the Balkan region was 132,933; the total number of the applications lodged by Afghan nationals was 31,902; the total number of the applications lodged by Iraqi nationals was 31,379. Eritrean nationals had lodged 10,990 applications. Id.
83 On the “EU-Turkey deal” and its consequences see supra note 20 and accompanying text.
84 MIGRATIONSBERICHT DES BUNDESMEMTES FUR MIGRATION UND FLUECHTLINGE IM AUFTRAG DER BUNDESREGIERUNG: MIGRATIONSBERICHT 2015 [REPORT ON MIGRATION BY THE FEDERAL OFFICE FOR MIGRATION AND REFUGEES, COMMISSIONED BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT], at 9 (2016).
85 Id. at 10.
86 Id. at 83, 32.
87 BUNDESMEMT Dec. 2016, supra note 83, at 2. Syrian nationals had lodged 265,000 applications in 2016, Afghan nationals 128,000 applications, Iraqi nationals 97,000 applications, Iranian nationals 27,000 applications, and Eritrean nationals 19,000 applications. Id.
88 Id., except for Albania (17,000 applications).
89 See Gesetz zur Einstufung weiterer Staaten, supra note 50; and Asylverfahrensbe- chleunigungsgesetz, supra note 46, and accompanying text.
91 Id.
92 Id.
93 Id.
96 Kai von Appen, Syrien zieht vor Gericht [Syrians go to Court], DIE TAGEZEITUNG (TAZ), Oct. 28, 2016, at 26.
97 Id.
98 See Barbara Dribusch, Im Zweisprachig [In Limbo], TAZ (Aug. 22, 2016), http://www.taz.de/Archiv-Suche?532641688-Abschlussrahmen-Start. About 166,000 asylum seekers from Syria were granted refugee status in 2016; 121,500 Syrians received subsidiary protection status. BUNDESMEMT Dec. 2016, supra note 83, at 2.
were Syria, closely followed by the Balkan region (Serbia, Kosovo, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and Albania), again followed by Eritrea, Afghanistan, and Iraq.87

In 2015, the total number of asylum applications lodged with the responsible authority, the BAMF, was about 480,000.79 That number was, in fact, not unique. Germany had a similar experience in 1992, when the number of applications lodged reached 440,000.46 Before 1992 and thereafter, numbers were much lower.83 In 2015, when numbers reached a first peak, the main countries of origin were again, Syria and countries of the Balkan region; Afghanistan and Iraq had climbed upward in the list of the top ten countries of origin and surpassed Eritrea.82 In 2016, the numbers were unique. The number of applications lodged reached the threshold of 745,000.52 However, the increase in 2016 was not so much due to new cross-border movements. In early 2016, borders along the Balkan route were sealed again.84 The increase rather indicated that many refugees who had entered Germany in 2015 had not been able to lodge their application in 2015.85 In 2015, the BAMF had simply been overwhelmed.86 The top ten countries of origin remained the same: Syria, Afghanistan, Iraq, and Iran ranked highest.87 Yet, the countries of the Balkan region had basically disappeared from the ranking,88 a striking effect of the amendments to the AsylG, listing the Balkan countries among the countries deemed safe countries of origin and the ensuing applicability of fast-track procedures.89

B. Protection Granted

The chances for asylum seekers from Syria, Afghanistan, Iraq, or Iran to receive protection were quite high throughout the crisis, from 2014 through 2016. For Syrian claimants, the protection rate was almost 100%; from 2012 until the fall of 2014, Syrian nationals were regularly granted subsidiary protection.89 In November 2014, the policy changed.90 For the rest of 201491 and in 2015,92 asylum seekers from Syria were granted the legal status provided for by the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees,93 or formal “refugee status,” even without being called in for a personal hearing.95 In March 2016, personal hearings resumed.96

Following March 2016, many asylum seekers from Syria were granted subsidiary protection again.97 The differences between those two kinds of protection seem subtle, yet the consequences are palpitating. Under the AsylG, “international protection” can be either protection through “refugee status” or

---
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81 To give but a few examples: in 1990, the total was 193,000; in 1998, it was 103,000; in 1986, it was 99,700. Id. In 1994, the total was 127,000; in 1996, it was 149,000; in 1998, it was 143,500; in 2000, it was 117,700; in 2008, it was 28,000. Id. 82 BUNDESMAB DEC. 2015, supra note 79, at 2. The total number of the applications lodged by Syrian nationals was 162,510; the total number of the applications lodged by nationals from a country of the Balkan region was 132,933; the total number of the applications lodged by Afghan nationals was 31,902; the total number of the applications lodged by Iraqi nationals was 31,379. Eritrean nationals had lodged 10,990 applications. Id.
83 Id.
84 BUNDESMAB FÜR MIGRATION UND FLÜCHTLINGE, ASSLGEBRUCHSTATISTIK FÜR DEN MONAT DEZEMBER 2016 [FEDERAL OFFICE FOR MIGRATION AND REFUGEES. STATISTICS ON ASYLUM CASES FOR THE MONTH OF DECEMBER 2016] (2016) at 2 (Ger.) [hereinafter BUNDESMAB DEC. 2016].
85 On the “EU-Turkey deal” and its consequences see supra note 20 and accompanying text.
86 MIGRATIONSBERICHT DES BUNDESMABES FÜR MIGRATION UND FLÜCHTLINGE IM AUFTRAG DER BUNDESREGIERUNG: MIGRATIONSBERICHT 2015 [REPORT ON MIGRATION BY THE FEDERAL OFFICE FOR MIGRATION AND REFUGEES, COMMISSIONED BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT], at 9 (2016).
87 Id. at 10.
88 Id. 89 Id. 90 Id. 91 Id. 92 BUNDESMAB DEC. 2015, supra note 79, at 2.
94 Kai von Appen, Syrren siehen vor Gericht [Syrians go to Court], DIE TAGESSPITZEN (TAZ), Oct. 28, 2016, at 26.
95 Id.
96 See Barbara Dribbusch, Im Zwiesschenreich [in Limbo], TAZ (Aug. 22, 2016), http://www.taz.de/Archiv-Suche/75326414/ks/AsylHaben Fran/. About 166,500 asylum seekers from Syria were granted refugee status in 2016; 121,500 Syrians received subsidiary protection status. BUNDESMAB DEC. 2016, supra note 83, at 2.
protection through "subsidiary protection status." Article 38 of the framework directive 2011/95, 2011 O.J. (L 337) 9 (EU). On the various statutes defined by the directive, see Directive 2011/95, infra note 557.

Article 39 of the framework directive 2011/95, infra note 557.

Article 40 of the framework directive 2011/95, infra note 557.

For Afghan nationals, the chance of being granted some form of protection was about 50% throughout the refugee crisis. Most Afghan nationals who were granted protection under the AsylG were given refugee status in 2014 and 2015. In 2016, the numbers of Afghan nationals who received subsidiary protection status only started to climb. For asylum seekers from Iraq, the picture was similar, though their protection rates were much higher. From 2014 through 2016, the rate was between 70% and 90%. While Iraqi nationals were regularly granted refugee status in 2014 and 2015, a considerable number of them merely received subsidiary protection status in 2016.

C. Decision-Making and Removal

Decision-making in asylum cases is centralized in Germany. Decision-making is in the hands of a single authority, the BAMF, located in Nuremberg. However, the BAMF operates numerous branch offices across the country; it is present in each of the Länder (states). When the numbers of asylum applications started to climb in 2014, the BAMF responded accordingly. The numbers of decisions issued per year also started to climb, from...
protection through "subsidiary protection status." 108 Being granted refugee status generally presupposes that the applicant’s fears are due to well-founded reasons—that he or she will be persecuted in the country of origin on account of race, religion, nationality, political opinion, or membership of a particular social group. 99 Applicants need to show that, upon return, they are likely to suffer harm that is linked to one of the characteristics listed in the definition of "refugeehood." 109 To be granted subsidiary protection status, the applicant needs to show "stichhaltige Gründe" (substantial grounds) for believing that he or she will, upon return, suffer "emsthaft" Schaden" (serious harm) inflicted through capital punishment, through inhumane or degrading treatment or punishment, or through indiscriminate violence in situations of armed conflict. 109 The harm believed to be inflicted after the return to the country needs not be linked to a particular personal characteristic of the applicant. 109

Prior to March 2016, the BAMF was willing to concede that Syrians would suffer harm linked to their political opinion (they would be treated as traitors by the regime), whereas after March 2016, the harm expected was deemed to be caused by indiscriminate violence related to war. 109 The shift in assessment coincided with an amendment to the AufenthG that suspended the right to family reunion for all persons who were granted subsidiary protection status after March 17, 2016. 109 Obviously, the BAMF sought to end an additional influx of Syrian nationals through granting a status that did—for a limited time—not give rise to further claims with respect to family members who had not yet reached German territory. 109

---

109 AsylG, supra note 46, at § 3(1) no. 1. The AsylG echoes the definition given by the Refugee Convention, art. 1(A).
112 Mauß & Hruschka, supra note 101, at marginal no. 31.
114 AsylG, supra note 44, at § 104(13), as amended by Gesetz zur Einführung beschleunigter Asylverfahren, supra note 55, art. 2, no. 4. According to § 104(13), the suspension was supposed to last until March 16, 2018.
115 See, e.g., Paul Nohl, Integration gelingt nicht ohne Familie (Integration Fails without Presence of Family), Die Welt (Apr. 1, 2016), https://www.welt.de/debatten/kommen-are/article153866254/Integration-gelingt-nicht-ohne-Familienmachzuch.html. The legality of the BAMF’s re-assessment was soon contested among the administrative courts of the Länder. For a critical analysis of the administrative courts’ case law backing the revocation of the BAMF, see Putzer, supra note 103, Torben Elserbrok & Lucas Hartmann, Flüchtlingsstatus statt subsidiärer Schutz für syrische Staatsangehörige? [Refugee Status instead of Subsidiary Protection Status for Syrian Nationals?], NVwZ 522 (2017).
117 See BUNDESMANT Dec. 2014, supra note 76, at 2, and BUNDESMANT Dec. 2015, supra note 79, at 2. The ratio of Afghan nationals granted subsidiary protection status was about 15%.
118 See BUNDESMANT Dec. 2016, supra note 83, at 2. The ratio of Afghan nationals receiving subsidiary protection status was about 30% in 2016.
120 See BUNDESMANT Dec. 2014, supra note 76, at 2; and BUNDESMANT Dec. 2015, supra note 79, at 2. The ratio of Iraqi nationals granted subsidiary protection status was between 2% and 3%.
121 See BUNDESMANT Dec. 2016, supra note 83, at 2. The ratio of Iraqi nationals receiving subsidiary protected status was about 30% in 2016.
122 AsylG, supra note 46, at § 5.
81,000 in 2013, to 136,000 in 2014, to more than 283,000 in 2015, and to almost 700,000 in 2016.仍然，the case-load was rising. In September 2016, there were about 580,000 applications pending before the BAMF.在 December 2016, the number of applications pending was still more than 433,000.另样地，the number of actual removals did not catch up with the number of applications rejected or struck from the list of pending applications for reasons specified by law (such as renunciation or going into hiding). Throughout the crisis, the gap between the number of removals and the number of applications rejected or declared obsolete was considerable: in 2014, protection was denied in about 88,000 cases, and the number of forced removals was 10,884.在 2015, protection was denied in about 141,000 cases, and the number of forced removals was 20,888.在 2016, protection was denied in 261,813 cases, and the number of forced removals was 25,375.

D. Processing of Claims

Non-nationals seeking protection in Germany are usually picked up by or reported to the police, at the border or somewhere in the territory. Upon contact, they usually ask—in one way or another—for protection from persecution or other serious harm. Legally, that plea is an informal request, often called "Asylsuchen" in scholarly literature in order to mark the difference between the informal request and the formal one. A formal "Asylantrag" (application for asylum) may be lodged only with the BAMF. Up to 2015, the processing of those claims were comprised of two steps. First, after raising their informal request, details concerning the non-nationals seeking protection were fed into a database called EASY (short for "Einsatznahmeecosystem", a system for the initial admission of asylum seekers). EASY has only one function: to distribute the claimants among the German Länder (and the reception centers run by them) according to a quota system agreed upon by the Länder. Second, upon arrival at the reception center, the claimants were provided accommodation and other necessities of life, and they were expected to lodge their formal application for asylum with the branch office of the BAMF affiliated with the reception center. At the branch office of the BAMF, the claimants were registered, photographed, fingerprinted, and given the opportunity to apply for asylum, usually in person.

In 2016, the mode of processing new claims was significantly restructured in order to enhance the efficiency of decision-making. Since the summer of 2016, the processing of claims comprises three steps. The first step is preliminary registering in EASY, row added by "Bearbeitungsstätten" (processing lines) and "Warterräume" (waiting rooms), which are facilities close to the border equipped to deal with huge numbers of claimants for quick

---

114 BUNDESMAY DEC. 2014, supra note 76, at 5.
115 BUNDESMAY DEC. 2015, supra note 79, at 6.
117 BUNDESMAY FÜR MIGRATION UND FLUCHTILCHE, ASYLGRUNDSTATISTIK FÜR DEN MONAT SEPTEMBER 2016 [BUNDESMAY FOR MIGRATION AND REFUGEES, STATISTICS ON ASYLUM CASES FOR THE MONTH OF SEPTEMBER 2016], at 7.
119 BUNDESMAY DEC. 2014, supra note 76, at 2.
120 See Antwort der Bundesregierung auf kleine Anfrage: Abschreibungen im Jahr 2014 [Response by the Federal Government to a Parliamentary Question: Forced Removals in the Year 2014], DEUTSCHE BUNDESTMAY DRUCKSCHRIFTEN [BUNDESTMAY PRESS PUBLICATIONS], at 19.
121 BUNDESMAY DEC. 2015, supra note 79, at 2.
124 See Antwort der Bundesregierung auf kleine Anfrage: Abschreibungen im Jahr 2016 [Response by the Federal Government to a Parliamentary Question: Forced Removals in the Year 2016], BT-DR. 18/31112, at 2, 9. In addition to the forced removals, there have been about 37,000 voluntary departures (facilitated through publicly funded programs) in 2015 and about 54,000 such departures in 2016.
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In 2013, to 130,000 in 2014,144 to more than 283,000 in 2015,145 and to almost 708,000 in 2016.146 Still, the case-load was rising. In September 2016, there were about 580,000 applications pending before the BAMF.147 In December 2016, the number of applications pending was still more than 433,000.148 Also, the number of actual removals did not catch up with the number of applications rejected or struck from the list of pending applications for reasons specified by law (such as renunciation or going into hiding). Throughout the crisis, the gap between the number of removals and the number of applications rejected or declared obsolete was considerable: in 2014, protection was denied in about 88,000 cases,149 and the number of forced removals was 10,884.150 In 2015, protection was denied in about 141,000 cases,151 and the number of forced removals was 20,888.152 In 2016, protection was denied in 261,813 cases,153 and the number of forced removals was 25,375.154

D. Processing of Claims

Non-nationals seeking protection in Germany are usually picked up by or reported to the police, at the border or somewhere in the territory. Upon contact, they usually ask—in one way or another—for protection from persecution or other serious harm.155 Legally, that plea is an informal request, often called “Asylsuchen” in scholarly literature in order to mark the difference between the informal request and the formal one.156 A formal “Asylantrag” (application for asylum) may be lodged only with the BAMF.157 Up to 2015, the processing of those claims comprised of two steps. First, after raising their informal request, details concerning the non-nationals seeking protection were fed into a database called EASY (short for “Erstausländersystem”), a system for the initial admission of asylum seekers.158 EASY has only one function: to distribute the claimants among the German Länder (and the reception centers run by them) according to a quota system agreed upon by the Länder.159 Second, upon arrival at the reception center, the claimants were provided accommodation and other necessities of life, and they were expected to lodge their formal application for asylum with the branch office of the BAMF affiliated with the reception center.160 At the branch office of the BAMF, the claimants were registered, photographed, fingerprinted, and given the opportunity to apply for asylum, usually in person.161

In 2016, the mode of processing new claims was significantly restructured in order to enhance the efficiency of decision-making.162 Since the summer of 2016, the processing of claims comprises three steps. The first step is preliminary registering in EASY, now added by “Bearbeitungssträger” (processing lanes) and “Warte Fürsten” (waiting rooms), which are facilities close to the border equipped to deal with huge numbers of claimants for quick
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identification of the responsible reception center.135 Second, new claimants are asked to proceed to an “Ankunftszeugnis” (arrival certificate), and given the opportunity to lodge their formal application for asylum.136 Applications lodged are classified according to the complexity of the case.137 Cases of low complexity (i.e., if the probability for receiving protection is either very high or very low) are meant to be decided within forty-eight hours.138 Applicants granted protection are free to leave the arrival center.139 If protection is denied based on fast-track procedures, the claimants are obliged to stay at the arrival center awaiting their removal.140 Cases of complex decision-making (i.e., cases involving difficult questions of law or fact) are referred to the branch office of the BAMF.141 Applicants are asked to proceed to a reception center where they are obliged to stay for at least six weeks.142 Third, the complex case is forwarded to the “Entscheidungszentrum” (decision-making center), a facility that wholly concentrates on putting together the text for the written decisions notified to asylum cases.143

Against that backdrop, the time asylum seekers stay in Germany primarily depends on the complexity of the case and, if the application is eventually rejected, the time needed for the voluntary departure or the enforcement of the obligation to leave the country.144 In 2016, decision-making took two or three months for new cases of low complexity; for complex cases, decision-making took seven months on average.145 Decisions of the BAMF are subject to judicial review.146 Rejected claimants may turn to the Verwaltungsgericht (administrative court) and ask for a revision of the BAMF’s decision.147 Bringing a lawsuit against the BAMF does not automatically entail a stay of execution.148 But a stay of execution may be granted in individual cases by the administrative court.149 In recent years, it took the administrative courts between seven and ten months on average to decide on judicial review.150 Further judicial review is limited.151 Hence, on average, it takes one and a half years to reach a final decision upon an asylum application if the case is a more complex one, and the claimants seek judicial review against the rejection of the claim.

E. Status of Claimants

i. Legality of Presence

Non-nationals seeking protection from persecution or other serious harm acquire the status of “Asylbewerber” (asylum seeker) the moment they communicate to a German official in one way or another that they seek protection from persecution or serious harm, i.e., the moment they raise their informal
identification of the responsible reception center. Second, new claimants are asked to proceed to an "Ankunftszentrum" (arrival center), where they are accommodated, handed an "Ankunftszertifikat" (arrival certificate), and given the opportunity to lodge their formal application for asylum. 

Applicants lodged are classified according to the complexity of the case. Cases of low complexity (i.e., if the propensity for receiving protection is either very high or very low) are meant to be decided within forty-eight hours. Applicants granted protection are free to leave the arrival center. If protection is denied based on fast-track procedures, the claimants are obliged to stay at the arrival center awaiting their removal. Cases of complex decision-making (i.e., cases involving difficult questions of law or fact) are referred to the branch office of the BAMF. Applicants are asked to proceed to a reception center where they are obliged to stay for at least six weeks. Third, the complex case is forwarded to the "Entscheidungszentrum" (deciding-making center), a facility that wholly concentrates on putting together the text for the written decisions notified in asylum cases.

Against that backdrop, the time asylum seekers stay in Germany primarily depends on the complexity of the case and, if the application is eventually rejected, the time needed for the voluntary departure or the enforcement of the obligation to leave the country. In 2016, decision-making took two or three months for new cases of low complexity, for complex cases, decision-making took seven months on average. Decisions of the BAMF are subject to judicial review. Rejected claimants may turn to the Verwaltungsgericht (administrative court) and ask for a revision of the BAMF’s decision. Bringing a lawsuit against the BAMF does not automatically entail a stay of execution. But a stay of execution may be granted in individual cases by the administrative court.

In recent years, it took the administrative courts between seven and ten months on average to decide on judicial review. Further judicial review is limited. Hence, on average, it takes one and a half years to reach a final decision upon an asylum application if the case is a more complex one, and the claimants seek judicial review against the rejection of the claim.

E. Status of Claimants

i. Legality of Presence

Non-nationals seeking protection from persecution or other serious harm acquire the status of "Asylbewerber" (asylum seekers) the moment they communicate to a German official in one way or another that they seek protection from persecution or serious harm, i.e., the moment they raise their informal
their stays in the territory are "permitted" by law ("gestattet"). The decision of the BAMF has become final. If the claimants opt for judicial review and judicial review entails a stay of execution, their stays remain permitted until the decision of the administrative court has become final. Upon finality of the decision, the claimants may have acquired refugee status or subsidiary protection status, according to their claims, and will be issued residence permits based on humanitarian grounds. If, on the other hand, protection is denied, the claimants become ordinary nationals whose stays are illegal and who are, in general, obliged to leave the country. If an application for asylum is turned down and judicial review does not entail a stay of execution, the BAMF may, right away, proceed with an order announcing its intention to remove the claimant. Once the order is executed, the permission to stay in the territory under the AsylG is terminated. Again, the claimants have become illegal immigrants who are obliged to leave the country and may be removed by force.

ii. Toleration

Even if an application for protection has been rejected, there is one more option for claimants to avoid forced removal. The claimants may request a declaration (by the BAMF) that they are protected under the clauses of the AsylG that extend the prohibition of removal—part and parcel of refugee status and subsidiary protection status—so to defined additional classes of removals. The classes include removals that violate the European Convention on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. The classes also include removals to a country where the claimants face any individualized serious harm to life, limb, and freedom that is not related to persecution as defined in Section 3 of the AsylG or to harm resulting from capital punishment, torture or other inhuman treatment, or a theater of war as defined in Section 4 of the AsylG. If the claimants succeed and the BAMF issues such a declaration, the execution of the order announcing the intention to remove will—temporarily—be suspended. The claimants’ further stay in the country will be "tolerated," and the authorities will issue a paper called "Duldung" (toleration). The toleration does not touch upon the individual obligation to leave the country; the obligation remains intact. A toleration may also be issued in cases where the removal proves impossible for more practical reasons, such as the lack of means of transport; the lack of proof regarding the identity of the claimant; an unwillingness of the country of origin to cooperate in the removal; or the illness of the non-national liable for removal. Hence, there are many legally accepted reasons why non-nationals may stay in Germany as merely tolerated claimants, and many non-nationals do so for lengthy periods of time. According to data released by the German federal government, there were more than 20,000 non-nationals staying in Germany as merely tolerated claimants on December 31, 2016; almost 50,000 of them had been staying in Germany for more than three years, more than 28,154 for more than six years, and more than 20,000 for more than ten years.

iii. Other Status

Pending their applications for asylum, asylum seekers are subject to numerous restrictions. First, the permit to stay as an asylum seeker in the country
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on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. The classes also include removals to a country where the claimants face any individualized serious harm to life, limb, and freedom that is not related to persecution as defined in Section 3 of the AsylG or to harm resulting from capital punishment, torture or other inhuman treatment, or a theater of war as defined in Section 4 of the AsylG. If the claimants succeed and the BAMF issues such a declaration, the execution of the order announcing the intention to remove will—temporarily—be suspended. The claimants’ further stay in the country will be "tolerated," and the authorities will issue a paper called "Duldung" (toleration). The toleration does not touch upon the individual obligation to leave the country; the obligation remains intact.

A toleration may also be issued in cases where the removal proves impossible for more practical reasons, such as the lack of means of transport; the lack of proof regarding the identity of the claimant; an unwillingness of the country of origin to cooperate in the removal; or the illness of the non-national liable for removal. Hence, there are many legally accepted reasons why non-nationals may stay in Germany as merely tolerated claimants, and many non-nationals do so for lengthy periods of time. According to data released by the German federal government, there were 153,047 non-nationals staying in Germany as merely tolerated claimants on December 31, 2016; almost 50,000 of them had been staying in Germany for more than three years, more than 28,154 for more than six years, and more than 20,000 for more than ten years.

iii. Other Status

Pending their applications for asylum, asylum seekers are subject to numerous restrictions. First, the permit to stay as an asylum seeker in the country


135 AffentL, supra note 44, at §§ 60(5), 60(7). AffentL § 60(5) covers, for instance, removals that violate the right to respect of family life under ECHR art. 8(1); AffentL § 60(7) covers, for instance, removals to a country where the claimant lacks access to medical treatment necessary for survival. For details, see, e.g., Jan Bergmann, AffentL, § 60 marginal nos. 45-50, 52-55, in AUSLÄNDERRECHT [Law on Nationals] (Jan Bergmann & Klaus Dönnert eds., 12th ed. 2018).

136 AffentL, supra note 44, at § 60(2).

137 Id. at § 60(4).

138 Id. at § 60(4)(1); Jan Bauer, AffentL, § 60 marginal nos. 3, 16, in AUSLÄNDERRECHT [Law on Nationals] (Jan Bergmann & Klaus Dönnert eds., 12th ed. 2018).

