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The illustration represents my areas of inquiry (the outer circles), then how I relate them to each other (the faded white shapes) and where I am aiming to end up (the white in the center), and the dark layer behind being the uncertainty of the beginning of my design process.
ABSTRACT

This BA thesis is about an attempt to explore micro-utopianism through design, an investigation that seeks which driving forces come into play in a search for a better place. In comparison to conventional utopianism, I will give my insights about why micro-utopianism should instead be practiced as an alternative approach to the subject. It is more about the process, exploring, imagining and experimenting rather than constituting a perfect place. The way I chose to go about this was through participatory design, which is a discipline that involves the stakeholders throughout the whole design process and beyond. I will also talk about dissecting as a design method and how I tried this out to explore micro-utopianism. To do this, the participants and I conducted two workshops so that, together with the participants, we could have a space where our imagination could ‘gestalta’ (or ‘exterpret’) thoughts of critique and opportunities. The two workshops were targeting different age groups: in the first one mainly adults participated and the second workshop was with youth. This will give you an insight of how dissecting can be applied to stimulate the utopian impulse using the power of imagination.
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BACKGROUND

What made me interested in studying utopian theories, apart from it being an intriguing area of possibilities, is the close connection to the kind of design area that I have been familiarizing myself with for the past three years: design for sustainability. The way I look at this practice and how I interpret it is: there are many possible ways of designing a chair, but the best one might be not to design one at all and instead find other means of approaching the task without assuming that the chair is the ideal solution. Even though I believe design and utopia are closely related, from an outside perspective it may seem that the two are distant areas that do not touch each other and originate from two completely different worlds. What motivates me is trying to explain to participants that utopianism and design (and change) are obvious companions that interact on several different layers, for is it not so that the purpose of design is to make a change? To envision how a controversy can be solved to then make that reality? The tension of bringing about the two subjects is what fascinates me, but also where challenges are starting to appear. Traditionally, utopia is a criticism of the contemporary, a criticism of a particular social structure and a longing for a place where everything seems to be perfectly intertwined, a place that is better than the pursuer is positioned in now. It appears that the greater margin of utopian theories and literature is situated in the future, one that may not be intended to put into practice. This leads me to the question; why these future visions? Should utopias be practiced and if so, how? It is somewhere here that I position myself in relation to my research, assuming that, unlike conventional utopianism, it is possible to act utopically now, i.e. ‘be utopian’ (Exyzt, 2018) and that a utopia does not at all need to pursue
a society of perfection, nor should it be a favor to feed neo-liberalism ideology. Instead, it should encourage small changes in the present as ways of practicing utopianism. With this starting point, some constructive questions follow such as, why this approach? And as mentioned before, how should one go about forming this kind of utopianism? What tools can be used to address areas that can be changed?

‘The theory of change behind micro-utopias is that if we offer a tangible glimpse or experience of a more desirable future, then people will be more likely to believe that such a future is possible and potentially participate in manifesting it. Further, if a critical mass of micro-utopias are created, then societies will be more capable of understanding and manifesting new societal structures, processes and relationships. Micro-utopias are by their nature temporary - they are not meant to be a definitive solution delivered by outsiders, but a model of what could be and a way to stimulate public imagination.’ (Duncombe and Lambert, 2017, 253-272).
FRAMING/INTRODUCTION

Since the beginning my plan was to design with people using methods related to co-design and participatory design, conducting workshops and fly in the dark, which I can describe as a mode in which one embraces not knowing completely which direction the process is heading, collecting abstract or intangible data to then go deeper into analysing those events. In my case together with other participants, to aim for a concrete and tangible outcome. My research question is how can dissection be used to practice micro-utopianism? I have composed my research question to have something to anchor my process within, and not to fly in the completely wrong direction. I believe there are many answers to this question, but I want to put great emphasis on the utopian impulse, which can be translated into ‘the fundamental will to change’ (Jameson 1994, 2010, cited in Bradley & Hedrén, 2014, 9) and this is where I have tried to intervene through design and the knowledge I have gathered over the past three years of my studies at Linnaeus University. It also means that I have not only tried to find out how the utopian impulse can be used, but also what this desire means and for whom? Through using idea generative design methods and holding workshops together with participants I have investigated if it is possible to show a result which we, the participants, feel like honest reflections of their emotions and concerns that arise about the contemporary environment. As well to push the boundaries of not only societal orders, but the way we imagine and perceive things i.e. the importance of the ‘opening of the mind to alternative possibilities: We need to broaden the range of imaginable alternatives’ (Jameson 2005 cited in Bradley & Hedrén 2014, 10). and the ‘power of imagination’ (Bradley & Hedrén, 2014, 10).

