

THE PROHIBITION OF MACHINE SLAUGHTER AND SANHA'S SLANDER

By

The Majlis

P.O.Box 3393, Port Elizabeth 6056

Published by
YOUNG MEN'S MUSLIM ASSOCIATION
P.O.BOX
ACTONVILLE

INTRODUCTION

The publication presently of this booklet, *THE PROHIBITION OF MACHINE-SLAUGHTERING*, has been necessitated by the dissemination of a gross slander and falsehood by SANHA, the carrion-halaalizing agency of Shaitaan. This utterly shameless carrion outfit, devoid of every vestige of fear for Allah Ta'ala, circulated the following deception in a deliberate attempt to malign *The Majlis*:

*“A member of a group who are under the patronage of the Majlis who themselves oppose all commercial slaughter, in a document to Rainbow Farms stated that **“you can by all means boost your production by even introducing machine slaughtering”** and that **“the majority of Muslims will be happy”**.*

We challenge these purveyors of carrion and propagators of falsehood and baatil to produce the document in full. Everyone who knows anything about *The Majlis* will know that we have nothing to conceal. Unlike the 233-page carrion document of SANHA, we have no hidden document whose revelation we fear. On the contrary we challenge the haraam carrion halaalizer to publish the “document” in full, and not extract bits and pieces for churning a haraam carrion potion with which to hoodwink, deceive and mislead the Muslim community.

The 233-page document referred to above is the findings of SANHA who had at the time gone on a witch hunt in a desperate bid to bring down the MJC or to compel the MJC to part with a large slice of the revenue it (MJC) was receiving from its Maitah trade in the avenue of ‘halaal’ certificates and riba royalties which it was collecting in the millions of rands. At the height of the SANHA-MJC blood-letting, the haraam carrion outfit (SANHA) had expended many thousands of riba rands in the investigation to humiliate the MJC. SANHA embarked on a thorough investigation of ten MJC certified carrion plants.

The results of SANHA's investigation were absolutely appalling to the extent that some Ulama's stomachs started to churn and their hearts began missing beats. SANHA had the MJC by the throat. To save its skin from the damaging exposure which SANHA had threatened, the MJC dictated to by the reality of the millions of rands, and understanding the wisdom of the adage, *Discretion is the better part of valour*, readily decided to bury the hatchet and enter into a marriage with SANHA, for such a haraam marriage ensured the concealment of the 233-page document of revelations which made stomachs churn and hearts skip beats.

Unfortunately for the MJC as well as for SANHA's future, the latter had solicited the support of the then Jamiatul Ulama of Natal in its attempt to bring the MJC to its knees.. Hence, it furnished a copy of its 233-page explosive report to Maulana Yunus Patel, the then president of the Natal Jamiatul Ulama. Although the parties are complicit in the plot to conceal the Haqq and are today desperately conspiring tricks to undo the mortal damage to the MJC, caused by SANHA's 233-page document from which Maulana Yunus Patel had highlighted crucial acts of gross haraam irregularities which render all the carrion products certified by the MJC "Haraam according to all Math-habs", SANHA is wringing its fingers and seeing nightmares because the truth which Maulana Yunus Patel states in his letter of exposure cannot be undone to save SANHA and the MJC. The rot stinks and is already in the public domain. *The Majlis* has no such carrion 'document' to conceal. We reiterate the challenge to the agent of Shaitaan to publish the 'document' in full.

The Prohibition of Machine-slaughter was an article which *The Majlis* had published 28 years ago in 1981 at the time when the MJC carrion outfit had halaalized machine slaughtering for Rainbow chicken plant in Worcester, Cape. The pursuit for more riba royalties had utterly blinded the MJC. Without a shred of Shar'i *daleel* (proof), the MJC following

faithfully in the footsteps of the condemned Ulama-e-Soo' of Bani Israaeel, declared machine slaughtering halaal.

Today, the SANHA SHAITAAN, fully cognizant of the MJC's view of permissibility and advocacy of machine slaughter, is silent and says not a word of reprimand to its carrion partner, yet it (SANHA) finds it appropriate to extricate bits and pieces from a 'document' and from such a totally out of context extraction, extravasate a haraam view which it slanderously attributes to *The Majlis*. The MJC has openly declared machine slaughtering halaal. But SANHA, the Shaitaan Incarnate, remains in haraam marriage with the MJC, and breathes not a word of condemnation or advice for the haraam view. On the other hand, SANHA splenatically and slanderously attributes permissibility of machine-slaughtering to *The Majlis*. What does it hope to gain from such falsehood? Even an insane baboon readily understands that it is not the likes of *The Majlis* to proclaim haraam machine slaughtering halaal. The Haqq cannot be eliminated with the baatil of SANHA.

After being horrified by the contents of SANHA's 233-page revelation of MJC haraam corruption, Maulana Yunus Patel, supplicated to Allah Ta'ala in the following terms:

"May Allah Ta'ala protect us from His Athaab".

We respond and say *Aameen thumma Aameen!*

THE MAJLIS

25 Ramadhaan 1430 – 15 September 2009

THE USE OF SLAUGHTERING MACHINES

A statement dated 18th Jamaadil Ulaa, 1401 (25th March, 1981), issued by the Muslim Judicial Council of Cape Town in support of its ruling that animals slaughtered automatically by a machine are halaal purports to answer the opposite Fatwa of the Jamiatul Ulama (Natal) which was issued on the basis of the Shariat. The opinion of the M.J.C. may seem to answer the Fatwa of the Jamiatul Ulama (Natal), but in reality the opinion of the MJC is not based on Shari'i grounds. We have chosen to examine this opinion of the MJC so that the darkness created by the MJC around the haraam-chicken issue could be dispelled and the Muslim public saved from the abomination (the fisq) or consuming carrion (maitah) -- carrion which these processed chickens are in fact.