139 See Bauer, supra note 163, at marginal nos. 18–33.

140 Antwort der Bundesregierung auf Kleine Anfrage: Zahlung in der Bundesrepublik lebender Flüchtlinge zum Stand 31. Dezember 2016 [Response by the Federal Government to a Parliamentary Question: Numbers of Refugees Living in Germany on December 31, 2016] BStz 2016 (Dez) 13385, 34–35 (Ger.).
is valid only for the district of the Ausländerbehörde (authority dealing with non-nationals), which is, according to the location of the reception center, responsible for administering the AufenthG in the individual case (territorial restriction). If they want to leave the district, asylum seekers need an additional permit. The territorial restriction of an asylum seeker’s permit to stay in the country generally expires after three months. Second, asylum seekers are obliged to reside in the reception center, that is, under the Königstein quotas system responsible for their admission. The obligation extends at least six weeks, and it may be extended to a maximum of six months. The obligation primarily serves the purposes of the asylum procedure. Applicants are supposed to be available on short notice. An applicant coming from a country of origin that is deemed safe is an exception to the rule. Such an applicant must, by law, remain in the reception center responsible for the applicant’s admission until a decision has been made on the application. An asylum seeker who must, to secure a livelihood, rely on public means is another exception to the rule. Such an applicant remains liable to territorial limitations. Third, asylum seekers must not take up employment for as long as they are obliged to reside in the reception center responsible for their admission. If asylum seekers are no longer obliged to reside in their respective reception centers (the obligations extend to at least six weeks and may extend to six months), employment may, by administrative decision, be permitted after a period of three months (commencing with the permit to stay in the country as an asylum seeker). However, the administrative authority will permit such employment only if there are no other persons available for that particular employment and the conditions of employment are not less favorable than the conditions in other comparable cases. After a stay of fifteen months, the authority will no longer inquire whether there are other persons available for the particular employment. Non-nationals who are merely tolerated in the country are liable to similar restrictions. They must stay within the borders of the Land responsible for administering the AufenthG vis-à-vis the non-nationals concerned. The obligation does not expire after three months if a non-national relies on public means to secure livelihood. A non-national whose presence is tolerated is, after a period of three months, no longer subject to a strict prohibition of employment; based on an administrative permit, the non-national may be employed. But the permit will not be issued if other persons are available for the employment in question or the working conditions do not comply with the usual standards. After fifteen months, the authority will no longer inquire into the availability of other persons; after four years of stay, employment is not restricted.

iv. Reliance on Social Benefits

Given the fact that most non-nationals seeking protection in Germany have no means to provide for their own living, and given the restrictions on their employment, many asylum seekers must rely on social benefits administered by the Länder. Statistical data detailing the benefits under the AsylbLG and its recipients clearly reflect the crisis of 2015 and 2016. In 2013, a year where numbers were not yet interpreted as foreboding a crisis, about 225,000 non-nationals received basic benefits under the AsylbLG. Of those, 127,708
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is valid only for the district of the Ausländerbehörde (authority dealing with non-nationals), which is, according to the location of the reception center, responsible for administering the AufenthG in the individual case (territorial restriction). If they want to leave the district, asylum seekers need an additional permit. The territorial restriction of an asylum seeker’s permit to stay in the country generally expires after three months. Second, asylum seekers are obliged to reside in the reception center, that is, under the Königstein quota system responsible for their admission. The obligation extends at least six weeks, and it may be extended to a maximum of six months. The obligation primarily serves the purposes of the asylum procedure. Applicants are supposed to be available on short notice. An applicant coming from a country of origin that is deemed safe is an exception to the rule. Such an applicant must, by law, remain in the reception center responsible for the applicant’s admission until a decision has been made on the application. An asylum seeker who must, to secure a livelihood, rely on public means is another exception to the rule. Such an applicant remains liable to territorial limitations. Third, asylum seekers must not take up employment for as long as they are obliged to reside in the reception center responsible for their admission. If asylum seekers are no longer obliged to reside in their respective reception centers (the obligations extend to at least six weeks and may extend to six months), employment may, by administrative decision, be permitted after a period of three months (commencing with the permit to stay in the country as an asylum seeker). However, the administrative authority will permit such employment only if there are no other persons available for that particular employment and the conditions of employment are not less favorable than the conditions in other comparable cases. After a stay of fifteen months, the authority will no longer inquire whether there are other persons available for the particular employment. Non-nationals who are merely tolerated in the country are liable to similar restrictions. They must stay within the borders of the Land responsible for administering the AufenthG vis-à-vis the non-nationals concerned. The obligation does not expire after three months if a non-national relies on public means to secure livelihood. A non-national whose presence is tolerated is, after a period of three months, no longer subject to a strict prohibition of employment; based on an administrative permit, the non-national may be employed. But the permit will not be issued if other persons are available for the employment in question or the working conditions do not comply with the usual standards. After fifteen months, the authority will no longer inquire into the availability of other persons; after four years of stay, employment is not restricted.

iv. Reliance on Social Benefits

Given the fact that most non-nationals seeking protection in Germany have no means to provide for their own living, and given the restrictions on their employment, many asylum seekers must rely on social benefits administered by the Länder. Statistical data detailing the benefits under the AsylblG and its recipients clearly reflect the crisis of 2015 and 2016. In 2013, a year where numbers were not yet interpreted as foreboding a crisis, about 225,000 non-nationals received basic benefits under the AsylblG. Of those, 127,798
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were asylum seekers, and 50,400 were tolerated non-nationals. In 2014, the overall number was 362,290 (249,000 asylum seekers and 56,000 tolerated non-nationals). In 2015, the overall number was 975,000 (709,000 asylum seekers and 80,000 tolerated non-nationals). In 2016, the number of recipients dropped slightly, yet expenditures increased considerably. In 2016, the overall total of recipients was 728,000 (351,000 asylum seekers and 68,000 tolerated non-nationals). 
Expenditures had increased from 5.3 billion Euros in 2015 to 9.4 billion Euros in 2016. 

The numbers detailing the recipients under the AsylbLG and the expenditures demonstrate the burden the German Länder had to shoulder as the crisis unfolded. However, the numbers also signal that many people—about 14% of all people receiving benefits securing the subsistence minimum—were subject to a regime that differed greatly from the regime designed to ensure the subsistence minimum in all other cases. In order to understand the differences between the regimes, we need to turn to the regimes first: What does the subsistence minimum look like when provided under the general regime, and what does it look like when provided under the AsylbLG? Why is there a general and a particular regime?

III. DEFINING THE SUBSISTENCE MINIMUM

A. The General Regime: Social Assistance and Basic Security

1. History
a. A State-Provided Minimum

Germany has a longstanding tradition of legal mechanisms mandating public authorities to provide a minimum of subsistence for residents. The tradition reaches back to the eighteenth century. In 1794, Prussia (then an independent German kingdom) adopted a codification of laws—called "Allgemeines Landrecht für die Preußischen Staaten"—that became famous, inter alia, because the codification contained, for the first time ever, a statement affirming the responsibility of the state to provide aid to Prussian citizens who were not able to provide for themselves. The denomination used to specify the aid provided by the state has changed over time. In the nineteenth century, the aid was termed "Armenpflege" or "Armenwesen" (poor relief). In the early twentieth century, the aid was called "Fürsorge".
were asylum seekers, and 50,400 were tolerated non-nationals. In 2014, the overall number was 362,900 (249,000 asylum seekers and 56,000 tolerated non-nationals). In 2015, the overall number was 975,000 (709,000 asylum seekers and 80,000 tolerated non-nationals). In 2016, the number of recipients dropped slightly, yet expenditures increased considerably. In 2016, the overall total of recipients was 728,000 (551,000 asylum seekers and 68,000 tolerated non-nationals). Expenditures had increased from 5.3 billion Euros in 2015 to 9.4 billion Euros in 2016.

The numbers detailing the recipients under the AsylbLG and the expenditures demonstrate the burden the German Länder had to shoulder as the crisis unfolded. However, the numbers also signal that many people—about 14% of all people receiving benefits securing the subsistence minimum—were subject to a regime that differed greatly from the regime designed to ensure the subsistence minimum in all other cases. In order to understand the differences between the regimes, we need to turn to the regimes first: What does the subsistence minimum look like when provided under the general regime, and what does it look like when provided under the AsylbLG? Why is there a general and a particular regime?

III. DEFINING THE SUBSISTENCE MINIMUM

A. The General Regime: Social Assistance and Basic Security

1. History

a. A State-Provided Minimum

Germany has a longstanding tradition of legal mechanisms mandating public authorities to provide a minimum of subsistence for residents. The tradition reaches back to the eighteenth century. In 1794, Prussia (then an independent German kingdom) adopted a codification of laws—called "Allgemeines Landrecht für die Preußischen Staaten"—that became famous, inter alia, because the codification contained, for the first time ever, a statement affirming the responsibility of the state to provide aid to Prussian citizens who were not able to provide for themselves. The denomination used to specify the aid provided by the state has changed over time. In the nineteenth century, the aid was termed "Aronnögelge" or "Aronnögenwesen" (poor relief). In the early twentieth century, the aid was called "Förderge".

nach Leistungssystemen und Ländern aus Jahresende 2006 bis 2015 [Federal Office for Statistics, Table B 1.3: Beneficiaries of Benefits Securing the Subsistence Minimum, According to Regimes and Länder from the End of the Year 2006 Through the End of the Year 2015]. http://www.asyl-sozialleistungen.de/statistik/2015/2015_06_25_BeneficiariesofBenefitsSecuringtheSubsistenceMinimum.pdf (last visited May 30, 2018). Compared with the total number of people receiving benefits meant to secure the subsistence minimum, the number of non-nationals liable to the particular regime established by the AsylbLG has always been minimal. The portion reached 5% in 2014, a first peak. In 2015, the portion was 14%, an all-time high. Id. (calculation by the author).

152 Allgemeines Landrecht für die Preußischen Staaten [ALR] [General Laws Applicable in the Prussian State], Grundtext (June 1, 1794), https://opinionarts.de/queueri1621.html.

153 ALR Part B, Title 19, § 1 (1): “It is incumbent on the state to provide food and care for those citizens who cannot provide for themselves, and who do not receive aid from other private persons who are obliged by law to do so.” (translation by the author). On the relevance of the ALR for the emergence of the German welfare state, see, e.g., EDZARD EICHENBERGER, SOZIALRECHT [SOCIAL LAW] 15 (10th ed. 2017).

154 On the various statutes applicable in German states and in some European countries, see ARNOLD EINHAGEN, DAS ARMENWesen UND DIE ARMENRECHTSGEGENWIRT IN euROPISCHEN STAATEN [POOR RELIEF AND POOR LAWS IN EUROPEAN STATES] (A. EINHAGEN ed., 1870).
meeting with friends and family, or going to the movies. The minimum has been coined the "socio-cultural minimum" by scholars and the judiciary. However, one characteristic of state-provided aid did not change throughout time: public aid is, and has always been, means-tested. The aid is provided only if the claimants are not able to provide for themselves through work, other income, the use of assets, or the help of others, particularly, family members (principle of subsidiarity). State-provided aid is meant to "jump in" last. 

b. A Constitutional Right to a Subsistence Minimum: Human Dignity

Under Germany's post-World War II constitution—the GG—adapting a legal framework for public aid is not simply the choice of the lawmakers. In the late nineteenth century, lawmakers have been free to deliberate on whether or not to enact laws concerning the provision of a subsistence minimum. Under the GG, lawmakers are no longer free. Following a judgment of the BVerfG of 2010, providing public aid is obligatory under Article 1 (1) of the GG, reading, "Human dignity is inviolable. To respect and protect it shall be the duty of all state authority." Prior to the 2010 judgment of the BVerfG, scholarly literature was split on the question of whether the constitution ought to be understood as implying an individual right (vis-à-vis the state) to a subsistence minimum and, if so, where such a right was to be found in the text of the constitution. Some authors thought that the dignity clause

198 See, e.g., Verordnung über die Fürsorgepflicht [FürsorgepflichtV] (Regulation Concerning the Obligation to Provide Welfare), Feb. 13, 1924, RGBl. I at 190.

199 See, e.g., Bundessozialhilfegesetz [BSHG] [Federal Act on Social Assistance], June 30, 1964, RGBl. I at 815, and currently Sozialgesetzbuch (SGB) ZWEITES BUCH (XII) SOZIALHELFER SGB XII) [Social Code Twelfth Book Social Assistance], art. 1 of G, Dec. 27, 2003, RGBl. I at 302Z, as amended [hereinafter SGB XII].


201 See, e.g., Walter Schillhorn, Hans Jersack & Paul Steffen, DAS BUNDESSOZIALHILFEGESETZ [The Federal Act on Social Assistance] 4, 7 (6th ed. 1974) (quoting the independence and scholarly literature prior to the 1950s and asserting that recipients of "Fürsorge" were merely the "object" of "public duty" in the maintenance of public order and security and, hence, no holders of individual rights). The legal status of welfare recipients was reconceived when the Bundesverwaltungsgericht (BVerwG), the Federal Administrative Court, ruled in 1954 that, under the constitutional order established by the GG, recipients of public welfare ought to be seen as "subjects" and—per implication—as right-holders even in the realm of public welfare. See BVerwG, June 24, 1954, V C 74.54, https://www.jurion.de/dt/artikel/bverwvg/1954-06-24/bverwvg-c-v-c-7854c.

202 See Entwurf eines Bundessozialhilfegesetzes [Bill on Social Assistance], Apr. 20, 1960, BT-Drs. 3/1799, at 52, "Nach der Rechtsgrundlage über Voraussetzung, Art und Maß der öffentlichen Fürsorge [RG] [Federal Principles Determining the Conditions, the Form and the Extent of Public Welfare], Dec. 4, 1924, RGBl. I at 765, § 6 (Ger.).
(welfare).\textsuperscript{198} In the 1960s, the denomination changed to "Sozialhilfe" (social assistance).\textsuperscript{199} Recently, lawmakers used the term "Grundsicherung" (basic security).\textsuperscript{200}

Some characteristics of the state-provided aid changed alongside its denomination. The change to Fürsorge marked the political wish to end the stigmatizing effects of the former Armenpflege. Yet, even at the beginning of the twentieth century, the provision of aid was still in the broad discretion of the authorities; recipients of welfare were not conceived of as right-holders.\textsuperscript{201} The change to Sozialhilfe by the 1961 BSHG signaled the political consensus that public aid should be provided by the authorities as a response to an individual right of the beneficiaries and that the law should expressly say so.\textsuperscript{202} Also, from the perspective of standards, the early mechanisms for state-provided aid were aimed simply at securing the bare physical minimum such as food, housing, clothing, and necessary medical care.\textsuperscript{203} In the 1960s, reforms introduced a higher standard for state-provided aid, adding a culturally determined minimum that included aspects of inclusion into society and participation in societal activities such as access to information, mobility, meeting with friends and family, or going to the movies.\textsuperscript{204} The minimum has been coined the "socio-cultural minimum" by scholars and the judiciary.\textsuperscript{205} However, one characteristic of state-provided aid did not change throughout time: public aid is, and has always been, means-tested.\textsuperscript{206} The aid is provided only if the claimants are not able to provide for themselves through work, other income, the use of assets, or the help of others, particularly, family members (principle of subsidiarity). State-provided aid is meant to "jump in" last.\textsuperscript{207}

b. A Constitutional Right to a Subsistence Minimum: Human Dignity

Under Germany’s post-World War II constitution—the GG—adopting a legal framework for public aid is not simply the choice of the lawmakers. In the late nineteenth century, lawmakers have been free to deliberate on whether or not to enact laws concerning the provision of a subsistence minimum. Under the GG, lawmakers are no longer free. Following a judgment of the BVerfG of 2010,\textsuperscript{208} providing public aid is obligatory under Article 11 of the GG, reading, "Human dignity is inviolable. To respect and protect it shall be the duty of all state authority."\textsuperscript{209} Prior to the 2010 judgment of the BVerfG, scholarly literature was split on the question of whether the constitution ought to be understood as implying an individual right (vis-à-vis the state) to a subsistence minimum and, if so, where such a right was to be found in the text of the constitution.\textsuperscript{210} Some authors thought that the dignity clause

\textsuperscript{198} See, e.g., Verordnung über die Fürsorgepflicht (FüRGPV) [Regulation Concerning the Obligation to Provide Welfare], Feb. 15, 1924, RGI I at 190.

\textsuperscript{199} See the former Bundessozialhillegesetz [BRSHG] [Federal Act on Social Assistance], June 30, 1964, RGI I at 815, and currently Sozialgesetzbuch (SGB) [Social Code] BUCH XII [SGB XII] [Social Code Twelve] [Social Code Book XII], art. 1 of G, Dec. 30, 2003, RGI I at 3022, as amended [henceforth SGB XII].

\textsuperscript{200} See Sozialgesetzbuch (SGB) Zweites Buch (II) [Social Code Second Book Basic Security for Jobseekers], art. 1 of G, Dec. 24, 2003, RGI I at 2954, as amended [henceforth SGB II].

\textsuperscript{201} The stigmatizing effects of the nineteenth century, poor relief, see Georg Simmel, Der Armte, in Soziologie: Untersuchungen über die Formen der Verhältnischaften [The Poor, in Sociology: Investigations into the Formations of Societies] 345 (5th ed. 1968) (describing the debasing effects resulting from having to rely on poor relief from a sociological perspective).

\textsuperscript{202} See, e.g., Walter Schellenberg, Hans Jäschke & Paul Steff, Das Bundessozialhillegesetz [The Federal Act on Social Assistance] 4, 7 (6th ed. 1974) (quoting the independence and scholarly literature prior to the 1950s and asserting that recipients of "Fürsorge" were merely the "object of" public policy aiming at the maintenance of public order and security and, hence, no holders of individual rights). The legal status of welfare recipients was reconceived when the Bundesverwaltungsgericht (BVerwG), the Federal Administrative Court, ruled in 1954 that, under the constitutional order established by the GG, recipients of public welfare ought to be seen as "subjects" and—per implication—as right-holders even in the realm of public welfare. See BVerwG, June 24, 1954, V C 78.54, https://www.jurion.de/urteil/bverw/1954-06-24/bverw-vg-vc-7854c.pdf.

\textsuperscript{203} See Entwurf eines Bundessozialhillegesetzes [Bill on Social Assistance], Apr. 20, 1960, BT-Drs. 3/1799, at 32.

\textsuperscript{204} See Reichsgrundsätze über Voraussetzung, Art und Maß der öffentlichen Fürsorge [RGf] [Federal Principles Determining the Conditions, the Form and the Extent of Public Welfare], Dec. 4, 1924, RGI I at 765, § (6) (Ger.).

\textsuperscript{205} See BSHG, supra note 199, at § 12 (introducing the category of "personal needs of quotidian life," comprising expenditures with respect to maintaining relationships with others and to participating in cultural life).

\textsuperscript{206} See, e.g., Ulrich-Arthur Lute, § 1 marginal no. 16, in Bundessozialhillegesetz [Federal Act on Social Assistance] (1985); Volker Wahrenhorst, § 1 SGB XII marginal no. 8, in SGB XII Sozialhilfe, Kommentar [Social Assistance. Commentary] (Christian Grübe & Volker Wahrenhorst eds., 2005); OVG Hamburg, Mar. 2, 1998, 8/FV 43-09, marginal no. 28 (Ger.), available at jures.de by subscription.

\textsuperscript{207} See ALR, supra note 195, at Part II, Title 19, § 1; RGf, supra note 204, at § 5; BSHG, supra note 199, at § 2; SGB XII, supra note 199, at § 2; and SGB II, supra note 200, at § 9 (1).

\textsuperscript{208} In scholarly literature, public aid is often classified as "das Netz unter dem sozialen Netz" (the final safety net). See, e.g., Eichhöffler, supra note 196, at 304.

\textsuperscript{209} BVerfG, 1 BvL, 1/09, Feb. 9, 2010.

\textsuperscript{210} Grundgesetz für die Bundesrepublik Deutschland [GG] [Basic Law], art. (1) sentences 1 and 2.

of the constitution was pertinent.\textsuperscript{222} Other authors considered the right to equality (Article 3 GG)\textsuperscript{223} or the right to life (Article 2(2) GG)\textsuperscript{224} to include such a right. And a third group of authors held the constitutional clause that refers to the welfare state (Article 20(1) GG) implied at least a responsibility for the state to care for the destitute.\textsuperscript{225} The 2010 judgment of the BVerfG resolved the issue. According to the BVerfG, the dignity clause under Article 1(1), sentence 1 of the GG also grants an individual right to a "menschenwürdiges Existenzminimum," i.e., to a subsistence minimum defined by human dignity.\textsuperscript{226} For the court, that minimum comprises all amenities necessary to lead a life in dignity,\textsuperscript{227} from physical needs to needs regarding participation in societal activities (socio-cultural minimum).\textsuperscript{228} That right, the BVerfG further held, corresponds with a duty on the side of the state, namely, the duty to ensure that the subsistence minimum was indeed available.\textsuperscript{229} Yet, the court added, the constitution would not give details regarding that right and duty; under Article 20(1) of the GG, it was left to the discretion of the lawmakers to define the "subsistence minimum" and to elaborate on what exactly was to be accorded under Article 1(1), sentence 1 of the GG.\textsuperscript{230} For the BVerfG, the proper textual location of the right to be provided with a

\textsuperscript{222} For references, see Horst Dreier, Art. 1 1 marginal no. 158, in GRUNDEBRECHT: KOMMENTAR [BASIC LAW: COMMENTARY] (Horst Dreier ed., 20 ed. 2004).

\textsuperscript{223} Volker Neumann, Menschenwürdige und Existenzminimum [Human Dignity and Subsistence Minimum], NVwZ 426, 429 (1995) (making a strong argument that the right to equality under Article 3 of the GG, rather than the right to respect of human dignity under Article 1(1) of the GG, be the yardstick for assessing whether or not the subsistence minimum had indeed been provided in a particular case).


\textsuperscript{225} See, e.g., Ernst-Wilhelm Lübke & Falbo Dmitra, Das Existenzminimum der Gegenwart [The Subsistence Minimum of the Present], Sozialgeschichtsbücherei [SGB] 272, 273 (2004) (assuming the idea of a social duty incumbent on the state to protect); (Ernst Schme PLCs) under Article 20(1) of the GG). Article 20(1) of the GG contains an obverse sentence saying: "Die Bundesrepublik Deutschland ist ein demokratischer und sozialer Bundesstaat" [The Federal Republic of Germany is a democratic and social federal state]. The word "social" used in Article 20(1) is meant to encompass one of the fundamental principles of the constitution, namely, the principle declaring that Germany be a welfare state, in German terminology rather a "social state." On the welfare or "social" state established under the GG, see the seminal contribution by Hans F. Zacher, Sozial Policy in the Federal Republic of Germany: The Constitution of the Social, in GERMAN SOCIAL POLICY 23 (Lutz Leisinger ed., 2013).

\textsuperscript{226} BVerfG, B VerfG 1 Bl. 109, Feb. 9, 2010, marginal no. 132.

\textsuperscript{227} Id. at marginal no. 133.

\textsuperscript{228} Id. at marginal no. 135.

\textsuperscript{229} Id. at marginal no. 124.

\textsuperscript{230} Id. at marginal no. 133.

\textsuperscript{222} For references, see Horst Dreier, Art. 1 1 marginal no. 158, in GRUNDEBRECHT: KOMMENTAR [BASIC LAW: COMMENTARY] (Horst Dreier ed., 20 ed. 2004).

\textsuperscript{223} Volker Neumann, Menschenwürdige und Existenzminimum [Human Dignity and Subsistence Minimum], NVwZ 426, 429 (1995) (making a strong argument that the right to equality under Article 3 of the GG, rather than the right to respect of human dignity under Article 1(1) of the GG, be the yardstick for assessing whether or not the subsistence minimum had indeed been provided in a particular case).


\textsuperscript{225} See, e.g., Ernst-Wilhelm Lübke & Falbo Dmitra, Das Existenzminimum der Gegenwart [The Subsistence Minimum of the Present], Sozialgeschichtsbücherei [SGB] 272, 273 (2004) (assuming the idea of a social duty incumbent on the state to protect); (Ernst Schme PLCs) under Article 20(1) of the GG). Article 20(1) of the GG contains an obverse sentence saying: "Die Bundesrepublik Deutschland ist ein demokratischer und sozialer Bundesstaat" [The Federal Republic of Germany is a democratic and social federal state]. The word "social" used in Article 20(1) is meant to encompass one of the fundamental principles of the constitution, namely, the principle declaring that Germany be a welfare state, in German terminology rather a "social state." On the welfare or "social" state established under the GG, see the seminal contribution by Hans F. Zacher, Sozial Policy in the Federal Republic of Germany: The Constitution of the Social, in GERMAN SOCIAL POLICY 23 (Lutz Leisinger ed., 2013).

\textsuperscript{226} BVerfG, B VerfG 1 Bl. 109, Feb. 9, 2010, marginal no. 132.

\textsuperscript{227} Id. at marginal no. 133.

\textsuperscript{228} Id. at marginal no. 135.

\textsuperscript{229} Id. at marginal no. 124.

\textsuperscript{230} Id. at marginal no. 133.

\textsuperscript{222} For references, see Horst Dreier, Art. 1 1 marginal no. 158, in GRUNDEBRECHT: KOMMENTAR [BASIC LAW: COMMENTARY] (Horst Dreier ed., 20 ed. 2004).

\textsuperscript{223} Volker Neumann, Menschenwürdige und Existenzminimum [Human Dignity and Subsistence Minimum], NVwZ 426, 429 (1995) (making a strong argument that the right to equality under Article 3 of the GG, rather than the right to respect of human dignity under Article 1(1) of the GG, be the yardstick for assessing whether or not the subsistence minimum had indeed been provided in a particular case).


\textsuperscript{225} See, e.g., Ernst-Wilhelm Lübke & Falbo Dmitra, Das Existenzminimum der Gegenwart [The Subsistence Minimum of the Present], Sozialgeschichtsbücherei [SGB] 272, 273 (2004) (assuming the idea of a social duty incumbent on the state to protect); (Ernst Schme PLCs) under Article 20(1) of the GG). Article 20(1) of the GG contains an obverse sentence saying: "Die Bundesrepublik Deutschland ist ein demokratischer und sozialer Bundesstaat" [The Federal Republic of Germany is a democratic and social federal state]. The word "social" used in Article 20(1) is meant to encompass one of the fundamental principles of the constitution, namely, the principle declaring that Germany be a welfare state, in German terminology rather a "social state." On the welfare or "social" state established under the GG, see the seminal contribution by Hans F. Zacher, Sozial Policy in the Federal Republic of Germany: The Constitution of the Social, in GERMAN SOCIAL POLICY 23 (Lutz Leisinger ed., 2013).

\textsuperscript{226} BVerfG, B VerfG 1 Bl. 109, Feb. 9, 2010, marginal no. 132.

\textsuperscript{227} Id. at marginal no. 133.

\textsuperscript{228} Id. at marginal no. 135.

\textsuperscript{229} Id. at marginal no. 124.

\textsuperscript{230} Id. at marginal no. 133.
of the constitution was pertinent.222 Other authors considered the right to equality (Article 3 GGG)223 or the right to life (Article 2(2) GGG)224 to include such a right. And a third group of authors held the constitutional clause that refers to the welfare state (Article 20(1) GGG) implied at least a responsibility for the state to care for the destitute.225 The 2010 judgment of the BVerfG resolved the issue. According to the BVerfG, the dignity clause under Article 1(1), sentence 1 of the GG also grants an individual right to a "menschenwürdiges Existenzminimum," ie, to a subsistence minimum defined by human dignity.226 For the court, that minimum comprises all amenities necessary to lead a life in dignity,227 from physical needs to needs regarding participation in societal activities (socio-cultural minimum).228 That right, the BVerfG further held, corresponds with a duty on the side of the state, namely, the duty to ensure that the subsistence minimum was indeed available.229 Yet, the court added, the constitution would not give details regarding that right and duty; under Article 20(1) of the GG, it was left to the discretion of the lawmakers to define the "subsistence minimum" and to elaborate on what exactly was to be accorded under Article 1(1), sentence 1 of the GG.230 For the BVerfG, the proper textual location of the right to be provided with a

223 Volker Neumann, Menschenwürdige und Existenzminimum [Human Dignity and Subsistence Minimum], NVwZ 426, 429 (1995) (making a strong argument that the right to equality under Article 3 of the GG, rather than the right to respect of human dignity under Article 1(1) of the GG, be the yardstick for assessing whether or not the subsistence minimum had indeed been provided in a particular case).
225 See, eg, Ernst-Wilhelm Liebe & Fallo Dittmar, Das Existenzminimum der Gegenwart [The Subsistence Minimum of the Present], SOzialgerichtsharZ [SGH] 272, 273 (2004) (insisting on the idea of a social duty incumbent on the state to protect [Lebensschutzpflicht] under Article 20(1) of the GG). Article 20(1) of the GG contains one brief sentence saying: "Die Bundesrepublik Deutschland ist ein demokratischer sozialer Bundesstaat" [The Federal Republic of Germany is a democratic and social federal state]. The word "social" used in Article 20(1) is meant to encompass one of the fundamental principles of the constitution, namely, the principle declaring that Germany be a welfare state, in German terminology rather a "social state." On the welfare or "social" state established under the GG, see the seminal contribution by Hans F. Zacher, Social Policy in the Federal Republic of Germany: The Constitution of the Social, in I GERMAN SOCIAL POLICY 23 (Last Leisinger ed., 2013).
226 BVerfG, 1 BvL 109/9, Feb. 9, 2010, marginal no. 132.
227 Id at marginal no. 133.
228 Id at marginal no. 155.
229 Id at marginal no. 124.
230 Id at marginal no. 133.

subistence minimum was, therefore, Article 1(1), sentence 1 of the GG read in conjunction with Article 20(1) of the GG (the welfare state clause).231 Still, under the BVerfG, the lawmakers' discretion with regard to defining the subsistence minimum was not unbound, even though the right under Article 1(1) of the GG was a positive one.222 The court insisted that the right was "absolute" in character.223 For the BVerfG, the question as to whether the subsistence minimum was to be provided for by the state had been answered in the affirmative by the GG in Article 1(1).224 In that regard, Article 1(1) granted an inviolable right (ein "unverfügbares Recht"), a right that was to be honored under all circumstances.225 And, according to the BVerfG, the custodian of that inviolable right was the BVerfG itself, the lawmakers' discretion and the corresponding judicial restraint notwithstanding. The 2010 judgment announced in no uncertain terms that the BVerfG would intervene in politics when the outcome of the lawmaking was—with respect to the requirements under Article 1(1) of the GG—"evidently insufficient."226 The court signaled that it would, for instance, intervene when the data used by the lawmakers for making their determinations was not reliable or the methods used were not sufficiently transparent.227

222 Id.
223 Id at marginal no. 134.
224 As a fundamental right, [Article 1(1)] is not only a defensive right against encroachments on the part of the state. The state must also protect human dignity in positive terms. . . . If a person does not have the material means to guarantee an existence that is in line with human dignity . . . the state is obligated . . . to protect human dignity and to ensure . . . that the material prerequisites for this are at the disposal of the person in need of assistance.
225 Id.
226 Id at marginal no. 133 (stressing that the fundamental right deriving from Article 1(1) of the GG had "an absolute effect" ("einen absolut wirksamen Ansporn").
227 Id.
228 Id. For a discussion on the absolute character of the various rights encapsulated in the human dignity clause, see Rolf Pucher, "Die Würde des Menschen ist unanfechtbar" ["Human Dignity is Inviolable"], JUSTIZSITUATION [JS] 756 (2004).
229 Id.
230 Id at marginal no. 141.
231 Id at marginal no. 143.
232 The Federal Constitutional Court . . . examines whether the legislature has covered and described the goal to ensure an existence that is in line with human dignity in a manner doing justice to Article 1.1 in conjunction with Article 20 of the Basic Law, whether within its margin of appreciation it has selected a calculation procedure that is fundamentally suited to an assessment of the subsistence minimum, whether, in essence, it has completely and correctly ascertained the necessary facts and, finally, whether it kept within the bounds of what is justifiable in all calculation steps with a comprehensive set of figures within this selected procedure and its structural principles.
ii. Beneficiaries

The general regime for the state-provided subsistence minimum comprises two distinct legal systems, addressing different categories of beneficiaries. Both systems are laid down by the Sozialgesetzbuch (SGB), the Social Code, yet in different books: the SGB II and the SGB XII. The SGB II (on the basic security for jobseekers) addresses able-bodied adults. Under the heading "beneficiaries," the SGB II preserves the right to basic security for jobseekers who fall into a defined age-bracket (they must be older than fifteen and younger than sixty-seven) who are able to work who cannot provide for themselves (through income or assets of their own, through work, or through the help of others), and who reside regularly in Germany. Non-nationals are not generally exempted from the right to a basic security for jobseekers. However, some specified groups of non-nationals are indeed expressly excluded from the category of potential beneficiaries. Moreover, non-nationals will not qualify as being able to work unless they are in possession of a work permit or they are eligible for a work permit under the pertinent provisions.

