

When Conscience Becomes a Fatwa

On Meat, Veganism, and the Limits of Personal Ethics



Introduction

Every year, as Muslims celebrate their religion's Festival of Sacrifice (Eid al-Adha), our digital group chats are being flooded with the same kinds of images and videos: families in impoverished communities slaughtering an animal, dividing up the meat, and sharing it with neighbours who may not have eaten meat for months. However, what is new is not the footage itself, but the comments that come along with it — sometimes even by Muslims themselves.

“Poor cow!”

“She was living peacefully and grazing just a short while ago...”

“We shouldn't be sharing such disturbing content!”

An act prescribed by our Creator as a religious rite suddenly seems to evoke disgust among people who profess that very faith.

But it doesn't stop at comments alone. Anyone looking around Muslim communities today will probably have come across someone who has chosen to stop eating meat altogether, or at least meat from conventional farming methods. This decision is often justified by claiming that such meat is not *tayyib* (good), with selected Islamic texts cited in support of their argument.

This white paper seeks to draw attention to this very problem: never before in Islamic history have Muslims had such easy access to the sources of their own ethical tradition, yet never before have they looked elsewhere for moral guidance to such an extent. The order has been completely flipped. Instead of using religious texts as a starting point for moral reasoning and deriving judgements from them, people now form their own judgements and convictions first, and only then search for texts that appear to support their preconceived notions.

For this reason, the question at the very heart of this white paper is not about diet; rather, it is this: How does a Muslim determine whether something is good or bad? What happens when they look for the answer in the wrong place and simply dress it an Islamic clothing?

As a matter of fact, the reaction that these videos and images provoke these days does not occur out of thin air. If we fail to recognise where it's truly coming from, we may already be following a *fatwa* that was never actually issued within the scholarly tradition of Islam.

Disclaimer

Before we begin, it is important to clarify what this white paper is not about. It is not about criticising anyone for choosing to abstain from meat. Muslims are free to make their own dietary choices, and the Messenger of Allah ﷺ himself refrained from things that were permissible without declaring them as forbidden.

This white paper is also not about declaring anyone outside the fold of Islam, as such judgements is neither mine nor the reader's business. And lastly, this white paper is certainly not an attempt to defend the modern meat industry where it clearly violates the Shari'ah's standards of animal welfare.

This paper is about something completely different — something far more consequential that reaches well beyond the question of meat consumption alone: the source from which such judgements arise in the first place. Who decides what is good and permissible for a Muslim? What is left of Islam when our own feelings become the standard by which those judgements are being made?

What Is Not Problematic

Before turning to the main subject, we first need to distinguish between four different things that are constantly being conflated in discussions on the topic, even though there is nothing inherently problematic about them.

Abstaining Out of Personal Preference

As mentioned earlier, every Muslim is entitled to have his or her own preferences when it comes to food and drink. A beautiful example of this can be found directly in the life of our beloved Prophet ﷺ :

In an authentic narration recorded by al-Bukhari, Khalid ibn al-Walid reported that a roasted mastigure was brought to the Prophet (ﷺ) who stretched his hand towards it to eat it. Then it was said to him, “It is a mastigure.” So he withdrew his hand again. Khalid asked, “Is it unlawful to eat?”, whereupon the Prophet replied, “No, but it is not found in the land of my people and that is why I do not like eating it.” So Khalid started eating [it] while Allah's Messenger (ﷺ) was just looking at him.¹

In this scene, the Messenger of Allah ﷺ explicitly explained the reason for his abstention for what it truly was: a personal aversion shaped by his own upbringing and cultural background. He did not forbid his Companions from consuming what Allah had permitted, nor did he prevent them from eating it in his presence.

Abstaining Out of Moderation

As we will see later, the Qur'an and the Sunnah actually speak far more explicitly on this matter than most contemporary critics of meat consumption do — only for entirely different, and entirely legitimate, reasons.