PURPOSE

This project/research/experiment is relevant for the reasons that there is a relationship to both social and environmental sustainability and the change that can potentially come with utopian thoughts and practices, which as a subject of itself criticizes and deals with changes in structures. By trying to understand what the utopian impulse really means and where or what it consists of, as a collective of humans the concepts of sustainability in its different forms will be addressed through practices of change. The purpose of this project is to generate ideas of alternative ways of acting within a society, pushing boundaries of societal structures. With the ‘power of imagination’ (Bradley & Hedrén, 2014, 10) originated in the participants taking part in this project, the aim is to expand the ‘realm of the possible’ (Wood, 2007) and stimulate the ‘utopian impulse’ (Bradley & Hedrén, 2014). An attempt to practice micro-utopianism through dissection.
PROCESS/METHOD

Together with a colleague from the design program at Linnaeus University, I constructed what is my own take on micro-utopia: a small farm on wheels which I can bring wherever I want. I do not have to worry about who owns the land because it is not anchored to a specific site, nor is it flying, but I believe it is drifting somewhere in between the lines of institution and too-hard-to-grasp-so-it-needs-to-be-regulated. It started off a self-exploration of micro-utopia, for myself to explore this theory. I thought about where I am situated, my circumstances, my needs, how I can construct something and go beyond current ways of acting in my everyday life, to fill my needs without relying on existing societal structures. Bradley and Hedrén state that ‘There are outright basic needs to immediately practice alternatives, to stimulate the utopian impulse telling us that change is both possible and necessary [...]’ (Bradley & Hedrén, 2014, 2), which reflects my take on this topic. I live in an apartment in Växjö where I have no access to land free for me to use however I want, besides the indoor floor of the apartment that I am renting. A basic need which I share with all living beings is the access to food. Situated within this context I thought: how can I be self-sufficient with at least some of the food I consume?

I needed a place for my food to grow, which led to the construction of a small farm. This would not fit in my apartment, neither get enough sun for the plants to thrive. If I were to place it just outside in the front yard of my building then I might have been fined by the real estate company or for public order disruption. I thought I had two choices: to cancel the project, or to come up with a way to go around the issue. It struck me when I looked out through my window at the horse paddock that is located right outside my building, as a horse stood there. She can easily move to another spot when her dining area has been consumed. If a person approaches the fence and the horse does not want a confrontation, it can move to a safer place. In the same way I thought my farm should be able to move to avoid conflicts. I therefore chose to put legs, or more correctly wheels, on my farm. In this way, I thought of my farm as a vehicle, like a car that also has wheels and can move freely but does not become a public disturbance just because it’s standing still. I would say this was a form of repurposing. Taking an existing thing, may it be an object, system or structure, facing controversies to then add/remove something or reform it so that it can continue to fulfill a purpose in a different shape and in this case, go beyond what is considered conventional.

I used this farm as an inquiry to how micro-utopianism can be practiced, to explain the concept itself for the participants of my process, and as the starting point of the narrative I developed.
DISSECTING

To continue exploring the possible meanings of micro-utopias, I participated in a workshop held by Marie O’Connor at Linnaeus University in Kalmar. At the location, other participants and I were introduced to ‘unpicking’, which is the action of taking an object apart to then observe its components, background and possibly create a new meaning out of these. I had brought soil with me from my micro-utopia that I proceeded to unpick. I sort of screened the soil and placed the different components in different piles to then see what the soil contained. I found rocks, clay, fibers, grass and perhaps most interesting, a tiny bit of glitter, i.e. plastic, or a footprint of human technology. What remained after the screening process was, as I see it, tiny pieces of refined soil for which I created a separate pile. It seemed to me that each of the unpicked components were merely empty bodies, however, together they created a kind of microcosmos, one that is commonly called soil. This was a huge milestone for me as it hit me how dependent these components are on each other to act as a whole body.
DISSECTING SOIL

A MICRO COSMOS

SOIL FROM MY FARM

WHAT IF?