The SGB XII (on social assistance) addresses persons who are not among the target groups of SGB II. Social assistance under the SGB XII addresses two specified groups and one unspecified group. The specified groups are comprised of (1) persons who, on account of sickness or disability, are indefinitely unable to participate in the labor market, and (2) persons who have reached the age of sixty-seven. The benefit meant to cover the needs of the two target groups is called "Grundsicherung im Alter und bei Erwerbsunfähigkeit" (basic security in case of old age and lack of earning capacity). The unspecified group encompasses, more generally, all persons who, for whatever reasons, do not qualify for the basic security for jobseekers, for instance, because they have not yet reached the age of fifteen and do not share a household with their parents, or because their inability to work is only temporary. The benefit for the unspecified group is called "Hilfe zum Lebensunterhalt" (aid securing a livelihood). In any case, the pertinent provisions of the SGB XII require that the beneficiaries cannot provide for themselves through income or assets and that they reside in Germany. Again, non-nationals are not generally excluded from the right to social assistance, though some groups are. Still, for non-nationals, access to benefits is subject to additional conditions resulting from their statuses under various forms of residence permits.

iii. Benefits

The benefits under the SGB II (on the basic security for jobseekers) and the benefits under the SGB XII (on social assistance) are equal in form and amount. Under both systems of the general regime, the aid aims to secure the "notwendigen Lebensunterhalt" (livelihood regarded as necessary) encompassing food, clothing, housing, and participation in societal and cultural activities (the so-called "socio-cultural minimum of subsistence"). Under both regimes, the beneficiaries are, exceptions notwithstanding, entitled to receive cash transfers, i.e., monthly allowances. Case law and scholarly literature assume that cash transfers are more attuned to the constitutional right...
The general regime for the state-provided subsistence minimum comprises two distinct legal systems, addressing different categories of beneficiaries. Both systems are laid down by the Sozialgesetzbuch (SGB), the Social Code, yet in different books: the SGB II228 and the SGB XII.229

The SGB II (on the basic security for jobseekers) addresses able-bodied adults.230 Under the heading "beneficiaries," the SGB II preserves the right to basic security for jobseekers who fall into a defined age-bracket (they must be older than fifteen and younger than sixty-seven)231 who are able to work232 who cannot provide for themselves (through income or assets of their own, through work, or through the help of others),233 and who reside regularly in Germany.234 Non-nationals are not generally exempted from the right to a basic security for jobseekers. However, some specified groups of non-nationals are indeed expressly excluded from the category of potential beneficiaries.235 Moreover, non-nationals will not qualify as being able to work unless they are in possession of a work permit or they are eligible for a work permit under the pertinent provisions.236

The SGB XII (on social assistance) addresses persons who are not among the target groups of SGB II. Social assistance under the SGB XII addresses two specified groups and one unspecified group.237 The specified groups are comprised of (1) persons who, on account of sickness or disability, are indefinitely unable to participate in the labor market,238 and (2) persons who have reached the age of sixty-seven.239 The benefit meant to cover the needs of the two target groups is called "Grundsicherung im Alter" and bei Erwerbsminderung" (basic security in case of old age and lack of earning capacity). The unspecified group encompasses, more generally, all persons who, for whatever reasons, do not qualify for the basic security for jobseekers, for instance, because they have not yet reached the age of fifteen and do not share a household with their parents, or because their inability to work is only temporary.240 The benefit for the unspecified group is called "Hilfe zum Lebensunterhalt" (aid securing a livelihood). In any case, the pertinent provisions of the SGB XII require that the beneficiaries cannot provide for themselves through income or assets241 and that they reside in Germany.242 Again, non-nationals are not generally excluded from the right to social assistance, though some groups are.243 Still, for non-nationals, access to benefits is subject to additional conditions resulting from their statuses under various forms of residence permits.244

The benefits under the SGB II (on the basic security for jobseekers) and the benefits under the SGB XII (on social assistance) are equal in form and amount. Under both systems of the general regime, the aid aims to secure the "notwendigen Lebensunterhalt" (livelihood regarded as necessary) encompassing food, clothing, housing, and participation in societal and cultural activities (the so-called "sozio-cultural minimum of subsistence").245 Under both regimes, the beneficiaries are, exceptions notwithstanding, entitled to receive cash transfers, i.e., monthly allowances.246 Case law and scholarly literature assume that cash transfers are more attuned to the constitutional right...
to the respect of human dignity than benefits in kind. 247 The amount of the benefits depends primarily on how beneficiaries fare with respect to work, income, or assets. The benefits are subject to a means-test 248 if recipients have income or assets, the income or assets will be offset against the benefit and, therefore, reduce the amount of the benefit the recipient is entitled to. 249 In addition, the recipients of benefits under SGB II and SGB XII receive aid in kind (medical care) in accordance to the rules that govern social health insurance in general. 250 The right to receive cash benefits and medical care is not restricted in time. If the legal requirements are met, the beneficiaries will receive the cash transfers as well as medical care.

Following the February 2010 judgment of the BVerfG, 251 lawmakers introduced an empirically grounded mechanism for determining and adjusting the amounts of money deemed necessary to live a life in dignity. 252 Under that mechanism, the amount of the monthly flat rate varied according to personal status and age. 253 In 2016, the flat-rate amount for a single person was

247 Under the RGII, supra note 200, at § 1(1)-(2), the flat rate in conjunction with §§ 11–12; SGB XII, supra note 199, at § 6(1)-(2) (read in conjunction with §§ 41(3), 43, 82–84, 90–91).

248 For recipients under the SGB II, see Sozialgesetzbuch (SGB) Flüchtlings-Buch (V) Gesetzliche Krankenversicherung (SGB V) (Social Code Flüchtlings-Buch Social Health Insurance), art. 1 of G, Dec. 20, 1988, BGBl I Art 2477, as amended, § 5(3) no. 2a (hereinafter SGB V). For recipients under the SGB XII, see art. 2(f), no. 13, and SGB XII, supra note 199, at §§ 48–52.


251 Bekanntmachung über die Höhe der Regelbedarfe nach § 20 Absatz 5 des Zweiten Buches Sozialgesetzbuch für die Zeit ab 1. Jan. 2016 [Proclamation Concerning the Amounts Pertaining to Regular Needs under SGB II, § 205], starting from January 1, 2016, onward]. [BRB 2014], Oct. 22, 2015, BGBl I at 1797. For the amounts generated under the SGB XII, see Regelbedarfsanlagen-Fortschreibungsverordnung 2016 [RBRFV 2016] (Regulation adjusting the amounts pertaining to regular needs), Oct. 22, 2015, BGBl I at 1788. From January 1, 2017, onward, all relevant needs under the SGB II and the SGB XII have been revalued based on more recent empirical data. See RBEG 2016, supra note 252, SGB II, supra note 200, at § 200 (a)–(4); SGB XII, supra note 199, at §§ 28, 28a, and Annex to § 28.

252 RBEG 2016, supra note 253, at no. 1; RBRFV 2016, supra note 253, at § 2. In 2017, the amount was adjusted to 409 Euros. RBEG 2016, supra note 252, at § 8(1), sentence 1, no. 1. The RBEG 2016 also introduced a new requirement. The benefit granted to single persons now presupposes that the claimant is living in a qualifying accommodation, and a qualifying accommodation is defined by law as a unit consisting of several rooms which are separated from other units and comprise all amenities and appliances necessary for keeping a household. RBEG 2016, supra note 252, at § 8(1), sentence 2.

253 RBEG 2016, supra note 253, at no. 4; RBRFV 2016, supra note 253, at § 2. In 2017, the amount was adjusted to 369 Euros. RBEG 2016, supra note 252, at § 8(1), sentence 1, no. 2.

254 For a child younger than seven years, the amount was 257 Euros in 2016; for a child aged between seven and fifteen years, it was 270 Euros, and for a child aged between fifteen and eighteen years, it was 306 Euros. RBEG 2016, supra note 253, at nos. 2, 5, 6, 7; RBRFV 2016, supra note 253, at § 2. Again, the amounts have been adjusted in 2017. RBEG 2016, supra note 252, at § 8(1), sentence 2, nos. 4–6.

255 SGB II, supra note 200, at § 12(1). SGB XII, supra note 199, at § 15(1)-(2). The "advantage" of the costs of accommodation depends, of course, on the location. In some areas of Germany, such as Munich, accommodation is more expensive than in other areas. On average, adequate costs for an accommodation range between four and six Euros per square meter. For a single person, a size of fifty square meters is deemed adequate.
to the respect of human dignity than benefits in kind. The amount of the benefits depends primarily on how beneficiaries fare with respect to work, income, or assets. The benefits are subject to a means-test, if recipients have income or assets, the income or assets will be offset against the benefit and, therefore, reduce the amount of the benefit the recipient is entitled to.

In addition, the recipients of benefits under SGB II and SGB XII receive aid in kind (medical care) in accordance to the rules that govern social health insurance in general. The right to receive cash benefits and medical care is not restricted in time. If the legal requirements are met, the beneficiaries will receive the cash transfers as well as medical care.

Following the February 2010 judgment of the BVerfG, lawmakers introduced an empirically grounded mechanism for determining and adjusting the amounts of money deemed necessary to live a life in dignity. Under that mechanism, the amount of the monthly flat rate varied according to personal status and age. In 2016, the flat-rate amount for a single person was 404 Euros.
Non-nationals subject to the AsylblG\textsuperscript{20} are among the clauses that are except from the general regime.\textsuperscript{219} For them, the subsistence minimum is determined by the AsylblG only.\textsuperscript{220} The AsylblG was introduced in the early 1990s, when Germany went through a crisis similar to the one endured in 2015 and 2016.\textsuperscript{221} After the fall of the Iron Curtain in 1989, the number of asylum seekers started to climb until the number reached 440,000—a number unheard of at that point in time.\textsuperscript{222} In December 1992, the Conservatives and the Social Democrats reached a compromise, which was coined in public discourse the “Asylkompromitt” (compromise on asylum). The compromise was a political agreement opening the door to several legal measures aimed at reducing the number of asylum applicants.\textsuperscript{223} First, the wording of the constitutional right to asylum was amended to no longer extend to non-nationals who reached German territory after passing through a safe third country.\textsuperscript{224} However, asylum seekers could, even after passing through a safe third country prior to their arrival in Germany, qualify for the status under the Refugee Convention (refugee status).\textsuperscript{225} Second, the constitutional right to asylum was curtailed with respect to asylum seekers coming from a country that had been classified by law as a “safe country of origin.”\textsuperscript{226} The amendments to the GG allowed lawmakers to introduce procedural rules shifting the burden of proof towards the claimants if the claimants’ country of origin had been classified “safe.”\textsuperscript{227} Under these rules, it was (and still is) up to the asylum seekers to rebut the legal presumption that they would not be persecuted when they returned to their country of origin. They were (and are) supposed to do so through accelerated procedures.\textsuperscript{228} Third, relating to social benefits, asylum seekers were denied access to the general regime of state-provided social assistance, though not through amending the text of the constitution, but by changing the then-existing rules contained in statutory law.\textsuperscript{229} The political compromise reached in early 1993 was based on the premise that the benefits granted under the general regime then in force were so generous that the regime per se attracted asylum seekers who could, while waiting for the rejection of their applications, secure more money than if they remained in their countries of origin.\textsuperscript{230} Hence, a particular regime of social assistance was introduced, designed to deter more asylum applicants.\textsuperscript{231} The AsylblG relinquished a principle that had been upheld for decades in the general regime, namely that benefits meant to secure a decent livelihood

\textsuperscript{20} GRUNDEGEBETZ FÜR DIE BUNDESRÜPUBLIK DEUTSCHLAND [GG] [BASIC LAW], art. 16a(3), as amended. The GG does not give a list of the countries deemed to be safe countries of origin. To establish such a list is left to the lawmakers, and it takes further compromising among lawmakers to reach the majority necessary for amending the AsylblG. In 2014 and 2015, such a compromise was indeed forged with respect to several Balkan countries. See Gesetz zur Einführung weiterer Staaten, supra note 50, and Asylverfahrensbeschleunigungsgesetz, supra note 54, at art. 1, no. 35.

\textsuperscript{21} GRUNDEGEBETZ FÜR DIE BUNDESRÜPUBLIK DEUTSCHLAND [GG] [BASIC LAW], art. 16a(3), as amended.

\textsuperscript{22} For details on the legislative history of the AsylblG, see e.g., Karl-Horst Holm, II Erarbeitungsgeschichte [Legislative History] margin note 55-69 in ASYLLG [ASYLBLG] GEMEINSCHAFTKOMMENTAR [Karl-Horst Holm ed., Jan. 2018].

\textsuperscript{23} See Tönn, supra note 80, and accompanying text.

\textsuperscript{24} Regarding the “asyl compromise” see e.g., Jürgen Habermas, Der Asylkompromitt vom 6. Dezember 1992 — eine Joke d’orchest [The Compromise on Asylum — One Year After], ZAK 3-9, 51-59 (1994) (reproducing the text of the compromise and the initial steps taken towards the implementation of the compromise). The compromise on asylum led to amendments to the GG that were needed to be implemented through statutory law. For the amendments to the GG, see Gesetz zur Änderung des Grundgesetzes [Act amending the Basic Law], June 28, 1993, BGBl. I at 1002 (Ger.).

\textsuperscript{25} See e.g., KAY HALBENZER, ASYL- UND AUSLÄNDERRECHT 407 (4th ed. 2017).
B. The Particular Regime: Asylum Seekers’ Benefits

i. History

a. The Introduction of the Regime

Non-nationals subject to the AsylbLG\footnote{See AsylbLG, supra note 57.} are among the classes that are excepted from the general regime.\footnote{250} For them, the subsistence minimum is determined by the AsylbLG only.\footnote{250} The AsylbLG was introduced in the early 1990s, when Germany went through a crisis similar to the one endured in 2015 and 2016.\footnote{251} After the fall of the Iron Curtain in 1989, the number of asylum seekers started to climb until the number reached 440,000—a number unheard of at that point in time.\footnote{252} In December 1992, the Conservatives and the Social Democrats reached a compromise, which was coined in public discourse the “Asylkompromiß” (compromise on asylum). The compromise was a political agreement opening the door to several legal measures aimed at reducing the number of asylum applicants.\footnote{253}

First, the wording of the constitutional right to asylum was amended to no longer extend to non-nationals who reached German territory after passing through a safe third country.\footnote{254} However, asylum seekers could, even after passing through a safe third country prior to their arrival in Germany, qualify for the status under the Refugee Convention (refugee status).\footnote{255} Second, the constitutional right to asylum was curtailed with respect to asylum seekers coming from a country that had been classified by law as a “safe country of origin.”\footnote{256} The amendments to the GG allowed lawmakers to introduce procedural rules shifting the burden of proof towards the claimants if the claimants’ country of origin had been classified “safe.”\footnote{257} Under these rules, it was (and still is) up to the asylum seekers to rebut the legal presumption that they would not be persecuted when they returned to their country of origin. They were (and are) supposed to do so through accelerated procedures.\footnote{258} Third, relating to social benefits, asylum seekers were denied access to the general regime of state-provided social assistance, though not through amending the text of the constitution, but by changing the then-existing rules contained in statutory law.\footnote{259} The political compromise reached in early 1993 was based on the premise that the benefits granted under the general regime then in force were so generous that the regime per se attracted asylum seekers who could, while waiting for the rejection of their applications, secure more money than if they remained in their countries of origin.\footnote{260} Hence, a particular regime of social assistance was introduced, designed to deter more asylum applicants.\footnote{261} The AsylbLG relinquished a principle that had been upheld for decades in the general regime, namely that benefits meant to secure a decent livelihood

250 Grundgesetz für die Bundesrepublik Deutschland [GG] [Basic Law], art. 16a(3), as amended. The GG does not give a list of the countries deemed to be safe countries of origin. To establish such a list is left to the lawmakers, and it takes further compromising among lawmakers to reach the majority necessary for amending the AsylbLG. In 2015 and 2016, such a compromise was indeed forged with respect to several Balkan countries. See Gesetz zur Einführung weiterer Staaten, supra note 50, and Asylverfahrensver


252 Regarding the “asylum compromise” see, e.g., Jürgen Habermas, Der Asylkompromiß vom 6. Dezember 1992—eine jüdische Ansage [The Compromise on Asylum—One Year After], ZAR 3-9, 51–59 (1994) (reproducing the text of the compromise and the initial steps taken towards the implementation of the compromise). The compromise on asylum led to amendments to the GG that these needed to be implemented through statutory law. For the amendments to the GG, see Gesetz zur Änderung des Grundgesetzes [Act amending the Basic Law], June 28, 1993, BGBl. I at 1002 (Ger.).

253 Grundgesetz für die Bundesrepublik Deutschland [GG] [Basic Law], art. 16a(2), as amended.

254 See e.g. KAY HALBRONNER, ASYL- UND AUSLÄNDERRECHT 407 (4th ed. 2017).
(food, clothing, housing) ought to be provided in cash. Under the AsylbLG, asylum seekers were to be provided primarily with benefits in kind, not only with respect to accommodation (e.g., in reception centers), but also with respect to food, clothing, or other personal necessities of life. Also, the AsylbLG lowered the benefits to be provided. The amounts of the cash benefits, if available, were considerably lower than under the general regime: in 1993, the benefits for a single person under the AsylbLG reached about 85% of the benefits for a single person under the general regime. Finally, asylum seekers were granted access to medical care. However, access to medical care was restricted to conditions of acute illness and pain. All these various curtailments notwithstanding, lawmakers believed that the AsylbLG would still ensure a standard of living consistent with the human dignity clause of Article 1(1) GG.

b. The Challenge Before the BVerfG: Human Dignity

When the BVerfG ruled in 2010 that the dignity clause of the GG also comprised an individual right to a subsistence minimum and that right needed to be elaborated by parliament in a transparent and consistent manner, doubts regarding the constitutionality of the particular regime of the AsylbLG gained new ground in academic circles. In July and November 2010, the Landessozialgericht (LSG) Nordrhein-Westfalen, the Higher Social Court of North Rhine Westphalia, initiated proceedings before the BVerfG. The LSG Nordrhein-Westfalen challenged the constitutionality of the AsylbLG, in particular the amounts of cash benefits granted to asylum seekers once they were no longer obliged to stay in a reception center.

In 2012, pivotal parts of the particular regime—namely, the provisions of the AsylbLG determining the cash benefits available in regular cases—were declared unconstitutional by the BVerfG. Without hesitating, the BVerfG presumed that non-nationals were right-holders under Article 1(1) of the GG. According to the BVerfG, Article 1(1) of the GG was to be read as enshrining a “Menschenrecht” (a human right); that is, in the understanding of the court, the right was not preserved for German nationals but also extended to non-nationals. On the merits, the BVerfG took issue with the amounts of the cash benefits granted under the AsylbLG. The court’s main concern was that the amounts fixed by the lawmakers in 1993 had never been upgraded afterwards, even though price levels had risen by more than 30%. To “illustrate” the “evident insufficiency,” the BVerfG referred to the cash benefits granted under the general regime and the considerable gaps in the amounts caused by the idleness of the lawmakers. The benefits available to a single person under the AsylbLG amounted only to 65% of the equivalent benefit under the general regime, leaving a gap of 35%. The ratio was even worse with regard to the benefits available to children and juveniles; in the case of children below the age of six, the benefits under the AsylbLG reached only 25% of the benefits available under the general regime. Against that backdrop, the BVerfG concluded that the benefits provided by the AsylbLG, set in 1993, were evidently not in accordance with what was demanded by Article 1(1) GG. The BVerfG also took issue with the main motif underpinning the AsylbLG. The BVerfG held, again in no uncertain terms, that considerations pertaining to migration policy, i.e., the wish to reduce the number of foreign nationals seeking protection in Germany, could not justify the

---

272 See supra Part III A.ii.
273 AsylbLG, as enacted in 1993, supra note 57, at § 3(1).
274 In North Rhine Westphalia, a single person liable to the general regime of social assistance was, in 1993, entitled to a cash benefit of 514 DM (263 Euros). Verordnung über die Regelung der Sozialhilfe [Regulation on Regular Benefits], June 29, 1993, NW OVL at 314. For asylum seekers liable to the particular regime of the AsylbLG, the comparable amount was 440 DM (225 Euros).
275 AsylbLG, supra note 57, at § 4.
276 Id.
277 See Gesetzentwurf, supra note 269, at 6.
278 BVerfG, 1 BvL 1/09, Feb. 9, 2010.
279 On the procedural safeguards established and reviewed by the BVerfG, see id.
282 Id. (arguing that the amounts granted under the AsylbLG were “evidently insufficient”)
283 Id. For details on the “Grundleistungen” (regular benefits) under the AsylbLG, see infra Part III B ii.a.
284 BVerfG, 1 BvL 1/10, July 18, 2012, at marginal no. 61.
285 Id. at marginal no. 62.
286 Id. at marginal no. 63. ("Because Article 1(1) GG is a human right, both German and foreign nationals who reside in the Federal Republic of Germany are entitled to this fundamental right.")
287 Id. at marginal nos. 81–89.
288 Id. at marginal nos. 82–84.
289 Id. at marginal no. 85.
290 BVerfG, 1 BvL 1/10, July 18, 2012, at marginal no. 87.
291 Id. at marginal no. 88.
292 Id. at marginal no. 81.
293 Id. at marginal nos. 90–95.
(food, clothing, housing) ought to be provided in cash. The AsylbLG, as enacted in 1993, was not upheld by the BVerfG; however, access to medical care was restricted to conditions of acute illness and pain. All these various curtailments notwithstanding, lawmakers believed that the AsylbLG would still ensure a living consistent with the human dignity clause of Article 1(1) GG.

b. The Challenge Before the BVerfG: Human Dignity

When the BVerfG ruled in 2010 that the dignity clause of the GG also comprised an individual right to a subsistence minimum and that right needed to be elaborated by parliament in a transparent and consistent manner, doubts regarding the constitutionality of the particular regime of the AsylbLG gained new ground in academic circles. In July and November 2010, the Landessozialgericht (LSG) Nordrhein-Westfalen, the Higher Social Court of North Rhine Westphalia, initiated proceedings before the BVerfG. The

LSG Nordrhein-Westfalen challenged the constitutionality of the AsylbLG, in particular the amounts of cash benefits granted to asylum seekers once they were no longer obliged to stay in a reception center.

In 2012, pivotal parts of the particular regime—namely, the provisions of the AsylbLG determining the cash benefits available in regular cases—were declared unconstitutional by the BVerfG without hesitation. The BVerfG presumed that non-nationals were right-holders under Article 1(1) of the GG. According to the BVerfG, Article 1(1) of the GG was to be read as enshrining a “Menschenrecht” (a human right); that is, in the understanding of the court, the right was not preserved for German nationals but also extended to non-nationals. On the merits, the BVerfG took issue with the amounts of the cash benefits granted under the AsylbLG. The court’s main concern was that the amounts fixed by the lawmakers in 1993 had never been upgraded afterwards, even though price levels had risen by more than 30%.

