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ABSTRACT
Noo-politics is a neologism that designates how minds (nous) come to think collaboratively at the scale of populations, a phenomenon facilitated by increasingly sophisticated information societies and their capacity for instantaneous electronic communications. Noopolitics complements the already well-established term biopolitics, which designates how the lives and deaths, and general health and well-being of individuals are managed at the scale of populations through practices of governance. What happens when a noopolitics rigidifies, what kinds of effects does it produce? A dogmatic Image of Thought understood as an ossified status quo takes hold, over-determining how people think together and about themselves, and about their worlds, including their local environment-worlds. In relation to an expanded understanding of the spatialities of feeling that architecture contributes to, this essay will focus in particular on the noopolitics at work in the production of architectural imagery where it becomes indistinguishable from real-estate imagery. The compelling case this essay will address is the emergence of the styled real-estate image in the Stockholm context where a large proportion of rental properties have been quite abruptly released onto the real-estate market place over just the last ten years. What is remarkable about the flood of images that have been made available for consumption is their consistency, even their homogeneity, and while Stockholm, with a focus on the inner city island of Södermalm, may prove to be a special case, what is aptly demonstrated through a noourbanography that attempts to map these images is how a dogmatic Image of Thought has taken hold that drives what a local population comes to expect in terms of the curation of their homes and local neighborhoods.
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Today it is a commonplace to remark that a relationship of near indiscernibility pertains between images composed to portray the privileged point of view of an architectural project and images dedicated to the commodification of architecture as real-estate. This commonplace proposition is located in what “everyone knows” in an observation that for the most part we (architectural thinkers, historians and practitioners) can agree upon. These images can be observed in any of the places where quasi-architectural imagery is consumed, across the pages of architectural magazines where featured projects appear alongside advertisements for building products; amidst weekend newspaper lifestyle inserts and biographies of home-owners and their homes; and online via any number of available Web 2.0 feeds. Especially uncanny are those moments of doubt where an image is apprehended and it is not at first obvious whether the image is a photograph taken of an existing space, or whether this space has been procured through sophisticated means of computational rendering. While the problem or “case” this essay is concerned with is located in the imagery that circulates in the real-estate marketplace of Stockholm, Sweden and how it manufactures spatialities of feeling (Thrift, 2004; 2008), arousing desire in prospective consumers in search of a home, the conceptual infrastructure I will utilize draws on a series of complex concepts that include: the Image of Thought, noopolitics, noourbanography, gentrification, all of which assist in understanding how habits of thought at the scale of populations influence the transformation of homes and neighborhoods. The noo of noopolitics and noourbanography designates the collaboration of minds (noo,
nous) drawn toward a comfortable consensus. For the purposes of this essay it is the normative curation of domestic interiors in relation to "vibrant" urban neighborhoods that is at stake. As for noourbanography, this approach extends well-established methods of discourse analysis in order to suggest ways in which the production of mood can be mapped via a study of real-estate imagery in terms of: recurring motifs, the composition of images, dominant color schemes, haptic arousal through represented textures, and so forth.

**IMAGE OF THOUGHT: A META-CONCEPT**

A meta-concept persists amidst the conceptual infrastructure I forward, that is the concept of the dogmatic "Image of Thought," which denominates a state of noopolitics that has become reified. In relation to architectural real-estate this identifies where spatial and social relations have begun to sour, resulting in the over-consumption of environment-worlds and the displacement of precarious segments of the community. Imagine a scenario where collectively a population has gotten themselves stuck in a rut of thought, fixated on an idée fixe, caught in a loop or a refrain, unable to think otherwise. Their collective thinking emerges from a background of preconceived ideas and uninterrogated habits of thought. All the while, projecting into the foreground and into the future, world-making practices continue toward either the support or destruction of environmental milieux. The capturing of opinions, which the cognitive labor of image making contributes to, is articulated as a noopolitics, that is, how minds (nous) collectively produce a politics of affect that is always at risk of producing a dogmatic Image of Thought. Noology, the logic of minds, is another term for what Gilles Deleuze calls the "Image of thought," an ambivalent concept that can enable either affirmative socio-political relations or else oppressive ones, depending on how it comes to be expressed in a given context. These socio-political relations of necessity take place somewhere, impacting on how human worlds are carved out of dynamic environmental milieux. The becoming-imperceptible of the distinction between images designed to portray the privileged point of view or salubriously named "money-shot" of an architectural project and the curated, bleach, distorted, wide-angle images dedicated to the sale of real-estate, alerts us to a critical, sensitive point in the politics of the Image of Thought and the situated performance of a noopolitics.

