Chapter 11
Conclusion: Performing Technocapitalism

The entrepreneurial making of technology is a delicate undertaking. It needs a strong team of computers, metal pins, breadboards, CNC machines, dark-rooms, technology developers, Excel sheets, CAD drawings, and money – to name a few of the team members. Further, the development of technology requires the support of knowledgeable co-workers, enabling juridical systems, affluent investors, and well-meaning bosses.

Workplaces such as makerspaces promise to fulfill these demands by offering access to digital fabrication tools, co-workers, and a network of funders. As a result, makerspaces serve as birthplaces of ideas – places where ideas hatch and develop into tangible prototypes. At these intimate workplaces, machines and makers form socio-material relations of trust while carefully drawing digital models of printed circuit boards or building water pumps. Touching emotions, such as love, are in the makerspaces' air when a prototype is born. The careful and loving entrepreneurial undertakings of making technologies, however, cannot be protected in an all-encompassing way by makerspaces because they are not self-contained workplaces (see McDowell 2009: 220). On the contrary, makerspaces are permeated with technocapitalist requirements, post-colonial power asymmetries, and tech-deterministic visions of the future. As such, they represent both places of intimate familiarity and, at the same time, of postcolonial exposure.

In this book, I have claimed that technology development in Kenya represents an example of how postcolonial positionalities in global power structures are desired to be re-scripted and thought anew. I argue that technocapitalism is an economy of promises and performances about technological futures, which requires *othered* tech scenes to convince doubters of their work by affectively promising and performing their capability of developing technology. My analyses of the work of telling public stories about technology and the actual

development of technologies have shown that the making of technologies in Kenya entails collaborative and loving care relations between co-workers, machines, and material, as well as strenuous efforts of positioning oneself within workplace hierarchies, technocapitalism, and colonial legacies.

11.1   Postcolonial Technocapitalist Positionalities

Kenya holds a postcolonial positionality in global technocapitalism. This means that the country's positionality (as is the case with almost every other country) continues to be shaped by colonial trajectories that privilege Western epistemologies of scientific work, technology, and societal progress. As Kenya is a former colony, its technologies contain colonial histories of technology transfer – whether through colonizers who used technology to 'civilize' racialized people or international organizations that use technology to enact development agendas by taking European industrialization and its knowledge economies as role models. Consequently, technologies evoke both affects of oppression, and also of 'liberating' modernity. They are not neutral tools; they are sticky with affects of the past (see Ahmed 2004b: 120). Against this ambivalent backdrop, the book examined Kenya's manufacturing policies and its ecosystem of tech investment to highlight that Kenyan technology entrepreneurship is situated in histories of colonialism and subsequent development experiments as well as in current innovation discourses that praise tech entrepreneurs for fostering national progress and societal well-being.

Kenya's situatedness in its past and present influences its discursive and material positionalities. Due to the pervasive imagination of Kenya as a technologically deficient place, the very existence of Nairobi's tech development sector rebuts colonial stereotypes (see Chapter 3). Nairobi is positioned as the center of African tech innovation as it receives most of the international media recognition (Pollio 2020: 2724f.) and funding for Africa's tech economies (Disrupt Africa 2021: 18). However, as positionalities are multiple and in flux, Nairobi also inhabits a peripheral positionality: the lack of state support, outdated laws, missing machines and components, the supreme economic position of countries in the Global North, and the continuous exoticization of African contexts all exclude Kenyan technology developers from global tech markets.

