

Cow Protection Vis-À-Vis the Constitution

Kuvam Verma

Student, NLU Delhi

ABSTRACT

Bans on cow slaughter or cow protection, whichever way one interprets it has become a controversial and sensitive issue in recent years. However, this has not been merely due to the change in power in New Delhi and in various states, while political power does have a significant role to play in formulation of stringent cow protection laws and the worrying rise of cow vigilantism, there is a constitutional basis to these actions and that basis is provided by Article 48 of the Constitution. In this research paper, I endeavour to trace the history of cow protection in this country and how that culminated in the inclusion of a contentious Directive Principle. I attempt to show that there is incredible diversity in the culinary habits of the people of this country and even among those belonging to the Hindu religion, many a times this diversity is influenced by a mix of socio-cultural factors. I examine the constitutional validity of this provision in light of Supreme Court judgements as well as its congruence to the principles of freedom of religion, of profession and above all the principle of secularism and its uniquely Indian interpretation. Through all this, I make a case of amending Article 48 so as to omit the cow protectionist clause, which has covertly given validity to mob lynching and cow vigilantism.

INTRODUCTION

Bans on cow slaughter or cow protection, whichever way one interprets it has become a controversial and sensitive issue in recent years. However, this has not been merely due to the change in power in New Delhi and in various states, while political power does have a significant role to play in formulation of stringent cow protection laws and the worrying rise of cow vigilantism, there is a constitutional basis to these actions and that basis is provided by Article 48 of the constitution which states the following:

48. Organisation of agriculture and animal husbandry The State shall endeavour to organise agriculture and animal husbandry on modern and scientific lines and shall, in particular, take steps for preserving and improving the breeds, and prohibiting the slaughter, of cows and calves and other milch and draught cattle¹ Due to the religious status accorded to cows by factions of Hindus, Jains, Zoroastrians, and Buddhists, the killing of cattle, especially cows, is a hotly debated topic in India. Article 48 was a topic of discussion in the Constitution's Constituent Assembly on whether it should be listed as a Fundamental Right. The Constituent Assembly finally decided to adopt the provision as a DPSP in order to avoid compelling non-Hindus to accept something against their choice and arguing that basic rights only apply to human beings and not animals.²

The rise of cow vigilantism in the past decade has led many to question the constitutional validity of Article 48 in no uncertain terms. It is felt that perhaps in their rush to end the protracted disputes, the authors of our Constitution appear to have blinked. They also decided to include a non-justiciable

¹ Constitution of India, 1950, Article 48

² Taruni Kavuri, 'The Constitutional Scheme of Animal Rights in India' (*Animal Legal and Historical Centre*) <<https://www.animallaw.info/article/constitutional-scheme-animal-rights-india>> accessed 23 April @023

Directive Principle urging the state to "prohibit... the slaughter of cows and calves and other milch and draught cattle." This idea, which has been quietly working away for so long, is now in danger of blowing our country apart and turning us into a de facto Hindu rashtra.³

Through the medium of this research paper, it is my aim to argue that Article 48 provides a legitimizing base to not only the stringent and to a certain degree discriminatory cow protection legislations, but it indirectly emboldens vigilante groups who target minority communities, especially Muslims.

During the course of this paper, I trace the historical background of cow protection in this country as well as analyse the Constituent Assembly debates to ascertain the rationale for which this directive principle was inducted into our Constitution. Further I look at cow slaughter and protection through the lens of society, which involves an interplay of religion, caste and nutrition and finally I argue how Article 48 in its current form is indirectly violating freedom of belief, faith and worship as well as the right to livelihood, and hence should be repealed.

A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

The History of Cow Slaughter and Protection in India

According to Nanditha Krishna, who studied the adoration of cows in ancient India during the Vedic era, religious scriptures from this time period frequently associated slaughtering a cow with the killing of a human, notably a Brahmin. They also urged for non-violence towards all bipeds and quadrupeds.⁴

According to another study, ancient Hindus ate a lot of meat. The justification for a voluntary end to cow slaughter and the pursuit of vegetarianism as part of a broader abstinence from violence towards others and all animal death is debated in many ancient and mediaeval Hindu writings.⁵ As a result, by the end of the first millennium CE, the veneration of the cow as a holy being had firmly taken root, this had been helped along due to growth in vegetarianism and belief in non-violence, which was interpreted to signify the presence of a soul in every living being. Similar stances are visible in both Buddhism and Jainism, which place paramount importance on non-violence or *ahimsa*.

