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Abstract. This essay discusses problems affecting the contemporary of the urban commons by addressing the emerging spatialization of the relational infrastructures of urban communities due to the recent transformations of the technological framework. It sheds light on three key macrophenomena that are changing the nature of these institutions, translocalism, transduction and transculturalism, and drafts design strategies to foster their agency for the affirmation of equality and pluralism while guaranteeing social inclusiveness, cohesiveness, pluralism and differentiation. It answers the research question on how designers and planners can respond to the effects of these disrupting phenomena that redefine their roles, mission and instruments. It proposes a design framework for new commons operating in the reality–virtuality continuum. We envisage them as constituted by three intertwined components: a) a set of enabling relations, which constitute relational machines that establish dynamic, robust and efficacious connections between distributed and mobile actants engaged in commoning actions; b) a concrete infrastructure, which includes the constitutive elements that come together in meta-stable and variable context-specific platforms supporting the relational machines; c) a set of constitutive agents, which includes counterhegemonic pluralistic narratives of possible futures that foster social formations to subvert the existing abstract (i.e., postpolitical, conflict-free and antidifferential) spaces. Our proposal contributes to the discourse on the spatialization of radical democracy ideas, foregrounding the role of design in liberating the creative collective power of co-create dialogical utopian realms. These narratives through fabulation, allegory and parody devise possible translocal, transductive and transcultural spatialities for commoning and differentiation to foster the collective appropriation of the new ordinary.
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1 Urban Commons and the Right to the City

This essay addresses the ongoing development of the urban commons, foregrounding the impact of the transformations of the technological framework on their infrastructure, activation and agents. It further develops a discussion on spatialization of relational infrastructures initiated elsewhere [1–4] and aimed...
at recognizing common trends and local differences through a comparative study of cultures and practices across geographic boundaries. By focusing on the impact of new digital technologies, this essay identifies key emerging challenges among the stakeholders of the commons to coproduce their urban space. Shedding light on three key macrophenomena, translocalism, transduction and transculturalism, that reframe these institutions, this discussion addresses the changing nature of the commons and drafts corresponding design strategies that foster their agency in the affirmation of equality and pluralism while guaranteeing social inclusiveness, cohesiveness, pluralism and differentiation.

In this essay we submit that this changing nature intensifies the ambivalent nature of these commons as concurrently assembled and assembling systems. Reinforcements of the infrastructures and activation processes of commons of constituted urban communities occur together with the expansions of their recombinant and dynamizing associative actions of distributed resources, both tangible and intangible, of mobile and transformative social networks. By using assemblage theory to frame the understanding of this duality, we describe such structured and structuring concatenating systems by breaking them down into three core components: a) The concrete elements that, associated in various concatenations, form their basic infrastructure and establish their social, spatial and cognitive centrality. These concrete elements include heterogeneous material things, values and paradigms, personalities and spheres of thought that constitute both the tangible and intangible structure of the social space. B) The set of enabling relations that links the different components and establishes them as networked concatenations to favor collaboration and sharing of resources. C) The constitutive agents that dialogically catalyze their embodiments as institutions that support the integration and autonomy of communities. They include a multiplicity of entities, such as individuals and narratives, that assemble, engage and activate the infrastructure and networks of the commons.

The cardinal role of these urban assemblages is the constitution of civic, autonomous, independent and participatory networks where the diversity of our progressively multicultural society is treasured and considered essential. By affirming diversity as the manifestation of irreconcilable differences, such commons are crucial contributors to the constitution of a “positive collective social subject” [5] who constitute collaborative multitudes where competing social, cultural and material countercospatialities are in permanent dialogue and cross-pollination. By reclaiming, defending, maintaining, and taking care of the “coming together of strangers who work collaboratively … despite their differences” [6] they sustain the “fundamental struggles in terms of a continuous conquest of (new) arenas of freedom, democracy, and creativity” [7] towards the development of a "non-mystified" form of democracy [5].

A social production based on diversity and differentiation stimulates political mobilization and intellectual engagement towards the collective appropriation and association of urban space, particularly reconquering the central space that has been enclosed, alienated and financialized by the private sector with the complicity of inadequate systems of governance. Only such mobilization can establish a common ground for dialogical relationships between the multiple spheres of the multitude that cocreatively sustains the construction of a society affirming freedom, integration, community of interest and transculturalism [8–10].