Documentation from the Unpicking workshop in Kalmar with Marie O’Connor.
Inspired by the film *Powers of Ten* by Charles and Ray Eames (1977), which begins ‘with a close-up shot of a man sleeping near the lakeside in Chicago, viewed from one meter away. The landscape steadily moves out until it reveals the edge of the known universe. Then, at a rate of 10-to-the-tenth meters per second, the film takes us towards Earth again, continuing back to the sleeping man’s hand and eventually down to the level of a carbon atom.’ (Eamesoffice.com, 2018) I zoomed out of the microcosmos, the soil or the structures I found in it, just to stop at the level of our society - translating the components I found in the soil to structures that can be found in the human society. This is when I saw a relationship between the two different zooming scales: just as the soil and its components depend on each other (working together to become soil), the society where we (humans) are situated in becomes a society when structures are made, connected and used by us.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEFORE:</th>
<th>ROCKS</th>
<th>GRASS</th>
<th>CLAY</th>
<th>FIBERS</th>
<th>GLITTER</th>
<th>REFINED SOIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRANSLATED:</td>
<td>VALUES AND ETHICS</td>
<td>NATURE</td>
<td>LAWS/ NORMS</td>
<td>COMMUNICATION</td>
<td>TECHNOLOGY/ MAN-MADE</td>
<td>PEOPLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now there was a question of how and if I could continue to build upon the material generated through the workshop in Kalmar.

After attending the workshop I started playing with the method of unpicking and I believe dissecting is a more accurate word to define my own process. I borrowed the term dissection, which is a method practiced within biology. Could this be a method used in design? Can it be used to address the purposes of micro-utopia, i.e. to explore, stimulate imagination, experimenting and to make a change? In biology ‘dissection provides concrete, hands-on learning experiences’ (Offner, 1993, 147-149), hence I will argue that it may reinforce the understanding of evolution and similarities and interrelationships between animals. Just as in biology, where dissection is used to better understand animals, could we use this practice to deepen our knowledge about objects, structures and systems of our society? Felix Guattari argues that in order to make a change in a system it needs to be reinvented from scratch (Guattari, 2014, 39). I, instead, want to explore if dissecting as a tool can be used to dig deeper into an object (being part of a system) to explore relations between the components, form new stories, take parts away or add new parts. Can this contribute to new ways of seeing things? If one looks at the actual experience of dissecting, there are some similarities with prototyping, a method of participatory design where the focus is more on the sensorial aspects rather than on the design as being visually appealing, allowing for participants to reconnect with their senses (Thorpe, 2007, 142).

**WHY DISSECTING?**

Deconstructivism, introduced by Jacques Derrida, is a similar method although it seems to be very focused on the object alone and how it was created, while I propose that dis-
secting, in this context, is a wider approach as it looks beyond the creation of things. It is also the biological background of dissecting which I believe is easier to grasp: the evolution of a dissected subject, the interrelationships between several and the use of one’s senses while dissecting. Not to forget, it is interesting to look at the connotation that comes with a word as ‘it has been known for centuries that language pre-determines the belief systems that guide our behaviour’ (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). Languaging, which is a metadesign method, is addressing this and how to create new meanings out of words, rearranging letters, combining words and inventing new ones. From my perspective, languaging could be seen as an already existing method practicing dissection within a specific field, as by ‘changing the metaphorical and syntactical structures of language (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980) we can re-attune ourselves to new ‘realities’. (Metadesigners.org, 2018) Maybe this is a way of expanding the ‘realm of possible’ (Wood, 2007). I also want to emphasize that dissecting can be a way to analyze and question the different parts by themselves and in relation to others: what do the different organs or components consist of? What are the stories behind the specific parts and how do they relate to parts of other systems?

PARTICIPATORY DESIGN

I have chosen to position myself exactly where I believe I should be, as one who does not have the answers, but has a library of tools which I am willing to share to further explore. One way I like to think of my role is as one who works in a grocery store, who can provide customers/participants with a set of necessities, but does not necessarily know how to cook the perfect stew. This means I am as much involved in the learning process as other participants. Participatory Design (PD) is an approach which involves all stakeholders in the design process, which is key for the end result. This may seem obvious to those who practice within this field, but it might not be the case of the stakeholders. Thus, I tried to be very careful with how I introduced myself, using language and creating an environment which was appropriate for its purpose and to allow for participants to feel safe during the design process. My role within this was also to function as a facilitator of two workshops.

