

THE UNGUARDED RECORD



*A Critical Commentary on
'Nameless Numberless ONE' by
Viktor Genel
and the Separation of Trajectile,
Recording, and Preservation*

'Nameless Numberless ONE' entered the archive through a retrospective correction. Executed on June 14, 2026 as a quick material test on generic printer paper, it was initially treated as an expendable experiment and passed over by the chronological numbering of the Nameless corpus. Later material investigations changed the terms of judgment. The work can no longer be understood as a failed attempt whose poor support disqualifies it. It is a **successful trajectile** recorded on a carrier that was never intended to endure. Its significance lies precisely in the clarity with which it separates three matters that had previously been conflated: the **bodily event**, the **material record**, and the **preservation** of that record through time.

I. THE NUMBERLESS POSITION: LOST ONLY TO CHRONOLOGY

The designation 'Numberless' does not describe an incomplete, inferior, or pre-artistic object. It names a specific historical condition: the work happened, survived, and belonged to the developing discipline, but the numbering system moved past it. Retrospective insertion into the numbered sequence would falsify the archive by pretending that the work had occupied a position it never received. Leaving it unnamed would create the opposite distortion by allowing chronology to erase an authentic event. '**Nameless Numberless ONE**' resolves both problems. It preserves the **truth of omission** while granting the artifact a formal place.

This is not a category for abandoned studies. Numberlessness identifies a **parallel archival track**: works that belong ontologically and historically to Somacentric Trajectilery but were not admitted into its numbered succession at the time of their making. The title therefore records not uncertainty about the work, but precision about the archive.

THE NUMBERLESS PRINCIPLE

A work may fall outside a sequence without falling outside the discipline.

Numberlessness records the gap honestly; it does not diminish the event.

II. THE SMOOTH FIELD: PRINTER PAPER AS AN EXPERIMENTAL INSTRUMENT

The material question was direct. After a handmade Indian paper proved unusable because its severe structure and warping overwhelmed the movement, a sheet of ordinary printer paper was selected for the opposite reason: it offered **almost no deliberate tooth**. The purpose was not to produce a permanent artwork. It was to discover how pastel behaves when the substrate contributes minimal texture. Judged by that question, **the experiment was positive**. The medium interacted well with the surface.



The full image presents two distinct chromatic systems. The green occupies the field as a broad, folded architecture: wide contacts, narrow edges, abrupt turns, loops, and partially open planes. The peach trajectory cuts through it with less mass but greater directional clarity, entering from the upper left, crossing the center, descending, and finally dispersing toward the lower edge.

The absence of pronounced paper texture does not erase velocity. It changes the kind of evidence. Instead of the crystalline relief produced by toothier supports, the material appears thinner, more compressed, and closer to transfer. Pressure changes become legible through density, breadth, interruption, and lateral spread rather than through heavy accumulation.

1. The Green Field: Broad Registration Without Tooth

The green passages demonstrate that a trajectile does not require an aggressively textured substrate in order to register. Large regions of the stick's side meet the paper

as a broad plane; other regions contract into edges or break into porous deposits as contact changes. The smoother surface allows the green to slide, compress, and transfer, producing a record that is **less granular but not less specific**. Its apparent thinness is not a deficiency. It is the visual form taken by this particular encounter.

2. The Peach Vector: Variable Contact as Evidence

The peach trajectory is especially revealing because it contains multiple recording states within a single movement: **full deposition, partial pickup, transparency, broken contact**, and **changing pressure**. These are not competing levels of quality. They are sequential readings of the body's relation to the surface. The long diagonal changes from a firm, opaque band into a sparse, dry passage and then re-forms as a broader descent. The trajectory remains continuous even when the visible deposit is not.

III. MATERIAL INTERSECTION: THE RECORD AS EVENT



At the central intersection, green and peach do not merely overlap as independent colors. Pressure drags one deposit through the other, producing a muted transitional zone whose physical mixture records the order and force of contact. The surface holds compression, pickup, lateral displacement, and local accumulation at once.

To call this passage smeared or uneven is descriptively possible but critically insufficient. Smearing is not an error imposed on an ideal line; it is one of the ways movement becomes material. The intersection is stronger because the collision remains visible. It preserves a miniature history of matter meeting matter under a moving hand.



The horizontal detail extends the same argument. The peach path thins, fragments, and partially merges into green before the darker field gathers again. What might once have been classified as skipping, uneven deposition, poor adhesion, or smearing must be understood more precisely as **modes of registration**. At times these conditions make the case for the work more forcefully, because they expose the changing mechanics of contact instead of disguising them beneath a uniformly polished surface.

THE RECORDING PRINCIPLE

A trajectory does not fail. Medium and substrate determine how the event becomes visible; preservation determines whether that record can endure.

IV. THE UNGUARDED CONDITION: WHEN THE CONSCIOUS MIND WITHDRAWS

The material experiment created a second condition that was not planned but proved equally important. Because the sheet was generic printer paper and the action was understood as a test, **there was nothing to protect**. The conscious mind did not assume its usual regulatory role. It did not supervise composition, attempt improvement, or interrupt the movement in order to rescue an anticipated artwork. As the artist later described it, **the conscious mind was absent**: it did not care and did not try to intervene.

