

M. E. O'BRIEN

INSURGENT UTOPIANISM AS REVOLUTIONARY METHOD

The following remarks were delivered as the keynote lecture of the 2026 Methods Symposium convened by the graduate students of the Department of English at the University of Massachusetts Amherst on April 25, 2026.

MY ARGUMENT TODAY focuses on a concept I've developed as I've been speaking and touring on my two books over the past few years. I call this concept an "insurgent utopianism." It emerged through retroactively trying to make sense of the method I had been using in my work. Insurgent utopianism became a way of conceptualizing my writing practice, particularly how it was informed by and contributes to my own engagement with movement organizing. I hope something here can be of use to other writers, artists, and theorists committed to collective protest movements.¹

THE 2020 GEORGE FLOYD REBELLION

IT CAN BE DIFFICULT now to remember the sheer scale of the George Floyd rebellion. There is an amnesia today about the 2020 uprising and remarkable little published analysis about its relationship to our present conjuncture. Through conversations with movement militants, I've come to see that the current fascist upsurge is in some part a direct response to the rebellion. The strengthening of fascist rule today is an attempt to make impossible future uprisings of such scale and intensity.

Amid COVID lockdowns and economic crisis, Black youth led a historically unprecedented mass protest movement across the U.S. in the summer of 2020, drawing large sectors of the working class into popular state opposition. Over three weeks, somewhere between fifteen and twenty-five million people marched in opposition to police violence across two thousand U.S. cities. Riots spread, with curfews insti-

tuted in two hundred cities and the national guard deployed in twenty-one U.S. states. In Minneapolis, where George Floyd was murdered and the protests began, youth burned down a police station. Police arrested fourteen thousand people over the course of the protests. We don't have estimates for labor actions, but with much of the economy already shut down, by anecdotal accounts hundreds of workplaces had to close because their staff were joining the protests.

Besides numbers in the streets or the scale of property destruction, what is it they saw that so worried capitalist elites and their white petite bourgeois and suburban allies? Though I do not think toppling the U.S. state was imminent during the 2020 uprising, there was something more that frightened them into their current rush toward fascism. Fundamental to understanding the current political moment, we have to draw out and identify the mass utopian revolutionary imaginary that emerged at scale during the protests and circulated among the masses in motion: the revolutionary horizon of abolishing the police.

POLICE ABOLITION AS MASS UTOPIAN DEMAND

DURING THE 2020 George Floyd rebellion the demand to abolish the police suddenly became a mass, widespread concern. For a few weeks, tens of thousands of young people debated police abolition on the streets, in social media, and across their personal networks. "Abolish the police" became the left poll of the mass movement. Some tried to temper this to a more ostensibly plausible reform: defund the police, or place police departments under civilian authority, or, worse yet, fund various police reform efforts like body cameras or sensitivity trainings. But the demand for abolition, despite its apparently quixotic and puzzling meaning among all sections of the political establishment, remained politically salient enough that there was little mass enthusiasm for subsequent limited and mostly failed efforts at police reform.

Abolishing the police, of course, is a utopian demand. It reflects and embodies the utopian impulse, as understood by Ernst Bloch, Fredric Jameson, and various currents of utopian studies. Further, using a slightly broadened definition of policing, such as Lenin's paraphrase of Engels, "special bodies of armed men," police in one form or another are integral to class society. Overcoming such a social institution would necessarily entail the overcoming of private property. Though its popular adherents named or understood this to varying extents, police abolition

was briefly a mass demand for something approaching communism.

Abolishing the police had circulated in radical circles over the previous decades. In the 2000s I was active in the prison abolitionist organization Critical Resistance. Prison abolitionism evolved from the prison uprisings of 1970s, taken up by a network of activists across various socialist, anarchist, and Black revolutionary traditions both inside and outside prison. The analysis of prison abolitionists, emphasizing the interconnection of prisons proper with a broader nexus of private industry, state development, and carceral practices, easily lent itself to arguing for the abolition of police. These ideas, however, remained marginal outside of a few left circles. The slogan “abolish the police” began to circulate in the years of Black Lives Matter protests. It took the George Floyd rebellion for this utopian horizon to become conceivable to many people, to take on a degree of political traction, to be a shared object of mass desire, even to be rigorously thinkable for revolutionary theory.

