

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

Meat from cattle slaughtered without stunning sold in the conventional market without appropriate labelling: A case study in Italy

This is the author's manuscript

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1648113> since 2017-09-21T15:29:04Z

Published version:

DOI:10.1016/j.meatsci.2017.07.011

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

Manuscript Details

Manuscript number	MEATSCI_2017_304
Title	Meat from cattle slaughtered without stunning sold in the conventional market without appropriate labelling: a case study in Italy
Article type	Research paper

Abstract

In the European Union, slaughter without stunning is allowed for religious slaughter to obtain halal and kosher meat. However, carcasses considered not fit for consumption for people of Islamic or Jewish faith are sold to regular market without any specific labelling on the slaughtering procedure. . This survey, conducted in Tuscany in 2016, aimed to quantify the carcasses rejected in relation to the type of religious slaughter. 656 bovines were slaughtered without stunning: 538 (82%) for halal and 118 (18%) for kosher. All carcasses slaughtered by the Islamic procedure (dhabiha) were considered halal, while 77.1% of carcasses slaughtered by the Jewish procedure (shechita) did not pass the approval. Carcasses were rejected after chest cavity inspection (50%) and after the lungs control (50%). This study provides an important insight in this field and postulates how to amalgamate the concepts of freedom of religion, as enshrined by the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU, with consumer rights and animal welfare.

Keywords	ritual slaughter, stunning, labelling, unwitting, purchases, kosher, halal
Taxonomy	Socio-Economic Aspect of Animal Production, Beef Cattle, Animal Production Ethics
Corresponding Author	Andrea Armani
Corresponding Author's Institution	University of Pisa
Order of Authors	Priscilla D'amico, Nicolò Vitelli, Beniamino Cenci Goga, Daniele Nucera, Francesca Pedonese, Alessandra Guidi, Andrea Armani
Suggested reviewers	Haluk Anl, Pavel Bystricky, Giancarlo Bozzo

Submission Files Included in this PDF

File Name [File Type]

cover letter.docx [Cover Letter]

Answers to reviewer 21-06-17.docx [Response to Reviewers]

New Highlights 21-06-17.docx [Highlights]

MEATSCI_2017_304_R1 D'Amico, Meat from religious slaughter 21-06-17.docx [Manuscript File]

To view all the submission files, including those not included in the PDF, click on the manuscript title on your EVISE Homepage, then click 'Download zip file'.



Perugia, March, 30th 2017

D.L. Hopkins
Editor, Meat Science
New South Wales - Department of Primary Industries - Centre for Red Meat and Sheep
Development
PO Box 129, Cowra, NSW - Australia 2794

Dear Prof. Hopkins,

Please find enclosed the manuscript of the paper "*Meat from religious slaughter sold to general meat market: a case study in Italy*" edited by Dr. Andrea ARMANI and other collaborators.

This paper is one of a series of papers based on the results of the follow-up of the EC funded project DIALREL involving partners in 11 countries and of a more recent DG SANTE tender. These projects aimed to address issues relating to religious slaughter by encouraging dialogue between stakeholders and interested parties as well as gathering and dissemination of information.

This paper, in particular, deals with the issue of meat from religious slaughter sold to general meat market.

According to Jewish and Islamic dietary precepts, animals stunned before slaughter are not eligible for the consumption of their believers. In order to respect these principles, in the European Union and in many countries worldwide an exception is applied. This exception allows for animals to be slaughtered without being stunned first, provided that it takes place in a licensed slaughterhouse.

Animals and their meat, in order to be accepted, not only have to be slaughtered in accordance with specific technical provisions but must meet a series of requirements set by Jewish and Islamic dietary laws. Due to very strict Jewish doctrine, according to data currently available, only about 20-25% of the animals slaughtered by Jewish ritual are then classified as suitable (kosher). With regard to the Islamic ritual, the percentage of accepted carcasses (halal) is significantly higher, between 80% and 100%. Meat discarded by religious slaughterers, if suitable for human consumption (i.e. if it has passed the veterinary inspection), are commonly sold on general markets, such as butchers, supermarkets, restaurants, catering and canteens, without being labeled as such. In recent decades, ritual slaughter has been a source of great debate, especially for the growing popular interest in animal welfare. Beyond the ethical implications relative to this practice (which will not be discussed in this paper), one of the biggest concerns arisen among European consumers, is the impossibility to recognize not stunned meats when purchasing. This is because, to date, in the EU, the labeling of meats from not stunned animals is not regulated.

This survey was conducted in a small licensed slaughterhouse, located in Italy (Tuscany), from January 2016 to December 2016 and was especially aimed to assess the carcasses rejection rate after Jewish and Islamic slaughtering and quantify the amount of meat from not stunned animals that enters the general trade.



Figures from this study could be useful to complete and supplement existing data in this area and stimulate debate on how to settle freedom of religion with consumer rights and animal welfare.

We consider the paper very innovative because it is one of the first attempt to quantify the meat rejection rate for current methods of Halal and Shechita slaughter.

The paper is part of the work coordinated by our younger colleague Dr. Andrea ARMANI (corresponding author).

Looking forward to hearing from you,
sincerely,

Beniamino Cenci Goga

Andrea Armani

Dear Editor,

We are sending you back the revised version of the manuscript entitled “*Meat from cattle slaughtered without stunning sold in the conventional market without appropriate labelling: a case study in Italy*”. Thank you for considering the manuscript for publication after revision. The manuscript has been implemented according the suggestions of the reviewer.

Reviewer 1

Lines 29-30- I am still not satisfied with your claim that some Halal slaughtered animals are considered unfit for Muslim consumption and passed on to the conventional market? You have stated that 'However, carcasses considered not fit for consumption for people of Islamic or Jewish faith are sold to regular market without any specific labelling on the slaughtering procedure'. With regard to Shechita slaughter, we all know that the hindquarters (if unporged) are considered unacceptable for Jews but there is no Islamic rule banning the consumption of any part of the carcass from animals slaughtered without stunning (As shown by your results). The DG Sanco (2015) project looked at information required by consumers on labels, did they give any data on the rejection rate of slaughter without stunning for halal? If yes, you will need to cite the original source of such information. You quoted 20% of Halal meat rejected, can you please look at this again? I cannot seem to find this figure in the report (DG Sanco). Can you please indicate the page number or cut and paste it for confirmation? Nonetheless, even if they stated that in the report, it was an error and I do not think you should repeat the same mistake.

As reported at page 60 in Study on information to consumers on the stunning of animals: Final Report DG SANTE Evaluation Framework Contract Lot 3 (Food Chain)

“The Conference of European Rabbis explained that the requirements for Kosher go beyond the meat being fit for human consumption and up to two out of three red meat carcasses can ultimately be rejected depending on the strictness of the rabbinical authorities (the hindquarters are also not considered to be Kosher (Barclay, 2012)). The Federation of Islamic Organisations in Europe confirmed that this is also the case for Halal meat, but here the rejection rate is around one-fifth.”

Considering the reference source, we believe this statement is valid. Therefore, we decided to maintain the sentence in the manuscript.

