

THE ARCHIVAL BATTLEFIELD

*A Critical Commentary on
'Nameless Numberless TWO' by Viktor Genel
and the Escalation from Trajectile to Confrontation*



'Nameless Numberless TWO' entered the archive through a reversal of judgment. The 12 x 16-inch work on Arches paper was first described as a spectacular failure: the blue medium barely registered, orange did not force the surface to cooperate, and the final all-out intervention appeared to bury the original trajectile beneath an illegible accumulation. A step back changed the definition. The first movement had succeeded. The substrate had failed to receive it. The second movement was not repair but renewed pressure on the same resistant field. The last was neither correction nor development in the conventional sense. It was a nuclear event - the release of full speed, full force, and rage against a material that would not yield. What remains is therefore not a failed trajectile, but a successful record of an escalating confrontation.

I. THE NUMBERLESS SECOND POSITION: RECOVERED FROM A PARALLEL CHRONOLOGY

The designation 'Numberless' again records an archival fact rather than an aesthetic rank. The work arose while the principal Nameless sequence was advancing elsewhere. Its three-stage encounter with Arches paper developed in parallel with the main direction, and by the time its significance became visible, the appropriate chronological number had already disappeared. To force the sheet retrospectively into the numbered succession would create a false history. To leave it outside the corpus would erase a genuine event. **'Nameless Numberless TWO'** resolves the contradiction by acknowledging that the work belongs fully to Somacentric Trajectilery while preserving the truth of its delayed recognition.

The word TWO does not claim that the artifact was literally the second work produced. It identifies it as the second work formally restored to the parallel Numberless archive. This distinction matters. Numberlessness is not a secondary category for marginal experiments; it is an exact historical instrument for works whose ontology became legible only after chronology had moved on.

THE PARALLEL CHRONOLOGY PRINCIPLE

A work may acquire its definitive meaning after the numbered sequence has passed it. Numberlessness preserves delayed recognition without falsifying historical order.

II. THE ARCHIVAL PARADOX: PERMANENCE WITHOUT RECEPTIVITY

The importance of this sheet becomes clearest beside 'Nameless Numberless ONE.' That earlier work, made on generic printer paper, was ultimately reclassified as a successful trajectile and successful recording compromised by what the artist called a provenance failure: the support's conservation pedigree could not be guaranteed. In 'Nameless Numberless TWO,' the material conditions are almost perfectly reversed. Arches is the first support in this experimental line whose archival legitimacy is not in doubt. Yet its pronounced, coarse granularity resisted the medium so aggressively that permanence arrived without adequate receptivity.



The first blue action is structurally clear. It contains broad sweeps, narrow contractions, loops, reversals, and changing pressure. In its underlying movement, it is an almost classic trajectile.

The surface, however, catches only intermittent portions of the contact. Pigment adheres to selected peaks while large intervals remain under-recorded. The trajectory survives as a coherent event, but its material translation is sparse, skeletal, and discontinuous.

This opposition establishes a decisive material law: **archival quality and recording fidelity are independent properties**. A paper may promise long physical survival while failing to register the body adequately; another may record with exceptional clarity while offering uncertain permanence. The support cannot be judged by a single hierarchy of 'good' and 'bad.' It must be evaluated simultaneously as a receiver of force and as a carrier through time.

1. The Blue Trajectile: Success Under Incomplete Registration

The first photograph is indispensable because it proves that the initial event was successful before later escalation altered the field. The blue trajectile does not need to be reconstructed hypothetically. Its continuity is visible despite the broken deposit. The eye follows its rise, compression, turns, closures, and long transitions because the motoric architecture is stronger than the substrate's failure to register every interval.

This is not merely a weak drawing on rough paper. It is a complete bodily proposition translated through an inadequate recording interface. The distinction is ontological. The trajectile exists in time as the movement itself; the image is the substrate's partial testimony. Arches did not invalidate the event. It testified incompletely.

2. The Orange Challenge: Experiment, Not Repair

The addition of orange must not be misread as an attempt to improve or rescue the first image. The color changes, the path is independent, and the new trajectile does not obediently retrace or reinforce the blue. Its target is not the existing composition. Its target is the stubborn substrate. The second action asks whether another hue, another contact pattern, and another application of pressure can force Arches to reveal a more receptive behavior.



The answer is again largely negative. Orange registers in fragments and peripheral bands, crossing and surrounding the blue without creating the hoped-for depth. Yet this negative result is not redundant. It confirms that the first failure of deposition was not peculiar to a single stick or color. Two independent trajectories encounter the same resistance. The paper has now delivered a consistent material verdict.

