

Eastern Orthodox Christianity and Animal Suffering

Eastern Orthodox Christianity and Animal Suffering:

*Ancient Voices
in Modern Theology*

By

Dr. Christina Nellist

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing



Eastern Orthodox Christianity and Animal Suffering:
Ancient Voices in Modern Theology

By Dr. Christina Nellist

This book first published 2018

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2018 by Christina Nellist

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-5275-1602-4

ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-1602-1

To my God.

To my Church.

To those who try to prevent or alleviate suffering.

EPIGRAPH

So the Lord God smelled a sweet aroma. Then the Lord God thought it over and said, “I will never again curse the earth because of man’s works, although the mind of man is diligently involved with evil things from his youth; nor will I again destroy every living thing as I have done.”¹

¹ Gn 8:21. Septuagint, *The Orthodox Study Bible*, St Athanasius Academy: Thomas Nelson.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-------------|
| List of Illustrations | xi |
| List of Graphs | xii |
| List of Tables..... | xiii |
| List of Abbreviations | xiv |
| Introduction | 1 |
| Hypothesis | 1 |
| A Note on Textual Criticism..... | 1 |
| Chapter One..... | 4 |
| A Brief Introduction to Animal Suffering | |
| Overview..... | 4 |
| The Contemporary Scene..... | 4 |
| Animal Suffering | 8 |
| Scales of Suffering..... | 9 |
| Deliberate Cruelty..... | 11 |
| Food Production..... | 12 |
| Entertainment..... | 15 |
| Entertainment as Tradition..... | 16 |
| Sport, Recreational and Trophy Hunting | 17 |
| Hunting for Fur and Fur Farms | 18 |
| Traditional Medicine..... | 21 |
| Experiments on Animals..... | 22 |
| Chapter One Summary..... | 23 |
| Chapter Two | 25 |
| Ancient Voices: The Old Testament | |
| Overview..... | 25 |
| Patristic Commentary: Behavioural Guidance | 26 |
| Knowing God: Father and Creator..... | 29 |
| God: The Source of All Goodness | 33 |
| A World Free of Suffering: Compassion and Mercy to Animals..... | 35 |
| The Law: Dispensations..... | 48 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| Noah: Protection and Failure | 52 |
| Chapter Two Summary | 64 |
| Chapter Three..... | 68 |
| Ancient Voices: The New Testament | |
| Overview..... | 68 |
| Knowing God: Son and Image..... | 68 |
| Image: A Christ-Like Life | 76 |
| Extending the Law: Protection and Success | 87 |
| The Sabbath Law: Matthew and Luke | 89 |
| Icon: “Christ Breaking the Bonds of Animal Suffering” | 94 |
| Chapter Three Summary | 98 |
| Chapter Four | 100 |
| Saints and Sinners | |
| Overview..... | 100 |
| The Saints | 100 |
| A Christ-Like Love | 101 |
| Prayers for Animals..... | 110 |
| The Saints Summary | 120 |
| The Sinners | 121 |
| The Sin of Animal Abuse and its Relevance | |
| for Human Salvation | 121 |
| The Sinners Summary | 129 |
| Chapter Four Summary..... | 130 |
| Chapter Five | 133 |
| Cyprus Case Study | |
| Overview..... | 133 |
| Part One | 134 |
| 2011 Research: Cyprus Voice for Animals Online Survey | 134 |
| Part One Summary | 138 |
| Part Two..... | 139 |
| 2012 Research: Animal Protectionist Questionnaire..... | 139 |
| Mixed-Method Questionnaire Participation Statistics..... | 139 |
| Sample Questions..... | 140 |
| Participant Comments | 142 |
| Participant Suggestions | 145 |
| Part Two Summary..... | 146 |
| Part Three..... | 148 |
| 2013 Research: A Priest’s Response | 148 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| Interview | 148 |
| Analysis..... | 151 |
| Part Three Summary..... | 155 |
| Chapter Five Summary | 157 |
| Chapter Six | 159 |
| Interview with Metropolitan Kallistos of Diokleia (Ware) | |
| Overview..... | 159 |
| Interview | 159 |
| Analysis | 175 |
| Chapter Six Summary | 186 |
| Chapter Seven..... | 187 |
| Interview with Bishop Isaias of Tamasou and Orinis | |
| Overview..... | 187 |
| Interview | 187 |
| Analysis | 196 |
| Chapter Seven Summary..... | 208 |
| Chapter Eight..... | 211 |
| Modern Voices | |
| Overview..... | 211 |
| Animal Science | 211 |
| Economics: Human Rationality and Self-interest | 212 |
| Sin and Evil..... | 217 |
| Extending Justice, Rights and Community | 224 |
| Image of God | 228 |
| A Role for the Church..... | 233 |
| Chapter Eight Summary..... | 240 |
| Chapter Nine..... | 244 |
| Implications and Application | |
| Overview | 244 |
| The Living Tradition of the Eastern Orthodox Church..... | 244 |
| An Inconvenient Truth: Sacrifice and Spiritual Revolution..... | 245 |
| Animal Food Production Industries and Dietary Choices..... | 247 |
| The Misuse of Human Freedom: The Animal Testing Model | 263 |
| Examining the Animal Testing Model..... | 269 |
| Historical Separation: Irrationality as Disposable Life | 292 |
| Chapter Nine Summary..... | 307 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| Chapter Ten | 312 |
| Concluding Remarks | |
| Appendix A | 351 |
| Cyprus Case Study | |
| 1) 2012 Animal Protectionist Questionnaire: | |
| Questions and Replies | 351 |
| 2) Documentary Evidence..... | 359 |
| 2 a. “Mother’s Letter.” | 359 |
| 2 b. “Reader’s Letter: Editor’s Choice.” | 360 |
| 2 c. “Holy Insult.” | 361 |
| Appendix B..... | 363 |
| Research Impact and Practical Applications | |
| a) Background..... | 364 |
| b) “Holy Synod of Cyprus Letter to C.V.A.” | 365 |
| c) “C.V.A. Public Statement.” | 366 |
| d) “Public Message by Bishop Isaías.” Statement on the Establishment of the Department for the Protection of the Natural Environment and the Animal Kingdom | 367 |
| e) Outline of a Masters Dissertation | 369 |
| f) Outline of an Eastern Orthodox Seminary Project | 371 |
| g) Outline of an Eastern Orthodox Church Animal Protection Group | 372 |
| h) Eastern Orthodox Animal Charity: Pan-Orthodox Concern for Animals..... | 375 |
| Bibliography..... | 376 |

