

**SHAREETATUSH
SHAITAAN
(THE SLAUGHTER
OF THE DEVIL)
THE SATANISM
OF MACHINE-KILLING**



**MUJLISUL ULAMA OF SOUTH AFRICA
PO BOX 3393
PORT ELIZABETH
6056 SOUTH AFRICA**

MACHINE KILLING

THE INFLUENCE OF IBLEES

Some muftis have sunk into the depths of deviation in their attempt to halaalize killing of animals by means of machines, which they term ‘machine-slaughtering’. The machine does not discharge the Shar’i act of *Thabah*. It kills animals satanically and is one of the ways of *Shareetatush shaitaan* (slaughter of the devil).

The muftis who lean heavily towards halaalizing machine-killed animals, scrounge for arguments in the Books of Fiqh, digging up some dead worms which have to be dismissed with scorn and contempt. Palpable errors of some seniors are presented as ‘*daleel*’ for the obnoxious idea of machine-killing being halaal *Thabah*. It seems that these muftis have developed a reputation for ignoring even the *Shiaar* (*Salient Features*) of Islam in their satanic endeavour to accommodate the institutions of the kuffaar.

The very first factor to consider underlying the attempt to Islamically legalize (i.e. to halaalize) machine-killing, is the *Niyyat* (intention). Why are these muftis so keen to halaalize machine-killing when it is a system of Iblees (*Shareetatush*

Shaitaan)? When the system is 100% in conflict with the *Masnoon* system, what goads them and spurs them to halaalize a haraam satanic system? The obvious answer is the *boodle*. The kuffaar entrepreneurs pay lucratively for shaitaan's 'halaal' certificates. To cater for mass production, *shareetatush shaitaan* is imperative.

Since the true *Masnoon* Islamic system can never fulfil the monetary objectives of the kuffaar, the need is to rope in some moron, corrupt muftis to halaalize by hook or crook machine-killing. The stupid '*dalaail*' which the miscreants proffer are absolutely flapdoodle, ludicrous and qualify them for the stricture:

*“He who presents the nawaadir of the Ulama
(as daleel), makes an exit from Islam.”*

*(Imam Al-Auzaai,
Allaamah Abdul Wahhaab Sha'raani
and other Fuqaha)*

Every Sunnat Act of Islamic *Thabah* is cancelled and abrogated in machine-killing. In fact, the entire Islamic system of *Thabah* is discarded in modern kuffaar systems even if the slaughterers are Muslims and the killing is effected by hand. Nothing of Islam's system of *Thabah* remains in any of the killing facilities of the kuffaar. Intentionally displacing the Islamic system and

substituting it with shaitaan's system solely for the monetary objective is KUFRA.

It is indeed lamentable, that the muftis concern themselves with only the cutting of the neck vessels regardless of the system producing the cutting being 100% shaitaani and in displacement of the holy system of Thabah commanded by Allah Ta'ala. They conduct themselves in a manner which portrays that there is no sacred system of Thabah ordained by Allah Ta'ala.

There is absolutely no imperative need for halaalizing the kuffaar-shaitaani system of killing. Anomalies are dug out from Fiqh kutub for the sole purpose of boosting and supporting the kuffaar financial enterprises. Acts which the Fuqaha have intended for utilization in cases of extreme need are proffered by the miscreant muftis to halaalize kuffaar institutions thereby cancelling Islamic systems solely for the sake of lining pockets with the haraam dollars doled out by the kuffaar.

The same shaitaanity regulates the halaalizing of the riba banks by muftis who have lost their Imaani bearings and have become blind to the reality of Maut, Qabr and Aakhirah.

There is no merit in the convoluted ‘fiqhi’ arguments proffered by the wayward liberal muftis for the fulfilment of their boodle motives. Machine-killing is **HARAAM**.

THE NAWAADIR

Their fiqhi citations are baseless *nawaadir* which the moron mufti proffered to bolster his egregiously erroneous idea of machine-killing being permissible. Rare and obscure views may not be presented as *daleel*. Imaam Al-Auzaai’ (Rahmatullah alayh) as well as other Fuqaha have said:

“He who holds on (proffers as daleel) to the nawaadir of the Ulama have made an exit from Islam.”

In his endeavour to bolster his idea, the mufti stupidly avers:

“Between the one who activates the machine and the act of slaughter is a lifeless actor (mubaashir) which effects the act (of slaughter) without any medium. When the mubaashir (here it refers to the machine) is lifeless, then the hukm will be attributed to the mutasabbib (the one who had activated the machine).

Hence, there is scope for attributing the act of Thabah (slaughter) to the one who had pressed the

button. In this regard, Kaasaani (Rahmatullah alayh) said:

“The Rukn (Fundamental) in Voluntary Slaughter (Az-zakaatu Ikhtiyaari), is Thabah (that is to slaughter). And, in Az-zakaat Idhtiraari (Involuntary Slaughter) the Rukn is Al-jarh (to wound), and that will be attributed to the Raami (the man who shoots the arrow), and to the mursil (the one who lets loose the hunting dog).

The arrow and the hunting dog are mere instruments of wounding. The act will be related to the one who uses the instruments, not to the instrument.”

In so far as Thabah is concerned, the principle proffered by the Mufti has no application because the Shariah stipulates that the slaughtering **MUST** be effected by the human hand in *Az-zakaatu Ikhtiyaari*. In *Az-zakaat Idhtiraari* the condition is that the instrument of wounding or the hunting dog must be effected by a Muslim human being. This essential condition will be further explained in this treatise, Insha-Allah.

The mufti has lamentably failed to apply his *Aql*. His claim of there being ‘scope’ for permissibility is highly irresponsible. He is unable to state with clarity and emphasis that it is permissible. A mere scope for permissibility may not be proffered to

halaalize kuffaar meat products for Muslim consumption. Meat must be 100% halaal. Even if momentarily it is accepted that there is ‘scope’, such scope is grossly baseless for proclaiming as halaal machine-killed animals.

While the chap who activates the machine is the cause of the killing of the animals, the killing in this way does not render the animals halaal. A man being the activator of the machine does not render the killed animals halaal for the simple reason that Shar’i Thabah has not been effected. It is the machine that kills, not the person. Even a child can understand this simple truth.

The text of Kaasaani (Rahmatullah alayh) in no way supports the flapdoodle claim of the mufti. The attribution of the killing to the shooter or the one who lets loose the hunting dog is specific with *Az-zakaat Idhtiraari -Involuntary Slaughter*. It does not apply *Az-zakaatu Ikhtiyaari*. The mufti appears to be ignorant of the conditions for validity of Shar’i Qiyaas. One of the conditions is that the *Maqees Alayh* (the premise on which the extension of the *hukm for the Fara’* will be based) must not be in conflict with Qiyaas (it should not be irrational).

Az-zakaat Idhtiraari is *khilaaf-e-qiyaas* (irrational), hence it may not be presented as a basis for

deciding the ruling of an issue for which there is no *Nass*. The *hukm* applicable to *Az-zakaat Idhtiraari* will be confined to it. While the wounding of the animal in *Az-zakaat Idhtiraari* will be attributed to the *raami* of the arrow, the machine's act of killing in *Az-zakaatu Ikhtiyaari* will not be attributed to the one who activates the machine since *Thabah* in this case is within the ability of the slaughterer. Thus the employment of *Qiyaas* in this scenario is palpably fallacious. The *shart* for the validity of *Qiyaas* is missing in this case.