INSURGENT UTOPIANISM

I BEGIN WITH THIS example for how utopian horizons circulate within existing social movements. Previously incomprehensible or outlandish demands suddenly take on a wider meaning, serving as a way of articulating a rapidly unfolding desire experienced by large numbers of people during popular rebellions. It was this sudden and massive appeal of police abolition, coupled to masses in militant motion on the streets, that played a key role in a substantial section of the U.S. ruling class backing a revanchist fascist movement and the current far right political turn in the U.S.

I am concerned in part with the peculiar quality of demands like abolishing the police, demands with a revolutionary dimension that take on meaning, or speak to something at play, during periods of intensifying protest. I call this particular form of demand insurgent utopianism, emphasizing its embedded role in the dynamics of mass struggle.

EVERYTHING FOR EVERYONE

A FEW OF MY PROJECTS led me to this analysis. In *Everything for Everyone: An Oral History of the New York Commune, 2052–2072* (Common Notions, 2022), a speculative novel I co-authored with Eman Abdelhadi, we depict a future communist society following a

global revolution. One reader called the book a “post-traumatic utopianism,” reflecting the book’s depiction of the substantial scars the unraveling of racial capitalism and the revolutionary transition had left on many of the novel’s characters. In keeping with my own research and that of my co-author, much of our focus was on the dimensions of social reproduction in the new society, including the organization of residential life, intimate relationships, and childrearing.

The reaction to our novel was quite startling. Neither my co-author nor I are accomplished fiction authors; we chose a small autonomous press, and there was little reason to think the book would be widely received. As we did public readings, in many cities we found fervent and impassioned fans. Multiple people told us it was their favorite book of all time, that they had given copies to dozens of friends, or that our book was profoundly transformative. This reaction could not be attributed easily to our book’s merits. Instead, I increasingly came to believe it reflected a deep yearning for what Robin D. G. Kelley calls “freedom dreams.” For many readers, the book offered an articulation of the utopian imaginings they had already encountered in social movements. People desperately want to connect to a sense that their present struggles, in some changed future context, could actually win.

PROJECT 2052

MANY OF OUR MORE impassioned readers had written their own stories in the world of *Everything for Everyone*. These reflected part of the political intent we had in writing the book. We picked a form, the fictional oral history, that was unusually easy to emulate and accessible to new writers. We developed a world that was open-ended and porous, leaving unspecified many places and social sectors of the world we had created. Many readers felt invited to imagine their stories in our world, and some felt able to write them.

From these conversations, we started a new online publishing platform called Project 2052. It’s a site for stories, poetry, and visual art set in the world of *Everything for Everyone*. In March 2026 we launched Project 2052 with a party in Chicago and five new stories. We had two of our authors come to Chicago; neither had ever published fiction and one had never published at all. Their stories are amazing; you can read them online for free through the website of our publisher, Common

Notions. We look forward to publishing one story a month for a while moving forward. We pay contributors a small honorarium, raised exclusively through online donations.

In a sense this is fan fiction for a book with an excited reading base. We like to imagine it is also a fun project with political content, offering a space for new writers to explore insurgent utopianism as a practice, to draw from their own movement experience to imagine speculative, revolutionary futures.

FAMILY ABOLITION

DURING OUR BOOK TOUR for *Everything for Everyone*, I was also finishing up my second book, *Family Abolition: Capitalism and the Communizing of Care* (Pluto, 2023), another utopian vision. Like other writers on family abolition, including Sophie Lewis, K. D. Griffiths, J. J. Gleeson, Madeline Lane-McKinley, Kathi Weeks, and Tiffany Lethabo-King, I understand family abolitionism as making universally available the care and supportive conditions necessary for human flourishing, rather than organizing care through the privatized system of the nuclear family. Who we love, who we are related to, and who we choose to live with should not impact if we have housing, food, or support when we need it. Such a revolutionary emancipatory vision of family abolition is a utopian demand, one that would demand a complete restructuring of society and an overcoming of the private household as an economic unit.

The first half of the book engages a history of the working-class family in racial capitalism and the tumult of the present moment. In each period, I argue the working-class family has a changing role in the reproduction of racial capitalism. This role in turn shaped the particular form that family abolitionist visions took when advanced by the leading edges of gender and sexual freedom in broader rebellions against capitalism and white supremacy. Because these family abolitionist politics are rooted in the collective desires of mass movements, they are also examples of what I call here insurgent utopianism.