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

| | |
|---|-----|
| Fig. 1-1 Deliberate Cruelty | 11 |
| Fig. 1-2 Gestation Crate..... | 12 |
| Fig. 1-3 Foie Gras Production | 13 |
| Fig. 1-4 Food and Skin Production in Asia | 14 |
| Fig. 1-5 Polar Bear in Russian Circus | 15 |
| Fig. 1-6 Bullfighting in Spain..... | 16 |
| Fig. 1-7 Cecil the Lion..... | 17 |
| Fig. 1-8 Canadian Seal Hunt..... | 18 |
| Fig. 1-9 Raccoon Fur Farm | 19 |
| Fig. 1-10 Mink Fur Farm..... | 20 |
| Fig. 1-11 Moon Bear in Crush-Cage | 21 |
| Fig. 1-12 Animal Experiments Cat..... | 22 |
| Fig. 1-13 Animal Experiments Primate | 23 |
| Fig. 2-1 Adam Naming the Animals..... | 26 |
| Fig. 3-1 Christ's Crucifixion | 84 |
| Fig. 3-2 Crucified Dog..... | 85 |
| Fig. 3-3 Animal Experiments Primate | 86 |
| Fig. 3-4 Triptych "Christ Breaking the Bonds of Animal Suffering" | 95 |
| Fig. 3-5 Centre panel of "Christ Breaking the Bonds of Animal Suffering" | 97 |
| Fig. 4-1 St. Gerasimos | 109 |
| Fig. 4-2 St. Modestos..... | 109 |
| Fig. 4-3 St. Mamas | 109 |
| Fig. 4-4 St. Seraphim of Sarov | 109 |
| Fig. 5-1 Poisoned Dog..... | 138 |
| Fig. A-1 "Mother's Letter" | 359 |
| Fig. A-2 "Reader's letter: Editor's Choice"..... | 360 |
| Fig. A-3 "Holy Insult" | 361 |
| Fig. B-1 "Holy Synod of Cyprus Statement to C.V.A" | 365 |
| Fig. B-2 "C.V.A Public Statement" | 366 |
| Fig. B-3 "Public Message by Bishop Isaias" | 367 |