THE INSTRUMENT OF KILLING

Adding to his confusion, the Mufti says:

“For Shar’i slaughter, it is not necessary for the instrument of slaughtering (e.g. the knife) to be in the hand at the time of the act of Thabah because the Fuqaha have permitted Nahr in place of Thabah, and Thabah in place of Nahr. What is Nahr? “

Again the Mufti has displayed his inability to apply his mind correctly. Whether the act of killing is by *Thabah* or *Nahr*, in both methods the instrument of killing is in the hand of the *Thaabih* (slaughterer). The *Shar’i* method of *Thabah* imperatively requires the knife to be in the hand of the *Thaabih*. If the *thaabih* flings the knife with dexterity at the animal, simultaneously reciting the *Tasmiya*, and thus

accomplishes the act of severing the neck vessels, the meat will be haraam since the demand of *Az-zakaatu Ikhtiyaari* repudiates the act which is valid for *Az-zakaat Idhtiraari*.

By what stretch of imagination did the Mufti understand that the instrument of killing in both Thabah and Nahr is not wielded by the hand of a human being? His understanding is weirdly peculiar. It is imperative for the knife/instrument to be administered by the hand of the one who effects the Thabah/Nahr.

This baseless idea has been formulated to accommodate machine-killing. But it is palpably haraam because unlike *Az-zakaat Idhtiraari*, the act of cutting may not be attributed to the chap who activates the machine. As mentioned, *Az-zakaat Idhtiraari* is an irrational (Khilaaf-e-Qiyaas) issue whose rules may not be extended to *Az-zakaatu Ikhtiyaari*. This attribution to the activator mentioned in the Kutub of Fiqh applies to only *Az-zakaat Idhtiraari*. Thus it is mentioned in *Badaaius Sanaa'* and in the other Kutub as well:

“In Az-zakaat Idhtiraari the Rukn is jarh (wounding the animal), and that is attributed to the raami (the archer) and the mursil (the one who lets loose the hunting dog). Verily the arrow and the

dog are the instruments causing the wound. However, the actual action is related to the one who uses the instrument.”

It is gross ignorance to conflate and confuse this attribution pertaining to *Az-zakaat Idhtiraari* to normal slaughter (*Az-zakaatu Ikhtiyaari*). The Mufti has perpetrated a colossal blunder by attributing the machine’s action of cutting the neck to the one who activates the machine. This is not a case of *Az-zakaat Idhtiraari*.

Although the Mufti acknowledges that:

“It is worthwhile to reflect whether machine-slaughtering is a dhuroorat (real need).....Claiming that machine-slaughtering is a dhuroorat is incomprehensible.”

Yes, and likewise is the Mufti’s labour to halaalize machine-slaughtering, incomprehensible. The only ‘dhuroorat’ for accommodating machine-slaughtering of any kind, is the pecuniary objective which is attained by promoting the kuffaar chicken/meat empires with the ‘halaal’ emblem. It is therefore a flagitious act of criminality for a Mufti to split hairs, dig up worms from the Kutub of Fiqh and meander in a zig zag pathway to discover stupidities for finding accommodation in

the Shariah for Shareetatush Shaitaan. Such extricating of *jawaaz* to promote the kuffaar enterprises is treacherous, to say the least.

A Mufti is under Shar'i command to take into consideration the prevailing circumstances and to defend the Shariah, and to ensure that his fatwa does not promote laxity in the tenets of the Deen. His entire discourse on the topic of machine-killing is spiritually nauseous and a rendition of great disservice to the Deen and to the Ummah.

His '*mubaashir*' and '*mutasabbib*' argument should be cremated and assigned to the realm of oblivion, and not introduced into a dimension where it is unneeded and uncalled for. The *Usool of the Shariah* formulated by the Fuqaha have their substrate of operation for their functionality, and may not be pillaged and plundered for just any nonsensical, satanic venture which is designed purely for the benefit of the kuffaar entrepreneurs.

Now what award should be bestowed to these zig zag muftis who display blithe disregard for the *Akhlaaqi* and *Roohaani* progress and elevation of the Ummah by churning out corrupt fatwas? The best award for them is the prize of *Humurum Mustanfiraah*. The exposition for this 'subliminal'

prize may be acquired from Aayat 50 of Surah Muddassir.

Further compounding his convoluted understanding, the Mufti says:

“It is not necessary for the instrument of Thabah to pass over the animal. If the neck of the animal is turned on to a motionless tool/instrument, then although this is in conflict with the Masnoon way, nevertheless it is sufficient for being halaal.”

This stupidity is debunked by the Shariah. Anything which is in conflict with the Shariah or the Masnoon way is the *ta'leem* of Iblees, hence it should not be entertained. Secondly, this stupid convolution does not support the Mufti's view pertaining to machine-killing because the killing instrument in this case is not motionless as the Mufti has baselessly imagined in his bunkum hypothesis. The machine is activated by electricity and the cutting blade is in continuous movement.

Thirdly, there is no valid *daleel* for claiming that killing of an animal in this devilish manner is permissible. It is pure satanism to fix a knife in some place, then brush the chicken's neck against the fixed motionless knife to sever its neck vessels.

This type of evil killing comes within the scope of *Shareetatush Shaitaan (the slaughter of shaitaan)*.

It is a display of *Istikhfaaf* to condone it by simply saying that despite being in conflict with the Sunnah (i.e. with the Qur'aan and Sunnah) it is halaal. The method of the devil can never be halaal, and what the devil's killing produces is not halaal regardless of the deception of the neck-veins being cut. The devil's method may not be ameliorated and mitigated for the sake of accommodating the kuffaar killing facilities.

The Mufti displaying stupid dissonance says: "*In Thabah Ikhtiyaari the objective (maqsood) is that the act of thabah be effected on the specific veins and that the action of a Mukallaf (baaligh person) be instrumental in it (in the killing). Thus some Ahnaaf Fuqaha have said that it suffices to burn the location of thabah (the neck) for the blood to flow.*"

The Mufti Sahib has indeed sunk into an extreme state of intellectual degeneration to proffer this *naadir (obscure, weird, discarded)* view for rendering the effects of devil's slaughter halaal to favour the kuffaar animal killing houses. In so doing, he has abdicated his august pedestal which a genuine Mufti of the Deen occupies. Assuming that this weird *naadir* specimen of flaccidity had any

real value and licence for application, then too, what business does this mufti have for digging in the dregs of incongruity?

The contextual ‘business’ here is the interests of the kuffaar entrepreneurs who manipulate and dominate the machine-killing apparatus all over the world. The job of the Mufti of the Deen is to guard and defend the glorious, hallowed Institution of the Deen. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had provided sufficient elaboration and emphasis for Muslims to understand the incumbency of implementing the Ahkaam of the Shariah to the fullest in the circumstances available. Such implementation may not be discarded to appease the bestial nafs and to sweeten the monetary palates of the kuffaar who operate the machine-killing apparatus of Iblees.

The Mufti has furthermore erroneously stated the *maqsood* (objective) of *Thabah Ikhtiyaari*. The two acts which he claims constitute the *maqsood*, are in fact the two fundamentals of *Thabah Ikhtiyaari*. The *Maqsood* is to provide Halaal-Tayyib meat, and this is realized only by executing *Thabah Ikhtiyaari* perfectly in the manner explained by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The *maqsood* is not the two fundamental acts which are imperative for the *Hillat* of the meat.

Any Shar'i system which is mutilated beyond recognition is never the *maqsood* as contemplated by the Shariah. The Shariah is the product of Wahi. It is not the product of intellectual conjecture which generally pivots on wild vacillating of the bestial nafs of man. Every person whose *Aql* has not been cast into disequilibrium by disobedience and nafsaniyat, readily understands that the mufti who digs up *nawaadir* from the Kutub of Fiqh in a bid to extravagate 'daleel' to bolster the monetary empires of the kuffaar with stupid zig zag mental gymnastics, has deviated from Siraatul Mustaqeem.

