1. What is the dichotomy in the 'scientific objectivity' debate that Haraway wants to address and why does she think this is important?
2. What do the social constructivists say about objectivity? What do you think about this view?
3. What do the feminist empiricists say about objectivity? Do you find this view acceptable?
4. What does Haraway mean by situated knowledges? Do you think this is a good way to approach knowledge?

Situated knowledge = Information that reflects a context and originates with a view point.

Feminist standpoint of SK: What one knows or experiences, reflects one’s social, cultural and historical location.

Epistemologically, sk is an effort to think outside the duality of objectivity-relativism (since ineffective and harmful for feminist purposes)

**A strong tool that preserves claims to objectivity, well aware of how certain standpoints are constructed and how contingent they are but does not accept one of the consequences that it is simply all a matter of opinion. (why situated knowledge is better approach)**

Health care products-> research is sort of objective but the context(people on whom research is tested and all, is to be considered as well)

Urban planning, Cultural studies .

1. What does Haraway mean by the "privilege of the partial perspective"? Do you think the partiality of a perspective can privilege it (i.e. make it better)? Give an example.

a perspective that is based on one of the component parts of a whole

1. How/why does Haraway employ the metaphor of vision? Do you think vision is always partial?
2. What does Haraway mean by seeing the world as 'witty agent'. Do you like or dislike this idea?