At the same time it must be acknowledged that the Image of Thought is the means by which we bring consistency to our thinking-doing, even though there persists the risk of creating a delimited paradigm. The Image of Thought can get stuck in the rut of what “everyone knows,” in that which is presupposed, offering the means by which thought establishes its right to think that... For instance, to think that architecture cannot be conceived beyond bricks, and mortar, form and material and space, and the virtuousness of the architect able to best distribute these as master image-maker. The image of thought tends to be tied to a conceptual persona who calls up the image and gives it expression and content (Deleuze and Guattari, 1994/1991, p. 81), and this conceptual persona can turn out to be generous or despotic. In architecture this function too often devolves into the repetitive refrain of the big name architect or signature project; the idol or the icon. On the other hand, the greatest affirmative power of the Image of Thought is where it plays a productively disruptive role, that is, if we gather enough critical resources to create a new Image of Thought, a very difficult task as it requires shaking up the habits, opinions and clichés with which we are so comfortable. In this way the Image of Thought can even manifest as an iconoclastic gesture, the role of which is to imagine the formation of a new, or at least a revised Image of Thought (Hême de Lacotte, 2010).

Noology, as Deleuze explains, is distinct from an "ideology," and also from a "phenomenology," because it does not assume an external thought imposed upon a subject, nor a stable consciousness who thinks, it comes neither from without nor within, neither from subject nor object, instead noology identifies pre-subjective and pre-objective protean relations, and in this way can also be related to discussions concerning pre-personal “affect.” As Colebrook argues: “noology assumes that if images of thought can be created, they can always be recreated, with the ideal of liberation from some proper image of thought” (Colebrook, 2004, p. 194). While it is possible to compose an Image of Thought that might institute a change, it is very hard to succeed in making this difference. Noology tries to imagine thought carried beyond the human, toward the post-human, but noology gets easily tied up with the concrete, empirical situation of a noopolitics, and the insistence of a current Image of Thought with which we must do battle. As Colebrook argues: “We can imagine approaching life, not as grounded in personal consciousness, but as a history of various images of thought, or what counts as thinking” (2005, p. 194). And the lesson is that what counts as thinking should never be separated out from the concrete.
situations in which it plays out. This is why the case, or the problematic field that this essay addresses is so important. While philosophers can offer long discursive and elegantly structured accounts of difficult concepts such as the “Image of Thought” (see Beistegui, 2012), for architectural thinkers and doers, it is important to recognize the specificities of the contemporary Image of Thought that constrains them in terms of their habits, opinions, and clichés.

There are eight postulates by which Gilles Deleuze treats the “Image of Thought” in the chapter so named in *Difference and Repetition* (1994/1968). The Image of Thought is based on both objective and subjective presuppositions, and Deleuze emphasizes the latter, those located in “what everyone knows.” Subjective presuppositions are located in the concordance of common sense, and organized according to the distribution of good sense. Subjective presuppositions of the Image of Thought pertain to the dangers of succumbing to atmospheres of affect and how the sensible is distributed in ways that offer false security and comfort. To complicate matters, the Image of Thought is given slightly different treatments in *Difference and Repetition* and in Deleuze and Guattari’s *What is Philosophy?* (1994/1991). It can also be found in *Nietzsche and Philosophy* (1993/1962), and in the collection of essays called *Desert Islands* (2004), as well as in Deleuze’s book *Proust and Signs* (2000/1964). Where in earlier renditions, such as that to be found in *Difference and Repetition*, the aim is to extricate thought from the hegemony of an over-determining Image, ruled over by the tyranny of the Same, or aspirations for the shallow friendship of Identity; in later work, such as in *What is Philosophy?* it would appear that the Image of Thought reappears as a possibility after all, that we might ask what an image can do, and we might even struggle to make an image (of thought) from time to time, an image that makes a difference (1989, p. 199).