The formation of such a civic realm involves a comprehensive engagement with questions of social, spatial and cultural justice, ethics and morality. These questions are particularly critical as highlighted in studies in political economy that address the ongoing shift of the mode of production towards a postconsumerist age with increased imbalances in power relations [11–13]. The threats posed by the intertwined superimposition of (excessive) production and (excessive) consumption of this novel production mode, which has been named “prosumption” [14,15], need a coordinated collective mobilization and engagement to gain awareness and elaborate responses.

By forming context-specific organizational formats, these assemblages facilitate modes of social production that enable “self-forming publics to appear, represent themselves [and] be represented” [16]. Such an integral sociospatial relationality promotes citizens’ participation, responsibilization and conscious decision making [17]. It sustains collectivities in their everyday query for political identity and affirmation of citizenship, and liberates them from externally imposed patterns, references and
constraints. It also fosters a sociospatially embedded empowerment that is fundamental for the sustainable development of the growing social mixité of local, migrant and diasporic communities. The resulting capacity of these assemblages to balance power crucially strengthens the exercises of the fundamental ontogenetic right of citizens to participate in the creation of their spatialities in a unitary way (i.e., spatial production that integrates its physical, social and mental dimensions and combines both the individual and associated agencies).

The discussion underlying these problems affecting public space and urban commons has progressively grown in the last decades and concentrated on the progressive decay of the collective agency and the increasing power of hegemonic actors. Seminal work by prominent scholars of the second half of the past century includes: Hannah Arendt’s [18] reflections on the transformation of public space into a pseudo-space of interaction, Jürgen Habermas’s [19,20] analysis of the effects of the decentralization of collective discursive structures and the colonization of the public sphere with alienation of citizens from their political dimension, Guy Debord’s [21] critique of the spectacle and alienation that are produced by the “autocratic reign of the market economy,” Henri Lefebvre’s [22] elucidation of the sweeping subjugation of people through fetishistic, concrete abstraction of the spatialities of the everyday life, and Richard Sennett’s [23] documentation of the modern “fall of the public man.”

These studies have led to a wider recognition of the necessity of a new approach to the question of spatialized publicness. Major studies by Seyla Benhabib [24], Nancy Fraser [25] and David Harvey [26,27] on the contemporary crisis of the political sphere and citizenship rights addressed the urban condition of increased dispossession of collective power on urbanisation and segmentation of publics with the formation of counterpublics. Others, who elaborated critical appraisal of spatial questions concerning imbalances in power relations, include the scrupulous dissections of disciplinary systems of spatial control by Honi Haber [28], David Graham Shane [29], and Michiel Dehaene and Lieven De Cauter [30]; the meticulous descriptions of the widening privatization of urban public space by Anastasia Loukaitou-Sideris [31], Edward Soja [32], and Anna Minton [33]; the in-depth discussions on spatial justice and loss of “common-wealth” generated by cooperative labor by Setha Low [34], Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri [35,36]; the wide-ranging investigations of sociospatial fragmentation and marginalization by Stuart Hodkinson [37] and Steven Miles [38]; and the detailed studies on severe social exclusion with selective deprivation of public space by Mike Davis [39], Michael Sorkin [40] and Don Mitchell [41].

2. New technologies and augmented urban commons

Central to this discussion are challenges emerging from the contemporary communication technology megatrend: a pervasion of virtual, augmented and mixed (VAM) reality in the way we work, live and play that has profoundly redefined the relational patterns of local communities virtually lending them access to any spatial, cultural, societal dimension external to them. This openness to other realities has a strong transformative impact on the processes and forces that define their lives as it operates ambivalently. Its agency can act simultaneously both to empower or deprive these communities in establishing or breaking partnerships, connections, strategies and mobilizations that transform their assets and attributes [42].

On the one hand, the new digital technologies have strengthened the hegemonic position of dominant actors by expanding the capability of their apparatuses to control and disempower autonomous association that counters their agendas [43–45]. New applications grant the former comprehensive access to activities and infrastructure of the latter. Seamless operations over multiple spatial and chronological distances enable the prevailing actors to detect, identify, target and monitor as well as directly engage with their opponents. Multimodal messages enriched with augmented, immersive multi- and fully synchronous realities relentlessly stimulate “sensuous appetites” to boost the capability of the spectacular machine for cultural hegemony to produce consensus and homologation. Systems for the amplification and multiplication of deceptively conceived social, cultural and material content saturate all communication channels and override the voice of any antagonist force. The creation of a hegemonic disciplinary space of flow with comprehensive triangulated scanning and feedback routines capable of
automatically converting or neutralizing adverse or divergent processes of commoning appearing in their realms, propagates the controlling power by inducing self-harmonizing, self-controlling and self-regulating behaviors.

