

Manifesting Manifestos

ALISON KAHER

I have written extensively about Donna Haraway's "Cyborg Manifesto" (1991). I have read countless articles, chapters, books, and interviews about it. I even participated in a symposium devoted to it. But before writing this chapter, I never once thought about it *as* a manifesto. Nor did it ever occur to me to position "A Cyborg Manifesto" within a larger history of manifestos, or to approach the piece as part of a literary or cultural genre, *the manifesto*. To the extent that I recognized it as part of any genre, I simply saw it as an example of feminist theory and criticism. What most interested me about the "Manifesto" was the cyborg figure and, especially, the feminist, queer, and trans of color critiques that had collected around it. I was drawn to the work the "Manifesto" was doing in the world, and how this work could inform disability theorists, artists, and activists as we grappled with cyborg technologies.

Perhaps this failure to register as a manifesto (despite its title), and to read instead as *feminist theory*, was by design. Haraway explicitly and repeatedly depicted the "Cyborg Manifesto" as an intervention in feminist thought, drawing heavily on women of color feminisms. The echoes I felt with other feminist theory and criticism were not mere coincidence. But Janet Lyon also locates a profound "wariness about manifestic discourse" (1999, 195) in Haraway's "Manifesto," highlighting her challenges to teleological narratives, her refusal to assert a unified feminist *we* or *us*, and her desire "for a complicated ironic myth" rather than a "specific agenda" (195, 196). "By calling her essay a manifesto," Lyon argues, "Haraway both invokes and plays ironically with the form's status as a foundational text," in part by subverting the conventions of manifestic writing (195). As a result, Lyon argues, Haraway's "Manifesto" is "a manifesto scorched almost beyond recognition" (195).

But another way of explaining my inattention is that I was too intently focused on tracing the histories, uses, and possibilities of "Cyborg" to make it to "Manifesto." In retrospect, I can see that in querying what work disability was doing for the cyborg, I neglected to ask the same questions of the manifesto: As a genre, rhetorical form, and cultural practice, what use does the manifesto make of disability, or disabled figures? To what extent does the manifesto form—and cultural or critical understandings of the form—draw on conceptualizations of disability?

Quite a bit, as it turns out. In critical and popular discourse, both the manifesto and the manifesto writer are understood to be *mad*, and mad in both senses

of the word. As a form, the manifesto is described as “infectious, contagious,” and uninterested in “rational back-and-forth discourse”; it “invites disorientation and distorts time” and is “not designed for remembering” (Fahs 2020, 5, 6). It “has a madness about it. It is peculiar and angry, quirky,” even “downright crazed” (Caws 2001, xix). “Univocal, unilateral, [and] single-minded” (Lyon 1999, 9), as a genre it “radiates certainty well beyond the point of good judgment into the blind obsession of the *idée fixe*” (Alvarez and Stephenson 2012, 7). The manifesto borders on “lunacy” and harbors an “ardent disregard for good manners and reasoned civility” (Lyon 1999, 200, 12). It is “immodest and forceful, exuberant and vivid, attention grabbing,” and “always in overdose and overdrive” (Caws 2001, xxi). “Lacking scholarly pedigree . . . bad tempered . . . [and] wonderfully cranky,” manifestos “require mania and are intentionally and consistently extreme” (Fahs 2020, 5–6, 9). Full of “fervid, even violent, rage” (Lyon 1999, 14), they are “rude and forceful” (Alvarez and Stephenson 2012, 4) and “loud” (Caws 2001, xx). “Not an attractive piece of writing by existing norms or standards” (Ahmed 2017, 252), the manifesto can be understood as the “discursive model of the lunatic” (Lyon 1999, 198) or as a “schizophrenic scream” (Atkinson quoted in Fahs 2020, 10).

According to many writers, it is precisely the angry screams of the manifesto that make it such an appealing and necessary form, or what Sara Ahmed identifies as “a survival strategy” (2017, 249). Annie Hill describes her collection, “State Killing: Queer and Women of Color Manifestas against U.S. Violence and Oppression,” as “releas[ing] an orchestra of furies that go by the name of *manifesta*” (2019, 5). Lamiyah Bahrainwala notes that she wrote her contribution to the collection both as and about a survival tactic: “Screaming is a vital response to white fragility, as I refuse to respond to this violence with rationality or silence” (2019, 21). For many feminist critics, the madness heralded in the manifesto is no mere metaphor. “Within the manifesto genre,” asserts Breanne Fahs, feminists “*could be mad* (both emotionally and psychologically)” (2020, 9; emphasis in the original). Presumably this attention to those who are mad *and* mad is what led Fahs to include Claude Steiner’s 1969 “Radical Psychiatry Manifesto” in her 2020 collection of feminist manifestos.¹

But as much as feminist critics love the manifesto, compiling collections of them and generating their own, there are hints of discomfort with how the “crazed” dimension of the manifesto attaches to manifesto writers and readers, marking feminists themselves as “crazy,” a marking that must be refuted or disavowed. Felicity Colman, for example, laments that “authors of manifestos are frequently dismissed . . . as nutters—demented or socially unstable people” (2010, 375–376), and although she acknowledges the societal stereotypes that undergird such characterizations, she also is quick to reassure readers that “the manifesto form offers more than just an insight into insane or schizo processual thinking” (376). If Fahs casts the manifesto as a place where a feminist can “*be*

mad,” Colman suggests that the *real* work of the manifesto is to be found elsewhere, far away from disability and madness.

