

READING GROUP TOOLKIT

for

Radical Justice:
Building the World We Need

by

Nani Jansen Reventlow

Pluto Press, 2026

Prepared by Ronald Jarrett for Pluto Press

Suitable for libraries, museums, history societies, and community groups

Includes three programme plans: one-session • two-session • four-weeks

Start Here

About the Book

Radical Justice: Building the World We Need is a collection of personal essays by Nani Jansen Reventlow, a human rights lawyer, activist, and writer with roots in both Africa and Europe. She is the founder of two organisations: the Digital Freedom Fund (2017), which supports digital rights litigation across Europe, and Systemic Justice, which develops models of community-driven litigation that place affected communities in charge of legal campaigns. She has worked as a litigator in approximately 50 countries and, as a law professor, has trained lawyers in freedom of expression.

Originally published in Dutch in 2024 and released in English by Pluto Press in 2026, *Radical Justice: Building the World We Need* examines how systemic injustice operates across interconnected domains (from climate to digital rights to reparations) and argues that meaningful change requires grasping injustice at its root rather than treating its symptoms.

The title takes its name from Angela Davis's observation that 'radical simply means grasping things at the root.' Jansen Reventlow applies that principle across nine chapters, each addressing a specific theme and drawing on her experience litigating, as well as her personal experience as a Black woman navigating predominantly white professional and civic spaces. The book is not a legal manual. It is a call to action for anyone who wants to understand why the world looks the way it does and what can be done about it.

Three threads run through every chapter: 1) that lasting change requires understanding root causes; 2) that oppression is interlocked and resists singular solutions; and 3) that each of us can and must act, without waiting for a designated leader or a perfect plan.

The Chapters at a Glance

Introduction	The personal, political, and professional are intertwined. Jansen Reventlow traces her own journey as a Black woman in law and activism, making the case that private experience of injustice and public resistance to it are inseparable.
Ch. 1: An ode to being radical	What does it mean to be radical? Drawing on Angela Davis and adrienne maree brown, the chapter argues for grasping root causes rather than pursuing cosmetic fixes.
Ch. 2: Hero worship in activism	Why the cult of the charismatic leader is harmful to movements, and how it erases the unglamorous collective work that makes change possible.
Ch. 3: The perfect plaintiff	Who gets to be the face of a legal case, and who gets filtered out? The chapter examines how the pursuit of palatable plaintiffs reproduces the very hierarchies that legal action claims to challenge.
Ch. 4: On using the master's tools	The marriage equality struggle as a case study in litigation for systemic change: when courts can and cannot deliver justice, and what community-driven litigation looks like.
Ch. 5: Climate justice	How climate change intersects with race, colonialism, and economic inequality, and why climate justice requires centring the communities most affected.

Ch. 6: Freedom of speech, power, and liberation	Who speech protections actually protect, and what radical uses of expression (from zines to social media) have looked like historically and now.
Ch. 7: Digital rights	How surveillance, algorithmic discrimination, and platform power bear disproportionately on marginalised communities, and what decolonising the digital rights field means.
Ch. 8: Reparations	The history and present of reparations movements, what reparations would actually require, and why the conversation keeps getting stuck.
Ch. 9: Distractions	A personal final chapter on the tactics used to undermine people doing resistance work, and on how to hold together self-care and sustained commitment.

Historical Context

The English edition of *Radical Justice* was published in 2026 against a backdrop Jansen Reventlow describes in her preface: the erosion of gains made following the 2020 George Floyd protests and Black Lives Matter movement; the rollback of DEI commitments across corporate and public sectors; and the political mainstreaming of positions that had previously been considered fringe. In the UK, this includes the ongoing consequences of Brexit; in the United States, the second Trump administration; and across Europe, the strengthening of neofascist and hard-right parties in national and European elections.

The book's roots are in a different political moment: Jansen Reventlow was originally prompted to write it by a conversation about reparations and the difficulty of moving that debate beyond symbol to substance. The Dutch edition appeared in October 2024, a week before the US presidential election. The English edition's release into a more overtly hostile political environment gives the book a different inflexion: its arguments about distraction, resistance to hero worship, and the need for sustained coalition work feel, to many readers, more urgent than when it was written.

For groups reading the book in the context of libraries, museums, or community groups, it is worth noting that it is explicitly about activism and resistance. Some facilitators may find it useful to name that at the outset and invite participants to locate themselves in relation to it: as people who share the book's political commitments; as people who are curious but uncertain; as professional practitioners in fields the book discusses; or as some combination of all of these. As a practical matter, the single-session format works best with six to eight participants, which gives each person enough airtime to move from first impressions through to applied analysis within a compressed timeframe; the four-week book club can sustain ten to twelve, since discussion time is distributed across multiple sessions.