LIST OF GRAPHS

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----|
| Graph 5-1 | C. V. A. Online Survey Demographic Data (2011)..... | 134 |
| Graph 5-2 | C. V. A. Question on the Eastern Orthodox Church (2011). | 136 |
| Graph 5-3 | Question 2 (2012)..... | 141 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|--|-----|
| Table 5-1 Mixed-Method Questionnaire Participation | |
| Statistics (2012) | 140 |
| Table 5-2 Results Table of Priest's Comments (2013)..... | 154 |

ABBREVIATIONS

- CANNPNF Schaff, P. ed. *The Complete Ante-Nicene & Nicene and Post-Nicene Church Fathers Collection*, Catholic Way Publishing, Kindle, 2014.
- CCSG Leemans, J. and Jocque, L. eds. *Corpus Christianorum Series Graeca*, Institute for Early Christian and Byzantine Studies: Leuven, 2016.
- CSCO *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium*, Washington, DC, 1903.
- GCS *Griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*, Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs' sche Buchhandlung, 1903.
- OC *Oriens Christianus*, Kaufhold, H., and M. Kropp, eds. Germany: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1901.
- OSB *The Orthodox Study Bible*, Metropolitan Maximus, Pentiuc, E. Najim, M., and J. N. Sparks. eds. St. Athanasius Academy of Orthodox Theology, Elk Grove, CA: Thomas Nelson, 2008.
- PG *Patrologia Graeca*, Minge, J. P. ed. Paris, 1857-66.
- SC *Sources Chrétiennes*, Meunier, B. ed. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1942.

INTRODUCTION

Hypothesis

Through the historical reading of work by Metropolitan Kallistos of Diokleia (Ware), H. A. H. Bartholomew, Sebastian Brock, and Andrew Linzey, I formed the opinion that the Eastern Orthodox Church has sufficient teachings to develop a theology that tackles the difficult subject of animal suffering. Traditionally, the dominant focus of Christian theology has been on humanity's relationship with God. I advance the opinion that there is another less prominent Eastern Orthodox tradition that advocated a more inclusive theology, which, if accepted and promoted, will provide guidance for a more compassionate treatment of animals than is currently the case. The overarching hypothesis has three component parts:

- 1) Eastern Orthodox teachings allow for the formulation of an inclusive theology, which addresses the subject of animal suffering.
- 2) There is a gap between Eastern Orthodox theory and practice on this subject, both at academic and pastoral level.
- 3) The abuse and exploitation of animals has negative soteriological consequences for those who indulge in such practices, those who know but are indifferent to animal suffering and those who know and are concerned but fail to act in order to reduce or prevent that suffering.

A Note on Textual Criticism

The academic community accepts the problems of differences in biblical translation and whilst the subject is too large to discuss here, it is important to note some points of significance to this work. Bible translations throughout the ages have produced various mistranslations and textual differences.¹ Wegner (2000) specifically comments upon the

¹ Wegner, *The Journey from Texts to Translations*. See Appendix 1, 50, for a comparison between the Codex Vaticanus, Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Alexandrinus.

significance of manuscripts used in translation, which relates to important points in discussions on New Testament texts:

The Textus Receptus derives from manuscripts no earlier than the 10th century, whereas we now have manuscripts dating as early as the 2nd century...The scholars translating the Authorised Version of 1611 could have known of only 25 late manuscripts at the most for the New Testament, whereas today there are at least 5,358 New Testament manuscripts and fragments. For the Old Testament, they had only a few later Hebrew texts and one text of the Septuagint, but now about 800 manuscripts and versions are available.²

The New Testament texts used by the Latin West also contain mistranslations from the original Greek.³ Wegner makes a further point of relevance:

It is hard to believe that in just a little over a century ago there was essentially, only one English translation of the Bible. Translations have multiplied to the extent that choosing a Bible can be quite confusing.⁴

It is important therefore to identify the source used in the New Testament discussion. I use the Nestle-Aland *Greek English New Testament*⁵ rather than *The Orthodox Study Bible*⁶ and do so due to the problems outlined by the Eastern Orthodox biblical scholar and translator, Fr Ephrem Lash, who was critical of some aspects of this translation. He states:

First of all, let us look at the translation used. *This is not an Orthodox one at all. The editors have taken the New King James Version (NKJV), which is a slightly modernised ('You' not 'Thou') re-edition of the version of 1611.*⁷

This is an important point relating to patristic teachings of relevance to the subject of animal suffering. This “modernised” version translates Luke

² Wegner, 339.