The Mufti Sahib should hang his head in shame for his reprehensible twiddling of the Ahkaam of the Shariah by proffering the ludicrous *naadir* act of burning the neck of an animal as 'daleel' for halaalizing the **haraam satanic system of killing** and for the products of the kuffaar machine-killing mafia operators. There is absolutely no scope whatsoever in this satanic venture for mitigation. Thus, it is an insult to his own *Aql* and *Ilm* for disgracing himself with the stupid 'fire' figment which is a view rejected by the vast majority of Fuqaha. Anyhow, be it as it may, it just has no validity in the discussion pertaining to machine-killing of animals.

The *Maqsood* of Salaat, for example, is not achieved by confining the performance of Salaat to only the Six Fardh factors. One who does so without valid reason confirms his abode in Jahannam. Similarly, is the case of Shar'i Thabah. It is among the *Shi-aar (Salient Features)* of Islam. It may not be mangled and mutilated to render it (the mutilated form) acceptable to the kuffaar. Such a devilish rendition is kufr. The Mufti should repent and dump his *naadir* on which he structures his argument, in the sewer gutters.

There is no valid acceptable *daleel* which could justify the displacement of the sacred Shar'i system of Thabah, and it is ludicrous to conflate the two systems of Shar'i Thabah in order to produce a fatwa of *jawaaz* for the kuffaar killing system. *Az-zakaat Idhtiraari* may not be employed as a basis for halaalizing acts which are haraam in *Az-zakaat Ikhtiyaari*. In the discourse of machine-killing *Az-zakaat Idhtiraari* does not feature in any way whatsoever. The masaa-il related to killing hunted animals belong to an entirely separate chapter. But this Mufti Sahib presents twaddle based on his twiddling and trifling with irrational (*khilaaf-e-qiyaas*) factors which may not be adopted. He has only obfuscated the issue with obnoxious conjecture.

Repeating his nonsense, the Mufti Sahib says:

“The actual maqsood (objective) is the cutting of the requisite neck vessels and the act of a Mukallaf. However, this permissibility shall have the following conditions:....

“At the time of slaughtering or at the time of pressing the button, only the animal present at that time by the cutting knife will be halaal. The Tasmiyah of the one who pressed the button will not suffice for animals coming afterwards (i.e. after the first animal).”

The venerable Mufti Sahib has insulted his own *Aql* with this nonsensical and blatantly haraam averment. Firstly, he has ignored the entire Shar’i – Masnoon – system of Thabah and has confined it to only the act of slitting the neck. Beyond this one requisite, the Mufti Sahib has miserably failed to understand the imperative importance of the Shar’i system, observance of which is Waajib.

Secondly, he has ignorantly imagined that the electrically operated devil’s machine can be switched on and off for each chicken. It is absolutely absurd to even entertain this ludicrous idea. The machine kills a million chickens daily in a killing facility. It is indeed a mystery to understand what constrained the Mufti to make this silly observation which is totally impractical. The issue

of machine-killing relates to the kuffaar. Thus the stupid idea postulated by the Mufti is laughable for them.

The chickens are suspended upside down on a fast moving conveyor belt and are killed at the rate of 50 per minute, but the Mufti dreams of the machine to be switched off after the killing of each chicken to conform to his incongruous understanding of the Shar'i procedure of Thabah.

In terms of his convoluted understanding which clearly confirms that he has not understood the machine-killing process, he says:

“If someone is appointed to be at the (machine’s) knife to grab hold of the (chicken’s) neck, then it is also necessary for him to be a Muslim or a Kitaabi and to recite Bismillaah because he too participates in the act of slaughtering.”

The chap at the machine who kills the chicken being a Muslim is in fact an incumbent condition even according to kuffaar understanding. As such all halaalized kuffaar killing houses employ only Muslims to do the machine-killing. Thus, this averment of the Mufti is superfluous. However, this Mufti believes that even if the machine slaughters on its own after the machine is activated by a

Muslim reciting the Tasmiyah, then the first chicken will be halaal. The subsequent chickens will be halaal according to him only if the chap switches off the machine after each chicken is killed, then switches it on for the next chicken, and repeats this process a million times for the million chickens which the killing facility kills daily. The nonsense of this stupidity is extremely incongruous. It is bereft of rationality.

Uttering seismically drivel which boggles the mind, the Mufti states:

“The machine-thabah in which the animal is slaughtered by hand and is used for other activities, is doubtlessly permissible.”

The ‘other activities’ of the machine remain a conundrum. Has this mufti become an agent for the kuffaar animal-killing facilities? What has happened to his Aql? How can a person who has any regard for the Deen and its Institutions ever conclude satanically that a 100% haraam kuffaar brutal system of killing in which not even one aspect of the Masnoon Shar’i method of the divinely ordained Thabah procedure is observed, that it is a flawless system which is halaal without doubt?

He is guilty of *Istikhfaaf*. With reckless temerity does he dump the Shariah's Waajib system into the drain to proclaim the kuffaar brutal system 'flawless'. It is also his belief that even if the animal is not slaughtered by hand, but its killing is the consequence of the machine which kills automatically. The only condition the Mufti attaches for the meat to be halaal in this devil's system of slaughter is that the chap who switches on the machine should be a Muslim reciting the Tasmiyah.

It is downright stupid and shaitaani to aver that the chap who switches on the machine is the slaughterer when he has absolutely no role in the actual cutting of the neck veins. By activating the machine, he merely removes the impediment from the entity (the machine in this case) which does the actual work of severing the neck vessels.

It is unanimously agreed that the thabah (slaughtering) of an insane person or of a drunk man is not valid and the meat will be haraam. An insane Muslim or drunk Muslim or a kaafir has a knife in hand and is about to slaughter an animal. A Muslim grabs hold of him, thus preventing him from slaughtering. The one who restrains the insane man/the drunk man/ the kaafir, is the impediment. Another faasiq Muslim of this Mufti's choice

appears on the scene and removes the impediment by chasing away the restraining man, and simultaneously with the slaughter effected by the insane one, etc., he (the man who removed the impediment) recites the Tasmiyah and the animal is slaughtered by one of the three chaps. Every Muslim besides the miscreant Mufti, will say that the animal is haraam. It is haraam because a kaafir slaughtered it – because a mad man slaughtered it – because an intoxicated man slaughtered it notwithstanding the fact that a Muslim had recited the Tasmiyah when he removed the impediment.

No one in his right frame of mind, besides the Mufti, will claim that the meat is halaal and argue that since the slaughtering despite being effected in this case by the kaafir, etc. has to be attributed to the Muslim who had removed the impediment and had recited the Tasmiyah.

Assuming this is correct and permissible, it can never ever be acceptable and workable in any of the chicken/animal killing facilities because neither the killing machine nor the conveyor belt on which the chickens hanging upside down come swirling, can be deactivated and brought to an abrupt halt a million times daily, i.e. a halt for each animal.

WHO IS THE THAABIH (SLAUGHTERER)?

Of vital importance in understanding the Shar'i ruling on this question is to establish who actually is doing the slaughtering (thabah). Is the machine doing the slaughtering or the operator of the machine? There is no difficulty in establishing who or what is doing the actual slaughtering of the animal. The operator of the machine merely presses a button and the machine comes into action. The assistant/s merely usher the animal or bird into the slaughtering machine. Human action then ceases and the animal is automatically slaughtered by the power-operated machine. The only relationship which the human operator has with the process is to switch on the machine. The only relationship which the handler of the animal has is to steer the animal into the machine. Beyond this, they have no participation in the actual act of thabah. The act of thabah is effected SOLELY by the machine operating automatically, i.e. the actual cutting of the neck-vessels is done by only the machine. No reasonable person can deny this indisputable fact that the animals are slaughtered by the machine and not by any human being. Hence, in regard to the actual slaughtering it is conclusively proven that this is effected by the machine. We have now

established that the slaughterer (the thaabih) in this case is the automatic machine and not the operator of the machine or the one who drives or ushers the bird/animal into the machine.