Ground Rules

These ground rules apply across all three programme formats. Read them aloud at the start of every session and display them where participants can see them.

- 1 One speaker at a time. Let each person finish before responding.
- 2 Speak from the text. Connect your point to something Jansen Reventlow actually says or argues.
- 3 Critique ideas, not people. Challenge arguments, not the person making them.
- 4 Stay on schedule. The facilitator will keep time. If a thread is cut short, note it and return if there is space.

- 5 Clarify jargon. If someone uses a term, acronym, or references a case you don't recognise, ask them to explain. If you use one, explain it yourself.
- 6 Make space for quiet voices. The facilitator may invite someone who has not yet spoken to share their view.

Programme A: Single Session

One session of 60–90 minutes. Designed around a single chapter. The run-of-show below uses Chapter 4 ('On using the master's tools: litigation for systemic change') as its focus, but can be adapted for any chapter with the guidance in the Facilitator's Notes.

Recommended Chapter: Chapter 4

Chapter 4 is the best single-session entry point into *Radical Justice* for most audiences. It takes a concrete historical case (the fight for marriage equality in the United States) and uses it to explore a question with broad resonance: when does working within existing systems produce real change, and when does it simply rearrange things without touching the structure underneath? That question does not require specialised legal knowledge to engage with. It speaks to anyone who has tried to change something and run into the institution designed to resist that change.

The chapter also contains the book's sharpest formulation of a theme that runs throughout: Audre Lorde's provocation that the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house. This gives the group a memorable phrase to return to and dispute. If your group has a specific thematic interest (climate, speech, digital rights, reparations), choose the corresponding chapter and substitute the discussion questions from the relevant section of this guide.

Facilitator Run-of-Show: 60 Minutes

Time	Phase	What happens
0–5 min	Welcome and ground rules	Welcome to the group. Introduce yourself briefly. Read the ground rules aloud and ask if anyone has questions. If this is the group's first session together, do a one-sentence round of introductions: name and one word describing their reaction to the chapter.
5–12 min	Ice-breaker prompt	Ask: 'Before we get into the chapter's arguments, what was the moment in your reading where you felt most strongly in any direction? What provoked that reaction?' Take two or three responses without debate. This surfaces the group's emotional register and identifies what they already care about.
12–35 min	First discussion round	Work through Questions 1-3 (see below). These move from first impressions and comprehension toward the author's central claims. Aim to spend roughly seven minutes per question. Keep the group speaking to the text.
35–40 min	Mini-activity (optional)	Pair-share: ask participants to turn to a neighbour and spend three minutes discussing 'One thing in this chapter you would push back

		on, and why.' Bring two or three responses back to the full group.
40–58 min	Second discussion round	Move to Questions 4-5. These ask participants to evaluate the argument and connect it to their own context. Accept more open-ended responses here. The facilitator's job is to hold the thread between different contributions, not to drive toward consensus.
58–60 min	Close	Invite a one-sentence response: 'What are you taking away from this conversation?' Go around the room if time allows. Mention any further reading from the list at the back of this guide.

To extend to 90 minutes: add 10 minutes to the first discussion round and 20 minutes to the second. Use that additional time to introduce a short audio clip from the Pluto Press podcast episode featuring Nani Jansen Reventlow, and open it up for responses.

Discussion Questions: Chapter 4

Opening questions (arouse interest/frame purpose)

These questions are designed to surface first impressions and orient the group toward what the chapter is doing. There are no wrong answers.

1. Before you read Chapter 4, how would you have answered this question: can you use the legal system to dismantle the structures the legal system was built to protect? Did the chapter change your answer?
2. Jansen Reventlow describes the early marriage equality cases not just as losses but as cases that made things worse, reinforcing in law exactly what campaigners were trying to overturn. Does that surprise you? Why do you think this history isn't usually told this way?
3. The chapter carries Audre Lorde's question as its title, but does not give a simple answer to it. In one sentence, what do you think Jansen Reventlow's answer actually is?

Main discussion questions (establish claim/provoke thought)

These questions ask participants to evaluate the argument and connect it to contexts outside the chapter.