Unusual for a work of Marxist theory, the last third of my book explicitly theorizes and envisions a speculative, family abolitionist, utopian future. I'm going to come back to *Family Abolition* later. But first, a bit about how, in this book, I engaged the place of utopian thinking in Marxism.

UTOPIANISM AND THE MARXIST CRITIQUE

UTOPIANISM AND MARXISM have often been at odds. In *Family Abolition* I closely engage with the French utopian socialist thinker Charles Fourier. Fourier's visions of large-scale future communes that value sexual freedom resonate with my own speculations about the residential commune as a means of deprivatizing care. There is much inspiring to find in the work of utopian socialists like Fourier. Marx himself closely read and drew much from Fourier, including his analysis of women's oppression. But ultimately Marx and Engels developed a trenchant critique of the utopian socialist tradition of which Fourier was a part. Here I will focus on this critique as a path to arrive at a more robust account of insurgent utopianism.

In *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, Engels argues that the lovers of a future communist society will have little use for the judgments of those of us living in the capitalist present: "Once such people appear, they will not care a damn about what we today think they should do. They will establish their own practice and their own public opinion, conforming therewith, on the practice of each individual—and that's the end of it."²

In response to a critical review of *Capital, Volume 1*, Marx references the utopian social theorist August Comte: "Thus the Paris Revue Positiviste reproaches me in that, on the one hand, I treat economics metaphysically, and on the other hand—imagine!—confine myself to the mere critical analysis of actual facts, instead of writing receipts (Comtist ones?) for the cook-shops of the future."³ This phrase "writing receipts for the cook-shops of the future" became the general condemnation by generations of Marxist activists for any discussion of a postrevolutionary society.

Marx and Engels correctly argued that utopian socialists like Fourier, Robert Owen, and Henri de Saint-Simon grossly erred in their understanding of social transformation. Without any vision of seizing the means of production, the utopian socialists wrongly thought a compelling vision of a just society could convince elites to cede land, power, and the means of production to new deliberate efforts at social planning. Moreover, many trying to advance the visions of the utopian socialists relied on genocide and settler colonialism to find the land for their projects. This includes Robert Owen's New Harmony in Indiana and twenty-eight Fourierist communes across the United States in the 1840s. To

this list I would add the Israeli kibbutz movement, where socialist values depended on settler colonialism and state-backed genocidal dispossession to create their models of collective living. Not surprisingly, Fourier and most utopian socialists were uncritical of European colonialism and white supremacy. The ties between utopian socialism and settler colonialism are well documented in the historical literature; yet it was Marx and Engels's critique that helped me understand that this link was nearly inevitable, a consequence of their model of change.

CRITIQUE OF SOCIAL JUSTICE AS PLANNING

THIS CRITIQUE OF UNDERSTANDING social justice as planning has considerable implications for how we understand utopianism as method. Seeing justice as something to be planned, Marx was quite right to point out, is a deeply flawed premise. The fundamental structures of a racial capitalist society impose severe and powerful constraints on the implementation of progressive visions of social change outside of revolutionary moments. Planners can internalize these constraints, unable to recognize new opportunities as conditions change due to struggle.

Planning itself, or the actions of planners, however inspiring they may be to large numbers of people, lack the social force to be able to pursue and implement visions that substantively challenge the organization of class society and the rule of capital. To the extent to which a utopian vision depends on such a model of social change it has little to offer.

This critique of planning also has implications for how we organize. Of course all of us should and must plan events all the time, and frankly our movements would do well to spend more time in concrete strategizing than we do. But there is an illusion that begins to develop among those who see themselves as in the chosen revolutionary organization, or in the upper echelons of large movement organizations: the illusion that we already have our strategy figured out. We can just resurrect an entire framework from a past revolution, or rely on our well-honed strategy document, or draw on our shared decades of struggle and see the path from here to victory. But what this misses is that the very form and content of victory will necessarily be discovered collectively in the unfolding of the struggle itself. Every movement has to practically innovate new ways of thinking and new practices in the unfolding course of a struggle itself. Rejecting utopianism as a blueprint also means ques-

tioning all our blueprints and having great skepticism about how confidently they can be proposed and implemented.