To “illustrate” the “evident insufficiency,” the BVerfG referred to the cash benefits granted under the general regime and the considerable gaps in the amounts caused by the idleness of the lawmakers. The benefits available to a single person under the AsylbLG amounted only to 65% of the equivalent benefit under the general regime, leaving a gap of 35%. The ratio was even worse with regard to the benefits available to children and juveniles; in the case of children below the age of six, the benefits under the AsylbLG reached only 25% of the benefits available under the general regime. Again that backdrop, the BVerfG concluded that the benefits provided by the AsylbLG, set in 1993, were evidently not in accordance with what was demanded by Article 1(1) GG. The BVerfG also took issue with the main motif underpinning the AsylbLG. The BVerfG held, in any uncertain terms, that considerations pertaining to migration policy, i.e., the wish to reduce the number of foreign nationals seeking protection in Germany, could not justify the

272 Id. (arguing that the amounts granted under the AsylbLG were “evidently insufficient”).
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withholding of what was owed under the dignity clause of the GG.\(^{284}\) "Human dignity, guaranteed in Article 1.1 of the Basic Law, may not be modified in light of migration-policy considerations."\(^{295}\) The July 2012 judgment of the BVerfG prompted major amendments to the AsylbLG in late 2014.\(^{296}\) The refugee crisis led to more adjustments in 2015 and 2016.\(^{297}\)

ii. Beneficiaries

Even though the title of the act explicitly refers to "asylum seekers," the scope of the AsylbLG is not, and never was, confined to nonnationals who are actually seeking international protection from persecution in Germany and who qualify as asylum seekers.\(^{298}\) Nonnationals seeking protection and awaiting the decision of the BAMF are just one major group covered by the AsylbLG.\(^{299}\) Nonnationals who have been granted certain humanitarian residence titles are another.\(^{300}\) Nonnationals who have no right to remain in Germany, but whose further stay is nonetheless tolerated,\(^{301}\) constitute a third group.\(^{302}\) And, more generally, nonnationals who are bound to leave the country constitute a fourth group.\(^{303}\) Clearly, many nonnationals who find themselves among one of the defined classes of beneficiaries might, at one point during their stay in Germany, have been asylum seekers in an informal or a formal sense. But that is not necessarily so.

iii. Benefits

\(^{284}\) Id. at marginal no. 95.
\(^{285}\) Id.
\(^{286}\) See Gesetz zur Änderung des Asylbewerberleistungsgesetzes und des Sozialgerichtsgesetzes, supra note 63.
\(^{287}\) See Asylverfahrensbeschleunigungsgesetz, supra note 46, at art. 2; Gesetz zur Einführung beschleunigter Asylverfahren, supra note 55, at art. 3; Integrationsgesetz, supra note 64, at art. 4.
\(^{288}\) On the notion of "asylum seeker" and the related status, see supra Part II.E.i. and iii.
\(^{289}\) See AsylbLG, supra note 57, at § 1(1), no. 1 (referring to nonnationals whose stay is "permitted" ["gestattet"] under the AsylbLG).
\(^{290}\) See id. at § 1(1), no. 3 (referring to nonnationals who have been issued a temporary residence permit because their country of origin is torn by war, or on account of weighty personal reasons, or because their factual removal is prohibited by law).
\(^{291}\) On the concept of "Duldung" (toleration) under the German AußerordbLG, see supra Part II.Eii.
\(^{292}\) See AsylbLG, supra note 57, at § 1(1), no. 4 (referring to nonnationals in possession of a "Duldung").
\(^{293}\) See id. at § 1(1), no. 3 (referring to nonnationals who are legally obliged to leave the country).
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The benefits provided under the AsylbLG to secure a livelihood may take three forms: the AsylbLG establishes a system of regular benefits,\(^{304}\) a system of downgraded benefits,\(^{305}\) and a system of upgraded benefits.\(^{306}\) Access to medical care is still restricted to conditions of acute illness or pain.\(^{307}\) Regular benefits and downgraded benefits were at the center of the lawmakers’ response to the crisis of 2015 and 2016.

a. Regular Benefits

The regular benefits ("Grundleistungen") are meant to cover, for one, essential needs ("notwendiger Bedarf") and, for another, essential personal needs ("notwendiger persönlicher Bedarf").\(^{308}\) Essential needs are defined by the AsylbLG to comprise needs regarding food, housing, clothing, minor medical care and hygiene, and household commodities.\(^{309}\) Essential personal needs are defined to encompass all quotidian personal necessities.\(^{310}\) Obviously, needs regarding societal and cultural activities (the so-called socio-cultural minimum), such as communication, mobility, or educational training, are part of what is called the essential personal needs.\(^{311}\) Whether regular benefits are provided in kind or in cash depends on where the beneficiaries are accommodated. When and if the beneficiaries are accommodated in reception centers (they must stay in reception centers for at least six weeks, or they may be ordered to stay there for up to six months),\(^{312}\) the essential needs are to be covered in kind.\(^{313}\) Essential personal needs are, in principle, also provided in kind.\(^{314}\) When the beneficiaries are accommodated in other facilities, some of the essential needs and the essential personal needs are to be covered by providing cash transfers.\(^{315}\) For example, under

\(^{304}\) See infra Part III.B.iii.a.
\(^{305}\) See infra Part III.B.iii.b.
\(^{306}\) See infra Part III.B.iii.c.
\(^{307}\) See AsylbLG, supra note 57, at § 4.
\(^{308}\) Id. at § 3(1).
\(^{309}\) Id. at § 3(1) sentence 1.
\(^{310}\) Id. at § 3(1) sentence 5 (referring to "persönliche Bedürfnisse des täglichen Lebens").
\(^{311}\) For the general regime, see SGB XII, supra note 199, at § 27a; and SGB II, supra note 200, at § 30(1).
\(^{312}\) See supra notes 169–171 and accompanying text.
\(^{313}\) AsylbLG, supra note 57, at § 3(3), sentences 1–2.
\(^{314}\) Id. at § 3(1), sentence 6.
\(^{315}\) Id. at § 3(2), sentence 1.
withholding of what was owed under the dignity clause of the GG.284 "Human dignity, guaranteed in Article 1.1 of the Basic Law, may not be modified in light of migration-policy considerations."285 The July 2012 judgment of the BVerfG prompted major amendments to the AsylbLG in late 2014.286 The refugee crisis led to more adjustments in 2015 and 2016.287

ii. Beneficiaries
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The benefits provided under the AsylbLG to secure a livelihood may take three forms: the AsylbLG establishes a system of regular benefits,295 a system of downgraded benefits,296 and a system of upgraded benefits.297 Access to medical care is still restricted to conditions of acute illness or pain.298 Regular benefits and downgraded benefits were at the center of the lawmakers' response to the crisis of 2015 and 2016.

a. Regular Benefits

The regular benefits ("Grundleistungen") are meant to cover, for one, essential needs ("notwendiger Bedarf") and, for another, essential personal needs ("notwendiger persönlicher Bedarf").299 Essential needs are defined by the AsylbLG to comprise needs regarding food, housing, clothing, minor medical care and hygiene, and household commodities.300 Essential personal needs are defined to encompass all quotidian personal necessities.301 Obviously, needs regarding societal and cultural activities (the so-called socio-cultural minimum), such as communication, mobility, or educational training, are part of what is called the essential personal needs.302 Whether regular benefits are provided in kind or in cash depends on where the beneficiaries are accommodated. When and if the beneficiaries are accommodated in reception centers (they must stay in reception centers for at least six weeks, or they may be ordered to stay there for up to six months),303 the essential needs are to be covered in kind.304 Essential personal needs are, in principle, also provided in kind.305 When the beneficiaries are accommodated in other facilities, some of the essential needs and the essential personal needs are to be covered by providing cash transfers.306 For example, under

---

295 See infra Part III.B.iii.a.
296 See infra Part III.B.iii.b.
297 See infra Part III.B.iii.c.
298 See AsylbLG, supra note 57, at § 4.
299 Id. at § 3(i).
300 Id. at § 3(ii) sentence 1.
301 Id. at § 3(ii) sentence 2 (referring to "persönliche Bedürfnisse des täglichen Lebens").
302 For the general regime, see SGB XII, supra note 199, at § 27a; and SGB II, supra note 200, at § 39(1).
303 See supra notes 169–171 and accompanying text.
304 AsylbLG, supra note 57, at § 3(i), sentences 1–2.
305 Id. at § 3(ii), sentence 6.
306 Id. at § 3(ii), sentence 1.
the rules applicable in 2016. 218 A single person received 219 Euros (essential needs) plus 135 Euros (essential personal needs), i.e., a total of 354 Euros in cash. 217 Accommodation and household commodities may still be provided in kind. 218 The relevant amounts were the same in 2017 and have not been adjusted. 219

b. Downgraded Benefits

Downgraded benefits are meant to cover merely some of the essential needs but no essential personal needs. 220 Downgraded benefits cover needs with respect to food, housing, and minor medical care and personal hygiene, but no needs with respect to clothing. 221 Downgraded benefits ought to be provided in kind. 222 Downgraded benefits are due for numerous classes of non-nationals. Downgraded benefits are due for non-nationals who are bound to leave the country (because they lack titles legalizing their stays), provided the dates for their departure are already set and departure proves possible. 223 Moreover, downgraded benefits are due for non-nationals who are bound to leave the country and who hamper the execution of the expulsion order for instance, through concealing their identities. 224 Asylum seekers do not belong to any of these classes yet rejected asylum seekers may. Asylum seekers, in an informal or formal sense, are liable for any downgraded benefits given under the AsylbLG if they violate provisions requiring that they cooperate in the decision-making regarding their asylum applications, such as the duty to hand papers over to the BAMF or the duty to show up for a hearing before the BAMF. 225 Finally, downgraded benefits are owed as long as asylum seekers have not yet received a certificate of arrival issued by the responsible arrival center. 226 The last class comprises asylum seekers at a very early stage of the procedure, namely, asylum seekers who have been registered in EASY but have not yet lodged their formal applications. 227

Clearly, all the classes of non-nationals given downgraded benefits have one common feature: one way or another, they do not (or might not) comply with the law. Downgraded benefits are in response to non-compliance.

c. Upgraded Benefits

Upgraded benefits are meant to cover all the elements of the subsistence minimum defined by the SGB XII on social assistance. 228 Hence, upgraded benefits cover the whole range of the so-called socio-cultural minimum of subsistence provided under the general regime, such as food, clothing, personal hygiene, household commodities, household energy, and the quotidian personal needs, including needs with respect to participation in societal and cultural activities. 229 Like the benefits under the general regime, the upgraded benefits under the AsylbLG are to take the form of cash transfers. 230 Upgraded benefits are due when the beneficiaries under the AsylbLG have been staying in Germany for fifteen months, without major interruption and without unduly manipulating the lengths of their stays. 231

---

218 Id. at § 3(1), sentence 8 and § 3(2), sentence 2, as amended by Bekanntmachung, supra note 253 and by Gesetze zur Einführung beschleunigter Asylverfahren, supra note 55, art. 3.
217 Id.
216 See id. at § 3(2), sentence 4.
215 In October 2016, the federal government suggested to once more reassess the amounts due under the AsylbLG. See Gesetzentwurf der Bundesregierung, Entwurf eines Dritten Gesetzes zur Änderung des Asylbewerberrechts-Gesetzes (Bill submitted by the Federal Government: A Third Bill Amending the AsylbLG), Oct. 17, 2016, BT-Drs. 18/9985 [hereinafter Entwurf eines Dritten Gesetzes]. The bill proposed to lower the regular benefits considerably for beneficiaries who were (still) accommodated in some form of collective accommodation and would, therefore, not live in a "qualifying accommodation" as defined by the RBBG 2016, supra note 252. On the characteristics of a "qualifying accommodation," see RBBG 2016, supra note 252, at § 8(1) sentence 2 and supra note 254. Under the rules suggested by the bill, a single person housed in collective accommodation would be granted 299 Euros instead of 354 Euros. Entwurf eines Dritten Gesetzes, at § 3a. The proposal was contested among political actors. The bill was adopted by the Bundestag, yet not the Bundesrat. See Deutscher Bundestag-Drucksachen [BT-DRS] 18/206 at 20585–20586 (Dec. 1, 2016), and Deutscher Bundestag-Drucksachen [BT-DRS] 19/532, at 544 (Dec. 12, 2016). The bill became mute when a new parliament was formed following the general elections of September 24, 2017.
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223 Id. at § 1a(2), sentence 1.
224 Id. at § 1a(2), sentence 1.
225 Id. at § 1a(2), sentence 2.
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227 Id. at § 1a(2), sentence 1.
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232 For details regarding the early stage of an asylum procedure, see supra Part III.D.
233 See AsylbLG, supra note 57, at § 2(1) (demanding that the SGB XII be applied "unabgeschont" (in an analogous manner) of claims under § 2).
234 See SGB XII, supra note 199, at § 27a(1), supra Part III.A III.
235 AsylbLG, supra note 57, at § 2(1). But see id. at § 2(2) (providing for an exception if and when asylum seekers are still housed in some form of collective accommodation).
236 Id. at § 2(1).
the rules applicable in 2016, a single person received 219 Euros (essential needs) plus 135 Euros (essential personal needs), i.e., a total of 354 Euros in cash. Accommodation and household commodities may still be provided in kind. The relevant amounts were the same in 2017 and have not been adjusted.

b. Downgraded Benefits

Downgraded benefits are meant to cover merely some of the essential needs but no essential personal needs. Downgraded benefits cover needs with respect to food, housing, and minor medical care and personal hygiene, but no needs with respect to clothing. Downgraded benefits ought to be provided in kind. Downgraded benefits are due for numerous classes of non-nationals. Downgraded benefits are due for non-nationals who are bound to leave the country (because they lack titles legalizing their stays), provided the dates for their departures are already set and departure proves possible. Moreover, downgraded benefits are due for non-nationals who are bound to

114 Id. at § 3(1), sentence 8 and § 3(2), sentence 2, as amended by Bekanntmachung, supra note 253 and by Gesetz zur Einführung beschleunigter Asylverfahren, supra note 55, art. 3.
115 Id.
116 See id. at § 3(2), sentence 4.
117 In October 2016, the federal government suggested to once more reduce the amounts due under the AsylBG. Sie Gesetzentwurf der Bundesregierung, Entwurf eines Dritten Gesetzes zur Änderung des Asylbewerberrechtsgesetzes [Bill submitted by the Federal Government: A Third Bill Amending the AsylBG], Oct. 17, 2016, BT-Drs. 18/9985 [hereinafter Entwurf eines Dritten Gesetzes]. The bill proposed to lower the regular benefits considerably for beneficiaries who were (still) accommodated in some form of collective accommodation and would, therefore, not live in a "qualifying accommodation" as defined by the RHEG 2016, supra note 252. On the characteristics of a "qualifying accommodation," see RHEG 2016, supra note 252, at § 8(1) sentence 2 and supra note 254. Under the rules suggested by the bill, a single person housed in collective accommodation would be granted 299 Euros instead of 354 Euros. Entwurf eines Dritten Gesetzes, at § 3a. The proposal was contested among political actors. The bill was adopted by the Bundesrat, yet not the Bundestag. See Deutscher Bundestag-Drucksachen [BT-Drs.] 18/206 at 20580–20581 (Dec. 1, 2016), and Deutscher Bundestag-Drucksachen [BT-Drs.] 19/552, at 344 (Dec. 12, 2016). The bill became mute when a new parliament was formed following the general elections of September 24, 2017.
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leave the country and who hamper the execution of the expulsion order, for instance, through concealing their identities. Asylum seekers do not belong to any of these classes yet rejected asylum seekers may. Asylum seekers, in an informal or formal sense, are liable for any downgraded benefits given under the AsylBG if they violate provisions requiring that they cooperate in the decision-making regarding their asylum applications, such the duty to hand papers over to the BAMF or the duty to show up for a hearing before the BAMF. Finally, downgraded benefits are owed as long as asylum seekers have not yet received a certificate of arrival issued by the responsible arrival center. The last class comprises asylum seekers at a very early stage of the procedure, namely, asylum seekers who have been registered in EASY but have not yet lodged their formal applications.

Clearly, all the classes of non-nationals given downgraded benefits have one common feature: one way or another, they do not (or might not) comply with the law. Downgraded benefits are in response to non-compliance.

c. Upgraded Benefits

Upgraded benefits are meant to cover all the elements of the subsistence minimum defined by the SGB XII on social assistance. Hence, upgraded benefits cover the whole range of the so-called socio-cultural minimum of subsistence provided under the general regime, such as food, clothing, personal hygiene, household commodities, household energy, and the quotidian personal needs, including needs with respect to participation in societal and cultural activities. Like the benefits under the general regime, the upgraded benefits under the AsylBG are due to take the form of cash transfers. Upgraded benefits are due when the beneficiaries under the AsylBG have been staying in Germany for fifteen months, without major interruption and without unduly manipulating the lengths of their stays.

122 Id. at § 1a(3).
123 Dagmar Oppermann, § 1a, marginal no. 63; AsylBG, in jurisPK-SGB XII [COMMENTARY ON SGB XII AND OTHER STATUTES] (Rainer Seibögel & Thomas Violette eds., 2nd ed. 2014).
124 AsylBG, supra note 57, at § 1a(3).
125 Id. at § 11(26), sentence 1.
126 For details regarding the early stage of an asylum procedure, see supra Part II.D.
127 See AsylBG, supra note 57, at § 2(2) (demanding that the SGB XII be applied "encompassed" (in an analogous manner) of claimants qualify under § 2).
128 See SGB XII, supra note 199, at § 27a(1), supra Part III.A.iii.
129 AsylBG, supra note 57, at § 2(1). But see id. at § 2G (providing for an exception if and when asylum seekers are still housed in some form of collective accommodation).
130 Id. at § 2(1).
IV. Differences Between the General and the Particular Regime: Why They Ought Not Exist

A. The Differences

The particular regime under the AsylbLG deviates in two significant respects from the general regime established by the SGB II and the SGB XII. The differences relate to the amounts of benefits and to their form of provision. First, if and when cash benefits are granted, the amounts granted under the AsylbLG are less than the amounts handed out under the general regime; that is even true for the regular benefit under the AsylbLG.331 For a single person, for instance, the amount provided under the AsylbLG in 2016 was about 90% of the comparable amount provided under the general regime.328 If handed out in cash,329 downgraded benefits are not meant to cover essential personal needs and clothing; apart from accommodation, downgraded benefits cover food and products for minor medical care and personal hygiene.325 In 2016, the amount due to a single person receiving downgraded benefits reached around 150 Euros,332 roughly 37% of the amount granted under the general regime (404 Euros). Second, regarding form, the benefits granted under the general regime are, as a rule, provided in cash.330 Under the AsylbLG, benefits are primarily granted in kind. If asylum seekers are obliged to stay in a reception center, all essential needs must be and all essential personal needs ought to be covered in kind.331 Downgraded benefits are, whenever feasible, to be covered in kind.332

The differences in amounts and in form raise questions under German constitutional law as well as under EU law: Are the differences compatible with Article 11(1) of the GG? Are the differences compatible with EU Directive 2011/33 and the Charter?342

328 For details on “regular benefits,” see supra Part III.B.iii.a.
329 In 2016, single persons were entitled to receive 354 Euros in cash, once they were no longer obliged to reside in a reception center. Supra text accompanying note 317 and accompanying text. Under the general regime, single persons were entitled to receive 404 Euros. SGB II and SGB IV, supra note 254 and accompanying text.
330 Under exceptional circumstances, downgraded benefits may take the form of cash transfers. See AsylbLG, supra note 57, at § Ia2(2), sentence 4.
331 See Part III.B.iii.b.
332 See RREG 2011, supra note 252, at § 5; RREG 2016, supra note 252, § 5. Calculation by the author.
333 See supra notes 246–247, and accompanying text.
334 See supra notes 313–314 and text accompanying,
335 See AsylbLG, supra note 57, at § Ia2(2), sentence 4.
336 See Part IV.B.
337 See Part IV.C.

B. The Perspective of the Grandgezet

i. Why the AsylbLG as of 2011 Undercuts Human Dignity

The main focus of the July 2012 judgment of the BVwVfG (declaring parts of the AsylbLG, as amended in 2011, unconstitutional) was on the amounts due under regular benefits.345 The BVwVfG ruled those amounts were “evidently insufficient” from the perspective of the constitutional clause on human dignity.346 When giving reasons, the court concentrated on the amounts granted (and the negligence on the side of the lawmakers).347 The purpose of the AsylbLG (to treat asylum seekers less favorably than other residents) and the differences in treatment had no place in the court’s thrust of arguments. At one point, the BVwVfG briefly noted that there were “gaps” between the amounts granted under the general and the particular regimes.348 But the court did so simply to “illustrate” the “evident insufficiency” of the benefits granted under the particular regime.349 Even so, the July 2012 judgment contains two statements that provide guidance for the assessment of the current regime established by the AsylbLG and its deviations from the general regime.

With prospective amendments to the AsylbLG in mind, the July 2012 judgment of the BVwVfG did reflect on the constitutionality of legal provisions that would treat people differently regarding their access to a state-provided subsistence minimum.350 The BVwVfG did not rule out altogether as unconstitutional that lawmakers treat certain classes of non-nationals less favorably than nationals or other defined classes of long-term residents. But less favorable treatment was tied to a test: different treatment was declared permissible by the BVwVfG if, and only if, lawmakers could show in court that the needs of the persons treated less favorably differed significantly from the needs of other persons (treated more favorably) and certain procedural requirements were met.351 In the words of the court:

If the legislature wishes to consider the particular characteristics of specific groups of individuals when determining the dignified minimum existence… it may not… differentiate across the board in light of the recipients’ residence status. Such differentiation is only possible if their need for existential

345 See supra Part III.B.ii.b.
347 Id. at marginal nos. 82–89.
348 Id. at marginal no. 88.
349 Id. at marginal no. 86.
350 Id. at marginal nos. 73–78.
351 Id. at marginal no. 73.
IV. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE GENERAL AND THE PARTICULAR REGIME: WHY THEY OUGHT NOT EXIST

A. The Differences

The particular regime under the AsylbLG deviates in two significant respects from the general regime established by the SGB II and the SGB XII. The differences relate to the amounts of benefits and to their form of provision. First, if and when cash benefits are granted, the amounts granted under the AsylbLG are less than the amounts handed out under the general regime; that is even true for the regular benefit under the AsylbLG.\(^{331}\) For a single person, for instance, the amount provided under the AsylbLG in 2016 was about 90% of the comparable amount provided under the general regime.\(^{254}\) If handed out in cash,\(^{335}\) downgraded benefits are not meant to cover essential personal needs and clothing; apart from accommodation, downgraded benefits cover food and products for minor medical care and personal hygiene.\(^{258}\) In 2016, the amount due to a single person receiving downgraded benefits reached about 150 Euros,\(^{377}\) roughly 37% of the amount granted under the general regime (404 Euros). Second, regarding form, the benefits granted under the general regime are, as a rule, provided in cash.\(^{258}\) Under the AsylbLG, benefits are primarily granted in kind. If asylum seekers are obliged to stay in a reception center, all essential needs must be and all essential personal needs ought to be covered in kind.\(^{383}\) Downgraded benefits are, whenever feasible, to be covered in kind.\(^{138}\)

The differences in amounts and in form raise questions under German constitutional law as well as under EU law: Are the differences compatible with Article 1(1) of the GG?\(^{144}\) Are the differences compatible with EU Directive 2013/33 and the Charter?\(^{242}\)
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benefits significantly deviates from that of other persons in need, and if this can be substantiated consistently based on the actual needs of this specific group, in a procedure that is transparent in terms of its content.\textsuperscript{134}

In the case of non-nationals whose stays were presumably short-term, so the court continued, the constitutionality of less favorable treatment depended "solely on whether one can comprehensively ascertain and calculate specifically lower needs precisely because of a short time of staying in the country."\textsuperscript{135} The act of ascertaining and calculating the "lower needs" of short-term residents was not conceived of as being a simple task. For the BVerfG, the task was quite a complex one, as lawmakers were asked to also consider "whether, as a result of a short-term nature of residence, lower needs are compensated for by greater needs which typically arise particularly when residence is only temporary."\textsuperscript{136} In any case, to the BVerfG assigned, lawmakers had to make sure that the subsistence minimum granted would cover physical as well as social and cultural needs.\textsuperscript{137} Even for short-term residents, the minimum was conceived of as a socio-cultural one.

The second statement of the BVerfG that is of importance here is concerned with the form of benefits intended to secure the subsistence minimum. The statement is very brief. When asserting that, under the welfare state clause of Article 20(1) of the GG, it was for the lawmakers to specify the "dignified" subsistence minimum, to set the conditions for granting the benefits, and to decide on the character and the elements of the benefits,\textsuperscript{138} the BVerfG remarked: "Whether [parliament] guarantees the [subsistence minimum] in cash, kind or services, is in principle subject to the legislature's discretion."\textsuperscript{139} The same statement is already found in the court’s February 2010 judgment.\textsuperscript{140} Obviously, the lawmakers’ leeway is conceptualized by the BVerfG as extending to the form of provision. Still, neither the July 2012 judgment nor the February 2010 judgment engaged in giving details on what the statement would imply, for the lawmakers on the one hand or for a constitutional assessment on the other.

\textsuperscript{134} Id.
\textsuperscript{135} Id. at marginal no. 74.
\textsuperscript{136} Id. at marginal no. 94.
\textsuperscript{137} Id. at marginal no. 67.
\textsuperscript{138} Id.
\textsuperscript{139} BVerfG, I BvL 1399, Feb. 9, 2010, at marginal no. 138.

\textit{ii. Why the AsylBlG Still Undercuts Human Dignity}

To build my case against the constitutionality of the current regime established under the AsylBlG, I shall first deal with the differences in the amounts of the benefits. The amounts of these benefits differ depending on whether the beneficiaries under the AsylBlG are granted regular benefits or downgraded benefits.\textsuperscript{141} Then I shall turn to the differences regarding the form of the provision of the benefits (benefits in cash versus benefits in kind).\textsuperscript{142}

\textbf{a. Differing Amounts of Benefits}

\textbf{1. Regular Benefits Under the AsylBlG}

The provisions of the AsylBlG defining the regular benefits (354 Euros for a single person in 2016 compared to 404 Euros under the general regime) violate the right to respect of human dignity under Article 1(1) of the GG if two conditions are met: First, the general regime, established by the SGB II and the SGB XII, is not so generous as to provide more than what is required by the dignity clause under Article 1(1) of the GG. Only then does a seemingly rather minor difference of 50 Euros per month possibly matter from the perspective of the human dignity clause. If the general regime is an almost exact implementation of the requirements under Article 1(1) of the GG, even a minor difference might undercuts what is demanded by the clause. Second, the difference in the amounts fails the test of constitutionality outlined by the 2012 judgment of the BVerfG regarding different, i.e., less favorable, treatment when lawmakers define what constitutes the relevant minimum.\textsuperscript{143} I strongly suggest the difference in the amounts matters, although the difference seems minor. The general regime established by the SGB II and the SGB XII is not over-generous. The parliamentary debates that followed the February 2010 judgment of the BVerfG and eventually led to a new empirically-based general regime\textsuperscript{144} give no indication whatsoever that lawmakers intended to grant more than what was demanded by the dignity clause under Article 1(1) of the GG. The majority in the Bundestag—then comprised of the Conservatives (CDU/CSU) and the Liberals (FDP)—wanted to attain the general regime to the demands of the BVerfG no more.\textsuperscript{145} And the majority

\textsuperscript{141} See Part IV B ii.a. For details regarding the amounts, see supra notes 335–337.
\textsuperscript{142} See Part IV B ii.b.
\textsuperscript{143} See BVerfG, I BvL 10/10, July 18, 2012, at marginal no. 73.
\textsuperscript{144} See supra Part III A ii.c.
\textsuperscript{145} Gesetzentwurf der Fraktionen der CDU/CSU und FDP: Entwurf eines Gesetzes zur Ermittlung von Regelbedarfen und zur Änderung des Zweiten und Zweiten Buches Sozialgesetzbuch [Bill Submitted by the Parliamentary Parties of CDU/CSU and FDP: Concerning the Determination of Regular Needs and Amending the Second and the Twelfth
benefits significantly deviates from that of other persons in need, and if this can be substantiated consistently based on the actual needs of this specific group, in a procedure that is transparent in terms of its content.\textsuperscript{139}

In the case of non-nationals whose stays were presumably short-term, so the court continued, the constitutionality of less favorable treatment depended "solely on whether one can comprehensively ascertain and calculate specifically lower needs precisely because of a short time of staying in the country."\textsuperscript{140} The act of ascertaining and calculating the "lower needs" of short-term residents was not conceived of as being a simple task. For the BunFV, the task was quite a complex one, as lawmakers were asked to also consider "whether, as a result of a short-term nature of residence, lower needs are compensated for by greater needs which typically arise particularly when residence is only temporary."\textsuperscript{141} In any case, so the BunFV asserted, lawmakers had to make sure that the subsistence minimum granted would cover physical as well as social and cultural needs.\textsuperscript{142} Even for short-term residents, the minimum was conceived of as a socio-cultural one.

