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I. STEWARDSHIP AND HUMANE TREATMENT OF ANIMALS  
IN ABRAHAMIC TRADITION

Laws and morals, given by G*D, in Islam, Judaism, and Christianity make compelling cases for practitioners to act humanely towards living animals, even when the practitioners are going to slaughter and eat animals. Because of their belief in the same G*D, Muslims, Jews, and Christians share a rich moral history that splintered into various similar laws and strong suggestions for the excellent treatment of, and if necessary, humane killing of animals. Within these religions, G*D’s intent to enforce a relationship between consumption and humane

---

1 “There is not an animal that lives on the earth, nor a being that flies on its wings, but forms part of communities like you. Nothing have We omitted from the Book, and they all shall be gathered to their Lord in the end.” (Sura 6:38). “Have you not seen how what is in the heavens and what is in the earth and the sun and the moon and the stars and the mountains and the trees and the beasts and many of the people prostrate before Allah? And yet many of the people defy Allah and thus deserve punishment.” (Surat al-Hajj 22:18). Hadith (traditions): “There is a reward (ajr) for helping any living creature” (Bukhari and Muslim); “There is no man who kills a sparrow or anything beyond that, without its deserving it, but God will ask him about it” (Ahmad and al-Nasai); “The grievous things are: shirk (polytheism); disobedience to parents; the killing of breathing beings …” (Bukhari and Muslim); “May god curse anyone who maims animals” (ibn al-Athir); “Whoever is kind to the creatures of God is kind to himself.” Id. “To God belongs all that is in the heavens and in the earth, for God encompasses everything [Qur’an 4:126].” khalifs, or stewards, “No creature is there on earth nor a bird flying with its wings but they are nations like you [6:38]”; “Surely the creation of the heavens and the earth is greater than the creation of man; but most people know not [40:57].”

2 “All the animals in the forest are Mine and the cattle on thousands of hills. All the wild birds are Mine and all living things in the fields.” Psalm 50:10, 11; “Look at the birds flying around . . . your Father in Heaven takes care of them.” Matthew 6:26; “He gives animals their food and feeds the young ravens when they call.” Psalm 147:9; “Wolves and sheep will live together in peace, and leopards will lie down with young goats, calves and lion cubs will feed together, and little children will take care of them. Cows and bears will eat together, and their calves and cubs will lie down in peace. Lions will eat straw as cattle do . . . The land will be as full of knowledge of the Lord as the seas are full of water.” Isaiah 11:6-9; “This plan, which God will complete when the time is right, is to bring all creation together, everything in heaven and on earth, with Christ as head.” Ephesians 1:10; The Holy Prophet Mohammed said: “All creatures are like a family (Ayal) of God: and he loves the most those who are the most beneficient to His family.” (Narrated by Anas. Mishkat al-Masabih,3:1392; quoted from Bukhari.)

3 Sura 5:3 makes it clear that animals that are stranggles, hit on the head, or gored cannot be consumed. While the list is not comprehensive of every type of torture, it certainly paints the picture that it would be wrong to make an animal suffer through asphyxiation, dying from a concussion, or by being boiled alive. It is arguable that the list does indeed suggest that any type of infliction of unnecessary pain upon an animal would be disobedient. Judaism and Christianity recite a parallel law in Deuteronomy 14:21.
treatment is apparent in strict slaughter laws given to Muslims, Jews, and Christians to obey. Voluntary adherence to these laws was once customary and should again become customary if the spirit and moral purpose of these laws are to remain intact. It is the practitioner’s responsibility to live up to G*D’s desire for humans to behave humanely. By reviewing accounts and passages that depict how animals were or should be treated, the importance of humanely treating animals is made clear to practitioners.

Abrahamic religions share a common religious patriarch. Islam, Judaism, and Christianity share the same interest and faith in the lineage beginning with the first man until the birth of Abraham. During these formative years of early history, religions cite that G*D, on numerous occasions, commanded the people to act morally towards animals. Beginning with the creation of the first man G*D made Adam a steward of creation. Adam was entrusted with the responsibility of caring for the animals. G*D’s purpose in creating man was so that man could oversee every living being on Earth.

Adam was permitted to eat all plant types. Animals were not created for Adam’s consumption. The only rule that G*D gave to Adam was a dietary rule. G*D forbid Adam from eating fruit from a particular tree. Adam broke the dietary rule and was cast out of paradise on Earth. The Qur’an, the Torah, and the Bible all describe man’s first mistake as choosing to disobey what G*D commanded. The moral in the story of Adam’s first mistake is that when G*D issues a commandment, it is to be obeyed. It is not for man to decide what or how he should eat and from what source, but it is for G*D to decide. Adam’s rebellion against G*D became the

---

undertone for all Abrahamic texts insofar as G*D made perfectly clear that free will was not to be used to break G*D’s law but obey G*D’s law.  

After Adam, Abrahamic religions trace their moral dietary codes to the story of Noah, a direct descendent of Adam. The majority of Abrahamic religious opinion is that before the conclusion of the story of Noah no person on the Earth had eaten meat. Adam lived as a protector and nurturer of the Earth, and his progeny likely obeyed G*D and behaved the same way. While the texts refer to the slaughtering of animals for sacrifice (or the presentation of live animals to G*D for sacrifice such as in the tale of “Cane and Able” or “Habil and Qabil”) no