This shift away from a blueprint mode of thinking also decenters the place of a particular kind of movement leader. As an individual or organization or specific network of committed radicals, we may have a great deal to offer the movements to which we belong. But we are only really helpful when we offer that from within the movements themselves, confronted with their specific contradictions and emergent innovations. To imagine we have the blueprint is also to put ourselves outside the movement as an expert who can then dictate a way forward to everyone else. We can share helpful ideas, but we share them as comrades, with comrades, not from an external position able to see more clearly and confidently than those in the middle of the struggle.

INSURGENT UTOPIANISM

MARX POINTS US TO a much more realistic and accurate model of social change: recognizing the internally produced contradictions within racial capitalism, fully participating in the practical task of day-to-day struggle and mass protest, and through that struggle seizing on political opportunities that open up the possibility for major reforms or revolutionary changes. It is specifically at revolutionary moments, when there is a substantive challenge to the rule of capital, that it becomes possible for utopian possibilities to take on real power. These do not emanate from social planners but from the capacity of masses of people to engage in collective and creative acts of forging new social practices and new social institutions together. What is the role of utopianism in such a conception?

An earlier version of this talk was entitled “Utopianism: Colonial or Insurgent?,” echoing the title of Engels’s classic denunciation of the utopian socialists. To this naïve utopian socialism that ended up relying on colonial dispossession, I contrast it with another way of understanding the relationship between utopian visions and movement dynamics. Utopian horizons emerge from *within* mass protest, and this is what I’m conceiving of as an insurgent utopianism.

Marx demonstrated something resembling this method of theoretical production in *The Civil War in France*. The events of the Paris Commune had a major impact on Marx. He wrote the commune was “the glorious harbinger of a new society,” as the first attempt at a “working-

class government.”⁴ Through the commune, Marx was able to make significant advances in his own theorizing of the nature of the capitalist state and the revolutionary transition. Jameson argues that in his account of the commune and its implications, Marx is engaging in his own form of utopian speculation. But this utopianism is of a specific character, concretely rooted in the discoveries by the revolutionary movement itself. Marx writes:

The working class did not expect miracles from the Commune. They have no ready-made utopias to introduce *par decret du peuple* [by decree of the people]. They know that in order to work out their own emancipation, and along with it that higher form to which present society is irresistibly tending, by its own economical agencies, they will have to pass through long struggles, through a series of historic processes transforming circumstances and men. They have no ideals to realize, but to set free the elements of the new society with which old collapsing bourgeois society itself is pregnant.⁵

INSURGENT UTOPIANISM AS METHOD

WHAT DOES THIS ALL MEAN for method? I am arguing that insurgent utopianism as I've formulated it here points to a specific positioning of radical artists, writers, and theorists with respect to mass social movements. Insurgent utopianism is a method of making theory and art, and a practice of tracing the revolutionary visions as they emerge and recede during protest waves.

This framework suggests two major roles for culture workers in movements. First, we can and must participate directly. This is the domain of directly joining in political collective action in all the places we find ourselves—with our neighbors and coworkers, with our comrades, for both our own shared interests and in solidarity with others. Being able to write or research or design are each one of many skills that may be of some use to our comrades, and one of many ways we may directly contribute to struggles where we are participants and partisans. This is the domain of direct agit-prop, movement-based statements and the direct use of art and writing as part of political struggle.

But insurgent utopianism also suggests another potential practice. Many people who have participated in mass struggles have had the experience of feeling shifts on the level of what they desire. We learn something new about the world through discovering something new

in what we want, together, as we organize. Within the heat of active campaigns we don't always have the space and time to be able to really flesh out the speculative dimension of these emergent desires. Often in specific struggles we instead divide up which desires are to be turned into actionable demands that are strategic in that particular conjuncture and which may be tabled or relegated to an implied gesture or single protest slogan.

Here is a second role for radical artists, writers, and theorists: to distill the revolutionary horizons as they emerge within mass struggle. Within the struggle, we can listen for and identify the revolutionary, utopian horizons as they emerge from within the struggle itself. Then we can take these utopian horizons and develop them in collaborative historical and theoretical study, in turn reflecting through our individual and shared art practice and writing. Through these creative practices, we can flesh out the speculative dimensions we had already encountered from within the movement. These can then be offered back to movements to circulate, be debated, and be put to use in collective work.