With this book, I argue that it is important to understand the situatedness of Kenya's technology development in colonial histories and the global politics

of technocapitalism because it shapes the visions, workplaces, technologies, labor, identities, and affects present in Nairobi's tech scene. I have shown that Kenya's positionalities influence the possibilities and futures of Nairobi as a place of technology development. In this vein, Kenya's peripherality in global technocapitalism not only complicates the local development of technology (see Chapter 7), but also makes it understandable why Kenyan politicians, investors, and entrepreneurs envision local technology development as driving national progress and global acknowledgement (see Chapter 2). I have highlighted that a neoliberal set of visions aims at national progress and the improvement of living standards in Kenya. In this manner, technology developers aim for a positive impact on marginalized citizens with their products. Together with the Kenyan government, they envision a Fourth Industrial Revolution to establish a new labor market for engineers and the country's position as a global tech player. Further, I have identified a decolonial set of visions that pushes tech developers to highlight their expertise and agency in building technology in order to gain acknowledgement from role models such as Silicon Valley, to emancipate themselves from tech imports, and to refute colonial stereotypes. Throughout the book, I have shown that the manifold visions assembled in technology development are driven by seemingly contradictory motivations: modernist assumptions of economic progress, entrepreneurial selves, and digital technologies meet desired futures of a decolonized country that cares for the needs of the African continent.

11.2 Technocapitalism and its Affective Promises and Performances

This book has emphasized the work that is necessary to re-script Kenya's postcolonial positionality within technocapitalism. What sounds simple, namely that ambitious engineers, high quality machines, and materials combine to build a prototype of an idea in order to participate in global tech markets, turns out to be complicated. The development of a technology requires money to afford material infrastructures, such as machines and workplaces, and it needs immaterial support in the form of knowledge sharing. As such, technology developers have to attract investment, political support, and co-workers to build a community around their technological vision. In order to gain this supportive network, tech developers have to make their work publicly visible. Therefore, the daily work practices of storytelling about innovative technologies are just

as necessary as the actual designing, prototyping, and coding of a technological idea (see Part I).

My argument is that technocapitalism represents an *economy of promises and performances* about technology yet to be. Instead of valorizing services or commodities, technocapitalism is about the capitalization of intangible promises about anticipated technological products and their envisioned futures. I extend current debates in the sociology of expectations and STS by arguing that in order to convince potential supporters and investors – and thus gain economic value – technology developers not only have to write about promising technological futures (e.g., Brown 2003; Felt and Fochler 2012; Wynne et al. 2007), but also make them tangible through socio-material affective performances. With my research focus on the performances of bodies, machines, and affects, I additionally broaden the academic perspective on workplaces of digital manufacturing (e.g., Aroles et al. 2019; Frey and Osborne 2013). Comparably, to work in the service sector, the work of technology developers requires self-presentations and social interaction (McDowell 2009: 225).

The empirical data from Nairobi's tech scene illustrates the affective practices demanded of places, bodies, and technologies that are peripheral to Western technoscience. My analysis shows that international doubts about the adequacy of the technology developed in Kenya are strong. Consequently, for Kenyan developers, simply promising technoscientific progress is not enough to gain legitimacy and convince investors. They also have to perform their work in a tangible and bodily perceivable way according to the audiences' expectations. Thus, tech developers invest their time and energy in public performances such as hackathons, pitching competitions, and storytelling at co-working spaces. Whether on a stage, at the workbench, or through social media, they constantly perform themselves, their visions, and technologies to make stories about Kenya's tech scene touchable, observable, and understandable for the spectators who mainly come from the Global North.

My research into the socio-material practices at innovative workplaces has shown that tech developers enter caring relationships to enact their own envisioned Kenyan futures. In this regard, technology developers, narratives, prototypes, and digital fabrication tools unite to create awareness of Kenya as a global tech player. They use Nairobi's central position within Africa's tech scenes to create media awareness and change Afro-pessimistic narratives, to gain investors' attention and change the tech scene's material scarcities, and to build an empowered Kenyan community of tech developers in global technocapitalism. Thus, intimate socio-material relations make technological

ideas tangible in order to re-work Kenya's postcolonial positionality, even if that means having to endure the (colonial) gaze of doubters (see Chapter 4).

