Editor's introduction

Pablo Cortés
University of Leicester

It is a pleasure to present this issue of *Amicus Curiae*. The past months have been a rewarding exercise in reviewing submissions, corresponding with authors and reviewers, and watching manuscripts develop through revision into the contributions gathered here. Each published piece has been subject to rigorous peer review, followed in some cases by more than one round of revision. This issue, like its predecessors, is therefore the product of the authors' research, the careful scrutiny of peer reviewers, and the authors' subsequent revisions.

I would like to begin by thanking the authors for trusting the journal with their research and for engaging so conscientiously with the feedback they received. In several cases, that engagement involved multiple revisions, and the quality of the final work reflects that commitment. I am equally grateful to our anonymous reviewers, whose careful, expert reading is the foundation of the journal's integrity. Their willingness to provide detailed, constructive feedback—often within demanding timeframes to allow publication in the present issue—is something I do not take for granted.

This publication would not have been possible without the institutional and financial support of the Institute of Advanced Legal Studies, whose commitment to making rigorous legal scholarship freely available to all remains a defining feature of this journal. I also wish to thank my co-editors, Drs Amy Kelly and Maria Moscati, and our consultant editor, Professor Michael Palmer, for their wise and timely counsel. A particular word of thanks is due to Marie Selwood, the technical and co-ordinating editor, whose professionalism and dedication were indispensable to the preparation and delivery of this issue.

This issue brings together an eclectic range of legal scholarship, alongside a Special Section edited by Dr Paolo Vargiu on the theme of justice on display. In his guest editor's introduction, Dr Vargiu presents an engaging collection of papers examining how law is made visible through popular culture, visual narrative, public discourse

and legal performance, and how these forms shape public legal consciousness. The contributions develop his central observation that legal authority is produced not only through rules, "but also by scenes, symbols, performances, narratives, and images". As he observes, the Special Section does not simply ask whether justice is seen to be done: its deeper concern is "how justice is made visible, who controls that visibility, who is exposed by it, and what remains unseen".

The issue opens with Michael Murphy's article "Law in the Accusative: Relational Legal Pluralism and the Architecture of Foreclosure." This article is a continuation of his work from the previous issue, where his "The Jurisprudence of the Threshold" (*Amicus Curiae* 7(2): 640–680) examined the administrative state. Murphy here develops a theory of Relational Legal Pluralism as a critical method for challenging closed and self-protective forms of governance. Drawing on the philosophical framework of Watsuji Tetsurō, the article grounds its argument in embodied and spatial forms of vulnerability that legal abstraction tends to occlude and illustrates the stakes of that argument through the Grenfell Tower disaster and the external enforcement of the European border regime. The article proposes an Aesthetic Impact Statement as a mechanism for reintroducing embodied harm into legal processes, reimagining the rule of law around survival, accountability, and relational justice.

Harry Meliniotis follows with "The Algorithm and the Tribunal: Philosophy to the Rescue and the Threat from Within", which asks whether English law can extend party autonomy to recognize binding decisions from autonomous artificial intelligence (AI) systems in construction disputes. Meliniotis argues that while automated dispute resolution may be technically feasible, algorithmic decision-making cannot satisfy the conditions of legitimate adjudication required to justify state-backed enforcement. Drawing on legal philosophy and doctrine, he contends that adjudication is a fundamentally human practice of responsible judgment. His article's most notable contribution, however, may be its warning about hybrid human–AI decision-making: precisely because it is harder to detect, it poses a more insidious threat to the very conception of judgment than full automation.

Remaining on the theme of digital dispute resolution, Faye F Wang's "Shaping the Law Curriculum with Authentic Assessment: Online Dispute Resolution (ODR) Simulation and Dispute

System Design (DSD) in Legal Education" updates her earlier study published in this journal ("Online Dispute Resolution Simulation" *Amicus Curiae* 2(2): 216-236). While the earlier article examined how ODR workshops develop students' legal and digital competencies, the present paper explores how DSD enables law students to advance their skills further—not only by engaging with digital dispute resolution, but by thinking collaboratively about the design of suitable ODR processes for different dispute types. Wang argues that these increasingly vital topics foster the analytical and critical skills students need in an ever-more digitalized legal landscape.

The next article turns to a markedly different domain. In "Barriers to Medical Cannabis in the UK: Human Rights Implications of Criminalization and Inequitable Access", Lydia Kitchen examines the legislative amendments of 2018 that legalized medical cannabis in the United Kingdom (UK) and finds that access to these treatments remains severely restricted in practice. While private prescriptions have increased, National Health Service treatment is exceedingly rare, leaving many individuals who use cannabis to manage health conditions exposed to the risk of criminalization when they obtain it through the illegal market. Kitchen documents how this disproportionately affects ethnic minorities, women, and people with disabilities—groups more likely to experience the conditions that medical cannabis can treat. Through a combined doctrinal and socio-legal analysis, she argues that current restrictions undermine the rights to autonomy and equality protected under Articles 8 and 14 of the European Convention on Human Rights, and makes the case for decriminalizing personal possession as the most practicable step towards addressing these inequalities.

The last two articles offer a detailed judicial perspective on Ghana's relatively recent insolvency reforms. In "Evaluation of the Efficacy of the Corporate Insolvency and Restructuring Act 2020 (Act 1015) of Ghana: A Comparative Analysis with the United Kingdom" (Parts I and II), Justice Dadzie provides a detailed exposition of both the Ghanaian and UK insolvency frameworks before undertaking a thoughtful comparative evaluation. Part I offers a systematic account of the regimes established under the Corporate Insolvency and Restructuring Act 2020 and the range of tools available under UK legislation; Part II carries out the comparative analysis and advances a carefully calibrated set of reform proposals. These include

the introduction of a specialist insolvency list, development of Practice Directions, enhanced judicial training, early warning mechanisms, recalibration of creditor voting thresholds, the introduction of a viability test, and the reform of wrongful trading liability and *ipso facto* rules—proposals that align with international best practices while remaining sensitive to Ghana's institutional context.

Taken together, the articles in this issue reflect the breadth of contemporary legal scholarship published in *Amicus Curiae*. They range across legal theory, AI, legal education, medical cannabis, and insolvency reform. The Special Section further brings together a collection of essays examining how justice is made visible in culture.

What unites these contributions is a shared concern with the relationship between law and lived experience: how legal institutions are represented; how they resolve disputes; how they regulate conduct; how they reflect society; and how they reform and respond to social change. I hope readers will find in this issue not only a diverse range of legal analyses, but also a set of contributions that affirm the continuing importance of rigorous, accessible, and publicly engaged legal scholarship.