I see PD as a design method in itself which works as a framework where other tools and methods of design can be applied. It is also a way to reduce the risk of failure in the process as participants bring a wide variety of knowledge to the process. It opens up for a dialogue between all people involved where the role of every participant is at an equal level and where values are trying to be met. This can give a confidence boost for the people participating, which creates a safer space but also allows for better results. As opposed to me, the designer, being the executive author of the work, the owner, in PD everyone involved in the process has their part ownership of the outcome. (Participateindesign.org, 2018) This is a strong motivation for me to use PD as I believe that sharing ownership shows a transparency of the process, but maybe more importantly, ‘If we are to design the futures we wish to live, then we need those whose futures they will be to actively participate in their design.’ (Simonsen & Robertson, 2012, 1).

If one looks at the history of PD, one of the first strong cases is called ‘Utopia’ (Ehn, 1988). It was ‘a Scandinavian research and development project on trade union based development of, and training in, computer technology and work organisation, especially text and image processing in graphic and newspaper production’ (Ehn, 1988, 343), working with Aftonbladet, a Swedish newspaper. Although this differs significantly from what
I am trying to achieve with my project, there are some similarities as ‘Utopia’ achieved ‘experience-based design methods, developed through the focus on hands-on experiences, emphasizing the need for technical and organizational alternatives’ (Bødker et al., 1987, 251–278) involving participants in the process.

To continue I planned two workshops where I wanted to introduce the participants to the concept of micro-utopia.

WORKSHOP NO.1

The first workshop was positioned within a context of people from many different age groups and backgrounds. This took place during the Earth Week in Växjö where the participants were visitors of all ages, although I aimed to reach adults ~40-70 years old. It took the shape of an open workshop where I brought my micro-utopia, the moving farm. I also brought six pots of soil which represented the six categories I made from the components of the soil I had dissected in the workshop with Marie. I asked the participants to look at the different categories and to, on a note, write about where they would like to see change happen. Afterwards they were asked to put the note in a jar, then plant a seed in one of the pots related to that category (see page 11). The intention of this workshop was for me to get an understanding of where values are situated, and to evoke the utopian impulse. Is it a myth or is this utopian impulse actually present?

There was a great risk of constructing a workshop in this way as I could not in any way affect how many participants would attend. Soon after the workshop I could count to 36 participants, some of whom participated actively where discussions about micro-utopias got to take place, but the larger margin of the participants briefly conveyed their thoughts. However, I do not regret the layout as it turned out to be open to a wide variety of dialogues.

As time went on, the open workshop got a bigger purpose. It had become not only open in its format but also open to all types of inputs and during the latter part of the workshop, a man stopped at my table, sat down and looked at me. I then explained who I was, my process, my purpose and the steps that had led me to hold this open workshop and how to participate in it. He seemed very interested and started, initially, a monologue which later became a discussion that lasted half an hour. The man said that he had his own model of how immigrants could better be integrated into the Swedish society. He created a scenario of two sides, of which, on the one hand, Swedish society was placed and the opposite side immigrants. In between, there was a thread that he said consisted of language, which the Swedish state is emphasizing as crucial for successful integration. He then argued that language should be approached in new ways, generating new threads, but also that teaching the Swedish language does not have to be the only solution for integration. I added that just as one single thread can not carry a big wave of different types of people, a bridge connecting a city cannot not carry all the heavy traffic trying to enter, but there should be many bridges and several different ways to get over them to avoid a bottleneck sieving the greater the number people using the bridge. The
man then drew a picture of a carpet on a piece of paper, and then said ‘the same way a carpet is woven, with several threads that create a bridge from one end to the other and with strings that go sideways and connects the whole, then a system of integration could work. If a thread breaks, the entire carpet will not be destroyed, but it can then be repaired and you may walk across it. Were we, through this conversation getting closer to practising dissection? A theoretical one?

Sketch by participant, ‘the carpet’, from the workshop during Växjö Earth Week.