6 (Sacrifice is the exception to early Abrahamic moral traditions of protecting animals. Recently, legal gains have been made in favor of sacrifice. See Church of the Lukumi Babalu Aye v. Hialeah, 508 U.S. 520 (1993). However, in contrast to this. Sacrifice has been greatly reduced in recent years. Muslims in France avoid sacrifice of cattle on Idul Azha and instead pay equivalent amount in cash to the beneficiaries, following a ruling from the Imam of the Paris Mosque. The Imam said that the animal sacrifice is not a must, and that one could pay a third of the value of a sheep in cash, instead to the poor and the needy. RIYADH, March 4 (IslamOnline & News Agencies) – “Saudi Arabia’s top-ranking cleric [Sheikh Abdelaziz bin Abdullah al-Sheikh.] said Sunday it was acceptable for Muslims living in Europe not to sacrifice animals for the upcoming Muslim holiday of Eid al-Adha...saying and that animal sacrifice for the holiday was not an obligation.” Sheikh Abdelaziz also declared illegal a religious decree, or fatwa, by a Turkish mufti authorizing the sacrifice of chickens for Eid al-Adha due to Turkey's economic woes. A Turkish newspaper quoted the dean of Fiqh School at Marmar University in Turkey, Zakaria Beyas as saying “a Muslim can slaughter chicken in place of sheep because of the economic crisis Turkey is going through.” Each year Muslims slaughter millions of goats or sheep to honor the sacrifice Abraham was to make to G*D, which was intended to be a human sacrifice. Al-Hafiz B.A. Masri writes in Animals in Islam (p. 117), that the well-known Sheikh Farid Wagdi wrote, “[T]here may come a day when Muslims shall have to substitute the rite of animal sacrifice with other methods of giving alms.” The question of substituting sacrificed animals is an interesting point, especially in light of the Abrahamic story. Abraham was to sacrifice his son, and at the last minute sacrificed a ram instead. Many ancient religions used human sacrifice to satisfy the G*D, such as the Aztecs who killed hundreds of thousands, but this sort of sacrifice would not concern the animal rights movement. Yet, it demonstrates that in some accounts it was not the sacrifice of the animal that G*D desired, but simply the act of sacrifice itself. This is also suggested in the Qur’an: “It is not their flesh nor their blood, that reaches Allah; it is your piety that reaches Him.” (22:37). This scripture, along with the accounts of human sacrifice give animal rights activists against the potential momentum of some religions to increase their traditional or previous cruelty to animals both through secular and/or religious legality. Jews, by legal decree, will not sacrifice until the temple is rebuilt, and some dispute whether the commandment to sacrifice animals is a consistent thread in Talmudic law. “I gave your ancestors no commands about burnt offerings or any other kinds of sacrifices, when I brought them out of Egypt. But I did command them to obey Me, so that I would be their God and they would be My people. And I told them to live as I commanded them, so that things would go well for them. But they did not obey Me or pay any attention. Instead, they did whatever their stubborn and evil hearts told them to do and they became worse instead of better.” Jeremiah 7:22:24. Hindus have the option to engage is Yajna. Non-animal sacrifice. Unfortunately, while little practiced, the Church of Latter day Saints believes that because sacrifice began before the laws of G*D were given to Moses, that sacrifice was not done away with when Jesus fulfilled the law, leaving the possibility that they could engage in sacrifice according to religious doctrine and 1st amendment protection. Many Christians believe that Jesus, The Lamb of God, took upon him all need for sacrifice and do not believe in animal sacrifice. You do not want sacrifices and offerings, but You have prepared a body for Me. You are not pleased with animals burnt whole on the altar or with sacrifices to take away sins. Then I said, ‘Here I am to do Your will, O God.’” Hebrews 10:4-7.
direct accounts exist that man had consumed animals for his own gratification, and to the contrary the story of Noah demonstrates a very respectful attitude towards animals, and the consumption of animals only when it became necessary.⁷

While discrepancies exist throughout the Abrahamic religions, and their various schools of thought about the exact magnitude and purpose of the flood, the account of how animals played into it remains relatively consistent. In the story of the Noah, G*D tells Noah that all people who behave disobediently will be killed. G*D intends to make no exception for any person who is found to be morally corrupt, not even members of Noah’s family.⁸ G*D does command at least two of every kind of animal living on the Earth.⁹ G*D has Noah toil to make a ship large enough, not to spare just Noah, but a ship large enough to save the animals and give them enough space to be transported well so that each of them endures the ride on the boat safely and is able to flourish anew. Nowhere in the story does G*D does say that any animals are evil and they should be washed away with those who do not follow G*D’s law, but instead, G*D shows compassion to every animal on the Earth by saving their species from annihilation.¹⁰ The conclusion of the flood was to be something akin to a second creation. G*D’s actions and words

---

⁷ “There is not an animal on earth, nor a bird that flies on its wings, but they are communities like you….” Qur’an 6:38; “O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, you who kill the prophets and stone those sent to you, how often I have longed to gather your children together, as a hen gathers her chicks under her wings, but you were not willing.” Matthew 23:37.
⁹ Sura 11:40.
¹⁰ Muhammad is quoted as saying, “He who takes pity on a sparrow and spares his life, Allah (God) will be merciful to him on the day of judgment.” The Koran (24.36): “Do you not see how Allah is praised by those in heaven and earth? The very birds praise Him as they wing their flight” (also note 24.44); It is said that During a journey, Muhammad found a man who started a fire and had endangered some ants. Muhammad was upset by this. The Prophet (PBUH) asked Who made this fire?” The man answered, “I made the fire, O Messenger of Allah “Put out the fire! Put out the fire!” The Prophet (PBUH) said.; In Hadith (Muslim religious text) of Sahih Bukhari, Vol. 4, Book 56, Number 673, narrated by Abu Huraira: The Prophet said, “While a dog was going round a well and was about to die of thirst, an Israeli prostitute saw it and took off her shoe and watered it. So Allah forgave her because of that good deed.” There are dozens of other examples of such kindness by the prophet in the Qur’an.
demonstrate that every type of animal was worth creating again.\textsuperscript{11} It is evident that G*D did not intend to have every type of person reestablish his or her line. Since G*D placed Adam on Earth to be a steward of creation and G*D punished him for disobeying rules, it can be inferred that at least to some capacity, the people who were killed were punished for not being good stewards. G*D eradicated the people who were the most disobedient to the law of G*D.

