

The Cambridge Journal of Law, Politics, and Art

Promoting free expression and calm thinking in a time of crisis

You have been invited to contribute to the Third Issue of *The Cambridge Journal of Law, Politics, and Art* ('*CJLPA*'). We believe very strongly in the past record of this publication. It would be our pleasure and privilege to involve you in our future.

Within two years of its founding, *CJLPA* has enjoyed a rapid rise within the international academic and professional community. It boasts a higher prestige of contributors than almost any other publication and is distributed in over 70 countries. The journal has been described as: 'the most exciting publication in recent years' (Paul Pickering, English novelist); 'a remarkable publication, probably unique' (Lady Arden, UK Supreme Court); 'interesting, eclectic and stimulating, by writers representing a remarkably wide range of perspectives' (Lord Sumption, UK Supreme Court); 'an important and courageous cause' (Professor John Finnis, legal philosopher, Oxford University); and 'greatly impressive..attractive, professional, and intelligent' (Professor Matthew Kramer, Professor of Jurisprudence, Cambridge University). Our Managing Editor is Jack Graveney, a Research Assistant at Cambridge University. Our Chief Coordinator is Thomas Hood, another Cambridge graduate specialising in Intellectual Property Law. Don Foresta, a world-renowned art theoretician, is our Advisory Editor. Lady Arden, a former UK Supreme Court Judge, is our Honorary Editor.

Our third edition will be a culturally significant snapshot of thought on the current state of the world, focusing on the impact that technology is having on the fundamental rationale of a post-Industrial Revolution society. It will explore the thinking and assumptions behind our current social system and consider what is changing and whether that change is a good thing. Coupled with this will be an international Legal Working Group dealing with law reform proposals stemming from trends identified by the edition's contributors, concentrating in particular on the legal regulation of technology. Overleaf, you will find a note from our Advisory Editor, explaining the creative thinking behind our third edition.

Our journal is flexible as regards articles' length, format, and style. Thorough referencing is encouraged, as are illustrations. We regret that we cannot financially compensate for articles. The present submission deadline for our third edition is 1 January 2024.

I very much hope that we will have the pleasure of publishing your work in our forthcoming edition.

Alexander S. Kardos-Nyheim

Founder and Editor-in-Chief



An Invitation to Change

Don Foresta
Advisory Editor to
*The Cambridge Journal
of Law, Politics, and Art*
Paris, France

What we hear consistently, a refrain which has become a din, is that we cannot continue as we have been anymore. Interestingly, this is coming from all corners of human activity, and many are already engaged in new directions with redefined goals. Perception of where we are as a species has changed profoundly: in how we see our world, our place in it, human efforts in every sphere, and how we define ourselves in relation to our planet, each other, and society. It goes beyond thinking that we can correct a few things here and there and everything will get back to normal. The ‘normal’ is the problem. Things that have been glorified in the past as virtuous and essential to humanity are now seen as having gone bad, as being the destructive root cause of many of today’s problems.

All of our activities must be re-examined and reinvented. We must create new institutions to promote the necessary changes, which means consulting with people from around the world to ask how they see that world today from their own experience, their own personal and professional development, to begin to probe where we need to go. Change in perception is the first step necessary for understanding and making these changes. No one person, no one government or institution has the answer. We must start the essential experimental period confronting us, by looking at our past, present, and future in a new light, examining what people are understanding and doing in their corner of the world to respond to the crises we face today. This must be the beginning of a long period of open experimentation, creativity, and reinvention, without a predetermined finality dictating that path. It is well beyond the miraculous silver bullet solutions society seems to love and look for. It will be work, calling for enormous effort, humility, openness, back-to-the-drawing-board stubbornness. Our survival will be the result if we do it well.

Across over four decades I have argued that we have been living a new renaissance for almost 150 years. A renaissance, in my definition, happens when art and science in parallel fundamentally change a culture’s definition of reality and its representation. That change inevitably ripples through society, provoking more change as the underlying belief system shifts. I think of art and science as representing our two principal ways of learning the world through both feeling and reason, meaning that beyond Descartes’ ‘cogito ergo sum’ we must now recognise ‘sentio ergo sum’, ‘I feel therefore I am’, acknowledging the whole human being and our capacity for knowing in the broadest sense. Art tells us things we would have no other way of knowing. Our new renaissance opened new avenues for art, artistic exploration, and creativity and made art an important actor for changing perception. Telecommunications have offered a space for a synthesis between the plastic and performing arts which was only imagined by earlier artists.

The new renaissance began in the late 19th century, first in art, normally a very public endeavour, later in science, particularly the first part of the 20th century with Relativity and Quantum Physics. Those changes, along with the revolution happening in art, proposed another worldview and a change in perception—the first role of art—a new operational schema, a paradigm. A renaissance is historically a very violent period, where the older order is wiped away, along with the shared value system it created and the shared



mythologies used to transmit it. People are left without anchors, without a common understanding of how the world works: no shared mythology or value system, no accepted paradigm.

The clockwork of the mechanical universe and Euclidean space of the last Renaissance and its way of understanding the world was declared obsolete by both art and science, and nothing was immediately proposed to replace it. In my view, both were actually pointing to the beginnings of a new world-view which expanded in meaning and force as the century progressed. A potentially new paradigm usually evolves slowly from the ruins of the old and takes a considerable amount of time and consensus before becoming manifest. The massive expansion of knowledge which marked the 20th century has been leading to the formation of that paradigm, and our more and more obvious need to find it has contributed to a re-examination of the world and our place in it.

I firmly believe that we are leaving the negative and destructive part of our renaissance and moving into the constructive phase of finding a larger worldview, one which is more inclusive, environmentally sound, humanly responsible and responsive, and closer to a broader truth in which more people can see themselves reflected. We need to move more positively into that mode, recognising that everything we have built in the past has to be reinvented and that institutions no longer working for the public good need to be replaced. Those institutions have lost their original mandate to serve and exist only to prolong themselves, serving only the people who operate them. We can no longer continue in that mode and its obsolescence must be replaced by an operational schema responding to human needs, including the thorough re-examination of our place in nature, how we relate to one another, and to society.

My personal proposal as a model for that paradigm is the interactive network. This is why I have spent half my life working to make a part of telecommunication's new communication space a place for art and culture, assuring that the knowledge gleaned from art helps define that space. A communication space for an individual or a society is the place where we receive or transmit information, word-of-mouth, family and friends, education, the media, literature, and art, where we see ourselves, and where the new ideas will be found and shared. A renaissance usually also includes a redefinition of the individual and his or her relation to society. The last Renaissance's definition of the individual as a singularity will now be expanded to those singularities plus the network of their relationships, which ultimately define them. I have even proposed, as a coming shared mythology, a neo-animism whereby we understand that all things are living and connected.

We are in a period of experimentation, calling on our deepest levels of creativity to find solutions which will eventually evolve into new institutional forms and the values and beliefs needed to support them. That creativity, as mentioned, is premised on avoiding predetermined results or ideologies—very hard for humans given the psychological and intellectual baggage we all carry. It's time to hear from all those corners who are living through the change, the front-line people who are experiencing it, how they see and live the change. We have to apply our creativity fully and openly to see where it takes us, whether squarely into the wall or through a newly open door. And continue until we succeed in finding many open doors. This issue of the *Cambridge Journal of Law, Politics, and Art* will participate in that search by bringing together people from many endeavours, including from the recent past, to share their preoccupations, their views of where we are going, to help us all see better.

