

LETTERS

Animal Revolution: Changing Attitudes Towards Speciesism

Sir,

Gauthier and Griffin significantly misrepresent my position in their otherwise responsible review of the new edition of my book *Animal Revolution: Changing Attitudes Towards Speciesism* (*Animal Welfare 10*: 108-110).

First, they imply that I do not take into account the variable painience of animals from species to species and quote, rather strangely, the inclusion of the cephalopods into protective legislation as some sort of evidence of this. Well, I was among those who successfully campaigned for this protection in the 1970's and I have always emphasised that x amount of pain has the same moral importance *regardless as to who or what experiences it*.

Secondly, Gauthier and Griffin say that I am 'strongly opposed to the cost/benefit analysis which is at the basis of the UK' law on animal experimentation. I am not. *But I am opposed to aggregating costs and benefits (or pains and pleasures) across individuals*. The distinction between aggregation and cost/benefit is most important. Finally, they accuse me of using 'the language of them and us'. No, I have always tried to break this down. As a scientist myself I have always struggled with government departments and others who have seen 'scientists' and 'animal welfarists' as separate. Thank goodness we now have a science of animal welfare!

Dr Richard D Ryder
Exeter
Devon, UK