On the other hand, these hegemonic disciplinary spaces of flow, which support forces that undermine the autonomy, relatedness, and instrumentality of the commons, also create opportunities for the growth of novel, countering commoning agencies. Confirming the Lefebvrian principle that spaces of abstraction carry within themselves radically antagonist spatialities that seek to emerge from them [22], the complexity and incongruencies of these dominating spatialities that intersect digital and actual realms create multiple gaps in the apparatuses that nurture countering practices [1]. To escape the control apparatuses, residual and marginalized agents, networks and resources find room to develop autonomous actions for the articulation of subversive immanent recoding of territories, languages and material elements. Within this room, defeating external surveillance, information with different locative attributes flows through multiple channels of interoperable platforms and morphs over various combinations of mode (video, audio and text), formats (software coding), sort (live and recorded) and access (public or restricted).

Adopting the multiplicity of contexts and media for mobile interaction introduced by information technology, these counterspatialities revive the public sphere by expanding the capability of individuals and communities to offset the above-mentioned criticalities by constituting independent networks and wider coalitions [46–48]. Spatial media have introduced degrees of freedom in the activities of the instituted and often commercialized commons that have supported a large variety of countering associations in developing alternative territorialization patterns, structures and dynamics. The dynamism and multimodality of the new context-specific relationality increases the capacity of the independent networks to positively react to the continuing disruptions and, more importantly, to withstand the emerging ones, as demonstrated by empirical research on the recent spatial effects of digitally augmented social networks in instituted urban centralities [49].

3. Framing the transitioning spatialities: networked translocalisation, multi-associative transduction and counterhegemonic transculturalism

Our interpretation of the impact of the technological change on the commons is framed by an understanding of key macro-phenomena that have substantive impact on their three components regarding their increasing translocal, transductive and transcultural conditions. Networked translocalisation concerns the constitution of infrastructures that cater for increasingly mobile and displaced actors through the reassociation of distributed and recombinable concrete elements. Multi-associative transduction pertains to the integration of the multiple and distributed resources of such variable infrastructure with highly performative sets of enabling relations. Counterhegemonic transculturalism involves the practices of the constitutive agents to purposefully engage concrete elements and sets of relations. The focus on these phenomena illuminates the understanding of the way in which patterns of actual mobility and digital augmentation have not only critically transformed the mode of spatial production of present-day urban communities, but have also decisively challenged their livelihood, resilience and patterns of territorialization.

3.1. Networked translocalisation of the concrete elements

Networked translocalisation of communities is the constant reproduction of meanings, practices and localities through negotiations of diverse mobile or displaced actors brought together and engaged in the deterritorialization and reterritorialization of their spatialities for the constitution of common grounds [50–53]. The expansion of networked translocal communities is consequent to the continuous increase of the movement of their members and concrete components. It is driven by the diffusion of electronically mediated communication and mobile internet. These communities with displaced, mobile and shared members extend the sociospatial relationships, size and capacity of emplaced communities, countering the loss of local interaction. Digital communication has indeed accomplished what Arjun
Appadurai described at the inception of the internet age as the creation of a new form of collective spatialization where communities are “no longer bounded by territory” [54].

The new translocal territorial patterns have increased plasticity and developed a global–local continuum that creates blended actual/virtual neighborhoods by seamlessly integrating the stable and the diasporic at all spatial scales. The global urbanization trend is indeed accompanied by a more-than-urban territorial development that creates a pattern of meta-cities. The sweeping global inurbation phenomenon with the creation of extended urban regions (the latter with imposing late-20th century formations of large-scale urban incorporations encompassing substantial rural territories, such as Terry McGee’s [55] southeast Asian desakotas) has dramatically reduced both the quantitative and qualitative differences between the rural and the urban. The two realms have established multidimensional interlinkages and integrated their mode of both production and social reproduction, as for example shown by the current exponential growth of Chinese Taobao Villages and Towns. Importantly, the spatial transformation produced by the networked translocalisation of communities has been accompanied by a profound change in rhythms affecting their temporal stability and duration. Strong acceleration and dynamism in structure and behavior have expanded their variability (i.e., their scale, churn, merging, overlap and reversals). Comprehensively, this translocalisation produces an extremely volatile sociospatial relationality that, while making the infrastructure of the commons more adaptive and robust, increases the vulnerability of the new communities. The autonomous coproduction of connectedness progressively depends on infrastructure provided by external forces over which these communities have little or no control, as for example the privately owned transnational digital platforms.