A majority of the Abrahamic religious adherents believe that after the flood G*D ordered that seven laws be followed by everyone on the Earth, who would all flow from the family of Noah. On par with the enforcement of justice and the prohibition of murder, idolatry, theft, sexual promiscuity, and blasphemy is the commandment to avoid the inhumane treatment of animals.\textsuperscript{12} Although there is not an explicit reference to this law in the Qur’an, the majority of Abrahamic practitioners adhere to these seven laws. It is evident in the Qur’an (7:73-7:93) that rebellion against G*D through the murder of an animal is equally demonstrative of sin as is sexual impropriety and idolatry. Again the Qur’an recites how G*D commanded the wicked to share water with a camel and instead, they slaughter the camel. G*D sends repeated warnings, but then sends judgment and destroys the wicked. (Id. at 54:24-54:38)\textsuperscript{13} (It is also evident that The Prophet practiced these seven laws, including the humane treatment of animals, as the part of his commitment to G*D through his actions and teachings.) Clearly G*D understood that with the destruction of plant life, it would be hard for Noah’s family to properly sustain themselves. So G*D gave the permission that one may, not should, but may eat an animal so long as the

\textsuperscript{11} “Be like a bee; anything he heats is clean, anything he drops is sweet and any branch he sits upon does not break.” (Maxims of Ali; translated by Al-Halal from Nahj-ul-Balagha (in Arabic); Sh. Muhammad Ashraf, Lahore, Pakistan; p. 436. The Imam, Hazrat Ali bin Abi Talib was the son-in-law of the Holy Prophet Muhammad(s), and the fourth Caliph (644-656 A.C. = 23-24 A.H.)
\textsuperscript{12} Genesis chapter 9:4
\textsuperscript{13} A similar concept is also found in (Genesis 24:14). “Let it be the maiden to whom I shall say, ‘Please tip over your jug so I may drink,’ and who replies, ‘Drink, and I will even water your camels,’ her will You have designated for Your servant, for Isaac.”
animal is not eaten while it is living. While this is the text of the law, the moral is that an animals’ suffering is not excused by our necessity due to hunger.

G*D issued this commandment to people who had almost nothing else to eat other than animals, but the gravity of their possible starvation did not over shadow the importance that an animal should not experience suffering. There is no account from the lineage of Adam to Noah, in any Abrahamic religion’s text, that insinuates G*D was pleased when an animal suffered. There is no reason to think that the seventh commandment of the Noahide laws reflected anything but consistency with G*D’s first intention that humans be good stewards. After the lineage of Noah, all Abrahamic religions trace their moral roots to “Abraham” or “Ibrahim,” the founder of rational monotheism. Because Abrahamic religions do not disregard any of their written traditions and laws as invalid, the notion that G*D would approve of the inhumane treatment of animals is incorrect and is not a logical extension of the Abrahamic tradition from Noah to Abraham.

II. HUMANE SLAUGHTER CUSTOMS IN ISLAMIC, JUDAIC, AND CHRISTIAN LAW

Killing an animal is not the same as torturing an animal. Adherents of Abrahamic killing traditions believe this. They believe animals are capable of suffering. When slaughter is prolonged or aggravated by inhumane or cruel treatment, animals experience unnecessary pain. Because G*D does not ever say in any sacred Abrahamic texts that animals will feel no pain when they are slaughtered, adherents will believe that inflicting pain is wrong and not
participate in a ritual or profession that permits animal abuse. Butchers are the only people allowed kill animals for food in the Abrahamic tradition so that the whole group can be assured that their killing methods will be the least cruel way for an animal to die; and that is, according to the law.

In keeping with the Adamic tradition that was the seed of the Abrahamic tradition, no person should eat animal flesh, but if the person does the person may not intentionally or permissibly inflict pain or suffering on an animal. This is why G*D made specific laws, narrowly tailored to address a fraction of the Abrahamic constituency, that is that those who are permitted to kill an animal should do so with no pain to the animal. The traditions of Islam, Judaism, and Christianity believe that every law set forth by G*D is important, but this one is so important, that G*D only legalizes killing for those who can properly slaughter an animal, and for no one else. The laws regarding killing an animal are not general laws. The laws are meant to inform those who have the permission to kill an animal as to exactly how G*D wants the animal to be killed.\(^\text{14}\)

One such law, common to all the Abrahamic religions is that a blade used to kill an animal must be as sharp as possible in order to mitigate the animal’s consciousness of the slaughter process and the resulting physical pain. In one swift, precise swipe the neck of the animal is sliced so that the trachea and the esophagus are immediately cut. The jugular vein along with the carotid arteries is immediately severed and the pumping of blood to the animal’s

\(^{14}\) Bukhari and Muslim, compilers of the Prophet’s (SAWS) authentic hadith, both report that the Prophet (SAWS) forbade a quadruped or any other animal to be kept waiting for slaughter. “[W]hen you must kill a living being, do it in the proper way - when you slaughter an animal, use the best method and sharpen your knife so as to cause as little pain as possible.” When he saw a man sharpening his knife in the presence of the animal he was to kill, the Prophet said, “Do you intend inflicting death on the animal twice - once by sharpening the knife within its sight, and once by cutting its throat?”
brain ceases nearly instantaneously. Without the flow of blood to the brain, the animal is
supposed to be unable to experience pain. The animal is then suspended upside down to continue
draining blood from its body. Kosher and halal meat does not conform to most state anti-cruelty
statues in the United States, but the separation of church and state has specifically allowed the
slaughter practice in every state. Some argue that the acceptance of the slaughter method can
evidence its humaneness. Irrespective of whether the animal actually suffers less, the moral
custom in Abrahamic religions is that the animal should suffer as little as possible.