**POSTULATES OF THE (REAL-ESTATE) IMAGE OF THOUGHT**

The postulates pertaining to the Image of Thought that most interest me for the purposes of this essay concern: 1. good sense, 2. common sense, 3. recognition, 4. representation, and finally 5. the subordination of learning to knowledge (or the postulate of the result or end-product). Here knowledge is assumed to be reified, immutable, given, fixed in time and place. These are just five postulates out of eight that Deleuze discusses in *Difference and Repetition*, the others concern: the role of the negative and error; the logical function of the proposition; and problems defined only in relation to pre-given solutions (such as those anodyne problems set out for school children), as distinct from a methodologies that involves a modicum of invention. To reiterate, what the dogmatic Image of Thought imposes is a neopoleitical situation where the unwitting collaboration of brains thinking together over-determines our tastes, our desires, and our feelings for home. Below I liberally take the 5 selected postulates, and re-site them in relation to real-estate imagery:

1. **Good Sense**: Is structurally sound, upright, and evenly distributed, manifesting situations of homogeneity. The good of good sense also presumes something of a moral attitude on the part of the thinker. In the Swedish context good sense is predisposed to a generalized “Lagom-ism,” a perfectly harmonious moderation, just enough, not too much. Good sense has a hand in determining what must be good design. Architectural culture, it can be argued, manifests by way of “communicative” and “immaterial” labor directed (intentionally or otherwise) toward the capturing of taste communities and the establishing of dominant opinions concerning what is “good design.” This is a process in which the image takes on a primary, if not a leading role. The frequency with which the observation is made that architectural culture is driven by the image has made this a received and accepted idea. The editors of *What is Good Design?*, an edition of *OASE* (2013), suggest we live in an (architectural) culture where image is primary, and even though the theory publications stack up, these simply exhaust our capacity to ever keep up. The editors assert, in response, that we simply don’t spend sufficient time asking what is “good”, and yet what are the implications of asking what is good architecture or design? If the immaterial labor of image making produces the informational and cultural content of a commodity then the doxa of design has already been established, and securing a consensus on what is good design merely serves to diminish the potential of critical differences (Gerrewey, Teerds & Patteeuw, 2013).

2. **Common Sense**: Obliges us to agree with our local taste communities, yes, of course, Stockholm White (the paint color most often used for domestic interior walls) is always the right solution, it makes sense, it’s about creating sensations of volume and light, much needed in the dark and cold north. Common sense is how we communally share our good sense in context. Further to what is good sense, and what pertains to good design, such decisions are presumed to be agreed upon by a community, they are opinions held in common, hence, common sense: *everyone knows that...*
3. Recognition: Is located in the “it looks like,” and if it “looks like” a contemporary, or even a “modern” architectural precursor or precedent then we think it must be OK. We can subsequently progress from the “it looks like” to the “this will be alright for us too.” A prospective home-owner needs to be able to project themselves into a real-estate image, and imagine how their lives could be carried out there. Recognition is comforting, it is non-confrontational, it draws on normative criteria. To stabilize good and common sense, a local environment-world has to be minimally recognizable, and it has to be assumed that a given population of urbanites agrees on how their domestic and urban environments should be laid out. Recognition is the mode of apprehension whereby an urban population can achieve consensus, and where formations of subjectivity can be comfortably projected.