3.2. Multi-associative transduction of the sets of enabling of relations

Transduction is a transmutative process that operates by combining heterogeneous forces diffusing an exogenous activity that restructures given domains and creates provisional unities or conditions [56]. Digital augmentations have increased the meta-stability [57] of the spatialities emerging from this process as they have enabled their transient and temporary states to emerge at any point along the entire reality–virtuality continuum [58] with patterns that range from progressive to iterative and from systematic to irregular. The transducted unities and conditions have recombinant and multi-associative properties, articulations and boundaries that introduce scalability in everyday practices, and expand both the capability and capacity of distributed infrastructures and members of translocal communities to operate efficaciously. Their fully immersive and intensely evemenetal instances, diffused on a global scale [59], embody the virtual and the remote in situated contests, enabling the active presence of actors and things in productive, reproductive and recreational activities to independently form their spatio-temporal location and belonging. The relational potential of these unities allows communities to strengthen and expand the inclusivity and openness of their networks by supporting dialogue, centrality of actors and multistakeholdership [60].

3.3. Counterhegemonic Transculturalism of the Constitutive Agents

The ultra-mediated globalization has brought unprecedented social dynamics and articulated cultural diversity as a crucial question not only to address growing social tensions, antagonisms and conflicts, but also to understand emerging lifeworlds operating transnationally. In order to sustain the growing complexity and affirm self-determination in the formation of diversity of plural and hybrid cultural identities in our increasing cosmopolitan condition, it is also fundamental to encourage equitable participation in social dialogue and exchange. Recent elaborations of the Arendtian idea of a democratic agonistic pluralism acknowledge conflict as essential elements of the political in a complex civil society [61–63]. Conflict is identified as a productive “disturbance” that is conducive to fundamental identification processes and sustains acculturation, recognition and understanding of the “other” and “diverse” [62–64]. In a world of growing complexity, such an affirmation of conflict is described as necessary to support a positive development based on individuation and autonomy. Through such an agonistic condition, competitive hegemonic discourses favor the development of a multiplicity of positions in dialogical relations that reassemble the collective dimension of the civic, while re-
establishing commoning practices and institutions that protect the citizens against the attempt of external hegemonic economic organizations to expand their power. To guarantee the possibility that contingent and fluid subjectivities, agencies and individualities emerge from the distributed “creative ways [that] use the powers of collective labor for the common good” [65 p107], agonistic fields of intelligibility with “rich mixes of instrumentalities” [65], which provide the foundation of the stability for these discourses [66], should be instituted.

4. Designing assemblages for commoning

To design efficacious institutions that support these digitally enhanced networks of more-than-urban communities and challenge the constituted power relationships that have caused the crisis of the traditional urban commons a major revisions of the goals, strategies and tactics that informed their conception and implementation are required. The critical paradoxes and ambivalences of their constitutive processes call for the introduction of design processes that guarantee advanced systemic redundancies to offset the growing threats of external forces to limit the meta-stable recombination of their concrete, relational and agental components. Most of these threats, however, are not new, as they dramatically exacerbated the magnitude of those introduced with sweeping neoliberal policies, which withdrew the direct state involvement and favored the comprehensive colonization of the commons by the private sector. To support the novel civic assemblages in making the urban commons “bounce forward” from the crisis, this revision must address the transformations that the mobile digital era has brought about in the exercise of the Right to the City and the related Right to Difference. This revision must consider the elaborations and operationalization of these notions, originally developed by Lefebvre (1968; Purcell, 2003) and Harvey [69], in their recent formulation in one of the highest level official documents on sustainable development of cities: the New Urban Agenda adopted at the United Nations Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development in Quito, Ecuador, in 2016 [70].