Professor Schulze and Dr. Hazem experimented with halal (nearly identical in method to
kosher killing) in Hanover University, Germany, to prove that animals do suffer less using
Abrahamic customs.¹⁵ An electroencephalograph (EEG) and electrocardiogram (ECG) were used
to measure the “pain” nerve impulses as well as the heart rate experienced by an animal during
halal slaughter as compared to captive bolt stunning (predominant method for killing a larger
animal in the United States). (While Abrahamic traditions do not indicate directly that
experimenting on animals is sinful, killing an animal for an inhumane purpose, almost any
purpose apart from sacrifice and consumption, is wrong. While nearly every sect of Abrahamic
tradition has come to the conclusion that the use of animals in scientific experimentation¹⁶ is
acceptable, there is no scripture that commands or permits man to learn from killing.)

The experimenters began their experiment by surgically implanting electrodes throughout
the animal’s skull, touching the surface of the animal’s brain. In order to not contaminate the
reading of the EEG, the animals were allowed to recover for several weeks. The scientists

¹⁵ W. Schulze, H. Schultze-Petzold, A.S. Hazem, and R. Gross, Deutsche Tierärztliche Wochenschrift, (German Vetrinary
¹⁶ Infra note 19.
divided all of the animals into two groups and slaughtered half according to halal method and slaughtered the other half through captive bolt stunning. The experimenters reported that the EEG’s of the animals killed by a sharp knife with one, swift stroke to the neck did not change in the first three seconds from the time the knife passed through the neck. The experimenters claimed that the animal’s “pain” impulses remained constant before, during, and immediately after the slaughter indicating that the animal did not feel an increase in pain during or immediately after the incision. During the next three seconds (seconds 4-6), the EEG recorded a condition of unconsciousness similar to deep sleep due to the lack of blood flow to the animal’s brain. The EEG then recorded zero level showing no nervous impulse reaching the brain at all.

The experimenters reported that although the heart was still pounding and the body convulsing vigorously the animal was not experiencing the convulsions consciously because the brain was not emanating nervous impulses and that the convulsions were a reflex of the spinal cord. This meant to the researchers that the halal method of killing does not cause an increase in pain to animals during slaughter making halal, and by extension kosher, killing methods consistent with G*D’s command to be good stewards and avoid cruelty to animals. In comparison, the experimenters claimed that captive bolt killing resulted in animal suffering. Schultz and Hazim reported that animals killed by captive bolt stunning were apparently unconscious soon after stunning yet the EEG showed severe pain immediately after stunning. (In contrast, the ECG recorded that the stunned animals heart ceased pumping blood much sooner.)

The question does not have to be asked “Does halal or kosher slaughter reduce or eliminate pain?” to reach the conclusion that Abrahamic religions’ adherents should be
concerned about animal welfare and suffering, and the humane treatment of animals.\textsuperscript{17} The halal or kosher methods intended to reduce the suffering of animals. It is the moral that embeds itself into these laws that should strongly remain in the objective of a halal or kosher killing. The moral is the purpose of the law. If religious adherents are not forced by castigation to comply with a law, and volunteer to do so by keeping as a member of a religion, then it is not the compulsion of keeping the law that motivates the member of the group. It is a belief that the rule comes from G*D and that wisdom is superior. Understanding what the basis of the law is and what G*D is actually commanding, not just how G*D requires that man comply with divine will, actually lets the member of the religion become more certain of their obedience and comply more fully with divine law when an animal is slaughtered.

If a practitioners are to follow the purpose of the law, and purpose of the law is to avoid inhumane treatment of animals, then the halal and kosher slaughter methods should increase overall awareness of animal suffering and increase adherents’ humane treatment of animals even if the actual slaughter ritual does not decrease the suffering of animals. The overall mindset of a practitioner following the purpose of the law (to treat animals humanely) will likely behave more compassionately towards animals. The purpose of the laws is the self-evident and widely accepted rationale for keeping the laws today. While many sacred scriptures are not commands or laws, and many do not directly reveal G*D’s moral preferences, they do support the moral themes that Abrahamic law follow. Numerous scriptures include tangential commentary, metaphors, poems, parables, or factual accounts that do not necessitate an act of obedience.\textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{17} “O believers, eat the clean things we have provided you, be grateful to Allah if you sincerely want to obey Him.” (Quran 7:158).
\textsuperscript{18} Supra notes 8-10.
From a legal perspective, these texts are not significant, but to the practitioner looking to comply with the purpose of a law or moral, the additional scriptures carry explanations for the practitioners about the depth, and importance of the moral.

The legal rule for halal/kosher killings come from moral laws made by G*D. G*D created morality so that humans could act in a way that kept them in line with G*D’s will. G*D’s will is that animals should be protected, that is why G*D created the first man to be the steward of animals. As Adam was responsible to be the sole steward of all the animals, each person is responsible for being a steward because it was the purpose of his or her creation; when G*D created the first person, the purpose of the person was to be a steward. G*D never revoked this purpose. In Islamic, Jewish, or Christian understanding, G*D never states that man is no longer to be the steward. So if G*D never revoked or changed that purpose, then man is still responsible, not as a group, but as an individual. The practitioner who observes the purpose of the halal/kosher killing is better off understanding the purpose of proper stewardship from an individual point-of-view than from a group point-of-view in order to satisfy the full intent of G*D’s command to avoid cruelty to animals.

The Abrahamic based slaughter codes clearly state that the meat is impure if one knowingly eats an animal that has not been humanely killed.\(^\text{19}\) This shows that the rule does not just apply to those who would kill the animal, but to all of those who would eat it. (This could be

\(^{19}\) Id. Jabir told that God’s Messenger(s) forbade striking the face or branding on the face of animals…The same companion of the Holy Prophet(s) reported him as saying, when an ass which had been branded in its face passed him by: ‘God curse the one who branded it.’ (Narrated by Jabir bin Abdullah. Muslim, Vol.3, Hadith No. 2116. Also Awn al-Ma’bud Sharh Abu Dawud (hereafter referred to as Awn); 7:232, hadith No. 2547. Also The Lawful and Unlawful in Islam (in Arabic); Yusuf el-Kardawi; Mektebe Vahba, Cairo; 1977; p. 293. Also ‘Robson’ (Ref. No. 15); p. 872). This Hadith is concerned with causing pain to the animal on the sensitive parts of its body, as well as with the disfigurement of its appearance. Animals in Islam, The Modern Religion, viewed on Mar. 20, 2008, http://www.themodernreligion.com/misc/an/an2.htm.
scores of people.) The law says that the person will be breaking the law if he eats meat that has not been killed properly. If the practitioner wants to be compliant with the purpose of the law then he has the responsibility to make certain that the meat complies. Even in examples where the person is under the belief that the meat has been killed properly, if the practitioner wants to be compliant with the purpose of the law then he has the responsibility. If a practitioner turns a blind eye, he will be as if he knowingly engages in the wrong, according to the purpose of the law. Accepting that a law has been complied with according to a text may equate to compliance according to G*D, but only complying with the text in order to circumnavigate technically breaking an exact law, may be an abomination to G*D if the purpose of the law is defiled anyway.