Notes from the jar of the workshop during Växjö Earth Week.
GROWING VALUES

Documentation from the first workshop I facilitated at Växjö Earth Week.
WORKSHOP NO.2

The second workshop took place in Ytterjärna, located outside Södertälje. There I visited the Youth Initiative Program (YIP), which is ‘a platform for young people to develop their fullest potential, to expand their understanding, find their authentic task in society and take initiative towards a better world.’ (YIP.se). As I was invited by Annie Meijer, working as an organizer at YIP, I spent six days together with the participants to get to know them better and also to better know how to construct the workshop I was going to hold at the end of the week. By now, dissection had become a big part of my work and I was ready to try out the method.

My interest in Ytterjärna lays in its background as being an anthroposophic village. Perhaps it is my preconceptions and the mystery I built up before my visit that haunted me, but it felt like coming to another country as soon as I turned at the exit of the highway. Going there barely knowing anything about the site, except that Rudolf Steiner - founder of not only anthroposophy itself, but also Waldorf pedagogy, biodynamic farming and anthroposophic medicine - once moved there and started what has become an important center for anthroposophy.

But why did I go here? In relation to micro-utopianism, Ytterjärna seemed to me as a place where societal structures were out of the ordinary, going against the conventional. This time, luckily, my preconceptions were right and I got a quite good picture of YIP, or the Yippies as they called themselves, and what they were practicing. It was not a school, although an outsider might use that term to describe it, but the participants had come from different parts of the world to take part in this program and learn new tools to take initiatives and develop themselves in a hands-on manner. I stayed with the other participants, sharing bedrooms, kitchen and bathrooms. Each morning began with fifteen minutes of singing, followed by an announcement round, a circle where everyone who wanted to share something that they felt was important to get out of their head. After a few days, I discovered that this was an ongoing theme and a big part of YIP, to sit down together and share feelings. Besides the practice of social inclusion, other recurring themes addressed, at least among the participants, were to be conscious about both social and environmental sustainability, and trying to be less materialistic, less consumerist, which goes along with how I look at the kind of design that I am practicing. I found many similarities between YIP and Design + Change, the design program I am studying. Even though the approaches are different, me coming from an academic practice and the participants practicing what could be described as a very hands-on idea of approaching complex tasks, it seems to me that we have common values. This is another reason I was curious about the participants from YIP working together with me. How would they approach dissecting? Could they find weaknesses or opportunities which I had been blind to?

It was a very different context for me to be situated in, but I would like to take the opportunity to honor their ways of sharing knowledge, the hands-on practice, creating safe spaces to allow for expression of emotions, and, this alternative education in general. I say ‘alternative education’ because some of the participants chose to apply to this program instead of university because they said they do not believe in the conventional education system. Some said they went to university before, but it was not something for them, and that they could not handle the stress and pressure. Looking at this wearing my ‘micro-utopian glasses’, I see YIP as an example of utopian practice. John Wood says
‘it is vital to dream of alternative futures, even if they seem unrealisable and impossible’, perhaps this is what made YIP possible when it first started in 2007.

I was very careful when introducing my workshop to the participants. I wanted to get to know them first so that I would not appear as a pretentious guy from a university, and although the workshop I initialized was the purpose of my visit, I would like to emphasize that I attribute a huge importance to those relationships which were created during my stay. I realized afterward that the workshop was only a small part of this journey and could never have been done without the incredible people who I met. It was also important for me to emphasize that this workshop was not for my benefit but more of a wish to try dissecting as a method that could be used also at YIP, without assuming that it would be an ideal solution but to experiment and explore if it could change our/their way of seeing things.

At the very end of my visit, I invited the participants to take things apart, to dissect. I asked them to bring an object, artifact, something they were working on right now or just something that they were curious and wanted to know more about. I also provided a sheet for them that listed how one might want to start performing dissection. I would like to present two objects which were dissected during the workshop which I found particularly interesting alone, but also in relation to each other.

WAYS TO GO ABOUT MIGHT BE TO:

- REVEAL
- OPEN UP
- TAKE APART
- SEPARATE
- RECORD HISTORY
- LOOK AT RELATIONS
- CREATE STORIES

...OR/AND A MIX BETWEEN THESE
DISSECTING MONEY
DISSECTING A TIMER
THOUGHTS THAT AROUSE AMONG THE PARTICIPANTS

THE MONEY

Are the different elements or symbols appearing on a bill what create money and value? What happens if one remove these symbols? What remains is the largest part of the banknote, but what is that worth? The power that lays in the symbols seems to be what makes a bill valuable. How are the symbols related to each other? Would they work on their own? If I go to the store with a bag of these parts of the bill and try to pay, would they accept the payment? Maybe if there was some tape in the bag so that they could repair it. What if we create a kit for making our own money with this dissected bill combined with elements of other bills? Who decided to put these symbols on the bill?