Abstaining Out of Doubts About the Slaughtering Process

Whether industrial stunning or mechanical slaughter constitutes a valid Islamic slaughter, whether the conditions for *tasmiya* (mentioning the name of Allah) can be fulfilled on a production line, or whether meat from the People of the Book (Jews and Christians) may still be consumed today — these are all serious, longstanding legal questions on which qualified scholars have differed. Anyone who follows the ruling of their own scholar on such matters and therefore refrains from eating certain types of meat is in no way the subject of criticism in this paper. The subject of slaughter itself and the various methods used today would also go far beyond the scope of this white paper. It may, however, be a suitable topic for a white paper in the future.

Criticism of the Modern Meat Industry

This, too, is entirely legitimate and could easily be explored in greater depth in a separate white paper. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ taught us that Allah has prescribed upon us applying *ihsan* in all things. He ﷺ also taught us what good treatment of our livestock looks like.² Wherever modern farming practices violate these principles, criticism is not merely justified, but it can even become a communal obligation. Islam does have an ethic of animal welfare — it is simply not the one that Muslims today have, often without realizing it, quietly adopted from elsewhere.

What Is Left?

This paper ultimately comes down to one crucial distinction: there is a world of difference between saying, “I don’t eat this,” and saying, “This *should not* be eaten.” Once that line is crossed, a personal preference becomes a moral judgment for everyone, and a personal practice becomes a standard others are expected to follow. In doing so, a person may end up speaking from a position of authority they were never given.

Firstly: Who Has the Right to Declare Something As Obligatory?

Almost no one would deny that human beings have an innate sense of right and wrong. We instinctively recognize cruelty as ugly and justice as beautiful, often long before having any proof to justify those judgments in the first place. But the crucial question is a different one: Does having such a moral sense also mean that it can impose an obligation upon us?

The fact that our minds can recognize something as good or bad is one thing; whether that recognition gives rise to a binding Islamic ruling is an entirely different one. A religious ruling (*hukm shar'i*) does not arise simply because someone *feels like* an action is wrong. It can only be established through Allah and His Messenger ﷺ. This is not the position of any particular school of thought or movement within Islam. It is the common foundation upon which Muslim jurists have derived legal rulings for more than 1,400 years: without reference to revelation, there is simply no *hukm* – it's simple as that.

That is precisely why the Qur'an speaks so sternly about those who take it upon themselves to decide what is permissible and what is forbidden:

“O believers! Do not forbid the good things which Allah has made lawful for you, and do not transgress. Indeed, Allah does not like transgressors.”³

And in a different place, as a direct question:

“Ask, ‘O Prophet,’ ‘Who has forbidden the adornments and lawful provisions (*tayyibaat*) Allah has brought forth for His servants?’”⁴

This question is rhetorical, implicitly asking: Who besides Allah could possibly have the right to make such a judgment?

And this finally allows us to identify exactly where some brothers and sisters go wrong on the issue. The problem is not that they make moral judgments in the first place. As mentioned before, we all have an instinctive aversion to rudeness and naturally regard certain gestures as beautiful without needing to consult a fatwa. The problem arises when we assign a religious ruling to an action that the Shari‘ah has clearly not given it.

Moreover, Islam does not remain silent on the subject of meat consumption. In fact, the Qur'an describes meat as a blessing from Allah and a provision for humankind. It is a permissible food and, during the ritual sacrifice of Eid al-Adha, it even becomes an established religious rite.⁵ Therefore, anyone seeking to make a moral judgement on this matter must be especially careful not to overstep the clear boundaries set by Allah.

The Sentiment's True Origin

Perhaps at this point you are wondering: If my feelings cannot establish a religious judgment, then why does it *feel* so obvious to me?

Part of the answer can be found in an explanation given by the Messenger ﷺ himself. Every human being is born upon an uncorrupted natural disposition (*fitra*), but that disposition does not remain unaffected:

“Every child is born upon the *fiṭrah*, and then his parents make him a Jew, a Christian, or a fire-worshipper.”⁶

If the deepest part of a person's natural disposition can be shaped by nothing more than their upbringing, how much more easily can their sense of what they *feel* is decent and what's repulsive be shaped? Anyone who has studied human history in depth will know about the consequences of this moral conditioning time and time again.

