

## Patterns.

### Diagrammatic Arrangements of Tracks in Space

Andrea Sick

To examine means to recognize, display and to make patterns visible. To pattern means to generate patterns. Consequently, for a pattern, borders and proximities – arrangements – have crucial meanings.

If the movements of passersby in the *Turnstile* installation at Schadowplatz are interpreted through geometrically oriented agents and these activities are used for the creation of audio fragments, they are patterned. Movement patterns are made perceptible in the sound and presentations on the LED screens. Conceptual reference points for the geometrically oriented operatives located directly below the square LED wall, where a light funnel enclosing elevators is found, are also the geometric master drawings with parquet polygons associated with the installation, or shell models nested within one another, based on clearly formulated rules. The subway's public extensively reads these as a program at one of the entrances.

With both parts of the installation, it is clear: The pattern requires a system of control that configures the pattern. This control system is called a program. But when are these rules used? Is it output or the result of a patterning process? And in which complex structures do traces of breaks in activity unfold? This question, which is fundamental to the pattern, is, in my opinion, substantiated in *Turnstiles* aesthetic constellations.

In general, in these brief considerations, the pattern should be understood as a theoretical and pictorial figure. In so far that, as an example, it overlaps theory and imagery.

A certain pattern (Latin – *monstrare*) shows something and points to something. On the one hand, this pattern implies a template (model) after which something is manufactured. The model, which the pattern is, determines in advance the permissible topical relations, directly comparable to an instruction manual. If the imagery were to be highlighted, we would better speak of a template. Will the pattern function as a template, must it – the template or instructions for use – already be there beforehand. If a model piece is made, does the pattern show how it should be made? The model is the instruction, is the program and determines in advance the topological relations – the diagram.<sup>1</sup>

The “comparison” in topological spaces, which rely on borders (breaks) and proximities, constitute the pattern and thus the patterns themselves. The term coined by Kant in

---

<sup>1</sup> See Andrea Sick, “Kartenmuster and Paradoxien mustergültiger Darstellung,” in “Orientierungen,” (Bremen: thealit, 2006), p. 73-91 and 115-129. Andrea Sick, “Muster Forschen,” <http://www.thealit.de/lab/serialitaet/teil/sick/sick.html>. See also thoughts on geographical nets (respectively central locations) from Walter Christaller, *Die zentralen Orte in Süddeutschland: Eine ökonomisch-geographische Untersuchung über die Gesetzmäßigkeit der Verbreitung und Entwicklung der Siedlungen mit städtischen Funktionen*, (Darmstadt, WBG, 2009), [1933].

“Critique of Judgment,” the “comparison”<sup>2</sup> thereby aims to adopt the always newly created interactions for seeing and knowing patterns or series of patterns.

Programs or operating instructions enable pattern. Like a schematic diagram. One of these diagrammatic constellations that conveys knowledge and its interpretations through a pattern, yet always presupposes it. Then the pattern also always indicates itself, makes itself perceptible. So the ideal in a pattern is anchored between *showing itself* and *showing*. This paradox of the pattern, which generates effects on the borders of representation, makes it complex and contrary at the same time.

In concrete terms this means: If the original country (here: the square with the passersby and the land registry of Dusseldorf) and the map (here: the display on the LED screen and the aerial extracts that are generated with the shell models – the polygons within the system of rules, which describe the activity and the radius of influence of man schematically, according to the theories of Abraham Moles<sup>3</sup>) the chart, here the pattern would be the relation between the land and the chart (or square and projection). Whereby, what would always be inherent in the chart and thus, the images on the LED screen and the map excerpts in the framework of the installation of *Turnstile* would be the question of relation.

The model, the program can always be understood as general or also the “ultimate pattern,” which is simultaneously effective as exemplary and general. It refers to the singular as well as totality. To that extent the patterns seem to always connect, also in relation to the singularities themselves.

