

INTRODUCTION

ON SPECULATION

Fiction, Finance, and Futurity

We need visions of the future, and our people need them more than most.

—SAMUEL DELANY, “The Necessity of Tomorrows,” 1978 address at the Studio Museum in Harlem

You’ve got to make your own worlds. You’ve got to write yourself in.

—OCTAVIA BUTLER, “Octavia Butler on Charlie Rose”

We must organize our methods to illuminate the relation between culture and economy, thus refusing to separate, as has been the practice, the operational and mathematical techniques of the derivatives markets from their social implications.

—EDWARD LIPUMA AND BENJAMIN LEE, *Financial Derivatives and the Globalization of Risk*

As of December 2014, approximately \$710 trillion of the world’s capital was circulating in the global financial derivatives market, a metamarket of trading in commodity futures, options, and swaps.¹ It is a statistic designed to stagger. Economists call it a “notional figure,” as it serves as more of a placeholder of value than actual money changing hands; it is alien currency from another time, from a time out of joint, from the future anterior.² This notional figure of future-refracted value shimmers in the dis-

tance like a desert mirage, with social factors such as risk and optimism flickering across its screen of projection. Even as economists apply mathematical algorithms to render their extrapolations more supple, accurate, and complex, the market in financial derivatives—tethered notionally to its underlying assets—relies on an engine of speculation, extrapolation, and projection to render value out of the not yet. Derivatives function as insurance policies, working to hedge against the uncertainty of speculative futures. What Marx termed “fictitious capital” emerged notably out of the national debt and credit systems of his day in the form of promissory notes with no link to underlying assets.³ Characterizing these financial claims on debtors as predatory lending, Marx described usury capital as parasitical on money wealth: “It sucks its blood, kills its nerve.”⁴ Marx’s figuration of fictitious capital as vampiric⁵ and the “notional figure” of the financial derivatives market point to the central role of fiction crafting and figuration in the production of finance capitalism.

This book puts into conversation speculative finance and speculative fiction as two forms of extrapolative figuration that participate in the cultural production of futurity. To put these two seemingly disparate arenas of narrative production into conversation, I largely use the methodologies of an emerging field that could be called critical finance studies in conjunction with a longer standing field called feminist science studies, which trained me to beware of the “god trick of seeing everything from nowhere” purveyed by the seemingly pure, objective vision of scientific and capitalist realism.⁶ It is indeed a god trick to get people to mistake prophecy for truth, notional figure for value, or futurity for the future. As a lifetime student of the power of narrative to alter reality, or at least perceptions of it, I have often been awed by fiction’s nearly magical actuarial potency. By approaching both speculative finance and speculative fiction as narrative productions, I emphasize the performativity of economics and therefore the potential power of the literary imagination to call forth new political economies, ways of living, and alternative relational structures; and different sorts of subjects into the world.

I use the term “futurity” to highlight the construction of the future and denaturalize its singularity, while maintaining an emphasis on how narrative constructions of the future play a significant role in materializing the present. “Extrapolation,” for example, is the name for the mathematical modeling practice economists use to predict future commodity prices and investment trends based on data compiled in databases such as the

CRB Commodity Yearbook, Wharton Research Data Services, as well as Global Financial Data Solutions. At the same time, science fiction studies might first associate extrapolation with the eponymous academic journal, which publishes scholarly essays on science fiction (also called extrapolative or speculative fiction). *Migrant Futures* investigates how we narrate futurity across various platforms, from speculative fiction to financial speculation. How do our stories of the future chart the ways we invest—financially, politically, ideologically, and intellectually—in the present? How do the logics of preemption break across the shores of financial securitization, military preparedness, and scientific projection? These are some of the questions taken up by anthropologists, sociologists, historians, cultural theorists, and other scholars contributing to an interdisciplinary examination of financialization.⁷

Most notably, Edward LiPuma and Benjamin Lee assert the social construction of financial derivatives—a social construction that, like race, nonetheless has profound material effects on people’s livelihoods, state politics, and international conflicts. LiPuma and Lee call derivatives “socially imaginary objects” and assert “the social construction of the various types of derivatives.”⁸ They also emphasize the “abstract symbolic violence” that speculative capital wreaks on the world—“symbolic in the sense that it is not accomplished physically by means of military force or colonialism, though it may, of course, engender the conditions (such as impoverishment) that precipitate violent crime and warfare” and “abstract in the sense that it never appears directly; rather it mediates and stands behind local realities—such as interest rates, food costs, and the price of petroleum.”⁹ One poignant example that LiPuma and Lee provide is the effect of presidential elections on the global economy. In the case of the 2002 Brazilian presidential election, for example, when Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva of the Worker’s Party was projected to win, “the principal players in the Latin American financial markets started to sell and short the Brazilian currency.”¹⁰ Electoral projections produced economic reality. As *Migrant Futures* headed into the final stages of production, the United States has witnessed the election of Donald Trump as its president. On the evening of November 8, 2016, as people watched the results come in, they also noted the Dow Jones falling precipitously. By morning, though, markets seemed to have leveled out, and the futures markets in U.S. Steel and private prisons in particular were looking quite good, indeed. This last example, when read through the burgeoning body of critical work in prison

abolition movements, yokes the abstract violence of finance capitalism to more overt manifestations of state violence as exacted through the police force disproportionately on black and brown, queer and trans bodies in the United States.