The second statement of the BunFV that is of importance here is concerned with the form of benefits intended to secure the subsistence minimum. The statement is very brief. When asserting that, under the welfare state clause of Article 20(1) of the GG, it was for the lawmakers to specify the "dignified" subsistence minimum, to set the conditions for granting the benefits, and to decide on the character and the elements of the benefits,\textsuperscript{143} the BunFV remarked: "Whether parliament guarantees the subsistence minimum in cash, kind or services, is in principle subject to the legislature’s discretion."\textsuperscript{144} The same statement is already found in the court’s February 2010 judgment.\textsuperscript{145} Obviously, the lawmakers’ leeway is conceptualized by the BunFV as extending to the form of provision. Still, neither the July 2012 judgment nor the February 2010 judgment engaged in giving details on what the statement would imply, for the lawmakers on the one hand or for a constitutional assessment on the other.

\textsuperscript{139} Id.
\textsuperscript{140} Id. at marginal no. 74.
\textsuperscript{141} Id. at marginal no. 94.
\textsuperscript{142} Id. at marginal no. 67.
\textsuperscript{143} Id.
\textsuperscript{144} BunFV, 1 BvL 1/99, Feb. 9, 2010, at marginal no. 138.

ii. Why the AsylBG Still Undercuts Human Dignity

To build my case against the constitutionality of the current regime established under the AsylBG, I shall first deal with the differences in the amounts of the benefits. The amounts of these benefits differ depending on whether the beneficiaries under the AsylBG are graded regular benefits or downgraded benefits.\textsuperscript{151} Then I shall turn to the differences regarding the form of the provision of the benefits (benefits in cash versus benefits in kind).\textsuperscript{152}

a. Differing Amounts of Benefits

1. Regular Benefits Under the AsylBG

The provisions of the AsylBG defining the regular benefits (354 Euros for a single person in 2016 compared to 404 Euros under the general regime) violate the right to respect of human dignity under Article 1(1) of the GG if two conditions are met: First, the general regime, established by the SGB II and the SGB XII, is not so generous as to provide more than what is required by the dignity clause under Article 1(1) of the GG. Only then does a seemingly rather minor difference of 50 Euros per month possibly matter from the perspective of the human dignity clause. If the general regime is an almost exact implementation of the requirements under Article 1(1) of the GG, even a minor difference might underwrite what is demanded by the clause. Second, the difference in the amounts fails the test of constitutionality outlined by the 2012 judgment of the BunFV regarding different, i.e., less favorable, treatment when lawmakers define what constitutes the relevant minimum.\textsuperscript{153} I strongly suggest the difference in the amounts matters, although the difference seems minor. The general regime established by the SGB II and the SGB XII is not over-generous. The parliamentary debates that followed the February 2010 judgment of the BunFV and eventually led to a new empirically-based general regime\textsuperscript{154} gave no indication whatsoever that lawmakers intended to grant more than what was demanded by the dignity clause under Article 1(1) of the GG. The majority in the Bundestag—then comprised of the Conservatives (CDU/CSU) and the Liberals (FDP)—wanted to attain the general regime to the demands of the BunFV no more.\textsuperscript{155} And the majority

\textsuperscript{151} See BVerfG I BvL 10/10, July 18, 2012, at marginal no. 73.
\textsuperscript{152} See supra Part II.A.iii.
\textsuperscript{153} Gesetzesvorlage der Fraktionen der CDU/CSU und FDP: Entwurf eines Gesetzes zur Ermittlung von Regelforderungen und zur Änderung des Zweiten und Zwölften Buches Sozialgesetzbuch (Bill Submitted by the Parliamentary Parties of CDU/CSU and FDP: Concerning the Determination of Regular Needs and Amending the Second and the Twelfth Book of Social Law.}
\textsuperscript{154} See supra Part III.A.ii.
did so facing persistent criticism voiced by minority parties, in particular Die Linke (The Left), Bündnis 90/Die Grünen (The Greens), and the Social Democrats, contending the newly defined benefits under the general regime would fall short of what was required by the constitutional clause on human dignity.\textsuperscript{562} Political criticism during decision-making was backed by scholarly criticism soon after enactment.\textsuperscript{563} It was no wonder then that the BVerfG was, in 2012, asked again to rule on the constitutionality of the benefits provided under the general regime.\textsuperscript{564} In a July 2014 ruling,\textsuperscript{565} the BVerfG decided not to intervene in politics, although expert statements submitted to the court contended the calculation underlying the amendments to the AsylBG were flawed in many ways.\textsuperscript{566} However, important for my argument, the BVerfG signaled it had serious doubts regarding the constitutionality of the new regime. After weighing numerous arguments, the BVerfG finally held that the benefits under the general regime were, at the moment, just "derzeit noch" in line with what the constitution demanded.\textsuperscript{567} The BVerfG asked lawmakers to consider a number of adjustments.\textsuperscript{568} Against that background, the general regime cannot be considered over-generous. The general regime simply...
did so facing persistent criticism voiced by minority parties, in particular Die Linke (The Left), Bündnis 90/Die Grünen (The Greens), and the Social Democrats, contending the newly defined benefits under the general regime would fall short of what was required by the constitutional clause on human dignity. Political criticism during decision-making was backed by scholarly criticism soon after enactment. It was no wonder then that the BVerfG was, in 2012, asked again to rule on the constitutionality of the benefits provided under the general regime. In a July 2014 ruling, the BVerfG decided not to intervene in politics, although expert statements submitted to the court contended the calculations underlying the amendments to the AsylBlG were flawed in many ways. However, important for my argument, the BVerfG signaled it had serious doubts regarding the constitutionality of the new regime. After weighing numerous arguments, the BVerfG finally held that the benefits under the general regime were, at the moment, just ("derzeit noch") in line with what the constitution demanded. The BVerfG asked lawmakers to consider a number of adjustments. Against that background, the general regime cannot be considered over-generous. The general regime simply provides what was, at the time given, the subsistence minimum envisioned and guaranteed by the constitutional clause on human dignity. I equally suggest the difference in amounts (in 2016, 404 Euros under the general regime and 354 Euros under the AsylBlG) be deemed unconstitutional. I have two arguments to back my suggestion.

Regarding the methods used to translate needs into amounts of money, the July 2012 judgment of the BVerfG asserted that lawmakers, when opting to treat certain classes of non-nationals less favorably than nationals or long-term residents, were allowed to do so only if and when certain specified conditions were met. The BVerfG demanded that lawmakers, if they decided to provide lower benefits for non-nationals seeking international protection, produce evidence showing that the needs of these non-nationals were in fact different from the needs of others and that the lack of needs in one area was not outweighed by additional needs in other areas. In September 2014, when the lawmakers were eventually set to comply with the demands of the July 2012 judgment, they did not abide by the demands laid down in the judgment. The lawmakers did not even try to do so. As the lawmakers engaged in calculating the needs of non-nationals liable to the regime established by the AsylBlG, they simply relied on empirical data they had already used for the calculation of the benefits under the general regime. The only aspect the lawmakers were specifically interested in was whether the data related to needs that were, for non-nationals liable to the particular regime, covered by benefits in kind or not necessary to lead a life of dignity. Needs covered in kind or deemed irrelevant from the perspective of human dignity were discarded. In the spring of 2016, the lawmakers decided to revise some of their 2014 value judgments. Under review, a number of needs accepted as essential in the context of the general regime were additionally discarded as the
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364 See Deutscher Bundestag, supra note 361, at 8742, 8744, 8746-47 (statement by Elke Femmer, member of SPD) (statement by Gregor Gysi, member of Die Linke) (statement by Markus Kurfürst, member of Bündnis 90/Die Grünen).

365 See, e.g., Irene Becker, Bewertung der Neuregelungen des SGB II [Evaluation of the Newly Adopted Amendments to the SGB II] (2011), 5 SOZIALE SICHERHEIT [SOCIAL SECURITY] Special Issue 7-62 (Ger.) (criticizing the methods applied by the lawmakers for translating needs into amounts of money); see also Johannes Müller, Verfassungsrechtliche Bewertung des Gesetzes zur Ermittlung von Regelbedarfen und zur Änderung des Zweiten und Zweifachen Buches Sozialgesetzbuch vom 24.3.2011 – BGBl I S. 4453 [Constitutional Assessment of the Act Concerning the Determination of Regular Needs and Amending the Second and the Twelfth Book of the Social Code of Mar. 24, 2011, BGBl I 1 4453, 2011, SÖRSCH] Special Issue 62-94 (Ger.) (holding the empirical data underpinning the various calculations and the value judgments involved in determining the benefits due under the SGB II and the SGB XII were highly questionable from the perspective of the constitutional clause on human dignity).

366 The proceedings were initiated by Sozialgericht [SG] (Social Court) Berlin, Apr. 25, 1282, S 55 AS 9238/12 (Ger.), available at JURIS by subscription; SG Berlin, Apr. 25, 2012, S 55 AS 2934/11 (Ger.), available at JURIS by subscription.


368 Id. at marginal no. 53 (German version only).

369 Id. at marginal no. 73 (German version only).

370 Id. at marginal nos. 143-48 (English version) (the adjustments deemed necessary by the BVerfG relate to taking account of the effects on prices of inflation, to the needs regarding mobility, and to the varying needs of household members).
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irrelevant from the calculation underlying the AsylBlG, such as needs relating to television, computer and software, sports equipment, hobbies, or out-of-school lessons. Yet, the mere discarding of needs deemed relevant in the context of the general regime fails the method advanced by the BVerfG in its July 2012 judgment. The lawmakers’ approach leaves no room at all for factoring in additional needs non-nationals, depending on a particular regime, typically might have.

Moreover, and regarding the intentions of the lawmakers, I doubt that, in 2015 and 2016, lawmaking was about ensuring a dignified standard of living for non-nationals depending on the regime established by the AsylBlG. Between March 2015—when the amendments implementing the July 2012 judgment of the BVerfG entered into force— and the end of 2016, lawmakers moved three times to adjust the regular benefits granted under the AsylBlG: once in October 2015, once in January 2016, and once in March 2016. The first two adjustments brought small upgrades balancing inflation. In March 2016, lawmakers decided to reevaluate the needs of the beneficiaries under the AsylBlG. Regular benefits were reduced for a single person from 364 Euros to 354 Euros. In December 2016, the Bundestag adopted a bill submitted by the federal government proposing to further reduce the regular benefits for all beneficiaries under the AsylBlG who were housed in collective accommodation, a condition met by most asylum seekers even if they were no longer obliged to live in a reception center. The December 2016 proposal to further reduce the regular benefit for a single person to 290 Euros became moot after the national election of September 2017. But my argument still stands: The pendulum of politics swung when public opinion turned against the asylum policy of the ruling coalition, coinciding with popular contentions that the benefits granted under the AsylBlG would be far exceed what was granted under the general regime. In 2016, policies seemed driven by the will to appease critics, not the will to define the needs of people asking for international protection in Germany.

2. Downgraded Benefits Under the AsylBlG

The case of the downgraded benefits is special because these benefits are certainly not meant to secure the subsistence minimum guaranteed by Article 1(1) of the GG. For one, downgraded benefits are not intended to cover so-called essential personal needs (including needs pertaining to the participation in societal or cultural activities). According to the July 2012 judgment of the BVerfG, the withholding of a minimum defined in socio-cultural terms is, in general, a violation of the guarantee under Article 1(1). For another, downgraded benefits are not even intended to cover the whole range of physical needs; the need for clothing has deliberately been disregarded. With respect to downgraded benefits, the pertinent question hence is whether it is permissible under the GG that the right to be provided with a subsistence minimum be, in certain circumstances, left unfulfilled.

HANDELSBLATT (Aug. 18, 2015), http://www.handelsblatt.com/politik/international/fluechtlinge-in-europa-wie-viel-geld-bekommt-ein-fluechtling-in-europa/12199754.html. At the beginning of 2016, the focus shifted to a particular kind of expenditures, namely the expenditures for food. The debate climaxed when the Berliner Journal published an article comparing expenditures for food per day across the board of the various German Länder and across various classes of beneficiaries. See Max Wolf, Flüchtlinge erhalten Essen für 16 Euro, Hartz IV Empfänger für 4.72 Euro (Expenditures for Food Amount to 16 Euros for Refugees, Recipients of Hartz IV Transfers Need to Get Along with 4.72 Euros), BERLINER J. (Jan. 6, 2016), https://www.berliner-journal.biz/fluechtlinge-erhalten-essen-bis-16-euro-pro-tag-hartz-iv-empfaenger-mehr-4-72-euro/. The message was quickly used by right-wing parties for fundamentally criticizing the government’s policy. The right-wingers’ allegation was: German law establishes a two-tiered society when providing a subsistence minimum; German poor are treated less worthy than asylum seekers. See, e.g., Karel Meissner, Flüchtlinge erhalten doch mehr Geld als Hartz IV. Aber wieso? (Refugees Indeed Get More Money than Hartz IV recipients. How Come?), COMPACT ONLINE (Jun. 17, 2016), https://www.compact-online.de/fluethlinge-erhalten-doch-mehr-geld-als-hartz-iv-empfaenger-ab-woehnschnee.


For details on downgraded benefits under the AsylBlG, see supra Part III.B.3.b.

Id.; BVerfG, 1 BvL, 10/10, July 18, 2012, at marginal no. 94.

See supra Part III.B.3.b.
irrelevant from the calculation underlying the AsylbLG, such as needs relating to television, computer and software, sports equipment, hobbies, or out-of-school lessons. Yet, the mere discarding of needs deemed relevant in the context of the general regime fails the method advanced by the BVerfG in its July 2012 judgment. The lawmakers’ approach leaves no room at all for factoring in additional needs non-nationals, depending on a particular regime, typically might have.

Moreover, and regarding the intentions of the lawmakers, I doubt that, in 2015 and 2016, lawmaking was about ensuring a dignified standard of living for non-nationals depending on the regime established by the AsylbLG. Between March 2015—when the amendments implementing the July 2012 judgment of the BVerfG entered into force— and the end of 2016, lawmakers moved three times to adjust the regular benefits granted under the AsylbLG: once in October 2015, once in January 2016, and once in March 2016. The first two adjustments brought small upgrades balancing inflation. In March 2016, lawmakers decided to reevaluate the needs of the beneficiaries under the AsylbLG. Regular benefits were reduced for a single person from 364 Euros to 354 Euros. In December 2016, the Bundestag adopted a bill submitted by the federal government proposing to further reduce the regular benefits for all beneficiaries under the AsylbLG who were housed in collective accommodation, a condition met by most asylum seekers even if they were no longer obliged to live in a reception center. The December 2016 proposal to further reduce the regular benefit for a single person to 290 Euros became moot after the national election of September 2017. But my argument still stands: The pendulum of politics swung when public opinion turned against the asylum policy of the ruling coalition, coinciding with popular contentions that the benefits granted under the AsylbLG would by far exceed what was granted under the general regime. In 2016, policies seemed driven by the will to appease critics, not the will to define the needs of people asking for international protection in Germany.

2. Downgraded Benefits Under the AsylbLG

The case of the downgraded benefits is special because these benefits are certainly not meant to secure the subsistence minimum guaranteed by Article 1(1) of the GG. For one, downgraded benefits are not intended to cover so-called essential personal needs (including needs pertaining to the participation in societal or cultural activities). According to the July 2012 judgment of the BVerfG, the withholding of a minimum defined in socio-cultural terms is, in general, a violation of the guarantee under Article 1(1). For another, downgraded benefits are not even intended to cover the whole range of physical needs; the need for clothing has deliberately been disregarded. With respect to downgraded benefits, the pertinent question hence is whether it is permissible under the GG that the right to be provided with a subsistence minimum be, in certain circumstances, left unfulfilled.

HANDELSBLATT (Aug. 18, 2015), http://www.handelsblatt.com/politik/international/fuechtlinge-in-europa-wie-viel-geld-bekommen-ein-fuechtling-in-europa/12199754.html. At the beginning of 2016, the focus shifted to a particular kind of expenditures, namely the expenditures for food. The debate climaxed when the Berliner Journal published an article comparing expenditures for food per day across the board of the various German Länder and across various classes of beneficiaries. See Max Wolf, Flüchtlinge erhalten Essen für 16 Euro, Hartz IV Empfänger für 47,2 Euro [Expenses for Food Amount to 16 Euros for Refugees, Recipients of Hartz IV Transfers Need to Get Along with 47.2 Euros], BERLINER J. (Jan. 6, 2016), https://www.berlinerjugeblatt.de/fechlinge-erhalten-esen-bis-16-euro-pro-tag-hartz-iv-empfanger-mer-47-2-euro/ The message was quickly used by right-wingers for fundamentally criticizing the government’s policy. The right-wingers’ allegation was: German law establishes a two-tiered society when providing a subsistence minimum; German poor are treated less worthy than asylum seekers. See, e.g., Karel Meissner, Flüchtlingen erhalten doch mehr Geld als Hartz IV: Aber winzig? [Refugees Indeed Get More Money than Hartz IV recipients. How Come?], COMPACT ONLINE (Jan. 17, 2016), https://www.compact-online.de/fluechtlinge-erhalten-doch-mehr-geld-als-hartz-iv-empfanger-aber-winzig/.
I suggest the answer is this: it is doubtful that the deliberate withholding of the substantive minimum is acceptable under the GG, even in defined circumstances. Even if it were, that would not render the downgraded benefits under the AsylBBl constitutionally legitimate.

For the BVfEG, the right to be provided with a subsistence minimum under Article 1(1) of the GG is certainly not unconditional. When the BVfEG summarized, in its February 2019 judgment, the content of Article 1(1) from the perspective of the state’s duty, the sentence started with an “if.”389 The BVfEG said:

If a person does not have the material means to guarantee an existence that is in line with human dignity because he or she is unable to obtain it either out of his or her gainful employment, or from his or her own property or by benefits from third parties, the state is obligated within its mandate to protect human dignity and to ensure, in the implementation of its social-welfare state mandate, that the material prerequisites for this are at the disposal of the person in need of assistance.390

The sentence reflects a traditional characteristic of state-provided aid which has been called the “principle of subsidiarity.”391 The right to be granted aid (and the corresponding state duty) has always been conceived of as being dependent on need for help. The right was and is activated only if the individual in need is not able to provide for him or herself and does not receive help from someone else, such as a family member obliged to support or a social security provider (lack of self-help, lack of help from others).392

The flipside of the principle is, of course, that the state’s duty and the individual right are not activated if the claimant can receive income or assets to cover their needs (hence the means-test) or if the claimant is able to provide for him or herself through work.393

When the BSHG entered into force in 1962, the principle of subsidiarity was bolstered by “sanctions,” i.e., provisions allowing authorities or other institutions to withhold benefits if the claimant is able, through not wanting to resort to self-help.394 However, the tradition of deliberately withholding the minimum
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389 BVfEG, 1 BvBl 1099, Feb. 9, 2010, margin no. 134.
390 Id.
391 See supra Part III.A.iii.
392 Currently, the principle of subsidiarity is laid down in the SGB II and the SGB XII. See SGB II, supra note 200, at § 9(3); and SGB XII, supra note 199, at § 2(1).
393 See also BVfEG, 1 BvBl 275/11, July 27, 2016, at margin no. 39 (holding, under the order of the welfare state established by the GG, it is too assumed people may turn to authorities administering public aid only if they are really in need).
394 BSHG, supra note 199, at § 25 (repealed 2005); see also SGB XII, supra note 199, at § 26; § 79c; and SGB II, supra note 200, at § 71a.
395 See supra Part III.B(iii).
396 See supra Part III.B(ii).
397 In 2016 and 2017, the constitutionality of AsylBBl § 1a became contested among social courts. Some of the lower social courts ruled cases from the perspective of the
I suggest the answer is this: it is deplorable that the deliberate withholding of the substantive minimum is unacceptable under the GG, even in defined circum- mstances. Even if it were, that would not render the downgraded benefits under the AsylBGL constitutionally legitimate.

For the BVerfG, the right to be provided with a subsistence minimum under Article 1 (1) of the GG is certainly not unconditional. When the BVerfG summarised, in its February 2019 judgment, the content of Article 1 (1) from the perspective of the state’s duty, the sentence started with an “if.”

The BVerfG said:

If a person does not have the material means to guarantee an existence that is rich with dignity because he or she is unable to obtain it either out of his or her gainful employment, or from [his or her] own property or by benefits from third parties, the state is obliged within its mandate to protect human dignity and to ensure, in the implementation of its social welfare state mandate, that the material prerequisites for this are at the disposal of the person in need of assistance.

The sentence reflects a traditional concept of state-provided aid which has been termed the “principle of subsidiarity.” The right to be granted aid (and the corresponding state duty) has always been conceived of as being dependent on need for help. The right was not activated only if the individual in need is not able to provide for him or herself and does not receive help from someone else, such as a family member obliged to support or a social security provider (lack of self-help, lack of help from others).

The flipside of the principle is, of course, that the state’s duty and the individual’s right are not activated if the claimant can use income or assets to cover their needs (hence the means-test) or if the claimant is able to provide for him or herself through work.

When the BSG entered into force in 1962, the principle of subsidiarity was bolstered by “sanctions,” i.e., provisions allowing authorities to reduce or withhold benefits if the claimant is able though not willing to resort to self-help. However, the tradition of deliberately withholding the minimum


130 Currently, the principle of subsidiarity is laid down in the SGB II and the SGB XII. See SGB II, supra note 200, at § 70 (1) and SGB XII, supra note 199, at § 71 (1).

131 See supra BVerfG, 1 BVerfGl 1999, at margin no. 39 (deciding, under the order of the welfare state established by the GG, it is to be assumed people may turn to authorities administering public aid only if they are really in need).

132 BVerfG, supra note 199, at § 25 (reproduced); see also SGB XII, supra note 199, at § 26; § 31 (1); and SGB II, supra note 200, at § 31a.

133 See BVerfG, 1 BVerfGl 1999, no. 93.

134 See e.g. SGB II, supra note 200, at § 70 (1) and SGB XII, supra note 199, at § 71 (1).

pay for the services of human traffickers, a use that was publicly decried as misconduct. Against that backdrop, opting for benefits in kind meant making migration to Germany less attractive, since coming to Germany would no longer entail an income that implicated some sort of transferable value.

When opting for benefits in kind back in 1993, the lawmakers might have been responding to popular feelings. From the perspective of the constitutional clause on human dignity, opting for benefits in kind was (and still is) deeply flawed. Asylum seekers depending on the AsylG are the only class of individuals legally staying in Germany who are denied access to cash benefits intended to secure a livelihood. They are denied access to cash benefits for reasons that relate to migration policy only. Such a framework fails the test of constitutionality under Article 1(1) of the GG. The BVerfG has already said so in a different context. Moreover, the point of human dignity, under the AsylG, asylum seekers are denied what is otherwise deemed self-understood and essential to fulfill the requirements of Article 1(1) of the GG. The denial of what is, in other cases, deemed an essential element of a dignified livelihood implies necessity that the beneficiaries are denied equal worth. Denial of equal worth is a clear violation of the right to respect of human dignity.

C. The Perspective of EU Directive 2015/33 and the Charter of Fundamental Rights

i. The Framework of EU Law

EU law constitutes another backdrop for challenging the legitimacy of the particular regime established under the AsylG. Primary and secondary EU law is binding upon member states. According to case law, EU law takes precedence over national law (statutory law and constitutional law) in cases
b. Differing Forms of Benefits

In both the February 2010 judgment and the July 2012 judgment, the BVerfG concluded that the lawmakers had let sway when it came to deciding what forms the benefits meant to secure a dignified livelihood should take. The court simply stated: ‘Whether parliament guarantees the [subsistence minimum] in cash, kind or services, is in principle subject to the legislature’s discretion.’ The court’s statement seems to imply that, with respect to forms (benefits in cash versus benefits in kind), the lawmakers’ discretion is without limits. If that reading is correct, I want to object. There are good reasons for holding that granting benefits in kind may violate the right to respect of human dignity under Article 1(1), sentence 1 of the GG. Also, there are good reasons for holding that the lawmakers crossed the line when deciding that the regular benefits under the AsylbG should be provided primarily in kind. Back in 1993, when the AsylbG was adopted, German lawmakers had one reason for phrasing that regular benefits be provided primarily in kind, at least as long as asylum seekers were obliged to reside in a reception center. The lawmakers believed that providing benefits in cash served—per se—as a substantial migration pull factor. Lawmakers assumed asylum seekers came to Germany because applying for protection in Germany was well given the level of benefits, even if it was only for the time the German authorities needed to reject the claim. Moreover, handing out money meant the benefits granted could be used at will and for all sorts of purposes such as to pay for the services of human traffickers, a use that was publicly decried as misconduct. Against that backdrop, opting for benefits in kind made marking migration to Germany less attractive, since coming to Germany would no longer entail an income that implicated some sort of transferable value. When opting for benefits in kind back in 1993, the lawmakers might have been responding to popular feelings. From the perspective of the constitutional clause on human dignity, opting for benefits in kind was (and still is) deeply flawed. Asylum seekers depending on the AsylbG are the only class of individuals legally staying in Germany who are denied access to cash benefits intended to secure a livelihood. They are denied access to cash benefits for reasons that relate to migration policy only. Such a framework fails the test of constitutionality under Article 1(1) of the GG. The BVerfG has already said so in a different context. Even more to the point of human dignity, under the AsylbG, asylum seekers are denied what is otherwise deemed self-understood and essential to fulfill the requirements of Article 1(1) of the GG. The denial of what is, in other cases, deemed an essential element of a dignified livelihood implies necessarily that the beneficiaries are denied equal worth. Denial of equal worth is a clear violation of the right to respect of human dignity.