4. Representation: Is related to Recognition, and facilitates the move toward the privileging of the architectural end product. If recognition is located as a first step toward re-presentation, what is achieved is the recapitulation and security of the same in identity (Deleuze, 1994/1968, p. 138). Representation operates according to analogy, similitude, identity, and simple opposition. Anything that cannot be categorized accordingly threatens representation with the unrecognizable, and can even be assumed to be monstrous. Representation holds off the potential of transformative becomings and difference for itself, and relies on the “same old."

5. The subordination of learning to knowledge, which is the postulate of the end-product or the result is where the open-ended processual unfurling of thinking and acting is reigned in and made to answer to some (well-designed) artifact. Design problems are assessed based on the solutions they propose rather than the labyrinthine processes they follow. Here the image and what affects it produces serves the satisfaction of a well-defined result. This becomes a problem with respect to the maintenance of a home environment, where an uncluttered, curated real-estate interior is expected. This is an impossible goal because home is an unending project that thwarts all attempts to achieve an end-result.

**SPATIALITIES OF FEELING**

And so, admixtures of images and ideas contribute to assumptions about good and common sense solutions to the problems of human habitation. How environments are increasingly over-determined, even curated in advance of the inhabitant’s arrival, just in time, is one symptom of how the remarkable technology of thinking together has become more and more refined in terms of its spatial implications (Deleuze, 1990a, p. 8; Lazzarato, 2014). The subjective presuppositions that delineate an Image of Thought, and a noopolitical diagram of power, can be described as a process of investment of subjectivity (Lazzarato, 1996, p. 134), whereby creative subjectivity is taken up by production for production’s sake. As Lazzarato explains “One has to express oneself, one has to speak, to communicate, cooperate…”, for instance, the productive-consumer participates in the production of the value of real-estate as a mode of their subjective expression (1996, p. 136. See also Lazzarato, 2014). The necessity of partaking in subjective expression directs us toward a politics of affect, how our desire for home ownership produces in us a feeling that marks us biographically, and an emotion that we share in collectively (Shouse, 2005). Affect, operationally prior to feelings and emotions which it nevertheless produces, is that pre-personal power produced amidst our encounters in an environment-world that either reduces our capacity of existence, subjecting us to forces beyond our control, or increases our capacities. Crucially, a politics of affect cannot be considered apart from its implications within spatially embedded social collectives. There is no doubt that we need to radically revise our critical imaginaries so that we can better grapple with the symptoms of “neural capital” (Braidotti, 2014, p. 2) that can be witnessed at work in the Image of Thought that pertains to “real(i)ty” and how the mood swings of a population fixed on the property market impacts upon urban environments.

The affective labor of images, and how they operate in a reciprocal, if disjunctive relation to the concepts and discursive statements architects enunciate, produces a disciplinary Image of Thought. This has less to do with the representational quality of imagery, or “representation” per se, than the power of images to procure affects, and how a politics of affect needs to be critically considered. It is important to understand that images do not stand by themselves in isolation, there is no such thing as a glossy architectural image that can be taken as a thing in itself, because images operate within animated networks or assemblages involving all manner of things and relations: “The image is not an object but a ‘process’” (Deleuze, 1998, p. 159). The risk I identify is how easily such images prescribe realities, foreclosing how future peoples, places, things and their admixtures might express themselves. The issue of *what images do* (to their consumers and to their producers), places a crucial emphasis on the implication of the projective composition, use and circulation of images, as distinct from the risk of the *mise en abyme* of discussions concerning meaning:
we can endlessly discuss what some image means, a process through which we merely reaffirm our personal preferences.