Even today, we can see how a person's sense of what is obviously right depends on where they grew up, what they were taught as "normal" by their surroundings, and what images they were exposed to as a child. Societies may regard an act as shameful for decades, only to accept it without a second thought a generation later — homosexuality may be a prime example for that — or vice versa. However, there is one thing we must understand: human moral intuitions change, but revelation does not. Therefore, anyone who thinks their moral instincts are a reliable source for morality should better start questioning them.

If we trace back the shift in public opinion towards our topic of Veganism, we can actually date it with surprising precision. As one might expect, the idea that eating meat is morally wrong does not represent a timeless voice of conscience. There is one book in particular that is widely regarded as a foundational text of the modern animal rights movement: *Animal Liberation*, published in 1975 by the Australian philosopher Peter Singer. Singer's central argument is that moral value should not depend on belonging to a specific species, but on the subject's capacity to suffer.

So anyone who thinks their conscience is expressing a timeless moral truth here is, in reality, merely echoing an idea rooted in a particular philosophical tradition. That is fundamentally different from following a God-given revelation.

The moral implications of such a criterion are rarely considered. If the value of a life is tied to its capacity to suffer, then that value becomes negotiable too. Singer himself has not shied away from the implications of his position, extending his argument to include the permissibility of killing severely disabled newborns,⁷ a stance that has repeatedly provoked major protests against him in Germany.⁸ Once again, we are forced to recognise that the moral standards that human beings devise for themselves may serve them well in some respects, yet lead them astray in many others.

Islam offers something very different, the true value of which becomes apparent only when we have seen the alternative:

"Indeed, We have dignified the children of Adam"⁹

Human dignity is a gift from Allah. We did not “earn” it ourselves, and therefore it is not something we can lose.

At this point, some readers may be tempted to dismiss all of this, saying they may never have heard any of it before, and if these claims were presented to them, they might firmly reject them – and I believe them. But that is exactly the challenge: moral frameworks do not spread like books that have to be read first. They spread as assumptions that we take for granted (see the OUF white paper “Islam Doesn’t Need No Add-On: A Wake-Up Call to Muslims on the Battlefield of Ideologies”¹⁰). They spread as outrage below a video, as a certain tone of a documentary or as the instinctive turning away of eyes when confronted with the sight of an animal being slaughtered. You do not have to read philosophy to breathe its air.

And that is why this section is not an attack on those who choose their meat thoughtfully and with care. Rather, it is an invitation to step back from your own feelings for a moment and examine them before blindly trusting your own judgment. While most people who avoid or reject meat for moral reasons today would likely agree with the above, they still insist that their judgement comes from the Qur'an itself, not some random philosopher. But this is precisely where many people make a mistake.

Secondly: The “*Tayyib*” Trap

This verse is probably cited more often than any other in this debate:

“O humanity! Eat from what is lawful (*halalan*) and good (*tayyiban*) on the earth”¹¹

The argument based on this verse may sound compelling at first: if Allah requires not only *halal*, but also *tayyib*, then *tayyib* must mean more than just mere permissibility. Surely, one might argue, meat from a facility where thousands of animals are kept in confined conditions could not possibly meet that additional standard.

While this conclusion may sound pious, there is a problem with it: it treats the term *tayyib* as though it had never been clearly defined within the Islamic scholarly tradition, as if anyone were free to interpret it according to their own personal feelings. Yet the reality is precisely the opposite.

How Our Scholars Defined the Term *tayyib*

Islamic jurists have discussed the meaning of this word at length, and their views are well established. According to Imam Malik and others, *tayyib* in this verse serves to reinforce the preceding word, *halal*. In other words, it essentially carries the same meaning as *halal*, adding emphasis rather than introducing a separate condition. However, Imam al-Shafi'i and others understood the term as an additional qualification, referring to “what is wholesome and pleasant to consume”.¹²

Interestingly, none of these definitions relates to the conditions under which the animals are kept. Each interpretation relates solely to the nature of the food itself.