11.3   Performing Poverty and Professionalism: The (Re-)Production of Norms

Another aspect of this book has been the study of how norms that determine how to be innovative in an African context come into being. Through the lens of performativity, I argue that these norms result from the repetitive staging of particular expectations, people, promises, and emotions within technoscientific performances. The norms of Kenyan tech entrepreneurship implicitly determine that the innovated technologies have to have a social impact, that the targeted users have to be impoverished, and that technology developers are supposed to be self-fulfilled and brilliant workers.

Empirically, I have shown that multiple reasons and emotions drive the (re-)production of these norms. On the one hand, the produced norms can be ascribed to external expectations, such as investors who demand impact technologies, global technology standards that define what a professional technology should look like, and the worldwide praise of innovation cultures that governs work to be flexible and precarious. On the other hand, tech developers in Kenya understand social impact as a societal heuristic; they want to build technology according to set standards, and they feel excited and self-fulfilled by their responsibility to solve challenges in Kenya. Overall, the examination of the affective part of knowledge production has highlighted that tech development is such a precious endeavor for Kenyan makers that they will agree to reproduce unpleasant norms in order to convince investors of their idea. Two main norm-producing performances have been detected in Nairobi's tech scene: the *performance of poverty* and the *performance of professionalism*.

Branding strategies, blog stories, media articles, visitor tours, and investment flows all perform poverty and thus, constitute Kenya as a homogenous African place of impact technologies for the rural poor. I claim that although the beliefs in social entrepreneurship and technology as universal solutions to societal challenges are a global phenomenon, their application in Kenya reproduces (post)colonial imaginations and limits the work of tech developers. Against the background of investors predominantly coming from countries such as the USA, Japan, or Germany and having little knowledge about Kenyan contexts, technology developers see the need to 'talk the funders' language'

and meet their expectations. As I have shown, the tech funders in Kenya are primarily interested in investing in technologies that have a social impact for impoverished and/or rural communities. As such, technology developers align their performances and stories with (inter)national development agendas because by doing so they have a higher chance of gaining funding: the enormous investment in social impact technologies consequently prompts tech developers to display their contexts as being in need of technological solutions to poverty. This performance of poverty is an expression of 'racial capitalism' (Robinson 1983/2021) and produces norms defining Kenyan innovations as having to foster the country's progress by solving long-standing societal problems and prospective users of new technologies as only marginalized communities, especially the rural poor.

Concerning the performance of professionalism, I have also identified practices entangled in global discourses as well as in local context specificities. Making technology in a place that is positioned as a periphery to global technocapitalism is aimed at offering a convincing case for the opposite of peripherality being true. In this manner, Kenyan technology developers feel empowered by making polished high-tech prototypes that refute the stereotypes of improvised low-tech handcraft from Africa. They desire the development of 'professional' technologies, meaning the fulfillment of a certain technological aesthetic and functionality, in order to present themselves as high-tech elites in an otherwise unusual – because exoticized – context for technology (see Chapter 8). This pursuit of professionalism stands in contrast to most academic accounts on makings' affects: it is not manual labor, tinkering, or the anti-capitalist appropriation of commodity production that empowers Kenyan makers (Carr and Gibson 2016; Grimme et al. 2014; Maxigas 2014), but the possibility to produce advanced technology. The loving affects that revolve around a professional prototype imply the love of liberation from postcolonial power asymmetries. The creation of high-tech products signifies the hope for an emancipation from the supremacy of Western technology and knowledge, and for inclusion in technocapitalism. Thus, a professional technology promises that global tech players, such as Chinese mass production facilities and Global North investors, will take Kenyan technologies seriously. Consequently, tech developers care for new technologies, startups, and co-working places because these things counter colonial imaginations of Africa as a passive and non-technological place. The predominant emotion of love in Kenyan makerspaces expresses the empowering feeling of making that reclaims "agency and a sense of control in the world" (Davies 2017: 161).