One tack I could take here would be to interrogate this very dynamic, questioning the use of madness as a way of signaling passion, urgency, and power while simultaneously isolating feminist political work from (the experiences of) people who identify as mad or who are perceived as mad. The mad passion celebrated in many of these descriptions is not directed against the surveillance, institutionalization, containment, and removal done to mad and neuroqueer people, nor is it aimed against the use of psych labels to support such violence. Moreover, as scholars such as Moya Bailey and Izetta Autumn Mobley (2019), La Marr Jurelle Bruce (2021), Bettina Judd (2019), and Therí Pickens (2016) have noted, the slippage between *mad* and *mad* is often used to shore up anti-Blackness, positioning Black women in particular as “unhealthy or unproductive” (Pickens 2016, 16).²

Another potential project would be to highlight the continued reliance on *coherence*, *meaningfulness*, and *usefulness* in feminist manifestos and feminist manifesto criticism, even as those same writers and critics describe *incoherence*, *irrationality*, and *waste* in exuberant terms. Or perhaps I could contrast the frequency with which manifesto critics draw on disability metaphors with the relative absence of disability manifestos in their collections.

As necessary as all of that work is, I want to turn instead to manifestos written *by* sick, mad, autistic, Deaf, and disabled people *to* sick, mad, autistic, Deaf, and disabled people as well as those centering anti-ableist practices, politics, and imaginaries. For the remainder of this chapter, I take feminist manifesto scholars at their word: If the manifesto is indeed *mad*, an ideal site for expressing irrationality, refusing productivity, playing with language, naming oppression, and imagining otherwise, then what work have disability studies scholars, disability justice activists, and disability artists and cultural workers made of, from, and in relation to it?

For me, this work includes a suspicion about the use of the manifesto label as a way “to identify a text’s foundational status” (Lyon 1999, 12). I am wary of any such moves for or in disability studies because of the way they obscure ongoing histories of unequal access, rely on and perpetuate a narrow view of the field’s scope, and marginalize alternate histories and legacies of struggle. In naming the following texts manifestos, especially the ones that don’t name themselves as such, I am not marking them as canonical or foundational but rather highlighting their disruption and refusal of such terms.

Crip Manifestos: Manifesting Sick, Mad, Autistic, Deaf, Disabled Futures Now

Critical access studies and movements for radical accessibility have been key sites of crip manifesting, in part because the manifesto form offers such a sharp

formal and tonal departure from the institutional “access checklist.” Aimi Hamraie suggests that the “first clue” to realizing disabled architect Ronald Mace had written “a covert manifesto for Universal Design” was that “not a single checklist was to be found” (2017, 203). Hamraie presents the access checklist, with its expectations of predictability, stability, and legibility (Price 2021), as diametrically opposed to the more radical manifesto, which “keep[s] misfits in mind” (Hamraie 2017, 203) rather than retroactively accommodating them after the fact. Carmen Papalia’s (2018) “Accessibility Manifesto for the Arts” argues for “an anti-policy approach to accessibility” that “instead confronts ideas of agency and power”; Papalia’s “Open Access” approach presents access as “a creative, long-term process,” one that is “a perpetual negotiation of trust between those who practice support as a mutual exchange.” Jos Boys (2020) argues for a similarly collaborative and iterative approach to design, using their “(Little) Manifesto” to articulate guiding principles for “doing dis/ability differently in architecture.” And in her “Intersectional Disability Arts Manifesto,” Alice Sheppard suggests that such work requires attending to “the beautiful complicated histories and cultures of disability, race, gender, and sexuality.” Design by misfits, for misfits; access as an ongoing collective process; attending to intersectional relations of power: these are the very moves that have long circulated in disability justice manifestos, statements, gatherings, practices, and dreams (e.g., Sins Invalid 2015; Piepzna-Samarasinha 2018; Lazard 2019).

Manifesto writers committed to this kind of crip design have found Haraway’s “Cyborg Manifesto” especially generative. Hamraie and Kelly Fritsch make brilliant use of Haraway in their 2019 “Crip Technoscience Manifesto.” They strategically lay claim to her title and language, noting that their “manifesto calls attention to the powerful, messy, non-innocent, contradictory, and nevertheless crucial work of crip technoscience” (2). In so doing, they assert the crip potential of technoscience as “a transformative tool for disability justice” (3) and the centrality of disabled designers and makers to practices of “world-building and -dismantling” (2).