C. The Perspective of EU Directive 2015/33 and the Charter of Fundamental Rights

i. The Framework of EU Law

EU law constitutes another yardstick for challenging the legitimacy of the particular regime established under the AsylbG. Primary and secondary EU law is binding upon member states. According to case law, EU law takes precedence over national law (statutory law and constitutional law) in cases
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481 See Graumann, supra note 209, at 8.
482 See supra Part III.B.ii.a.
483 See supra Part III.B.ii.a.
484 See supra Part III.B.i
485 See supra Part III.B.i.
486 See supra Part III.B.i.
487 See supra Part III.B.i.
488 See Graumann, supra note 270; see also Statement by Norbert Zierer, F.D.P., member of the Standing Committee on European Affairs, B-PtP 2015 276 12/166, May 26, 1993, at 15996 (condemning the federal legislation for having the same legal value as the Treaty).
of conflict. In case of conflict, national law is set aside and rendered inapplicable based on the principle of supremacy of EU law. Given that EU law establishes a hierarchy of norms (primary law is hierarchically higher than secondary law), any challenge to the legitimacy of national law needs to start at the level of the more elaborated secondary law. If the national law is found to conform with the legal framework established by secondary law, it must be given to primary EU law. Secondary EU law must, in any case, be interpreted so as not to conflict with primary EU law. If a conflict cannot be resolved through an interpretation making secondary law conform with primary law, the validity of secondary law is in doubt. Secondary law contradicting primary law will be declared invalid or void by the European Court of Justice (ECJ). National courts are responsible for evaluating national laws that conform with secondary EU law, but that contradict established primary law. National courts are required to invalidate national law that contradicts primary law, for instance, EU fundamental rights. That basic structure for challenging national law or secondary EU law is echoed in the final part of the article. Under the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), the EU is authorized to adopt measures for a common European asylum system comprising, inter alia, standards concerning the conditions for the reception of applicants for asylum or subsidiary protection. When acting under Article 78(2)(f), the EU chose to adopt a directive in 2003 that was recast in 2013. The binding force of directives is specifically qualified by primary law. Member states are bound by a directive as to the result to be achieved, but they are free to choose the forms and the methods of how to achieve the results. In other words, and with a view to the German AsylbLG, the AsylbLG must comply with the directive on the standards for the reception of asylum seekers insofar as the directive curtails the member states’ discretion regarding the standards for the reception of asylum seekers, including what the directive calls the “material reception conditions,” such as housing, food, and clothing. If compliance with the directive can be ascertained, primary EU law comes into the picture. Under the framework constituted by EU law, challenging the AsylbLG therefore means to proceed in steps: First, I must establish what standards the member states are bound to grant under the EU directive. I shall show that, since the beginning of lawmaking at the EU level, member states were anxious to avoid setting standards that would effectively curb national policies vis-à-vis asylum seekers. The standards laid down by the EU directive regarding material reception conditions remain utterly vague, even in its recast version. The second step involves challenging the AsylbLG from the perspective of primary law, in particular from the perspective of the Charter. That step turns to the case law of the ECJ. Yet, even the ECJ takes a cautious stance when it comes to adjudicating on reception conditions from the perspectives

409 See, e.g., Case 26/62, Van Gerld en Loos v. Nederlandse Administratie der Belastingen, 1963 E.C.R. 4, 12; and Case 6/64, COSTA v. ENEL, 1964 E.C.R. 588, 594. The case law of the ECJ inspired Declaration no. 17. The declaration confirmed the Treaties and the law adopted by the EU, on the basis of the Treaties, have priority over the law of member states.

410 See LEXNA Woods, PHILIPPA WATSON & MARIOS COSTA, STEINER & WOODS, EU LAW (13th ed. 2017) (speaking of an “obligation to disapply inconsistent law”) (l. 1)

411 See Case C-333/13, Elisabeta Dino v. Jobcenter Leipzig, ECLI:EU:C:2014:2358, ¶ 61–62 (Nov. 11, 2014) (indicating that, in the case of judicial review, an assessment ought to start with the norms that give a more specified meaning to a general principle laid down by the Treaties, i.e., at the level of secondary law).

412 See, e.g., Case C-356/12, Wolfgang Glätzel v. Freistaat Bayern, ECLI:EU:C:2013:350, ¶ 40 (May 22, 2014). The EU turned to primary EU law (and international law) once it ascertained that the contested national law was simply implementing what was ordered by secondary EU law, thus challenging national law as well as secondary EU law.

413 See, e.g., Case C-60/11 PPU, J.N. v. Staatssecretaris voor Veiligheid en Justitie, ECLI:EU:C:2012:68, ¶ 48 (Feb. 15, 2016) (“[i]n accordance with a general principle of interpretation, an EU measure must be interpreted, as far as possible, in such a way as not to affect its validity and in conformity with primary law....” See also Case C-649/11, M.A. v. Secretary of State for the Home Department, ECLI:EU:C:2013:567, ¶ 58 (June 6, 2013) (stressing that a provision laid down by a regulation “cannot be interpreted in such a way that it disregards [a] fundamental right” enshrined in the Charter).

414 The ECI may be called to adjudicate upon the validity of secondary law under Article 267(1) of the TFEU (jurisdiction to give preliminary rulings) and under Article 265 of the TFEU (jurisdiction in actions brought by a member state, the European Parliament, the Council or the Commission on grounds of lack of competence, infringement of an essential procedural requirement, infringement of the Treaties or of any rule of law relating to their application, or misuse of power).

of conflict." In case of conflict, national law is set aside and rendered inapplicable based on the principle of supremacy of EU law. Given that EU law establishes a hierarchy of norms (primary law is hierarchically higher than secondary law), any challenge to the legitimacy of national law needs to start at the level of the more elaborated secondary law. If the national law is found to conform with the legal framework established by secondary law, regard must be given to primary EU law. Secondary EU law must, in any case, be interpreted so as not to conflict with primary EU law. If a conflict cannot be resolved through an interpretation making secondary law conform with primary law, the validity of secondary law is in doubt. Secondary law contradicting primary law will be declared invalid or void by the European Court of Justice (ECJ). National courts are responsible for evaluating national laws that conform with secondary EU law, but that contradict established primary law. National courts are required to invalidate national law that contradicts primary law, for instance, EU fundamental rights.

That basic structure for challenging national law or secondary EU law is echoed in the final part of the article. Under the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), the EU is authorized to adopt measures for a common European asylum system comprising, inter alia, standards concerning the conditions for the reception of applicants for asylum or subsidiary protection. When acting under Article 78(2)(f), the EU chose to adopt a directive in 2003 that was recasted in 2013. The binding force of directives is specifically qualified by primary law. Member states are bound by a directive as to the result to be achieved, but they are free to choose the forms and the methods of how to achieve the results. In other words, and with a view to the German AsylbLG, the AsylbLG must comply with the directive on the standards for the reception of asylum seekers insofar as the directive curtails the member states’ discretion regarding the standards for the reception of asylum seekers, including what the directive calls the “material reception conditions,” such as housing, food, and clothing. If compliance with the directive can be ascertained, primary EU law comes into the picture. Under the framework constituted by EU law, challenging the AsylbLG therefore means to proceed in steps: First, I must establish what standards the member states are bound to grant under the EU directive. I shall show that, since the beginning of lawmaking at the EU level, member states were anxious to avoid setting standards that would effectively curb national policies vis-à-vis asylum seekers. The standards laid down by the EU directive regarding material reception conditions remain utterly vague, even in its recast version. The second step involves challenging the AsylbLG from the perspective of primary EU law, in particular from the perspective of the Charter. That step turns to the case law of the ECJ. Yet, even the ECJ takes a cautious stance when it comes to adjudicating on reception conditions from the perspectives

409 See, e.g., Case 26/62, Van Gend en Loos v. Nederlandse Administratie der Belastingen, 1963 E.C.R. 4, 12; and Case 6/64, COSTA v. ENEL, 1964 E.C.R. 588, 594. The case law of the ECJ inspired Declaration no. 17. The declaration confirmed the Treaties and the law adopted by the EU, on the basis of the Treaties, have priority over the law of member states.

410 See LORNA WOODS, PHILIPPA WATSON & MARÍO COSTA, STEINER & WOODS, EU LAW 99 (13th ed. 2017) (speaking of an “oligarchy to dispel the inconsistent law lightly”) However, EU law takes precedence over national law only if the requirements for direct applicability (direct effect) are met, such as clarity of the provision, unconditionality, and lack of room for the exercise of discretion. Id. at 116.

411 See Case C-333/13, Elisabeth Duno v. Jobcenter Leipzig, ECLI:EU:C:2014:2358, ¶¶ 61–62 (Nov. 11, 2014) (indicating that, in the case of judicial review, an assessment ought to start with the norm that gives a more specified meaning to a general principle laid down by the Treaties, i.e., at the level of secondary law).

412 See, e.g., Case C-356/12, Wolfgang Glätzel v. Freistaat Bayern, ECLI:EU:C:2014:358, ¶ 40 (May 22, 2014). The EU turned to primary EU law (and interpreted the ECJ rights law) once it ascertained that the contested national law was simply implementing what was ordered by secondary EU law, thus challenging national law as well as secondary EU law.

413 See, e.g., Case C-601/15 PPU, J.N. v. Staatssecretaris voor Veiligheid en Justitie, ECLI:EU:C:2016:84, ¶ 48 (Feb. 15, 2016) (“In accordance with a general principle of interpretation, an EU measure must be interpreted, as far as possible, in such a way as not to affect its validity and in conformity with primary law . . . .” See also Case C-649/11, M.A. v. Secretary of State for the Home Department, ECLI:EU:C:2013:567, ¶ 58 (June 6, 2013) (stressing that a provision laid down by a regulation “cannot be interpreted in such a way that it disregards [a] fundamental right” enshrined in the Charter).

414 The ECJ may be called to adjudicate upon the validity of secondary EU law under Article 267(1) of the TFEU (jurisdiction to give preliminary rulings) and under Article 263 of the TFEU (jurisdiction in actions brought by a member state, the European Parliament, the Council or the Commission on grounds of lack of competence, infringement of an essential procedural requirement, infringement of the Treaties or of any rule of law relating to their application, or misuse of power).

415 See, e.g., WOODS, WATSON & COSTA, supra note 410, at 247.

416 Ulrich Karpentin, AUER Art. 267 marginal no. 109, in DAS RECHT DER EUROPÄISCHEN UNION (Eberhard Grabosz, Meinhard Hilf & Martin Nettenheim eds., 2017).

417 TFEU, supra note 20, at art. 78(2)(f).


419 Directive 2013/33, supra note 74.

420 TFEU, supra note 20, at art. 288(3).

421 Directive 2003/9, supra note 418, at art. 20 (defining the term “reception conditions” to encompass “the full set of measures that Member States grant to asylum seekers in accordance with this Directive”). “Material reception conditions” means “the reception conditions that include housing, food and clothing, provided in kind, or as financial allowances or in vouchers, and a daily expenses allowance.” Id. at 2(2). The asylum seekers’ benefits dealt with in this article match the definition of “material reception conditions” given by the directive.
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of human dignity and equality.\textsuperscript{424} In a third step, I shall argue that Directive 2013/33 will not pass the test of constitutionality when human dignity and equality are taken more seriously.\textsuperscript{425}

ii. The Background of Directive 2003/9 on Reception Standards

a. Common European Asylum System

Directive 2003/9 was “one of the building blocks of the first phase of the Common European Asylum System,”\textsuperscript{426} as outlined in the 1999 Tampere program.\textsuperscript{427} Directive 2003/9 was closely related to a number of legislative initiatives, such as initiatives determining the only member state responsible for dealing with an application for asylum, initiatives relating to asylum procedures, and initiatives concerning the standards for granting international protection (refugee status, subsidiary protection status).\textsuperscript{428} Against that political background, Directive 2003/9 on reception standards, and later Directive 2013/33, serve two main goals. One goal explicitly relates to the human dignity clause enshrined in the Charter.\textsuperscript{429} The directive “seeks to ensure full respect for human dignity.”\textsuperscript{430} More particularly, the directive seeks to define minimum standards for the reception of asylum seekers that will normally suffice to ensure them a dignified standard of living and comparable living conditions in all member states.\textsuperscript{431} Clearly, from the perspective of fundamental rights, the directive’s purpose is similar to the purpose of the SGB XII, the SGB II, and the AsylbLG.\textsuperscript{432} All these norms purport to implement a higher ranking clause on human dignity. The other goal of the directive relates to member states’ interests. The directive aims to harmonize reception conditions, and the “harmonization of conditions for the reception of asylum seekers should help to limit secondary movements of asylum seekers influenced by the variety of conditions for their reception.”\textsuperscript{433} Hence, the directive also seeks to curb secondary movements, i.e., movements prompted by differences in reception standards between member states. The rationale for wanting to dampen secondary movements was, of course, to protect member states that granted—in 2003 or 2013 respectively—higher levels of benefits than other member states, and Germany was certainly a prime candidate for a member state being affected by secondary movements.\textsuperscript{434} EU lawmakers believed that, as soon as the conditions for the reception of asylum seekers were, to some degree, harmonized, non-nationals seeking international protection would basically remain in the first country of reception, as there was nothing to gain from moving from one member state to another.

Chapter II of Directive 2003/9 and Chapter II of Directive 2013/33 contain “general provisions on reception conditions.”\textsuperscript{435} The chapters start by imposing upon member states a duty to keep asylum seekers informed about their rights and duties, inter alia, rights regarding benefits and access to legal assistance,\textsuperscript{436} and a duty to provide applicants with a document certifying their status as applicants and their right to remain in the country pending the decision-making process.\textsuperscript{437} The chapters acknowledge and preserve the power of member states with respect to deciding the residence of applicants and the restrictions on their freedom of movement. Yet, their power is not limitless.\textsuperscript{438} The chapters oblige member states to grant to minors access to schooling and education\textsuperscript{439} and, with respect to adults, to grant access to employment and vocational training.\textsuperscript{440} Finally, and more to the point of interest in the context

\textsuperscript{424} Infra Part IV.C.iv.
\textsuperscript{425} Infra Part IV.C.v.
\textsuperscript{428} Id. at ¶ 14.
\textsuperscript{429} Charter, supra note 75, at art. 1 (“Human dignity is inviolable. It must be respected and protected.”).
\textsuperscript{430} Directive 2003/9, supra note 418, at recital 5; Directive 2013/33, supra note 74, at recital 35.
\textsuperscript{431} Directive 2003/9, supra note 418, at recital 7; Directive 2013/33, supra note 74, at recital 13.
\textsuperscript{432} On the purpose underpinning the SGB XII, the SGB II, and the AsylbLG, see supra Part III.A.i and Part III.B.i.
\textsuperscript{433} Directive 2003/9, supra note 418, at recital 8; Directive 2013/33, supra note 74, at recital 12.
\textsuperscript{434} See, e.g., Commission Green Paper on the Future Common European Asylum System, at 4–5, COM (2007) 301 final (June 6, 2007). In charts showing the numbers of asylum applications per EU member state per year, Germany usually ranks highest or very high. Id. at 22–23.
\textsuperscript{435} Directive 2003/9, supra note 418, at 18, 20; see also Directive 2013/33, supra note 74 at 96, 100.
\textsuperscript{436} Directive 2003/9, supra note 418, at art. 5; later Directive 2013/33, supra note 74 at art. 5.
\textsuperscript{437} Directive 2003/9, supra note 418, at art. 6; later Directive 2013/33, supra note 74 at art. 6.
\textsuperscript{438} Directive 2003/9, supra note 418, at art. 7; later Directive 2013/33, supra note 74 at arts. 7–11.
\textsuperscript{439} Directive 2003/9, supra note 418, at art. 10; later Directive 2013/33, supra note 74 at art. 14.
\textsuperscript{440} Directive 2003/9, supra note 418, at arts. 11–12; Directive 2013/33, supra note 74, at arts. 15–16. With respect to access to employment, member states are given some leeway. Member states may “determine a period of time, starting from the date on which an
of human dignity and equality. In a third step, I shall argue that Directive 2013/33 will not pass the test of constitutionality when human dignity and equality are taken more seriously.

ii. The Background of Directive 2003/9 on Reception Standards

a. Common European Asylum System

Directive 2003/9 was "one of the building blocks of the first phase of the Common European Asylum System," as outlined in the 1999 Tampere program. Directive 2003/9 was closely related to a number of legislative initiatives, such as initiatives determining the only member state responsible for dealing with an application for asylum, initiatives relating to asylum procedures, and initiatives concerning the standards for granting international protection (refugee status, subsidiary protection status). Against that political background, Directive 2003/9 on reception standards, and later Directive 2013/33, serve two main goals. One goal explicitly relates to the human dignity clause enshrined in the Charter. The directive "seeks to ensure full respect for human dignity." More particularly, the directive seeks to define minimum standards for the reception of asylum seekers that will normally suffice to ensure them a dignified standard of living and comparable living conditions in all member states. Clearly, from the perspective of fundamental rights, the directive's purpose is similar to the purpose of the SGB XII, the SGB II, and the AsylbLG. All these norms purport to implement a higher ranking clause on human dignity. The other goal of the directive relates to member states' interests. The directive aims to harmonize reception conditions, and the "harmonization of conditions for the reception of asylum seekers should help to limit secondary movements of asylum seekers influenced by the variety of conditions for their reception." Hence, the directive also seeks to curb secondary movements, i.e., movements prompted by differences in reception standards between member states. The rationale for wanting to dampen secondary movements was, of course, to protect member states that granted—in 2003 or 2013 respectively—higher levels of benefits than other member states, and Germany was certainly a prime candidate for a member state being affected by secondary movements. EU lawmakers believed that, as soon as the conditions for the reception of asylum seekers were, to some degree, harmonized, non-nationals seeking international protection would basically remain in the first country of reception, as there was nothing to gain from moving from one member state to another.

Chapter II of Directive 2003/9 and Chapter II of Directive 2013/33 contain "general provisions on reception conditions." The chapters start by imposing upon member states a duty to keep asylum seekers informed about their rights and duties, inter alia, rights regarding benefits and access to legal assistance, and a duty to provide applicants with a document certifying their status as applicants and their right to remain in the country pending the decision-making process. The chapters acknowledge and preserve the power of member states with respect to deciding the residence of applicants and the restrictions on their freedom of movement. Yet, their power is not limitless. The chapters oblige member states to grant to minors access to schooling and, with respect to adults, to grant access to employment and vocational training. Finally, and more to the point of interest in the context
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of a state-provided subsistence minimum, the chapters contain "general rules on material reception conditions and health care," including an article on the "modalities for material reception conditions" focusing on the standards member states are supposed to keep when providing housing.\textsuperscript{422}

b. Discontent and Critique

Under Directive 2003/9, the European Commission (the Commission) was obliged to evaluate the implementation and the effects of the directive.\textsuperscript{421} When the Commission did so in 2001,\textsuperscript{422} it unreservedly expressed discontent. One point of concern was the scope of the directive’s application. Many member states had taken the position that the directive would not apply to detention centers.\textsuperscript{423} Also, member states had failed to comply with their obligation to provide applicants with proper documents\textsuperscript{424} to provide adequate means of subsistence, in particular where asylum seekers were given benefits in cash.\textsuperscript{425} In many instances, the allowances granted were deemed too low to cover subsistence.\textsuperscript{426} Another “main deficiency” in the application of the directive, so the Commission stressed, related to the identifying and

\textsuperscript{421} Directive 2005/9, supra note 418, at art. 13(1). See also Directive 2001/30, supra note 25, at art. 4(3) (prohibiting the transfer of the number of states in terms of time (more months from the date when the application was lodged if a first instance decision has not been taken and the delay cannot be attributed to the applicant)).


\textsuperscript{423} Directive 2005/9, supra note 418, at arts. 17-20; Directive 2005/9, supra note 418, at art. 13(1).

\textsuperscript{424} Compete of the European Communities, supra note 629.

\textsuperscript{425} Id. at 3 (comparing that “at least seven Member States (UK, BE, IT, NL, PL, LU, CY) do not apply the (Directive) in detention centers; other Member States (e.g., AT) do not apply it in transfer centers”). The European Commission objected quite vigorously to that practice: “As the Directive does not allow for exceptions . . . its provisions apply to all types of reception, including detention centers.” Id.

\textsuperscript{426} Id. at 4.

\textsuperscript{427} Id. at 6.

The main problems concerning application of the Directive were discovered in Member States where asylum seekers are given financial allowances, which are insufficient to accommodate subsistence (C, FR, EE, AT, PT, SI). The amounts are only rarely commensurate with the minimum social support granted to nationals, and even when they are, they might still be insufficient, as asylum seekers lack family and/or other informal kind of support.

\textsuperscript{422} Id. at 9.

\textsuperscript{423} See, e.g., id. at 7 (“Given the broad discretion of Member States in limiting the right to free movement and residence, no substantial problems in application of the pertinent provisions were reported.”)

\textsuperscript{424} Id. at 10 (conclusion).


\textsuperscript{426} Id. at 4.

\textsuperscript{427} Id. at 6.
of a state-provided subsistence minimum, the chapters contain "general rules on material reception conditions and health care," including an article on the "modalities for material reception conditions" focusing on the standards member states are supposed to keep when providing housing.\textsuperscript{442}

b. Discontent and Critique

Under Directive 2003/9, the European Commission (the Commission) was obliged to evaluate the implementation and the effects of the directive.\textsuperscript{443} When the Commission did so in 2003,\textsuperscript{444} it unremittingly expressed discontent. One point of concern was the scope of the directive’s application. Many member states had taken the position that the directive would not apply to detention centers.\textsuperscript{445} Also, member states had failed to comply with their obligation to provide applicants with proper documents\textsuperscript{446} or to provide adequate means of subsistence, in particular where asylum seekers were given benefits in cash.\textsuperscript{447} In many instances, the allowances granted were deemed too low to cover subsistence.\textsuperscript{448} Another "main deficiency" in the application of the directive, so the Commission stressed, related to the identifying and

addressing the needs of vulnerable persons.\textsuperscript{449} Yet another concern was the directive’s lack of clear guidance regarding standards. Time and again, the Commission stated that, with respect to a particular duty under review, it had not been able to detect substantial problems, but added that was mainly due to the broad discretion left to the member states.\textsuperscript{450} When reflecting on the shortcomings of the directive more generally, the Commission strongly advocated against the breadth of discretionary powers left to the member states.\textsuperscript{451} That, the Commission concluded, created a major problem from the perspective of the directive’s overall goals:

[The] wide discretion allowed by the Directive in a number of areas, notably in regard to access to employment, health care, level and form of material reception conditions, free movement rights and needs of vulnerable persons, undermines the objective of creating a level playing field in the area of reception conditions.\textsuperscript{452}

Hence, when proposing to recast the directive, the Commission resolutely moved to limit the states’ discretion in several respects.\textsuperscript{453} The catalyzer of the 2008 proposal was to "ensure higher standards of treatment for asylum seekers with regard to reception conditions that would guarantee a dignified standard of living" and to intensify the "harmonization of national rules on reception conditions" in order to "limit the phenomenon of secondary movements."\textsuperscript{454} The main goals had not changed; the proposal for recast was still about ensuring a dignified standard of living and thwarting secondary movements caused by varying reception conditions. The target of the Commission’s quest for renewal was the legal framework under EU law meant to further the goals. The existing framework under Directive 2003/9 was deemed inadequate. The 2008 proposal suggested introducing new rules governing the detention of asylum seekers or the rights of persons with special needs.\textsuperscript{455} The proposal also addressed other critical issues, such as the scope of the

442 Id at 9.
443 See, eg, id at 7 ("Givens the broad discretion of Member States in limiting the right to free movement and residence, no substantial problems in application of the pertinent provisions were reported.").
444 Id at 10 (conclusion).
446 Id at 4.
447 Id at 6.
directives, the rules on the access to the labor market, and the material reception conditions.\textsuperscript{406} Eventually, the Commission succeeded in pulling through with new provisions regarding detainees and persons with special needs.\textsuperscript{407} The Commission was less successful when it came to raising and harmonizing the standards for the material reception conditions, that is, the conditions pertaining to, inter alia, housing, food, and clothing—the core of a person's livelihood.

iii. Material Reception Conditions Recap: Reluctant Lawmakers

a. First Initiative

The Commission's 2008 proposal for a recast started from the assumption that "the lack of clear benchmarks regarding the level and form of material reception conditions that should be available to asylum seekers has led to cases where asylum seekers are left in poverty.\textsuperscript{408} The differences in conditions of reception between member states were deemed "so big ... that they [were] not limiting secondary movements of asylum seekers who look[ed] for a more adequate level of support during the asylum procedure."\textsuperscript{409} These movements, so the Commission continued, would increase the burden of member states, which were willing to offer generous reception facilities.\textsuperscript{410} That, again, might then induce these more burdened member states to lower their standards to avoid a possible increase in asylum applications in their territory.\textsuperscript{411} Against that background, the 2008 proposal of the Commission suggested specifying, at least to some extent, the notion of human dignity— the overarching standard underpinning the directive—by inserting a benchmark, with the clear aim of establishing at the EU level a harmonised standard that would be higher than the one prevailing in many member states.\textsuperscript{412} The Commission's attention was primarily on the level, and to some extent on the form, of the material reception conditions, in particular, the level of cash transfers.\textsuperscript{413} As some of the practical concerns were, according to the Commission,
The Commission's 2008 proposal for recast started from the assumption that "the lack of clear benchmarks regarding the level and form of material reception conditions that should be available to asylum seekers has led to cases where asylum seekers are left in poverty."483 The differences in conditions of reception between member states were deemed "so big... that they were not limiting secondary movements of asylum seekers who look[ed] for a more adequate level of support during the asylum procedure."484 These movements, so the Commission continued, would increase the burden of member states, which were willing to offer generous reception facilities.485 That, again, might then induce these more burdened member states to lower their standards to avoid a possible increase in asylum applications in their territories.486 Against that background, the 2008 proposal of the Commission suggested specifying, at least to some extent, the notion of human dignity—the overarching standard underpinning the directive—by inserting a benchmark, with the clear aim of establishing at the EU level a harmonised standard that would be higher than the one prevailing in many member states.487 The Commission's attention was primarily on the level, and to some extent on the form, of the material reception conditions, in particular, the level of cash transfers.488 As some of the practical concerns were, according to the Commission,

483 Id at 45.
486 Id at 22.
487 Id.
488 Id.
489 See generally Proposal, supra note 455, at 4 ("The main objective of this proposal is... to ensure higher standards of treatment for asylum seekers with regard to reception conditions that would generate a dignified standard of living.").
Parliament was willing to go along with the idea that, regarding material reception conditions, asylum seekers and nationals should—as a rule—receive equal treatment. In its legislative resolution of May 7, 2009, the European Parliament insisted on deleting all references to the benchmark proposed by the Commission. All amendments adopted by the European Parliament simply rephrased what Directive 2003/99 said regarding reception conditions. When the members of the Council of the EU also raised numerous objections against Draft Article 17, which was the end of the Commission’s (first) initiative.

b. Second Initiative

In the summer of 2011, the European Commission launched an amended proposal for recasting Directive 2003/99. Regarding material reception conditions, the Commission dropped the idea of prescribing equal treatment with nationals, as political resistance was deemed too strong. Yet, the Commission still held that a reference to benchmarks was needed, even though it could and should be done in a more flexible manner. According to the amended 2011 proposal, Draft Article 17(5) was now supposed to read:

Where Member States provide material reception conditions in the form of financial allowances and vouchers, the amount thereof shall be determined on the basis of the point(s) of

reference established by the Member State concerned either by law or practice to ensure adequate standards of living for nationals, such as the minimum level of social welfare assistance. Member States may grant less favourable treatment to asylum applicants compared to nationals in this respect, where it is duly justified.

The 2011 version of Article 17(5) referred vaguely to “point(s)” of reference determined under national law, openly implying there could be more than one point of reference. But that was not the only concession signaled by the wording of the new Draft Article 17(5). There were other signals too. The reference in Draft Article 17(5) to the “minimum level of social welfare assistance” was now meant to be no more than an example, leaving room for member states to opt for other points of reference. Moreover, the relevant amounts were proposed to be determined simply “on the basis” of those “points,” implicitly that the connection between the nationally defined points of reference and the amount thus granted to asylum seekers was not intended to be too tight. However, the text still preferred equal treatment over different treatment. “Less favourable treatment” was deemed legitimate only if it was “duly justified.”

The 2011 proposal was, again, met with resistance by the Council. According to the political compromise reached in October 2012, Draft Article 17(5) on material reception conditions was proposed to read:

Where Member States provide material reception conditions in the form of financial allowances and vouchers, the amount thereof shall be determined on the basis of the level(s) established by the Member State concerned either by law or practice to ensure adequate standards of living for nationals. Member States may grant less favourable treatment to asylum seekers compared to nationals in this respect, in particular where material support is partially provided in kind or where the above-mentioned level(s), applied to nationals, aim to ensure a

-------------------

476 Id. at 500, 359.
479 Id. at 1 (responding, with respect to healthcare, “The proposal does not include reference to equal treatment with nationals concerning access to health care, taking none of the positions of the European Parliament and strong reservations in the Council.”).
480 Id. The Commission reminded lawmakers that an evaluation of the implementation of Directive 2003/99 had revealed deficiencies, in particular with regard to the level of material support, and then continued: Although the current Directive stipulates the obligation of ensuring adequate standards of treatment, it has been difficult in practice to define the required level of support. It is therefore necessary to introduce points of reference that could better ‘quantify’ this obligation and can also be effectively applied by national administrations.