Thus, the self-fulfilling happiness and love for one's own work stands for the neoliberal subjectification of technology developers to work for national goals and societal well-being.

The norms about what form Kenyan innovation is supposed to take also evoke negative feelings, such as fear (see Chapter 9). As explained above, a makerspace cannot protect entrepreneurial endeavors from capitalist requirements and colonial trajectories. I claim that the emotion of fear encountered in Kenyan makerspaces points to the entrepreneurialization of technology developers and their workplaces. I observed that the fear of failure is most dominant when confronted with the lack of state support, difficult access to global commodity flows, and scarcity of investors who dare to invest in hardware made in an African country. To illustrate this point, I have argued that a postcolonial context differs from the Silicon Valley global role model through specific affective and collaborative socio-technical care – for example, making professional technologies in a resource-constrained context. These care practices are characterized by the emotional work of building prototypes and telling stories about Nairobi's technologies, but also by *calculative making*. The makers are responsible for taking care of their idea; that is, calculating every step of an idea's implementation to circumvent failure through theft or imperfection. Thus, my analyses of making practices have shown that calculative work usually associated with rationalized scientific practice is closely entwined with practices of care that are more usually seen in domestic or service work. I argue that the emotional and rationalized investments are inseparable, and both are necessary to survive in the competitive world of technology entrepreneurship.

The performances of poverty and professionalism demonstrate that technology developers and machines invest care and calculation in the socio-material promises and performances of technologies yet to be. I identified that these performances most often resonate with others' expectations of Kenyan innovation due to the economic necessity of gaining investment to build technological ideas. Hence, I claim that the told and performed stories about Nairobi's tech scene constantly reproduce the master narrative of technoscientific progress as well as the colonial imaginations of a single 'Africa' in order to make these technological endeavors plausible to international audiences. The stories do not mention the context specificities that complicate the entrepreneurial work at makerspaces – such as the lack of prototyping material or the unfulfilled desire to make tech for industrial processes. Instead, they repeat the promising visions of 'Africa Rising' and a Fourth Industrial Revolution, present flaw-

less high-tech prototypes that enact technoscientific modernity, invite others to gaze at innovative work in Nairobi, and evoke emotions of excitement and wonder about technology development in Kenya. The media, investors, politicians, and the tech developers themselves, portray Nairobi's tech scene as a surprising phenomenon in which Kenya represents a place that has to catch up in terms of technology, its national economy, and societal concerns.

This book has demonstrated that the narrative and embodied performances in Nairobi's tech scene create norms that see technology as the only solution to meet Kenyan development goals. I argue that an ahistorical, apolitical, and exoticized image of postcolonial inequalities is drawn, which normatively and affectively narrows tech developers', technologies', and Kenya's possibilities in re-scripting their positionalities within technocapitalism. Although anger about the restrictive norms of 'how to be innovative' surfaces from time to time, technology developers are invested in social impact norms and affectively comply with the norms of technoscientific progress and teleological Eurocentric development. The manifold and often ambiguous emotions emphasize that the technology developers' work life consists of negotiations between global norms of innovative work, colonial imaginations of Kenya, and context specific challenges to entrepreneurship. Further, it involves continuous negotiations between the developers' dependence on capital from the Global North and their wish to be emancipated from it (see Chapter 6). Thus, postcolonial technology entrepreneurs have to handle and withstand the tensions between neoliberal aspirations, technocapitalist world markets, and decolonial motivations in their workplace.

11.4   The Politics and Affects of Postcolonial Technology Entrepreneurship

At a symposium on 'The Value of Critique',[1] Bruno Latour said that critique is an affect. According to him, critique should not be understood as something imposed from the outside, but as interactions from the inside. Thus, he called for ethnomethodological descriptions of how critique is lived, experienced, and practiced. I realized much later that researching postcolonial tech-

---

1   The symposium was organized by the Cluster of Excellence "The Formation of Normative Orders" and the Staatliche Hochschule für Bildende Künste, Städelschule and took place on January 19, 2017.

nology entrepreneurship is doing exactly that: tracing the affective force of critique throughout practices of technology development. In this regard, I have examined the criticism within Kenya's tech sector; in particular, how it drives (ambivalent) visions of Kenyan futures and daily life in innovative workplaces.

