

A Feminist Utopia

Beatrice Halsaa, Opland Distriktshøyskole

Project Alternative Future is funded by the Norwegian parliament, and its aim is partly the construction of a model for an alternative society. It is a utopian project in the best meaning of the concept. Like Plato's ideal society, the project attempts to combine ambitious visions and concrete thinking. This paper is a discussion of feminist principles on which to base a model for a fundamentally different society. Feminism, as distinct from womanism, is seen as a political ideology criticizing the sexist, patriarchal social structures as well as general structures of domination, competition and violence. A feminist utopia involves new principles for allocating values; a new ethics based on the principle of reproduction. Feminist theory is criticized for its dualist tradition, and the paper argues for the rationality of aesthetics in addition to the rationality of utility and the rationality of care. Several suggestions as to how to approach a feminist utopia are made.

Utopia and Project Alternative Future

Political science has a long tradition in asking normative and empirical questions. We are still inspired by Plato's *Republic*. Nevertheless, modern political science is mostly preoccupied with 'real-politik'. This is regrettable, as people are deeply concerned about what ought to be. More than ever do we need visions for better ways of living, loving and dying. Political scientists could have important contributions, for instance by taking seriously questions like: what is the best way of allocating values? what is the ideal society? (cf. Ricci 1984).

Whereas utopian thinking is as old as wo/mankind, the concept of Utopia itself came into being rather late in our history. It was introduced in a novel by Thomas More, *Utopia*, published in 1516 (Manuel & Fritzie 1979; Rohrlich & Baruch 1984). More's title intentionally contains a twofold meaning, referring to the Greek words 'ou' (no/nowhere), 'eu' (ideal/good), and 'topos' (place/region). Thus, utopia means 'the best place ever' ('eu-topos'), as well as 'the land that does not exist' ('ou-topos') (Woll 1981).

Utopias are protests against conventional wisdom, and grow up in the 'pores' of the established society. They are often answers to crises, and show a special explosive force in times of shifting epochs. Revolutions, shifts in the spiritual climate and new technological developments give rich nourishment to utopian fantasies. Utopian blossoming often is a

A Feminist Utopia

Beatrice Halsaa, Opland Distriktshøyskole

Project Alternative Future is funded by the Norwegian parliament, and its aim is partly the construction of a model for an alternative society. It is a utopian project in the best meaning of the concept. Like Plato's ideal society, the project attempts to combine ambitious visions and concrete thinking. This paper is a discussion of feminist principles on which to base a model for a fundamentally different society. Feminism, as distinct from womanism, is seen as a political ideology criticizing the sexist, patriarchal social structures as well as general structures of domination, competition and violence. A feminist utopia involves new principles for allocating values; a new ethics based on the principle of reproduction. Feminist theory is criticized for its dualist tradition, and the paper argues for the rationality of aesthetics in addition to the rationality of utility and the rationality of care. Several suggestions as to how to approach a feminist utopia are made.

Utopia and Project Alternative Future

Political science has a long tradition in asking normative and empirical questions. We are still inspired by Plato's *Republic*. Nevertheless, modern political science is mostly preoccupied with 'real-politik'. This is regrettable, as people are deeply concerned about what ought to be. More than ever do we need visions for better ways of living, loving and dying. Political scientists could have important contributions, for instance by taking seriously questions like: what is the best way of allocating values? what is the ideal society? (cf. Ricci 1984).

Whereas utopian thinking is as old as wo/mankind, the concept of Utopia itself came into being rather late in our history. It was introduced in a novel by Thomas More, *Utopia*, published in 1516 (Manuel & Fritzie 1979; Rohrlich & Baruch 1984). More's title intentionally contains a twofold meaning, referring to the Greek words 'ou' (no/nowhere), 'eu' (ideal/good), and 'topos' (place/region). Thus, utopia means 'the best place ever' ('eu-topos'), as well as 'the land that does not exist' ('ou-topos') (Woll 1981).

Utopias are protests against conventional wisdom, and grow up in the 'pores' of the established society. They are often answers to crises, and show a special explosive force in times of shifting epochs. Revolutions, shifts in the spiritual climate and new technological developments give rich nourishment to utopian fantasies. Utopian blossoming often is a

symptom of deeper changes in public feeling, the spirit of a new time. (My transl. Hagtvet 1981)

The Norwegian project Alternative Future (AF) was launched in the eighties out of deep frustrations with our times. It was given shape by the alternative movements as they united in an effort to establish constructive alternatives to the dominating economic trends. The project was established in 1986, funded by the Norwegian parliament. An extraordinary alliance between the power elite and the grass-root level, based on a strong belief in our capacity to consciously change for the better, finally carried the day.