4. Jansen Reventlow describes a community partner observing that 'there are lots of legal and human rights frameworks that could be used to fight for justice; there is a lot of justice spelt out on paper that is not being applied in practice.' Think about an issue you know well: are you trying to create new rules, or enforce ones that already exist? Does that distinction change the strategy?
5. The chapter argues that community-driven litigation (where affected communities lead rather than follow) produces better outcomes than cases chosen and managed solely by lawyers or NGOs. What does 'communities leading' actually require in practice? What would have to change in the institutions around them for that to be possible?

Programme B: Two Sessions

Two sessions of 60–90 minutes each, covering the full book. Session 1 addresses the book's structural and methodological arguments (Chapters 1–4); Session 2 moves through its thematic chapters (Chapters 5–9). Participants should read each half before the corresponding session.

Session 1: Understanding the Framework

Chapters covered: Introduction, Chapter 1 (An ode to being radical), Chapter 2 (Hero worship in activism), Chapter 3 (The perfect plaintiff), Chapter 4 (On using the master's tools).

Facilitator Run-of-Show: Session 1 (60 Minutes)

Time	Phase	What happens
0–6 min	Welcome and ground rules	Welcome to the group. Read the ground rules aloud. If this is the group's first time meeting, do a brief introduction round: name and what brought them to this book.
6–15 min	Ice-breaker prompt	Ask: 'The author opens the book by connecting her personal experience of injustice (being underpaid relative to a white colleague, being stopped at airports) to the systemic patterns she works on professionally. Where does that kind of connection between the personal and the systemic feel most alive or most difficult in your own experience?'
15–35 min	First discussion round	Work through Questions 6-8. These cover Chapters 1 and 2 and address the book's core argument about what 'radical' means and why collective, unglamorous organising tends to get erased.
35–40 min	Mini-activity	Ask participants to write down, individually and in silence, the name of one person doing important work for justice that they think is underrecognised. Invite two or three people to share. What do those examples have in common with the figures Jansen Reventlow discusses?
40–57 min	Second discussion round	Move to Questions 9-10, which address Chapters 3 and 4. These are more technically grounded; some participants may feel less confident here. The facilitator should keep the focus on the political argument rather than the legal detail.
57–60 min	Close	One-sentence round: 'One question you are bringing into the second session.' Note these; they may shape the opening of Session 2.

Discussion Questions: Session 1

Opening questions (arouse interest/frame purpose)

6. Jansen Reventlow defines 'radical' using Angela Davis's formulation: grasping things at the root. She contrasts this with cosmetic or performative responses to injustice. Can you think of a recent example — from the news, from your own institution, or from a field you know — where the response to injustice was cosmetic rather than radical? What made it cosmetic?
7. Chapter 2 argues that the cult of the heroic leader is not just a misrepresentation of how change happens but actively harmful — that it creates passivity and makes

movements fragile. Do you agree? Can you think of a movement or campaign where the hero-leader model has helped rather than harmed?

8. The Introduction makes the case that Jansen Reventlow's personal experiences of racism as a professional — being paid less, being questioned by security, being asked to be 'the one diverse person' on panels — are continuous with the systemic injustices her work addresses. What does it mean to make that argument in a book about law and activism? What does it ask of the reader?

Main discussion questions (establish claim / provoke thought)

9. Chapter 3 examines how legal campaigns choose plaintiffs: who gets selected to be the face of a case, and why. Jansen Reventlow suggests that the criteria used tend to reproduce the very hierarchies that the campaign claims to challenge. What criteria do you think should govern who leads or represents a campaign for justice? And who gets to decide?
10. Chapter 4 closes by arguing that litigation is most powerful not as a standalone tactic but as part of a broader movement that combines direct action, organising, and legal work simultaneously. In your experience or observation, what happens when these elements get separated — when litigation runs ahead of organising, or when organising ignores legal tools?

Session 2: The Thematic Chapters

Chapters covered: Chapter 5 (Climate justice), Chapter 6 (Freedom of speech, power, and liberation), Chapter 7 (Digital rights), Chapter 8 (Reparations), Chapter 9 (Distractions).