For these theorists and artists, the label *manifesto* serves to signal the radical dimension of the work under discussion or to position their own work within a larger intellectual tradition. But as a quick look at the table of contents of various manifesto collections will confirm, many texts widely regarded as manifestos do not declare themselves as such in their titles. As with Hamraie’s interpretation of Mace, what makes a manifesto a manifesto is not (only) its title, but what it does, how it reads, and what it asks of readers. Fahs suggests, for example, that manifestos pose “a different set of questions,” including a critical interrogation and active refusal of “the very painful ways in which feminist writing and thinking is often dismissed as trivial, overly emotional, and unsophisticated” (2020, 13). Colman shares Fahs’s sense that a wide range of texts register as feminist manifestos based on their “critical appraisal of language” (Colman 2010, 382) and their ability to “provide a new syntax for thinking” (380).

Artists, activists, and students of disability offer a rich archive of such language work, highlighting exclusions and offering examples of how to approach communication otherwise. The new syntax of the “maddened” (Riley 2022), crippled manifesto makes explicit the ableist entanglements of language and power. Consider Lydia X. Z. Brown, E. Ashkenazy, and Morénike Giwa Onaiwu’s editorial decisions in compiling *All the Weight of Our Dreams: On Living Racialized Autism*. Brown explains that the editors decided not to “focus on grammar, style, voice, punctuation, capitalization, or spelling, because we want to encourage and highlight all forms of communication, speech, and writing. We are aware that forced conformity to arbitrary standards of ‘better’ language usage has a violent and oppressive history, especially targeting poor people, those for whom English is not a first language, cognitively disabled people, and uneducated people (which is often related to class, race, and disability)” (Brown 2017, viii–ix). Brown, Ashkenazy, and Onaiwu demonstrate a keen awareness of the myriad ways linguistic norms determine whose experiences are deemed worthy, putting this awareness into practice in the very formation of their text (and their relations to authors). Sins Invalid’s 2021 statement on language justice similarly intervenes in these modes of exclusion, radically expanding conceptions of language, communication, and presence:

There are languages created and used specifically by disabled and Deaf people, as our bodyminds inform our means of expression. We use Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC), American Sign Language (ASL), Lengua de Señas Mexicana (LSM), Black American Sign Language (BASL), ProTactile Communication, with and through our trachs and our staccato breathing, through our brain fog and aphasia, through pain and pain meds, through masks and voice amplifiers, through text and videos, through our grunts and moans and sounding our worlds, through blinks and blowing through straws and more ways than we can outline.

In their “Manifesto,” the Canaries, a collective of artists with chronic illnesses, note that language is a key site for the denial of their experiences with pain, illness, and disability: “OUR MALFUNCTIONING PARTS ARE SILENCED OR REPLACED WITH APPROXIMATIONS . . . WE SHRINK IN A DISCOURSE THAT DENIES OUR EXPERIENCE AND ITS CAUSES. . . . HOW CAN WE BE LEGIBLE WHEN DOMINANT LANGUAGE EXCLUDES US?” (Canaries 2016, 22; all caps in original).

Given the focus on manifestos as a particularly “crazed” form, I also want to highlight the work of those naming the possibilities of mad methodologies of reading, writing, and thinking that are committed to mad lives (Bruce 2021; Minich 2023). Take, for example, Lindsay Eales’s “Loose Leaf” essay, in which she invites readers to “print these pages. Shuffle them. Read” (2016, 59). She describes her essay with the same words critics use to describe manifestos:

“Excess. . . . Non-linear. . . . Disjointed, unformed, messy, hurting, mad” (58), and the essay shifts widely, wildly, across different tonal registers and textual forms. Eales makes apparent how one can issue manifestic invocations while refusing definitive lists of guiding principles or coherent demands. Indeed, the thrust of Eales’s essay is a refusal of coherence altogether.

In their 2019 “Queer Crip Mad Manifesta against the Medical Industrial Complex,” Lzz Johnk and Sasha A. Khan deploy Leah Lakshmi Piepzna-Samarasinha’s formulation of “echotextia, an autistic poetic form where others’ words echo in our own and are in conversation” (Piepzna-Samarasinha 2018, 11). Johnk and Khan “disrupt and talk back to psychiatric and medical systems” (2019, 34) by taking in pathologizing language and spitting it back out, differently. They splice together “quotations, paraphrases, and subtext from and of conversations we and loved ones have had with doctors and with each other” in order to “craft coalitional resistance” (29).

If manifestos are intended to refuse capitalist logics of property and propriety, and to exhibit mad, incoherent multiplicities of voice and meaning, then collaborative writing is an essential mode of the crip manifesto; “singular, individual modes of cognition are not enough” (Young 2023, 37) for manifestic work. Writing for/with each other, Mel Y. Chen and I turn to Mia Mingus’s (2010) call for “crip solidarity” (and these two paragraphs also appear in Chen’s chapter):

“I want to be with you. If you can’t go, then I don’t want to go. If we are traveling together, sharing political space together, building political family together, then I want to be with you. I want us to be together.” Can we imagine this way of being as a mode of crip authorship? And how might such being make space for more expansive, capacious approaches to collaboration? We learned to wait on each other—for the migraine to lift, the fatigue to ease, the energy to return—as we wrote the introduction to *Crip Genealogies* together (with Eunjung Kim and Julie Avril Minich), in spite of our training to do otherwise.