This condition closely parallels what later occurred in Nameless Numbers Six and Seven. Those works also began under the shelter of technical inquiry rather than artistic expectation. Their apparent secondary purpose reduced the pressure to perform, and that indifference opened the unmediated route. The conscious mind selected the material, prepared the surface, and initiated the act; during execution, however, it withdrew. **The body completed the trajectory before judgment returned.**

This is not automatism in the simple sense of unconscious randomness. The movement carries decades of embodied structural intelligence: habits of tension, spatial turning, collision, closure, and release. What disappears is not intelligence but editorial interference. The work is therefore **unguarded, not unformed**. It emerges from a trained organism operating without a contemporaneous supervisory filter.

THE UNGUARDED CONDITION

The conscious mind prepares the arena and withdraws. The body acts; the material records; judgment returns only after the event has become irreversible.

V. THREE LAYERS OF THE WORK: TRAJECTILE, RECORDING, PRESERVATION

'Nameless Numberless ONE' makes it possible to distinguish the internal ontology of Somacentric Trajectilery with unusual clarity. The first layer is the **trajectile itself**: the embodied event unfolding through time. It cannot be judged by whether the resulting mark is smooth, dense, continuous, or conventionally resolved. The event either occurred or it did not. **Here it occurred fully.**

The second layer is **the recording**: the material transformation created by the encounter between pastel and paper. Every skip, compression, transfer, fracture, smudge, overlap, and exposed interval belongs to this layer. None is a defect by definition. Each is a factual consequence of pressure, velocity, angle, surface, and sequence. The recording is not a neutral copy of the trajectile; it is the trajectile **translated through matter**.

The third layer is **preservation**. Only here does the serious limitation of the work appear. Generic printer paper is not a conservation-grade support and was never selected as one. The substrate is therefore unfit to guarantee long-term survival. Yet this **temporal vulnerability** must not be projected backward and misread as an aesthetic or ontological failure. The carrier may deteriorate; **the event was successful**, and the record remains historically real for as long as the artifact survives.

ARCHIVAL AND MATERIAL STATUS

Work: Nameless Numberless ONE

Date: June 14, 2026

Medium: Oil pastel; green and peach trajectories

Substrate: Generic smooth printer paper, intentionally selected for a texture-free material test

Archival status: Non-archival carrier; the original sheet is historically significant but cannot be represented as a permanent conservation-grade support

Sequence status: Chronologically omitted from the numbered corpus; formally restored as the first Numberless work

VI. THE ARCHIVAL PARADOX: A SUCCESS WITHOUT A PERMANENT CARRIER

The work's paradox is now exact. It was made on disposable paper precisely because permanence was irrelevant to the experiment. That indifference helped suspend conscious control and enabled a genuine trajectory. The same condition that **opened the work psychologically compromised it materially**. The non-archival substrate is therefore not an incidental embarrassment attached to the artifact; it is part of the causal history of its success.

This does not romanticize deterioration. The archive must state the material truth without euphemism: the support is non-archival. Nor should the record be transferred, reconstructed, or remade on better paper, because such an operation would replace the original event with an illustration of it. The correct response is **documentation, disclosure, and conservation** of the existing sheet as far as its material permits. Its vulnerability is a condition to be managed, not a reason to erase it from the lineage.

VII. PLACE WITHIN SOMACENTRIC TRAJECTILERY AND ARTEANITY

Within the developing history of Somacentric Trajectilery, 'Nameless Numberless ONE' marks the point at which **substrate ceased to be a passive background** and became an active experimental variable. It establishes one extreme of the later material spectrum: a smooth, minimally textured field capable of receiving pastel through transfer, compression, and intermittent contact. Subsequent encounters with highly toothed and unstable papers would reveal the opposite extreme. Together, these investigations made clear that no universal ideal substrate exists. **Each support records a different material truth.**

Within the broader Arteanity paradigm, the work also demonstrates the unmediated route from creative drivery to physical manifestation. No object had to be deutilized, no practical function dismantled, and no representation designed. The event passed directly from **body to medium to surface**. What entered the archive was not a composition planned in advance, but an index of biological motion negotiating matter in real time.

Its kinship with Nameless Numbers Six and Seven is therefore structural rather than merely chronological. All three show how a technical pretext can become a protective absence: when the conscious mind believes it is only testing materials, the deeper motoric intelligence is allowed to act without correction. **The test becomes the portal.** The artifact arrives before the maker has decided to call it art.

VIII. CURATORIAL CONCLUSION

'Nameless Numberless ONE' should be retained not as a rescued failure but as a **fully successful work** whose archival limitation was understood only later. Its green and peach trajectories register well on a smooth field; their transfers, interruptions, mixtures, and smudges **enlarge rather than weaken** the evidence of movement. The conscious mind's withdrawal allowed the act to proceed unguarded, producing the same unregulated condition later recognized in other pivotal works.

The work's true deficiency belongs exclusively to preservation. The paper cannot promise permanence, but permanence is not the criterion by which the trajectory is born. By naming the sheet 'Nameless Numberless ONE,' the archive acknowledges both truths at once: **the event belongs, and the chronology omitted it.** Numberlessness does not place the work beneath the numbered corpus. It records the exact historical route by which the corpus learned to understand itself.

ARCHIVAL POSITION

A successful Somacentric Trajectory recorded on a deliberately smooth but non-archival carrier; chronologically omitted, retrospectively restored, and permanently distinguished from the numbered sequence as Nameless Numberless ONE.