My argument is that the ambivalent ambitions of decoloniality and capitalist market integration become entangled in the critique of exclusions due to Kenya's postcolonial positionality. Technology developers problematize their exclusion from commodity flows, the postcolonial asymmetries within investor-relationships, and the overall obligation to adapt to Western norms of technological progress. Consequently, actors in Nairobi's tech scene envision, on the one hand, a decolonial emancipation from the West and, on the other, a capitalist integration into global tech markets to independently foster national well-being. This has led me to define *postcolonial technology entrepreneurship* as politically inflected neoliberal work as it aims at re-making Kenya's oppressive positionality through affective and caring socio-technical practices of technology development. In this book, I have shown that the performativity of storytelling and technology development leaves space to intervene in hegemony, but that most often emancipatory aims succumb to postcolonial capitalist structures.

Every day, different constellations of actors criticised varying circumstances related to Kenya's tech scene. On a state level, the Kenyan government problematizes the country's economic performance that is characterized by its dependence on primary (agricultural) commodity exports, a stagnating manufacturing sector, high unemployment rates, and overall 'exclusion' from technocapitalist markets. Development organizations, the Government of Kenya, and the country's technology developers all problematize the poor living standards of the majority of Kenyans. Further, technology developers and other actors within the tech sector, who feel pressured to live up to external expectations and responsibilizations, angrily inspect global norms of technoscience, colonial imaginations of a non-technological African continent, and workplace hierarchies that lack acknowledgment for intangible knowledge work. All of these critics have in common that they see technology as the right tool for change – be it through large technological projects such as a Fourth Industrial Revolution or through technological products that serve the needs of marginalized communities.

As shown throughout the chapters, the development of technologies is a political expression. The built technologies and the told stories promise and perform Kenya as a place of technology development and, as such, re-script

Kenya's peripheral positionality in technocapitalism. To counter the global dominant imaginations about Africa as a single passive recipient, technology developers demonstrate their local expertise that does not depend on knowledge 'from outside'. As such, they proudly market their technological innovations as continental achievements "Made in Africa, for Africa" (see Chapter 6). Furthermore, they build an empowering collective identity of local tech developers who care for each other and their contexts. Numerous hashtags on Instagram illustrate the overall aim to abolish postcolonial asymmetries by demarcating technology development in African countries from global technoscientific centers in the Global North (see Part I). The hashtags #blackengineers, #blackexcellence, and #blackmindsmatter tagged in the first photo showing a high-tech innovation at #africanengineering demonstrate that technology development is an empowering practice for hitherto discriminated against people (Funches 2018).[2]

However, being situated within capitalist structures, the feelings of empowerment, self-fulfillment, love, and excitement about the emancipatory, decolonial possibilities of technology development eventually come to a halt. As stated above, the technology developers' economic necessity to gain income and the (postcolonial) requirements to become included in technocapitalism cause them to comply with the norms of technoscientific progress and societal development driven by international investors. Against this backdrop, Mark Karake, a proponent of local investment, compares the investor activities in Nairobi's tech scene with the colonial era:

> Observing the actors, forces, and outcomes so far in the East African startup ecosystem one is forced to contend with the uneasy sense that history could be repeating itself with the digital scramble for Africa threatening to mirror the original scramble for Africa. (2018b: n.p.)