Western utopian thought in general has been characterized by a combination of soaring ideas and practical details, the heavenly and the worldly (Hagtvet 1981). Alternative Future is no exception in its trying to combine grand visions of social and ecological considerations with concrete thinking and actions.

The project is utopian in the best tradition of the word, supposed as it is to stimulate a process towards a fundamentally different society, through research and public debate. One of the main tasks is to make a *model* (one or several) of a society where *societal needs, ecological – and resource – responsibility have priority instead of material level and economic growth.*

Today the concept of utopia has a negative meaning. It is often used to characterize and discard dreams and visions as totally unrealistic and therefore unworthy of consideration. I believe, nevertheless, in reinstating the original meaning of utopia. Planners are making decisions about our future all the time, planning when children are to start school, when the ordinary working day starts and ends, how to reach and keep the optimal population size, etc. Utopian thinking, in this respect, is about supplying all kinds of planners with different and better visions of the future; to change their concepts of what is realistic or not. This is exactly what the feminist part of the project Alternative Future is trying to accomplish.

Utopias in general are often accused of being dull; of being elaborated in too great detail, and for establishing new structures once and for all.

A feminist utopia should not, however, be based on harmony, but rather include structures that ease conflicts and increase our capacity for handling them peacefully. It should establish general principles rather than focus concrete details, although concrete proposals are useful in order to make the utopia comprehensible (i.e. a concrete utopia) (Bloch 1959).

A feminist utopia should make the future open-ended, rather than put forward solutions once and for all. It should stress that what we do here and now must be part of utopia, and must therefore be consistent with its basic principles.

Two Definitions of Feminism

Feminism refers to the perspectives and politics of the modern radical

women's movement. It is not yet a concept much used in political science, although it implicates an alternative to traditional political 'isms' like fascism, conservatism, liberalism, socialism, Marxism, anarchism. Feminism as such is a global political movement. It is not, however, manifested in political parties, but primarily in global networks and local groups, and secondarily in formal organizations. The UN Women's Forum in Nairobi in 1985 and the Nordic Women's Forum in Oslo in 1988 are examples of informal networks.

Also, feminism is an alternative to the concepts of equal rights and of 'different but equal'. It refers to certain political goals and strategies, at odds with mainstream governmental equal-rights politics, as expressed in laws like Equal Pay and Equal Treatment Acts. Feminism symbolizes an offensive female community, in contrast to traditional defensive communities (Holter 1984).

Feminism implies a critique of the sexist aspects of society. As such, feminism is merely one aspect of traditional 'isms'. However, feminism is also used as a full-fledged ideology, and not just as a critique of sexism. Three assertions concerning modern society will illustrate the two different meanings of feminism:

1. Women are oppressed in our society, irrespective of acts forbidding sex discrimination. This implies that society is still ruled by men; *patriarchy* is still a reality.
2. Sex is a fundamental category concerning allocation and distribution of values. The existence of two different sexes is basic to political analysis as well as political behaviour. In other words, the concept of a single *individual* is a deceit. In modern society there are two kinds of individuals, male and female (Siim 1987).
3. Society in general is based on *intolerable structures*. The system of production is based on power, exploitation and inhuman competition; the economy on values of insatiable growth and profit; technology is unaffected by human needs, based as it often is on exploitation of the third and fourth worlds; and repression of the relationship between nature and wo/man.

The first two assertions above constitute the least common denominator of feminism, or, as I prefer: *womanism*. Add the third assertion, however, and feminism emerges as an ideology in itself. Criteria one and two are still considered necessary, but they are no longer sufficient. The three together constitute what I regard as the basic elements of feminism.

Feminism as an ideology is distinguished by its basis in the critique of the sexist society, *and* by its critique of dominant structures of oppression as such: the economical, the technological, the cultural, the political, the religious, etc. According to feminism, then, as distinguished from woman-

ism, society is not only based on the power of men over women (patriarchy); but human relationships are in general characterized by subordination, competition and violence.

The advantage of this distinction between feminists and other womanists (red-stockings) is how it distinguishes feminist strategies and visions from womanist strategies and visions. Women at the Nordic Forum in Oslo in 1988, for instance, were all fighting to improve the lot of women, but only some were feminists. Women from the Conservative Party (Høyre), calling themselves Conservative feminists in the seventies, would, for instance, not pass as feminists according to my criteria.

Feminism and Equal Rights

Fighting for equal rights is the strategy for womanists merely aiming to change the relationship between the sexes. The right of women to the same conditions as men is a significant demand, as women have worse conditions than men at home as well as in the labour market. I do not contend that it will be easy to realize such a change. It will obviously take a lot of effort before women get a fair share of existing privileges and values, and before the 'biological competitive disadvantage' of women is compensated.