Line 62- Delete ',' and replace with 'and' between 'authorities' and 'meat' and delete 'and worshippers' between 'certifiers' and 'accept' **Done**

Lines 63-64- Please delete 'and animals can return to their state of normal living consciousness' and replace with 'that is, animals are able to make full recovery after stunning if neck incision is not performed'. **Done**

Line 259-Please delete 'particular' between 'A' and 'head-only'. **Done**

Line 260- Please delete 'called' between ',' and 'Jarvis' and insert 'The' there. **Done**

Line 261-262- Please modify this sentence-The Jarvis Beef Stunner used in NZ does not incorporate a cardiac arrest cycle. The one described by Wotton and Weaver (2009) is the modified version which is accepted within the EU. The NZ system induces a stun and uses electro-immobilisation post-stun which makes it illegal in Europe due to the electro-immobilisation element. Again, Mpanhanga and Wotton (2015) are talking about the EU version and not the NZ version. Your statement started with a head-only system but the one you described includes a cardiac arrest cycle (Head-to-body.

The sentence was modified as follow:

However, as the original method of the Jarvis Beef Stunner requires the application of a post-stun, low-voltage electro-immobilisation to control post-stun convulsions, violating the EU animal welfare provisions, it was subsequently modified for the European market by introducing an additional current application to cause a cardiac arrest in the animal (Weaver and Wotton, 2009). The Jarvis Beef Stunner applied in EU is a head-to-body electrical stunning and induces stun, cardiac arrest and spinal discharge by three consecutive cycles, with considerable welfare advantage (Weaver and Wotton, 2009) over the head-only electrical stunning method, designed in New Zealand.

Highlights

Second bullet point -Please replace 'rituals' with 'methods of slaughter' between 'Islamic' and 'respectively'

Third bullet point- Please replace 'Meats' with 'Meat' and replace 'slaughters' with 'slaughter' between 'ritual' and 'were'

Fourth bullet point- Insert 'the' between 'In' and 'EU' and replace 'unstunned meats' with 'meat from animals slaughtered without stunning'

Fifth bullet point-Replace 'unaware' with 'unintentional' and insert 'of meat from animals slaughtered without any form of stunning' after 'purchases'

Highlights have been modified except for the fifth. In fact, the proposed change would have excessively increased the numbers of characters (more than 150 instead of 85 as requested by the journal).

Highlights

- This survey aimed to quantify the carcasses rejected during ritual slaughtering
- 77% and 0% of animals were discarded during Jewish and Islamic methods of slaughter rituals, respectively
- Meats rejected during ritual slaughters were sold on regular commercial channels
- In the EU, the labelling and identification of meat from animals slaughtered without stunning/unstunned meats is not mandatory
- Mandatory stunning after cutting is a possible solution to avoid unintentional unaware purchases

1
2
3 **1 Meat from cattle slaughtered without stunning sold in the conventional market without appropriate**
4
5 **2 labelling: a case study in Italy**
6
7
8
9

10 4 Priscilla D'amico^{1#}, Nicolò Vitelli^{1#}, Beniamino Cenci Goga², Daniele Nucera³, Francesca
11 5 Pedonese¹, Alessandra Guidi¹, Andrea Armani^{1*}
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 8 ¹*Department of Veterinary Sciences, University of Pisa, Viale delle Piagge 2, 56124, Pisa, Italy;*
19

20 9 ²*Department of Veterinary Medicine, University of Perugia, Via San Costanzo, 4, 06126 Perugia,*
21
22 10 *Italy;*
23

24 11 ³*Department of Agriculture, Forest and Food Science, University of Turin, Largo Braccini 2,*
25
26 12 *10095, Grugliasco - Torino (Italy);*
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 20 # These authors have equally contributed to this work.
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 23 *Corresponding author:

51 24 Tel.: +39 0502210207

52 25 fax: +39 0502210213

53 26 E-mail address: andrea.armani@unipi.it (A. Armani)
54
55
56
57
58
59

60
61
62 **Abstract**
63

64 28 In the European Union, slaughter without stunning is allowed for religious slaughter to obtain halal
65
66 29 and kosher meat. However, carcasses considered not fit for consumption for people of Islamic or
67
68 30 Jewish faith are sold to regular market without any specific labelling on the slaughtering procedure.
69
70 31 This survey, conducted in Tuscany in 2016, aimed to quantify the carcasses rejected in relation to the
71
72 32 type of religious slaughter. 656 bovines were slaughtered without stunning: 538 (82%) for halal and
73
74 33 118 (18%) for kosher. All carcasses slaughtered by the Islamic procedure (dhabiha) were considered
75
76 34 halal, while 77.1% of carcasses slaughtered by the Jewish procedure (shechita) did not pass the
77
78 35 approval. Carcasses were rejected after chest cavity inspection (50%) and after the lungs control
79
80 36 (50%). This study provides an important insight in this field and postulates how to amalgamate the
81
82 37 concepts of freedom of religion, as enshrined by the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU, with
83
84 38 consumer rights and animal welfare.
85
86
87
88 39

89
90 40 **Key words:** ritual slaughter, stunning, labelling, unwitting purchases, kosher, halal
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118

119
120
121 42 **1. INTRODUCTION**
122

123 43 As concerns animal slaughter at the European level, Article 4 Paragraph 1 of Council Regulation
124
125 44 (EC) n. 1099/2009 on the protection of animals at the time of killing requires that, prior to slaughter,
126
127 45 animals must be rendered unconscious through the application of a stunning method. Stunning is
128
129 46 usually applied through electrical, mechanical or gaseous means (approved by Council Regulation
130
131 47 (EC) No 1099/2009) and causes immediate loss of consciousness, making animals insensible to pain
132
133 48 until death supervenes through exsanguination. However, Par. 4 of the same Article allows slaughter
134
135 49 without stunning for particular religious' rites, provided that they take place in a licensed
136
137 50 slaughterhouse (Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009). This derogation is designed to respect freedom of
138
139 51 religion and the right to manifest religion or belief in worship, teaching, practice and observance, as
140
141 52 enshrined in Article 10 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (EU) (European
142
143 53 Commission, 2017).
144
145

146 54 There are many ritual slaughter methods around the world but Islamic and Jewish are the most
147
148 55 commercially relevant. Religious slaughter is performed by Muslims and Jewish in order to obtain
149
150 56 halal and kosher foods, respectively. According to dietary precepts of these religions, animals that
151
152 57 are not conscious, healthy and whole at the time of killing are not eligible for the consumption of
153
154 58 worshippers (Downing, 2015). Accordingly, both these communities interpret the stunning of animals
155
156 59 as not compliant with their religious dietary precepts. However, it should be pointed out that some
157
158 60 Muslim authorities, ~~and~~ meat certifiers ~~and worshippers~~ accept certain pre-slaughter stunning
159
160 61 methods provided they are reversible that is, animals are able to make full recovery after stunning if
161
162 62 neck incision is not performed ~~and animals can return to their state of normal living consciousness~~
163
164 63 (Needham, 2012). According to recent data from the EU Dialrel project, in the EU, about 65% of
165
166 64 cattle abattoirs, 50% of small ruminants abattoirs and 50% of poultry abattoirs carry out pre-slaughter
167
168 65 stunning and, on average, 84% of cattle, 81% of small ruminants and 88% of poultry are stunned
169
170 66 before or after neck cut (Needham, 2012; Velarde et al., 2014). The global volume and value of trade
171
172 67 in halal and kosher meat is vast and it has been increasing especially after the rise of Islamic
173
174
175
176
177