Facilitator Run-of-Show: Session 2 (60 Minutes)

Time	Phase	What happens
0–5 min	Welcome back	Briefly recap the themes from Session 1. Acknowledge any questions the group carried forward.
5–14 min	Ice-breaker prompt	Ask: 'Of the five themes in today's chapters (climate, speech, digital rights, reparations, and distractions), which felt most surprising or most familiar? Why?'
14–35 min	First discussion round	Work through Questions 11-13, which cover Chapters 5 through 7. These chapters are dense; the facilitator may find it useful to read a sentence aloud as a prompt before each question.
35–40 min	Mini-activity	Pair-share: 'Pick one of the three chapters we've just discussed. In two sentences, explain Jansen Reventlow's main argument in it to your partner. Did your partner understand it the same way?' Brief debrief with the full group.
40–57 min	Second discussion round	Move to Questions 14-15, which take in Chapters 8 and 9 and ask participants to synthesise across the book as a whole.
57–60 min	Close	Invite a final reflection: 'If you were to act on one thing this book argues, what would it be and where would you start?'

Discussion Questions: Session 2

Opening questions (arouse interest/frame purpose)

11. Chapter 5 opens with the story of Ella Adoo-Kissi-Debrah, a nine-year-old in London whose death from asthma was linked to air pollution from nearby traffic; one of the first cases in UK legal history where air pollution was recorded as a cause of death. What does that case illustrate about who bears the cost of environmental harm? What does it tell us about who gets listened to when they name that harm?
12. Chapter 6 argues that legal protections for freedom of speech have historically served to protect those already powerful rather than to liberate those who have been silenced. Do you find that argument convincing? Can you think of a case where legal protections for free speech have worked as intended, protecting marginalised voices rather than entrenched ones?
13. Chapter 7 describes efforts to decolonise the digital rights field: to bring in the communities most affected by algorithmic discrimination and surveillance, who were absent from the spaces where digital rights were being debated and regulated. What made those spaces closed in the first place? And what would 'open' actually mean?

Main discussion questions (establish claim / provoke thought)

14. Chapter 8 on reparations argues that the conversation keeps getting stuck because it is reduced to a single, divisive question (monetary compensation) rather than opened up to a broader accounting of what colonial legacies require. What would it take to unstuck the conversation? What are the conditions that would have to change (politically, institutionally, culturally)?
15. The final chapter, 'Distractions,' is the most personal in the book. Jansen Reventlow describes the specific tactics used against people doing resistance work: co-optation, burnout, institutional violence, and smear campaigns. Looking back across the whole book, what does she suggest is the answer to those distractions? And do you find that answer convincing?

Programme C: Four-Week Book Club

Four sessions of 60–90 minutes, covering the full book. Each session covers two to three chapters. The question arc across the four weeks follows the book's own movement: from structural diagnosis to thematic application to synthesis and action. Participants should read each week's chapters before the corresponding session.

Four-Week Schedule

Week	Chapters to read	Session focus
Week 1	Preface, Note on Language, Introduction, Ch. 1 (An ode to being radical)	The personal is political. What does 'radical' mean and why does it matter?
Week 2	Ch. 2 (Hero worship in activism), Ch. 3 (The perfect plaintiff), Ch. 4 (On using the master's tools)	How change is made: leadership, representation, and the law as a tool.
Week 3	Ch. 5 (Climate justice), Ch. 6 (Freedom of speech), Ch. 7 (Digital rights)	Three arenas: environment, expression, and technology. How do the book's arguments land in each?
Week 4	Ch. 8 (Reparations), Ch. 9 (Distractions), plus whole-book synthesis	Accountability, sustainability, and action: where do we go from here?

Universal Run-of-Show for Four-Week Sessions

Each session follows the same five-phase structure. Timings below are for a 60-minute session; notes on extending to 90 minutes are included at the end of each phase.

Time	Phase	What happens
0–6 min	Welcome and ground rules	Open by reading or displaying the ground rules. From Week 2 onwards, ask one participant to read them aloud. This distributes the ritual and embeds it in the group.
6–15 min	Ice-breaker prompt	Rotate the ice-breaker prompt each week (see individual session notes below). Aim for quick, honest responses rather than considered arguments. The facilitator does not evaluate or debate.
15–35 min	First discussion round	Arouse interest and frame-purpose questions. Keep the group speaking to the text. If the discussion stalls, ask: ‘Can you point to a passage that made you think that?’
35–45 min	Mini-activity (optional)	Choose one of the activities suggested in the individual session notes. If time is short, skip the activity and extend the second discussion round.
45–57 min	Second discussion round	Establish-claim and provoke-thought questions. These are where the group should do its most rigorous thinking. The facilitator’s job is to hold friction open rather than resolve it.
57–60 min	Close	Invite one-sentence takeaways. In Week 4, replace this with a structured whole-book reflection (see Week 4 notes).

