



Political Options
Results from the DIALREL Ethics Workshops

Prof. Dr. Joerg Luy
Freie Universitaet Berlin/Germany

What we did:

- As partner of the task “legislation” we identified relevant “elements” in existing regulations.
- As partner of the task “public debate” we identified a widespread desire for one not yet existing prescription (an additional element).
- We organized a workshop with 8 ethicists from 3 countries and 3 religions: pros and cons of these elements
- We organized a workshop with representatives of the legal profession and investigated the human rights guarantees in the ECHR, EU law and the German constitution.
- We drafted an ethically and legally recommended law.

We found 6 relevant elements:



1. Obligatory stunning prior to cut without exemption (e.g. Switzerland, Liechtenstein, Iceland, Norway + within EU: Sweden, the Finnish province of Åland, Latvia)
2. Obligatory stunning ... with exemption for religious methods but no details (e.g. Council Directive 93/119/EC)
3. Exemption for religious methods ... with labelling of meat clearly indicating whether or not prior stunning was employed (NGOs, e.g. many veterinary organisations)
4. Exemption for religious methods ... with measures that guarantee that no more animals are used than unavoidable (quotas) (e.g. Germany, Austria)
5. Exemption for religious methods only if done with post-cut stunning (e.g. Austria, Slovakia, Estonia, Denmark/cattle, Finland/except province of Åland, Australia/shechita cattle)
6. Exemption for halal slaughter only if done with reversible electrical stunning (e.g. Germany 1995-2002, Denmark, New Zealand)

dialrel

Main ethical findings:



1. Obligatory stunning prior to cut without exemption:
↑: Animal Welfare - ↓: import shifts problems geographically
2. Obligatory stunning ... with exemption for religious methods but no details:
“Methods” cannot justify exemptions. ↓: more animals and pain than unavoidable
3. Exemption for religious methods ... with labelling of meat clearly indicating whether or not prior stunning was employed:
↑: equal treatment of religious and moral believes in the population
4. Exemption for religious methods ... with measures that guarantee that no more animals are used than unavoidable (quotas):
↑: less stun-free products on non-religious market
5. Exemption for religious methods only if done with post-cut stunning:
↑: at least some avoidable pain eliminated
6. Exemption for halal slaughter only if done with reversible electrical stunning:
↑: perfect solution (where accepted)

Main legal findings:



1. Obligatory stunning prior to cut without exemption:
No indicators that existing regulations clash with human rights.
2. Obligatory stunning ... with exemption for religious methods but no details:
↓: Clash with principle of proportionality and equality before the law.
3. Exemption for religious methods ... with labelling of meat clearly indicating whether or not prior stunning was employed:
Recommended (equality before the law): No legal problem if done in a way which avoids discrimination.
4. Exemption for religious methods ... with measures that guarantee that no more animals are used than unavoidable (quotas):
Recommended (reduction of avoidable pain): No legal problem if big enough.
5. Exemption for religious methods only if done with post-cut stunning:
Recommended (reduction of avoidable pain): No legal problem.
6. Exemption for halal slaughter only if done with reversible electrical stunning:
↑: perfect solution (where accepted)

dialrel

Recommendation (law):

- (1) A warm-blooded animal may only be slaughtered if, before the commencement of the exsanguination, it has been made irreversibly unconscious.
- (2) Notwithstanding subsection (1), slaughter in a state of reversible unconsciousness is permissible provided the procedure is defined as an exception by delegated legislation.
- (3) The competent authority shall issue an authorisation for religious slaughter without stunning if the applicant presents prima facie evidence that its nature and extent satisfies the needs of members of particular religious communities in the area of application of this statute, where these persons are, by mandatory rules of their community of belief, permitted to consume meat only of animals slaughtered without stunning, and that the provision of meat that complies with the mandatory religious rules is impossible on reasonable terms.

The Federal Ministry shall pass delegated legislation ensuring that the conditions are satisfied for the protection of the animals, in particular the presence of a veterinary surgeon, restraint while standing upright, post-cut stunning and a special proof of expertise.

The logo for dialrel, featuring the word "dialrel" in a bold, lowercase, sans-serif font. The letter "i" is replaced by a red exclamation mark inside a white circle, and the letter "a" is replaced by a red asterisk inside a white circle.

Acknowledgments:

Dr. Dr. Regina Binder	(Austria, Lawyer, Ethicist)
Dr. Hanna Rheinze	(Germany, Jewish Ethicist)
Dr. Elhadi Essabah	(Germany, Muslim Ethicist)
Prof. Dr. Thomas Gil	(Germany, Ethicist)
Prof. Dr. F.-Th. Gottwald	(Germany, Ethicist, Theologian)
Dr. Erwin Lengauer	(Austria, Ethicist)
Prof. Dr. Peter Sandoe	(Denmark, Ethicist)
Dr. Heike Baranzke	(Germany, Ethicist, Theologian)
Prof. Dr. Ute Mager	(Germany, Lawyer)
Prof. Dr. Joh. Caspar	(Germany, Lawyer)
Prof. Dr. Th. Cirsovius	(Germany, Lawyer)
Cord Riechelmann	(Germany, Biologist, Philosopher)
Dr. Michael Schröter	(Germany, Lawyer)
Prof. Dr. Peter Unruh	(Germany, Lawyer)

dialrel

Thank You very much!

Report (German/English) online: www.dialrel.eu → Publications