The utopian demand, when resonant with protest upsurges, can serve as a means of articulating and contributing to the motion of mass desires. Utopian horizons in movement demands, political theory, or speculative fiction can be ways of articulating and developing what we are fighting for in the present as we work it through and discover it in the practical tasks of advancing our shared emancipation.

This notion of insurgent utopianism as method is fundamentally dialectical and dialogical. It depends on writers and artists having an intimate involvement within movements as comrades from which they draw the circulating desires and having avenues to share them back in dialogue and collaborative thinking. This is never simple and can easily be captured into competing priorities of academic prestige, social media influence, or the narrow interests of organization-building. But many can and do find ways of entering into such a dialogical relationship to movements, learning from the wisdom discovered on the streets and offering back creative and challenging formulations that evoke the struggle's implied revolutionary horizon. We can collectively create more pathways and spaces for artists and writers to contribute to movements through insurgent utopianism.

This formulation of insurgent utopianism relies on a certain understanding of movements. Collective struggles necessarily must be creative, innovating new tactics, new strategies, new ways of analyzing and

understanding the conditions we are rebelling against, and new forms of freedom. No one tradition can be resurrected from a past period of struggle and be adequate to our new changed conditions. This is both because the world has since changed and because previous iterations of struggle were defeated. Movements can and should draw from the past, but what from past frameworks is helpful and what is not has to be debated and assessed in light of the present, the particular conjuncture of a struggle in its specific context. Movements have to figure this out together, on the streets, through the process of struggle and reflection within the work itself. This draws from my understanding of the political tendency known as communization.

Insurgent utopianism shares some relation to the critical utopianism of Marxist utopian studies and elements of Jameson's arguments, though emphasizing more our role in intimate dialogue with movements. As well as critical utopianism, my analysis here is also shaped by engaging the Maoist organizing method called the Mass Line and by Gramsci's understanding of the generative role of organic intellectuals and intellectualism.

INSURGENT SOCIAL REPRODUCTION

IN THE COURSE OF writing *Family Abolition*, I came to see acts of care within mass struggles as essential to the overcoming of the family as a form of privatized care. I call this "insurgent social reproduction." It refers to the practical activities of caring for each other during periods of mass protest, extended periods of confrontation with the state and capital.

I open the book with the example of Oaxaca Commune of 2006, when Indigenous women lived on the barricades defending their neighborhoods against nightly raids by police and paramilitaries. There on the barricades the tasks they once did in the home as housewives—caring for their children, procuring and preparing food, arranging the conditions for sleeping, aiding disabled comrades—became collective practices of sustaining the rebellion. I cite many other examples, drawing from my own time at protest camps. Insurgent social reproduction becomes central to the book's theorizing family abolition, providing the pivot from the past to the future.

Unlike the other forms of insurgent utopianism I named earlier that operate primarily on the level of the movement demand, here insurgent social reproduction as a form of family abolition is not necessar-

ily named by movement militants or directly theorized by its organic intellectuals. Instead, it's an immanent process within the dynamics of struggle itself, on the level of a movement practice. But like the utopian demand, it evokes the utopian horizon, a form of collective desire, and a new world to be won.

Identifying insurgent social reproduction as the kernel of family abolitionism shares many qualities with insurgent utopianism: It's learning from movements, being attentive to the discoveries and experimentation that happens during mass rebellions, and seeing in those practices the evocation of revolutionary horizons. It highlights a second facet of insurgent utopianism as a practice also important to my thinking. I opened with the example of the George Floyd rebellion, where the utopian horizon was most visible in the demands raised in the struggle; for the women of the Oaxaca Commune and other examples of insurgent social reproduction, it is most visible in the direct practices of care themselves.

Insurgent utopianism as demand and as practice are intertwined and dialectically supportive of each other, in necessary relation as praxis. In the collective practices of care within moments of mass struggle, we can see something of the world we are fighting for. In this sense, insurgent utopianism and insurgent social reproduction are intimately linked: Experiencing alternative, radical practices of care is one of the experiences in struggle that most dramatically opens up the sense of transformative possibilities.