About the thaabih (actual slaughterer), the Shariat decrees:

"And, among its (Shar'i thabah's) conditions is that the thaabih be a person of the millat of tauhid....."
(Hidayah)

"Among its conditions is that the thaabih is a Muslim or a Kitabi."

(Raddul Muhtaar)

There is absolutely no difference of opinion on this issue. Unanimously – according to all Mathahib – has it been established that an absolute and obligatory condition for the validity of Shar'i thabah is that the act of thabah MUST be effected by a human slaughterer (thaabih).

Elaborating further on this Fardh (compulsory) requirement, the Shariat states:

"Among its conditions is that the thaabih be an understanding person. Hence, the slaughtered animal of an insane person and a child who does not understand will not be consumed."

(Raddul Muhtaar)

Elaborating on the unlawfulness of the animal slaughtered by an insane person, Raddul Muhtaar states:

"Because an insane person has no intention. And, the validity of intention (qasd) is with that which we have mentioned, viz., the author's statement: 'When he is able to understand the Tasmiah, realizes the animal and possesses the ability (to slaughter).' It is for this reason that he says in Jauharah: 'The thabeegah (slaughtered animal) of a child who does not understand, of an insane person and of an intoxicated person who does not understand will not be consumed.' (Shurambulaliyah)"

"Verily, an insane person has no intention (qasd.)"
(Raddul Muhtaar)

"The slaughtered animal will be halaal if the thaabih understands the Tasmiah and the thabeegah."
(Hidayah)

"If he (the thaabih) does not understand the Tasmiah nor understands (perceives or realises) the thabeegah, it (the animal so slaughtered) is not halaal." (Hidayah)

"And, qasd (conscious intention) has been decreed a condition in thabah." (Minhajut Talibeen of Imam Nawawi)

The aforementioned references indicate very clearly that according to the Shariat, the thaabih (the actual slaughterer) must be a human being who possesses understanding or intelligence so that he may discharge the condition of qasd (intention) and understand what act he is executing. He, himself, i.e. the actual slaughterer **MUST** understand that he is slaughtering; reciting the Tasmiah, and he must perceive the animal. In short, one of the essential requisites of valid and lawful Shar'i thabah (slaughtering) is consciousness of the slaughterer. The following facts will be clear from the references cited above:

(a) The thabah (slaughtering) of an insane person although Muslim reciting the Tasmiah at the time of thabah and severing the required four vessels, is not valid. An animal slaughtered by an insane Muslim will not be halaal notwithstanding the fact that he has slaughtered "correctly".

(b) If a child who is not of proper understanding effects thabah "correctly" by reciting Tasmiah and severing the four neck vessels, the animal will nevertheless be haraam.

"THE ANIMAL SLAUGHTERED BY A CHILD WHO DOES NOT UNDERSTAND, BY AN INSANE PERSON AND BY AN INTOXICATED PERSON

WHO DOES NOT UNDERSTAND, WILL NOT BE CONSUMED'.

(Jauharah, Shurambulaliyah, Raddal Mukhtar)

The Shar'i emphasis on the essentiality of CONSCIOUSNESS, INTENTION and UNDERSTANDING of the slaughterer (thaabih) is abundantly manifest. It has already been established that the actual slaughterer in machine-slaughtering (the mode of automatic slaughtering effected by machines) is the automatic power-driven machine, not the one who ushers the animals into the machine. In so far, as the machine is concerned the essential Shar'i requirement for the validity of Shar'i thabah, viz., consciousness is absolutely non-existent. The animals slaughtered unconsciously by the machine being haraam is, therefore readily comprehensible and indisputable on the basis of Shar'i proofs. When the Shariat brands as haraam animals slaughtered "correctly" by children and insane persons who happen to be members of Islam, then to a greater degree will the Shariat apply its ruling of haraam to animals slaughtered by an inanimate and an unconscious machine. An inanimate machine does not enjoy a status higher than a child or an insane Muslim.

The reference cited above informs us that another compulsory condition for the validity of Shar'i thabah is that the slaughterer be a Muslim or

a Kitaabi, but the slaughterer in automatic machine slaughtering is not a human being. The slaughtering force in this case is an inanimate machine. Thus, in the absence of this condition too, the slaughtered animal of the machine is haraam.

The Shariat emphasises much the demand that slaughtering MUST be effected by a human being and that animals slaughtered by non-humans are haraam. It should not be assumed (as some supposedly learned people have done) that because of the non-existence of power-driven, electrically-operated slaughtering machines in the time of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the Shariat is silent or ambiguous on the slaughtering effected by such machines. The Shariat of Islam is the Law of Allah Ta'ala which brings within the ambit of its decree all and every exigency and development until the Day of Qiyamat. Declaring its emphasis on human-slaughtering in negation of machine or inanimate and unconscious slaughtering, the perfect and all-embracing Shariat of Muhammadur Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) says:

"The shart (i.e. a compulsory stipulation for the validity of Shar'i slaughtering) is that a human being wounds the animal (in case of thabah idhtirari) or slaughters it. Without this (human slaughtering) it (the animal) will be like an animal which has been gored to death or an animal which has fallen to its death."

(Raddul Muhtaar)

The slaughtering accompanied by all its Shar'i conditions (shurut) must be executed consciously and intentionally by direct action of a human being. And, by direct action, the Shariat means that the act of severing the required neck-vessels must be executed manually – the instrument of cutting to be wielded and directly manipulated by the hand of the thaabih (slaughterer). The actual act of cutting must be effected by the instrument operated by the power of the human hand and not by mechanical power or some other external force. The Shariat emphasises the condition of human power for the validity of thabah to such an extent that human power – man's personal act – is stipulated as a condition for the validity of even thabah idhtirari (viz., killing the animal by means of an arrow or sharp instrument in case of game or even domesticated animals which have gone wild and out of man's control). Thus Imam Shaafi (rahmatullah alayhi) states in Kitaabul Umm, Vol. 2:

"Thakat (i.e. Shar'i thabah) is of two kinds. One kind pertains to animals over which man has control. In this class is thabah (actual slaughtering accompanied by all Shar'i conditions) and nahr. (The second class of slaughter-thakat), pertains to animals not in man's control. In this class (of thakat) the human being captures (or kills) an

*animal by means of a silaah (sharp weapon) with HIS HAND (bi-yadihi); or a human being with his HAND shoots an arrow at the animal. Hence, it (Shar'i Thakat or slaughter) is the **ACT OF MAN'S HAND.**"*

Imam Shaafi's repeated use of the phrase, "bi-yadihi" or "with his hand" indicates the Shar'i emphasis on human power – the power of the human hand actually driving the knife or instrument to bring about thabah. Therefore, a type of "slaughter which is not the direct consequence of the power of man's hand – a slaughter in which the required neck-vessels are severed by an instrument NOT driven by the power of a human hand, but by mechanical power or some other external force, will not be Shar'i thakat.

In defining Shar'i slaughter, Imam Shaafi (rahmatullah alayhi) stresses,

"THUS IT IS THE ACT OF MAN'S HAND"

If human hand-power was not a stipulation for the validity of Shar'i thabah, then Imam Shaafi (rahmatullah alayhi) would not have defined such thabah as "the act of man's hand" nor would he have stressed that the weapon must be wielded by man's hand; neither would he have said that the arrow must be shot with man's hand. If the driving force of man's hand in effecting the thabah was not a

Shar'i stipulation then it would have sufficed if Imam Shaafi (rahmatullah alayhi) had said: "with a weapon or with an arrow". There would then have been no need to condition the wielding of the weapon and the shooting of the arrow with "man's hand". The Shariat thus very clearly negates automatic slaughtering in which an inanimate machine NOT driven by human power, executes the act of slaughter.