The politics of equal rights seem to have accomplished astonishing results lately; just look at the number of women in elected political bodies in the Nordic countries (Haavio-Mannila et al. 1985). The progress is due to women's struggles for new rights. Important claims have also been encouraged by the economic boom, and not the least by the oil reserves in the North Sea. Essential changes in women's roles – from that of housewife to the double role of wageearner and housewife – gave women material and economic gains. As Edwardsen (1988) argues, the equal rights policies, focusing women's rights in education and paid work, have been compatible with and supported by dominant post-war values like economic growth and increased consumption.

The breakthrough of equal rights, however imperfect, is not to be confused with the claims of the radical women's movement, and not with feminism. It is rather an expression of co-opted feminism; of radical feminist policies tamed and cultivated, and no longer contrary to dominant power structures (Edwards et al. 1985).

Equality at the top, without equality at the bottom – more women travelling first class, more women carrying stress-bags, more female officers etc. – implies on the one hand that we have succeeded in improving the material conditions for some women. But it does not mean that we have eliminated patriarchy, competition, dominance and violence as distinct aspects of modern society. We have merely done the same as those socialists

who forgot the collective battle over private property to improve their own individual economic conditions.

Feminism denies using men's lives and values as a standard, partly because it would be unfair, as women can never be like men. It is, after all, part of the female body to menstruate, to be pregnant, to give birth, to breast-feed, etc. Even more important, however, is the fact that feminists dissociate from the content of male standards, which are judged contrary to the needs of our time, like the challenge of war, poverty and ecological catastrophe.

A Feminist Dream

Feminism is a vision created and maintained by women as the only 'ism' uncompromisingly focused on women's interests. It is an answer to female dreams of a world based on love, nearness, care, responsibility, solidarity and respect between women, women and men, women and children, culture and nature. A world in which not only reason but also intuition is seen as a valid foundation for knowledge and practice. It is the dream of a world stimulating imagination, diversity and self-respect.

Feminism is women's vision because it is an answer to our strife, our traumas and our insufficiency. Feminism comprises claims for equal pay, a six hours' workday, economic independence, voluntary motherhood, voluntary and mutual sexuality.

Feminism is ambitious, however. Its task is not restricted to women's problems and aspirations. Feminism also represents answers to other basic, global problems. Feminism favours care according to need, not according to clock nor purse; production for need and use, not for profit and garbage; and peace and disarmament, not war and arms race. Feminism is

- a dream of a society that cares for all its members, but not at the expense of women;
- a vision simultaneously attending women's special interests (særinteresser) and the general interests of mankind (almeninteresser);
- a vision of a world free of oppression, where neither sex, race, sexuality, ethnicity, religion, age nor ability are the basis for suppression and domination.

In short, feminism is a dream of a basically different world; the opposite of the existing patriarchal world (according to assertion 3). It is a world in which we can live, love and die as whole beings, not fragmented like we do today; a world in which the antagonism, if not the differences and conflicts, between men and women, between children and adults, between body and spirit, between production and reproduction, family and work,

between love and labour, and between human being and nature are abolished.

How can these visions come true? Certainly not without deep and painful changes. Definitely not without protracted struggle. The dreams are deemed naive by many, and ridiculed and concealed in public debate. Nevertheless, feminist thinking is about to be established worldwide through the women's movement. It might become an important political force, as women organize their interests.

Trends in Feminism and the Role of Men

There are differences within the feminist movement when it comes to strategies, due to differential perspectives on patriarchy. The definition of feminism chosen here is a kind of greatest common denominator. It represents a framework for all feminists – whether socialists, Marxist, radical, or ecological – within which there are numerous disagreements and conflicts (Jaggar 1983; Segal 1987).

Some feminists pretend that the present differences between the sexes are expressions of everlasting, essential differences between men and women. They argue for the existence of both a male and a female *essence*. Others argue, this project included, that the present differences are caused and shaped by human culture, and that there is no such thing as eternal, essential differences.

The disagreement over essence is quite fundamental. Is feminism purely a women's issue, or is it a way of explaining, understanding, dreaming and acting that can be shared among wo/men? It is the conviction of this project that men can share the feminist vision. For me, this is just as obvious as the fact that many women don't.

A feminist man is a man who shares the feminist description of reality, and accordingly tries to show solidarity with women. This is not any more self-contradictory than pledging that white, Euro-American people can be anti-racist. For a man to be feminist, however, is not easy, neither when it comes to being accepted among women as an ally, nor when it comes to being in accord (solidary) with women on the personal level. A male feminist will share feminist dreams, join the political actions when invited, and support the feminists economically and otherwise. But he cannot act, speak or write on behalf of the feminists.