One might argue that the Islamic tradition does discuss a situation in which an animal's living conditions can affect the ruling on consuming its meat: the case of the *jallalah*. A *jallalah* is livestock that feeds on substances deemed ritually impure (*najasa*). According to most legal schools, eating the meat of a *jallalah* is technically permissible (*halal*), though it is disliked (*makruh*). However, some scholars have gone so far as to classify it as forbidden (*haram*). The objection does have some merit, but ultimately, the definition of a *jallalah* shows why it does not support the argument being made here. For example, Imam al-Nawawi describes the *jallalah* as an animal that consumes faeces and other substances considered ritually impure (*najasa*).¹³ Islamic jurists have also discussed the case of an animal whose diet consists of both impure substances and food that would otherwise be permissible. In such cases, the animal is not automatically considered a *jallalah* simply because of its mixed diet; what matters is whether the impure part predominates. The criterion is therefore what the animal eats, not how confined its living conditions were. Even with regard to its feed, this distinction remains important: corn, soy and grain-based feed are not considered impure. Nor are the additives mixed into such feed, such as hormones, antibiotics or vitamin supplements. These substances have not been classified as ritually impure by the jurists. The same principle we have just discussed applies even where animal-derived ingredients are present in the feed: what matters is not whether impurities are present at all, but whether they constitute the predominant part of the diet. Whether such additives may pose other risks, such as potential health problems, is a separate issue. However, as we will see shortly, that question is not one that the individual consumer gets to answer either. Therefore, the analogy to the *jallalah* does not hold up to closer scrutiny.

The Context in Which the Verse Was Revealed

Having said all of this, the verse just refuted the opposing argument. However, it is even more telling because the circumstances surrounding the verse's revelation concern almost the exact opposite situation. Al-Hasan al-Basri, may Allah have mercy on him, reported that the verse was revealed concerning those who prohibited for themselves what Allah had not prohibited.¹⁴ Reports mention Arab tribes who had declared certain categories of animals taboo, a practice that the Qur'an condemns as fabricating lies against Allah.¹⁵

Therefore, we should be careful not to repeat the same pattern ourselves. A personal preference can quickly turn into abstention, and that abstention can then become a universal prohibition whose decision belongs only to Allah alone.

“Ask Your Heart”

One final objection is based on a narration in which the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said to his companion Wabisa:

“O Wabisa! Ask yourself for a decision, ask your heart for a decision (saying it three times). Righteousness is that with which the soul is tranquil and the heart is tranquil, but sin is that which rouses suspicion in the soul and is perplexing in the breast, even if people give you a decision in its favour.”¹⁶

But here too, the scholars have already provided us with a clear answer. In his commentary on this narration, the eminent scholar Ibn Rajab al-Hanbali explains the different types of situations to which it applies:

“This only applies when the person’s heart was opened to faith and the mufti gives a ruling based on conjecture or personal inclination without specific proof from the Shari‘ah. However, if the mufti has proof from the Shari‘ah, the person then must follow it, even if they do not feel at ease with it. This is similar to the concessions granted by the Shari‘ah, such as breaking the fast while travelling or due to illness, or shortening the prayer while away — matters with which many ignorant people may not feel comfortable. However, this [feeling] does not determine the ruling.”¹⁷

Notice how closely this example relates to our case. Ibn Rajab discusses people who feel uneasy about something that is explicitly permissible, making it clear that such unease has no legal significance whatsoever.

In the same passage, he also clarifies the circumstances in which one can rely on one's personal feelings:

“As for matters concerning which there is no text from Allah and His Messenger, nor any statement from those whose words are followed, i. e. the Companions and the righteous predecessors of this ummah:

If something causes unease in the soul of a believer whose heart has found tranquillity through faith and whose chest has been opened by the light of knowledge and certainty, and this unease stems from a genuine ambiguity in the matter, and he cannot find anyone willing to give him a concession except someone who merely expresses their own opinion, whose knowledge and religious commitment cannot be trusted and who is known to follow their desires, then the believer may return to what troubles their heart, even if the muftis have given them a ruling [i. e. in this case, they follow what their heart tells them].”¹⁸

So when we look at the conditions that must all be present here, the following picture emerges:

- There is no relevant text from the Qur'an or Sunnah.
- There is no statement from the Companions or the early scholars.
- The believer's heart is firmly grounded in faith.
- There is a genuine ambiguity or cause for doubt.
- There is no trustworthy scholar to consult, only someone lacking either sufficient knowledge or religious integrity.