To extend any session to 90 minutes: add 10 minutes to the first discussion round, 10 minutes to the mini-activity, and 10 minutes to the second discussion round. Do not compress the close — the final three minutes matter for group cohesion across a multi-week programme.

Week 1: The Personal is Political

Chapters: Preface, A Note on Language, Introduction, Chapter 1 (An ode to being radical).

Ice-breaker: ‘The preface describes the moment in 2024 when the political world seemed to change visibly. Did your experience of that period, or your observation of it, match how Jansen Reventlow describes it? What was different?’

Week 1 Discussion Questions

16. Jansen Reventlow opens the Introduction by describing her experience of pay discrimination, medical racism, and racial profiling as a professional, and argues that these experiences are not separate from the systemic injustices she writes about but continuous with them. Is that a persuasive argument? What does it do to the text (and to you as a reader) that she begins personally rather than analytically?
17. Chapter 1 defines ‘radical’ using Angela Davis’s formulation: grasping things at the root. It contrasts this with what the author calls performative or cosmetic responses to injustice. What is an example of a cosmetic response you have encountered? What made it cosmetic rather than radical?
18. The Note on Language asks readers to think carefully about terms like ‘minorities,’ ‘vulnerable communities,’ and ‘ethnic groups,’ arguing that they embed particular assumptions about who is the problem. Do you find that argument convincing? Is

there a term in common use in your field or institution that you think deserves that kind of scrutiny?

19. Chapter 1 describes adrienne maree brown's concept of emergent strategy: that change emerges from small, repeated actions rather than grand plans. Does that sit comfortably alongside Jansen Reventlow's call for radical, root-cause change? Or is there a tension between the two?

Suggested mini-activity: Ask participants to write down, individually, one word that describes their existing assumption about how systemic change happens (for example: slowly, through elections, through protest, through courts).

Compare: How much variation is there in the room? Does that variation matter for how a group reads this book together?

Week 2: How Change is Made

Chapters: Chapter 2 (Hero worship in activism), Chapter 3 (The perfect plaintiff), Chapter 4 (On using the master's tools).

Ice-breaker: 'Name a figure in activism or public life who you have, at some point, thought of as a hero. Has that view changed? What changed it?'

Week 2 Discussion Questions

20. Chapter 2 argues that the cult of the charismatic leader enforces passivity, that people wait to be mobilised rather than recognising their own capacity to act. Have you experienced that dynamic, either as the person waiting or as someone frustrated by others' passivity? What produced it?
21. Angela Davis is quoted as saying that it is essential to resist the depiction of history as the work of heroic individuals so that people today can recognise their own potential agency as part of a community of struggle. Is that achievable? What would history, or news coverage, or organisational culture have to look like for that recognition to become normal?
22. Chapter 3 examines how plaintiffs get selected for legal cases: who is considered 'relatable,' 'sympathetic,' 'credible.' Jansen Reventlow describes the Obergefell plaintiffs as statistically unrepresentative of the queer community and discusses the critique that the legal strategy reproduced heteronormative ideals. Do you think that the critique is fair, given what the campaign achieved? Where do you draw the line between strategic compromise and structural complicity?
23. Chapter 4 closes by arguing that community-driven litigation (where affected communities lead cases rather than being their subjects) produces better long-term outcomes. What would it take for that model to become standard rather than exceptional in legal practice?

Suggested mini-activity: Pair-share. Ask participants to discuss with a partner: 'In the sector or institution you work in or are most familiar with, what is the equivalent of the 'perfect plaintiff'; the template of the acceptable person that shapes whose voice gets heard and whose claim gets taken seriously?' Brief debrief with the full group.

Week 3: Three Arenas

Chapters: Chapter 5 (Climate justice), Chapter 6 (Freedom of speech, power, and liberation), Chapter 7 (Digital rights).

Ice-breaker: 'Of the three themes in this week's reading, which felt most directly connected to your own life or work? And which felt most distant? Why?'

Week 3 Discussion Questions

24. Chapter 5 opens with Ella Adoo-Kissi-Debrah's death and argues that climate justice requires centring the communities most exposed to environmental harm rather than treating climate change as a universal crisis with universal solutions. What does 'centring' actually require in practice? What would it mean for a cultural institution (a museum, a library, a community organisation) trying to address climate in its programming?
25. Chapter 6 traces a history of expression (zines, pirate radio, Black Twitter) that operated outside or against formal legal protections for speech. What does that history suggest about the limits of relying on the law to protect marginalised voices? And what does it suggest about what those communities did instead?
26. Chapter 7 describes how the digital rights field was, until recently, dominated by white, male, cis-het voices, and how Jansen Reventlow's work at the Digital Freedom Fund sought to change that. Have you observed a similar dynamic in any field you know well? What made it possible to change, or what has kept it stuck?
27. Across these three chapters, a pattern emerges: marginalised communities bear the greatest costs of environmental, expressive, and technological harms, while having the least power over the frameworks designed to address them. What is the common mechanism that produces that pattern? And is the same mechanism at work in all three domains?