Affective atmospheres procured by way of the circulation of architectural-cum-real-estate imagery can contribute to a noopolitics that results in insatiable over-consumptions of local and global environment-worlds. Reading Lazzarato, the Swedish philosopher Sven Olov Wallenstein explains that contemporary capitalism “no longer bases itself on labor, the factory, and the institutions that regulate the relations between them, but on a ‘collaboration of brains’” (Wallenstein, 2010, p. 54). The globally integrated organization of capital exploits the collective intelligence of our cognitive facilities, as we come to be trained as docile minds, fed by media, plugged into our screens, feeding and being fed information by our smart phones, exporting our reflective capacities into our external hardware, consuming ever more quotas of data. All of which contributes to a hyper-hypo-affective disorder fed by experience economies (Colebrook, 2014, p. 73; Pine and Gilmore, 1999; Klingman, 2007).

GENTRI-FICTION: A SPATIAL STORY
Enabling the circulation of the otherwise fixed spatial commodity that is (architectural) real-estate is the antipathetic concept of “gentri-fiction,” a phenomenon that noourbanography can be used to identify and study. Gentri-fiction is a tactic of an insidious form of noopolitics; it is a spatial story shared through compositions of image and text and deployed less as a means of making an account of local urban environment-worlds than of repackaging these worlds as embodied spatial commodities. Rather than opening up new worlds of possibility, gentri-fiction operates as a form of instructions-for-use available 24-7, reiterated recursively through one image after the next, delivered via abundant media channels where spatial consumers are perpetually switched-on. This of course means there are also concomitant effects produced by way of a meta-Image that over-determines thinking, and that is the Image of Thought. While gentri-fiction might appear to be the means by which local revitalization is plotted, the impending reality of gentrification risks producing increasingly homogenized neighborhoods and disturbing forms of consensus through the redistribution of socio-demographics as well as through urban aesthetic acts of renovation and renewal. Equally unsettling is how easily experimental architectural practices and their expanded media can be integrated into the work of gentri-fiction and in turn recuperated by the interests of what can be called Integrating World Capitalism (Guattari, 2000/1989, p. 47). For architects and theorists the challenge becomes how to turn our local gentri-fiction around so that it expresses a sympathetic concept, which promises a more diverse spatial imaginary, or even a socially

This is where the role of gentri-fiction in relation to contemporary architecture repackaged as so much branded real-estate becomes a helpful concept to describe the way in which we repeat the same old stories as a means of making excuses for our habits of spatial consumption. A stultified noopolitics manifests as a dogmatic Image of Thought, one symptom of which can be described as gentri-fiction, and to assist in a cartography of these relations, noourbanography can be deployed. While a dogmatic Image of Thought curtails our critical capacities, and makes us apt to think according to the status quo, a new or radical Image of Thought can break up our dogmatic slumber. Likewise, gentri-fiction may be recaptured as a means of telling stories such that habits of spatial consumption are critically redirected. In response to the gentri-fictionalization of our environment-worlds, we need to remain critically vigilant, because complex relationships of image and text together procure noopolitical effects by way of a meta-Image that over-determines thinking, and that is the Image of Thought.

While gentri-fiction might appear to be the means by which local revitalization is plotted, the impending reality of gentrification risks producing increasingly homogenized neighborhoods and disturbing forms of consensus through the redistribution of socio-demographics as well as through urban aesthetic acts of renovation and renewal. Equally unsettling is how easily experimental architectural practices and their expanded media can be integrated into the work of gentri-fiction and in turn recuperated by the interests of what can be called Integrating World Capitalism (Guattari, 2000/1989, p. 47). For architects and theorists the challenge becomes how to turn our local gentri-fiction around so that it expresses a sympathetic concept, which promises a more diverse spatial imaginary, or even a socially
engaged concept that enables a heterogeneous and complex body politic to deliberate on ways of living together amidst dissensual desires.