We can therefore conclude that the term *tayyib* has a clearly established meaning, that the analogy with the *jallalah* does not hold, that the verse in question actually addresses the opposite situation, and that appealing to one's own personal feelings is only valid under very strict conditions — conditions that are not present in our case. With that established, we can now turn to the question of who ultimately has the authority to determine how such matters are to be judged.

Thirdly: Not Everyone Has the Right to Judge

At this point, an important clarification must be made: nobody is claiming that an Islamic jurist can rule on farming conditions or animal feed without first knowing the relevant details. Quite the opposite, in fact. Islamic legal methodology has always recognised a fundamental principle.

“The ruling on a matter is a branch of its proper understanding [i.e. it requires accurate knowledge of the matter itself].”

In other words: If you don't know what you're talking about, you simply can't pass judgement on it.

This is why Islamic jurists have always sought the advice of specialists whenever a matter has required specialised knowledge, such as physicians for medical issues and experts for assessing the value of something. This is by no means a concession to modernity; rather, it has been part of the classical methodology of Islamic scholarship throughout history.

This gives us three distinct areas that must be carefully distinguished:

1. **Establishing the facts:** What are the actual circumstances? This is determined by specialists.
2. **The ruling:** What is the Islamic ruling on those circumstances? This is determined by the jurist.
3. **Following the ruling:** Adhering to the jurist's ruling. This is the role of the layperson.

This distinction is not an invention of the scholars, but a direct application of the Qur'an's instruction:

“Then ask those who have knowledge”¹⁹

In practice, however, these three roles often become blurred. For example, a Muslim might watch a documentary, read a few articles and come across footage from intensive livestock farming, all of which causes them to take on all three roles at once. They establish the facts, derive a ruling from them and follow that ruling themselves. They may even go a step further and start urging others to do the same or criticising them when they do not.

Selective Juristic Opinion

And this brings us to a deeper problem. We are not talking about Muslims who have no access to scholars or imams whatsoever. In fact, many of them do have access to several people they can turn to.

They are often part of communities, attend mosques, and know individuals whose knowledge and religious commitment they trust and whom they consult when they have questions. On many matters, they are perfectly willing to follow their guidance. Yet on this particular issue — the question of eating meat — and perhaps on other similar issues as well, they are more inclined to follow their own judgment or actively search for an opinion that confirms what they have already decided in their hearts.

The scholars have a specific term for this behavior: *tatabbu‘ ar-rukhas*, commonly described as “chasing after concessions” in matters of Islamic law. They did not treat this as a minor issue. On the contrary, they warned against it in exceptionally strong terms.

Sulayman al-Taymi, a scholar from the Second Generation (*tabi’een*), said: “If you were to take the concessions of every scholar, all that is evil would gather within you.”²⁰

The reason for such strong words runs deeper than it may initially seem. It's not just that scholars can make mistakes and may have made errors before — for example, because certain evidence did not reach them, or because they misunderstood something. Rather, the deeper point here is that the various schools of Islamic law have different methodological principles (*usul*) through which they derive rulings from the evidence, and each school constitutes a coherent system in its own right.

Simply picking and choosing the easiest opinion from each of these systems does not result in a 'more lenient school of law', but rather a combination that does not exist within any established school of law and could never be derived from a single methodology. Marriage law provides a classic example: if one accepts the view that a guardian is not required from one school and the view that witnesses are not required at the time of the marriage contract from another, the result is a combination that no school of law would recognise as valid. You can only imagine the implications for the people involved.