Inspired by those experiences, we invite an explicit turning toward collaboration and acknowledge the fundamentally collaborative nature of thinking in making that collaboration known. From this perspective, crippling authorship might mean crippling single authorship, even as we recognize that it must not be a cloak indictment: that in fact, single authoring may necessarily be someone else’s best and only crip mode. But when single authorship is a proprietary accumulation of intellectual property that should have been shared (which, we note, goes hand in hand with intersectional theft), then it could be seen as “ripping off.” Instead, we wonder what possibilities are made by messing with this formula, with unknown risks, erotics, and consequences: “cripping off.” While the risks lean toward precarious positions vis-à-vis the academy, we commit to making more and more places where crippling off is imaginable and recognized.

To return to where I started, consider a text that offers wordplay akin to “A Cyborg Manifesto,” Pickens’s kaleidoscopic, textured, echolalic works of and on Black madness. Unafraid of committing “literary theorist blasphemy,” Pickens knows that “get[ting] us to think about how we think when we think about Blackness and madness” requires a profound “distrust of linearity” (2019, 21, xi). She refuses a conclusion, approaches her arguments sideways, embraces messy contradiction, and frequently interrupts herself and her reader. The range of affect the text embraces and fosters is part of Pickens’s method. Her footnotes, for example, “are not solely explanations of sources and methodologies, but they also signify, joke, pun, turn a phrase, explore. Both the footnotes and epigraphs are asides, witticisms, and musings,” allowing us “to theorize from above and below” (Pickens 2019, xi). If “manifestoes disrupt the assumption of linear progress” (Czerwicz et al. 2015, 3), then the refusal of linearity found in *Black Madness :: Mad Blackness* might mark it as a contribution to the genre.

Given the generative theorizations happening under the name of crip time and disability futurities, the manifesto might be particularly enticing for the possibilities it offers in demanding more just, accountable, and accessible futures. Not only might manifestos offer a kind of crip time in their disruption of linear time, but they also are a site for speculating on what a crip future might be, or do, or allow. As Hill explains, manifestos “can move us toward the futures we desire” by fostering radical “consciousness and collectivity with the express purpose of changing lived conditions” (2019, 7). Other feminist theorists share Hill’s position that the manifesto is concerned with naming ongoing oppressions, demanding change in the present, and expanding current conceptualizations of what is possible, thereby naming more just futurities into being (e.g., Ahmed 2017; Fahs 2020; Weiss 2018). As Karma Chávez explains, the imagined futures of the manifesto have effects *now*: “Their very existence is a present political action, a performative gesture that engages and alters the conditions of the public sphere” (2013, 26).

In “Femme Shark Manifesto!,” Piepzna-Samarasinha names into existence a radical crip love: “FEMME SHARKS RECOGNIZE THAT FEMMES COME IN ALL KINDS OF SIZES AND EACH KIND IS LUSCIOUS. WE WORK TOWARDS LOVING OUR CURVY, FAT, SKINNY, SUPERSIZE, THICK, DISABLED, BLACK AND BROWN FINE-ASS BODIES EVERY DAY. WE REALIZE THAT LOVING OURSELVES IN A RACIST/SEXIST/HOMO/TRANSPHOBIC/ABLEIST/ CLASSIST SYSTEM IS AN EVERY DAY ACT OF WAR AGAINST THAT SYSTEM” (2008; all caps in original). Jina B. Kim and Sami Schalk similarly understand crip self-care as “inextricably tied to the lived experiences and temporalities of multiply marginalized people, especially disabled queer people, disabled people of color, and disabled queer people of color,” arguing that it points to the possibilities for “self-care outside capitalist imperatives” (2021, 327).

Crip artists Sky Cubacub (2020) and Sandie Yi (2020) have both turned to body adornment as a way to bring this kind of radical crip love into practice; they both center crip fashion as a site of care work. In Yi's framing, "makers follow Crip time: the design ideas do not arrive based on the production speed required by capitalism" but allow for continuous negotiation between maker and wearer; "the production process therefore is a form of providing care." While Yi and Cubacub have each published manifestos about their process, their manifesting exceeds the written word. Their adornments—built for the contours and needs of crip, trans, sick, fat bodies—carry out the mad, crip work of the manifesto, both in the sense of imagining disability otherwise and, perhaps especially, in highlighting the possibilities of nonverbal modes of relation.

Yi (2020) firmly places Crip Couture within disability culture, but she also calls into being a diverse, inclusive crip community: "Crip Couture's creations are based on the agenda and issues identified by people who are Sick (chronically ill), Mad, Autistic, Disabled and Deaf people (S.M.A.D.D.) who are from a diverse range of race, class, and gender identity expressions. Crip Couture also creates room for people who may not have had the opportunity to claim a disability identity or connect to a disability activist community. Crip Couture aims to hold a space for . . . those who are still questioning their disability identity." Sophia Maier, V. Jo Hsu, Christina V. Cedillo, and M. Remi Yergeau issue an even more expansive invitation in their trans, crip "Fractal Many-Festo" (2020), calling in those who are committed to trans disability justice, regardless of identity: "In writing this manifesto, we ask whether you would collaborate with us, whether you would tic with us, whether you would help us to invent and sustain and share trans, crip space. . . . Not because you're trans. Not because you're disabled. But because you share with trans disabled communities a project of world-building. Because you take pleasure in your tics, in your (gender)queerness, in your desire."