Predicated on prediction, the algorithmic models used in the financial sector as well as by insurance companies often count on the movements of legible and calculable subjects. Financial speculation, extrapolation, and prediction rely on mathematical models and probabilistic logics to transform quantitative data into a narrative arc. By plotting points along a line on a graph and deriving meaning from those data, these narratives require a rendering of a trajectory. Though that rendering often takes shape in the visual field of graphic representation, financial forecasters produce extrapolative fiction when they functionally convert data into an interpretive arc, to be articulated and narrativized in and beyond the graphic form. Econometrics extrapolates from data collected by the University of Michigan Consumer Sentiment Index and Index of Consumer Expectations, for example, which reduce sentiment and expectation to numeric values in an attempt to measure and then advise for or against hedging uncertain futures. This “datafication” is also a rendering of data into fiction or statistical narrative, which Kathleen Woodward has characterized as “the pre-eminent expression of late capitalism.”¹¹ Financial speculation produces a kind of speculative fiction, and despite its overtures to fact over fiction, it both contributes to and is affected by a broader cultural production of futurity. By reading the social construction of financial derivatives alongside more readily recognizable forms of speculative fiction, *Migrant Futures* asks if another mode of speculation is possible, one that is not immediately captured by the anxious gatherings of risk.¹² If finance is, as Max Haiven characterizes it, “capitalism’s imagination,” wherein neoliberal financialization “comes at the expense of the radical imagination,” I locate a primary site of radical imagination in migrant futures that shift the site of emergency away from terror toward deportation, attend to alternative pockets of wonder such as feminist fabulation rather than defense strategy think tanks, and speculate worlds that demand new onto-epistemological ways of being and thinking.

Launching this examination are fundamental questions about who narrates these futurities and what kinds of subject positions play out in these projected temporal landscapes. Implicitly, the project interrogates who stands to profit from and who risks extinction in prevailing narratives

about the future. The principal players in the derivatives markets are multinational corporations, international agencies such as the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank, investment banks, and hedge funds that pool the investments of wealthy clients—basically, everyone but individuals and nations.¹³ The funds of the four largest U.S. participants—JPMorgan Chase, Citibank, Bank of America, and Goldman Sachs—represent more than 30 percent of the total global derivatives market.¹⁴ Furthermore, the fundamental governance of the global financial system has been dominated entirely by U.S. and European economic interests, though countries with clearly emerging market economies, such as China, India, and Brazil, have demanded a seat at the rule-making table.¹⁵ The financial colonization of the future builds on preexisting disparities of wealth held over from earlier histories of empire and neocolonial enterprises that break at the fault line between what has been called the Global North and South.

Meanwhile, mass migrations of the undocumented, unbanked, and state-less workers move in and out of geopolitical spaces, the nuances and histories of their displacement and precarity flattened by statistical aggregation. They are migrant noncitizens, outliers, most of whom hail from the Global South and have slipped beyond even “dividual” statistical legibility.¹⁶ In the calculus of risk, the unmeasurable uncertainty of this statistical undercommons generates some friction, some disruption of the would-be-unflappable promises of securitization. The economist Frank Knight, in his interrogation of risk, distinguishes calculable probability (risk) from the “absolute unpredictability of things” (true uncertainty).¹⁷ In the risk-uncertainty dialectic, sheer uncertainty invites profit seekers to convert profoundly unknowable states into probabilistic forecasts, to fold uncertainty back into risk practices—yet uncertainty cuts loose from risk discourse’s capture, eluding containment and quantification. While true uncertainty might refuse the grid of intelligibility that securitization would foist upon it, it remains knowable as lived experience, felt and negotiated perhaps most profoundly by those held in “the waiting-room of history.” As he describes this imaginary waiting room in *Provincializing Europe*, Dipesh Chakrabarty suggests that the “modern, European idea of history. . . came to non-European peoples in the 19th century as somebody’s way of saying ‘not yet’ to somebody else.”¹⁸ In the context of finance capitalism, though, the inhabitants of the waiting room are in fact being written out of the future. What would it mean to reconfigure that marginalization from European notions of progress, modernity, history, and futurity? What alter-

native futurities emerge from those living beyond the purview of statistical projection?

