



**A. Feminist Objectivity Through Diversity: Another Logic of Scientific research**  
女性主義客觀性與多樣思維：科學研究的另類邏輯

- Date & Time: 6/20 (Mon.) 16:00-17:00
- Moderator (主持人): Dr. Lingfang Cheng (成令方教授)
- Speaker (主講人): Dr. Sandra Harding
- Translator (翻譯者): Dr. Pei-Ru Liao (廖珮如教授)

**B. Dialogues on gender, science, and technology**  
性別與科技的國際對話工作坊

- Date & Time: 6/20 (Mon.) 17:00-18:00
- Moderator (主持人): Dr. Lingfang Cheng (成令方教授)
- Panelists (引言人):  
Dr. Shiu-Ching Wu (吳秀瑾教授，國立中正大學哲學系暨研究所  
Department of Philosophy, NCCU)  
Dr. Zuway-R Hong (洪瑞兒教授，國立中山大學教育研究所  
Institute of Education, NSYSU)  
Dr. Hsiuyun Wang (王秀雲副教授，國立成功大學醫學系暨醫學、  
科技與社會研究中心，STM center, NCKU)
- Discussant (回應人): Dr. Sandra Harding
- Translator (翻譯): Dr. Pei-Ru Liao (廖珮如教授)

**Venue: 10F International Conference Hall, National Kaohsiung Normal University**

## **Feminist Objectivity Through Diversity: Another Logic of Scientific Research**

Sandra Harding

Distinguished Research Professor of Education and Gender Studies  
University of California, Los Angeles

### Abstract

Today strategies to maximize the “view from nowhere” are widely recognized to be incompetent to detect in the results of research social values and interests that are *shared* across research communities, such as those that promote racism, sexism, class exploitation, coloniality, and heteronormativity. Of course familiar methodological strategies for maximizing value-neutrality are good at identifying social values and interests that differ between individuals or research teams. Each science has developed innovative and effective strategies for such tasks. But the most powerful and hard to detect social values and interests usually escape detection through such processes, as feminism and the many other social justice movements arising around the globe since the 1960’s have pointed out. The problem for feminism and these other social movements is not primarily “bad science” (though, of course, that always needs attention), but rather “good science.” What is to be done?

Fortunately, a different “logic of scientific research” has emerged from these social justice movements. This is standpoint methodology, that was first developed in its recent form by feminist theorists such as sociologists Dorothy Smith and Hilary Rose, political philosopher Nancy Hartsock, and philosopher of science Sandra Harding. It identifies precedures for maximizing “strong objectivity.” Its fundamental principle is to start off research projects not from the dominant conceptual frameworks, but rather from the everyday lives of those social groups who receive a disproportionately low share of the benefits and bear a disproportionately large share of the costs of the existing social order. Women in different classes, races, and ethnicities have been the focus of feminist research, of course. What do these groups need and want to know about nature and social relations that will enable them to take greater control of their lives? What can policy makers learn from their research questions? Originating in the social sciences, this methodology has been found useful also in many areas of natural science research such as health, medicine, and environmental sciences. This research methodology is “value- and interest-rich,” in contrast with the “view from nowhere.”

Such a standard is a response to the insight that societies and their sciences co-produce and co-constitute each other. A sexist society will produce sexist sciences that, in turn, enable and legitimate sexist societies. Thus advancing toward the goal of a multicultural, democratic world requires strategizing not only how to improve social relations in and between societies, but also how to improve the knowledge-production principles and practices that have maintained social, political, and economic inequalities, and thus non-democratic social relations.

One might be tempted to assume that this is not “real objectivity” since it detaches the goal of maximizing objectivity from the requirement to maximize social neutrality. But it is, indeed “real objectivity.” It insists on the two fundamental requirements of the conventional value-neutral ideal: fairness to the data, and fairness to a knowledge claim’s severest critics. However, The conclusion will respond to various criticisms of standpoint methodology that have been raised through the years.