However, it is important to make an important distinction here so that no one is unfairly included in this criticism. A layperson who has access to someone knowledgeable in *fiqh* whom they trust and respect may follow that person's legal rulings, even if they do not understand the methodology by which those rulings are derived from the texts, simply because they lack the necessary knowledge themselves. This is entirely legitimate and is known in Islamic scholarship as *taqlid* (literally, 'imitation'). Furthermore, scholars consider it obligatory for the layperson to follow such a trusted authority, so that they can perform their acts of worship correctly. However, someone who forms their own judgement — whether under the influence of external ideologies or through their own interpretation of Islam's primary texts — and then deliberately searches for a scholarly opinion that aligns with their predetermined conclusion, is not practising *taqlid*; they are merely looking for justification for their already existing beliefs.

Fourthly: Islam Already Has an Ethics of Meat Consumption

If a Muslim today wants to eat less meat, there is no need to import ethical frameworks from outside Islam. Islam already has its own ethic of moderation when it comes to meat consumption – and any consumption at all.

It begins in the Qur'an, with an instruction that leaves no room for ambiguity:

“Eat and drink, but do not waste.”²¹

The Messenger of Allah ﷺ applied this principle directly to the way we eat:

“The human does not fill any container that is worse than his stomach. It is sufficient for the son of Adam to eat what will support his back. If this is not possible, then a third for food, a third for drink, and third for his breath.”²²

Notice what these texts are really concerned with: not the animal, but the human being — his self-restraint, and how he treats what Allah has entrusted to him. Anyone who chooses to eat more moderately for these reasons is firmly grounded in Islamic principles.

At the same time, it would be wrong to make this moderation a universal standard by which we judge others. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ did eat meat, and he openly expressed his fondness for it. Jabir ibn ‘Abdullah reported that the Prophet once visited him and his family, who slaughtered a sheep for him. He then said:

“It is as though they knew how much we love meat.”²³

The Qur'an also counts meat among the blessings Allah has bestowed upon humankind — and even among the foods of Paradise.²⁴

Here, I would like to go back to something we saw at the beginning of this white paper: the Prophet ﷺ withdrew his hand from the mastigure, explicitly stated why he did not eat it, and then watched Khalid ibn al-Walid eat it. Personal restraint and permissibility can therefore coexist without contradicting one another.

Also, there is a striking detail here that brings us back to Point 2: The “*Tayyib*” Trap. The very word now being used to argue for abstention appears in the Qur’an in Allah’s rebuke of those who sought to prohibit what He had made permissible: “Who has forbidden the adornments and lawful provisions (*tayibaat*) Allah has brought forth for His servants?”²⁵ The very term being invoked as an argument against meat thus appears in the Qur’an as part of a question directed at those who sought to restrict the blessings Allah had granted.

Die *adhiya* (Sacrificial Animal)

Let us return to the image with which this white paper began: the video from an impoverished country and the comments below it.

Consider for a moment what is actually taking place in those recordings. Allah, Exalted is He, says regarding the sacrificial animal:

“So eat from their meat and feed the desperately poor.”²⁶

And Allah also makes clear what truly matters in this act of worship:

“Neither their meat nor blood reaches Allah. Rather, it is your piety that reaches Him.”²⁷

The fact that this very act now evokes disgust among Muslims therefore says less about the act itself than it does about the observer — especially when that reaction leads him to cross the boundaries Allah has set.

Conclusion

So what, specifically, should the reader take away from this white paper? I would summarize it in the following four pieces of advice:

Advice 1: Don't Make Up Your Own Rules

Before declaring something as good or bad, pause for a moment and ask yourself where that judgment derives from. Is it rooted in the explanation of a trustworthy scholar, or is it simply a feeling you picked up somewhere along the way without ever questioning where it came from? Your feelings may prompt you to reflect, but they must not lead you to speak about Allah's religion without knowledge. Allah alone determines what is commanded and what is forbidden, while our sincere scholars have devoted — and continue to devote — their lives to deriving these rulings from the revealed texts and conveying them to us.