481 Id. at 20.
483 "U.S." from Note from the General Secretariat of the Council, COUNCIL DOC. 14132/12 REV 3 (Sept. 27, 2012).
Parliament was willing to go along with the idea that, regarding material reception conditions, asylum seekers and nationals should—as a rule—receive equal treatment. In its legislative resolution of May 7, 2009,475 the European Parliament insisted on deleting all references to the benchmark proposed by the Commission.476 All amendments adopted by the European Parliament simply restated what Directive 2003/95 said regarding reception conditions. When the members of the Council of the EU also raised numerous objections against draft Article 17,477 that was the end of the Commission’s (first) initiative.

b. Second Initiative

In the summer of 2011, the European Commission launched an amended proposal for recasting Directive 2003/95.478 Regarding material reception conditions, the Commission dropped the idea of prescribing equal treatment with nationals, as political resistance was deemed too strong.479 Yet, the Commission still held that a reference to benchmarks was needed, even though it could and should be done in a more flexible manner.480 According to the amended 2011 proposal, Draft Article 17(5) was now supposed to read:

Where Member States provide material reception conditions in the form of financial allowances and vouchers, the amount thereof shall be determined on the basis of the point(s) of

reference established by the Member State concerned either by law or practice to ensure adequate standards of living for nationals, such as the minimum level of social welfare assistance. Member States may grant less favourable treatment to asylum applicants compared to nationals in this respect, where it is duly justified.481

The 2011 version of Article 17(5) referred vaguely to "point(s)" of reference determined under national law, openly implying there could be more than one point of reference. But that was not the only concession signaled by the wording of the new Draft Article 17(5). There were other signals too. The reference in Draft Article 17(5) to the “minimum level of social welfare assistance” was now meant to be no more than an example, leaving room for member states to opt for other points of reference. Moreover, the relevant amounts were proposed to be determined simply “on the basis” of those “points,” implicating that the connection between the nationally defined points of reference and the amount thus granted to asylum seekers was not intended to be too tight. However, the text still preferred equal treatment over different treatment. "Less favourable treatment" was deemed legitimate only if it was "duly justified."

The 2011 proposal was, again, met with resistance by the Council.482 According to the political compromise reached in October 2012,483 Draft Article 17(5) on material reception conditions was proposed to read:

Where Member States provide material reception conditions in the form of financial allowances and vouchers, the amount thereof shall be determined on the basis of the level(s) established by the Member State concerned either by law or practice to ensure adequate standards of living for nationals. Member States may grant less favourable treatment to asylum seekers compared to nationals in this respect, in particular where material support is partially provided in kind or where the above-mentioned level(s), applied to nationals, aim to ensure a

479 Id. at 7 (noting, with respect to healthcare, "the proposal does not include reference to equal treatment with nationals concerning access to health care, taking note of the position of the European Parliament and strong reservations in the Council.").
480 Id. The Commission reminded lawmakers that an evaluation of the implementation of Directive 2003/95 had revealed deficiencies, in particular with regard to the level of material support, and thus continued:

Although the current Directive stipulated the obligation of ensuring adequate standards of treatment, it has been difficult in practice to define the required level of support. It is therefore necessary to introduce points of reference that could better 'quantify' this obligation and can also be effectively applied by national administrations.
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standard of living higher than what is prescribed for asylum seekers under this Directive.\footnote{Id. at 43.}

c. Outcome of Initiatives


When compared to the wording of the clause proposed by the Commission in 2008,\footnote{See Proposal, \textit{supra} note 453.} the standards have been watered down considerably. Most importantly, the discretion of member states has been restored. Regarding form of provision, the 2008 proposal had some leaning towards cash transfers.\footnote{See id. \textit{supra} note 43. See id. \textit{at} art. 17(5).}

Under Directive 2013/33, member states may choose freely among all options concerning the form of benefits (in kind, in cash, in the form of vouchers, or a combination of all these forms). The restoration of the member states’ discretion is even more palpable with respect to the level of material reception conditions. Regarding the level, the 2008 proposal opted for the introduction of a straightforward benchmark based on the idea of equality between nationals and non-nationals.\footnote{See Proposal, \textit{supra} note 453. See id. \textit{supra} note 43. See id. \textit{at} art. 17(5).}

Under the proposal, the amount of benefits granted to non-nationals seeking protection was supposed to be equivalent to the amount granted to nationals, different treatment needed to be duly justified.\footnote{Id. \textit{supra} note 453. See \textit{ibid.} \textit{at} art. 17(5).}

The current wording of the clause on material reception standards embodies a compromise that somehow still upholds the original idea of setting a benchmark in the first sentence, but rejects the idea in the second sentence.\footnote{See \textit{ibid.} \textit{supra} note 453. See \textit{ibid.} \textit{at} art. 17(5).}

The original idea was to curtail the member states’ discretion with respect to defining material reception conditions by prescribing a defined standard, namely the standard applicable to the nationals of the member states under their respective regimes.\footnote{See \textit{ibid.} \textit{supra} note 453, at art. 17(5).}

The first sentence of Article 17(5) is at least reminiscent of that idea, even though it speaks rather vaguely of “levels.”\footnote{See, e.g., \textit{Outcome of Proceedings}, submitted by the Asylum Working Party, COUNCIL DOC. 1478/11, at 45 (Oct. 12, 2011) (listing numerous reservations put forward by the member states). Slovenia remained critical until the very end of the negotiations. See Addendum to the “I/A” Item Note from the General Secretariat of the Council, COUNCIL DOC. 10183/13 ADD 1 (May 31, 2013) (claiming non-nationals seeking international protection should not be subject to any material reception conditions provided for in the directive).}

The second sentence explicitly allows member states to deviate from that standard, without giving any guidance regarding the prerequisites for deviation or the standards that should still be observed in that case. The directive simply gives two examples of deviation that are seemingly accepted as legitimate. Deviation seems legitimate when member states resort to provision in kind and when the standards applicable to nationals surmount the standards established by the directive. Regarding the former case, the directive gives no indication on how benefits in kind and benefits in cash ought to be offset against each other. What sort of benefits in kind suffice and to what extent do they justify the lowering of the amount of cash benefits? The latter example is even more irritating. If the standards applicable to nationals do not serve as standards under the directive, the standards under the directive remain undetermined. In particular, courts are not provided with a yardstick for holding that a member state’s law is in conflict with the directive because the standards applicable to the nationals of that member state are in fact not higher than the standards under the directive. Member states still decide freely on all relevant standards, just as some member states sitting in the Council wanted it to be.\footnote{See \textit{ibid.} \textit{supra} note 453, at art. 17(5).}

The Commission’s main concern\footnote{See \textit{supra} Part IV.C ii.b.} is left unresolved.

The outcome of the proceedings leading up to the adoption of Directive 2013/33 is \textit{prima facie} good news for the German lawmakers wondering whether the AsylbLG is legitimate under Directive 2013/13. Neither the lawmakers’ preference for benefits in kind nor the level of the regular benefits under the AsylbLG, or even the downgraded benefits, can be challenged under the directive’s thin standards. I am bound to rephrase the sort of comment given by the Commission in 2007 when evaluating the regime established under Directive 2003/9.\footnote{See Comm’n of the European Communities, \textit{supra} note 426, at 7.}

Due to the considerable flexibility of the directive’s clause on material reception standards, no major problems occur with respect to the German AsylbLG. However, the meager outcome of the Commission’s
standard of living higher than what is prescribed for asylum seekers under this Directive.\footnote{Id. at 43.}

c. Outcome of Initiatives


When compared to the wording of the clause proposed by the Commission in 2008,\footnote{See Proposal, supra note 453.} the standards have been watered down considerably. Most importantly, the discretion of member states has been restored. Regarding form of provision, the 2008 proposal had some leaning towards cash transfers.\footnote{See id.}

Under Directive 2013/33, member states may choose freely among all options concerning the form of benefits (in kind, in cash, in the form of vouchers, or a combination of all these forms). The restoration of the member states’ discretion is even more palpable with respect to the level of material reception conditions. Regarding the level, the 2008 proposal opted for the introduction of a straightforward benchmark based on the idea of equality between nationals and non-nationals.\footnote{See id. at art. 17(5).}

Under the proposal, the amount of benefits granted to non-nationals seeking protection was supposed to be equivalent to the amount granted to nationals; different treatment needed to be duly justified.\footnote{Id.}

The current wording of the clause on material reception standards embodies a compromise that somehow still upholds the original idea of setting a benchmark in the first sentence, but rejects the idea in the second sentence.\footnote{See Directive 2013/33, supra note 74, at art. 17(5).}

Where Member States provide material reception conditions in the form of financial allowances or vouchers, the amount thereof shall be determined on the basis of the level(s) established by the Member State concerned either by law or by the practice to ensure adequate standards of living for nationals. Member States may grant less favourable treatment to applicants compared with nationals in this respect, in particular where material support is partially provided in kind or where those level(s), applied for nationals, aim to ensure a standard of living higher than that prescribed for applicants under this Directive.

The original idea was to curtail the member states’ discretion with respect to defining material reception conditions by prescribing a defined standard, namely the standard applicable to the nationals of the member states under their respective regimes.\footnote{See Proposal, supra note 453, at art. 17(5).}

The first sentence of Article 17(5) is at least reminiscent of that idea, even though it speaks rather vaguely of “levels.” The second sentence explicitly allows member states to deviate from that standard, without giving any guidance regarding the prerequisites for deviation or the standards that should still be observed in that case. The directive simply gives two examples of deviation that are seemingly accepted as legitimate. Deviation seems legitimate when member states resort to provision in kind and when the standards applicable to nationals surmount the standards established by the directive. Regarding the former case, the directive gives no indication on how benefits in kind and benefits in cash ought to be offset against each other. What sort of benefits in kind suffice and to what extent do they justify the lowering of the amount of cash benefits? The latter example is even more irritating. If the standards applicable to nationals do not serve as standards under the directive, the standards under the directive remain undetermined. In particular, courts are not provided with a yardstick for holding that a member state’s law is in conflict with the directive because the standards applicable to the nationals of that member state are in fact not higher than the standards under the directive. Member states still decide freely on all relevant standards, just as some member states sitting in the Council wanted it to be.\footnote{See supra Part IV.C.II.b.}

The Commission’s main concern\footnote{See Commit of the European Communities, supra note 426, at 7.} is left unresolved.

The outcome of the proceedings leading up to the adoption of Directive 2013/33 is prima facie good news for the German lawmakers wondering whether the AsylbLG is legitimate under Directive 2013/13. Neither the lawmakers’ preference for benefits in kind nor the level of the regular benefits under the AsylbLG, or even the downgraded benefits, can be challenged under the directive’s thin standards. I am bound to rehearse the sort of comment given by the Commission in 2007 when evaluating the regime established under Directive 2003/9.\footnote{See supra note 453.}

Due to the considerable flexibility of the directive’s clause on material reception standards, no major problems occur with respect to the German AsylbLG. However, the meager outcome of the Commission’s
initiatives begs the question of how the clause on material reception standards under Directive 2013/33 is to be judged when measured against primary EU law: is the clause in line with the Charter? The answer to that question must have due regard to the case law of the ECJ. The final judgment regarding the validity of secondary EU law is in the hands of the justices of the EU.

iv. Material Reception Conditions: Cautious Justices

a. The Role of the European Court of Justice

Under the TEU, the ECJ “shall ensure that in the interpretation and application of the Treaties the law is observed.” That power implies, in the understanding of the court, the mandate to ensure that all secondary acts of EU law, such as regulations, directives, or decisions, are in accordance with primary law, in particular, the treaties, the Charter, and the ECHR as general principles of EU law. In case of conflict, the court may declare secondary EU law to be invalid or void. Yet, in order to preserve existing secondary law, the court often resorts to an interpretation that renders the legal act under scrutiny consistent with primary law, e.g., consistent with the rights recognized by the Charter. When doing so, the court serves as a supplementary lawmaker.

So far, the number of ECJ judgments that touch upon issues relating to the material reception conditions of asylum seekers is rather small. Also, the cases indicate that the court is reluctant to intervene in the political quarrels underpinning Directive 2003/9 and Directive 2013/33, either as a secondary lawmaker or as a court empowered to strike down secondary law. The right to respect of human dignity and the right to equality have been considered relevant to the cases, but the court remained cautious with respect to defining more robust standards which would then bind member states when determining benefits for asylum seekers.

b. The Court’s Approaches to Human Dignity

1. Cimade and GISTI

In Cimade and Groupe d’information et de soutien des immigrants (GISTI), the ECJ was asked, inter alia, whether Directive 2003/9 (later superseded by Directive 2013/33) mandated member states to guarantee minimum reception conditions even in cases where a member state had requested another member state under the Dublin System to take back the asylum seeker because the other member state was deemed responsible for processing and determining the application for asylum. Under French law, asylum seekers liable to the Dublin System were explicitly excluded from the subsistence benefit generally payable to asylum seekers pending decision-making. The benefits granted to them were even less favorable than the benefits granted to asylum seekers.

Before the ECJ, France denied having any responsibilities regarding the material reception conditions under Directive 2003/9 and asserted the transfer to the responsible member state would be swift. Pending the transfer, so the French government contended, France would be free to legislate at will regarding the benefits granted.

Advocate General Eleanor Sharpston rejected all of France’s arguments denying responsibility under Directive 2003/9 and then turned to the legitimacy of reduced benefits. The take of the advocate general was quite straight: “It cannot . . . be permissible to provide the asylum seekers in question with a reduced level of benefits.” When making her argument, Eleanor Sharpston relied on the dignity clause of the Charter of Fundamental Rights.

---
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initiatives begs the question of how the clause on material reception standards under Directive 2013/33 is to be judged when measured against primary EU law: is the clause in line with the Charter? The answer to that question must have due regard to the case law of the ECJ. The final judgment regarding the validity of secondary EU law is in the hands of the justices of the EU.

iv. Material Reception Conditions: Cautious Justices

a. The Role of the European Court of Justice

Under the TEU, the ECJ “shall ensure that in the interpretation and application of the Treaties the law is observed.” That power implies, in the understanding of the court, the mandate to ensure that all secondary acts of EU law, such as regulations, directives, or decisions, are in accordance with primary law, in particular, the treaties, the Charter, and the ECtHR as general principles of EU law. In case of conflict, the court may declare secondary EU law to be invalid or void. Yet, in order to preserve existing secondary law, the court often resorts to an interpretation that renders the legal act under scrutiny consistent with primary law, e.g., consistent with the rights recognized by the Charter. When doing so, the court serves as a supplementary lawmaker.

So far, the number of ECJ judgments that touch upon issues relating to the material reception conditions of asylum seekers is rather small. Also, the cases indicate that the court is reluctant to intervene in the political quarrels underpinning Directive 2003/9 and Directive 2013/33, either as a secondary lawmaker or as a court empowered to strike down secondary law. The right to respect of human dignity and the right to equality have been considered relevant to the cases, but the court remained cautious with respect to defining more robust standards which would bind member states when determining benefits for asylum seekers.
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b. The Court’s Approaches to Human Dignity

1. Cindase and GISTI

In Cindase and Groupe d’information et de soutien des immigrés (GISTI), the ECJ was asked, inter alia, whether Directive 2003/9 (later superseded by Directive 2013/33) mandated member states to guarantee minimum reception conditions even in cases where a member state had requested another member state under the Dublin System to take back the asylum seeker because the other member state was deemed responsible for processing and determining the application for asylum. Under French law, asylum seekers liable to the Dublin System were explicitly excluded from the subsistence benefit generally payable to asylum seekers pending decision-making. The benefits granted to them were even less favorable than the benefits granted to asylum seekers. Before the ECJ, France denied having any responsibilities regarding the material reception conditions under Directive 2003/9 and asserted the transfer to the responsible member state would be swift. Pending the transfer, so the French government contended, France would be free to legislate at will regarding the benefits granted.

Advocate General Eleanor Sharpston rejected all of France’s arguments denying responsibility under Directive 2003/9 and then turned to the legitimacy of reduced benefits. The take of the advocate general was quite straight: “It cannot . . . be permissible to provide the asylum seekers in question with a reduced level of benefits.” When making her argument, Eleanor Sharpston relied on the dignity clause of the Charter of Fundamental
Fredericks quoted in the recitals of Directive 2003/9. The advocate general held: "(The standards laid down by Directive 2003/9) are minimum standards that should apply throughout the Union in order to reflect the requirements of inter alia, Article 1 of the Charter that human dignity be respected and protected." When the ECI delivered its judgment, the court concentrated on whether the directive was applicable to asylum seekers liable to be returned to another member state under the Dublin System, which was France’s major concern. The legitimacy of reduced levels of benefits was not addressed. The court briefly referred to the dignity clause of the Charter and concluded:

Thus, those requirements (i.e., the requirements laid down by Directive 2003/9) apply not only with regard to asylum seekers present in the territory of the Member State responsible pending that State’s decision on their application for asylum but also to asylum seekers awaiting a decision on which Member State will be responsible for their application.

That statement certainly sufficed to reject France’s arguments in the case. But the court provides little help for assessing the measures (i.e., less favorable treatment) France had applied vis-à-vis a defined class of asylum seekers (asylum seekers liable to the Dublin System). In the court’s judgment, there is no reference to less favorable treatment, to standards, or to minimum applicable to all.

2. Saciri et al.

In Saciri et al., the ECI was asked to adjudicate on the standards applicable under Directive 2003/9 in case a member state (Belgium) decided to provide the material support in the form of cash transfers.

---
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 Freedoms quoted in the recitals of Directive 2003/9. The advocate general held: "[The standards laid down by Directive 2003/9] are minimum standards that should apply throughout the Union in order to reflect the requirements of, inter alia, Article 1 of the Charter that human dignity be respected and protected." When the ECI delivered its judgment, the court concentrated on whether the directive was applicable to asylum seekers liable to be returned to another member state under the Dublin System, which was France’s major concern. The legitimacy of reduced levels of benefits was not addressed. The court briefly referred to the dignity clause of the Charter and concluded:

Thus, those requirements [i.e., the requirements laid down by Directive 2003/9] apply not only with regard to asylum seekers present in the territory of the Member State responsible pending that State’s decision on their application for asylum but also to asylum seekers awaiting a decision on which Member State will be held responsible for their application.

That statement certainly sufficed to reject France’s arguments in the case. But the court provides little help for assessing the measures (i.e., less favorable treatment) France had applied vis-à-vis a defined class of asylum seekers (asylum seekers liable to the Dublin System). In the court’s judgment, there is no reference to less favorable treatment, to standards, or to minimum applicable to all.

2. Saciri et al.

In Saciri et al., the ECI was asked to adjudicate on the standards applicable under Directive 2003/9 in case a member state (Belgium) decided to provide the material support in the form of cash transfers.

---
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3. Abdala

In Abdala, the ECJ was concerned with the situation of a critically ill Nigerian national who applied for a leave to reside in the country on medical grounds but had been rejected by the responsible Belgian authority in 2011. Mr. Abdala appealed the decision. According to Belgian law, Mr. Abdala was, pending the decision-making, not entitled to any form of social assistance other than emergency medical assistance. That was prima facie in line with Directive 2008/115255 which was pertinent to the case at hand. The relevant clause of Directive 2008/115 addressing illegal non-nationals reads:

Member States shall . . . ensure that [with respect to non-nationals liable to the directive] the following principles are taken into account as far as possible . . . during periods for which removal has been postponed . . . (b) emergency health care and essential treatment of illness are provided.256

Under the directive, member states are obviously bound to provide, to some extent, access to medical treatment ("emergency" health care, "essential treatment"). The whole range of other basic needs, however, seems irrelevant.

Advocate General Yves Bot257 was the first to express discontent with the legal framework created by Directive 2008/115, holding:

Mr. Abdala is excluded from the regular job market, which means that he has no income to meet his needs and, in particular, to feed, clothe and house himself. He undoubtedly has serious problems finding accommodation . . . . Such a state of affairs is clearly capable of rendering Mr. Abdala destitute and has a direct bearing on respect for his fundamental rights.258

Advocate General Bot suggested to read into the relevant article of the directive an obligation incumbent on member states to "ensure that the subsistence needs of those individuals [i.e., third-country nationals liable under Directive 2008/115] are met and to provide them with humane and decent living conditions."

The ECJ followed up on the Advocate General’s arguments but avoided any reference to fundamental rights or human dignity in its reasoning.259 When asserting that member states were, under Directive 2008/115, required to also make provisions with respect to “the basic needs” of third-country nationals staying illegally in the country,260 the ECJ simply argued: "The requirement to provide emergency health care and essential treatment of illness under Article 14(1)(b) of Directive 2008/115 may . . . be rendered meaningless if there were not also a concomitant requirement to make provision for the basic needs of the third country national concerned."261

From Abdala, we learn (in moderately strong words) that member states are required to provide more than emergency health care and essential treatment of illness. Member states are additionally obliged to provide for the satisfaction of "basic needs." Yet, once more, the ECJ refrains from giving substantial guidance. This time, the court refrains from elaborating on the concept of "basic needs." Obviously, the "basic needs" comprise needs regarding food, housing, and clothing. That is what is referred to explicitly in the opinion of the Advocate General. But it is not certain that "basic needs" are indeed confined to physical needs. Regarding standards, we are still in the dark.


254 Id. at ¶ 23.


256 The case was not covered by Directive 2003/9, because Mr. Abdala’s claim was not considered to qualify as an application for international protection. Case C-562/13, Centre public d’action sociale d’Origine-Louvain-la-Neuve v. Moussa Abdala, ECLI:EU:C:2014:2453, ¶ 36 (judgment of ECJ, Dec. 18, 2014).


259 Id. at ¶¶ 147-48.

3. Abidja

In Abidja,233 the ECJ was concerned with the situation of a critically ill Nigerian national whose application for a leave to reside in the country on medical grounds had been rejected by the responsible Belgian authority in 2011.234 Mr. Abidja appealed the decision. According to Belgian law, Mr. Abidja was, pending the decision-making, not entitled to any form of social assistance other than emergency medical assistance.235 That was prima facie in line with Directive 2008/115236 which was pertinent to the case at hand.237

The relevant clause of Directive 2008/115 addressing illegal non-nationals reads:

Member States shall . . . ensure that [with respect to non-nationals liable to the directive] the following principles are taken into account as far as possible . . . during periods for which removal has been postponed . . . (b) emergency health care and essential treatment of illness are provided.238

Under the directive, member states are obviously bound to provide, to some extent, access to medical treatment ("emergency" health care, "essential treatment"). The whole range of other basic needs, however, seems irrelevant. Advocate General Yves Bot239 was the first to express discontent with the legal framework created by Directive 2008/115, holding:

Mr. Abidja is excluded from the regular job market, which means that he has no income to meet his needs and, in particular, to feed, clothe and house himself. He undoubtedly has serious problems finding accommodation . . . Such a state of affairs is clearly capable of rendering Mr. Abidja destitute and has a direct bearing on respect for his fundamental rights.240


234 Id. at ¶ 21-23.
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237 The case was not covered by Directive 2003/9, because Mr. Abidja's claim was not considered to qualify as an application for international protection. Case: C-562/13, Centre public d'action sociale d'Ortiguière-Louvain-la-Neuve v. Moussa Abidja, ECLI:EU:C:2014:2453, ¶ 36 (judgment of ECJ, Dec. 18, 2014).
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that family unity is maintained, or the duty to issue travel documents. Other duties listed in the directive are expressly equality-oriented, as they link the status of the directive’s beneficiaries to the status enjoyed by other groups. The wording of the duty, pertaining to a certain context, introduces a group of reference and obliges member states, in the particular context, to treat the beneficiaries of international protection and the group of reference the same to ensure equal treatment. In abstract terms, the norm says in that specified context, group A should be treated like group B. Most of the member states’ duties under Directive 2011/95 that relate to the socio-economic status of the beneficiaries are in that sense equality-oriented, and nationals or third-country nationals legally resident in the member state serve as the most prominent reference groups.

Two duties under Directive 2011/95 are relevant to recent case law. Under Article 29, and hence in the context of social welfare, nationals are the designated group of reference. The first paragraph of Article 29 reads: “Member States shall ensure that beneficiaries of international protection receive, in the Member State that has granted such protection, the necessary social assistance as provided to nationals of that Member State.” For the context of freedom of movement, Article 33 refers to “third-country nationals legally resident” as the relevant reference group. Article 33 reads: “Member States shall allow freedom of movement within their territory to beneficiaries of international protection, under the same conditions and restrictions as those provided for other third-country nationals legally resident in their territories.”

2. Ali and Osso

In Ali and Osso, the ECtHR was asked to elaborate on the duties deriving from Article 29 and Article 33 of Directive 2011/95, both of which were closely entwined in the case. In 2009, Germany moved to impose on the holders of certain humanitarian titles (mainly beneficiaries of subsidiary

---

544 Id. at art. 23.
545 Id. at art. 22.
546 Id. at art. 26 (access to employment), art. 27 (access to education), art. 29 (social welfare), art. 30 (health care), art. 32 (access to accommodation), art. 33 (freedom of movement).
547 Id. at art. 29(1). With respect to non-nationals granted subsidiary protection status, the directive allows member states to deviate from the general rule laid down in art. 29(1).
548 For the beneficiaries of subsidiary protection status, member states may limit social assistance to “core benefits” yet even then, these core benefits must be provided “at the same level and under the same eligibility conditions” as are applicable to nationals. Id. at art. 29(2).
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c. The Court's Approaches to Equality

1. International Protection Standards

EU law regarding access to a minimum of subsistence is more restrictive on standards when it comes to non-nationals who have been granted international protection under the regime of Directive 2011/95, either in the form of refugee status or in the form of subsidiary protection status. Chapter VII of Directive 2011/95, defining the "content of international protection," lists several duties member states must bear in mind as they make provisions regarding the individual or societal legal status of the beneficiaries of international protection. Some of those duties clearly address the situation of beneficiaries of international protection only, such as the member states' duty to respect the principle of non-refoulement, the duty to ensure that family unity is maintained, or the duty to issue travel documents. Other duties listed in the directive are expressly equality-oriented, as they link the status of the directive's beneficiaries to the status enjoyed by other groups. The wording of the duty, pertaining to a certain context, introduces a group of reference and obliges member states, in the particular context, to treat the beneficiaries of international protection and the group of reference the same to ensure equal treatment. In abstract terms, the norm says in that specified context, group A should be treated like group B. Most of the member states' duties under Directive 2011/95 that relate to the socio-economic status of the beneficiaries are in that sense equality-oriented, and nationals or third-country nationals legally resident in the member state serve as the most prominent reference groups.

Two duties under Directive 2011/95 are relevant to recent case law. Under Article 29, and hence in the context of social welfare, nationals are the designated group of reference. The first paragraph of Article 29 reads: "Member States shall ensure that beneficiaries of international protection receive, in the Member State that has granted such protection, the necessary social assistance as provided to nationals of that Member State." For the context of freedom of movement, Article 33 refers to "third-country nationals legally resident" as the relevant reference group. Article 33 reads: "Member States shall allow freedom of movement within their territory to beneficiaries of international protection, under the same conditions and restrictions as those provided for other third-country nationals legally resident in their territories."