Thabah - not an automatic act

Automatic slaughtering has been invalidated by the Shariat in unambiguous terms. Stating the invalidity of automatic slaughtering, the authoritative and famous Book of Islamic Jurisprudence, Hidayah states in Volume 4:

"Thabah (slaughtering) is not attained (i.e. not valid) by means of only the instrument, but (is valid) by means of isti'mal (use). And, that (i.e. use) in both (the hunting dog and the hunting falcon) is by means of irsal (intentionally despatching or setting loose the dog or falcon in pursuit of the game). Hence, the irsal takes the place of shooting the arrow and driving the knife."

Here two terms of utmost significance appear, viz., "isti'mal" and "imrarus sikkeen". Isti'mal means "to employ"; "to use" and "imrarus sikkeen" means "the driving of the knife" or "to drive the

knife". This employment and driving of the knife must be effected by means of the human hand as appears elsewhere in the books of the Shariat, e.g. *Kitaabul Umm* cited above. Besides the clear text of the Shar'i verdicts on this issue, the grammatical connotation of the term, "isti'mal" a member of the word-class, *Istif'al* renders the translation of the term as: to seek use; to make use; to bring into action. The word-category to which "isti'mal" belongs negates automatic use or automatic action from its meaning. An instrument could be used manually – by man's direct force or it can operate automatically, without the direct force of man. If the instrument – the knife in our case – is driven by the force of man's hand, it will be described as "Imrarus sikkeen", and the term "isti'mal" will apply. But if the instrument operates of its own accord – i.e. automatically – then it will not be described as imrarus-sikkeen nor will the word *isti'mal* be applicable to it. On the contrary, the phrase, *bimujarradil alah* which appears in the aforementioned quotation from *Hidayah* will then apply to it. The meaning of the phrase is: "by means of only the instrument", in other words, automatic operation of the instrument or the operation of the instrument without human power or force. Hence, it is stated explicitly:

"Thabah (Shar'i slaughter) is not attained (not valid) by means of only the instrument, but by (it being) employed (or used)."

It is further clarified that the meaning of this "employment" or isti'mal is "to drive the knife":

In case someone attempts to fallaciously argue that by switching on the machine, man is employing or "using" it, thereby fulfilling the requirement of isti'mal, and hence imrarus sikkeen, we better exhibit the fallacy of such argument. Firstly, it will only be one not versed in Arabic who will resort to such a baseless argument. Secondly, only one ignorant of the clear-cut Shar'i meanings assigned to these terms, will argue thus. Thirdly, the statement of the Shariat, viz.(Thabah is not attained by means of only the instrument, negates this argument.

What does the Shariat mean by saying that slaughtering is not valid if the instrument is not used? The inference from this statement is clear. If the instrument is used, thabah is valid. If the instrument is not used, thabah is not valid. But, the question remains: If the instrument is not used, how could slaughtering be effected? In rejecting slaughter in which the knife is "not used", but operates of its own accord – automatically – the

Shariat negates the assertion that isti'mal exists in automatic operation. In saying:

i.e. slaughter by the instrument itself is not thabah, the Shariat accepts the fact that an instrument can slaughter or kill without the direct action of man, i.e. without the power of the human hand although such instrument is set-up or set into motion by man's operation or activity. In this case man's operation is confined to setting the instrument into motion and is not extended to the actual cutting of the neck-vessels. The Shariat has beautifully illustrated such automatic slaughtering for us to ensure that we remain in no doubt and to protect adherents of the Deen from being hoodwinked by "fatwas" of the nafs.

In the following citation appears an example of automatic slaughter – slaughtering achieved by the operation or activity of man, but not with the hand-power of man. Man's operation is merely confined to setting up the apparatus which executes the slaughter.

"Thus, a pit dug (to trap game) is none of the two kinds of thakat (Shar'i slaughter) whether a weapon (silah – a sharp instrument, e.g. spear, sword, dagger) is fixed in the pit or not."

In this illustration a man sets up the apparatus to trap and wound/kill a wild animal. In the process his action is confined to the setting up of the

apparatus and is not related to the actual wounding or killing. Since the animal was killed in the trap automatically and not by the power of the human hand, the Shariat proclaims the animal haraam and excludes this automatic form of killing from the definition of Shar'i thabah. On the contrary, if the man had killed the wild animal by directing the weapon to the animal with his own hands, then the animal would have been halaal. The Shariat gives as its reason for proclaiming this automatic killing haraam, the fact that human force was not utilized to kill the animal:

"The condition (shart) for the validity of Shar'i thakat is that the animal must be wounded by a human being or that a human being must slaughter it. Without this (human action), the animal will be like an animal gored to death or like an animal which was killed by falling." (Raddul Muhtaar)

Illustration (b)

"A man sets up a spear (or any other instrument in a trap) for the purpose of hunting a zebra. After a while he finds the zebra dead (having been killed by the spear-trap). The zebra is not halaal . . . because the condition (for the validity of Shar'i thakat which renders an animal halaal) is that a human being wounds it or slaughters it. Without this (human action) the animal will be like one gored to death or having fallen (from a height) to its death."

(Raddul Muhtaar)

In this example, no pit was dug. The apparatus of slaughter, viz., a spear was set up in a way which would wound or kill an animal passing by it. An animal was trapped in this spear-trap and killed. The Shariat brands the animal thus killed as haraam because the act of killing was NOT the effect of direct human force. If on the other hand the animal was killed by the spear driven by the force of the man's hands, then it (the animal) would have been halaal. This illustration furnished by the Fuqaha also clearly negates the validity of automatic killing.

Illustration (c)

"If a person sets up a sword or a spear (as a trap to kill game), then drives the game towards it (the sword or spear) and it reaches the sword/spear which slaughters it (the animal), its consumption is not halaal because the slaughter is without the killing of any person."

(Kitaabul Umm)

In this illustration too, the apparatus of killing is set up by a human being but in the actual killing of the animal, human force is not a feature. The killing is by the inanimate cutting device. The human being's action in the process is confined to setting

up or setting in motion the apparatus. Hence, the Shariat brands the automatically killed animal haraam and furnishes as its grounds:

*"BECAUSE ITS SLAUGHTERING IS WITHOUT
THE KILLING OF ANY HUMAN."*

In illustration (c), above, the operator of the apparatus (no matter how primitive the method of automatic slaughtering is in this illustration) is a Muslim who recites the Tasmiah when setting up the apparatus which will bring about the death of the animal. He then drives the animal towards the instrument which will kill. In other words, he operates his automatic-killing apparatus and drives the animal towards it. The animal is then killed automatically by the sword. The Shariat brands the animal as haraam since the cause of the killing is attributed by the Shariat to the apparatus and not to the man who operates the apparatus or the automatic machine. Automatic slaughter in terms of the Shariat is killing effected by any means without the direct force or power of the human being:

"The condition being that a human being must wound the animal or slaughter it. . ." (Raddul Muhtaar)

Illustration (d)

"A goat brushed against the knife which is in the hand of a person. As a result, it's gullet and wind-pipe are severed. The goat will not be halaal."
(Minhajut Talibeen of Imam Nawawi)

In this illustration, the animal is killed, not by the act of a human being, but by the goat brushing against the knife. The killing is thus executed automatically, and the Shariat proclaims it haraam despite the fact that the knife is held in the hand of a human being and the required vessels are severed. (According to the Shaafi Math-hab the vessels required to be compulsorily severed are the gullet and the wind-pipe, hence we have said, "required" here. However, according to the Hanafi Math-hab the required vessels to be severed are at least three.) The slaughtering although effected by a knife held in the hand of a Muslim, is nevertheless not valid according to the Shariat because such killing was not by the force of the human hand.