G*D wants reverence for the law of G*D, and respect for the animal, to be included in the act of animal slaughter. In Islamic, Judaic, and Christian text it is clear that a prayer must be said to slaughter and meat that is to be eaten. This is because G*D wants to remind humanity of the seriousness of the act of killing an animal. G*D commands the holy name be included in order to remind people that the prescribed ritual for humane killing is the only holy way to kill, and that it in of itself is not holy, but it is holy because of the practitioner’s relationship to the divine and respect for the animal being killed (that also has a relationship to the divine). In these types of slaughter, the practitioner has been given strict instructions as to the most minimal way to inflict pain on the animal. As an offering to G*D, demonstrating compliance with G*D’s law, the practitioner must say a prayer to sanctify the act of killing an animal.

__________________________

20 “Do not eat meat of animal on which the name of Allah has not been invoked because this is an act of sin.” (Quran 6: 121).
This prayer also reminds the practitioner of the basic principle that stewardship is not the equivalent of dominion, but rather it is a position of servitude under G*D and creation. The law that states that a prayer to G*D must be said at each animal’s killing serves to remind man that the power to and permission for taking an animal’s life does not belong to him. G*D asks man to remember that the animal’s life is important to G*D. The practitioner proves to G*D, himself, and those benefiting from the slaughter (including consumers) that he has prostrated himself through prayer before G*D during the act of killing. The prayer serves as a moment to act humbly out of respect for the position of stewardship, out of respect for the inspirer of the animal’s life, and out of respect for the whole method of halal or kosher killing, which seeks to eliminate the cruelty of pain.

III. NOT TECHNICALLY ILLEGAL, BUT IMMORAL: A case for why Vegetarianism is currently the best form of compliance with the Abrahamic laws and morals relating to the humane treatment of animals.

A. Islam and Judaism

Today, halal killing has been enveloped by the world of factory-farming, in nearly every country producing halal meat, the slaughter process is actually haram. In lieu of killing one animal, with an attitude of reverence for Allah while saying the name of G*D to demonstrate respect for the creation’s life being taken; at halal plants cattle are placed on a conveyor belt; While the cattle rush by on these conveyor belts a loud speaker repeats a prayer and name of

---

21 Theologian Rev. Andrew Linzey states, “We need a concept of ourselves in the universe not as the master species but as the servant species—as the one given responsibility for the whole and the good of the whole. We must move from the idea that animals were given to us and made for us to the idea that we were made for creation, to serve it and ensure its continuance. This actually is little more than the theology of Genesis Chapter Two. The garden is made beautiful and abounds with life: Humans are created specifically to take care of it.” “Did God Give Humans Dominion over Animals,” Essene.com, viewed on Apr. 2, 2011, http://www.essene.com/Vegetarian/DidGodGiveHumansDominionOverAnimals.htm.

22 Al Shaddad Bin Aous has quoted this tradition of the Holy Prophet (P.B.U.H.) “God calls for mercy in everything, so be merciful when you kill and when you slaughter, sharpen your blade to relieve its pain.”
Allah to satisfy the requirement. This procedure satisfies the literal requirement but reduces the purpose of the law, to acknowledge the taking of the life from the Kingdom of Allah, to nothing more than a scheme. The entire idea that animals are suppose to be treated humanely is not just disturbed by convenient textual interpretations that facilitate greedy factory-farmers, some laws are blatantly disobeyed by major exporters of halal meat to the middle east.

In January 2006 undercover investigation conducted by People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) U.S. and Animals Australia captured shocking footage of the horrendous conditions and cruel treatment endured by Australian sheep and cattle who were exported to the Middle East and North Africa for consumption by Muslims. The sheep and cattle were packed on extremely crowded, disease-ridden ships, where they suffered for weeks or months at a time, and often died of starvation before they reached the ports where they would be transferred to filthy and more than questionable slaughterhouses. On board these ships the welfare of the animals was completely disregarded as they were exposed to all weather extremes and stuck amid their own waste on ships. These ships transport as many as 100,000 animals at a time. Because of the difficult conditions, thousands of these gentle animals die en route and many more become ill or injured. Animals who survive the grueling ocean voyage are dragged from trucks by their ears and legs, tied up, beaten, and hauled to abattoirs, where their throats are slit while they are still conscious. While the slitting of the throat conforms to Islamic law since the animal must bleed out before it can be consumed, many killers have no concern with the sharpness of the knife, which makes an enormous difference in the amount of suffering the animal experiences.