## 參考閱讀

說明：1999年，Sandra Harding於新竹清華大學演講Feminist Science and Technology Studies in a multicultural and Postcolonial world（多元文化與後殖民世界中的女性主義科技研究），由蔡麗玲翻譯並撰寫「導讀」，刊登於《科技渴望性別》一書。以下為「導讀」內容之一部分。

「性別與科學」的問題要如何提問？除了「科學界的女性為什麼這麼少」之外，還有什麼更「基進」的問法？在性別與科技研究界，作品幾乎是人人必讀的大師珊卓哈定 Sandra Harding，已經在八零年代將「科學界的女人問題」(The Woman Question in Science，即，問科學界的女性為什麼這麼少)，推進到「女性主義的科學問題」(The Science Question in Feminism，即，以女性主義的觀點質疑主流科學出了什麼問題，為何無法滿足女性)。這個推進以她在1986年出版的同名名著為代表。在後殖民研究盛行的九零年代，哈定又將性別與科學的問題，擴大關連到後殖民研究對殖民與帝國擴張的反省，而以「多元文化作為科學與科技工具箱」的理念，在1998年出版了「科學是多元文化的嗎？」一書。哈定在科學與性別的議題上著作極豐富且深具影響力。她在1999年五月受台灣科學研究界傅大為等人之邀到台灣訪問的演講稿「多元文化與後殖民世界中的女性主義科技研究」一文，可以視為過去二十五年來她對女性主義科技研究（Feminist Science and Technology Studies）這個領域研究成果的濃縮入門簡介。

哈定的學術首先批評，主流的所謂「客觀中立」的科學，不過是十七世紀西方一小撮布爾喬亞白人男性發展出來的雄性中心主義式的「自然科學」。它反映的只是與這個社群特別相關的問題與現象，無法真正客觀地替其他性別、階級、與族群發問，也因此應該被稱為是一種「同好/民俗科學」(folk science)，而它所發展與強調的「客觀性」也因此是一種「弱客觀」。哈定從這個反省開始，結合她在女性主義理論與科學哲學方面的素養，從認識論與方法論的雙重角度來反省，如何發展比主流弱客觀科學包含更多政治、社會、經濟、種族立場的「強客觀」科學。她所發展的「立場論」就是可以用來建構強客觀性的認識論兼方法論，即強調弱勢族群的社會與文化經驗在知識生產的版圖中應佔有的位置。以性別為例，就是思考如何從女性日常生活的經驗發問，來發展更具性別客觀的科學知識。九零年代以後，哈定思考的「強客觀」基礎擴大到非歐美弱勢國家中弱勢族群的經驗，她結合後殖民研究中科學科技與帝國擴張的關係，進一步反省了科學信仰中的歐洲中心主義，並進而指出「科學即在地知識體系」的概念。「科學」是生活於某特定環境脈絡下的居民發展出來的認知自我與自然關係的特定知識體系。以歐洲為脈絡所發展出來「科學」，藉由帝國的擴張，吸收、吞併、反芻、拆解它所接觸的其他「科學」，而成為獨霸全球具主宰權力的唯一科學。因此，哈定認為，目前科學研究界面臨的挑戰，是如何讓歐洲式的知識認識方式「去中心化」，讓全球「重北輕南」的知識生產模式去主流化，而去發展一種可以充分理解反民族中心與反性別歧視的科學與技術哲學。

以台灣而言，由於台灣的非歐洲、非中心、與後殖民脈絡，台灣應自許佔據了一個思考「可以充分理解反民族中心與反性別歧視的科學與技術哲學」的重要位置。台灣可以發展或已經發展的在地知識系統是什麼？對台灣有意義的「科學」又是什麼？台灣內部的性別、族群、階級政治又如何介入此知識系統與知識哲學的產生？這些都是發展「可以充分理解反民族中心與反性別歧視的科學與技術哲學」所必須嚴肅面對的難題。因此，科學不是客觀中立，科學也不止是權力；科學定義本身即是權力鬥爭的場域。

出處：蔡麗玲(2004)。多元文化與後殖民世界中的女性主義科技研究。載於吳嘉苓、傅大為、雷祥麟(編)，科技渴望性別(頁225-256)。台北：群學。