³ Wegner, 400.

⁴ Wegner, 399. An ‘Eastern Orthodox Bible’ was first published in English in 1998.

⁵ Aland, et al., *Nestle-Aland Greek-English New Testament*. For an explanation of the texts used in this critical edition, see v-x, 1-46.

⁶ *The Orthodox Study Bible*. For an explanation of the texts used in the New Testament section, see xii.

⁷ My emphasis. Lash, “The Orthodox Study Bible: A Review,” 3.

14:5 as “donkey or an ox.” In some ancient manuscripts an alternative translation of ‘ass’ is used in place of ‘donkey’. Other manuscripts use “son or an ox.” The obvious and serious question arising here is which interpretation is correct? Upon examination of the patristic commentaries on Luke 14:5, I find that the Fathers use ‘son’. Whilst I cannot identify the specific manuscripts used for their interpretations and commentaries on Luke 14:5, I am confident that the Fathers manuscripts accord with the Nestle-Aland translation, which translates Luke 14:5 as “son or an ox”. As a result, I use the Nestle-Aland translation for my arguments on this particular text.

CHAPTER ONE

A BRIEF INTRODUCTION TO ANIMAL SUFFERING

Overview

In Chapter One, I examine the contemporary Eastern Orthodox academic literature and find that despite the considerable debate on the need to care for and protect the environment there is still little engagement by leaders of the Eastern Orthodox Church or its scholars on the suffering of individual animals within that environment. Whilst there are positive comments, which denounce cruelty there is ambiguity regarding our treatment and relationships with animals. Due to the lack of engagement, there is likely to be ignorance on most aspects of this subject. As a result, there is a brief discussion on the common definition of ‘unnecessary suffering’ and degrees of suffering. There is also an outline of the main areas through pictorial depictions. The process of offering information on academic literature and relevant websites for further reference begins.

The Contemporary Scene

This work is a natural progression of the contemporary Eastern Orthodox debate on the environment. To position the work in terms of the Eastern Orthodox academic debate, this work stands alone. In the Western theological corpus, it broadly aligns with the works of Linzey and Clough who argue for an inclusive theology, which rejects any form of violence, exploitation and abuse of human and non-human beings.¹ Whilst I am in full agreement with these scholars, my work differs in that I combine the theological debate with my own social science research and focus on Eastern Orthodox voices, ancient and modern, whereas my contemporaries occasionally dip into Orthodoxy to make or validate a specific point. In

¹ Neither of these Christian academics are Orthodox and this is why much of their work is not referenced. Nonetheless upon meeting them one cannot but be struck by their deep spirituality.

addition, whilst I discuss many aspects of animal suffering, my arguments also focus on the soteriological implications of animal suffering. In the non-theological Western debate, this work aligns with Godlovitch & Harris's work on moral philosophy and with some of Singer's views, though I reject aspects of his utilitarian arguments. It also aligns with the work of Knight and Bekoff who use scientific research in their discussions on aspects of the animal suffering theme.

In general, there is positive engagement by Eastern Orthodox theologians and academics with the environmental debate although Engelhardt (2013) suggests that Orthodoxy provides "little clear, direct and specific guidance regarding a range of environmental issues."² I would tend to agree with his assessment but posit that this lack of clarity arises not from a lack of material from which to produce such an environmental or indeed animal theology and ethic but rather, from a failure to explore the available material in order to produce them.³

The leader in positive commentary is unquestionably the Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew who grounds his comments in the patristic tradition with its frequent general references to "the creation" "the world" and "all things." His teachings on the sin involved in the misuse of creation, is extremely important for this work.⁴ In this context he reflects the 'ancient teachings' of St. Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*⁵ and other patristic writers who teach on the significance of knowledge of good and evil; without such teachings it would be difficult to evolve any spiritual, moral or ethical treatment of the environment or animals. H. A. H. Bartholomew has also brought together scientists and theologians, in order to find an ethical response to the environmental crisis. This might suggest that a thorough exploration of animal suffering within this environmental debate has taken place, yet from the review of Eastern Orthodox literature, this appears not

² Engelhardt, Jr, "Ecology, Morality and the Challenge of the Twenty-First Century," 278.