Suggested mini-activity: Ask each participant to name, in one sentence, the argument from this week's chapters that they most want to push back on. Write them on a shared surface if possible. Are there clusters? Which argument generates the most disagreement in the room, and what does that tell you?

Week 4: Accountability and Action

Chapters: Chapter 8 (Reparations), Chapter 9 (Distractions), plus whole-book synthesis.
Ice-breaker: 'One year from now, if someone asked you what you had done differently as a result of reading this book, what would you want to be able to say?'

Week 4 Discussion Questions

28. Chapter 8 argues that the reparations debate stalls because it is framed around a single, divisive question (monetary compensation) rather than a broader accounting of what colonial legacies require. What would a broader framing look like? And who has the authority to define it?
29. Chapter 9, the book's final chapter, is explicitly personal. Jansen Reventlow describes the specific tactics used against people engaged in resistance work and argues that sustaining that work requires more than resilience; it requires community. What is the difference between resilience as it is usually understood and the collective sustainability the chapter argues for?
30. Looking back across the whole book, Jansen Reventlow argues that systemic injustices are interlocked and resist singular solutions. Does the book itself model the kind of thinking it calls for, or does it fall short in places? Where did you find it most and least persuasive?
31. The book's epigraph is a dedication to 'all the unsung heroes everywhere who are resisting injustice and are creating positive change, and to Black women in particular.' Having read the book, do you understand that dedication differently than you did when you first read it? What does it commit the reader to?

Closing activity (replace the standard one-sentence round): Ask each participant to complete two sentences aloud: 'One thing this book changed or sharpened in my thinking is...' and 'One thing I will do differently as a result is...' The facilitator should go last, not first.

Further Reading and Resources

Books Referenced in Radical Justice

These titles appear in Jansen Reventlow's notes and are particularly useful for deepening discussion in the sessions where they are most relevant.

- Audre Lorde, *Sister Outsider* (1984): essential for any group engaging with Chapters 1, 4, and 6. Lorde's essays 'The Master's Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master's House' and 'Learning from the 60s' are the most directly relevant.
- adrienne maree brown, *Emergent Strategy* (2017): develops the argument from Chapter 1 about small, generative action as the basis for systemic change.
- Angela Davis, *Freedom is a Constant Struggle* (2015), shares Jansen Reventlow's framework of interconnected oppression and collective resistance.
- Olúfẹmi O. Táíwò, *Reconsidering Reparations* (2021): the most rigorous philosophical treatment of the reparations argument; useful background for Week 4.
- Virginia Eubanks, in *Automating Inequality* (2018), extends the Chapter 7 argument to the US welfare system through detailed case studies.
- Mikaela Loach, *It's Not That Radical* (2023): shares Jansen Reventlow's combination of personal voice and systemic analysis; useful for Week 3.

On Reading Groups and Facilitation

- Neal Meyer, 'How to Run a Socialist Reading Group' (Democratic Socialists of America), practical facilitation guidance developed for politically engaged reading groups; the ground rules in this toolkit draw on it.
- Luigina Vileno, 'From paper to electronic, the evolution of pathfinders: a review of the literature,' *Reference Services Review* 35:3 (2007), provides the theoretical background for the toolkit's design as a self-contained entry point into the text.

About This Toolkit

This toolkit was developed by Ronald Jarrett for Pluto Press for use by libraries, museums, history societies, community groups, and advocacy organisations. It is freely reproducible for non-commercial use with attribution. Questions and feedback can be directed to Pluto Press at www.plutobooks.com.

The discussion questions draw on the question-design framework developed in Peng Cui et al., 'How to engage your readers? Generating guiding questions to promote active reading,' arXiv (2024), and on Janet Kobobel Grant's practical guidance on discussion-question design, *Books & Such Literary Management*, 26 June 2019, <https://www.booksandsuch.com/blog/how-write-great-discussion-questions>.

Radical Justice: Building the World We Need by Nani Jansen Reventlow
Published by Pluto Press, 2026 • ISBN 978 0 7453 5184 1
www.plutobooks.com