**According to Alcoff, what exactly do we have to address to examine a speaker’s location and why this accounting important? Is Alcoff’s reasoning different from standpoint epistemology?**

According to Alcoff, examining the speaker’s location is important because it will determine the position of the speaker on the issue so it can help eliminate oppression or bias. To examine the location of the speaker important because “the work of privileged authors who speak on behalf of the oppressed is coming more and more under criticism from members of those oppressed groups themselves.” She also argues that though a person’s location can enforce oppression but the location of the speaker may not necessary cause oppression to people spoken for, “contested relationship between location on the one hand and meaning and truth on the other, we cannot reduce evaluation of meaning and truth to a simple identification of the speaker's location.” (17). It is not the only power or venue for determining a person’s position on issue.

**What is problematic with the ‘retreat position’ and the idea that “I speak only for myself”?**

Alcoff argues that retreat postion refers to one person speaking for oneself only, undermining the effect of others or not putting others in perspective. She argues that one should not have influence on others giving them privllege over others. The problem that with retreat position is it will not give other people the chance to express or will not

The problem is that there is no position that somebody can be unconnected to others in his or her authentic self. The autonomy from others given certain conditions cannot be achieved.

No neutral place exists that researcher can stand free because there is no boundary between one’s location and others. I speak only for myself idea is only for avoiding the responsibility of effect on others. It becomes individualist and defeat collective fight against social problems “the problematic of speaking for by retreating into an individualist realm is based on an illusion, well-supported in the individualist ideology of the West, that a self is not constituted by multiple intersecting discourses but consists in a unified whole capable of autonomy from others.”(21). I speak for myself prevent political change as she contended it as “Retreat undercuts the possibility of political effectiveness”.

**How do you understand the advice to “speak with” the oppressed rather speak for them? It is ever possible to speak about others with oppression or dominating them?**

Speak with the oppressed, the speaker must analyse the situation to avoid oppression or bias. To speak means being in line with the oppressed on their situation because the author has understood and analysed their situation before speaking with them. To me the best person to speak with oppressed is the one coming the same situation as the example she cited by Menchu, a Quiche Indian, who by speaking to a situation mated on her and her people because she was part of the oppression so she was able to speak with them.