Maier, Hsu, Cedillo, and Yergeau's call for solidarity is, in part, a response to transphobic comments made by the editor of *Disability and Society*, Michele Moore, and the essay links to a petition demanding the journal's editorial board take action to affirm trans lives.³ Their manifesto is one of many crip manifestos directed as much to those *within* disability studies and activism as those outside it; even as they invoke a collective "we," they insistently interrogate the exclusions such unifying language makes possible. Perhaps the most well-known internal critique of disability studies comes from Chris Bell, whose "Introducing White Disability Studies: A Modest Proposal" (2006) offered a searing indictment of the whiteness of the field's founding frameworks; as he noted in the essay—a manifesto in everything but name—his critique built on the earlier manifesto statements of the International and People of Color Caucuses of the Society for Disability Studies, statements that were themselves repeatedly revised and resued in response to ongoing exclusions, erasures, and marginalization. Ahmed

(2017) suggests that this kind of iterative, recursive process is a necessary part of the feminist manifesto, particularly those manifestos speaking back to racism, imperialism, and white supremacy; she uses her looping wordplay to reveal how we keep coming against the same things, over and over and over again. The work remains undone.

Manifest Failures, Affective Shifts, and Necessary Imaginings

While it is true that I failed to register Haraway's text as a manifesto, manifestos have played a significant role in my scholarly life. For well over a decade I organized part of my Introduction to Feminist Studies course around them. In addition to reading a wide range of manifestos, I asked my students to spend several class periods writing their own feminist manifesto in small groups. The only requirements were that they create something they could share with the class (e.g., a poem, a list of demands, a map, a process) and that each group come to consensus on its own manifesto. The assignment was, in many ways, designed to fail. Despite their best intentions, with every articulation of what they wanted to create or become, they found gaps, unspoken assumptions, a narrowing of perspectives, erasures, and exclusions. Sometimes they recognized these failures in the moment; other students would return to their articulations later in the semester, or later in their studies, and exclaim that they would write a very different manifesto now. Fahs describes such realizations as part of the process: "Good manifestos . . . do not claim to know things *for all time*; they only claim to know things *for this moment*" (2020, 4).

As I tell my students, these very gaps and erasures are exactly what keep me coming back to the manifesto-as-feminist-theory / feminist-theory-as-manifesto, or what continues to fascinate and intrigue me about these forms. The erasures in any given manifesto remind me that I have my own exclusions and, more broadly, they remind me that no single manifesto (or theory, or practice, or formation) can get everything right. Moreover, as queer theory cautions, any naming of what we want always, inevitably, forecloses other articulations or namings. But rather than cast those concerns as condemning the manifesto from the start, might they instead be reasons to keep writing, and rewriting, and rewriting? As José Esteban Muñoz (2009) puts it, we are not yet queer, but there is great possibility in the aspirations of that "yet," and the "we" conjured in such documents is the "we" still to be imagined. The manifesto, he reminds us, is "a call to a doing in and for the future" (26), a place where we can imagine radical crip politics and radiating crip futures. Manifestos, in this queer framing, are relational—formed in relation to this moment—rather than prescriptive; they are about process rather than outcome. Audre Lorde describes this process as "*believing, working for what has not yet been while living fully in the present now*" (2009, 148). In other words, the manifesto—because of its incompleteness

and its related promise of more manifestos to come—provides a place to counter the erasure of some bodies from our collective futures, an erasure that makes possible the ongoing evisceration of bodies in the present. As Joshua Chambers-Letson, Tavia Nyong'o, and Ann Pellegrini put it in their gloss of Muñoz, “That hope will be disappointed, and fail us, is not its negation but its condition of possibility” (2019, xiv).

When the editors of the present volume first invited me to reflect on the role of manifestos in my work, I thought that I would use this opportunity to create my own manifesto, to imagine the textures of a more just, accessible, and accountable present, a present and presence that fostered feminist, queer, antiracist, and anti-imperialist practices, one that recognized the importance of crip lives and crip deaths. Or perhaps a manifesto specific to life in Texas in 2021, a manifesto refusing the violence of manufactured power failures, rampant reproductive and trans injustices, voter suppression, anti-immigrant and anti-Black vitriol, and the ableism tangled within each. But I could never get myself to write those pieces, as necessary as I think they are. Instead, I wanted to revel in the crip imaginaries and futurities I've mentioned here, and many, many more. From Akemi Nishida's bed activism to Sunaura Taylor's speculative aquifers to Leroy Moore's Krip-Hop to HEARD's cross-disability abolitionist organizing to whatever it is you are doing right now: all of your everythings continue to carry me through much more than whatever I could create.