³ It is encouraging to note his comments on our obligation not to harm animals, although 'wanton' suggests an acceptance of some form of harm. See H. A. H. Bartholomew, Zizioulas, Keselopoulos, Harakas, Theokritoff, Chrysavgis, Gschwandtner and the Hamalis and Papanikolaou's (2013) article, which argues that such ideas are in Evagrius of Pontus and Maximus the Confessor, "Toward a Godly Mode of Being," 271-280.

⁴ If we do not identify the sin of abuse, misuse and exploitation of animals, our treatment of them is unlikely to change. We shall continue to fail to comprehend the significance of sinful actions against animals for human salvation. I discuss his teachings in Chapters Eight and Nine.

⁵ Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, 4.39.1.

to be the case.⁶ Gschwandtner (2012)⁷ supports this assertion when commenting that the “most important collection” for her thesis was published in 1990. The works she refers to are Limouris (1990) and issue 10.3 of *Epiphany Journal*, which although containing work of significance for certain aspects of this theme, the majority of its statements focus on general environmental concerns.⁸ The “one book-length” treatment of the ecological problem referred to by Gschwandtner is by Theokritoff (2009).⁹ The title of this work indicates its primary focus and whilst the author is clearly sympathetic to the plight of animals and includes much useful material, the specific section on contemporary themes entitled “Animals and their Creator” is limited to just three pages in length.¹⁰ Within these three pages, Theokritoff mentions two texts: one is an untranslated article from 1989 by Clément¹¹ the other is by the Russian philosopher Goricheva.¹² Theokritoff describes both works as speculative but worthy of consideration. I would agree, particularly as Goricheva identifies problems between theory and praxis:

Treatment of animals is an area where there is a disturbing gulf between the implications of our theology and tradition, and the attitudes and behaviour typical of Orthodox societies.¹³

Gschwandtner confirms this point:

It is not clear, however, that these apparently so positive features of Orthodox thought and attitudes have led to greater sensitivity to the environment in its practice or to any clearly articulated ecological theology.¹⁴

⁶ Brock confirms this is also the case regarding Syriac authors, “Animals and Humans,” 1-9.

⁷ Gschwandtner, *The Role of Non-Human Creation*, 7.

⁸ Limouris, *Justice, Peace and the Integrity of Creation: Orthodox Perspectives on Ecology*.

⁹ Theokritoff, *Living in God's Creation*.

¹⁰ Theokritoff, 238-40. When we consider the almost total lack of theological debate on the subject of animal suffering, I believe she is to be commended for including animals in this work. One must also acknowledge the possibility that discussions on animal suffering were outside Theokritoff's remit for this particular work.

¹¹ Clément, O. “Les animaux dans la pensée orthodoxe” *Contacts* 145 (1): 24-44 cited in Theokritoff, *Living in God's Creation*, 238.

¹² Goricheva, *The Burning Bush*, 35.

¹³ Theokritoff, *Living in God's Creation*, 240.

¹⁴ Gschwandtner, 8.

Theokritoff also informs us of another unfortunate tendency within Eastern Orthodox debate which:

...draw a sharp distinction between personhood, on the one hand, and the relationships, individuality and consciousness to be found in animals on the other.¹⁵

She states that such arguments “tend to be vehement”, “somewhat circular” and “frequently show little interest in what is actually known about animal behaviour.”¹⁶ I agree with her analysis, for my review of Eastern Orthodox academic literature indicates that very few Eastern Orthodox theologians use the scientific evidence available on all aspects of animal suffering. Knight (2013) supports this point when informing us that very few Eastern Orthodox theologians engage with modern science unlike those in the West.¹⁷ He does however inform us that both he and Basarab Nicolescu believe science “provides genuine insights into major theological themes.” I completely agree with his assertion. This is an important point, for as we shall see in Chapters Five and Nine, ignorance leads to a lack of understanding of other opinions and fails to produce reasoned argument or good theology. This ‘separationist’ theology as I refer to it is commonplace and many factors account for its inception.