**THE REAL-ESTATE IMAGE OF THOUGHT**

As I have explained, the noological instance or Image of Thought I address in the particular is that pertaining to real-estate, which is itself articulated by multiplicitous and affective images. I should be careful here, because immediately the two kinds of image I introduce must be distinguished: that which pertains to the Image of Thought, which constrains the way we think and feel, keeping us from the critical powers of thinking in thought, and then those images with which we are more immediately familiar for they are ubiquitous and insistent in our urban environments and collectively compose what I call our daily gentri-fiction. The situation I present in broad outline is the real-estate market in Stockholm, where the status of reality (that is, real-estate), is easily collapsed with perceptions of what composes our local reality, by ungrounding personal consciousness, and alerting us instead to the power of collective thinking and how far what counts as thinking is swayed by collective consumptions of imagery. Stockholm is an apt setting for the question of the real-estate Image of Thought, because real-estate as a commodity, and the rise of the real-estate image for the purposes of home-consumption is a relatively recent and pronounced phenomenon here (Bengtson, 2013). The sophistication of real-estate imagery also neatly coincides in its fervor with the emergence of the world-wide-web, and in rapid cumulative succession Web 2.0, both of which ease and smooth out the circulation of images produced for the purposes of curating spatial commodities in preparation for sale. The exigency of real-estate is that it sells itself via imagery that operates according to the formula:

what modes of life do we thereby preclude?

A rumored, or rather a gleamed Image of Thought operates according to the formula: *everyone knows that...* For instance, “everyone knows what it means to be and to exist” (Deleuze and Guattari, 1994/1991; Deleuze 1994/1968, p. 130), or else, everyone knows that there is a housing crisis in Sweden today. There is a housing crisis in Sweden that has purportedly been growing over the last twenty years, revealing a real pressure for housing that could be compared with the impetus that led to the ambitious Miljonprogrammet project, which extended from the mid nineteen-sixties to the mid nineteen-seventies with the aim of providing not social housing but good quality affordable housing for all hard working sober Swedes; “sound, spacious, well-planned, and adequately equipped quality housing at a reasonable cost” as a universal claim, without means-testing, for all members of Swedish society (Blücher, 2013, p. 52; Hedlund, 2012; Mack, 2014). As the economic geographer Eric Clark argues, Sweden has opened its arms to radical neoliberalization, taking housing as its first project of privatization, followed promptly by education and health care (Clark, 2014). All of which is to say that the neoliberal diagram has fundamentally transformed what it means to be at home, and one compelling symptom of this change can be discovered in the emergence of the affectively composed real-estate image.

Less than their representational power, the images that circulate amidst assemblages such as that pertaining to the emergence of the Stockholm real-estate market, collapse the distinction between architecture and real-estate and operate through the production of affective atmospheres. Rather than an exhaustion of the image, an increasingly insatiable thirst is generated toward the ever more rapacious consumption of images. Contemporary architectural culture can be seen to operate by way of “communicative labor” (Greene, 2004; 2007), which can be identified as a component of “immaterial” and/or “cognitive labor,” which as Maurizio Lazzarato explains is that labor which produces the informational and cultural content of a commodity, or that labor which is dedicated to fixing aesthetic norms, tastes, fashions, consumer norms, and thence opinions (Lazzarato, 1996, p. 133). Emerging networks of information and communication generate new logics of representation at a distance that operate as noopolitical apparatuses, systems which emerged with the onset of mass-media at the end of the nineteenth century, and which can be discovered in such seemingly innocuous forms as the daily newspaper (Hauptman and Neidich 2010, p. 12). While the idea of a collaboration of minds (and their collectivized images) might seem a powerful and even a politically emancipatory one, the risk is that our brainpower comes to be resourced so as to better track, map and analyze consumer demand in order to stimulate ever greater demand, not to mention more nefarious ends within what has come to be called our societies of control (Deleuze 1995/1990). Such imagery populates our existential territories, and we, in turn, become increasingly sophisticated and adept in our image literacy, but what cannot be underestimated is the power of the circulation of affect, the spatialities of feeling, produced through imagery, and its resultant politics. Real-Estate arouses “irrational exuberance” and “housing lust” (Hanan, 2010, 176-177), shifts in an affective register that...
suggests a new cartography of the home is needed that maps a history of its real-estate image, which is to say, further development of a noourbanography.