2. Ako and Osso

In Ako and Osso, the ECHR was asked to elaborate on the duties deriving from Article 29 and Article 33 of Directive 2011/95, both of which were closely entwined in the case. In 2009, Germany moved to impose on the holders of certain humanitarian titles (mainly beneficiaries of subsidiary protection)
protection) the obligation to reside in a specified geographical area (a municipality or a region) in case they were in receipt of benefits granted under the SGB II or the SGB XII.\footnote{Id. at § 12 (giving details on the national legal background).} The measure was based on a general administrative instruction which, in turn, was based on a provision of the AufenthG allowing conditions to be added to a residence permit.\footnote{Id.} The measure did not extend to non-nationals granted refugee status, other third-country nationals legally staying in the country, or German nationals.\footnote{Id.} Those groups were free of any obligation regarding residence. The rationale behind the policy introduced in 2009 was that German politics wanted the financial burden linked to the provision of a subsistence minimum to be evenly distributed among the local authorities of the various German Länder.\footnote{Id.} German politics also claimed the condition served as a instrument supporting national integration policies.\footnote{Id.} And indeed, there was a legal link between the duty to reside at a certain place in Germany and the right to receive benefits, securing the subsistence minimum under the SGB II and the SGB XII. Under the SGB II as well as under the SGB XII, the place where the claimant ordinarily resides ("gewöhnlicher Aufenthalt") predetermines the authority that, at the local level, is responsible for the actual granting and handing out of the benefit.\footnote{Id.} The residence condition imposed under the AufenthG in fact determined where exactly (in a territorial sense) the holder of the residence title had access to benefits under the SGB II or the SGB XII.

In 2014, the BVerwG referred to the ECJ for a preliminary ruling.\footnote{BVerwG, supra note 200, at § 7(1), sentence 1, no. 4; see also SGB XII, supra note 199, at § 4(1).} The BVerwG doubted that the German practice of imposing a residence condition was legitimate under Directive 2011/95, in particular under Article 29 (promising access to social assistance on an equal footing with nationals)\footnote{Joined Cases C-443/14 & C-444/14, Kreis Warendorf v. Ibrahim Alo & Amira Osso v. Region Hannover, ECLI:EU:C:2016:127, ¶ 21 (Mar. 1, 2016) (judgment of ECJ).} and/or under Article 33 (promising freedom of movement on an equal footing with other third-country nationals).\footnote{On the wording see Directive 2011/95, supra note 98, at art. 29(3).} Apparently, the BVerwG was unsure from about which of the member states’ duties under Directive 2011/95 to choose when assessing the legitimacy of the German policy. The BVerwG quoted both articles and left it to the ECJ to pick either one of them or to opt for both when adjudicating on the legitimacy of the German practice.\footnote{Id. at ¶ 40(1).}

The ECJ opted for an assessment under both duties. For the ECJ, Article 29 was pertinent because, of all recipients of subsistence benefits, only the beneficiaries of subsidiary protection status had to accept that a residence condition would be imposed once they applied for the benefits.\footnote{Id. at ¶ 53.} There was no such consequence for any other group receiving those benefits. That was deemed different treatment with respect to access to social welfare (subsistence benefits).\footnote{Id. at ¶ 48, 54.} Article 33, again, was considered pertinent to the case, because the residence condition imposed under the AufenthG constituted, in the eyes of the ECJ, “a restriction of the freedom of movement guaranteed by that article.”\footnote{Id. at ¶ 42.} In its assessment under Article 29, the court turned to investigate whether the beneficiaries of subsidiary protection status were in an “objectively comparable situation” with German nationals as “regards [to] the objective pursued” by the general administrative instruction, i.e., the objective of distributing the costs of granting subsistence benefits evenly among local authorities.\footnote{Id. at ¶ 54-55.} The ECJ’s answer was clearly in the affirmative.\footnote{Id. at ¶ 55-56.} The argument was simple: all recipients of subsistence cause financial burdens, and to single out but one group of recipients is precluded by Article 29.\footnote{Id. at ¶ 55.} Under Article 33, the ECJ’s main concern was whether the beneficiaries of subsidiary protection status formed, from the perspective of a policy seeking to facilitate the integration of non-nationals, a group that was not objectively comparable with the group of other third-country nationals legally resident in Germany (the pertinent reference group under Article 33).\footnote{Id. at ¶ 61.} In that regard, the court avoided giving a final answer but again signaled that the yardstick implied strict standards. For the ECJ, imposing residence conditions on the beneficiaries of subsidiary protection status, yet not on refugees or other third-country nationals, was legitimate only if it were the case that the beneficiaries of subsidiary protection status faced greater difficulties in relation to integration than other groups of third-country nationals.\footnote{Id. at ¶ 62.} Without explicitly saying so, the ECJ certainly doubted the condition was met with respect to non-nationals enjoying refugee status.\footnote{Id. at ¶ 63.}
The ECIJ opted for an assessment under both duties. For the ECIJ, Article 29 was pertinent because, of all recipients of subsistence benefits, only the beneficiaries of subsidiary protection status had to accept that a residence condition would be imposed once they applied for the benefits. There was no such consequence for any other group receiving those benefits. That was deemed different treatment with respect to access to social welfare (subsistence benefits). Article 33, again, was considered pertinent to the case, because the residence condition imposed under the AufenthG constituted, in the eyes of the ECIJ, "a restriction of the freedom of movement guaranteed by that article. In its assessment under Article 29, the court turned to investigate whether the beneficiaries of subsidiary protection status were in an "objectively comparable situation" with German nationals as "regards [to] the objective pursued" by the general administrative instruction, i.e., the objective of distributing the costs of granting subsistence benefits evenly among local authorities. The ECIJ’s answer was clearly in the affirmative. The argument was simple: all recipients of subsistence cause financial burdens, and to single out but one group of recipients is precluded by Article 29. Under Article 33, the ECIJ’s main concern was whether the beneficiaries of subsidiary protection status formed, from the perspective of a policy seeking to facilitate the integration of non-nationals, a group that was not objectively comparable with the group of other third-country nationals legally resident in Germany (the pertinent reference group under Article 33). In that regard, the court avoided giving a final answer but again signaled that the yardstick implied strict standards. For the ECIJ, imposing residence conditions on the beneficiaries of subsidiary status, yet not on refugees or other third-country nationals, was legitimate only if it were the case that the beneficiaries of subsidiary protection status faced greater difficulties in relation to integration than other groups of third-country nationals. Without explicitly saying so, the ECIJ certainly doubted the condition was met with respect to non-nationals enjoying refugee status.

The ECIJ gives no explanation for the rigorous assessment of the German measures in Alo and Osso. We can assume that differences in immigration status or differences in nationality have been discarded as irrelevant because the differences are not mentioned in the judgment. The silence of the court...
marks a striking difference to the opinion of Advocate General Pedro Cruz Villalón preceding the ECJ’s judgment. For Cruz Villalón, the obvious differences in the case at hand—differences in immigration status—were highly suspect. The legal status of a migrant, so Cruz Villalón held, was one of the “prohibited grounds of discrimination,” even though it was not explicitly mentioned in Article 21 of the Charter. Consequently, so the Advocate General went on, unequal treatment based on immigration status could be deemed justified only when “very strong reasons” existed for doing so. In case of judicial review, courts needed to apply “a strict level of scrutiny in the examination of proportionality.” It seems that the ECJ, quite deliberately, did not pick up on that line of thinking. The reason the court did not follow the Advocate General’s line of thinking might be a strong one: the silence of the court could indicate that the court was even more skeptical than the advocate general. It might indicate that, for the ECJ, different treatment based on immigration status per se was illegitimate, no matter what reasons were put forward by the respondent nation-state.

i. A Less Cautious Approach: Taking Human Dignity and Equality More Seriously

a. Human Dignity and Equality

At first sight, Ali and Onosay very much resonates with the approach of the BVVerfG when adjudicating, under Article 11(1) of the GG, on the right of asylum seekers to be provided (by the state) with a subsistence minimum. Under the BVVerfG, lawmakers were not allowed to define and grant the subsistence minimum differently according to immigration status. Only if the needs of asylum seekers were different in some significant way, and there was proof of that in empirical data, could different treatment possibly be considered . Or, following the wording of the ECJ, only then could asylum seekers be considered as “not in an objectively comparable situation” vis-à-vis other groups of immigrants or nationals. However, the legal foundation of the arguments differs greatly, not just with respect to formal sources of law (German GG here, primary and secondary EU law there), but also with respect to the substance of the law. The BVVerfG drew on the notion of human dignity under the GG, and the ECJ drew on the notion of equality under EU law. Still, the differences in sources notwithstanding, the different approaches inspire one to reflect on how human dignity and equality relate when the substance minimum is specified by law. Reflections on this relationship serve as the starting point for my challenging of Directive 2013/33 and, indirectly, the AsylBG under EU law.

In its July 2012 judgment, the BVVerfG started from the premise that the right to respect of human dignity was a universal right. From the perspective of morals common to all mankind, a universal right is usually conceptualized as a right that pertains to every human being, everywhere, at any given moment. From the perspective of a national constitution (which is a particular, i.e., a non-universal, source of law), a universal right is something less ambitious. In that particular context, a universal right is merely a right that pertains to every human being who happens to be within the jurisdiction of that particular state, in the case of the German GG, within the jurisdiction of German authorities. Universal rights have, per implication, a dimension that relates to “equality.” If every human being that is within Germany’s jurisdiction is entitled to be provided with a subsistence minimum, then all human beings present in Germany are formally equal before the law. In other words, they are treated equally by law, and they have the same right to be granted a subsistence minimum. Having the same right is simply a side effect of the universal character of the right to respect of human dignity. Assuming that human dignity is universal in character does not, however, imply that all human beings need to be treated the same when it comes to the actual granting of benefits intended to secure the subsistence minimum. This

1009 Id. at ¶ 71-77.
1010 Id. at ¶ 76.
1011 Id.
1013 See supra Part IV.B.1.
1014 Id.
1015 Id. at ¶ 74. The Directive on the subject is vast. For an excellent introduction into natural rights thinking, combining aspects of philosophy and aspects of law, see H. Lauterpacht, An Introduction to International Law (Oxford University Press 1944).
1016 See BVVerfG, 1 BvL 18/10, 17 Aug. 2012, at marginals no. 73.
marks a striking difference to the opinion of Advocate General Pedro Cruz Villalón preceding the ECJ’s judgment. 302 The Advocate General drew strongly on the idea of equality and its peculiar component, the prohibition of discrimination. 303 For Cruz Villalón, the obvious differences in the case at hand—differences in immigration status—were highly suspect. The legal status of a migrant, so Cruz Villalón held, was one of the “prohibited grounds of discrimination,” even though it was not explicitly mentioned in Article 21 of the Charter. 304 Consequently, so the Advocate General went on, unequal treatment based on immigration status could be deemed justified only when “very strong reasons” existed for doing so. 305 In case of judicial review, courts needed to apply “a strict level of scrutiny in the examination of proportionality.” 306 It seems that the ECJ, quite deliberately, did not pick up on that line of thinking. The reason the court did not follow the Advocate General’s line of thinking might be a strong one: the silence of the court could indicate that the court was even more skeptical than the advocate general. It might indicate that, for the ECJ, different treatment based on immigration status per se was illegitimate, no matter what reasons were put forward by the respondent num-
ber state.

v. A Less Cautious Approach: Taking Human Dignity and Equality More Seriously

a. Human Dignity and Equality

At first sight, Alo and Onos 307 very much resonates with the approach of the BVVerfG when adjudicating under Article 1(1) of the GG, on the right of asylum seekers to be provided (by the state) with a subsistence minimum. 308 Under the BVVerfG, lawmakers were not allowed to define and grant the subsistence minimum differently according to immigration status. 309 Only if the needs of asylum seekers were different in some significant way, and there was proof of that in empirical data, could different treatment possibly be
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is where the idea of equality gains important prominence. Obviously, the basic needs of infants differ from the needs of adults, the needs of school children differ from the needs of young mothers or of dying grandparents. Different instants are permissible, sometimes even required, most of all from the perspective of equality. 184 That is why the Commission, when proposing a recast of Directive 2003/9, rightly insisted on paying particular attention to vulnerable groups, such as destitute, unaccompanied minors, or traumatized persons. 185 Yet, what is common in those varying instances of differing needs is the abstract and fundamental concept of what constitutes basic needs (for instance, physical needs, such as food, housing, and clothing; social and cultural needs; medical needs) and the abstract concept of the level at which those needs are to be satisfied (e.g., substandard housing, standard housing, high-end housing). Both needs and the level of satisfaction make up the standard for defining the measures needed in order to implement on a concrete level the abstract right to a dignified subsistence minimum and the assessment of its fulfillment. 186 Ignoring some essential elements of needs cumulative for human dignity with respect to some designated groups of human beings 187 creates a problem under the dignity clause because human dignity is directed universal and not particular. 188 There is also a problem under the human dignity clause if levels of satisfaction are different for different groups (e.g., substandard housing for groups and standard housing for all other groups; differing amounts of cash benefits for differing groups not justified by differing needs). 189 Needs and levels of satisfaction, essential elements of human dignity, ought to be conceptualized the same for all human beings. Other matters, i.e., matters not

184 For the German doctrine and jurisprudence, see, e.g., Paul Karches, GG Art. 5 Abs. 1-3 marginal nr. 708, 706 in Commentar [Basic Law: Commentary] (Theodor Marie & Olaf Glaser formers eds., Rainer Horing, Matthias Herberg, Rüdiger Schulte & Mari H. Klett eds., Kohl ed. 2017). For the case law of the ECJ under primary EU law, see, e.g., Case C-402/07 P, Akzo Nobel Chemieids Ltd and Alcoa Chemieids Ltd, ECJ EU:C:2008:512, ¶ 26 (Ringer J., 2018) (“According to settled case-law, the principle of equality requires that comparable situations must not be treated differently and that different situations must not be treated in the same way unless such treatment is objectively justified.”).

185 See Proposal, supra note 45, at 6.

186 For the German constitutional order, see Karches, supra note 578, at marginal nr. 301 (introducing the notion of “Nachdrücklichkeit” [basic equality]) when describing the core content of the constitutional clause on human dignity).

187 On the needs covered and also not covered by derogated benefits under the AGBLG, see supra Part III.E.6.b.8.

188 That is why the derogated benefits under the AGBLG are unauthorized from the perspective of the GG. For details see supra Part IV.B.1.a.6.b.9.

189 The difference is the amount of cash benefits granted under the SGB II and the SGB XIL to the one hand, and the cash benefits granted under the AGBLG to the other hand, is a case in point. On the difference, see supra Part IV.A. For a critique from the perspective of the GG, see supra Part IV.B.1.a.6.b.9.
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is where the idea of equality gains important prominence. Obviously, the basic needs of infants differ from the needs of adults, the needs of young children differ from the needs of young mothers or dying grandparents. Different instances are permissible, sometimes even required, most of all from the perspective of equality. It is why the Commission, when proposing a recast of Directive 2003/9, rightly insisted on paying particular attention to vulnerable groups, such as destitute, unaccompanied minors, or transgender persons. Yet, what is common in these varying instances of differing needs is the abstract and fundamental concept of what constitutes basic needs (for instance, physical needs, such as food, housing, and clothing, and social and cultural needs; medical needs) and the abstract concept of the level at which those needs are to be satisfied (e.g., standard housing, standard housing, high-end housing). Both needs and the level of satisfaction make up the standard for defining the measure needed in order to implement on a concrete level the abstract right to a dignified subsistence minimum and the assessment of its fulfillment.

Ignoring some essential elements of needs cumulative for human dignity with respect to some designated groups of human beings creates a problem under the dignity clause because human dignity is defined universal and not particular. There is also a problem under the human dignity clause if levels of satisfaction are different for different groups (e.g., standard housing for groups A and standard housing for all other groups; differing amounts of cash benefits for differing needs not justified by differing needs). Needs and levels of satisfaction, essential elements of human dignity, ought to be conceptualized the same for all human beings. Other matters, i.e., matters not

---

78 For the German doctrine and jurisprudence, see, e.g., Paul Karchhof, GG Art. 5 Abs. 1 st 1-3 and 177, 296, 1489-1514 (Basic Law Commentary) (Thomale Maier & Olaf Dage Fangt former eds., Rainer Hertig, Matthias Herbinger, Rupert Schlech & Horst J. Klein eds., Albis ed. 2017). For the case law of the ECHR under privacy, see Kier, supra note 17; K. Scholler, H. Meissner, 296, 1489-1514 (Basic Law Commentary) (Thomale Maier & Olaf Dage Fangt former eds., Rainer Hertig, Matthias Herbinger, Rupert Schlech & Horst J. Klein eds., Albis ed. 2017). For the case law of the ECHR under privacy, see, e.g., Cons C-239/07 F. Akio Noah Chemree Ltd and Alcoa Chemree Ltd, [2008] ECHR 612, 296, 1489-1514 (ECHR 114, 2014) ("According to its case law, the principle of equality requires that comparable situations must not be treated differently and that different situations must not be treated in the same way unless such treatment is objectively justified.")

79 See Proposal, supra note 451, at 6.

80 For the German constitutional order, see Karchhof, supra note 77, at paras. 201 and 203 (introducing the notion of "Rahmenprinzipien" [basic equivalences] when describing the core content of the constitutional clause on human dignity).

81 On the needs covered and also not covered by downgraded benefits under the ArbeitsG, see supra Part III.B.1.b.2.

82 That is why the downgraded benefits under the ArbeitsG are not summarized from the perspective of the GG. For details see supra Part IV.B.1.b.2.

83 The difference is the amount of cash benefits granted under the SBH II and the SGB XII, on the one hand, and the cash benefits granted under the ArbeitsG, on the other hand, in a case in point. On the differences, see supra Part IV.A.3. For a critique from the perspective of the GG, see supra Part IV.B.1.b.

84 I doubt that secondary EU law conceives of "human dignity" in universal terms, and I doubt that Directive 2013/33 adheres to the principle of equality as it is supposed to do. For one, Directive 2013/33 (exception conditions for non-nationals seeking international protection) (supra note 159) is the (content of refugee status and subsidiary protection status). And Directive 2008/15 (status of third-country nationals illegally staying in the country) (supra note 159) seems to be based on a concept that allows human dignity according to residence status. The relatively secure residence status of refugees, for instance, comes along with the right of refugees to be treated like nationals regarding access to social assistance. For the beneficiaries of the less secure subsidiary protection status, access to social assistance may be restricted to core benefits, yet access to core benefits must be granted on an equal footing with nationals. The precarious immigration status of asylum seekers may be combined with less-than-equal treatment, especially in comparison to the treatment of nationals in their access to and level of social assistance. The non-status of illegal third-country nationals is mirrored in the complete denial of access to a state-provided subsistence minimum (with the exception of emergency medical treatment). The beneficiaries addressed in these provisions are obviously excluded according to immigration status. The more precarious the status, the less benefits to be accorded. Such a tiered system of access to a state-provided subsistence minimum, based on immigration status, is valid only if the notion of "human dignity" underlying the Charter (Article 1) is also conceptualized as tiered according to status. Clearly, the ECHR and the Advocate General rejected a tiered notion of human dignity in Asadul. The rejection came in uncertain terms, though. In Asadul, much has been left upon regarding relevant needs and levels of satisfaction, i.e., standards. The court missed the opportunity to
give guidance on how to conceptualize human dignity in more concrete terms, in particular, in the context of the rights of asylum seekers in second-
ary law. These uncertainties notwithstanding, under EU law human dignity is not dependent on residence status. That much seems clear. From the per-
spective of human dignity and the right to a subsistence minimum, all pertinent
norms under the Common European Asylum System are flawed.

For another, if taken seriously, the principle of equality canon an additional,
independent shadow on the legitimacy of Article 17(3) of Directive 2013/33.
In Ali and Osuo, the advocate general conceded that equal treatment was
"a general principle of EU law." [392] There is no question that the continuation is correct. [393] In Ali and Osuo, the advocate general further stressed that dif-
ferences in immigration status could hardly justify differences in treatment
regarding access to and the content of nationally provided subsistence mini-
num. [394] The ECJ seemed even more skeptical. [395] If we accept the principle
and its rendering in Ali and Osuo, it applies to secondary EU law just as it ap-
pplies to member states acting under secondary EU law. When applied to Ar-
nance 17(3) of Directive 2013/33, the directive seems to fail the test. It is the
immigration status of the applicants, nothing else, that underpins the member
states’ discretion regarding the form of the subsistence minimum (benefits in
kind, benefits in cash, vouchers). And it is the immigration status of the ap-
pliers that inspire the idea that the standard of human dignity applicable to
nationals could be different from that established under Directive 2013/33.
Hence, member states should be free to resort to unequal treatment where
the standards are aimed to “ensure a standard of living higher than that prescribed
for applicants under this Directive.” [396] The frivolous use of immigration sta-
tus as a normative compassions is ruled out by the principle of equality.

In sum, Article 17(3) of Directive 2013/33 is flawed from both perspec-
tives, the perspective of human dignity and the perspective of equality. Once
the directive is declared void or interpreted by the ECJ in a manner that con-
forms with human dignity or equality, the AsylBG will face new challenges
arising from EU law.

[393] Joined Cases C-443/14 & C-444/14, Kriszti Wenzelovsz’s, Ibrahim Ali and Arinze Osuo
v. Regional Hannover, FRR/ECUEU: 2013:665, ¶ 71 (Oct. 6, 2013) (opinions of Advocate Gen-
eral Oonagh Oonagh Viviane). [394] See e.g., Woon, Wettstein & Chius, supra note 410, at 148, 179; see also Paul
[395] Joined Cases C-443/14 & C-444/14, Kriszti Wenzelovsz’s, Ibrahim Ali and Arinze Osuo
See supra Part IV.C.1.b.b.


V. CONCLUSION

This Article presented facts on what has been termed the “refugee crisis”
in German politics. Unprecedented in European post-war history, numerous
European countries resorted border controls in late 2015 to allow huge num-
bers of people seeking international protection to enter the country. Germany
led this policy and received almost one million asylum applicants in a short
period of time. This Article described the political responses to the refugee
crisis, in particular, the responses relating to the state-provided subsistence
minimum. In the course of the crisis, lawmakers amended the AsylBG more
than once in order to cut down on benefits. The main focus of this Article was
on the differences between the benefits accorded under the AsylBG and the
benefits granted under the general regime (SBG II, SGB XII). These differ-
ences relate, for one, to the form of provisions. Under the general regime, the
benefits take the form of cash transfers. Under the AsylBG, the subsistence
minimum is primarily provided in kind, at least as long as the beneficiaries
are obliged to reside in a reception center. For another, the differences relate
to the amounts handed out if, under the AsylBG, subsistence is secured through
the provision of money. Under the AsylBG, the amount is less than the amount
under the general regime. Finally, in the case of downsized ben-
efits, state-provided subsistence does not cover all the needs covered by
the general regime.

This Article argues that these differences matter from the perspective of
the German GO and the perspective of EU law. These differences ought not
to exist. When building my arguments against these differences from the per-
spective of the GO, I draw on case law of the VwEG. Resting in detail
what is demanded by the human dignity clause of the GO, not only with re-
spect to German or long-term residents of another nationality, but also with
respect to non-nationals seeking international protection. Against the back-
drop of that case law, none of the differences created by the AsylBG passes
the test of constitutionality, for various reasons. By contrast, case law at the
European level is piecemeal; that is particularly true for case law relating to
the right to a subsistence minimum for non-nationals whose residence statuses
are utoty precarious. Also, at the European level, lawmakers is often dic-
tuated by the member states’ interests, interests that are played out in an almost
unbiased manner in the negotiations taking place in the Council of the EU.
The clause on material reception conditions defining the member states’ du-
ties regarding the subsistence of non-nationals seeking protection is in a case
in point. At the level of secondary EU law (Directive 2013/33), the will of mem-
ber states to have their own saying at home prevented a compromise with
“seven.” Nonetheless, there are good reasons for holding that the relevant
clause in Directive 2013/33 neglects, in a relevant manner, the right to respect
give guidance on how to conceptualize human dignity in more concrete terms, in particular, in the context of defining the rights of asylum seekers in second-
ary law. These uncertainties notwithstanding, under German law human dignity is not dependent on residence status. That much seems clear. From the per-
spective of human dignity and the right to a subsistence minimum, all pertinent norms under the Common European Asylum System are flawed.

For another, if taken seriously, the principle of equality carries an additional, independent shadow on the legitimacy of Article 17(5) of Directive 2013/33.

In Ali v. Oono, the advocate general contended that equal treatment was "a general principle of EU law." There is no question that the conclusion is correct. In Ali v. Oono, the advocate general further stressed that differ-
cences in immigration status could hardly justify differences in treatment regarding access to and the content of nationally provided subsistence mini-
mum. The ECJ seemed even more skeptical. If we accept the principle
and its rendition in Ali v. Oono, it applies to secondary EU law just as it ap-
pplies to member states acting under secondary EU law. When applied to Ar-
grave 17(5) of Directive 2013/33, the directive seems to fail the test. It is the immigration status of the applicants, nothing else, that underpins the member states’ discretion regarding the form of the subsistence minimum (benefits in kind, benefits in cash, vouchers). And it is the immigration status of the ap-

licants that inspires the idea that the standard of human dignity applicable to nationals could be different from the standard under Directive 2013/33.

Hence, member states should be free to resort to unequal treatment where the standards are aimed to "ensuring a standard of living higher than that prescribed for applicants under this Directive." The frivolous use of immigration sta-
tus as a terminum persequendi is ruled out by the principle of equality.

In sum, Article 17(5) of Directive 2013/33 is flawed from both perspec-
tives, the perspective of human dignity and the perspective of equality. Once the directive is declared void or interpreted by the ECJ as a manner that con-
forms with human dignity or equality, the AsylBG will face new challenges aris-
ing from EU law.
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In the long run, Directive 2013/33 will not shield the AsylBlG from criticism raised under EU law. Clearly, the BVelG and the ECJ will have the final say on all the questions asked and the answers given in this Article.

One final remark: On its surface, this Article dealt with a number of technicalities: the requirements for receiving benefits under the general regime and the AsylBlG, the specifications of the respective benefits, the comparison of benefits and amounts, and the evaluation of the differences against the yardstick of higher-ranking law. However, in the background of those technicalities, one of the most sensitive issues of our time was always looming: Why should non-nationals seeking protection in some other country, in our case Germany, be provided with a subsistence minimum by the state at all? This Article took two clauses on human dignity, one in the GG, the other in the Charter, as a given. But these clauses—assuming solidarity among human beings—can be attacked in the political realm. And the clauses are indeed attacked in real politics. “Brexit” occurred because many British people thought the EU was demanding too much solidarity. In the 2017 elections in Germany, Austria, and the Czech Republic, parties gained enough through attacking prevalent migration politics—and Chancellor Angela Merkel as the beacon of such politics—with arguments depicting migrants as a threat. They bring in an alien culture, an alien religion, diseases and parasites; they put strain on public budgets that could be used in a different manner, i.e., in a manner that favors us instead of them. The issue of migration splits families, societies, nations, and the EU. Against the backdrop of such a political climate, it is no wonder that even neutral institutions, such as the ECJ, are under political fire. It takes courage to uphold the rule of law in a judgment, when what is demanded by the rule of law is itself a matter of contention. It takes courage to give a judgment that is then not accepted by politics. Will “human dignity” and “equality” be defended by the courts and survive unharmed?