ALLAAMAH MAHMOOD ON MACHINE-SLAUGHTERING

(In refutation of a fatwa which had declared the carrion produced by machine-slaughtering to be halaal.)

Hadhratul Allamah Maulana Mufti Mahmood Sahib, Mufti and Shaikhul Hadith of Madrassah Qasimul Uloom, Multan, Pakistan states about the automatic machine-slaughtering:

"After the explicit fatwa of the animal slaughtered by this (automatic) method being halaal, it is absolutely meaningless to merely say that this method is contrary to the Sunnat. Makruh, cruel or that the thaabih's (slaughterer) act in slaughtering by this means is bad. Even if the one who presses the button be a Muslim and recites the Tasmiah at the time of pressing the button, then too the thabeedah (slaughtered animal) of the machine will not be halaal. On the contrary. It will be carrion.

It is evident that the only act of the one who presses the button is the restoration of the electrical power which was disconnected from the machine when it was switched off. In pressing the button, the operator has merely removed the impediment which restrained the activation of the machine. He merely removed this impediment thereby permitting the action of the machine. In reality, the blade of the machine and the cutter of the neck of the animal will be driven by electrical power and not the driving force of the hand of a Muslim. Thus, the slitting of the throat of the animal is the act of the electrically driven machine and not the act of a Muslim.

In thabah, it is a shart (a compulsory condition) that the direct act, i.e. the driving force of the hand, of the thaabih be effective in rendering the slaughter. But in regard to the machine, the act of the one who presses the button is confined to removing the impediment. How then can the act of Thabah by removal of the impediment be asserted to be the act of the remover? How can the remover of the impediment be described as the thaabih? The following example will clarify this more.

(1) A Majusi (fire-worshipper) with knife in hand is about to slaughter an animal. Another person grabs hold of his hand restraining him from executing the act of slaughtering. A Muslim, then, reciting, Bismillahi Allahu Akbar, releases the Majusi's hand from the restraining force (the grip of the one who was holding the Majusi's hand) and he (the Majusi) simultaneously executes the slaughter, slitting the throat of the animal. Will the animal be halaal?

In this example the act of removing the impediment was rendered by a Muslim reciting the Tasmiah, nevertheless, in view of the fact that the actual driving force in slaughtering the animal was the Majusi, the animal thus slaughtered is branded haraam. The act of the remover of the impediment has not been considered here.

(2) Similarly, a sharp instrument or knife is suspended by rope. An animal is positioned under it. A Muslim reciting the Tasmiah cuts the rope and

the instrument by virtue of its impact when it strikes the animal slits the throat of the animal. Will the animal be halaal? Will the actual act of slaughtering be attributed to the Muslim who removed the impediment? Will he be described as the thaabih and will it be said that the slaughtered animal is the thabeedah of a Muslim?

Most assuredly, the animal in both these examples will not be halaal. How can it then be said that animals slaughtered by a machine are halaal? What is the difference between the animal slaughtered by the methods in the examples and by the machine?

Even if for a brief moment this reality be overlooked and it be accepted that pressing the button is an affective and voluntary act (in so far as the slaughtering is concerned), it should be well understood that the act of the button presser for the switch-operator) ceases upon him having pressed the button. His act is non-existent in the motion of the machine and at the time of the machine cutting the throat. The machine moves continuously while throats are being cut. The machine-operator ceases his action prior to the slaughtering.

The fundamental difference between Thabah Idhtirari (pertaining to game and animals out of control) and Thabah Ikhtiyari, the act of slaughtering is in fact, imrarus sikkeen (a Muslim driving the knife with his power), and in Thabah Idhtirari, rami (the act of shooting the arrow) and

irsal (the act of setting loose the trained hunting animal) is proclaimed by the Shariat to be the substitutes of Thabah. Imam Shaafi (rahmatullah alayhi) also stipulates "human action" for the validity of Thabah Ikhtiyari. In Kitabul Umm, page 198, Vol. 2, he states:

“Thakat is of two kinds. (1) That in which man has control over the animal. This form is thabah and nahr. (2) That in which man has no control over the animal. This form is that man kills the animal by means of a weapon with his hand or he shoots an arrow with his hand. Thus, it (Thakat) is the act of the hand. And, that which Allah Azza Wa Jal has made halaal by means of trained hunting animals which catch (game) with the act of man is like the arrow which strikes (with the act of man). But, a pit dug (to trap game) is none of the two kinds of thakat whether there be a weapon in it or not. If a man sets up a sword or spear, then drives the game (towards the sword-trap) and the animal reaches it and is thus slaughtered, its consumption is not lawful because it is slaughtered without the act of anyone (any human being).”

There is absolutely no doubt in the fact that animals slaughtered by the automatic slaughtering machine are not slaughtered by the act of a human being nor does the power of man's hand operate in slitting the throat. It is precisely for this reason that

even a person of the least understanding will not attribute the cutting of the throat to the act of man, but will say that it is an animal slaughtered by the machine.

In his dissertation the Mufti who halaalizes automatic machine-slaughtering, that is the machine itself cuts the neck – says:

“Zabeehah and Qur’baani are among the Shi-aar of Islam, hence Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

‘He who performs our Salaat, faces our Qiblah, and eats our zabeehah (slaughtered meat), verily he is a Muslim for whom is the Protection of Allah and the Protection of His Rasool. Therefore, do not violate (him whom Allah) has given protection.’

“The act of slaughtering animals is rooted in with the Aqeedah of Imaan.”

He does accept that the Islamic System of Thabah is among the *Shi-aar* of Islam, and that it is rooted in the Aqeedah of Imaan. But then he incongruently and recklessly proclaims the kuffaar machine-killing system flawless ‘without any doubt’. The displacement of the entire Masnoon System suddenly becomes permissible and shaitaan’s

method of killing becomes flawless for him. He has therefore deracinated – ripped up from the roots – the System which he says “*is rooted in the Aqeedah of Islam.*”

He has justified his *Istikhfaaf* with Fiqhi technicalities and *Nawaadir* narrations which should never be proffered, especially in relation to an issue which is rooted in *Aqeedah* and which is among the *Shi-aar* of Islam. *Istikhfaaf* is to attach insignificance to an act, and on the basis of this insignificance, the Act of the Shariah is dismissed or discarded or viewed lightly. This attitude is Kufr. Proclaiming shaitaan’s system of slaughter flawless ‘without doubt’ is brutal *Istikhfaaf* even if it is not the intentional perpetration of the Mufti.

ZIG ZAGGING MUFTIS

The zig-zagging approach and acquittal of the senior Mufti is indeed intriguing, to say the least. When a Mufti receives a query on any matter pertaining to the Shariah, the first issue to strike his mind should be stemming from the preconceived attitude of guarding the Deen. With this essential fact in mind the Mufti will correctly search the Kutub of the Shariah for acquiring the Fatwa which will be in consonance with the *Ridha* (Pleasure) of Allah Ta’ala, and he will then faithfully discharge

his obligation of *Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahy Anil Munkar*.

If the Mufti does not approach and scrutinize the query with this preconceived notion embedded in his mind, he will then acquit himself like an evil molvi whose objective is the dunya and the nafs, not the Deen. Consider this senior Mufti Sahib who despite acknowledging that the Shar'i system of Thabah is rooted in the Aqeedah of Imaan and that it is among the *Sha-aaair* of Islam, he states with temerity that the kuffaar system of automatic killing in which features only a Muslim who presses the button to activate the machine, is without doubt flawless.