178
179
180 68 communities around the world (Lada et al., 2009). The global and European market for halal food is
181
182 69 estimated to be worth around 547 and 77 billion dollars a year respectively (Lever et al., 2010). It
183
184 70 should be stated, however, that halal and kosher products are not consumed just for religious reasons.
185
186 71 According to the UK Halal Food Authority, while Muslims account for around 3% of the UK
187
188 72 population, halal meat makes up about 25% of the domestic meat market (Lever & Puig de la
189
190 73 Bellacasa, 2010). In addition, a 2009 survey (Mintel, 2009) showed that in the United States only a
191
192 74 low percentage (14%) of consumers purchased kosher food following Jewish precepts. Most of them
193
194 75 claimed to prefer kosher products for reasons related to food quality and safety (Mintel, 2009).
195
196

197 76 Dhabihah and shechita have apparently a similar procedure (slaughter without stunning) but differ
198
199 77 in some aspects (Farouk et al., 2014; Bozzo et al., 2017). In both procedures, operators who actually
200
201 78 carry out the slaughter must be authorized by their respective religious authority (Velarde et al., 2014;
202
203 79 Farouk et al., 2014). The Jewish slaughterer, named shochet, in order to be licensed must be a
204
205 80 practicing worshipper and have attended a specific training course on ritual slaughtering. For Muslim
206
207 81 procedures, slaughtering must be done by a sane (mentally competent) adult Muslim (Pozzi et al.,
208
209 82 2015). At European level, religious slaughterers must be authorized by the competent local authority
210
211 83 that attests their ability and experience and issues them a license (Ferrari & Bottoni 2010).
212
213

214 84 Aside the peculiarities concerning the operator, dhabihah does ask for other particular requirements
215
216 85 for its execution: there aren't parts of the animal to be considered forbidden, except blood, and a *post*
217
218 86 *mortem* inspection is not required (Anil, 2012; Farouk et al., 2014). On the contrary, shechita is
219
220 87 characterized by several and specific dispositions (Bozzo et al., 2017). In particular, the cut of the
221
222 88 throat is a very important procedure and the shochet has to avoid the occurrence of one of the "five
223
224 89 forbidden techniques" (Table 1) that disqualify a kosher cut and renders animals not-kosher and
225
226 90 unsuitable (*treif*) (Roosen, 2004; Hayes et al., 2015; Pozzi et al., 2015).
227
228

Forbidden technique	Description	Examples
Pressing	Hacking or pressing instead of sliding, occurrence of forward and backward movements.	The shochet pushes the knife into the animal's throat against the force of gravity or positions the animal improperly so that its head presses down on the blade as it expires.

Pausing	Hesitation during the incision	The shochet stops the slaughtering process after cutting the trachea or oesophagus but before completing the cut.
Piercing	Cutting above the large ring in the trachea or below upper lobe of the lung (when injected with air)	
Tearing	Tearing the oesophagus or the trachea. It may happen if there is a nick in the knife.	The shochet performs the cut by using a knife with an imperfection on the blade, such as a scratch or nick, that causes a section of blade to be lower than the surface of the blade. It may occur in heavy birds if not correctly restrained.
Digging	The knife is not visible along all the shechita.	The shochet cuts the animal's throat so deeply that the entire width of the knife disappears in the wound; knife is too short so that the end disappears in the wound or is buried by fur or hide. It may be caused even by a foreign object fall over the knife so the <i>shochet</i> loses sight of the incision.

Table 1. The “five forbidden techniques” to be avoided during the shechita (Hayes et al., 2015; Pozzi et al., 2015).

After slaughter, the shochet carries out *post-mortem* inspection (bedikah) of the carcasses to detect alterations, especially of the rib cage (pleura), lungs and liver (Farouk et al., 2014; Hayes et al., 2015; Bozzo et al., 2017). During the bedikah, the shochet blows the lungs with air (this only applies to mammals). If signs of disease are found, the animal cannot be considered suitable for consumption (Hayes et al., 2015; Bozzo et al., 2017). Depending on the lesions found in the lungs and liver, the carcasses can be classified as chalak or glatt (top-quality), kosher (medium-quality) or treif (unsuitable) (Bozzo et al., 2017).

After a kosher animal is properly slaughtered and inspected, it still cannot be consumed until certain large blood vessels, the chelev (a forbidden fat known as ‘Tallow’ or ‘Suet’) (Leviticus 7:25) and the gid hanashe (the sciatic nerve) are removed from the carcass (Gurtman, 2005). The removal of these parts is called nikkur (tunnelling or deveining in English) and the operator that performs it menakker (porger) (Farouk et al., 2014; Bozzo et al., 2017). Nikkur in the forequarters is significantly easy; the operator has just to remove the blood vessels because the front half of the animal has a low chelev content and does not contain the sciatic nerve (Blech, 2009; Lytton, 2013). On the contrary, nikkur in the hindquarters is very complicated and it requires highly trained operators (Blech, 2009; Anil, 2012; Lytton, 2013). While in Israel nikkur in hindquarters is a routinely practice, it is uncommon and limited in countries abroad (Anil, 2012). This is because skilled operators are difficult to find outside of Israeli borders and the removal process is time consuming and not very cost-

296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354

112 effective (Anil, 2012). Therefore, Jewish communities outside of Israeli borders prefer to directly
113 avoid hindquarters, which are systematically rejected by the shochet, even those from carcasses
114 deemed kosher at the end of the shechita (Blech, 2009; Anil, 2012; Lytton, 2013). All carcasses
115 rejected by the shochet as well as all hindquarters are usually sold to non-kosher markets, giving rise
116 to a series of commercial and ethical disputes (Lever et al., 2010; Havinga, 2010; Needham, 2012;
117 DG SANTE, 2015). Concerns have emerged because such meats are marketed on regular commercial
118 channels without being properly labelled as coming from animals slaughtered without stunning (DG
119 SANTE, 2015). Therefore, unwitting consumers may purchase them (Lever et al., 2010; Havinga,
120 2010; Needham, 2012). However, in recent years, the attention of EU consumers towards animal
121 welfare has significantly increased and consumers do not only ask for safe and quality foods but also
122 that they come from animals ethically farmed and slaughtered (Salamano et al., 2013). Therefore, the
123 lack of information on the use (or not) of a stunning method might adversely affect informed
124 purchasing decisions of consumers.

125 According to the most recent data, at European level, about 2.1 million cattle (8.5% of the total
126 cattle slaughtered in EU) are slaughtered without stunning annually; however, figures vary according
127 to the local consistency of Jewish and Muslim population (Needham, 2012). Currently, it is estimated
128 that 19 million (3.8% of the EU population) and 1.4 million (0.2%) of Muslims and Jews respectively
129 live in EU (Lugo and Cooperman, 2011; Lipka, 2015). In France, which is considered to have the
130 largest Muslim community in EU, about 40% of calves, 25% of cattle and 54% of ovine are
131 slaughtered without stunning each year (Needham, 2012). In Italy, considering that the percentage of
132 Muslims and Jews over the total population (2.3% Muslims and 0.04% Jews) (ISMU, 2016; Della
133 Pergola, 2017) is significantly below the European average (6% Muslims and 0.2% Jews) (Lipka,
134 2015; Hackett, 2016), the number of ritual-slaughtered animals is not as high as in other Member
135 States. In 2010, Cenci-Goga et al. estimated that in Italy dhabaha accounts for 4.27% of cattle, 5.47%
136 of small ruminants and 1.31% of poultry, while shechita is practiced for 0.43% of cattle and 4.16%
137 of small ruminants and for almost no poultry.