Advice 2: Don't Twist the Meaning of Islamic Terms

Before you start playing the "*tayyib*" card, make sure you know what the scholars actually understood it to mean. A term from revelation is not a blank canvas that everyone is free to fill in however they please. Remember the Arab tribes we mentioned earlier, who, in the name of piety, prohibited for themselves what Allah had permitted — and remember Allah's severe rebuke of them.

Advice 3: Don't Assume You Can Issue a Ruling Just Because You Understand the Facts

Experts can assess the factual and technical aspects of a matter. Determining the Islamic ruling that follows from those facts, however, is the task of the jurist (*faqih*). Your role is to ask questions, explain the circumstances in detail, then follow the answer and be content with it — even when you do not like the answer. Do not switch to a different authority simply because the ruling you received is inconvenient. That is precisely where the blameworthy practice of chasing after rulings may begin — the very practice against which the scholars have warned us so strongly.

Advice 4: Put Your Concern in the Right Perspective

If you genuinely care about animal suffering, know that Islam has addressed this issue in considerable detail. Learn about the Islamic ethic of animal welfare, including the command of *ihsan* and the prohibition of *israf*. You can also learn about Islamic slaughter practices and animal husbandry. But as you do so, make sure your understanding stays grounded in authentic Islamic scholarship rather than allowing outside ideologies to become your standard.

Footnotes

1. Sahih al-Bukhari 5400.
2. Sahih Muslim 1955.
3. Surah Al-Ma'idah, 5:87.
4. Surah Al-A'raf, 7:32.
5. Surah An-Nahl 16:5, Surah Yasin 36:71, Surah Al-Hajj 22:36.
6. Sahih al-Bukhari 1385.
7. See: Peter Singer, Practical Ethics (Cambridge University Press)
8. <https://www.aerzteblatt.de/archiv/diskussion-um-den-philosophen-peter-singer-widerstand-gegen-eine-neue-ethik-861ea607-18ce-489a-bf6c-f735cb6f439a>
9. Surah Al-Isra, 17:70.
10. <https://ouforum.com/whitepapers/>
11. Surah Al-Baqarah, 2:168.
12. Abu Hayyan al-Andalusi, al-Bahr al-Muhit, referring to 2:168.
13. See: An-Nawawi, Majmuu Sharh al-Muhaddab Part 9 p. 28.
14. Abu Hayyan al-Andalusi, al-Bahr al-Muhit, referring to 2:168.
15. Surah Al-An'aam, 6:138.
16. Musnad Ahmad 18001.
17. See Ibn Rajab al-Hanbali, Jaami Uloom wal-Hikam, ed. Abil Nur, 2/739.
18. See Ibn Rajab al-Hanbali, Jaami Uloom wal-Hikam, ed. Abil Nur, 2/740.
19. Surah Al-Anbiya, 21:7.
20. Ibn Abd al-Barr, Jami Bayan al-Ilm wa Fadlihi 2/927.
21. Surah Al-A'raaf, 7:31.
22. Tirmidhi 2380.
23. Reported by Jabir ibn Abdillah, classified as authentic according to as-Sachawi, al-Ajwiba al-Mardiyyah, 1/77.
24. Surah An-Nahl, 16:14. Surah Ya-Sin, 36:71-72. Surah At-Tur, 52:22.
25. Surah Al-A'raaf, 7:32.
26. Surah al-Hajj, 22:28.
27. Surah al-Hajj, 22:37.

This whitepaper is published by One Ummah Forum and may be freely shared and distributed in its original, unaltered form.

The content within this document may be copied, quoted, or repurposed for non-commercial purposes only, including educational or research-related use, provided that proper attribution is given to One Ummah Forum as the original source.

Commercial use, redistribution for profit, or any modification of the content is strictly prohibited.

© One Ummah Forum. All rights reserved.



The author of this whitepaper - **Ustd. Erfan** - has thoroughly engaged with the subject matter through independent study and in-depth research. Great care was taken to verify sources and ensure the accuracy of the information presented. After completion, the content was reviewed and approved by the Quality Management Team to ensure that it meets our standards for clarity, reliability, and scholarly rigor.