Gschwandtner and Engelhardt’s statements define part of the problem—there are few specific comments regarding animal suffering and where they exist, they are far from developed. This indicates a lack of Eastern Orthodox engagement with the subject and in part, confirms the hypothesis of a gap in the literature. There is little reference to Stefanatos and I presume this is because she is a veterinarian, rather than an Eastern Orthodox theologian.¹⁸ The point to emphasise here is that whilst there is occasional commentary there is a lack of engagement on the subject of animal suffering by the leaders of the Eastern Orthodox Church or its academics and theologians. In this regard, Eastern Orthodoxy has a fifty-year deficit in serious theological debate on animal suffering as compared

¹⁵ Theokritoff, *Living in God’s Creation*, 240. “Other” theologians are unreferenced.

¹⁶ Theokritoff, 240.

¹⁷ Knight, “Natural Theology”. He does however inform us that both he and Basarab Nicolescu believe science “provides genuine insights into major theological themes.”

¹⁸ I had been advised by a senior theologian to ignore her work and did not review it until after I completed my PhD. This was an error, for whilst it is certainly not an academic work, the majority of her comments comply with Eastern Orthodox theology.

with the West.¹⁹ There are signs of hope. Chryssavgis & Foltz (2013) have produced a compilation of articles, many of which mention animals, yet there is still little engagement with specific animal suffering issues.

This work aims to bridge this gap by outlining the implications for animals and humans of this lack of engagement. It also aims to provide references to other literature and scientific studies in order to encourage further engagement and reduce ignorance on this subject. I do not suggest that I have all the answers to the vast subject of animal suffering but I believe that this material will provide an outline and foundation for a theological position on animal suffering for Eastern Orthodox theologians and ethicists to develop. As noted, due to the lack of engagement by leaders of our Church and its academics, I expect there to be ignorance on most aspects of this subject. As a result, it is both necessary and useful to outline what is understood as unnecessary suffering.

Animal Suffering

In light of the fact that no detailed analysis on animal suffering by Eastern Orthodox scholars exists, it is reasonable to suggest that most, if not all, are not authorities in this field. I believe therefore, that before I present my arguments, it would be useful to examine the terminology. In general, the phrase ‘unnecessary suffering’²⁰ indicates an acceptable boundary beyond which one must not traverse.²¹ What is generally not acceptable is any form of suffering that is not to the animal’s benefit and obvious examples here would be any veterinary procedure that was entirely due to the preference of the owner or indeed arbitrary breed requirements such as ear cropping and tail docking. It would also include any form of suffering caused by direct and indirect forms of abuse and exploitation, and examples here would be direct cruelty and any

¹⁹ Arguably, this began with White, “The Historical Roots of our Ecological Crisis”; Godlovitch & Harris’s work on moral philosophy, *Animals, Men and Morals*; via Linzey in theology *Animal Rights: A Christian Assessment* and via Singer in philosophy, *Animal Liberation: A New Ethics For Our Treatment of Animals*.

²⁰ There are many who oppose any suffering and object to this concept and terminology. Whilst this is an entirely acceptable position to take, it is important to note that its use here is simply because it is a familiar term to those who are not familiar with the discussions surrounding their objections.

²¹ The acceptance of the need to prevent animal suffering via the formulation and implementation of animal protection laws is found in most, if not all cultures, thus avoiding the accusation of cultural imperialism.

circumstance that resulted in profits acquired at the expense of the animal's physical and psychological well-being.

The obvious question arising here is who decides what is and what is not, 'unnecessary suffering'? The generally accepted answer would be those who are expert in this field, i.e. the veterinarians and the animal protectionist organisations. Yet here there must be caution, for as in the case of the medical experts employed by the tobacco industries who denied the links to cancer, the animal food industries employ veterinarians who may deny the suffering of animals within their systems. To overcome the obvious potential for bias, one would need to weigh their definitions of what is 'acceptable suffering' with those who are employed by the other acknowledged experts in the field-the animal protection organisations, such as the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals²² whose interest lie not in profit, but in reducing animal suffering.²³ I have a background in both the sciences and in animal conservation and protection and incorporate both scientific evidence and the views of animal conservation and protection groups in this work. Having defined 'unnecessary suffering' I now outline my objection to the relativizing of suffering.

Scales of Suffering

Whilst scales of suffering can be constructed, such as the EU classification of experimental procedures²⁴ of sub-threshold, non-recovery, mild/moderate/severe etc., I submit that the very existence of such scales presents a normalization of the unthinkable²⁵ and fails to deal with the theological, spiritual, moral and ethical problems involved in the suffering

²² This society was established in 1824.

