that we simply don't see the wood for the trees, as administrative practices have become all-pervasive and we lost the imagination of living our lives in a different way. Further, standardization has an intrinsic ahistorical aspect to itself, as it is usually a previous step to the actual task and, thus, easily overlooked. Standards are part of invisible infrastructures, just take the electricity grid and the standards that come with it as an example (Star & Lampland 2009: 10–11). „Standardizing has become a central feature of social and cultural life in modernity. The purpose of standardizing – to streamline procedures or regulate behaviors, to demand specific results, or to prevent harm – is rarely queried because it has come to be understood as a valuable and necessary, even if cumbersome, process" (Star & Lampland 2009: 10).

When visible though, the prominent claim of bureaucracy being ultimately rational is a highly contested one considering the arbitrariness of standards (Star & Lapland 2009: 15). Standards have to be set somewhere – the exact point to which they are set might be a pure coincidence. Not only does bureaucracy in this case fail to hold its promise to ultimate rationality but also becomes arbitrary. Arbitrariness is one of the core features of the critique of bureaucracy and the frustration, anger and confusion that people facing it express. Standards are an incomplete and inadequate depiction of the reality they try to regulate. „The push to standardize presumes to constrain a phenomenon within a particular set of dimensions, as well as the ability to dictate behavior to achieve the narrowly defined dimensions that stimulate its outcome" (Star & Lampland 2009: 14). There is a certain dichotomy between „the constructed" and „the real" in bureaucratic procedure (Hull 2012: 5). Certainly, in order to deal with a messy reality one needs to simplify things. But the gap that results from this process is large and affects peoples lives seriously. David Graeber (2015: 48) goes further to the point of framing bureaucracies as utopian projects, arguing that „a significant proportion of actors will not be