TOWARD A NOOURBANOGRAPHY: A METHODOLOGY
Here is where the development of a noourbanography may assist in both critical analysis, and creative projection. It is a term that I appropriate from the Australian philosopher Jon Roffe, which points toward a means of tracing the impact of collective human intelligence on the sensible distribution of urban environments, and how associated material phenomena are in need of a mapping combined with a critical spatial writing. A connection must be promptly made here, between noology, noosphere, noourbanography and what has more recently come to be called the Anthropocene. Immersed in this moment of a material affective turn, it might be easy to forget how far thinking and thinkables remain embroiled in how material global effects are procured. Good ideas, advancements in technological and industrial acumen, also result in massive changes to already dynamic environmental milieux.

If we commence as architects by mapping the diversity and conflicting positions these constructed points of view offer, we might explore what it means to follow the fractured line between resistance and creation (Lazzarato, 2002, p. 110). This could be the means of drawing out the lines, relations, passages, thresholds and detours of a noourbanography. Then through minor, sometimes incidental actions of everyday creative resistance new styles of life might be allowed to emerge, rather than being repressed and homogenized into dull refrains, sound-bytes and platitudes. Images of Thought can confront us and constrain us, over-determining our relations in a world, but we also have the reciprocal capacity to alter them, and even to remake them: to make ourselves worthy of the encounter with an Image of Thought, to destroy it if we have to.

It is useful to take a now oft-repeated refrain from Deleuze where he reads Spinoza: “We do not even know what a body is capable of. . . . We do not even know of what affections we are capable, nor the extent of our power.” (Deleuze, 1990b, p. 226). We can take this assertion and compose a correlate: We do not yet know what an image can do, neither do we even know of what affections the image is capable, nor the extent of their power: this is not a deficiency of knowledge (an epistemological deficiency), rather a “cry” (Deleuze, 1994, p. 130; Stengers, 2005, p. 195; 2011, p. 40), joyous or fearful, that the image will produce its affects, that the image, right now, is producing its material-semiotic affects (Haraway, 1988). The challenge emerges as to what to do in response to an encounter with images, for instance, when encountering the insistent ubiquity and sophistication of contemporary real-estate images. How does one ethically cope, beyond fixed moral codes? This returns us to practices: practices of critical and creative engagement in a world, and the preparation of skills that enable a better critical grasp of the images we both consume and create, which further work on a critical noourbanography might just allow. The task would appear to be how to challenge the normative regimes that over-determine recognition or the “it looks like”, which always seems to make good sense, and tends to be evenly distributed as a politely agreed upon or consensual “common sense” that is recognizable, well-represented, and directed at some anticipated end-product. Neither the architect nor any creative practitioner commences with an empty canvas or tabula rasa as site, but a problematic field packed full of habit, opinion and cliché, with received ideas and images that must first be cleaned away, or at least critically interrogated and challenged, as much as one is able (Deleuze, 2003/1981). A great deal of critical labor is required to break with daily habit, opinion and cliché. The challenge: “The conditions of a true critique and a true creation are the same: the destruction of an image of thought which presupposes itself and the genesis of the act of thinking in thought itself.” (Deleuze, 1994/1968, p. 139). How might we, as architectural thinkers and doers, invent an Untimely Image of Thought? We are so habituated to what we identify as aesthetic forms of “representation” in architecture that it is hard to think beyond these conventions, and in any case, there is never any guarantee that an image that commences with a critical admixture of content and expression will not be subsequently recuperated by a neoliberal traffic in ideas. If “something in the world forces us to think” and if this is acknowledged as the object of a fundamental pre-personal, pre-philosophical encounter (Deleuze, 1994/1968, p. 139), there remains no guarantees concerning the outcome, even once we have sprung into conscious, critical action.
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