If the abstraction of populations into calculated risks and algorithmic approximations of lived experiences produces for state and international regulatory institutions “a legible and administratively convenient format,”¹⁹ queer and trans theorists have been particularly helpful in thinking through a politics that does not simply demand inclusion in that system. A 2015 special issue of *Transgender Studies Quarterly*, for example, takes aim at the “imperative to be counted,” which becomes “another form of normativizing violence that trans subjects can encounter.”²⁰ Census Bureau and National Health Statistics data that feed U.S. biopolitical regimes of population regulation work to regularize a population and “flatten its zoetic confusions of movement and form, of time and space, of doing and being, into neat two-dimensional axes specifying static properties and numbers.”²¹ Population regulation and public health discourse, insofar as they share statistical methods with financial models of speculating on risk, could very well move toward three-dimensional models using differential geometry and statistical mechanics to predict volatility.²² But no matter how nuanced and complex the models get, Paisley Currah and Susan Stryker’s provocation to consider how trans disrupts configurations of “statistical citizenship” opens up a queering of speculation and perhaps even a queering of statistical data as numerical or categorical, discrete or continuous, nominal or ordinal.²³ By “queering speculation,” I refer to a host of reconfigurations of our relationships to the “financialization of daily life” and the manifestation of a “risk society” — which is to say a normative investment in quantitative data to project futurity.²⁴

When José Muñoz asserts that “the future is queerness’s domain,” he posits a horizon of potentiality. Though that horizon might invoke Martin Heidegger’s *Being and Time* and therefore asks us to contend with Heidegger’s Nazism, Muñoz’s articulation of a not yet draws more compellingly not only on Giorgio Agamben’s formulation but also on Ernst Bloch’s theorization of indeterminacy. Muñoz’s presentation of the not yet of queer futurity suggests a way to seize the not yet of European historicity as described in Chakrabarty’s waiting-room scenario. In Muñoz’s words, “we are left waiting but vigilant in our desire for another time that is not yet here.” Queer futurity offers a model for transforming the waiting room into a horizon. As it moves through examples of queer art, performance, and other queer utopian expressions, Muñoz’s *Cruising Utopia* looks to the

realm of the open-ended gesture as an alternative to the way other forms of speculation attempt to pull that horizon of the future into the present for profit.²⁵

By enjamming these two formulations of the not yet—one that seeks to illuminate histories of empire and exclusion, and another that insists on futurity as an opening up rather than a closing down—I want to consider the relationship between the waiting room and the horizon. For it is precisely in the exile’s relation to time—the point at which one is pushed out of what could be called straight time, settler time, or the profitable time of compound interest—that one can glimpse the horizon of the not yet, where not yet manifests itself not as a decree of foreclosure but as an embrace of the unknown. Building on the work of C. L. R. James, Muñoz writes: “To call for this notion of the future in the present is to summon a refunctioned notion of utopia in the service of subaltern politics.”²⁶

If speculation is indeed our *zeitgeist*, how can we imagine the future otherwise? In the face of a seemingly monolithic financialized future, as conceived by investment banks and international development funds, this book looks to speculative fictions that highlight the displacements and violences of global finance capitalism. *Migrant Futures* sets out to think speculation from below and highlights alternative engagements with futurity emerging from the colonized, displaced, and disavowed. Through close analyses of speculative fiction, film, and graphic narrative, I examine how the genre’s emergent cultural producers usurp conventional science fiction tropes of abduction, alienation, and teleportation and recast them against the backdrop of slavery, histories of forced migration, and deportation. By excavating forgotten histories of science and empire, revising conceptualizations of technological subjectivities, and seeking out queer affinities that belie privatized futures, these works demonstrate how speculation can take the shape of radical unfurling, rather than protectionist anticipation. Instead of using predictive calculations that perpetually attempt to pull the future into the present, these alternative speculative fictions, films, and other media forms work to release speculation from capitalism’s persistent instrumentalization of futurity. I hold up these works of speculative fiction by people of color not as antidotes in and of themselves to racialized global capitalism but as affecting experiments that, in the process of imagining another way of being in time, point to the limitations of the new world order’s ongoing drive toward modes of privatization and securitization.

I focus my analysis on close readings of cultural texts from the 1990s on,

written from contexts that challenge categories of national literatures and yet coalesce around critiques of global capitalism. These texts play across various geographies of colonialism (Latin America, the Caribbean, South and Southeast Asia, East Asia and the Pacific, and Africa), and they share an impulse to complicate Eurocentric ideas about the universal subject, modernity, science, and history. Together, they facilitate temporal and spatial disorientations that intervene in a neoliberal fantasy of a seamless world unified under the sign of global capitalism for the global (financial) citizen.

More specifically, I look to the genre of speculative fiction, wherein cultural producers from the global financial undercommons have refused to relinquish the terrain of imagined futures.²⁷ These migrant futures serve as theoretical models through which to reconfigure speculation as a modality more fundamentally rooted in inconclusive reflection; tidy resolution is not its ultimate goal. Rather, the term “speculation” carries with it a sense of lingering conjecture and registers hypothesis as beyond so-called fact. Speculative fiction is a genre of inventing other possibilities (alternate realities, upside-down hierarchies, and supernatural interventions). Speculation is not exclusively interested in predicting the future but is equally compelled to explore different accounts of history. It calls for a disruption of teleological ordering of the past, present, and future and foregrounds the processes of narrating the past (history) and the future (science). While speculation embraces an ethic of meticulous inquiry, it shifts the emphasis of scientific pursuit from fact-chasing to experiment-reveling. Speculation calls into question the genre-making practices of science fiction and interrogates the hierarchical and gendered relationship between hard and soft science fiction. The term “speculation” has also been helpful in that it obliquely and bleakly resonates with the discourse of venture capitalism. It tethers financial speculation to other forms of capitalist expansion, including land acquisition and purchasing on the margin.