Since many women are anti-feminists, a feminist utopia hardly stands a chance without political alliances between women and men, and between the radical women's movement and other alternative movements. This should not be impossible, since feminism is comprehending more than 'just' the special interests of women.

A feminist utopia, according to the definition of feminism in this project, must embrace both women and men. It is not a dream of a *Herland* (Perkins Gilman 1915), but rather of a world in which wo/men live peacefully together. It is a world tolerating a variety of relationships, sexually and otherwise, and where wo/men can co-exist on a non-patriarchal basis with reciprocal respect for differences, whether based on cultural or biological characteristics, individual or sex-related.

Reproduction and the Construction of a Feminist Utopia

While utopias written by men tend to focus on production and economy (collective property, for instance), and to rely primarily on reason, female utopias tend to focus on reproduction and care, and often to rely on moral. While male writers have often been concerned with poverty and stupidity, women have focused on the birthing and care of children (Bjørhovde 1988; Højgaard 1981; Mellor 1982).

In the novel *Herland* women get children by parthenogenesis (Perkins Gilman 1915). In *Women at the Edge of Time* (Piercy 1976), the foetus is taken care of by machines; in 'The Other Country' (my transl.; Eckblad 1986), women are encouraged to postpone childbearing until they are in their thirties.

These three novels, written by women in different times and cultures, are all built on the same basic values: mothering and the needs of children. This is also in accordance with the feminist perspective I have argued for. A feminist utopia involves a new moral principle to guide our actions, reasoning, sensing and imagination. The nucleus of this principle (to be applied in the political as well as economical and technological spheres), is *reproduction*.

Reproduction refers to maintaining and renewing. It has a physical-biological aspect as well as a cultural one (Halsaa 1987). It is relevant both when it comes to reproduction of nature/the ecosystem and when it comes to reproduction of wo/mankind. One might use the concept 'sustainable development' (Brundtland Commission 1987, NAVF 1988) when referring to the reproduction of nature, and 'needs of children' when referring to the social reproduction of wo/mankind.

If you pay proper attention to optimal reproduction processes, you improve the lot of all, both future generations and nature, without letting women carry the sole burden. Consider reproduction, and you have a key to the solution of the particular female burdens, whether you think of paid work, housework, caring, etc.

This is not to say that women's interests are always compatible with the

interests of children, or that women are intrinsically and always very caring human beings. It is more a question of stating the fact that today women are the primary adults responsible for the care of children and adults; that women still carry a moral urge to give priority to the needs of others (Gilligan 1982; Halsaa 1987; Wærness 1985).

A feminist utopia must be founded on the concept of a female standard. This standard is based on the rearing and caring of children, about preparing for birth and death, about structuring society around concrete life processes. It is based on the *value of differences* between men and women, well documented through feminist research all over the world (Stang Dahl 1988). Instead of 'opening up' the male standard for women, as in the equal right's strategy, feminism is about giving priority to the female standard, and opening it up for men.

Strategic Considerations

I will not go into details concerning strategy. Nevertheless, a few ideas will be briefly presented.

One might start by listing the main social institutions of today and ask which of them are indispensable, and in what way. The military would obviously disappear; the porn industry as well. These are both examples of intrinsic parts of patriarchy, of control, domination and violence. The family and the educational system, however, would have to change fundamentally, but not disappear. We need a family institution for intimacy and personal relationships, but not the nuclear family as the only ideal. It is quite possible to build families on the basis of friendships. And we certainly need education for reproduction, caring and nurturing.

The production could no longer use poisonous chemicals, neither in agriculture nor in the production of goods. Production would not be allowed to use energy without properly taking care of the reproduction of energy itself.

Several claims, like the 6-hours' day and abortion on demand, important and legitimate claims today, would probably be irrelevant in a feminist utopia. In a society where rape is non-existent, where sexuality is voluntary, where production is adjusted according to reproduction, where mothering is respected and children praised, there would be no need for abortion on demand. In a society where production is based on use, where work is adjusted to human need for variety and continuity, and where the physical distance between home and work is drastically reduced, people would not need restrictions on the normal hours of a work day like we do. The relationship between work, love and leisure would be changed, probably making our legitimate claims inappropriate.

A different political strategy would be to focus on *one* of the main institutions only, change it fundamentally, and thereby cause numerous side-effects: Take away the military, for instance, and stop training new soldiers. Let all the potential recruits (18–20 year old men) stay in their neighbourhood to take care of young children. The consequences would be that the military would gradually disappear, and young men would be given a radically different experience – you would simply change the socialization of men. Furthermore, the problem of empty neighbourhoods and suburbs would disappear as the young men established their activities and their culture where they naturally lived. The problem of lacking child care would be solved as the young men would take care of neighbourhood children, supervised by the parents, grand-parents and trained personnel.