But if I'm honest, it's also that the more I read about manifestos as a genre, the less able I felt to write one. Everything I read about manifestos kept telling me that they are to be written quickly, fiercely, with passion and in rage; they are to be written with specific targets and clear agendas and razor-sharp precision. And the more I read these affect imperatives, the more tired, the more slow, the more stuck I felt.

I want to close, then, by returning to this question of what it might mean to take seriously the notion of the manifesto as a mad, crip form. What—and whom—do we exclude when we insist on particular affective modes and responses, especially if under the rubric of crip authorship? Sarah Orem (2021) encourages disability studies scholars to look carefully at the places where the field has failed to feel anger, recognizing that such moments often signal a failure to register the workings of whiteness, and that is certainly part of what I'm wanting here.

I'm also wanting to register the potential for more muted presences (E. Kim 2012) and affects (Chen 2014) to become sites of crip manifesting. I'm drawn to the possibilities of the nonverbal and the nontextual; I want both the excess of language and its absence. Quiet, inward, solo; anxious, worried, depressed; reluctant, uncertain, ambivalent; slow, hesitant, halting: don't the textures of crip lives, disability futurities, and disability justice require a recognition that protest

can take many forms (e.g., Burch 2021; Hedva 2016; Nishida 2022)? As Bruce (2021, 236, 11) reminds us, mad methodologies include not only digressions, ramblings, and strikethroughs but also quiet “painstaking study” and “obsessive care,” “a deft dance between release and hold, hold and release.”

In imagining what this kind of careful interplay can mean, I am reminded of Ellen Samuels quietly writing haikus “in [her] head” while “laying stiffly in the rigid embrace of an MRI machine,” “thinking, *how do I get through the next minute, the next hour, week, day, year of this?*” (2021, 69). Samuels’s poems do the manifesto work of invocation, reaching out explicitly to “other sick and disabled people, to say: you are not alone. And neither am I” (76). With each silent haiku, Samuels imagines herself in relation, an imagining that not only gets her through the realities of the medical-industrial complex but also carves a crip space of community that exceeds it. Such quiet calling reminds me of the care scores by Park McArthur and Constantina Zavitsanos (2013) and Carolyn Lazard (2015) that guide readers through acts of care and touch between people and texts; *here*, they explain, are ways of being together: follow along, use these steps. Or, in the neuroqueer imaginings of Maier, Hsu, Cedillo, and Yergeau, “obsess with us. Echo with us. Perseverate with us. . . . Manifest with us” (2020).

Those involved in abolition movements have long insisted on the need for radical imaginations, for imagining futures without prisons, without racial capitalism, without carceral logics and practices; abolition requires thinking and acting as if it were possible (e.g., Ben-Moshe 2020; Davis 2003; Kaba 2021). In her “manifesta against U.S. violence and oppression,” Caitlin Gunn explains that “a framework of radical speculation enables us to bypass mental hurdles of feasibility, freeing us to accept the challenge of imagining and building the futures we desire” (2019, 16). We cannot stop dreaming simply because we do not yet know how to bring those dreams to fruition.

Eli Clare provides exactly this kind of reminder in his poem “May Day, 2020”:

It is time. It is time. It is time

to listen to our grief and soothe our jangled nerves—
we cannot afford to forfeit imagination. (2021, 256)

We cannot afford to forfeit imagination. The poem offers, all at once, a manifesto, an argument for the necessity of manifestos, and an exhortation to create our own. Join me; join us; begin. Manifest again and again and again.

Thanks to all those who have supported this writing, especially Lamiyah Bahrainwala, Susan Burch, Mel Y. Chen, Eunjung Kim, Julie Avril Minich, Dana Newlove, Lisa Olstein, Alexis Riley, Ellen Samuels, and Hershini Young; the editors of this collection, Mara Mills and Rebecca Sanchez; and my Introduction to Feminist Studies students.