The works of literature, film, and graphic narrative collected herein could be called Afrofuturist, Chican@futurist, or Asian futurist, but as they all highlight modes of exchange that move beyond national cultural traditions, they might better be brought into a rubric of “migrant futures.” Taken together, these migrant futures configure a transnational counterpoetics to the predatory speculations of global capitalism.²⁸ On the one hand, “migrant futures” refers in this case to the ways futures markets have moved from place to place and built on the momentum of earlier forms

of capitalist incentivization, such as civilizing missions and the rhetorics of development. On the other hand, this book investigates narratives of futurity alternatively fabulated by transnational speculative fiction authors who challenge neoliberal ideas of freewheeling global entrepreneurialism. Projections of futurity abound, each preoccupied with fears of oncoming deterioration, disaster, or accident. Some invite us to buy into these futures markets, placing bets on which will return the best dividends; others imagine things differently.

Decolonizing Futurity

At the outset of the twenty-first century, two momentous collections of science fiction sought to illuminate and show evidence of a long-standing tradition of speculative writing by black writers. Edited by Sheree Thomas, *Dark Matter: A Century of Speculative Fiction from the African Diaspora* (2000) and *Dark Matter: Reading the Bones* (2004) establish a rich collection of black speculative writing, reaching back to W. E. B. Du Bois's 1929 short story "The Comet." Another anthology titled *So Long Been Dreaming: Postcolonial Science Fiction and Fantasy* (2004), edited by Nalo Hopkinson and Uppinder Mehan, similarly broadened notions of a genre often associated primarily with white male writers from the United States and Europe. Furthermore, the *Dark Matter* anthologies and *So Long Been Dreaming* engage in a theoretical discussion about race and science fiction. In addition to featuring various short stories and excerpts of fiction, Thomas's collections include several critical essays by esteemed writers such as Samuel R. Delany, Octavia E. Butler, and Walter Mosley, who seek to complicate and expand notions of what constitutes and defines the genre of science fiction. In the introduction to *So Long Been Dreaming*, Hopkinson describes postcolonial speculative fiction as "stories that take the meme of colonizing the natives and, from the experience of the colonizee, critique it, pervert it, fuck with it, with irony, with anger, with humour, and also, with love and respect for the genre of science fiction that makes it possible to think about new ways of doing things."²⁹ Mentored by Samuel Delany through the Clarion Writers Workshop, Hopkinson both carries on a tradition of black speculative writing and urges a more transnational consideration of science fiction writing among diasporic peoples. Hopkinson's powerful statement begins to lay out some of the stakes of postcolonial science fiction: How useful can the genre of science fiction be as a critical tool in the

hands of authors for whom “Science” has not historically been particularly kind? How might science fiction writers use this genre as the very occasion for interrogating a history of scientific racism, the collaboration of scientific institutions and the building of empires, and the disciplining of aberrant bodies under the rubric of “progress”?

Progress narratives, conceptualizations of modernity, and empiricist imperatives break across varied histories of imperialism, slavery, settler colonialism, and scenes of forced displacement from military and neocolonial incursions. Afro futurism and Chican@ futurism might have some similar stakes in writing black and brown bodies into the future, but they do so against different forms of racist primitivism. Asian futurism can be trickier to fabulate, given science fiction’s persistent fascination with techno-Orientalist themes and landscapes. When it comes to futurity, it’s not so much that Asians have been written out of it. We’ve become the sign of it, the backdrop to it, and the style manual for it.³⁰ As some scholars of modernity and postmodernity have demonstrated, modernity and—we can extrapolate here—futurity get mobilized and experienced differently across global contexts, in part because of the varied ways racial difference gets mapped onto colonial projections of elsewhere as well as onto neoliberal fantasies of one world. What might a more comparativist approach to decolonizing futurity reveal about some of the consistencies across futurity’s omissions? *Migrant Futures* takes up this minoritarian sector of a genre as a counterpoint to other forms of speculation—specifically, a financial speculation assumptive of a naturalized empiricism and universal financial subject, which may pretend not to care about race but that nonetheless traffics across histories of racialized capitalism.

The emergence of these anthologies at the outset of the twenty-first century provides an occasion for examining how science and the fictions of science participate in the construction of national and international ideas about modernity and futurity. How are these narratives about science, modernity, and futurity intertwined with how we think about race, gender, and sexuality? Given the long and complicated relationship between science and empire, what critical considerations and contributions does postcolonial speculation offer the genre of science fiction and scientific disciplines? The critique levied by these postcolonial speculative fiction writers examines some common science fiction tropes—an emphasis on exploration, the settlement of new lands, potential alien invasions, and technological advancement that emerges from and characterizes the First

World—and questions to what extent the genre itself reproduces the social and political ideologies of a system of science that has historically operated in close conjunction with imperialist and neocolonial enterprises.