Islamic dietary customs were introduced to India in the 12th century with the establishment of the Delhi Sultanate as an Islamic state. God created animals for human benefit, and the Quran advises Muslims to consume cow flesh, but condemns eating pork. Particularly on joyous occasions like the Bakri-Id, the killing of cattle had been and still is an accepted religious practise among Muslim rulers and adherents.⁶ Ironically, it was during the Mughal Empire that we find the first instances of the State imposing restrictions on the slaughtering of cows. According to the Tezkerah al-Vakiat, Emperor Humayun ceased consuming beef when his forces slaughtered cows in a Hindu province, which resulted in violence.⁷ In Mughal history, Akbar is usually seen as the one strengthening the roots of his dynasty in India, this he did through various means but what endeared him to the people the most was his policy of religious tolerance and generosity towards other faiths. In keeping with this, Akbar issued edicts banning cow slaughter, especially during Hindu and Jain religious festivals, it is also noted that towards the end of his life he had turned to vegetarianism. This practice was largely continued by Jahangir and Shah Jahan as well, although the same was not true for Aurangzeb.⁸

Cow slaughter was completely prohibited under Maratha rule and later it was also prohibited by Maharaja

³

⁴ Nanditha Krishna, *Sacred Animals of India* (Penguin Books, 2014) p 80

⁵ Ludwig Alsdorf, *The History of Vegetarianism and Cow-Veneration in India* (Routledge, 2010) p 362

⁶ Clive Phillips, *The Welfare of Animals: The Silent Majority* (Springer, 2015) p 116-117

⁷ Manimugdha Sharma, *Allahu Akbar* (Bloomsbury India, 2018) p 43

Ranjit Singh in Punjab. The Revolt of 1857 against the East India Company was influenced by the veneration for cows. Hindu and Muslim sepoys in the East India Company's army eventually came to believe that the cow and pig was used to grease their paper cartridges, which contained measured amounts of gunpowder, this was the best and most convenient method at the time for lubricating weapons because cows and pigs had a good amount of fat in them. According to historians, the cow emblem was employed to inspire Hindus to take up arms against the Company.⁸

Some well-known figures in the independence struggle, including Mahatma Gandhi, Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Lala Lajpat Rai, Madan Mohan Malviya, Rajendra Prasad, and Purushottam Das Tandon, condemned the killing of cows. When India earned independence from the colonial British, they supported a prohibition on the killing of cattle. Gandhi advocated for the preservation of cows and opposed cow slaughter, which he attributed to the respect for cows in March 1945. Gandhi backed the leather business, but he believed that since calves may be used for their skin when they die naturally, killing is not essential.

The Making of Article 48

In the 1940s, It was one of the Muslim members of the Constituent Assembly who voiced support for a ban on cow-slaughter. That the Constitution should expressly state that the restriction was implemented to protect Hindus' religious sensitivities, was the only requirement he offered.⁹ Within the Constituent Assembly, two different sorts of arguments were used by supporters of the cow protection movement to make their case. There was the moral argument, according to which the cow shouldn't be killed since it had long been revered by Hindus, who avoided eating beef because it was considered unclean. Then there was the economic case, which discussed the several functions that the cow performs in the agrarian economy, including the production of milk, the pulling of the plough, the production of cheap fuel, the curative properties of her urine, and its status as a symbol of wealth. Accordingly, it was said that because to the numerous financial advantages the cow provides, Hindus view it as sacred.¹⁰

The most outspoken Hindu Right supporters demanded that cow slaughter be clearly prohibited in the Constitution and included in the chapter on fundamental rights. The protection of the cow would have been considered equally with other essential human rights, such as the right to life, the right to equality, etc., thanks to this special constitutional protection.¹¹

In the Constituent Assembly Debates, we find that Thakur Dass Bhargawa and Seth Govind Dass argued for the prohibition of cow slaughter and based their arguments on primarily economic concerns. They relied on the centrality of cows to Indian farming at the time, mentioning how cows were integral to food production, dairy production and cattle breeding. They argued that cow protection was in the best interests of a prosperous and well fed human community, while at the same time it would ensure the productivity of other milch and draught animals, like buffaloes. However, in his written submissions to the Constituent Assembly, Bhargawa made an essentially religious argument, claiming that 'Cow protection is not only a matter of religion with us; it is also a cultural and economic question.'

