EDITORIAL

If a cultural "renaissance" would hypothetically take place, it would require each and every artist to subjectively fight their own decay – opting out of the easy options that contribute to it. Regressive accelerationism, idleness, non-participation, the transformation of the self into geography, the consolidation of a speculative form of branding, conformity, normalization, parasitical absorption of information without surplus on it, speculative mass production, opportunism, self design rather than social design, emphasis on passive free flows, arto-biography without entitlement, reactionary comfort-seeking, unnecessary self indulgence, tautological mirrorings of the market in place of relevance, trolling, rubbish, depression, herd justification of stasis – in terms of game theory, the probability of each and every single artist avoiding any of these modes of participation (which have been offering them traction in varying degrees) – seems to be a long shot. The only way one can collectively encourage "renaissance" is by rewarding negentropy and providing personal merit to the artists who create it.

Of course in game theory, if each individual pursues their private interests, the collective outcome is always worse than if the individual agreed upon a common collective value as true. At best there is a personal advantage in an art world fit for no-one rendering it a solitary place, at worst there is a social darwinism that eventually takes hold of every individual as victim one by one in order of rank. This kind of fierce survival of the fittest system is not actually sustainable as Hobbesians or speculators rely on a majority quotient of Kantians to exist in order to gain an advantage. This means that those who rely on others to produce art (or intellectual ideas or progress *for* them) are dependent on growth produced by others to sustain themselves. Without growth from somewhere, there is nothing to grab. Without traction, one will see the stagnation of ideas that we are already witnessing, which will embed itself further into our culture.

The danger is that instead of the system facilitating exceptional artists, its mode of recognition wants predatory artist-bots. Based on a speculative logic the predator artist-bot must exploit pools of semantics to create the consciousness necessary to create art; otherwise they would operate only on a language of information level like any computer could. This is why AI is not especially interesting as a single means of art production and why Flip Art fails as an art historical cultural movement in the long term – becoming merely a detail that can be appended easily to other known business models in the art world. In effect, the allure of being a purely commercial artist gets quickly transferred into a fast-track towards irrelevance that will soon be forgotten.