One of the most prominent themes of postcolonial speculative fiction is the revision of Western origin myths of technoscience to encourage a radical shift in the epistemological assumptions of scientific endeavors. In other words, one of the fictions about science that these writers contest is that because of the Enlightenment, Europe has an exclusive claim to science's origins. At stake in this debate is that, as David Harvey has argued, "Enlightenment thought . . . embraced the idea of progress, and actively sought that break with history and tradition which modernity espouses."³¹ Pursuing alternative technocultural origin myths also means rejecting the progress narratives that Enlightenment thought encourages. In my analysis of postcolonial speculative fiction, I foreground the critique of progress narratives that makes this emergent set of science fiction writing so vital a countersite for development models of capitalism.

The colonization of the future works to justify and rationalize imperialist expansionism by mobilizing ideological narratives that characterize its predation as a civilizing mission. In the case of finance capitalism, statistical projection transforms the untenable future into a futurescape—akin to the transformation of land into landscape—that materializes the abstract, rendering it available for possession, even as a sight to behold, or an imaginary to occupy. Art historians and indigenous studies scholars call such manifestations of the imaginary into the real the "visual regimes of colonization," with the idea that to aestheticize a landscape is to lay claim to it as if creating "portraits of property."³²

Sixteenth-century cartographers drew dragons at the end of the known world on their maps. They used magic and the fantastic to mark where uncertainty lay in waiting.³³ Mary Louise Pratt demonstrated in *Imperial Eyes* how empire's "mapping of progress" manifested itself in European imperialist cartography and travel writing, alongside European economic and political expansion since 1700.³⁴ Pratt's work needs to be read in conjunction with Ian Hacking's history of probability theory in the largely overlapping period of the seventeenth to late-nineteenth centuries as part of the history of speculation. If the literary and cartographic speculations of *Imperial Eyes* emerge alongside Hacking's historical mapping of the probabilistic "taming of chance,"³⁵ these concomitant proliferations of speculative fictions and financial speculation suggest a prehistory for the contempo-

rary convergence of speculative practices in world markets and global cultural imaginaries. I turn to the future as a temporal geography, as a contemporary extension of how temporality gets narrativized in the service of imperial conquest, from the fantastical maps that facilitated the settler colonial conquest of the Americas in the fifteenth through seventeenth centuries through eighteenth- and nineteenth-century EuroAmerican representations of a racialized and gendered evolutionary family Tree of Man.³⁶ Thriving on the calculation and redistribution of projected risk and volatility, the derivatives markets work “to colonize the future,”³⁷ wherein the future becomes *terra nullius*, emptied of its true uncertainty, filled with securitized risk, and sanctified by a positivist accounting of projection. Critical inquiry into speculation demands not only a study of genre but also a critique of an ideology. The gambit of *Migrant Futures* is to examine futurity from the perspective of the dragons at the edge of the map.

Toward an Antipositivist Science Fiction

The future is an always already occupied space. Though often idealized as blank and empty, primed for projection and population, the future is in practice never so fixed or consolidated, though financial instruments work precisely toward actualizing the future in order to monetize and profit from it. The future exists as absolute uncertainty, which capitalism attempts to contain through the calculation of risk, but ultimately cannot foreclose entirely. Indeed, with the faltering beginning in 2007–8 of an ever-flexible system of speculative capital, the bubble of the subprime mortgage crisis popping, and the failure to predict and protect against the 2011 Tōhoku earthquake and tsunami that caused the meltdown of three reactors at the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant, the early twenty-first century seems a particularly interesting time to be theorizing speculation. We have recently witnessed the ramifications of the betrayed promises of speculative capital in the form of empty returns on financial derivatives, the collapse of the hedge fund promise, and the disastrous impact on low-income homeowners of a credit bubble bursting.

Simultaneously filled with corporate fantasies of limitless profit and leftist antihierarchical possibilities, the future—or, rather, the endless multiplicity of futures—can never be fully colonized. Even as the speculative fictions highlighted in *Migrant Futures* fabulate anti-racist, queer critiques of global capitalism, financial speculation similarly invests in con-

verting possible futures into calculated risk. When used to orient subjects toward normativity, the future offers seemingly flexible but always narrow projections of improvement. Capitalism, after all, is interested in normativity only to the extent that it produces insecurity and consumerist desire. Mark Fisher's *Capitalist Realism* conjures a spectacularly absorptive foe, a blob capitalism indiscriminately folding would-be outliers into its ever-expanding domain. If it is to remain a space of possibility, the future must always also be a multiply occupied space.