It seems that technology development may lose its emancipatory potential due to historically manifested structures and hegemonies, such as racialized pasts, current postcolonial disadvantages, and neoliberal desires for thriving economies, that affectively lead (and financially force) tech developers to invest

---

2   In September 2018, the first Instagram post at #africanengineering about a high-tech innovation stated that the "26-year-old Robotics Engineer, Silas Adekunle, the Founder and CEO of Reach Robotics, the developer of the world's first augmented reality gaming robots, is the Highest Paid Robotic Engineer in the world" (Funches 2018).

themselves in conservative norms. Achille Mbembe (2001: 12) describes how the goal of an 'African modernity' finds itself situated between emancipation and assimilation; whereby the assimilation into Western modernity still gains the upper hand. "Afrocentric entrepreneurship" (Ouma 2020: n.p.) can thus be seen not as breaking with colonial trajectories, but as a slight elevation "beyond a state of simple mimicry" (Ouma et al. 2019: 354) of Western capitalism. Ouma et al. explain:

> Even the most promising local initiatives, trying to create better futures for people in many African countries, such as M-Pesa, usually do not escape this coloniality of "global value relations" (Araghi 2003). (ibid.: 355)

Instead of joining pessimistic and deterministic interpretations of technology development in Kenya, this book has emphasized performativity. The strenuous emotional work of negotiating (post)colonial representations and positionalities manages to leave space for emancipatory moments; for example, making local expertise visible, creating images other than an impoverished rural environment, and building communities and economic networks that are based on local understandings of investment and social impact. Further, the analyses of the experienced and observed emotions in Nairobi's tech scene have shown that fearing failure or loving technology are not individual feelings, but signifiers of structural effects. Sara Ahmed claims that the realization that "what happens to us might be connected in some way to what happens to others" (2010: 87) can result in a collective force for liberation. In response, I have rendered visible the (oppressive) structures that cause tech developers to feel as they do.

In addition to the emancipatory potential of emotions and the focus on the performative changeability of postcolonial positionalities, I have shown that technoscientific endeavors are always historically situated and context-specific. Kenyan technology development looks back to histories of African entrepreneurship that have always seen business as a political sphere. Sub-Saharan ontologies understand social impact not only as a business model, but also as a heuristic in which everyone and everything is part of a whole that is cared about. Furthermore, even the historical struggle for Kenya's independence combined the decolonial vision to emancipate intellectually and economically from colonizing countries with a Eurocentric teleology of (economic) development (see Chapter 2). As such, the emancipatory goals in Kenya's makerspaces follow different logics from the maker- and hackerspaces

in post-industrial countries. It is not the anti-capitalist appropriation of manual work, but the use of digital fabrication tools to be included in global markets that defines emancipation. Based on these insights, I claim that postcolonial technology entrepreneurship is enmeshed in the ambiguity of technocapitalist and decolonial logics. The ambition to re-make Kenya's positionality through the capitalization of local knowledge and high tech shows that critique affectively entangles (politically) heterogeneous practices, multiple futures of societal progress, capitalist markets, and emancipatory ambitions.

11.5   Africanfuturist Speculation on Emancipation

Acknowledging the multiplicity and context-specificity of emancipatory ambitions and moments that exist within capitalist structures does not mean that I am ignoring the devastating effects of capitalism on the planet (including humanity). As a big fan of science-fiction (sci-fi) literature, I claim that the sci-fi novels and short stories written by writers from African countries, termed variously *Afrofuturism*, *Africanfuturism* or speculative fiction from the African continent,[3] offer insights into what emancipated technology-driven futures could look like. Instead of advocating for a further musealization of technologies from Africa by presenting startups and their innovations in exhibitions all over the world (Figures 12 and 13), or for a simplified (ethnicized) comparison of Nairobi's tech scene to *Black Panther*'s prosperous Wakanda (Kreye and Rabe 2018), I call for taking the narratives and imaginations in Africanfuturism seriously.