To guarantee the exercise of these rights in the mobile internet era, the interpretation of the comprehensive “right to freedom, to individualization in socialization, to habitat and to inhabit … to participation and appropriation” [67] should be reframed. Redefined as the Right to digitally augmented collective power and commoning of the multitude, this right continues to be a common (rather than an individual) right to create common fabrics that establish platforms for patterns of unity and multiplicity. This is the right to rearticulate the existing elements of the meta-city through the collective will in mobilized and distributed yet hyperconnected communities: a right to the civic that—paraphrasing Jacques Rancière’s politics of aesthetics [71]—produces agonistic coalitions with heterologous forms of subjectivation, radical differences of individuation and diverging logics.

The work discussed here aims to reflect on the current transition affecting public space and urban commons, and develop experimental design applications that use the speculative architectural method to envision possible futures.

4.1 Devising the spatialities for differentiation, pluralism and commoning

In recent research on public space and urban commons we coordinated at the Urban Relational Informatics Laboratory of University of Auckland the conception of the new spatialities has revolved around the following research questions:

How can designers and planners adapt their role, mission and practices to respond to these disrupting phenomena and pursue the integral wellbeing of the emerging meta-citizen by fostering equality full participation and collaboration?

Considering the meta-city and its public space as a crucial domain for the above challenge, how can the design of the commons assemblages (i.e., the conception of concrete elements, set of enabling relations and constitutive agents of the commons) take advantage of the new condition to foster processes that subvert the fragmented structure of the city and the inequity of its distribution of resources and opportunities?

If it is true that, as Ranciere [71] maintains, equality exists [only] when we exert it, is it possible to use design and planning to demonstrate the existence of equality without falling into the trap of
“revealing inequality” and ineffectively “raising awareness” as fundamental for individualization and citizenship?

The design streams of the Laboratory looked at responding to these questions by developing spatialities for differentiation, pluralism and commoning through architectural design propositions that activate the combined potentials of utopia and desire. The projects of this stream have produced architectural propositions for urban assemblages that operationalize the Deleuzian *assemblage theory*. According to this, the assemblages form heterogeneous concatenations of material elements, agents of change and systems of relations that radically restructure the order of things. These assemblages are a series of emplaced narratives of possible futures composed by relational machines, concrete infrastructures and agential narratives.

4.2 Envisioning relational machines
Relational machines are conceived as open systems for agonistic pluralism that establish robust and efficacious connection between actants (i.e., people and things) for actions of commoning. These are machines for radical democracy that enable the constitution of dynamic assemblages for the affirmation of the city as space of difference and equality. As devices that facilitate the embodiment of a public “space of appearance” in the collective realm [18], they contribute to the construction of emplaced elements of the meta-city of the local–global continuum as the main arena for productive and creative conflicts, where equality is manifested, acknowledged and developed through multiple relations of exchange, confrontation and political actions that guarantee the collective ownership of this very space [27,72].

Inclusive commons are the core places of these machines as their agency sustains collective participation, shared understanding and conflicts of ideas, tenets and personalities, and enables co-creativity in transcultural processes that implement the capacities that are denied in conditions of overdetermination and homogenization. Contrasting the power of hegemonic actors, these machines sustain the collective appropriation and repossession of the spatial conception, practices and actions that contribute to the production of the city [37].

Digitally augmented networked translocalisation makes it possible to establish what Deleuze described as *nomadic* sets of relations of pluralistic and differential concatenations. Unlimited qualitative transformations and expansions of assemblages trigger revolutionary processes that positively deterritorialize the existent and build better and alternative worlds *in the shell of the old*. Favoring translocally transduced relations, these machines sustain genuine transcultural and “rhizomatic” participatory arrangements of active presences, which require neither representation nor delegation. This is conducive to comprehensive processes of transformation of all elements, conditions and agents towards “maximal difference.” Identification occurs through subverted exchange values, generalized self-management and integral relationality [22].

4.3 Outlining concrete infrastructures
Concrete infrastructures are designed as the sets of constitutive tangible and intangible elements of permanently reterritorializing assemblages. They form emplaced civic institutions, which enable communities to share resources, such as territories, objects, practices, ideas and values, that escape the logic of abstraction, control and domination. These infrastructures sustain the growth of new meta-urban centralities by establishing counterspaces inspired by the Right to the city and the Right to the center ideas [22,27,73,74]. These counterspaces constitute the main spatial reference for communities engaged in emancipatory processes to counteract the dissipation of the “common worlds.” They reverse sustained processes of social fragmentation, marginalization and exclusion that create cities of enclosures. As structures open to incremental development, they are combinations of spaces, devices and technologies that provide knowledge and instruments to terminate the abstractive delegation of the transformation of urban space to circles of expert managers. VAM reality make it possible for these infrastructures to provide translocal communities with a common ground which is both transformational and transformative. These augmentations facilitate the emplaced embodiment of the meta-stable spatialites.
of the overall assemblages, by constructing, piece by piece, context-specific platforms that support the nomadic set of relations of the machines for difference and pluralism.