Migrant Futures concerns itself with speculative fiction. By using this term instead of the genre's more commonly used moniker of "science fiction," I invoke a decades-long debate about a literary genre's relationship to a form of knowledge production called science. For the science fiction theorist Darko Suvin, science fiction is a genre delimited by works "whose main formal device is an imaginative framework alternative to the author's empirical environment."³⁸ The genre produces, for Suvin, a useful tension between estrangement (a departure from realism) and cognition (the possibility that the world described could be real, as opposed to myth and fantasy). Suvin's theorization of cognitive estrangement has long served the field of science fiction studies as the definitive account of what distinguishes science fiction from other genres, and it operates firmly on the universalist assumptions of an "empirical environment" and the presumption of a universally agreed upon "estrangement" (or for that matter, "realism"). But strangeness and familiarity both remain inherently attached to situated, subjective experiences. Suvin's definition of science fiction through this formulation of cognitive estrangement has always sought to nail down, pinpoint, and close off the boundaries of a genre in ways I have always found rather limiting. For this reason, I have generally preferred more capacious terms that are less interested in literary taxonomies than in the various modalities of writing and reading that can alter relations between writer and reader, shift ways of thinking, and produce different kinds of subjects. I take up the term "speculative fiction" not to identify a genre wholly distinct from science fiction, but to use a more expansive term that might include related genres such as fantasy, horror, and historical fiction; and that highlights the speculative mode of the "What if?"

Some works of science fiction bear an aspirational fidelity to the trending ideals of scientists, but science, like futurity, is contested terrain, consisting of varying arenas of scientific production and publication situated in specific historical contexts and political economies. Nevertheless, many

science fiction scholars have often adhered to a “one world” idealization of science that performs a degree of globalizing visioning itself. For example, in his discussion of “hard” science fiction, Gregory Benford works to align science fiction writers and scientists by pointing to a shared “internationalist idealism” and engagement in the “free trading of ideas.”³⁹ Benford writes of a free trade idealism that could well describe global economic neoliberalism. Published in 1994 in an anthology titled *The Ascent of Wonder: The Evolution of Hard SF*, Benford’s essay laments (“Alas!”) the genre’s yielding to “the old styles,” in which “scientific accuracy and worldview are subordinate to conventional literary virtues of character or plot, style or setting.” In his valuation of internationalist idealism and the scientific worldview, Benford reveals the global scale of his aspirations for the futures of both science and science fiction. His privileging of “hard SF” over “old,” “soft” forms of science fiction—beyond invoking a rather gendered set of criteria—suits the narrative arc of a genre’s “evolution” set forth by the anthology’s subtitle.

In this matter of narrating the evolution of science fiction, though, Benford bumps up against the genre’s own preoccupation with novelty. Benford’s “old” forms actually refer to the “New Wave” of U.S. speculative fiction that emerges throughout the 1960s and 70s, a period when increasing numbers of women, queers, and people of color took to writing in and around the genre.⁴⁰ By calling the New Wave “old” and mapping a rubric of “evolution” onto his genealogy of the genre, Benford participates in the social reproduction of science fiction as the exclusive privilege of white men.⁴¹

Though Benford sets out to advocate for a vigorously collaborative approach to knowledge production that models itself on research published in scientific journals that might have fifty authors’ names attached to the article, the model has some flaws, as the sciences continue to present a pool of thinkers with rather homogeneous profiles. In addition, Benford’s language gives away some of his preconceived valuations of worth. In his praise of communally developed ideas, he lauds the “family” feeling of collaborative research and points to the “fidelity” of facts definitional to the “hardness” of fiction.⁴² In repeatedly referring to “faithfulness to the physical facts of the universe,” Benford conjures a heteronormative marriage between science and science fiction, and he mobilizes a decidedly patriarchal rhetoric, evoking not only gendered allocations of value (“hard” not “soft”) but also eugenicist language (the “simon-pure breed” of “physical science”

over the social sciences) to perform his generic gatekeeping.⁴³ This normative policing of what deserves the designation “science fiction” seems ill-conceived for a genre ostensibly interested in pushing the boundaries of the possible.

Understanding the production of scientific knowledge, as with other forms of knowledge production, requires critical attention to the conditions and contexts that shape these knowledges. Following the work of Donna Haraway, I approach the sciences as “specific historical and culture productions” and consider them “radically contingent” upon the situations that give rise to them.⁴⁴ Haraway’s cyborg manifesto, for example, not only calls forth a feminist epistemology, but also situates the need for a radical revision of technoscientific origin myths in the political context of science-based industries that capitalize on the exploitation of a transnational female labor force.⁴⁵ Haraway also famously looks to feminist works of science fiction as cultural contestations of what she calls “the god trick.”⁴⁶ Advocating for the production of “situated knowledges” and narratives with multiple meanings, Haraway sees in science fiction a site for unmooring scientific knowledge production from a pursuit of mastery or claims to perfect objectivity.⁴⁷

In her investigation of the history of scientific autonomy, Nancy Leys Stepan questions how claims to scientific authority became, in the nineteenth century, “increasingly conceptualised as ‘a sharply-edged, value-neutral, a-political, non-theological, empirical and objective form of knowledge unlike any other’” through a relentless process of “boundary-setting between science and non-science.”⁴⁸ Stepan argues that science emerged from this proliferation of dichotomies as a distinct form of knowledge production that positioned itself as “pure,” “rational,” “objective,” “hard,” and “male.” The writer and theorist Samuel Delany argues that a concomitant positivism during the “precritical period in SF when scientism dominates the field” imagines that “all the difficulties of the world are presented as amenable to scientific solution.”⁴⁹