In speaking about my books, I often try to avoid occupying the position of telling people what they should be doing in their political work. But to the extent to which I have any advice to offer, I locate it in this presentation's problematic of utopianism: As participants in shared social struggles, we can all embrace elements of utopian visioning as a legitimate articulation of our desires, of allowing ourselves to dream the world we want to live in. As artists, writers, researchers, and theorists, we can practice what I call here a method of insurgent utopianism. Among our other contributions to movements, we can also work to notice and create space to flesh out the utopian revolutionary horizons that are created and circulate within mass struggles.

PALESTINE AND THE UTOPIAN HORIZON

I WILL CLOSE WITH another example of a demand that, like abolishing the police, has long historical roots but has been taken up again

with new vigor and resonance: “From the river to the sea,” often coupled with the refrain, “Palestine will be free.”

The Israeli genocide in Gaza has been a leading force in the wholesale global collapse of the always limited post-WWII liberal social order of humanitarian aid, international law, and international cooperation. The repression of Palestine solidarity movements in the U.S., including those backed by liberal politicians and university administrators, directly and concretely opened the door to the current fascist dismantling of any rights to protest, to organize or express political opposition. The Trump administration, for example, is currently engaged in an unprecedented intervention in higher education curriculum, admissions, and policy, explicitly framed around combating antisemitism, which they conflate with opposition to Israeli genocide, using the same rhetorical and policy framing that university administrators used to broadly repress student protest prior to Trump’s reelection. Tied to their fears from the George Floyd rebellion with which I opened this lecture, the liberal elite opposition to Palestine solidarity protests is essential to understanding their swift capitulation to Trump’s demands. I gather there are parallel dynamics across Europe, as state efforts to repress Palestine solidarity activists under the rubric of fighting antisemitism has converged with a growing far right opposed to Arab and Muslim migrants.

For decades, the Palestinian freedom struggle has been a guiding force for international liberation struggles. In the 1970s Palestinian militants built ties with and directly supported the movement against apartheid in South Africa, British occupation in Ireland, the radical Black freedom struggle in the U.S., and multiple revolutionary anti-colonial movements in Africa and Asia. In the last three years of the genocide in Gaza, the steadfastness of Palestinian freedom struggle has revitalized international solidarity movements. Palestine has offered a powerful lesson of freedom to the world.

In this context, the slogan “from the river to the sea” takes on its revolutionary meaning. Israeli state policy has actively worked to fragment the Palestinian people, dividing them between those expelled altogether from the historic territory of Palestine, who often live as second-class refugees in surrounding Arab nations or scattered globally, those Arab citizens of Israel who face extensive discrimination in Israeli state policy, and those in the occupied territories of Gaza and the West Bank. Most peace processes have presumed this continued fragmentation and the maintenance of an apartheid regime based on ethnic and religious nationhood.

“From the river to the sea” originated in the 1960s from the Palestinian Liberation Organization. It joined a commitment to the right to return for the Palestinian diaspora to the creation of a secular, democratic and multiethnic state that encompassed historic Palestine. As a slogan, it refuses this fragmentation of the Palestinian people integral to Israeli state policy and insists on the shared solidarity between Palestinians as well as the need to overturn apartheid altogether.

The slogan, like all utopian horizons, points beyond the immediately concrete toward a Palestine also free of capitalism and its violence. Palestinians have forged an insurgent utopianism, articulating in myriad ways a commitment to a shared liberated future, often evoking a freedom beyond the narrow confines of a nation state.

To declare “from the river to the sea” is an act of science fiction, of a speculative imaginary that allows people to vision beyond the brutal constraints of the present, the horror and war of history, and the restricted and tepid proposals often available for what could come next. It resonates from the past into the present movement as an ongoing freedom struggle toward a revolutionary future. It is an act of utopian speculation, the kind on which our collective survival necessarily depends.

NOTES

1 The author wishes to thank the organizers of this conference, in particular Jeremy Geragotelis and Jon Hoel, and the graduate students of the University of Massachusetts Amherst English Department, for the invitation to speak.

2 Engels, Frederick. *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, in *Marx & Engels Collected Works* Vol. 26 (Lawrence & Wishart, 2010)

3 Marx, Karl. “Afterward to the Second German Edition,” *Capital* Vol. 1, in *Marx & Engels Collected Works* Vol. 35 (Lawrence & Wishart, 2010)

4 Marx, Karl. *The Civil War in France*, in *Marx & Engels Collected Works* Vol. 22 (Lawrence & Wishart, 2010)

5 Ibid.