²³ This does not exclude other experts in specific fields such as Prof. Andrew Knight on animal experimentation and Will Travers and Virginia McKenna from the Born Free Foundation on zoos and the illegal trade in wild animals, which is circa \$19 billion per year. Further details can be found online e.g. <http://www.bornfree.org.uk>.

²⁴ See the following website for various categorisations: https://www.google.co.uk/search?q=EU+classification+of+experimental+procedures&rlz=1C1AFAB_enGB460GB755&tbm=isch&tbo=u&source=univ&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwihsp7ss6XbAhWOW8AKHUJNDvUQsAQIPA&biw=1904&bih=922

²⁵ This relates to the 2015 Linzey report *Normalizing the Unthinkable: The Ethics of Using Animals in Research* by the Working Group of the Oxford Centre for Animal Ethics. This incorporates over 200 studies and reports into animal experimentation. Published as a book entitled *The Ethical Case Against Animal Experiments*.

of the individual animal being. For example, whilst we might relativize the suffering of a woman who is beaten with a fist with that of a woman who is beaten with a metal bar, set on fire or burnt with acid,²⁶ it does not alter the fact that the woman who is beaten with a fist, suffers. The point is that her suffering, despite its relativity to other levels or types of suffering, is nonetheless, against God's will. Much the same argument is applicable to animal suffering. When we try to relativize the suffering of animals for example in the various farming industries with those who²⁷ suffer in laboratory testing or indeed within those laboratories or elsewhere, it is equally important to recognize that each individual animal suffers. I argue that this suffering is also against God's will.

An associated and important aspect of theological discussions on all types of cruelty and suffering is to determine the soteriological implications for those who cause the suffering; know of it but are indifferent to it; or know and are concerned but fail to act in order to reduce or prevent that suffering. I submit that these soteriological discussions must include the non-human animal creation and state that if we choose to ignore their suffering, we are guilty of at least one of the three scenarios outlined above.

I now outline the main areas of abuse and exploitation. In light of the desire to return to normative theological discussions, I include photographs of the main areas together with a very brief commentary on each. I also provide references to monographs/websites to aid further investigation of each theme. Out of compassion for my reader, I use examples of low-level abuse.

²⁶ I dealt with these issues when living and teaching in Pakistan in 1995-2000.

²⁷ I use the personal pronoun for non-human animals, for language such as 'it' indicates an object or a thing and disregards the intrinsic value, dignity and integrity of God's created non-human animal beings.

Deliberate Cruelty



Fig. 1-1 Deliberate Cruelty

Fig. 1-1 is a Boxer female dog used for breeding but represents millions of animals throughout the world, who are either deliberately starved, fed an inappropriate diet, used for breeding until they are malnourished or who are abandoned. Cruelty to animals takes many forms and examples are available on most animal protection websites.²⁸

²⁸ Other examples are readily available online, e.g. <https://www.rspca.org.uk/whatwedo/endcruelty>.

Food Production

Another area of animal suffering is that caused within the food production industries. One major cause of suffering is the confinement in small cages or pens.²⁹ The phrase “evil profit” is an extract from an interview with Metropolitan Kallistos of Diokleia (Ware) and used to describe the intensive farming process he witnessed in an American monastery.³⁰



Fig. 1-2 Gestation/Farrowing Crates

Fig. 1-2 is a sow in a gestation/farrowing crate. A 24-hour time-lap video from a German farm accurately represents the reality for these animals.³¹ Females are kept in crates, which are too small for the sow to turn or walk but large enough for them to lie down on their sides to provide milk for the piglets. No natural behaviour or flourishing is possible in such circumstances.³²

²⁹ One can find many examples of confined living spaces on the net such as <http://www.care2.com/causes/10-animals-that-spend-their-entire-lives-in-a-space-smaller-than-your-bathtub.html#ixzz49eJ8wvWR>.

³⁰ See Chapter Six.

³¹ Video available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=buJKrJKRfuw>.

Fig 1-2 is available from <https://www.rspcaassured.org.uk/farm-animal-welfare/pigs/>. Other images are available at <https://www.google.co.uk/search?q=free+photos+of+gestation+crates+pigs&tbs=sch&tbs=ring>.