Rather than policing genre borders of what counts and what does not count as science fiction, I attend to the imaginative work this speculative mode, which engages a specific relationship to futurity, does on what kinds of knowledges we produce. For Haraway, “SF” includes “Science Fiction, Speculative Fabulation, String Figures, So Far” — practices that model worldings that redo “what counts as — what is — real.”⁵⁰ For Delany, speculative fiction exemplifies “paraliterature,” which names those forms of

writing—“comic books, mysteries, westerns, science fiction, pornography, greeting card verse, newspaper reports, academic criticism, advertising texts, movie and tv scripts, popular song lyrics”—deemed extrinsic to but therefore also dialectically constitutive of “literature.”⁵¹ As a paraliterary form, speculative fiction virally occupies the structural site of “proper” fiction. So, rather than a “genre,” which Derrida understood as an announcement of normative delineations that does not “risk impurity, anomaly, or monstrosity,”⁵² speculation harbors a promiscuous impulse.

Though this promiscuity and disregard for the proper may be what makes speculation such a formidable instrument of capitalist appetite—it is not unlike Fisher’s blobular capitalism, after all—it is also what makes speculative fiction such a well-matched alternative to capitalist realism. For the future is on the move, and though finance capitalism attempts to monopolize it through speculative instruments that render it a profitable space, the future remains profoundly unknowable and unpredictable. If the financial, actuarial, and statistical seek to produce predictive models sold to economic markets as scientific, perhaps this is precisely the moment to reassert Delany’s provocation that “fiction makes models of reality.”⁵³ In one of his earliest essays on speculative fiction, co-written with Marilyn Hacker, Delany takes up mathematical modeling as a counterpoint to speculative fiction. He writes: “As soon as we want to look at ‘the real world’ with any greater accuracy and sophistication . . . other models than the arithmetically predictable are more useful to help us appreciate what we are looking at.”⁵⁴ “On Speculative Fiction,” by Delany and Hacker, appears as an introduction to the fourth volume of *Quark: A Quarterly Review of Science Fiction*, published in 1971, at the dawn of the global financial system—when capitalism in the United States and European contexts had to restructure itself vis-à-vis the emerging markets of the “Asian tigers.” The result, of course, was the rise of the financial derivatives markets and the proliferation of futures contracts.⁵⁵ As LiPuma and Lee note, “in 1970 the yearly valuation of financial derivatives . . . was probably only a few million dollars. The sum swelled to about \$100 million by 1980, to nearly \$100 billion by 1990, and to nearly \$100 trillion by 2000.”⁵⁶ Writing at the onset of this rapid ascent of finance capitalism, Delany was already calling for an alternative approach to imagining futures. More specifically, he was calling for a mode of speculation that moved beyond the “incantatory function—a better word than ‘predictive.’”⁵⁷ Delany was after an antipositivist science fiction. He was theorizing a speculative fiction wherein “the impossible re-

lieves the probable, and the possible illuminates the improbable.”⁵⁸ It is this striking move from the instrumentalization of probability to the unbound-
edness of possibility that this book posits as a response to the “corrosion of
social imagination” that so preoccupied Fisher.⁵⁹

Temporal Geographies of the Speculative Undercommons

The texts I examine herein posit critiques and alternatives to the specula-
tions of globalization and interject radical revisions of progress narratives
by attending to the markedly uneven accumulation of wealth of late capital-
ism. These counterspeculations tend to refuse strictly utopian or dystopian
trajectories for technoculture, and they attempt to intervene in develop-
mental teleologies by denaturalizing linear arrangements of time. These
speculative fictions enact what Lisa Lowe and David Lloyd have called “the
excavation and connection of alternative histories and their different tem-
poralities that cannot be contained by the progressive narrative of Western
developmentalism.”⁶⁰ In the recent years of rampant speculation, late capi-
talism has insistently faced forward, driving Walter Benjamin’s Angel of
History along, if not attempting to push it aside. When speculative futures
run wild, excavation, historicization, and haunting become increasingly
important modes of contingency to slow the storm of progress.⁶¹

The speculative fictions that I discuss come from a wide range of geo-
graphical contexts, each the site of some form of U.S. imperialism. Under
the rubric of speculative fiction, various historical networks of affiliations
(among Asian immigrants to the Caribbean and Mexico, Malaysian workers
in Singapore, and Asian Brazilians who migrate for a second time to South-
ern California) are evoked that decenter the United States in the narra-
tive of immigration to the Americas. The authors I examine posit the geo-
graphical loci of the Brazilian Amazon, the U.S.-Mexico borderlands, and
the Southeast Asian archipelago as speculative spaces, wherein histories of
colonization and labor exploitation have produced markedly different re-
lationships to Western science and technology. My project, therefore, sug-
gests that these speculative fictions forge transnational affiliations by posit-
ing diasporic movement as a technology that works covalently with other
intensified global flows. *Migrant Futures* considers speculative fictions that
create transnational affiliations among communities of color that extend
networks of care beyond national narratives of “risky subjects” and the cal-
culations of global financialization.⁶²