THE TIMER

What if I just stopped time? Who knew a timer contains all these different parts? Why are the plastic components in different colors? Is there a hierarchy of the components? The timer has a ticking sound, does that mean we can hear time? Maybe we can smell it and taste it too?
RESULTS

Through the two workshops I facilitated, I acted as a generator of structures in society which people in Växjö, Sweden considered being important to develop or change. It became a record of values that could be used in the future. Next step could be to combine the results of the two workshops. Perhaps the result would have turned out to be greater if a more specific target group participated in this workshop: it would have been easier to manage the material generated. However, I think it was reasonable to start by including all these participants because it gave an overview of structures and other target groups to consider next, in a possible future of this project. The utopian impulse seemed to be present among those who participated in the first workshop. It was shown through the notes put in the jar, which by themselves reflected the fundamental will to change, and together composed an extract of a smaller group of people who wanted to see change happening within society, possibly starting at local level and in this case, Växjö.

From the second workshop I facilitated, it was the act of dissecting that seemed to stimulate the participants’ will to change. Throughout the workshop, I could sense an excitement similar to when one opens a birthday present or the urge to solve a puzzle once given to you. After the participants finished examine the components of the dissected objects they brought, there was a common need for them to proceed playing, creating and constructing new things out of the separated parts. One of them said that the way they looked at their object before it was dissected, the bill, was as just one thing, an object functioning on its own whereas afterwards they considered many more aspects of it and why, why is this such a huge part of their life to rely on. This is of course only one aspect of the dissected bill. One might want to look at the compressed power it brings or what type of materials being used for production.

There are many possible layers to discover while using this method. However, seen from a sustainability perspective, it is argued in Green Utopianism that within our society ‘Sustainability policies tend to treat the symptoms rather than treating their cause’ (Bradley & Hedrén, 2014, 1). In this context, I believe dissecting acts as a tool of critique, used to examine a chosen topic to investigate if there is a cause that can be treated.

For me trying out the method of dissecting, one of the most fascinating results was the action of questioning and trying to get a glimpse of other possibilities, other futures of the dissected subjects. The thoughts expressed appeared to be extracts of the utopian impulse located in the participants, opening up for new ways of seeing things, using their power of imagination.
CONTRIBUTION AND CONCLUSION

I believe the contribution of this thesis is a method which makes it possible to see and understand things in a new way. To the research of micro-utopias, emphasizing the importance of imagining new futures, this method may act as a tool for stimulating thought processes. As a designer, it is important to look at different aspect of not only objects alone but how they affect the larger picture, to look ‘beyond the current state of things’ (Levitas, 2001, cited in Bradley & Hedrén, 2014, 7). Practicing dissecting as a group arouse a diverse collection of thoughts and questions. This, I believe, is a strong motivation for using PD. It is also easier to find limits and possibilities working as a whole body, a group of people, rather than working as separate organs.

It is as well the adaptability which makes it interesting and relevant to further investigate. In the workshop where dissecting was practiced, the participants brought an object they owned, which is one aspect of a system, but it seems possible that dissection could also be adapted and practiced including less tangible things such as an organization or a concept.

Although my initial intention of this project was to practice micro-utopianism, I have come to the conclusion that this was not done since the result of this project landed in a state of exploration and not a full out practice. However, going back to my research question: How can dissecting be used to practice micro-utopianism? I believe the participants of this project have started the development of a method touching important aspects of micro-utopian practices, which is to stimulate the ‘utopian impulse’ and ‘the power of imagination.’ Using this method is a practice in itself although it might not have all the components that make it a concrete micro-utopia. I hope this method will create a path for new ways of approaching micro-utopianism, continue to thrive among those who have been involved in the process and, through this thesis, spread within design practices.

I am aware that there are limits to this method. One who wants to try it out has to be well taught about the purpose of it. Further on, dissecting is not a method which will make radical changes in structures by simply playing it out, but one has to know how to make the best use of it, draw the right conclusions for the purpose and picking the right findings so that they can continue to be built upon.

My hope is that dissecting may have plenty of purposes to fulfill. I used the method within a design framework together with a group of participants, trying to change the way we see things.
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