By that time, the cow had already erupted into a contentious issue dividing Hindus and Muslims, partly as

⁸ Thomas Metcalf and Barbara Metcalf, *A Concise History of Modern India* (CUP, 2012) p 83-84

⁹ Ajaz Ashraf, 'A short account of India's long history of hypocrisy on cow slaughter laws' (*Scroll.in*, 1 October 2015) <<https://scroll.in/article/759157/a-short-account-of-indias-long-history-of-hypocrisy-on-cow-slaughter-laws>> accessed 24 April 2023

¹⁰ Aakar Patel, 'The Dark Chronology of India's Cow Slaughter Laws' (*Article 14*, 30 December 2020) <<https://article-14.com/post/the-dark-chronology-of-india-s-cow-slaughter-laws>> accessed 24 April 2023

¹¹ Shraddha Chigateri, 'Negotiating the 'Sacred' Cow: Cow Slaughter and the Regulation of Difference in India' in Monica Mookherjee (ed), *Democracy, Religious Pluralism and the Liberal Dilemma of Accommodation* (Springer Books, 2015)

a result of the Gaurakshini (cow protection) Sabhas that had already proliferated over most of North India. In the latter decade of the 19th century, riots broke out in a number of places as a result of the Sabha members' involvement. The Hindu Right provided assistance to Muslim leaders during the Khilafat movement of 1919 in exchange for their support of the prohibition on cow slaughter.¹²

The tendency of the cow protectionists to justify their demands through economic benefits and nationalist rhetoric was counterrd by ZA Lari, a member of the Assembly from UP. Lari stated that the Muslim community in India had for centuries been under the asumption that they were allowed to slaughter cattle, including cows, especially on religious holidays. If the Assembly wanted to prohibit cow slaughter in the draft Constitution, it should do it in clear and unambiguous terms, mentioning the reasons for doing so. Syed Mohammad Sa'adullah from Assam further stated that he did not wish to prevent the Constituent Assembly from banning cow slaughter, if they so wished, but such a ban should explicitly state that the purpose for its inclusion is that it violates religious sensibilities of the Hindus, if the same was not done he feared make many people would believe that the engrained Hindu sentiment against cow slaughter is being met behind closed doors.¹³

However, India sought to conceal from the outside world the irrationality that drew its people and their leaders at the birth of a new age. In the chapter on the Directive Principle of State Policy, it introduced cow protection using the language of reason and modern science. Hence, Article 48 came into existence.

THROUGH THE LENS OF SOCIETY

Caste and Nutrition

Leave out for the moment Muslims and Christians, beef is the most inexpensive food millions of SCs can purchase. According to Veena Shatrugna of the National Institute of Nutrition, rice only has a 6–8% protein content compared to beef's 21%. Vegetable protein content never exceeds 10%. The poorest of the impoverished continued to consume beef for this reason despite traditional Hindu society's condemnation of it.¹⁴

It is well-known in medicine that eating foods high in protein is the best defence against chronic illnesses like TB. The most prevalent illness that affects malnourished people is tuberculosis. Therefore, among SCs and STs, beef eating was solely responsible for avoiding TB, and when instances of tuberculosis predominated, the only readily accessible, inexpensive treatment was beef.¹⁵

According to Ambedkar, the untouchables' consumption of carrion was what made them pollute and cause pollution, and their life of utter destitution was what made them consume. Eating the flesh of a dead cow was one of the few ways they could supplement their meagre food supply while living on the doles of the upper caste and being required to perform scavenging work, including the removal of dead animals as part of their caste obligation. They also had no access to live cattle whose fresh meat could be consumed.¹⁶

The challenge offered by the Dalit organisations expands beyond the 'right to eat' to recreate caste as 'a new identity of assertion and pride. Instead of eradicating caste in this new interpretation, the goal is to repurpose it as a modern, individualised form of authority. The consumption of beef consequently

¹² Ashraf, *Supra*, note 10

¹³ *ibid*

¹⁴ Kancha Illiah, 'Beef and Food Rights' (1996) *Economic and Political Weekly* 144

¹⁵ Human Rights Watch. "Violent Cow Protection in India: Vigilante Groups Attack Minorities." February 2019. https://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/report_pdf/india0219_web3.pdf