NOTES

- 1 Hill makes a similar move with her inclusion of Lzz Johnk and Sasha Khan's "'Crippling the Fuck Out:' A Queer Crip Mad Manifesta against the Medical Industrial Complex" (2019) in her special issue. Both Fahs and Hill are unusual here, in that many manifesto collections draw on the language of madness without any attention to health care inequities, the role of psychiatry in carceral logics, or the experiences of people with mental illnesses, disabilities, and/or diagnoses.
- 2 As Bettina Judd wryly, furiously notes, "I have to make this point perfectly clear: Black women are no angrier than any other group of people. I'm pissed that I even have to tell you this" (180).
- 3 As of this writing, the petition is still accepting signatures: <https://www.ipetitions.com/petition/ds>.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahmed, Sara. 2017. *Living a Feminist Life*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Alvarez, Natalie, and Jenn Stephenson. 2012. "A Manifesto for Manifestos." *Canadian Theatre Review* 150 (Spring): 3–7.
- Bahrainwala, Lamiyah. 2019. "Responding to 'White Fragility': A Manifesta of Screams." *Feral Feminisms*, no. 9 (Fall): 21–25.
- Bailey, Moya, and Izetta Autumn Mobley. 2019. "Work in the Intersections: A Black Feminist Disability Framework." *Gender and Society* 33 (1): 19–40.
- Bell, Chris. 2006. "Introducing White Disability Studies: A Modest Proposal." In *The Disability Studies Reader*, 2nd ed., edited by Lennard Davis, 275–282. New York: Routledge.
- Ben-Moshe, Liat. 2020. *Decarcerating Disability: Deinstitutionalization and Prison Abolition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Boys, Jos. 2020. "A (Little) Manifesto for Doing Dis/ability Differently in Architecture." *Journal of Architectural Education* 74 (2): 170–172.
- Brown, Lydia X. Z. 2017. "A Note on Process." In *All the Weight of Our Dreams: On Living Racialized Autism*, edited by Lydia X. Z. Brown, E. Ashkenazy, and Morénike Giwa Onaiwu, viii–ix. Lincoln, NE: DragonBee.
- Bruce, La Marr Jurelle. 2021. *How to Go Mad without Losing Your Mind: Madness and Black Radical Creativity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Burch, Susan. 2021. *Committed: Remembering Native Kinship in and beyond Institutions*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2021.
- Canaries. 2016. "Canaries Manifesto." In *Notes for the Waiting Room*, edited by Taraneh Fazeli, 22: n.p.
- Caws, Mary Ann. 2001. "The Poetics of the Manifesto: Nowness and Newness." In *Manifesto: A Century of Isms*, xix–xxxi. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Chambers-Letson, Joshua, Tavia Nyong'o, and Ann Pellegrini. 2019. "Foreword: Before and After." In *Cruising Utopia: The Then and There of Queer Futurity*, by José Esteban Muñoz, ix–xvi. 10th anniversary ed. New York: New York University Press.
- Chávez, Karma R. 2013. "Differential Visions of Queer Migration Manifestos." In *Queer Migration Politics: Activist Rhetoric and Coalitional Possibilities*, 21–48. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Chen, Mel Y. 2014. "Brain Fog: The Race for Cripistemology." *Journal of Literary and Cultural Disability Studies* 8 (2): 171–184.
- Clare, Eli. 2021. "May Day, 2020." *South Atlantic Quarterly* 120 (2): 255–256.
- Colman, Felicity. 2010. "Notes on the Feminist Manifesto: The Strategic Use of Hope." *Journal for Cultural Research* 14 (4): 375–392.

- Cubacub, Sky. 2020. "Radical Visibility: A Disabled Queer Clothing Reform Movement Manifesto." In *Disability Visibility: First-Person Stories from the Twenty-First Century*, edited by Alice Wong, 90–100. New York: Vintage.
- Czerwec, M. K., Ian Williams, Susan Merrill Squier, Michael J. Green, Kimberly R. Myers, and Scott T. Smith. 2015. Introduction to *Graphic Medicine Manifesto*, 1–20. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Davis, Angela. 2003. *Are Prisons Obsolete?* New York: Seven Stories Press.
- Eales, Lindsay. 2016. "Loose Leaf." *Canadian Journal of Disability Studies* 5 (3): 58–76.
- Fahs, Breanne. 2020. "Introduction: The Bleeding Edge: On the Necessity of Feminist Manifestos." In *Burn It Down! Feminist Manifestos for the Revolution*, edited by Breanne Fahs, 1–21. New York: Verso.
- Gunn, Caitlin. 2019. "Black Feminist Futurity: From Survival Rhetoric to Radical Speculation." *Feral Feminisms*, no. 9 (Fall): 15–20.
- Hamraie, Aimi. 2017. *Building Access: Universal Design and the Politics of Disability*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Hamraie, Aimi, and Kelly Fritsch. 2019. "Crip Technoscience Manifesto." *Catalyst: Feminism, Theory, Technoscience* 5 (1). <https://catalystjournal.org/index.php/catalyst/article/view/29607/>.
- Haraway, Donna J. 1991. "A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist-Feminism in the Late Twentieth Century." In *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*, 149–182. New York: Routledge.
- Hedva, Johanna. 2016. "Sick Woman Theory." *Mask Magazine*. <http://www.maskmagazine.com/not-again/struggle/sick-woman-theory>.
- Hill, Annie. 2019. "Introduction: State Killing: Queer and Women of Color Manifestas against U.S. Violence and Oppression." *Feral Feminisms*, no. 9 (Fall): 5–11.
- Johnk, Lzz, and Sasha A. Khan. 2019. "'Crippling the Fuck Out': A Queer Crip Mad Manifesta against the Medical Industrial Complex." *Feral Feminisms*, no. 9 (Fall): 26–38.
- Judd, Bettina. 2019. "Sapphire as Praxis: Toward a Methodology of Anger." *Feminist Studies* 45 (1): 178–208.
- Kaba, Mariame. 2021. *We Do This 'Til We Free Us: Abolitionist Organizing and Transforming Justice*. Edited by Tamara K. Nopper. Chicago: Haymarket.
- Kim, Eunjung. 2012. "Why Do Dolls Die? The Power of Passivity and the Embodied Interplay between Disability and Sex Dolls." *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies* 34 (3–4): 94–106.
- Kim, Jina B., and Sami Schalk. 2021. "Reclaiming the Radical Politics of Self-Care: A Crip-of-Color Critique." *South Atlantic Quarterly* 120 (2): 325–342.
- Lazard, Carolyn. 2016. "Score for Patient Interaction." In *Notes for the Waiting Room*, edited by Taraneh Fazeli. digiiid.ee/en/exhibitions-archive/disarming-language/canaries-2.
- Lazard, Carolyn. 2019. "Accessibility in the Arts: A Promise and a Practice." Philadelphia: Recess Art / Common Field.
- Lorde, Audre. 2009. "A Burst of Light: Living with Cancer." In *I Am Your Sister: Collected and Unpublished Writings of Audre Lorde*, edited by Rudolph P. Byrd, Johnnetta B. Cole, and Beverly Guy-Sheftall, 81–149. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lyon, Janet. 1999. *Manifestoes: Provocations of the Modern*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- McArthur, Park, and Constantina Zavitsanos. 2013. "Other Forms of Conviviality." *Women and Performance* 23 (1): 126–32.
- Maier, Sophia, V. Jo Hsu, Christina V. Cedillo, and M. Remi Yergeau. 2020. "GET THE FRAC IN! Or, The Fractal Many-Festo: A (Trans)(crip)t." *Peitho* 22 (4). <https://cfshrc.org/article/get-the-frac-in-or-the-fractal-many-festo-a-transcript/>.