4.4 Formulating spatial narratives
The design propositions integrate the relational machines and concrete infrastructure with narratives that articulate possible futures with social formations that subvert the depoliticised, conflict-free and antidifferential spaces of the dominated commons. The narratives contribute to the formulations of cocrated hegemonic discourses among meta-urban communities that affirm their rights to the city and difference. This formulation initiates with the detection, disclosure and activation of “something in common” [71] found in the meta-stable lifeworld and move those in dialogue from producing noise to speech, from being inaudible to audible [75–77]. The agency of these narratives is exerted through communicative actions in everyday practices that are constitutive of coalitions for maximal differentiation and appropriation of homogenized and abstracted urban spatialities. In the construction of the reterritorializing assemblages of elements, behaviors and practices these narratives are not precisely defined, but constructed as producer of meticulous indeterminant frameworks through subtraction of meanings and defamiliarization (Verfremdung). Indeterminacy gives back the capacity of acting emancipatorily through the co-formulation of contingent and “meaningless” structural forms [78] for possible common worlds [79]. These propositions formulate specific topoi that use prose to help imagine new meta-emplaced utopias and establish sign-values as bases for social relations that deploy the productive agency of desire.

5. The strength and impact of codesigning commons’ differential assemblages
The propositions resulting from this process delineate socially equal, context specific and spatially differential systems, which enact restorative relational, infrastructural and narrative recodings to contest dissociative and homogenizing modes of production. The implementation of their commoning strategies informs processes of radical change to reassemble socially and environmentally fragmented and abstracted urbanities. The infrastructures, links and narratives of the new assemblages are designed with open, yet highly internally consistent, cohesive and tight signifying recoding chains. The concatenations deploy the free play of signifiers to spatially reappropriate what escapes imposed determinations. Thus three main strategies are at play. a) translocal networking to foster the dynamic and distributed coalitions for the commoning goal; b) transductive synchronization to guarantee the dialogue for unity in the difference; c) transcultural integration to sustain dialogue and reidentification through productive conflicts. Tactics that apply these strategies have produced exemplary basic configurations of institutions to be developed through incremental collective processes. These configurations reinforce processes of sociospatial relationality for collective and collaborative production of finely tuned machinic allegorical freespatial assemblages.

The assemblages are the prototypes of new commons for the production of production that counters the marginalization of any stakeholder and support processes of emplaced sociopolitical change. They show possible future autonomous and independent counterspatial formations in digitally augmented concatenations. Their composition is plural and offered through dioramic theatricalizations that emphasize their nature of illusory heterotopias [29] illustrating desiring machines of reassociated heterogeneous meta-spatialities without organs [80,81]. The created visions reassociate heterogeneous entities actively producing and socially reproducing moments of emancipation, enjoyment and pleasure [Figure 1]. They deploy the power of allegory by using signs as super-signifiers to contribute to the growth of heterohegemonic cultures that contest and confute the spatialities produced by exogenous culturally hegemonic systems. Their illusionary instances delineate architectonics of wonder and affirmation of maximal difference in urban life to show the potential of radical deterritorialization and reterritorialization processes for the affirmation of autonomy and self-determination. Using rich mixes of instrumentalities, these contributions spatially articulate the discourse on radical democracy, presenting the capacity of codesigning collective platforms for the liberation of dialogical power of communities in the imagination of everyday utopian realms. The fabulatory, allegoric and parodic
presentation of the new ordinary devises possible forms of translocal, transductive and transcultural mode of production. Advocating for the deconstruction of complex apparatuses of antagonist dominating powers, these visions of spatialities for commoning endorse modes of production where maximal differentiation emerges from processes of democratic decision making and control on urban life that celebrate both bodily and experiential particularities.

Figure 1. Daniel Choi, Manfredo Manfredini Studio, Adtopia: a counterspace of resistance in the era of advanced abstractive advertisement, 2020
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