³² For a veterinary perspective see the article from the Humane Society Veterinary Medical Association, available at:



Fig. 1-3 Foie Gras production,

Fig. 1-3 shows geese being forced fed (gavage feeding) in order to produce Foie Gras.³³ The farmer inserts all of this tube into the animal's mouth and gullet. The procedure results in impaired liver function, expansion of the abdomen making it difficult for birds to walk, scarring of the oesophagus and death. Foie Gras production is banned in many countries including the UK, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, Norway and Poland as the process is proven and acknowledged to be cruel, yet it remains legal elsewhere.

http://www.hsvma.org/factory_farming_and_welfare_minded_veterinary_professionals_110512?utm_source=ipnewsarchive&utm_medium=hsvmaweb&utm_campaign=advocacy#.Wwp0dEgvyUk.

³³ Image available from:

https://www.google.co.uk/search?q=free+photos+of+gavage+feeding+ducks+for+foie+gras&rlz=1C1AFAB_enGB460GB755&tbm=isch&tbo=u&source=univ&sa=X&ved=0ahUKewjL_fGeuqXbAhXnBcAKHVdcBlgQsAQIhgE&biw=1904&bih=873; see also video narrated by Kate Winslet which outlines the process, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DyOu-GVtgPQ>.



Fig. 1-4 Food and Skin production in Asia

In the West we tend to think of food production mainly in relation to cows, pigs, sheep and chickens and indeed those processes do cause great suffering to those and many other niche food animals. In other cultures, animals such as dogs, cats and apes (bush meat) are examples of food.³⁴ Fig. 1-4 shows Asian dogs in crowded cages, who travel long distances without food or water and killed via beatings or cut throats and without stunning.³⁵ This process occurs in front of the other animals who are waiting to die. The physical and psychological suffering involved in such scenarios is obvious.

³⁴ For information on bushmeat and links to the illegal trade in wild animals see: <http://www.bornfree.org.uk/animals/chimps/projects/bushmeat/>

³⁵ Image is courtesy of Animals Asia Foundation. <http://www.animalsasia.org>. See also <https://www.animalsasia.org/uk/our-work/cat-and-dog-welfare/what-we-do/tackling-the-meat-trade.html>.

Entertainment

Fig. 1-5 shows a Polar bear ‘singing’ for its audience.³⁶ Circuses use a wide variety of animals who, for example, jump through burning hoops, sing, dance, ice-skate, play football etc. It would be naive to think that animals perform in this way without violence. Many countries have banned the use of animals in circuses, as many undercover reports have proven the cruelty involved in many of the training processes; nonetheless, many remain.



Fig. 1-5 Polar bear in Russian circus

Other examples of this type of entertainment would be aquatic parks, zoos, horse and dog racing.³⁷

³⁶ Image is from a petition on <https://www.change.org/p/ivanovo-circus-in-russia-tell-ivanovo-circus-in-russia-to-stop-torturing-using-polar-bears-in-their-shows>. The normal range for a polar bear would be approximately 300,000 sq. km. Similar photographs are available on-line. See also <https://www.bornfree.org.uk>.

³⁷ See for example, <https://www.animalaid.org.uk/the-issues/our-campaigns/horse-racing/>; <https://www.league.org.uk/greyhound-racing>.

Entertainment as Tradition

In his documentary, Miguel Ángel Rolland has chronicled some of the 16,000 religious festivals across Spain, which involve the abuse of animals. He informs us “Every year about 60,000 animals are killed during these festivals, often held in honour of a local saint or the Virgin Mary. Spanish identity is a local, rather than a national affair and people are fiercely loyal to their town or village and the customs associated with it.”³⁸ There are numerous other traditions around the world, which cause immense suffering to animals.



Fig. 1-6 Bullfighting in Spain³⁹

³⁸ <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/jul/06/violent-nation-spain-festival-animal-cruelty-turkey-bulls-film-santa-fieta>.

The 2002 Greek documentary “Breath of Earth” by Panos Karkanavatos, directed by Lampros Liavas (Uni. of Athens) indicates the slaughtering of animals in pagan rituals throughout modern Greece.

<http://www.filmfestival.gr/2003/uk/process.php?movieid=576&eventid=124>.

³⁹ Available and with permission from Asociación Defensa Drechos Animal at: <http://www.addaong.org>. The copyright of the photo belongs to ADDA. See also <https://www.change.org/search?q=bullfighting%20in%20spain>.