The MJC states in its statement:

"Recently a Fatwa was issued by the Jamiatul Ulama of Natal against the use of the slaughtering machine. The objection was mainly on the grounds that the machine cannot mention Allah's name when it slaughters."

The Jamiatul Ulama (Natal) in its Fatwa does not limit its conclusion on only or mainly the grounds of non-recital of the FARDH Tasmiah (Bismillahi Allahu Akbar). Clearly the MJC either has not understood what was written in the Jamiat's statement or it is deliberately sidestepping the other facts raised by the Jamiatul Ulama (Natal) in order to conceal its gross inability to argue academically on the basis of the Principles of Islamic Law. The Insipidity of the MJC's statement portrays vividly its inability to formulate discussion on the basis of Shar'i Principles. Because of its incompetence in so far as the Law of Islam is concerned, the MJC generally tailors its opinions and statements to suit the whims of public consumption regardless of whether such statements accord with the Shariat or not. If the MJC or those in the MJC responsible for the statement care to read the Jamiat's Fatwa carefully, they will not then fail to recognize the incongruity of their statement. We shall now elaborate the Shar'i stand on the question of animals slaughtered by automatic machine.

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 chickens 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 thabih) in this case is the automatic machine and not the operator of the machine or the one who drives or ushers the bird into the machine.

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

"And, among its (Shar'i thabah's) conditions is that the thabih be a person of the' millat of tauhid either by faith like a Muslim or by claim like a Kitabi (Jew or Christian)."

(Hidayah)

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

(Raddul Mukhtar)

There is absolutely no difference of opinion on this issue. Unanimously – according to all Matha-hib – 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 Muslim or Kitabi slaughterer (thabih).

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

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

(Raddul Mukhtar)

Elaborating on the unlawfulness of the animal slaughtered by an insane person, Raddul Mukhtar 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 Mukhtdr)

"The slaughtered animal will be halaal if the thabih understands the Tasmiah and the thabeegah."

(Hidayah)

"If he (the thabih) 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 afore-mentioned references indicate very clearly that according to the Shariat the thabih (the actual slaughterer) must be, besides being a Muslim or a Kitabi, one 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 CONCIOUSNESS, INTENTION and UNDERSTANDING of the slaughterer (thabih) is now abundantly manifest. It has already been established that the actual slaughterer in machine-slaughtering (the mode of automatic slaughtering effected by machines in South Africa) 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.

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 Kitabi, 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 Mukhtar)

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 (alah) of cutting to be wielded and directly manipulated by the hand of the thabih (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 Shafi (rahmatullah alayhi) states in Kitabul 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 special form of slaughter-thakat), the second kind 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 silah (sharp weapon) with HIS HAND (bi-yadihi); or a human being with his HAND shoots the animal with an arrow. 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 Shafi (rahmatullah alayhi) stresses,

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

If human hand-power was not a stipulation for the validity of Sha'i thabah, then Imam Shafi (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 (employment). And, that (i.e. employment) 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. Kitabul 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 Mukhtar)

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 Mukhtar)

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 haraarn 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."

(Kitabul Umm)

In this illustration too, the apparatus of killing is set up by a human being but in the actual killing of the animal the action of the instrument is exclusive. 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 as haraam and furnishes as its grounds:

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

In its statement, the MJC justifying its stand, states:

"The Muslim Judicial Council approves the use of the slaughtering machine because it meets with the requirements of the Shariah by cutting the required vessels, thus allowing blood to flow, and the Muslims operate the machine invoking the name of Allah at the starting point as well as at the point of slaughtering."

The operators of the machine and those who are present "at the point of slaughtering" are NOT the thabiheen (slaughterers), hence it does not matter if they recite the Tasmiah even a thousand times. The animal or chicken will still remain haraam carrion because the conditions for a Shar'i thabih (a valid Shar'i slaughterer) and valid Shar'i Tasmiah are lacking. The Shariat does not stipulate for the

validity of thabah, recital of Tasmiah by non-thabiheen. Those who are not the slaughterers do not fall within the strict and fardh requirements (Shurut) applicable to Shar'i Thabah. Illustration (c), above, will demonstrate the fallacy of the MJC claim. In this example, 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 ushers 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 Makhtar)

Killing which is not attributable directly to the force of man's hand, is thus automatic slaughter which is haraam in the Shariat. The MJC's claim, therefore, of operators of the machine and handlers of the animals reciting Tasmiah is absolutely of no substance. Such operation and handling are not related to the act of Shar'i thabah which is the ONLY act which renders the animal halaal.

The MJC's approval of machine-slaughtering is based on ONLY one fact, viz., "cutting the required vessels." But, this act executed by the inanimate machine is NOT sufficient for a valid Shar'i Thakat. The compulsory condition which has to be fulfilled is *the cutting of the required vessels by a thabih who is a Muslim or a Kitabi*, NOT by a machine. The requirements of the Shariat are thus not met as is claimed by the MJC.

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 Shafi 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.

This example furnished by Imam Nawawi (rahmatullah alayhi) also refutes strongly the MJC assertion that the mere "allowing of blood to flow" by the "cutting of the required vessels" renders, the animal halaal. In illustration (d), above, the required vessels were cut, "thus allowing blood to flow", but inspite of this fact, the Shariat rules the animal haraam as is evident from the reference of Minhajut Talibeen cited above.

It will now be realised from the above discussion that automatic slaughtering – killing executed by non-human force – is not valid Shar'i slaughtering. It forms no part of any of the two types of thakat decreed by the Shariat. The MJC's legalizing of haraam machine slaughtering cannot be substantiated on the basis of the Shariat. Such legalizing is the product of personal whim, opinion and jahalat – all motivated by monetary lust.