He has no qualms about displacing the System ordained by Allah Ta'ala and to substitute it with *shareetatush shaitaan*. His fatwa serves only the monetary objective of the kuffaar enterprises. Thus, he embraces kufr without a pinged of revolting Imaani conscience. Then he mines the Kutub of Fiqh to dig out some obscure, rejected and unacceptable view which is classified *naadir*, on which to structure his corrupt fatwa dictated to him, not by his *Aql*, but by his *nafs*. He zig zags through meandering technicalities to proffer silly examples in his abortive bid to cloak his dastardly baseless

fatwa with Shar'i substance when in reality it is bereft of even a semblance of Shar'i basis.

It is haraam for a Mufti bereft of Taqwa to issue fatwas. He poses a danger for his own Imaan and he becomes a *mudhil* (one who misleads) for others.

A ZIG ZAGGING FATWA

A query from Canada to Darul Uloom Karachi

**Respected Muftis of the Shariah,
As-Salāmu ‘Alaykum wa Raḥmatullāhi wa
Barakātuh,**

We seek your guidance on a very important matter. The **Halal Monitoring Authority (HMA)** is an organization based in Canada that oversees all aspects related to meat production, including slaughtering, processing, and distribution, to ensure compliance with halal standards. They label and certify products as **halal** after thorough inspections. In recent years, a **modern slaughter method** has been introduced to minimize the pain of chickens, ducks, and other small birds during slaughter. This method, known as **Controlled Atmosphere Stunning (CAS)**, has been approved by government agencies.

In this method, **carbon dioxide gas (CO₂)** is gradually released into the chamber where the animals are kept. Over a period of **6 to 12 minutes**, the birds become unconscious. According to various experiments, the **exact duration varies** based on the strength and nature of each animal. If the birds are **not slaughtered within this period, they will certainly die from the gas exposure.**

(See Appendix 1 for complete details on this process.)

To ensure that the birds are still alive before slaughter, the following methods are used:

1. **Body Temperature Check:** The temperature of the animal is measured, as a dead animal has a lower body temperature compared to a living one.

2. **Blood Flow Examination:** It is assumed that **more blood flows** from a living animal than from a dead one. Additionally, the **meat of a dead animal appears darker** than that of a living one.

3. **Heartbeat Monitoring (ECG Test):** Instruments are used to confirm whether the animal's heart is still beating.

After these tests, it is ensured that the animal is still alive before slaughter.

(See Appendix 2 for details.)

However, it should be noted that these **tests were only performed on a small number of gas-affected birds** before concluding that this method is permissible. The **actual method remains questionable** since it is practically **impossible to check every individual bird** before slaughter, especially when slaughterhouses operate at **high speeds**.

Due to the **rapid processing**, only **a few birds from each batch are tested**, and **it is assumed that the entire batch is still alive**. However, **this assumption remains doubtful** because:

- **Each bird's weight and immunity differ**, meaning some birds **may die from the gas exposure** without the operators realizing it.
- There are serious concerns with the testing methods:
 1. **Body Temperature Check:** If a bird's **survival duration after gas exposure varies**, then testing body temperature is unreliable, as **the bird may have already died** before the test.
 2. **Blood Flow Examination:** Since birds are slaughtered **upside down**, blood naturally accumulates in the neck area. Whether the bird is alive or dead, **the same amount of blood will flow**, making this test inconclusive.
 3. **Heartbeat Monitoring (ECG Test):** Research shows that **a heartbeat is not a definitive sign of life**. Even after **brain death**, the heart may continue to beat for a short while.

(See Appendix 3 for supporting research.)

Furthermore, different **Islamic fatwa institutions** have been consulted regarding this method. However, the **detailed process was not clearly explained** in their responses, leaving many aspects unclear. Hence, a follow-up inquiry has been made for **further clarification in light of Islamic teachings**.

The **collected research materials** are attached for reference.

Additionally, **the HMA claims** that they are **forced to adopt this method** due to legal requirements. They argue that **gas stunning is the "lesser of two evils,"** and they **prefer this over other stunning methods.** However, **our investigation of Canadian law clearly states** that:

"Religious groups must be allowed to follow their beliefs in slaughtering. The government will not interfere with **halal** or **kosher (Jewish)** slaughter methods."

(See Appendix 5 for legal details.)

The Key Questions for Religious Ruling:

1. Are animals slaughtered using this method considered halal?

2. Is it permissible to adopt this method of slaughter?

3. **Since this method creates doubt regarding whether the animal is alive or dead at the time of slaughter, does it impact the permissibility of consuming such meat?**
 - o Islamic jurisprudence states that **"The original ruling on meat is prohibition unless proven otherwise."**

 - o Does this principle apply here?

We kindly request a **detailed fatwa** addressing these questions based on the given information.

Sincerely,

‘Āṣim ‘Abbās Toronto, Canada +1 416 697 8916
(End of Canada’s Query)

While the answer of Darul Ifta of Karachi, Pakistan meanders through the kutub of Fiqh for substantiating its opinion which vacillates (zig zags) between opposites, it fails to do justice to the *Istifta’* and with its despicable ambivalence the fatwa is not a valid guide for the masses. Although the fatwa of the Karachi Darul Uloom presents arguments to negate the haraam stunning and gassing explained in the question, the Muftis add some urine to the bucket of water thereby invalidating their fatwa.

Despite acknowledging that the method/system of slaughter is in conflict with the shariah’s system of slaughter and that it is tantamount to kufr, the muftis leave open a window of latitude to appease the muck and agents of Shaitaan who issue halaal certificates to the kuffaar establishment which is the primary provider of carrion chickens which Muslims all over the world consume regardless of the physical diseases and spiritual diseases concomitant in carrion consumption.

Adding some urine to contaminate and negate their fatwa, the Karachi muftis say:

“If in this method the animal dies before being slaughtered it will be carrion and eating it is

haraam. But, if it is known with certitude that the animal is not dead before being slaughtered and that it is only unconscious or it is numb, and all the conditions of thabah are fully executed, then that animal will not be haraam and eating it is permissible.”

Then leaving a window open for the muftis to escape when attacked for their rubbish view, they say: *“However, it is necessary to inspect every animal separately (to determine if it is alive or dead). The ruling of halaal for all the animals cannot be issued by making an inspection of some animals.”*

Whatever valid argument these muftis had incorporated in their fatwa is negated by this zigzagging. The question contains such a detailed exposition of the absolutely haraam method of killing animals that even a layman is not in need of a fatwa from muftis to understand the satanism and *hurmat* of the devil’s system termed *shareetatush shaitaan* by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

Regarding issues which are readily comprehensible to even laymen, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: *“Seek a fatwa from your heart.”*

This command of our Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) has greater application today in these times of corruption in which there is a preponderance of zigzagging muftis who, instead of guiding Muslims and taking them closer to the Shariah, open up avenues for haraam and spiritual ruin.

Really, what constrained these muftis to introduce in their fatwa a simple mas'alah which every child understands, namely, if the animal is alive at the time of thabah it will be halaal, and if dead, it will be haraam. Why did they have to state this mas'alah when there is 100% certitude that in the devil's system of killing there is no possibility of establishing these two factors.

The chickens come swirling upside down at speed on a fast moving conveyor belt and killed by reckless, fussiaq killers at the rate of dozens per minute. We have explained this issue in detail in many of our articles after having made personal inspections and having obtained signed affidavits from slaughtermen.

A fatwa is for practical consumption. It is not for passing the time or for displaying *ilmi* erudition with copious Arabic citations from the Kutub which the masses do not understand. When issuing a fatwa

for mass consumption, the mufti is not in a class of Madrasah students explaining to them Fiqhi technicalities.