At minimum, the torture endured by these docile animals during live export could easily be eliminated by slaughtering animals in Australia and shipping the meat to the Middle East. With more than 50 export abattoirs with halal-certified programs already in place in Australia, these exports are overseen and enforced by people who are trained to enforce sharia, yet, they fall so miserably short of their original training and purpose. There are no barriers to increasing shipments of chilled-flesh products to the Middle East in the absence of live-animal imports. The slaughter of each animal is overseen by Muslim officials, and Australian Islamic leaders have approved the practice of electrical head stunning prior to slitting the animals' throats. As the animals are stunned—not killed—during this process, the practice is both consistent with halal requirements and is more humane. This advance was a compromise reached between animal rights activists and halal flesh producers. Notably, it circumvents the entire issue of halal slaughter and squeezes the idea in the absence of any sharia on the issue of whether an animal may be stunned before it is slaughtered.24

“If animals have been subjected to cruelties in their breeding, transport, slaughter, or in their general welfare, meat from them is considered impure and unlawful to eat (haram). The flesh of animals killed by cruel methods (Al-Muthiah) is carrion (Al-Mujathamad). Even if these animals have been slaughtered in the strictest manner, if cruelties were inflicted on them otherwise, their flesh is still forbidden food (haram).” Imam B.A. Hafiz al-Masri.25 The Abrahamic tradition does not just expect practitioners to comply with the legal letter of killing rituals if the treatment of the animals before they are killed goes against G*D’s principle of stewardship.

24
Islamic Concerns describes PETA’s undercover investigation. Unloading procedures are appalling. While some unloading is carried out on suitable permanent ramps, most frequently the delegation witnessed trucks backed up to the sides of hills. The steep, muddy incline of the hillside caused the cows to slip and fall while trying to negotiate their footing. Many of these falls resulted in broken legs, broken pelvises, and other injuries.

Cows have a wide field of vision (greater than 300 degrees) and will often balk or refuse to move in new situations. They may also be hesitant to move when they become frightened by shadows (much unloading is done at night with artificial light) or by a change in flooring surface or texture. In most cases, no effort was made to provide a gradual decline for the unloading of the cattle. Instead, the cattle were forced to jump or were beaten and pushed from the high beds of the trucks onto the ground below. On some occasions, we witnessed downed cows and bullocks left at the foot of the truck while other cattle were forced to jump down and land on them, causing further injuries. Overcrowding is particularly cruel when temperatures soar, leading to crippling exhaustion and suffocation. Often cattle are injured or blinded when they are gored by the horns of other animals or when they lose their footing and slip in the speeding trucks. Our team followed one truck in southern India that was going over 80 kph on bumpy, winding roads. The cattle in the truck continuously lost their footing and fell. Many were kept upright only by the ropes through their noses pulled taut over the truck's frame, keeping their heads up. The cattle also caught their long horns in the slats in the trucks, causing painful neck and disc injuries and also resulting in their horns' being twisted and broken off. The cattle were also denied food and water during their transport, contrary to Indian law.” Care should be taken to ensure that all cattle have sufficient space to avoid injuring their horns and necks, goring their companions, and suffocating from heat and lack of air. Transporters found guilty of violations must face heavy fines and penalties. Compliant halal slaughterhouses should refuse to pay for or accept downed animals and should refuse to contract with carriers that transport cattle illegally and inhumanely. This will provide an incentive for shippers to properly transport their cattle. “During their journey from auction to slaughterhouse, cattle are often forced to walk hundreds of kilometers to and from trucking points. During these forced marches, cattle who collapse from exhaustion suffer the additional horror of having chili peppers, tobacco, and/or salt rubbed into their eyes to try to move them along. During PETA India's investigation, the delegates pulled whole and cut-up chili peppers, as well as leaves, from the eyes of countless cattle. Another method of forcing the cattle to move forward, used during the marches as well as in truck transport, is to twist and break their tails. The animals are also typically denied food, water, rest, or veterinary treatment during the forced marches and during truck transport. At the Deonar slaughterhouse in Mumbai, the situation was far worse than anything PETA has ever witnessed, leaving us no doubts that the cruel treatment continues.

worse. At the time of the delegation's tour at 10 a.m., there were already more than a dozen downed cattle. At least four had broken legs and could not stand up. One bull kept trying to raise himself to his feet but could not put his broken right front leg down. He struggled, moving in circles as he tried to get that foot on the ground until he finally collapsed under the heat of the sun. This same bull also had a broken horn from the truck transport nearly half-gone and oozing blood. While the slaughterhouse veterinarian providing the tour noted the bull's broken leg and stated that a broken horn is quite painful, he made no effort to provide any pain relief to the animal nor to put the bull out of his misery. At the Al-Kabeer slaughterhouse in Hyderabad, the delegation was refused access to the loading area, but from the road it could still be seen that several dead or dying cows had been left around the ramp. At Al-Kabeer and Deonar, no shade was provided at the unloading area, forcing the downed cows to endure temperatures of 100 degrees F with no relief. The delegation observed the cattle left in the unloading area until they died or until they could move themselves when the day became cooler. “Bukhari and Muslim, compilers of the Prophet’s (SAWS) authentic hadith, both report that the Prophet (SAWS) forbade a quadruped or any other animal to be kept waiting for slaughter. Cattle in India are routinely kept waiting long periods before they are finally killed, and their legs are sometimes even intentionally broken and slung around their necks to prevent them from wandering. Throughout this suffering, they are denied food and water. Much of the slaughter itself is also contrary to Islamic teachings. An hadith reported by Muslim states, "[W]hen you must kill a living being, do it in the proper way - when you slaughter an animal, use the best method and sharpen your knife so as to cause as little pain as possible." When he saw a man sharpening his knife in the presence of the animal he was to kill, the Prophet said, "Do you intend inflicting death on the animal twice - once by sharpening the knife within its sight, and once by cutting its throat?" Most cattle killed in India are not afforded the "luxury" of a sharp knife and a quick deadly cut to the jugular. Instead, in smaller slaughterhouses, their throats are sawed and hacked at with dull, small blades. The animals' legs are often cut off before the occurrence of death, and sometimes the animals suffer the agony of being skinned alive. Slaughter is not always better in large export operations. While cattle at these slaughterhouses are sometimes provided with some shade and water, the PETA India delegation observed improper and inhumane slaughter. For example, at the Al-Kabeer slaughterhouse in Hyderabad, while the captive-bolt stunning was used properly and effectively prior to slaughter, the delegation found several violations of halal principles. The most flagrant was the savage beating of cattle who were reluctant to move from the holding pen to the killing floor. These cattle were viciously beaten all the way to the stunning area. Such beatings contrast sharply with Islamic teachings. In addition, cattle were killed side-by-side in Al-Kabeer, in full view of one another, in violation of Muslim admonitions to shield the animal from the knowledge of impending death or danger. The situation was even worse at the Deonar slaughterhouse in Mumbai. Animals driven to this slaughter area were savagely beaten about their legs, neck, and face. These beatings, coupled with the appallingly rough treatment the animals received during transportation, left many
of the cattle with open and bleeding wounds all over their bodies. At the actual time of slaughter, the cattle are lined up, bound, and thrown on the floor in full view of all the other animals.