355
356
357 138 This study was performed at a small throughput slaughterhouse in Italy (Tuscany) and aimed at
358
359 139 assessing the percentage of cattle rejected in the course of ritual slaughter. Our study quantified the
360
361 140 amount of meat from animals slaughtered without stunning that enter the regular trade. Figures from
362
363
364 141 this study could be useful to complete and supplement existing data in this sector and discuss further
365
366 142 issues related to the labelling of meats, especially given the current lack of specific requirements at
367
368 143 EU level.

370 144 **2. MATERIAL AND METHODS**

371

372 145 This survey was conducted in a small licensed slaughterhouse (authorized to carry out ritual killing
373
374 146 of animals by the Local Health Authority), located in Italy (Tuscany), from January to December
375
376 147 2016. In this period, the following data were collected:

- 378 148 -) number of slaughtered animals and information regarding gender and age (commercial category);
- 380
381 149 -) number of animals slaughtered by each religious procedure;
- 382
383 150 -) information regarding the immobilization method;
- 384
385 151 -) number of animals stunned by post-cut stunning;
- 386
387 152 -) number of carcasses accepted/rejected by each procedure (in the case of shechita the total number
388
389 153 of carcasses rejected from kosher certification due to the occurrence of a prohibited technique or the
390
391 154 detection of abnormalities of the carcass were registered);
- 392
393 155 -) commercial destination of the rejected carcasses.

395 156 A statistical analysis was performed to explore rejection rate differences according to slaughtering
396
397
398 157 age by means of χ^2 test for a 3x2 contingency. After the assessment of the overall significance
399
400 158 ($P < 0,05$) $k-1$ χ^2 tests (where k is the number of age category groups) were performed in order to assess
401
402 159 which age class was different. Analyses were performed using EPI info 6™ (<https://www.cdc.gov>).

404 160 **3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

405

406 161 Slaughter without stunning is allowed in most EU Member States. It was banned in Norway,
407
408 162 Switzerland and Sweden (Anil, 2012; Needham, 2012). In Latvia, slaughter without stunning is
409
410 163 allowed only if “immediate” post-cut stunning is applied (Needham, 2012). In 2011, the Dutch

parliament voted in favour of banning slaughter without stunning but following complaints of the Jewish community, the Senate granted exemption from stunning in ritual slaughter provided there is a close veterinary supervision and animals die within 40 seconds (Needham, 2012). In Italy, slaughter without stunning is allowed in all Regions except the Liguria where derogation was halted in 2016 (Regione Liguria, 2016).

During the study period, 656 cattle (about 27% of the animals slaughtered annually in the plant under investigation) were slaughtered by religious rite without stunning (neither before nor after the neck cut). Of these, 538 (82%) by dhabiha and 118 (18%) by shechita (Table 2). All animals (Limousine breed), came from local farms and they were all “Adult Cattle” with an average age of 14 months (Tab 2). With regard to the selection of animals, while the Muslim operators did not express any preference about gender, the shochet specifically requested only male cattle. This preference is due to a higher meat yield of male carcasses with respect to female ones.

	Dhabiha	Shechita
Number of animals slaughtered	538	118
Sex	No preference (male and female)	All male
Breed	Limousine	Limousine
Mean age	14 months	14 months
Commercial category	“ <i>Vitellone</i> ” (Adult Cattle)	“ <i>Vitellone</i> ” (Adult Cattle)
Use of the rotary pen	0%	0%
Post-cut stunning	0%	0%
Rejected carcasses	0%	77.1%

Table 2. Numbers and characteristics of animals slaughtered according to ritual.

At the end of the slaughter, carcasses accepted by the religious slaughterer were usually marked with a halal or kosher stamp. Even though in EU religious stamps are not a legal requirement they are usually applied by operators as a means of certification and warranty for the faithful.

3.1 Slaughtering operations: similarities and differences between Jews and Muslims

There are a number of ways animals destined for halal and kosher slaughters are restrained, including casting with a rope, hoisting by a hind leg, restraint in a straddled conveyor or restraining (V-shaped) conveyor, inversion in a rotary pen (Facomia and Weinberg are the most common worldwide) and restraint whilst standing upright (Grandin & Regenstein, 1994; Farouk et al., 2014;

473
474
475 185 Pozzi et al., 2015). Worldwide, in the opinion of both the Muslim and Jewish communities, the use
476
477 186 of rotating devices is preferred while head restraints (irrespective of the position) should be avoided
478
479
480 187 as they can seriously affect the performance of the cut and the bleeding efficiency (Pozzi et al., 2015).
481
482 188 In a report on the welfare aspects of animal stunning, scientists of the European Food Safety Authority
483
484 189 (EFSA) favoured restraining animals in an upright position in case of slaughter without stunning
485
486 190 (European Commission, 2016). This is due to the behaviour of animals that fidget and get very
487
488 191 stressed when inverted. The inverted position is particularly unnatural, uncomfortable and painful for
489
490 192 cattle because it generates high abdominal pressure, especially if the animal is inverted for a long
491
492 193 time (European Commission, 2016). On the other hand, upright position for slaughter without
493
494 194 stunning makes the cutting more difficult for the operator (European Commission, 2016). At
495
496 195 European level, the use of rotating pens is widespread (on average, more than 78% of the animals
497
498 196 subjected to ritual slaughter are killed in a rotating pen) although there are considerable variations
499
500
501 197 depending on the Member State (European Commission, 2016). In France, for example, 98% of
502
503 198 animals are slaughtered in an inverted position while in other EU countries rotating devices are not
504
505 199 in use (Latvia, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia) or banned (in UK the upright position is mandatory)
506
507 200 (European Commission, 2016).

509 201 During this study, in both Islamic and Jewish methods of slaughter, animals were restrained in the
510
511 202 same restraint used for regular slaughter (with stunning) and sticking was performed in the upright
512
513 203 position. To facilitate the cut of the throat and the exposure of the ventral surface of the neck towards
514
515
516 204 the operator, the animal's head was immobilized and placed in traction upwards by mechanical
517
518 205 devices. Although the slaughterhouse was equipped with a cattle rotational trap, in 100% of the cases
519
520 206 Jewish and Muslim operators preferred to avoid its use. Overall, findings of this survey confirm a
521
522 207 previous study conducted in Italy, where the rotating pens are permitted but rarely used. Cenci-Goga
523
524 208 et al. (2010) reported that cattle are mainly slaughtered in upright position while small ruminants on
525
526 209 the floor or on a table, restrained on their back or side.

532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590

210 From a comparison of the two methods of slaughter, a stricter procedure for the Jewish slaughter
211 is observed. As also observed by other authors (Farouk et al., 2014; Bozzo et al., 2017), Jews make a
212 strict selection of the animals, require detailed arrangements on the technical execution and carry out
213 a *post mortem* inspection of the viscera and exclude certain portions of the carcass systematically.
214 Islamic procedure is generally more flexible (Farouk et al., 2014). One of the main differences
215 between the two methods of slaughter regards the knife used. In fact, Jewish precepts requires that
216 the knife used for slaughtering (*chalef*) must be perfectly sharp so that trachea, oesophagus, carotid
217 arteries and jugular veins can be cut in one swift action (Bozzo et al., 2017). So that the blade is as
218 smooth as possible and the cut is made in a single movement, the *shochet* sharpens the knife several
219 times on a slate stone before slaughtering each animal. Also in this study, the *shochet* tested the knife
220 for any imperfection, nicks or unevenness by lightly passing the edge of the index or pointer fingernail
221 along the cutting edge or by moving the edge of the knife back and forth on the edge of the fingernail.
222 Beyond this, in general, the appropriateness of the knife is pivotal in terms of animal welfare and
223 bleeding efficiency. In fact, a blunt or imperfect knife can, determine an inadequate cut resulting in a
224 slow-down of the bleeding, a delay in loss of consciousness and above all in deep suffering of animals
225 (Grandin & Regenstein, 1994).