When this new arrangement is established, it could be advisable to shorten the young men's obligations to half a year, and let the young women step in. In this way, young men and women would be trained for parenting and other caring roles, trained to co-operate, to appreciate and to tolerate each other. The last six months of the service could, for instance, be used for both sexes to care for the elderly and disabled. This would give them a concrete sense of belonging, and a responsibility extended far beyond the nuclear family. Also, it would give them a closer and more direct experience with illness and death as a normal part of our life cycle.

What do we do with all the generals and officers? Let them use most of their free time working out ways of changing the war industry towards peaceful ends. Part of the time, however, could be spent in the garbage disposal areas where they would supervise the work of youngsters (12–14 years), who take their share in the cleaning up process on the basis of a two weeks yearly rotation. This would certainly create a more relevant consciousness of our present waste and contamination, and stimulate towards better ways of saving and using food and goods.

Reproduction, Rationality and Aesthetics

In this project, however, I have sought for general principles on which to build a better future, rather than look for concrete ideas for future institutions. I have argued that the principle of reproduction should be the basic political principle in a feminist utopia. For women to be liberated, the dominance of production over reproduction has to come to an end. For women, men and children, as well as for nature, to be liberated, this implies that the domination of the rationality of utility over the rationality of care must stop.

Rationality 'describes the kind of reasoning which people of any epoch use to describe their world, and thus – consciously or unconsciously – to

make their own history and their own future' (Hall 1977). The *rationality of utility* is based on logical reason. It implies a mechanical, fragmented, and utilitarian concept of wo/man. Behaviour and politics are based on calculation and profit. The *rationality of care*, on the other hand, is based on intuitive feeling, with a cyclical, holistic and loving concept of wo/man. Behaviour and politics are based on moral obligations and love. According to feminist theory, the politics of the male culture is distinguished by the rationality of utility, whereas the politics of the female culture is characterized by the rationality of care (Halsaa 1988; Wærness 1984; Sørensen 1977).

Feminist theory, however, is marked by a dualist tradition. This dualism is symbolized by the focus on production/reproduction and on the two forms of rationality just mentioned. All the concern for love, care and peace which this implies, however, may give strong associations to a harmonious but rather dull utopian world. People are kind, but life is quiet-running.

The dualism also restricts the feminist perspective. Modern, industrial society is not only distinguished by the lack of the rationality of caring; it is also suffering from lack of beauty, imagination and sensuousness. Our culture is hideous. We are often reduced to passive consumers, and our senses are blunt.

To overcome the dualism in feminist theory, to extend the feminist critique of society, and to construct a utopia that is concerned about joy and beauty, I therefore suggest the inclusion of another principle, the *rationality of aesthetics*.

I contend that if you add aesthetics to a feminist utopia based on care, you have the opposite of a dull society. Aesthetics is, after all, about continuously criticizing and enlarging our understanding of the world; of developing the potential for imagination, and is thereby a contribution to the raising of genuinely open-minded wo/men.

The modern concept of aesthetics originated in the eighteenth century as an attempt to conciliate two old traditions; the theories of beauty and the theories of art. The concept thus implies two different aspects, not always compatible. In this context, aesthetics will be used in this double meaning.

Aesthetics thus refers partly to our capacity for creative, imaginary behaviour and thinking, i.e. to our artistic potentiality, but also partly to our ability to enjoy beauty, in art as well as in nature. It is thus linked to our senses, but not the way science or morals are. I refer to aesthetics as a different mode of knowing than both the logical-rational way and the moral-caring way, that is, as a rationality in its own right.

Aesthetics is something we don't need to survive, but like sexuality, life is poorer without art and beauty (Dahlerup 1987). It is closely linked to

our senses; sight, feeling, listening, tasting, moving, etc. It is a vital part of our human potential, important for a critical attitude.

Aesthetics is about interpreting and constructing reality. Where science interprets by means of logic and concepts, aesthetics does it by way of intuition and symbols. Where science asks for the cause and effect of things, aesthetics asks for the form of things. Where science structures our thoughts and looks for regularity, unity and unambiguity, aesthetics structures our understanding of what is behind the visible, empirical properties of things, looking for *the form of things*, their manifold and variety (Cassirer 1947).

Science restricts and simplifies, *art extends and intensifies reality*. Take the example of water; water is reduced to H₂O in science, always, whatever, while in poetry, music, ballet, painting, water has infinite ways of being expressed, making our lives richer. The effect is to give us pleasure, and make us see the world differently.