¹⁶ BR Ambedkar, 'The Untouchables: Who Were They and Why They Became Untouchable' in *Babasaheb Ambedkar: Writings and Speeches* (Government of Maharashtra, 2007) p 233

becomes a sign of identity, one that must be embraced in opposition to centuries of hostility and humiliation inflicted on a specific people due to their placement in the unjust order as a result of an accident of birth.¹⁷

More than two-thirds of respondents in a nationwide poll from 2014 declared themselves non-vegetarians, with more than 90% of respondents in the states of Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Jharkhand, Kerala, Odisha, Tamil Nadu, and West Bengal. Additionally, 4% of rural and 5% of urban consumers ate beef or buffalo meat.¹⁸ Contrary to popular assumption, eating beef is a common practise in most religions, including Hinduism, and it plays a significant role in local cuisine, as in, for example, the states of Kerala and Meghalaya. As a result, the slaughter prohibition forces all of its residents to adhere to a minority social group's dietary norms.

Food and Livelihood Rights

People's rights to food are intertwined with their civic and democratic rights. Until and unless a specific religious group becomes cannibalistic, no religious community may forbid the food of another religious community. No caste may also forbid the consumption of food from another caste. For people who have traditionally eaten meat and beef, the argument that vegetarian cuisine is ethically superior is invalid. In India, for instance, it is impossible to envision a holiday without meat for many classes and groups. In some groups, vegetarian cuisine is devalued. It is considered a shame to provide vegetarian cuisine to a visitor. Many castes and groups make jokes about one other, including¹⁹

Every Indian citizen is guaranteed the right to equality under Article 14 of the Constitution. It forbids unfair categorisation of people and upholds the fundamental values of equality before the law. The prohibition on the selling of flesh unquestionably permits such prejudice. "Reasonable classification" and "intelligent differentiation" are the two guiding concepts of Article 14. This means that if a law distinguishes between two groups of people or objects, it must be "logical and lucid" and not "artificial or contrived" in order to be easily understood. It also means that the classification of people and objects must be based on intelligible differentia. Clearly, bans on the slaughter of cows fall short of this standard.

The right to personal liberty [Article 21] and the freedom to practise any trade or occupation [Article 19(1)(g)] are two fundamental rights that would be completely ignored and violated if all states outlawed the slaughter of cattle for professional or consumption purposes. The cow slaughter prohibition targets a group of people, mostly traders, businesspeople, and store owners from underserved or economically challenged groups.²⁰ It is also important to note here that these legislations which prohibit cow slaughter have an adverse economic impact on the key sectors and industries of the Indian economy, for in instance when the Maharashtra state government enacted a law prohibiting cow slaughter in the state, the leather industry was badly hit, this industry had according to studies built up good momentum prior to the ban, but subsequent to it it was all lost.

COW SLAUGHTER AND CONSTITUTIONALISM

Judicial Interpretation

The jurisprudence of the Supreme Court on the matter of the slaughtering of cows is well established. The court was faced with deciding the maintainability of a cow slaughter ban in Bihar in the case of *Abdul*

¹⁷ C Sathyamala, 'Meat Eating in India: Whose Food, Whose Politics and Whose Rights' (2019) SAGE Journals 20

¹⁸ Johann Mazer and Abigail Richard, 'Diet or Deity? A Study of Cows in Indian Society' (2017)

¹⁹ Illiah, *Supra*, note 15

²⁰ Gautam Bhatia, 'Cow Slaughter and The Constitution' (*The Hindu*, New Delhi, 1 June 2015) accessed 25 April 2023

Hakim Quraeshi v. State of Bihar.²¹ It was contended by the petitioner that the regulations violated Muslims' fundamental right to religious freedom as given under Article 25, by forbidding them from openly engaging in customs associated with their faith, such as the sacrifice of cows on Bakr-Id. The Supreme Court affirmed that no Islamic source, including the Hadith and the Quran, strictly called for the killing of cows and permitted the sacrifice of a goat or a camel in its place. Therefore, the Court concluded that a complete prohibition on cow slaughter did not interfere with Muslims' right to practise their religion. The Court ruled that Article 48 only applies to cows, and other animals with the capability to provide milk or with the ability to plough field and help in harvesting. As a result, Article 48, the Court reasoned was framed with the intention to curb the slaughter of all cows and other cattle.²²