226 Muslims and Jews have contrasting positions about the possible use of stunning (Salamano et al.,
227 2013). Available data show that while a very high percentage (80-90%) of animals slaughtered by
228 shechita are not subject to stunning, those slaughtered by *dhabiha* are subjected to stunning in most
229 of the cases (Salamano et al., 2013; Farouk et al., 2014). Worldwide, many Muslim communities
230 voluntarily apply stunning as long as it is reversible and the animal's physical integrity is maintained
231 (Velarde et al., 2014; Pozzi et al., 2015). In 2011, according to a study of the UK Food Standards
232 Agency (FSA), 43,772 cattle and calves were slaughtered in UK, of which 1,314 (3%) by shechita
233 and 1,727 (4%) by *dhabiha* (Food Standards Agency, 2012). Ten per cent of those slaughtered by
234 Jews were stunned immediately after bleeding while 84% of those slaughtered by Muslims were
235 stunned before slaughter and less than 1% after bleeding (Food Standards Agency, 2012). In 2015,

591
592
593 236 the Food Standards Agency (FSA) published the result of another Animal Welfare Survey undertaken
594
595
596 237 in abattoirs across UK in a one week period in September 2013. The survey stated that around 84%
597
598 238 of animals slaughtered by dhabaha were stunned before slaughter, confirming earlier 2011 figures
599
600 239 (Food Standard Agency, 2015).

601
602 240 Muslims commonly accept reversible stunning methods, such as head-only electronarcosis, but
603
604 241 they are reluctant to approve mechanical stunning, as it may cause irreversible loss of consciousness
605
606 242 and injuries to animals (McLean et al., 2017). Unfortunately, there are some animal species,
607
608 243 especially large ones, where stunning by electric current is not easily applicable for various technical
609
610 244 reasons (Wotton et al., 2000; Grandin, 2011; Robins et al. 2014, McLean et al., 2017) and mechanical
611
612 245 means, such as captive bolt gun, are preferred. A ~~particular~~ head-only electrical stunning method,
613
614
615 246 ~~called the~~ Jarvis Beef Stunner, was specifically developed for adult bovines in New Zealand.
616
617 247 However, as the original method of the Jarvis Beef Stunner requires the application of a post-stun,
618
619 248 low-voltage electro-immobilisation to control post-stun convulsions, violating the EU animal welfare
620
621 249 provisions, it was subsequently modified for the European market by introducing an additional
622
623 250 current application to cause a cardiac arrest in the animal (Weaver and Wotton, 2009). The Jarvis
624
625 251 Beef Stunner currently applied in EU is a head-to-body electrical stunning andIt induces stun, cardiac
626
627 252 arrest and spinal discharge by three consecutive cycles, with considerable welfare advantage (Weaver
628
629 253 and Wotton, 2009) over the head-only electrical stunning method, designed in New Zealand.
630
631
632 254 However, currently, ~~Jarvis Beef Stunner~~it is not yet widespread at European level, and for example
633
634 255 in UK it has been introduced only into 7 plants across the country (Mpamhanga and Wotton, 2015).
635
636 256 It follows that species such as cattle and horses are automatically excluded from the possibility of
637
638 257 being stunned before ritual slaughter unless the captive bolt gun is used immediately after cutting.
639
640 258 However, this practice is very uncommon among religious slaughterer (Cenci-Goga et al., 2013) and
641
642 259 during the current study, it happened only once (0.001%), during Muslim ritual, because of the
643
644 260 prolonged state of animal consciousness. Studies on cattle indicate that some animals may have a
645
646 261 period of prolonged sensibility (Grandin, 1994) as cattle have a particular anatomical conformation

650
651
652 262 of vessels (Gregory et al., 2008; Bartz et al., 2015). In addition to branches from the carotid and
653
654 263 basilar arteries, cattle brain is supplied with blood via a basioccipital plexus. During slaughter, when
655
656 264 carotid arteries are cut, the thick anastomotic network of the basioccipital plexus keeps the brain
657
658
659 265 perfused, prolonging the state of consciousness (Gregory et al., 2006; Gregory et al., 2008; Bartz et
660
661 266 al., 2015). Further complication can result from the tendency of cattle to develop "false aneurysm" or
662
663 267 "Ballooning" shortly after resection of the carotid arteries (Gregory et al., 2006; Bartz et al., 2015).
664
665 268 This phenomenon is due to the partial occlusion of the severed artery orifice by engorgement with
666
667 269 blood in the lumen or in the connective tissue of the vessel, slowing down the bleeding and
668
669 270 considerably extending the duration of animal consciousness (Gregory et al., 2006; Gregory et al.,
670
671 271 2008; Bartz et al., 2015).

673 674 272 **3.2 Evaluation and acceptability of carcasses**

675
676 273 During our study, none of the animals slaughtered with Jewish ritual was rejected because of
677
678 274 anomalies arising during *ante mortem* inspection or the occurrence of a prohibited technique (Table
679
680 275 1). A low rejection rate (2.4%) during cutting was also confirmed by Bozzo et al. (2017) and it is
681
682 276 probably due to the technical expertise of operators and the routine application of standardized
683
684 277 procedures (Bozzo et al., 2017).

686 278 On the contrary, a very high percentage of carcasses (77.1%) were refused by the shochet during
687
688 279 his inspection. In particular, 50% of rejections occurred during the first step of the bedikah (when the
689
690 280 shochet checks the thoracic cavity with organs *in situ*), because the shochet reported the presence of
691
692 281 lung adhesions and irregularities, and 50% during the second step, when the shochet specifically
693
694 282 examines the lungs and liver of animals that have passed the first step. In this case, the carcasses were
695
696 283 mainly rejected following the detection of inflammatory or reparative processes. In addition to these
697
698 284 rejected carcasses, because of the impossibility to perform nikkur (extremely rare practice outside
699
700 285 Israel), the shochet systematically discarded the hindquarters of all animals, even those deemed
701
702 286 kosher. Our data confirm figures found at global level where it has been estimated that only about
703
704 287 20-25% of beef and sheep meat, slaughtered according to shechita is ultimately classed as kosher
705
706
707
708