The problem with either Jew or Muslim accepting these products to satisfy the requirements of the law is that again, the manufacturers blatantly disobey the laws making the meat inedible. Many exposés of the kosher industry have shed light on the absurd torture that has become the replacement for the once cruelty free practice. As recently as 2007 the kosher industry was caught on tape violating fundamental tenets of Jewish law, compassion for animals and reducing unnecessary animal suffering. Increasingly, the insistence that life is sacred has led Jewish leaders to advocate vegetarianism. From the first chief rabbi of pre-state Israel, Rav Abraham Isaac Kook, to giants of Jewish culture such as Albert Einstein and Nobel Prize for literature winner Isaac Bashevis Singer, the vegetarian diet first prescribed in the Garden of Eden (Genesis 1:28-29) has been held forth as a kashrut [dietary law] for our age.

In the 2007 exposé, chickens and turkeys killed for their flesh in kosher slaughterhouses often suffered broken legs and wings as a result of rough handling and malfunctioning equipment. When they were slaughtered incorrectly, these sensitive animals survived for several minutes as they hung upside-down from metal shackles. As they hang they can only writhe in pain and torment as they slowly bleed to death. The animals are hung upside down to bleed to death, as is consistent with kosher killing, but the hanging of a live animal is severely inconsistent with kosher law, and happens very often. Hens used for eggs live with up to six other birds in battery cages that are the size of file drawers. Thousands of these battery cages are stacked row upon row in huge, filthy warehouses. The smell of waste and blood in these kosher

---

warehouses is so strong that it is often unbearable for undercover investigators. Male chicks are of no use to the egg industry and are often thrown into garbage bags and left to suffocate.\textsuperscript{28} Cattle raised for kosher meat are castrated, their horns are ripped from their heads, and third-degree burns (branding) are inflicted on them—all without any painkillers. This absolutely does not conform to the purpose of the human treatment of animals required by Judaism. The cruelty discovered during PETA's investigation into AgriProcessors, one of the largest exporters of kosher flesh, was shocking, but according to kosher authorities, it is not unique to this particular slaughterhouse. Even the strictest countries like Israel have been infiltrated by the demeaning and pathetic factory-farming industry.\textsuperscript{29}

AgriProcessors, the world's largest glatt kosher slaughterhouse, has been ignoring the Jewish commitment to compassion, and abusing U.S. federal law exceptions for kosher meat by mutilating fully conscious animals, shocking them in the face, and slaughtering living beings in a way that leaves many able to stand and attempt to flee, even minutes after their throats had been slit. AgriProcessors kosher slaughterhouse in Postville, Iowa. neglects cows, chickens, and turkeys who have suffered through prolonged consciousness after having their throats cut and being dismembered while still fully conscious. Though there are many instances of inhumane slaughter that have been captured on film, investigator's notes provide a detailed account of the entire process he witnessed occurring as regular business practice at the all kosher slaughter plant.

An undercover investigator saw the following:\textsuperscript{30}

The cow was loaded into a machine that resembles a large metal tube. His head stuck out of the front, then a metal bar clamped under his neck and forced his

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
head upwards and back, cocked in an awkward and painful-looking position. The entire machine rotated, turning the cow upside-down. This process seemed to terrify him—his eyes were wide with fright—I imagine because he had never been in such a helpless position. The cow’s exposed neck was scrubbed with a hose and brush, then a rabbi came out of a small room and slit the cow’s throat. Another worker followed the rabbi and gouged a chunk of flesh out of the cow’s neck and then pulled his trachea or esophagus (I'm not sure which one) outside of his throat so that it hung down. Then the machine reverted the cow into an upright position. The trap door on the side opened up and the cow was dumped onto the floor, where another worker attached a chain to the animal’s ankle so that he could be hoisted into the air and sent down the line. Many cows were still alive and conscious when they came out of the tube and were slammed onto the floor. Their heads often hit the concrete with a sickening crack. I watched as one cow landed on his feet and started scrambling around with a shocked look on his face. The workers simply jumped behind their barricade and waited for him to collapse. A cow stood up after being dumped on the floor and went into the corner. They managed to kill one or two more cows while he lay there moving around trying to stand up. He continually moved his nearly severed head around as his legs were also making an effort to stand. Some birds fell after being placed into buckets—these birds flopped around on the ground violently, and once stopped, they were thrown into the garbage. I took footage of chickens in trailers where the vents/fans were not running. It's August 11 and really hot. I also took footage of the dumping of chickens onto the conveyor system to be killed. I noticed that one chicken had her foot caught between the conveyor and the wall, and she was unable to pull her foot out. The auger broke today. That’s the machinery that brings the inedible parts out to the trailer to be dumped. The inedible matter went all over the basement. The maintenance man told me that the inedible matter was sent to be used in pet food and cosmetics. The USDA inspector, Chad, told me that there is another kosher plant in Waterloo called Cason. They use a different method, one recommended by Temple Grandin, where the cows are lowered onto their stomachs instead of being turned upside-down in this horrible machine. I filmed another chicken who was caught in the conveyor system of the poultry line. This time, the chicken’s head and wing were caught between the retaining wall and the conveyor. I did my best to free her, but access to the conveyor itself was blocked. The first time I saw a cow stagger to his feet and walk around with his trachea dangling outside of his body, I thought to myself, this can't be happening—but after several days I knew better…The suffering and cruelty I witnessed didn't phase anyone on that killing floor…I just wish that people who eat meat could stand where I did for a day and see cows whose eyes are wide with fright have their throats slit and tracheas gouged out…There is no justification for the cruelty I documented in that slaughterhouse. The presence of the USDA didn't have any effect, nor did the presence of the rabbis. These animals were failed by both religion and regulations…Jewish law (halacha) for kosher slaughter (shechitah) is quite strict and the process is supposed to be less traumatic for animals than mass production methods used in ordinary slaughterhouses, where high-speed slaughter
lines often leave conscious animals dangling in the air—their full bodyweight pulling their hip joints out of their sockets…