Similar reasoning was applied in the case of *Mohd. Hanif Qureshi v. State of Bihar*²³, in which the Supreme Court determined that it was not appropriate to outright ban the slaughter of cattle when, an agriculturalist was in possession of animals (such as bulls and bullocks) that were of no apparent commercial use to him but was still forced to maintain them, an outright ban was found by the Court to be against the greater public good. However, the Court overturned the argument in *State of Gujarat v. Mirzapur Moti Kureshi Kassab Jamat*²⁴, holding that Article 48 forbade the killing of cows and their offspring in their entirety. In what was a rather peculiar argument, the Court noted that a cow could not be slaughtered if it had been of any use at all to its owners. Even more interestingly, the court called on the people to be sympathetic towards the welfare of animals based on reading of Articles 48 and 51-A(g) of the Constitution together. Animals have their own basic rights, the court declared. According to Article 48, the state had a duty to put in every effort to forbid the slaughtering of cows and calves, as well as other milch and draught livestock.²⁵

The Supreme Court essentially set out in *Mirzapur* to overturn the ruling rendered by its constitution bench in *Qureshi*. According to the ruling, a bull or bullock could not be killed until it was no longer usable for draught purposes, while cows and their offspring could not be killed until they ceased producing milk. The court disregarded all accepted constitutional interpretation guidelines in favour of concentrating solely on the value of cows, their offspring, and particularly cow manure. This line of inquiry excludes the fundamental rights of butchers, who operate in auxiliary industries and slaughter 'useless' livestock, as well as those who deal with skins or at tanneries or other related places.²⁶ What is even more absurd in all this is the court's constant extolling of the virtues of cow dung, from where did the court get data on scientific value of cow dung, we don't know, but most likely such data was obtained from a report of the Animal Welfare Board of India, a report that the court had rejected previously in 1996, calling the report vague and reprimanding the High Court for relying on such evidence.²⁷

Secularism and Freedom of Religion

One of the fundamental principles of the Indian Constitution is secularism, which is incorporated in the Preamble, which declares that India is a secular nation. This indicates that regardless of a citizen's religious affiliation, the state should not favour any one religion over another and should treat everyone equally.

²¹ AIR 1961 SC 448

²² Kavuri, *Supra*, note 2

²³ AIR 1958 SC 731

²⁴ (2005) 8 SCC 534

²⁵ Bhatia, *Supra*, note 10

²⁶ Indira Jaisingh. 'It's Time the Supreme Court Untangled Its Contradictory Rulings on Cow Protection' (*The Wire*, 18 August, 2016) < <https://thewire.in/law/untangling-the-supreme-courts-contradictory-rulings-on-cow-protection> > accessed 26 April 2023

²⁷ *Hashmatullah v. State of Madhya Pradesh*, (1996) 4 SCC 391

Article 48's detractors contend that it contradicts secularism since it prioritises the interests of Hinduism over those of other religions. They contend that Hindus have a religious conviction in cow preservation and that the government shouldn't meddle in religious affairs.

The Gandhian ideal of equal regard for all religions served as the foundation for India's constitutional secularism. Quintessentially, there are three pillars on which the secular fabric of the nation rests, these are:

- Freedom of belief, faith and worship
- Equality
- Tolerance

These 3 form the core of the secular doctrine in India, which can be characterised as equal respect for all religions or *sarv dharm sama bhav*. This model allows for government intervention in religion, provided that such intervention is in accordance with the principles of equality and freedom of religion. The classical conception of secularism as it has been propounded in Western Europe and the United States is opposed to this, classical secularism formulates rigid Church-State separation, where the State does not interfere in religious affairs. It is commonly understood that this uniquely Indian interpretation of secularism envisions courts playing both an intervening and reforming role.²⁸

The history of official involvement in religious concerns, as it has been interpreted by the courts, has not been without issues. One of the arguments made against the judiciary's interventionist role focuses on how the courts have established the parameters of the "religious" area. A rationalised form of high Hinduism has been made legitimate by the court's application of the "essential practises" theory, whereas superstitious applications of popular Hinduism have been deemed invalid. This reasoning also applies to Muslim practises, as shown by the Supreme Court's ruling in *Mohd Hanif Quareshi*, where the court declined to acknowledge a practise as deserving of protection under the umbrella of one's freedom to religion since it was not "obligatory." Numerous instances show how the Hindu viewpoint on cow slaughter is prioritised in the legal discourse.²⁹

Ironically, one of the most severe accusations levelled about India's constitutional secularism is that, particularly in the area of personal legislation, the majority religion has been given a reforming role. In actuality, this makes up the majority of how the Hindu right describes politically progressive secularists as pseudo-secularists.³⁰