709
710
711 288 (Barclay, 2012; Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, 2015; DG SANTE, 2015).
712
713 289 These data also agree with the high percentage of the carcasses failing to qualify as kosher reported
714
715
716 290 in a recent study of Bozzo et al., (2017). In their study, 67.2% and 40.7% of the total carcasses were
717
718 291 rejected by the Rabbis from the Community of Milan and Rome, respectively. The variability is
719
720 292 probably due both to the subjective selection criteria of the shochet and to the commercial outcome
721
722 293 of the kosher meat. In particular, stricter requirements seemed to be applied when the meat is intended
723
724 294 for orthodox Jewish communities. However, another aspect that can reduce the percentage of the
725
726 295 carcasses qualified as kosher is the age of cattle. In fact, the older the cattle the greater is the likelihood
727
728 296 of finding lesions in their organs, as our statistical analyses confirmed. In the current study, the
729
730 297 frequency of carcass rejection observed for adult calves (over 12 months,) was compared to those
731
732
733 298 reported in a similar study for calves younger than 8 months, and bull calves aged between 8 and 12
734
735 299 months (see Bozzo et al. 2017) by statistical analysis. The overall difference in frequency of rejected
736
737 300 carcasses across age groups was highly significant, being $X^2=60,45$ and $P<0,001$; interestingly, the
738
739 301 comparison between young calves and bull calves also resulted in highly significant differences
740
741 302 ($X^2=34,9$ and $P<0,001$), as well as between bull calves and adult bulls ($X^2=6,92$ and $P<0,001$). These
742
743 303 results indicate an effect of age on carcass acceptability. Therefore, the very high difference in value
744
745 304 between the acceptances of adult cattle compared to other categories of cattle is unlikely to be due to
746
747 305 other external factors (such as operator or slaughtering procedures).

749 306 All rejected carcasses observed during the present study period and non-eligible hindquarters were
750
751
752 307 sold to the (non-religious) conventional market (i. e. local butchers). This "*modus operandi*"
753
754 308 represents a practical (even though not ethical) solution for slaughterhouses and farmers to minimize
755
756 309 the economic loss. According to industry estimates (unofficial data), sheep and beef meat derived
757
758 310 from animals slaughtered without stunning which was sold through the conventional market in 2012
759
760 311 accounted for 40,000 tons of meat for grilling (5% of the conventional market of meat for grilling)
761
762 312 and 20,000 tons for slow cooking (3.5% of the conventional market of slow cooking meat.) (DG
763
764 313 SANTE, 2015). Moreover, there have been cases of state schools, hospitals, pubs, sports arenas, cafes,
765
766
767

768
769
770 314 markets and hotels serving halal and kosher meat to customers without their awareness (Barclay,
771
772 315 2012).

774
775 316 Our survey confirmed that, usually, during Islamic slaughtering the carcasses rejection rate is very
776
777 317 low (according to the Federation of Islamic Organizations in Europe it is less than 20%) (DG SANTE,
778
779 318 2015). In fact, all animals were accepted and sold to local halal butchers. This could be due not only
780
781 319 to the absence of particular operational or qualitative criteria adopted during carcass and organs
782
783 320 evaluation but, probably, also to the growing demand for halal meat in Italy and especially in Tuscany,
784
785 321 which is among the regions with the highest Muslim population (7.3% of foreigners) (ISMU, 2016).
786
787 322 Presently halal meat produced in Italy is marketed at national level (Cenci-Goga et al., 2010; Cenci-
788
789 323 Goga et al., 2013) and not exported. In 2009, the Italian-Islamic Religious Community (Co.Re.Is),
790
791 324 with the support of several institutional bodies signatories of an inter-ministerial agreement, initiated
792
793 325 the first pilot-project for halal certification in Italy and, a year later, registered the "Halal Italia" mark.
794
795 326 This certification was established to certify compliance of various products (food, drugs, cosmetics,
796
797 327 etc.) with the Koranic laws and encourage their export abroad (Interministerial Agreement, 2010).
798
799 328 Recently halal meat has also appeared in supermarkets and large stores (especially of big cities) in
800
801 329 dedicated shelves or counters.

804 330 **3.4 Implications of consumers: in search for a legislative “politically correct” solution**

805
806 331 In recent years, following the growing interest of consumers in animal welfare, the resale of meat
807
808 332 coming from ritual slaughter to conventional retail outlets has aroused several concerns worldwide.
809
810 333 This is especially because nowadays at global level, no government has made mandatory the labelling
811
812 334 of meats from animals slaughtered without stunning and therefore there is no chance for consumers
813
814 335 to avoid them if they so desire. In 2010, even the president of the UK Halal Food Authority recognized
815
816 336 the importance of labelling, arguing that as Muslims have a choice of eating halal meat, non-Muslims
817
818 337 should have the opportunity to not eat it (Barclay, 2012).

819
820 338 Issues related to unintentional purchase and consumption of these meats by EU citizens has led
821
822 339 the Food Chain Evaluation Consortium (FCEC) for the European Commission Directorate General
823
824
825
826

827
828
829 340 for Health and Food Safety to carry out an EU wide survey. Through the interview of 13,500 EU
830
831 341 consumers, the FCEC attempted to ascertain if respondents would be interested in receiving
832
833 342 information on the method of slaughter when purchasing meat (DG SANTE 2015). In 2015, the
834
835
836 343 findings were published in a report entitled “*Study on information to consumers on the stunning of*
837
838 344 *animals*” according to which 72% of consumers were interested in receiving information about the
839
840 345 stunning of animals and 45% of them thought that it should be reported on label. However, it must
841
842 346 be pointed out that the respondents did not voluntarily suggest that slaughter method was an important
843
844 347 criterion when purchasing meat, but only mentioned it when asked directly whether they would like
845
846 348 to know more about it (DG SANTE, 2015). Moreover, most stakeholders stated the only relevant
847
848
849 349 information on this issue is whether an animal had been stunned prior to slaughter and not the method
850
851 350 of stunning used. Probably the information on the method of stunning is not significant to consumers
852
853 351 because they are not properly aware of the various types of stunning methods. In particular,
854
855 352 considering the low level of consumers’ understanding of slaughter practices, the introduction of
856
857 353 labelling on stunning would require substantial efforts in terms of educating consumers. Introducing
858
859 354 labelling without a preliminary education and awareness may result in false alarms and further
860
861 355 reductions in consumer confidence in the meat supply chain. This also holds true for Muslim
862
863 356 consumers who are likely to question whether pre-slaughter stunning is acceptable if they are not
864
865 357 adequately informed.

867
868 358 Following the data obtained from the study, EU has not considered it necessary to impose label
869
870 359 information on the type (or absence) of the stunning. This decision was probably made because
871
872 360 ordinary consumers will likely refuse to buy meat labelled as coming from animals slaughtered
873
874 361 without stunning, with a consequent depreciation of the value of this meat (especially hindquarters)
875
876 362 on the market. Moreover, the distribution chain is likely to refuse to market meat from animals
877
878 363 slaughtered without stunning, for communication/image to the general public reasons and to avoid
879
880 364 bearing the risk of unsold meat. However, the Federation of Veterinarians of Europe (FVE) has
881
882 365 supported the correct identification of meat from animals slaughtered without stunning, arguing that
883
884
885

886
887
888 366 *“the practice of slaughtering animals without prior stunning is unacceptable under any*
889 *circumstances”*. Therefore meat (or products thereof) coming from ritual slaughter without stunning
890 367 should be clearly labelled to enable consumers to make an informed choice based on welfare, ethics
891 368 or personal belief (Federation of Veterinarians of Europe, 2014). Furthermore, FVE advocate that
892 369 labelling should refer to non-stun slaughter rather than a method of religious slaughter because it may
893 370 discriminate against Jewish or Muslim communities (Federation of Veterinarians of Europe, 2014).
894 371 In fact, labelling to indicate whether animals had been stunned or not, rather than whether the meat
895 372 was halal or kosher, could mitigate the stigmatization of certain religious groups (Federation of
896 373 Veterinarians of Europe, 2014). Many evidence of possible racial and anti-cultural implications
897 374 already exists (Gruber, 2012; Rauschnabel et al., 2015) and in this regard, the case of French fast food
898 375 is emblematic (Wright & Annes, 2013). In 2009, the introduction of halal meat in the menu of a fast
899 376 food restaurant located in a densely populated Muslim area in Toulouse raised strong public outrage.
900 377 Many French media and citizens saw the episode as an abuse of national identity, arguing that the
901 378 spread of certain products on a large-scale could threaten the French national identity and food culture
902 379 (Wright & Annes, 2013).
903 380

904 381 In order to reduce the risk of stigmatization, as proposed by several stakeholders, the information
905 382 related to stunning could be communicated via a code rather than text, for instance a letter, for
906 383 example “S” for stunned, that would allow informed consumers to make their choice while avoiding
907 384 misinterpretation for other consumers.