III. FROM INQUIRY TO ESCALATION: THE SUBSTRATE BECOMES AN ANTAGONIST

After the second refusal, the relationship between body and support changes. The paper is no longer a neutral experimental instrument whose properties are being measured. It becomes an antagonist. The artist has already asked it to receive one trajectory and then challenged it with another. The surface has refused both with the same granular indifference. At that point the remaining action is not a third test in the ordinary sense. It is escalation.

The final approach was described as bringing all the weaponry to obliterate the resistance: full speed, all in, a nuclear event. This language is not rhetorical decoration applied afterward. It identifies a real transformation in the event's motive structure. The earlier stages directed movement through the substrate. The last directs force against the substrate. The artist is no longer attempting to persuade the paper to behave. He attacks its refusal.

THE CONFRONTATION PRINCIPLE

When the support ceases to function as a receiver and is experienced as an opponent, the work no longer records only bodily motion. It records conflict between bodily force and material refusal.

IV. THE NUCLEAR RECORD: WHEN LEGIBILITY CEASES TO BE THE CRITERION



The final surface defeats the criteria that organized the first two states. Individual trajectories overlap so densely that the original blue architecture can no longer be read cleanly. Red, black, orange, and blue collide across the sheet, and the Arches surface is visually suppressed beneath the chromatic assault.

Judged as a conventional composition, the result approaches an illegible mess. Judged as a record of confrontation, however, its accuracy is severe. Density increases, crossings multiply, direction becomes more violent, and earlier zones are overridden rather than harmonized.

The field loses hierarchy because the objective is no longer to organize a picture; it is to overwhelm resistance. The surface is not decorated by rage. It is the residue of rage. This is the central reversal. The apparent mess is not an unsuccessful attempt to produce clarity. It is a successful registration of the moment clarity was abandoned as irrelevant. The work records an escalation from coherent proposition, through material challenge, into obliterating confrontation. Its illegibility is therefore not evidence that nothing happened. It is evidence that too much happened under a changed imperative.

V. LET THE FAILURE FAIL: THE LAW OF NECESSARY ADDITION

The experiment generated a methodological conclusion of unusual precision: **Let the failure fail.** Additions make sense only when they are truly necessary; they cannot improve a work by cosmetic accumulation. Once a material event has answered its question, further marks made merely to beautify, repair, or disguise the answer usually obscure the evidence.

This principle does not mean that the first failed registration should always terminate action. It requires a distinction between **repair** and **necessity**. Orange was necessary because it tested whether the substrate's refusal persisted under a different trajectory.

The final attack was necessary because the material relationship itself had changed and demanded expression. Neither stage was an attempt to make the blue image prettier. Each introduced a new question and then a new state of confrontation.

THE LAW OF NECESSARY ADDITION

An addition cannot repair an earlier event. It is justified only when it carries a new necessity - another question, another force, or another irreversible phase of the work.

The first blue trajectory is now irreversibly buried. The Russian saying invoked during the discussion - *Фарш невозможно проверить назад* - becomes exact: what has passed through transformation cannot be returned to its former state. The blue event remains materially inside the artifact, but it can no longer be recovered as an autonomous visible work. Only the first photograph preserves its temporary clarity.

VI. THE PHOTOGRAPHIC SUCCESSION: PROVENANCE OF AN IRREVERSIBLE EVENT

Because the final artifact contains all three stages but displays them unequally, the photographic succession acquires unusual archival importance. The photographs do not constitute separate artworks, nor do they authorize a digital reconstruction of the lost first state. They function as provenance evidence: three time-stamped visual witnesses showing the work before, during, and after escalation.

The first image proves the existence of the clearly established blue trajectory. The second proves that orange was an independent challenge rather than an effort to trace or repair blue. The third proves that the concluding density emerged through a discrete change of intention and force. Without this sequence, a future viewer might reasonably interpret the final surface as a single episode of chaotic accumulation. With it, the work becomes legible as a temporal structure.

This temporal structure is not ancillary documentation attached to a static object. It is part of the critical understanding of the artifact. Somacentric Trajectilery ordinarily compresses movement into a single physical remainder. Here the successive photographs partially reopen that compression, allowing the viewer to see the transition from trajectory to test, from test to confrontation, and from confrontation to irreversible residue.