There are several theories as to why aesthetics gives us pleasure. One is that aesthetics gives us a feeling of freedom: Wo/man is a product of nature, and therefore is restricted by natural laws. But we are also products of culture, and in aesthetics we transcend the boundaries of natural laws and become free (Dahlerup 1987).

Aesthetics is partly about beauty; the organic beauty of nature and culture. The concept of the sublime is important in this connection. *The sublime*, in Kant's writings, refers to the quantitative aspect of things, however, whereas beauty refers to the quality of things. The sublime is the immense or the elevated, and can be experienced as a force (like a waterfall), or as infinity (the stars in the sky, or numbers for example). In this respect, aesthetics is an important reminder of things larger than wo/man, and should make us humble.

Modern artists have become producers of a commodity to be sold in the market. The market itself has become the dominating arena to mediate art. Art is now a commodity to be owned. This is contrary to Kant's ideas of beauty, as part of aesthetics. Beauty is what spontaneously and disinterestedly gives us pleasure: 'One does not desire the stars'. And it is contrary to Brecht's contention of the critical function of art: Art should be used to expose the possibilities of a better world; to make us see what is, in the light of what could be (Brochmann 1979).

What concerns me even more than the role of professional art and artists is building a world in which the aesthetic capacity in each of us is encouraged the most – a world where the aesthetic imagination is not only accepted, but even valued in its own right; where beauty is nurtured and where the creation of beauty and the ability to experience aesthetics are taken seriously.

The aesthetical potential in each of us is now suffering under bad conditions, for instance in the educational system. In general, the noise

and stress in modern society is contrary to the principles of aesthetics. We need *time and quiet* to develop the inner qualities of aesthetic experience. We need opportunities to listen to and get in touch with our inner creative capabilities, however small. In one sentence: we need to take 'the pressure' from our inside seriously. In order to do that, we need to decrease the continuous stream of external pressure, whether it is the stream of material things, or the stream of words, pictures or other symbols (Berg Eriksen 1986). Michael Ende's novel *Momo* illustrates this very convincingly. The paragraph where Momo tries to play with a modern 'talking' doll is a brilliant example (Ende 1957).

The distinction between natural time and clock time should be made (Hernes 1987; Tornes 1983; Negt 1984). Natural time is cyclic, following the rhythm of nature and culture (like spring, summer, fall, childhood, youth, etc.), whereas clock time is mechanical and linear. Reproduction and the rationality of care is based on natural time, while modern production and the rationality of utility is based on clock time; time as money.

Imagine what would happen if Parliament could pass a law making *natural time the standard* time, and clock time the extraordinary time! Not only would the rationality of care profit from such a change, so would the conditions for practising the aesthetic fantasy.

A feminist utopia along these lines is not a nostalgic dream of returning to the time standard of the good old days. It is rather the dream of a new ethic where wo/man is not placed above nature, and material things not above living organisms. It is also a prospective dream of a time standard in accordance with our dependency on nature and on each other.

As a first step towards more peace and quiet; one could for a start introduce two days a week free from television, broadcasting and maybe even newspapers, and at least one day a week with no private cars in the streets. It might be a good idea also to cut off electricity twice a month – when this is technically possible in relation to refrigerators, freezers, etc. It would save huge amounts of electricity (or gas), would make the stars visible, and it might even stimulate us to relate in new ways, maybe around the candle light. And who knows, we might regain our lost sense of storytelling, too?

A feminist utopia must be based on a politics promoting new relationships between production, reproduction and aesthetics. The superior principle should be reproduction. Consequently, the aesthetics should not be left alone, according to its own standards, but rather be regulated by the criteria of reproduction. The same goes for production. Aesthetics and production should both promote reproduction, and not, as today, restrict it (Grøtvedt 1987).

Accordingly, the relationship between the three forms of rationalities today should be turned upside down. The rationality of caring should be

the dominant one. The relationship between the three should not, however, be understood as unilateral, but as dialectical. Production in a utopia is not contradictory to reproduction, but an addition, and so is aesthetics. The rationality of utility is, accordingly, not to be neglected, but rather to be adjusted to the principle of care. As for the rationality of aesthetics, this will be considered as important as the rationality of utility.

Whether this implies a denial of three separate, autonomous forms of rationality, as in Habermas' concept of 'the modern project' (Habermas 1981, 1983; Nørager 1987), or merely to be understood as a strategy to defy the present destructive dominance of production and the principle of utility, is a question for further research.