908 385 **4. CONCLUSIONS**

909 386 The percentage of rejected carcasses identified in the current study was particularly high for the
910 387 Jewish slaughtering. Therefore, a big proportion of carcasses was sold on the conventional market
911 388 without appropriate labelling. On the contrary, no rejection was observed during Muslim procedures.
912 389 The results of this study confirm those found by other scientific studies, however, surveys in this
913 390 sector are still limited and further investigations are needed at national, EU and global level. As
914 391 regards the labelling of stunning method, the EU, following its 2015 study, has taken a clear position,

945
946
947 392 deciding not to make it mandatory. In this light, if EU government does not intend to regulate the
948
949 393 labelling of meat from animals slaughtered without stunning, then it would be necessary to explore a
950
951
952 394 range of alternative options and actions to prevent non-religious consumers from unwitting and
953
954 395 unwelcome purchases.

955 956 396 **Funding sources**

957
958 397 This research was financed by the University of Pisa. The funding source was not involved in the
959
960 398 article preparation and submission process.

961 962 399 **Conflict of Interest:**

963
964 400 D'Amico Priscilla, Vitelli Nicolò, Cenci Goga Beniamino, Nucera Daniele, Pedonese Francesca,
965
966 401 Guidi Alessandra, Armani Andrea declare that they have no conflict of interest.

967 968 969 402 **Bibliography**

- 970 403
971 404 1. Anil, M.H. (2012). Effects of slaughter method on carcass and meat characteristics in the meat of
972 405 cattle and sheep. Available at: [http://beefandlamb.ahdb.org.uk/wp/wp-](http://beefandlamb.ahdb.org.uk/wp/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/slaughter_and_meat_quality_feb_2012-final-report.pdf)
973
974 406 [content/uploads/2013/04/slaughter_and_meat_quality_feb_2012-final-report.pdf](http://beefandlamb.ahdb.org.uk/wp/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/slaughter_and_meat_quality_feb_2012-final-report.pdf).
- 975 407 2. Barclay, C. (2012). Religious Slaughter. *House of Commons Standard Note: SN/SC/1314*.
- 977 408 3. Bartz, B., Collins, M., Stoddard, G., Appleton, A., Livingood, R., Sobczynski, H., & Vogel, K. D.
978
979 409 (2015). Assessment of nonpenetrating captive bolt stunning followed by electrical induction of
980 410 cardiac arrest in veal calves. *Journal of Animal Science*, 93(9), 4557-4563.
- 981 411 4. Blech, Z.Y. (2009). *Kosher Food Production*. (2nd ed.). Ames: John Wiley & Sons.
- 982 412 5. Bozzo, G., Di Pinto, A., Bonerba, E., Ceci, E., Mottola, A., Roma, R., Capozza, P., Samoilis, G.,
983
984 413 Tantillo G., & Celano, G. V. (2017). Kosher slaughter paradigms: Evaluation of slaughterhouse
985 414 inspection procedures. *Meat Science*, 128, 30-33.
- 988 415 6. Cenci-Goga, B. T., Mattiacci, C., De Angelis, G., Marini, P., Cuccurese, A., Rossi, R., &
989
990 416 Catanese, B. (2010). Religious slaughter in Italy. *Veterinary Research Communications*, 34(1),
991 417 139-143.
- 992 418 7. Cenci-Goga, B. T., Sechi, P., Cuccurese, A., Poeta, A., De Angelis, G., Marini, P., Mattiacci, C.,
993 419 Rossi, R., Pezzato, R., Salamano G., & Santori, P. (2013). Religious slaughter: Data from surveys
994
995 419 and spot-check visits in Italy and animal welfare issues. *Society & Animals*, 21(5), 459-488.
- 996 420 8. Council Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009 of 24 September 2009 on the protection of animals at the
997
998 421 time of killing. *Official Journal*, L303.
- 999 422
1000
1001
1002
1003

- 1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1060
1061
1062
9. Della Pergola, S. (2017). World Jewish Population, 2016. In A. Dashefsky, & I.M. Sheskin (Eds.), *American Jewish Year Book 2016* (pp. 253-332). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
 10. DG SANTE (2015). Study on information to consumers on the stunning of animals. Final Report. Available at: <http://www.ceasc.com/Images/Content/2643%20Appendices.pdf>
 11. Downing, E. (2015). Religious slaughter of animals. Available at: <http://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/SN07108/SN07108.pdf>.
 12. EBLEX (2010). The Halal meat market: EBLEX Special Report. Available at: http://beefandlamb.ahdb.org.uk/wp/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/p_cp_EBLEX_Halal_Meat_FINAL_111110.pdf
 13. European Commission (2016). Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on systems restraining bovine animals by inversion or any unnatural position. COM/2016/048 final. Available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A52016DC0048>
 14. European Commission (2017). Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union. Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/charter/index_en.htm.
 15. Farouk, M. M. (2013). Advances in the industrial production of halal and kosher red meat. *Meat Science*, 95(4), 805-820.
 16. Farouk, M.M., Al-Mazeedi H.M., Sabow A.B., Bekhit A.E.D., Adeyemi K.D., Sazili A.Q., & Ghani A. (2014). Halal and kosher slaughter methods and meat quality. *Meat Science*, 98, 507-509.
 17. Federation of Veterinarians of Europe (2014). Slaughter of animals without prior stunning. FVE Position Paper FVE/02/104 Final. Available at: http://www.fve.org/news/position_papers/animal_welfare/fve_02_104_slaughter_prior_stunning.pdf
 18. Ferrari, S., & Bottoni R. (2010). Legislation regarding religious slaughter in the EU member, candidate and associated countries. Dialrel Report Deliverable 1.4. Available at: <http://www.dialrel.eu/images/report-legislation.pdf>
 19. Food Standard Agency (2012). Results of the 2011 FSA animal welfare survey in Great Britain. Available at: <https://www.food.gov.uk/sites/default/files/multimedia/pdfs/board/fsa120508.pdf>.
 20. Food Standard Agency (2015). Results of the 2013 animal welfare survey in Great Britain. Available at: <https://www.food.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2013-animal-welfare-survey.pdf>
 21. Grandin, T. (2011). Electrical stunning of cattle. Available at: <http://www.grandin.com/humane/elec.stunning.cattle.html>.