If this constellation is transmitted to the question of what is even visible, with a specific pattern one could make it clear that the visible (for example, the patterns of movement that are associated with the operatives) presupposes an invisible, or non-visible. In media theory the discussion is one of constitutive invisibility, “that the visible or displayable – framework settings – are the first opened, in that it escapes this context. This edge of what is to be seen, the frames, do not appear in the visual field, only existing as a breaks, in that they remain prior to their own present.”<sup>4</sup>

The pattern is always before the patterns; the diagram is before the sample. The plan before the city. The knowledge of the object first constitutes seeing (a pattern), which again presupposes and establishes knowledge itself. This paradox can be brought about by the “failure of presentability” of scientific evidence in the framework of a dualistic system of knowledge of recognition and knowledge in impact.

With its complex structure *Turnstile* thwarts this paradox, and opens aesthetic experiences beyond scientific evidence, but in exchange for its production processes.

---

<sup>2</sup> Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Judgment*, Wilhelm Weischedel (Ed.), Volume X, 2. Edition, (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1996), p. 146 [1790].

<sup>3</sup> See Abraham Moles, “Psychologie und Wahrnehmung des Raumes, Die Schalen des Menschen,” Gabriele Reichenbach (translator), in Gadso Lammers, Ernst Reichenbach (eds.), *Verhalten in der Stadt*, (Karlsruhe, Karlsruher Institut für Technologie, Fak. für Bauingenieur-, Geo- und Umweltwissenschaften, Institut für Städtebau und Landesplanung –ISL, 1977), p. 13-23.

<sup>4</sup> Christoph Tholen, “Digitale Differenz,” in: Martin Warnke et.al. (Eds.), *Hyperkult, Geschichte, Theorie und Kontext, digitaler Medien*, (Basel: Stroemfeld/Nexus, 1997), p. 99-119, 104.

The so-called invisible – one could describe it as a background – is the trace of movement patterns of pedestrians. The traces themselves are not models of an event. They stand between the event and its interpretation, between movement and evaluation.<sup>5</sup>

The traces of movement in *Turnstile* are visible through the evaluation of data recorded by the cameras, which are swept up, reoriented and attached to operative polygon geometries from so-called (software implemented) “brooms.” The visibility, and ultimately the audibility adjust through an organically appearing interplay of receiving systems and methods of evaluation. In the presentation on the LED wall, as well as on the related cartographic excerpts, these “media breaks” emerge and become perceptible in the visible (on the LED walls and as sound).

What can be made clear with *Turnstile*, are the realms of possibilities offered by an architecture that is cartographically processed, but then not merely depicted or translated. The interplay of elements generates architecture seeking a balance between geometric constructions and the movements of people. The patterning process here creates connections and enables the perception and the consideration of an architecture beyond “frozen” structures that place the actions of people in the foreground.

*Turnstile* shows a topological diagram that allows the underlying schematics to become visible and audible. A transparency is generated, which allows the obvious (the passersby) to appear in the background and give priority to the visual and sound processes that influence the architecture. Thus, the pattern drawings show representations that are generated on the LED walls, which exist in urban space in addition to the constructed urban centers in yet another form of architecture, their short-term relationships and movements feed on the energetic traces of passersby and can be set in geometric processes.

Within the ever-changing images on the LED screen short-lived reference points are created when the traces of movement patterns are swept up into piles in places that were previously unoccupied. Likewise, on the sample drawings such reference points are recognizable through sectional layers and centers and between the polygon shell models. Through these reference points a short-term orientation is made possible and a pattern for observers is perceptible.

Despite their reference points what is characteristic of these patterns of energy movement oriented toward urban architecture is their continuous modification. The processes are presented, visible and perceptible moments on the projection (on the LED screen). The complexity of the layered processes is transformed in a display. Not as mere translations, but as dynamic processes generated and determined by the changing energies in the force and collisions of moving bodies.

The pattern of *Turnstile* is a topological fluctuation between fictions, facts (measurement), movements of passersby and planning intentions based on comparisons that point to a collective dynamic architecture beyond a topically rigid structure.

---

<sup>5</sup> See Sybille Krämer, Werne Kogge, Gernot Grube(Eds.), *Spur, Spurenlesen als Orientierungstechnik und Wissenskunst*, (Frankfurt am Main: Surhkamp, 2007).