According to the National Jewish Population Study, the American Jewish population presently comprises 5.2 million people, 1 million of whom observe kashrut (kosher) all the time. For these observant people, the importance of adherence to strict Jewish law cannot be overstated. But the vast majority of Jewish people—even those who are not observant—identify kashrut as the marker of Jewish identity. According to Jewish authorities, what PETA documented at AgriProcessors violates both Jewish ideals and kosher laws so important to observant Jews. The eminent chief rabbi of Haifa (Israel), Shear-Yashuv Cohen, condemned the actions as “definitely unacceptable by halakhic standards.” Rabbi David Rosen, former chief rabbi of Ireland, called the abuse a “flagrant violation of Jewish halachic (religious legal) requirements.” Rabbi Barry Schwartz, who sits on the Central Conference of American Rabbis' Task Force on Kashrut, asserts, “The suffering of these animals during slaughter is sickening. Death is neither quick nor merciful.”

B. Christianity

Jesus, a rabbi, alluded to Talmudic law from Leviticus 11:17 saying in Mark 7:18-19, “Do you not see that whatever goes into a person from outside cannot defile him, since it enters not his heart but his stomach, and is expelled?” It is Mark who adds the explanation, “Thus he declared all foods clean.” But Jesus himself did not say that Jews should eat pig flesh. More relevant to this discussion is that the disciples, such as Paul, taught that the pig could be consumed, but he also taught that vegetarianism was acceptable. Paul addresses vegetarians in
Romans and Corinthians. The bible depicts a scene where some of the Christians remaining after Jesus’ death continue become splintered in their belief about eating meat. Some said meat was acceptable to eat, no matter the animal, and some said meat should not be eaten at all in order to best conform to the message of Jesus.

The New Testament writes an account about the faction that won, those who eat all meat. The bible is plagued with examples that show that Paul intervened into the group’s affairs with a campaign against vegetarians. “Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; and let not him which eateth not judge him that eateth: for God hath received him.” Romans 14:3. Paul, as a leader of a church appears to be neutral, but truly he is not. In these verses, they are asking him which is better, to rebel against Jewish customs by being vegetarians or by being an eater of animals. Paul openly ridicules the vegetarians saying “they are weak”—but then ads “in Christ” as to not offend. Id. Paul is making-fun of vegetarians as a method of persuading the early-Christians. It is obvious that Paul is making a joke about vegetarians’ thin appearance. (Just imagine a vegetarian who has not ever eaten preservatives and only eats herbs and vegetables, all while living in the desert. He would probably be rail thin.) This demonstrates that this barbaric idea toward man being weak in the body makes him weak in the soul cultivates the notion that we now share in America that the more meat, the better. (This attitude explains factory-farming.) Paul says they are weak in their faith because they cannot bring themselves to rebel in this direction. But Paul’s argument leads to breaking the spirit of the law. He allows people to decide how they should eat and slaughter based on external factors, like the strength of a person’s body.

---

31 Paul in Colossians 2:16, “Let no man judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days: which are a shadow of things to come.” Verses 16, 17.
32 This is a very Shaesperean moment. See, Dorothy Minkus-McKenna, The Pursuit of Halal, Progressive Grocer, 86, 17, Dec. 1, 2007.
This is the same mistake Adam committed when he chose for himself what he should eat, based on external influences in the garden.

It is Paul (as well as Mark and others) who began the current Christian tradition of over eating meat. The consumption of meat, especially in America, has become a huge rebellion against what G*D commanded and what Jesus’ apostle, who was one of the early founders of the Christian meat-eating faction, had in mind. Even Paul said to give thanks and pray over meat when it is eaten. Paul claims this will satisfy G*D’s dietary requirements insofar as it satisfies the spirit of the law. But Jesus never said this. Jesus says the opposite. Jesus never intended to teach his fellow Jews to disrespect or degrade animals; and it is evident that Jesus believed, at the least, that the less cruel form of intimate and reverential killing practiced by the Jews at the time was a practice that should endure. “Do not think that I have come to abolish the Law or the Prophets; I have come not to abolish them but to fulfill them. I tell you the truth, until heaven and earth disappear, not the smallest letter, not the least stroke of a pen; will by any means disappear from the Law until everything is accomplished. Anyone who breaks one of the least of these commandments and teaches others to do the same will be called least in the kingdom of heaven, but whoever practices and teaches these commands will be called great in the kingdom of heaven.” Matthew 5:17-19.

Jesus would not support the factory-farming practices in America and would certainly stand in opposition to everyone of the killing of any animal in the way that factory-farms kill. Jesus stated that the vegetarian mentality is superior. In Matthew chapter five Jesus explains “Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the Kingdom of heaven. Blessed are those who mourn

33 Luke 2:7, Mark 1:12-13
for they shall be comforted. Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth. Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for righteousness, for they shall be filled. Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy. Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see G*D. Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of G*D. Blessed are those who are persecuted for righteousness’ sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.”

CONCLUSION

It is the responsibility of all Abrahamic adherents to follow the spirit of G*D’s dietary laws by avoiding all associations with animal cruelty. Vegetarianism eliminates the possibility of consuming meat from a tortured animal and also obeys G*D’s intention that humans be stewards.