- 1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1120
1121
22. Grandin, T., & Regenstein J.M. (1994). Religious slaughter and animal welfare: A discussion for meat scientists. *CAB International*, 115–123
 23. Gregory, N. G., Shaw, F. D., Whitford, J. C., & Patterson-Kane, J. C. (2006). Prevalence of ballooning of the severed carotid arteries at slaughter in cattle, calves and sheep. *Meat science*, 74(4), 655-657.
 24. Gregory, N. G., von Wenzlawowicz, M., Alam, R. M., Anil, H. M., Yeşildere, T., & Silva-Fletcher, A. (2008). False aneurysms in carotid arteries of cattle and water buffalo during shechita and halal slaughter. *Meat Science*, 79(2), 285-288.
 25. Gruber, V. (2012). Case study: KFC in France. In T. Rudolph, B. B. Schlegelmilch, J. Franch, A. Bauer, & J. N. Meise (Eds.), *Diversity in European marketing: Text and cases* (pp. 41–55). Wiesbaden: Springer Gabler.
 26. Gurtman, R. (2005). Shehitah: Jewish Ritual Slaughter. Available at: <https://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/8852091/Gurtman05.pdf?sequence=3>.
 27. Hackett C. (2016). 5 facts about the Muslim population in Europe. *The Pew Research Center*. Available at: <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/07/19/5-facts-about-the-muslim-population-in-europe/>.
 28. Havinga, T. (2010). Regulating halal and kosher foods: Different arrangements between state, industry and religious actors. *Erasmus Law Review*, 3(4), 241.
 29. Hayes N.S., Schwartz C.A., Phelps K.J., Borowicz K.R., Maddock-Carlin K.R., & Maddock R.J. (2015). The relationship between pre-harvest stress and the carcass characteristics of beef heifers that qualified for kosher designation. *Meat Science*, 100, 134–138.
 30. Interministerial Agreement (2010). Convenzione interministeriale a sostegno dell'iniziativa Halal Italia. Available at: <http://www.halalitalia.org/documenti/Conv.%20Interm.firmata.pdf>
 31. ISMU (2016). Immigrati e religioni in Italia: gli ortodossi sono più numerosi dei musulmani. Available at: <http://www.ismu.org/2016/07/in-italia-ortodossi-piu-numerosi-dei-musulmani/>.
 32. Lada, S., Harvey Tanakinjal, G., & Amin, H. (2009). Predicting intention to choose halal products using theory of reasoned action. *International Journal of Islamic and Middle Eastern Finance and Management*, 2(1), 66-76.
 33. Lever, J., & Puig de la Bellacasa, M. (2010). The development of halal and kosher meat markets in the UK. Other. Cardiff University.
 34. Lever, J., Puig della Bellacasa, M., Miele, M., & Higgin, M. (2010). From the slaughterhouse to the consumer: transparency and information in the distribution of Halal and Kosher meat. Dialrel Report n. 43. Available at: http://orca.cf.ac.uk/20492/1/Dialrel_report_43.pdf

- 1122
1123
1124
1125 489 35. Lipka, M. (2015). The continuing decline of Europe's Jewish population. *The Pew Research Center*. Available at: <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2015/02/09/europes-jewish-population/>
1126 491
1127
1128
1129 492 36. Lugo, L., & Cooperman, A. (2011). The future of the global Muslim population. *The Pew Research Center*. Available at: http://www.euro-muslims.eu/future_global.pdf.
1130 493
1131
1132 494 37. Lytton, T. D. (2013). *Kosher*. Harvard University Press.
1133 495
1134 496 38. McLean, D., Meers, L., Ralph, J., Owen, J. S., & Small, A. (2017). Development of a microwave energy delivery system for reversible stunning of cattle. *Research in Veterinary Science*, 112, 13-17.
1135 497
1136 498 39. Mintel (2009). *Kosher Foods - US - January 2009*. Available at: <http://store.mintel.com/kosher-foods-us-january-2009>.
1137 499
1138 500 40. Mpamhanga, C. J., & Wotton, S. B. (2015). The effects of pre-slaughter restraint (for the purpose of cattle identification) on post-slaughter responses and carcass quality following the electrical stun/killing of cattle in a Jarvis Beef stunner. *Meat science*, 107, 104-108
1139 501
1140 502 41. Needham, C. (2012). *Religious slaughter of animals in the EU*. Library of the European Parliament. Available at: [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/bibliotheque/briefing/2012/120375/LDM_BRI\(2012\)120375_REV2_EN.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/bibliotheque/briefing/2012/120375/LDM_BRI(2012)120375_REV2_EN.pdf)
1141 503
1142 504
1143 505 42. Pozzi, P. S., Geraisy, W., Barakeh, S., & Azaran, M. (2015). Principles of Jewish and Islamic Slaughter with Respect to OIE (World Organization for Animal Health) Recommendations. *Israel Journal of Veterinary Medicine*, 70, 3.
1144 506
1145 507 43. Rauschnabel, P. A., Herz, M., Schlegelmilch, B. B., & Ivens, B. S. (2015). Brands and religious labels: a spillover perspective. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 31(11-12), 1285-1309.
1146 508
1147 509 44. Regione Liguria (2016). *Rispetto e modifica della normativa in materia di macellazione degli animali*. Atto n. 47 del Consiglio Regionale di Giovedì 25 Febbraio 2016. Available at: <http://www.regione.liguria.it/regione-liguria/ente/consiglio/archivio-comunicati-stampa-del-consiglio/item/13197-i-lavori-del-consiglio-regionale-di-gioved-25-febbraio-pomeriggio-seconda-parte.html>
1148 510
1149 511
1150 512 45. Robins, A., Pleiter, H., Latter, M., & Phillips, C. J. C. (2014). The efficacy of pulsed ultrahigh current for the stunning of cattle prior to slaughter. *Meat science*, 96(3), 1201-1209.
1151 513
1152 514 46. Rosen, S.D. (2004). Physiological insights into Shechita. *Veterinary Record*, 154, 759-765.
1153 515
1154 516 47. Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (2015) *Slaughter without pre-stunning*. Available at:
1155 517
1156 518
1157 519
1158 520
1159 521
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1180

1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239

<https://www.rspca.org.uk/ImageLocator/LocateAsset?asset=document&assetId=1232719611043&mode=prd>

48. Salamano, G., Cuccurese, A., Poeta, A., Santella, E., Sechi, P., Cambiotti, V., & Cenci-Goga, B. T. (2013). Acceptability of electrical stunning and post-cut stunning among Muslim communities: A possible dialogue. *Society & Animals*, 21(5), 443-458.
49. Thomas, A. M., White, G. R., Plant, E., & Zhou, P. (2017). Challenges and practices in Halal meat preparation: a case study investigation of a UK slaughterhouse. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 28(1-2), 12-31.
50. Velarde, A., Rodriguez, P., Dalmau, A., Fuentes, C., Llonch, P., Von Holleben, K. V., ... & Cenci-Goga, B. T. (2014). Religious slaughter: Evaluation of current practices in selected countries. *Meat science*, 96(1), 278-287.
51. Weaver, A. L., & Wotton, S. B. (2009). The Jarvis Beef Stunner: Effects of a prototype chest electrode. *Meat science*, 81(1), 51-56.
52. Wotton, S.B., Gregory, N.G., Whittington, P.E., & Parkman, I.D. (2000). Electrical stunning of cattle. *Veterinary Record*, 147, 681-684.
53. Wright, W., & Annes, A. (2013). Halal on the menu?: Contested food politics and French identity in fast-food. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 32, 388-399.