VII. FOUR LAYERS OF MATERIAL ONTOLOGY: TRAJECTILE, NEGOTIATION, RECORDING, PRESERVATION

'Nameless Numberless ONE' clarified three layers of the discipline: trajectory, recording, and preservation. 'Nameless Numberless TWO' requires a fourth layer to be inserted between the first and second: **material negotiation**. The expanded structure now reads: bodily event, negotiation with the support, material record, and survival through time.

The trajectory is the embodied movement unfolding through time. In the first blue stage it succeeds clearly. **Material negotiation** is the changing relation among body, medium, and support: cooperation, interruption, resistance, challenge, or conflict. Here negotiation begins as partial contact and ends as antagonism. **The recording** is the deposit that remains: sparse blue, fragmented orange, and finally the dense multi-colored residue of escalation. **Preservation** concerns whether that deposit can endure. On Arches paper, this last layer is the strongest of all.

The contrast with the first Numberless work is now foundational. 'Nameless Numberless ONE' presents a receptive but non-certifiable carrier: the event and its recording succeed, while archival pedigree remains compromised. 'Nameless Numberless TWO' presents the opposite condition: an archival carrier whose surface resists the event's translation. Together they establish two poles of the material field - **recordable but vulnerable** and **permanent but resistant**. Neither pole is sufficient by itself. A mature substrate for the discipline must negotiate both.

ARCHIVAL AND MATERIAL STATUS

Work: Nameless Numberless TWO

Date: July 2026

Medium: Oil pastel; sequential blue, orange, red, black, and additional chromatic trajectories

Substrate: Arches paper, 12 x 16 inches; conservation-grade archival support

Recording status: The substrate resisted continuous deposition; the final surface records the escalation of that conflict

Sequence status: Created in a parallel experimental chronology and formally restored as the second Numberless work

Documentary status: The three process photographs are essential provenance records of the buried stages, but do not replace the final artifact

VIII. PLACE WITHIN SOMACENTRIC TRAJECTILERY AND ARTEANITY

Within Somacentric Trajectilery, the work marks the moment when substrate resistance ceased to be a technical inconvenience and became the work's central antagonist. Earlier investigations had already shown that support determines how movement becomes visible. This sheet goes further. It demonstrates that the relationship can evolve during execution, and that the evolution itself can become the primary record. The artifact is therefore not simply a trajectile on rough paper. It is a layered history of force discovering, testing, and finally attacking the limits of its material receiver.

Within the broader Arteanity paradigm, the event stages liberation not as a clean passage from the Raw to the Awe, but as a violent obstruction within that passage. The creative drivery reaches the surface directly, yet the surface refuses transparent transmission. The body responds by intensifying rather than translating itself into a more civilized, controlled form. No compromise is designed. No decorative solution is negotiated. The resistance is met with greater resistance until the paper becomes the battlefield on which both forces remain visible.

The work also complicates the maxim that a trajectile does not fail. The blue trajectile indeed does not fail; the first photograph proves this. What fails is the expectation that an archival substrate will necessarily serve as an adequate witness. The subsequent artifact then exceeds the original category. It ceases to be only the record of a trajectile and becomes the record of a relation - a material conflict whose rising intensity is itself the final content.

IX. CURATORIAL CONCLUSION

'Nameless Numberless TWO' should be retained not as a rescued mess and not as an object retrospectively beautified by theory. Its critical status depends on preserving the exact sequence of events. The first blue trajectile was successful and clearly established. Arches failed to record it adequately. Orange constituted a second, independent attempt to force the support into responsiveness. When that failed, the work crossed into another state: a full-speed, all-in act of rage directed against the substrate's refusal.

The final surface remains visually difficult. That difficulty should not be softened. It has little of the elegant hierarchy or readable spatial architecture that characterizes many successful trajectiles recordings. But visual illegibility is not the only possible criterion of record. Here the density, collision, and obliteration register the changing emotional and physical stakes with extraordinary directness. The work succeeds because the confrontation happened, escalated, and was materially preserved.

Its irony is exact. The first Numberless work recorded beautifully on a support whose permanence cannot be guaranteed. The second is preserved on a truly archival support that initially refused to record. The solution was not to achieve harmony between body and material, but to let their incompatibility become visible. By naming the artifact 'Nameless Numberless TWO,' the archive acknowledges both the lost chronology and the newly discovered category: **an archival battlefield whose apparent disorder is the successful residue of resistance met by rage.**

ARCHIVAL POSITION

An archival Somacentric artifact in which a clearly established trajectory encounters a support that refuses adequate registration; the successive layers transform that refusal into an escalating, irreversible record of material confrontation and human rage.