How are the competing claims on the regulation of cow slaughter to be handled? is a legitimate question to ask if the conundrum of accommodating diverging and conflicting beliefs and practises in the setting of a religiously heterogeneous society is to be raised in the context of cow slaughter. But I think we are a long way from talking about "equal respect for all religions" in the context of legal debate about cow slaughter. Where does the issue of tolerating opposing and divergent ideas and practises come up when such variety is systematically and repeatedly controverted by a Hindu ethic that privileges the dominant caste while disguising itself as a widely held Hindu belief?³¹

Contested ethical assertions and various cultural practises are at the centre of the discussions surrounding cow slaughter. In order to firmly establish a Hindu morality based on the ruling caste, this variety has been

²⁸ Chigateri, *Supra*, note 12

²⁹ Ronojoy Sen, 'The Indian Supreme Court and the quest for a Rational Hinduism' (2010) 1 South Asia History and Culture 86

³⁰ *ibid*

³¹ Chigateri, *Supra*, note 12

glossed over. The multiplicity of ecological notions that do not cleanly correlate non-violence with restrictions on cow slaughter, as well as ecological concerns as they have been expressed in legal discourse on cow slaughter, have not been addressed with. The understanding that there is a plurality is a necessary prerequisite in order to address the issue of how the state should handle religious differences. In this way, the legal debate over cow slaughter cuts to the core of India's constitutional secularism.³²

There is a possibility of modifying constitutional secularism to incorporate state action, not for the reform of the dominant religion but for defending its predicated ideals, on the grounds that court discourse has consistently supported Article 48. Although this argument has some value in that it refutes the criticisms of pseudo-secularism, its basic weakness is that it ignores the fact that the state has no right to meddle in matters of constitutional secularism, as conceived in terms of substantive equality. Instead, a dominant caste Hindu ethic on cow slaughter has been repeatedly reaffirmed and given priority in legal discourse.

CONCLUSION

Through the means of this research paper, it has been my objective to make a case for the repeal of Article 48 of the Constitution. I have argued that the matter of cow slaughter is not in truth an issue that can be said to offend the Hindu religious consciousness. Through an analysis of historical evidence it can be concluded that it was the Mughal emperor Akbar who for the first time instituted a governmental restriction on cow slaughter. In the Constituent assembly, several Muslim members called for it to be clearly mentioned in the Constitution that any ban on the slaughtering of cows and indeed, cattle as a whole was specifically to honour Hindu sentiments.

The Article demonstrates a misunderstanding of Indian and even Hindu society, as it has been well established that Dalits and Adivasis have been known to consume beef, indeed beef consumption is not even prohibited in South India and the Northeast. The Article forms a validating and constitutional basis for bans on cow slaughter imposed by various state governments, bans which have become ever more stringent and dangerously close to disregarding freedom of religion, profession and livelihood. Any bans on cow slaughter is also bound to adversely impact industries such as leather making and tanning.

There has also been considerable confusion in the Supreme Court's interpretation of the Constitution. While the court took a moderate view in the *Qureshi* case in the 1950s, wherein it held that aged bulls and bullocks beyond any economic use to their owners could be slaughtered keeping in view economic interests and changing realities, but inexplicably the court reversed this decision in 2005 to extend the blanket of protection over bulls and bullocks, extolling the virtues of cow dung and making a case for complete prohibition on cattle slaughter on the basis of humane treatment of animals.

The court's decisions demonstrate an acceptance of a particular religious dogma as mainstream Hindu thinking. This is fundamentally violative of the doctrine of secularism enshrined in our Constitution. If Indian secularism has to maintain its central tenet of "equal respect for all religions", then it is imperative for Article 48 to go. Here I don't say that the Article be repealed in its entirety, for it also talks about the promotion of animal husbandry, only the part that talks about preventing slaughter of cows, calves and other milch and draught animals should be deleted. Thus Article 48 should be amended to read as follows:
48. Organisation of agriculture and animal husbandry The State shall endeavour to organise agriculture and animal husbandry on modern and scientific lines and shall, in particular, take steps for preserving and improving the breeds of cows and calves and other milch and draught cattle

³² Shraddha Chigateri, 'Glory to the Cow: Cultural Difference and Social Justice in the Food Hierarchy in India' (2008) 31 Journal of South Asian Studies 10