- Mingus, Mia. 2010. "Wherever You Are Is Where I Want to Be: Crip Solidarity." *Leaving Evidence* (blog), May 3, 2010. <https://leavingevidence.wordpress.com/2010/05/03/where-ever-you-are-is-where-i-want-to-be-crip-solidarity/>.
- Minich, Julie Avril. 2023. *Radical Health: Justice, Care, and Latinx Expressive Culture*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Muñoz, José Esteban. 2009. *Cruising Utopia: The Then and There of Queer Futurity*. New York: New York University Press.
- Nishida, Akemi. 2022. *Just Care: Messy Entanglements of Disability, Dependency, and Desire*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Orem, Sarah. 2021. "Tangles of Resentment." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 46 (4): 963–985.
- Papalia, Carmen. 2018. "An Accessibility Manifesto for the Arts." As told to Caoimhe Morgan-Feir. *Canadianart* (blog), January 2, 2018. <https://canadianart.ca/essays/access-revived/>.
- Pickens, Therí Alyce. 2016. "The Verb Is No: Towards a Grammar of Black Women's Anger." *CLA Journal* 60 (1): 15–31.
- Pickens, Therí Alyce. 2019. *Black Madness :: Mad Blackness*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Piepzna-Samarasinha, Leah Lakshmi. 2008. "Femme Shark Manifesto!" Leah Lakshmi Piepzna-Samarasinha's website. <https://brownstargirl.org/femme-shark-manifesto/>.
- Piepzna-Samarasinha, Leah Lakshmi. 2018. *Care Work: Dreaming Disability Justice*. Vancouver, Canada: Arsenal Pulp.
- Price, Margaret. 2021. "Time Harms: Disabled Faculty Navigating the Accommodations Loop." *South Atlantic Quarterly* 120 (2): 257–277.
- Riley, Alexis. 2022. *Patient Acts: Performance, Disability, and the Making of Mad Memory*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation] University of Texas.
- Samuels, Ellen. 2021. *Hypermobilities: Poems*. Brooklyn, NY: Operating System.
- Sheppard, Alice. n.d. "Intersectional Disability Arts Manifesto." <https://alicesheppard.com/intersectional-disability-arts-manifesto/>.
- Sins Invalid. 2015. "10 Principles of Disability Justice." *Sins Invalid: An Unshamed Claim to Beauty in the Face of Invisibility* (blog), September 17, 2015. <https://www.sinsinvalid.org/blog/10-principles-of-disability-justice>.
- Sins Invalid. 2021. "La justicia de lenguaje es justicia para personas con discapacidades / Language Justice Is Disability Justice." *Sins Invalid: An Unshamed Claim to Beauty in the Face of Invisibility* (blog), June 8, 2021. <https://www.sinsinvalid.org/news-1/2021/6/8/la-justicia-de-lenguaje-es-justicia-para-personas-con-discapacidadeslanguage-justice-is-disability-justice>.
- Weiss, Penny A. 2018. *Feminist Manifestos: A Global Documentary Reader*. New York: New York University Press.
- Yi, Chun-shan (Sandie). 2020. "The Crip Couture Manifesto." *Wordgathering* 14 (4). <https://wordgathering.com/vol14/issue4/disability-futures/yi/>.
- Young, Hershini Bhana. 2023. *Falling, Floating, Flickering: Disability and Differential Movement in African Diasporic Performance*. New York: New York University Press.