---

3   The term *Afrofuturism* describes sci-fi that depicts Afro-American alienation experienced since slavery (Eshun 2003: 298f.). Thus, sci-fi writers from African countries declared that they do not want to be defined as Afrofuturists as their daily lives differ from those of Afro-Americans. Mohale Mashigo (2018: n.p.) for example, states that she did not grow up as an alienated minority in her country and thus, "has never suffered from a lack of representation" (ibid.). Nnedi Okorafor highlights that sci-fi from the African continent is directly rooted in "African culture, history, mythology and point-of-view" and therefore de-centers the West (Okorafor 2020: n.p.). She created the term *Africanfuturism* to emphasize these attributes in contrast to Afrofuturism as diasporic literature and art genre (ibid.).

Figure 13: A BRCK version exhibited at "Afro-Tech and the Future of Re-Invention" at HMKV in Dortmund (author's photo).

Figure 14: The iHub exhibited at "Digital Imaginaries – Africas in Production" at ZKM in Karlsruhe (author's photo).

Africanfuturistic stories can be distinguished from other sci-fi due to their references to the non-human (and non-alien) world: mythical creatures, animals, spirits, plants, and cyborgs (Woods 2020). In this vein, these stories are epistemologically based on oral histories of diverse African contexts (Okorafor 2020: n.p.). In Okorafor's *Lagoon* (2014), for example, a skate opens the book by expressing anger about the environmental pollution from offshore oil platforms. Later, figures from Nigerian myths, incarnated in the form of a bat and spider, intermingle with humans and aliens in Lagos. Wangechi Mutu (2013) also depicts the inseparability of all living beings and (technological) things in her animated short film "The End of Eating Everything". The visual artist explains that she wanted to illustrate the earth as "a living being", a planetary persona that is not a simple and single character (Mutu 2015: n.p.). Thus, she created a being (performed by Santigold) that has been deformed by capitalism's environmental destruction and exploitation (Hartware MedienKunstVerein 2017: 22). In the film, this Medusa-headed planetary persona flies through a brownish polluted atmosphere and ends up eating everything, thereby representing the capitalist loss of control (Mutu 2015: n.p.).

The relationality of living creatures, materialities, and nature is reminiscent of the theorizations of Actor-Network-Theory that argue for relational agency in more-than-human assemblages (Latour 2005). In this regard, Africanfuturism depicts the world as a planetary whole in which there are no boundaries between differing existences. By knitting epistemologies, figures, and things together, the imagined Africanfuturist future is "multiple, non-linear, and ultimately focused on the transcendence of boundaries" (Woods 2021: n.p.).

Using Africanfuturism to speculate about emancipatory futures, it becomes clear that a decolonial world would have no 'others' (Woods 2021: n.p.). It would neither demarcate nations from each other, nor a Global South from a Global North; it would have abandoned the binary thinking of the West (Woods 2020: 46). This planetary view acknowledges the interdependence between everything and anything. Feminist scholars understand this interdependence as emancipatory when seen as constituent to life (e.g., Haraway 1991; Mol et al. 2010; Precarias a la deriva 2014). They claim that from the perspective of mutual solidarity, affection, and affinity no boundaries exist between those who give and those who receive care, because relationships are reciprocal and infinitely indebted with care (Lorey 2019: 13).

Combining Africanfuturism's imaginations of decoloniality with feminists' ontology of care, an emancipatory planet would foster the "sociotechnical, affective, and situated relationships forming the base of life" (Coban and Wenten 2021: 67). Technology development in a decolonial and feminist world would not be valued along categories of wealth accumulation. As a result, the socio-technical care for the implementation of a technological idea would not be a vehicle to survive and eventually thrive in technocapitalism, but a part of caring for the whole. I argue that if we take Africanfuturistic epistemologies and ontologies as role models for an emancipatory future, we could create societies that are aware of the postcolonial situatedness of bodies, machines, and affects while remembering that collective planetary care is of the utmost importance to survive and provide well-being. In this respect, I speculatively ask, why not reconcile with all beings, spirits, matters, and technologies and re-make the world by caringly depending on each other?