REFERENCES

- Bjørhovde, G. 1988. 'Feministiske utopier i litteraturen, in Halsaa & Gornitzka, eds., *En feministisk utopi og veier dit*. Oslo: Alternativ Framtid.
- Bloch, E. 1959. *Da Prinzip Hoffnung*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.
- Bomann-Larsen, J. 1988. 'Oversikt over forsøk med Another Economics', (Preliminary title) Manus, Oslo: Alternativ Framtid.
- Brochman, J. 1974. 'Estetikk'. Oslo: *Pax leksikon*.
- Brundtland, G. 1987. (ed.) *Our Common Future*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press. The World Commission on Environment & Development.
- Cassirer, E. 1947. *An Essay on Man*. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press.
- Dahlerup, P. 1987. *Lyst og ulyst*. København: Gyldendal.
- Eckblad, G. 1986. *Det andre landet*. Oslo: Solum.
- Eduards, M., Halsaa, B. & Skjeie, H. 1985. 'Equality: How Equal?', in Haavio-Mannila et al. Pergamon Press.
- Edwarden, A. 1988. 'Den siste motbakke mot likestillingen?', i Bergby et al. eds. *Underveis*. Oslo: Aventura.
- Ende, M. 1957. *Momo* (Norwegian trans., Oslo 1986, Ex Libris).
- Eriksen, T. B. 1986. *Den usynlige død og andre essays*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Gilligan, C. 1982. *In a Different Voice*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Gilman, C. P. 1915. *Herland*, Oslo [1980] (Norwegian ed. Pax).
- Grøtvedt, P. 1987. *Moderniteten og post-modernismen*. Oslo: Aventura.
- Habermas, J. 1981. *Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns*. Frankfurt am Main.
- Habermas, J. 1983. 'Sammenflettingen av myte og opplysning', *Sosiologi i dag*, nr. 2-3, 29-49.
- Hagtvet, B. 1981. 'Utopier'. *Pax Leksikon*. Oslo: Pax.
- Hall, P. 1977. *Europe 2000*. London: Duckworth.
- Haavio-Mannila, E. 1985. *Unfinished Democracy*. Pergamon Press.
- Halsaa, B. 1988. 'Fragmenter til feministisk utopi'. *En feministisk utopi, og veier dit*. Oslo: Alternativ Framtid.
- Halsaa, B. 1987. 'Har kvinner felles interesser', *Kvinnevitenskapelig Tidsskrift* nr. 4, 42-55.
- Hernes, H. 1987. 'Arbeidstidspolitikk og livsløpspolitikk'. *NOU 1987:9b*; Vedlegg til Arbeidstidsutvalgets utredning, Oslo.
- Holter, H. 1984. *Patriarchy in a Welfare Society*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Højgaard, G. 1981. 'Drømmen om kvindelandet', i Koch, Nynne ed., *Kvindestudier 5*. Copenhagen: Delta.
- Jaggard, A. M. 1983. *Feminist Politics and Human Nature*. Ottawa: Rowman & Allanhead.
- Kant, I. 1983. *Kritik der Urteilskraft* (Norw. trans. in Storheim, ed., *Kant. Moral, politikk og historie*. Oslo.
- Manuel, F. E. & Fritzie, P. 1979. *Utopian Thought in the Western World*. Blackwell.

the dominant one. The relationship between the three should not, however, be understood as unilateral, but as dialectical. Production in a utopia is not contradictory to reproduction, but an addition, and so is aesthetics. The rationality of utility is, accordingly, not to be neglected, but rather to be adjusted to the principle of care. As for the rationality of aesthetics, this will be considered as important as the rationality of utility.

Whether this implies a denial of three separate, autonomous forms of rationality, as in Habermas' concept of 'the modern project' (Habermas 1981, 1983; Nørager 1987), or merely to be understood as a strategy to defy the present destructive dominance of production and the principle of utility, is a question for further research.