Furthermore, assuming that it is possible (but which is impossible) to ascertain the condition of each animal prior to slaughter, then too, it will be Islamically treacherous for the mufti to pass it as halaal. In so doing, the mufti will be upholding the system of shaitaan and cancelling the Shar'i system of Thabah. In fact, that is precisely the situation today. The entire Shar'i system of Thabah which is among the Shi-aar of Islam, has been flushed down the drain of kufr to appease carrion-devouring juhala and to legalize the kuffaar carrion empires in return for the haraam boodle which these kuffaar satanists pay lucratively to the carrion halaalizing molvi outfits.

Despite the entire shaitaani system of killing animals being absolutely haraam, the wayward muftis have no qualms in halaalizing the devil's systems. Then they soothe their conscience by convincing themselves with hyperbolic self-deception that the measures set in place by the kuffaar satanists are an adequate assurance for believing that the animals are correctly slaughtered.

These zigzagging muftis following in the footsteps of shaitaan dig out obscure Fiqhi technicalities to halaalize, not only the animals which they claim are slaughtered adequately for *hillat*, but to legalize the very system described as *Shareetatush Shaitaan* by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). While the obscure Fiqhi technicalities are applicable to extraordinary scenarios and refer to only the meat acquired from exceptional cases of slaughter, the intent is never to condone and legalize the kuffaar's satanic system of killing animals. But these miscreant muftis remain entirely dumb regarding the devil's abhorrent system, and focus on only the end product which they imagine to be halaal. How can a devil's system which is haraam from A to Z ever deliver halaal-tayyib products for Muslim consumption? Their brains have indeed been convoluted by the manipulation of Iblees with the disease termed *Takhabbutush Shaitaan* by the Qur'aan.

Gross-misadvantage of the Fiqhi technicalities

The satanic dexterity with which the miscreant muftis employ the Fiqhi technicalities, rarities, obscurities and far-fetched imaginary contingencies is a deplorable perambulation which in reality is designed to extract permissibility for haraam by means of gross mismanipulation of these details which the Fuqaha had never intended to be the

norm, leave alone such gross misadvantage which in entirety abolishes the Divine Systems of the Shariah which are all the products of Wahi, not of reason.

The *hillat* of the meat stated by the Fuqaha in cases of obnoxious killing which yields the severance of the four neck vessels which is the imperative requisite of Shar'i Thabah, is postulated by the Fuqaha in total isolation of the System of Thabah. The ruling of *hillat* is incumbently restricted to the contingency and may not be extended to the kuffaar system of *Shareetatush Shaitaan*. The meat being 'halaal' in exceptional cases of killing, ***never ever*** renders the kuffaar's brutal, satanic system of killing halaal.

Totally ignoring this fact or being grossly ignorant of it, the miscreant muftis of the '*darul iftas*' of our era, extend the ruling of the *hillat* of the meat to the kuffaar killing system thereby proclaiming it permissible. But this was never the objective of the Fuqaha for issuing rulings on rarities based on imaginary expediencies.

Compounding the evil of proclaiming the end product of these evil systems to be 'halaal' is the reality of the end products being ***haraam***. The system of Iblees does not produce halaal meat. It

can never produce halaal meat no matter what type of skulduggery these dunderheaded muftis employ in their stupid mental gymnastics to cunningly scuttle and abolish the System ordained by Allah Ta'ala and which is among the *Shi-aar* of Islam. And all of this *khuraafaat* is after all for the sake of haraam money which the kuffaar killing plants pay lucratively. The moral and spiritual interests of the Ummah and the purity of the Shariah are far, extremely far from the minds of these muftis who treat Shar'i issues with disgusting laxity.

The “end product” chimera is a massive deception to mislead Muslims. The attempt is to relegate the actual Shar'i Thabah System into oblivion. Their argument is that if the ‘end product’ is halaal, then it is well and fine to abrogate the System of the Shariah. This is massive deception even if the ‘end product’ is halaal. But the reality is that the ‘end product’ is not halaal. This compounds the evil and wickedness of the entire kuffaar system which these miscreant muftis legalize.

Consider the example of a married woman having committed zina. The child she bears is regarded legitimate by the Shariah despite it being the product of zina. The muftis who halaalize the haraam killing system on the basis of the ‘end product’ being halaal, by implication also halaalize

the zina committed by married women because the ‘end product’ is legitimate and halaal. This is the stupidity of these wayward muftis whose concern is only the ‘end product’ which they proclaim halaal by hook or crook solely to sustain the kuffaar animal killing empires. The objective is nothing but despicably mercenary.

And consider the example of a Muslim woman becoming a *murtaddah*. Her *irtidaad* forthwith invalidates her nikah. After having reneged from Islam, she again embraces Islam. According to the Shariah, she may not marry any man other than her former husband. Despite this ruling of the Shariah another man marries her. Although a proper Shar’i nikah is performed, the ruling is that this ‘end product’ is haraam. Notwithstanding the valid Nikah being performed, this ‘end product’ remains haraam.

In the same way, even the ‘end product’ of the kuffaar killing system, even if the animal is assumed to have been slaughtered correctly, will be declared haraam due to the entire process of *Shareetatush Shaitaan* being haraam. Since the *murtaddah*’s process of *irtidaad* is haraam, the ‘end product’ of her nikah is haraam regardless of the requisites of Nikah having taken place.

The fundamental issue at stake is the System of Thabah ordained by Allah Ta'ala. This sacred System may not be abrogated. It may not be ignored, especially with the satanic gimmick and trick of the 'end product' - and even this 'end product' is actually haraam, but by means of the employment of skulduggery it is proclaimed 'halaal'. The Carrion Muftis should hang their heads in shame for their treachery against Allah Azza Wa Jal – treachery perpetrated in the name of the Deen. Instead of guarding and defending the Deen, they actively collude with the kuffaar to dismantle the Deen.

The miscreant muftis should examine their hearts to identify the shaitaan lurking therein – the shaitaan under whose influence they are condoning the invalidation and abrogation of the Thabah System of Islam which is among the Shi-aar of this Deen about which the Qur'aan Majeed states:

***“Thus, honouring the Shi-aar of Allah
is because of the Taqwa of the hearts.
(Al-Hajj, Aayat 32)***

CONCLUSION

Forget about all the Fiqhi technicalities and splitting of hairs, the simple issue to understand is that the

valid, sacred system of Thabah ordained for Muslims by Allah Ta'ala has to be compulsorily upheld and employed. This System which is among the *Shi-aar* of Islam consists of the following essential ingredients:

- (1) The animal must be physically slaughtered by a Muslim using his hand to drive the knife on the neck of the animal.
- (2) The Thaabih and the animal must face the Qiblah.
- (3) The Four neck vessels must be severed.

Discarding any requisite of the Masnoon Thabah system for no valid reason, is not permissible. Regardless of the Fiqhi designation, every Masnoon act must be incumbently observed. Thus:

- (1) Not facing the Qiblah is **Haraam**.
- (2) Killing the animal by means of automatic slaughtering of any kind in which the human hand is not the driving force is **Haraam**.
- (3) Hanging the chickens/animals upside down for slaughtering is **Haraam**.

(4) Moving the animals on a conveyor belt is **Haraam**.

(5) Slaughtering the animals while they are in motion is **Haraam**.

(6) Shocking or stunning the animals prior to slaughtering is **Haraam**.

(7) Passing the slaughtered animals through hot water before removal of its entrails is **Haraam**.

(8) Slaughtering an animal in the presence of another animal is **Haraam**.

(9) Inflicting any kind of wound/injury prior to slaughter is **Haraam**.

(10) **Abandoning the Masnoon Shar'i System of Thabah and substituting it with any kuffaar/shaitaani system such as machine slaughtering is HARAAM and tantamount to KUFR.**

“Allah guides whomever He wills, and He leads astray whomever He wills.” (Qur’aan)

“Salaam on those who follow the Hidaayat of Allah”. (Qur’aan)