REFERENCES

- Bjørhovde, G. 1988. 'Feministiske utopier i litteraturen, in Halsaa & Gornitzka, eds., *En feministisk utopi og veier dit*. Oslo: Alternativ Framtid.
- Bloch, E. 1959. *Da Prinzip Hoffnung*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.
- Bomann-Larsen, J. 1988. 'Oversikt over forsøk med Another Economics', (Preliminary title) Manus, Oslo: Alternativ Framtid.
- Brochman, J. 1974. 'Estetikk'. Oslo: *Pax leksikon*.
- Brundtland, G. 1987. (ed.) *Our Common Future*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press. The World Commission on Environment & Development.
- Cassirer, E. 1947. *An Essay on Man*. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press.
- Dahlerup, P. 1987. *Lyst og ulyst*. København: Gyldendal.
- Eckblad, G. 1986. *Det andre landet*. Oslo: Solum.
- Eduards, M., Halsaa, B. & Skjeie, H. 1985. 'Equality: How Equal?', in Haavio-Mannila et al. Pergamon Press.
- Edwarden, A. 1988. 'Den siste motbakke mot likestillingen?', i Bergby et al. eds. *Underveis*. Oslo: Aventura.
- Ende, M. 1957. *Momo* (Norwegian trans., Oslo 1986, Ex Libris).
- Eriksen, T. B. 1986. *Den usynlige død og andre essays*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Gilligan, C. 1982. *In a Different Voice*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Gilman, C. P. 1915. *Herland*, Oslo [1980] (Norwegian ed. Pax).
- Grøtvedt, P. 1987. *Moderniteten og post-modernismen*. Oslo: Aventura.
- Habermas, J. 1981. *Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns*. Frankfurt am Main.
- Habermas, J. 1983. 'Sammenflettingen av myte og opplysning', *Sosiologi i dag*, nr. 2-3, 29-49.
- Hagtvet, B. 1981. 'Utopier'. *Pax Leksikon*. Oslo: Pax.
- Hall, P. 1977. *Europe 2000*. London: Duckworth.
- Haavio-Mannila, E. 1985. *Unfinished Democracy*. Pergamon Press.
- Halsaa, B. 1988. 'Fragmenter til feministisk utopi'. *En feministisk utopi, og veier dit*. Oslo: Alternativ Framtid.
- Halsaa, B. 1987. 'Har kvinner felles interesser', *Kvinnevitenskapelig Tidsskrift* nr. 4, 42-55.
- Hernes, H. 1987. 'Arbeidstidspolitikk og livsløpspolitikk'. *NOU 1987:9b*; Vedlegg til Arbeidstidsutvalgets utredning, Oslo.
- Holter, H. 1984. *Patriarchy in a Welfare Society*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Højgaard, G. 1981. 'Drømmen om kvindelandet', i Koch, Nynne ed., *Kvindestudier 5*. Copenhagen: Delta.
- Jaggard, A. M. 1983. *Feminist Politics and Human Nature*. Ottawa: Rowman & Allanhead.
- Kant, I. 1983. *Kritik der Urteilskraft* (Norw. trans. in Storheim, ed., *Kant. Moral, politikk og historie*. Oslo.
- Manuel, F. E. & Fritzie, P. 1979. *Utopian Thought in the Western World*. Blackwell.

- Mellor, A. K. 1982. 'On feminist utopias', *Women's Studies* 1982 vol. 9 (Swedish trans., *Kvinnovetenskapelig Tidsskrift* no. 1).
- More, T. 1979. *Utopia* (Swedish trans.). Uppsala: Carmina Klassiker.
- NAVF 1988. *One Earth – One World*. Report from a research conference on environment and development. Oslo: The Norwegian Research Council for Science and the Humanities.
- Negt, O. 1985. *Lebendige Arbeit, enteignete Zeit* (Danish trans.) Det levende arbejde, den stjålne tid. Copenhagen: Politisk Revy.
- Nørager, T. 1987. *System og livsverden*. Århus: Anis.
- Piercy, M. 1976. *Woman at the edge of time* (Danish ed.) Gyldendal [1986].
- Plato, 1969. *The Republic*. (English ed. London: Oxford Univ. Press).
- Ricci, D. 1984. *The Tragedy of Political Science*. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press.
- Rohrlich, R. & B. 1984. *Elaine Hoffman: Women in Search of Utopia*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Segal, L. 1987. *Is the Future Female?* London: Virago.
- Siim, B. 1987. 'Towards a Feminist Re-Thinking of the Welfare State', in Jónasdóttir & Jones, eds., *The Political Interests of Gender: Developing Theory and Research with a Feminist Face*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Stang Dahl, T. 1988. 'Kvinneres rett til penger', Paper at Nordic Sex Equality Conference during Nordic Forum, Blindern, Oslo.
- Sørensen, B. Å. 1977. 'Arbeidskvinner og verdighet' i Berg et al. eds., *I kvinners bilde*. Oslo: UniPax.
- Tornes, K. 1983. 'Kvinner og tid' i Skrede & Tornes eds., *Studier i kvinners livsløp*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Woll, M. A. 1981. 'Om kvinders plassering i Thomas Mores "Utopia"' i Nynne Koch, ed. *Kvindestudier 5*, Copenhagen: Delta.
- Wærness, K. 1984. 'Caring as Woman's Work in the Welfare State', in Harriet Holter, ed., *Patriarchy in a Welfare Society*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Wærness, K. 1984. 'The Rationality of Caring', *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 5, 185–210.