I write at a moment when Asian Americanists and queer theorists alike have witnessed neoliberalism's all-too-easy co-optation of rights-based advocacy work. Queer theorists have named a homonormativity, homonationalism, and queer liberalism that point to the limitations of social movements for legal recognition, one that ultimately locks the struggle into a juridical framework that demands the production of a fixed subject, tethered to the nation as its citizen.⁶³ A similar dissatisfaction has emerged among Asian Americanists who not only continue to grapple with the inadequacy of a term that attempts to span an unwieldy range of disparate economic living and working conditions as well as diverse histories of migration and cultural negotiations but also grow impatient with the false prophecies of multicultural triumphalism, model minority achievements and beneficent refuge.⁶⁴

Given these frustrations with neoliberal pluralism, it is heartening that the search for sociopolitical alternatives, or the will to "imagine otherwise" is still on, especially via a "critique of subjectification rather than the desire for subjectivity."⁶⁵ In her formulation of "subjectlessness, as a conceptual tool, [which] points to the need to manufacture 'Asian American' situationally,"⁶⁶ Kandice Chuh discusses Lowe's demonstration in *Immigrant Acts* of how the nation-state advances Enlightenment liberalism's promises of citizenship as key to freedom even as capitalism requires differentiation and uneven distributions of power. Chuh indicates the limitations of rights-based advocacy that is already orienting the battle toward a notion of the liberal citizen-subject who might find herself knee-deep in multiculturalism but still without much in the way of justice or equity.⁶⁷ Chuh's call for a redefinition of the political involves a departure from a nation-framed politics of inclusion and the positivism of identity politics. Calling critical attention to the rights-bearing subject as one tethered to Enlightenment ideals of citizenship and notions of universal subjectivity that emerged from a historically specific moment when slavery and other institutions excluded many from the category of the human, practitioners of queer theory and ethnic studies have pointed to the limitations of a politics that seeks recognition from a system fundamentally bound to prerequisites of normative belonging.⁶⁸

Queer critiques, in particular, offer alternatives to the developmental and aspirational drives ascribed to heteronormative life courses. "Queer subcultures," writes Jack Halberstam, "produce alternative temporalities by allowing their participants to believe that their futures can be imagined

according to logics that lie outside of those paradigmatic markers of life experience — namely, birth, marriage, reproduction, and death.”⁶⁹ One of the reasons Halberstam looks to Delany’s *Times Square Red, Times Square Blue* is to illustrate how “queers use space and time in ways that challenge conventional logics of development, maturity, adulthood, and responsibility.”⁷⁰ Rather than seeing “no future” in systems driven by the clock time of sexual and social reproduction,⁷¹ Halberstam — along with Elizabeth Freeman, for starters — limns the political potentiality of queer failure, refusal, recalcitrance, withholding, and other techniques of disrupting what Benjamin calls “homogeneous empty time.”⁷² As “denizens of times out of joint,” queers unsettle the temporal ordering practices of “*chrononormativity*.”⁷³

Freeman’s attention to the ways laboring bodies in the industrial era are “bound into socially meaningful embodiment through temporal regulation” and tempered into normative rhythms of work and productivity directs us to consider the pivotal role temporality plays in producing modern subjectivities and marching out the tempo of modernity itself. The aspirational “*chronobiopolitics*” (to borrow Dana Luciano’s term)⁷⁴ of neoliberal futurity capitalizes on subjective orientations toward flexible temporalities (such as the use of “flex time” to obscure the increased number of overtime hours) and perpetual self-improvement (with achievement badges for every stage of endlessly upgradeable life). Lauren Berlant’s notion of the impasse seems particularly apt as a refusal of this relentlessly anticipatory trajectory of time.⁷⁵

In the chapters that follow, I emphasize the continuity across finance speculation’s harnessing of futurity and an older imperialist practice of leveraging white supremacist notions of modernity toward the same end of extracting profit. I draw on the work of historians of science and technology who trace how technoscience — from its material inventions to its ideological disseminations — has aided and abetted (and sought to rationalize) colonizing forces in the conquest, subjugation, and/or exploitation of other peoples.⁷⁶ At the same time, rather than approaching science as a hegemonic force, my readings of speculative fictions emphasize the reciprocal, dialectical relationships in technocultural formation. I investigate how speculative fiction helps shift the conventional framework of “technology” to consider other types of knowledge-networks that cut across center-periphery models of scientific production. My attention to a more inclusive account of scientific practice is motivated by an effort to recognize the often invisible labor that supports scientific enterprises and dis-

covery claims. From the explorer's indigenous translator to the factory worker who assembles laboratory instruments, the production of scientific knowledge has been contingent upon a labor force that takes a much more central role in the speculative fictions I analyze in this project. Labor becomes more visible in these narratives as part of more cooperative models of intellectual, and material, production that emphasize cross-class, inter-ethnic collaborations and transnational circulations of knowledge. I argue that speculative fiction can foster alternative forms of connectivity that exceed and defy the privatizing logics of nation, corporation, and nuclear family. The fictions I examine formulate innovative structures of belonging and possible coalition building across conventional differences that emerge from alternative genealogies of speculative fiction, including 1960s Latin American magical realism, Caribbean carnival, Afro futurism, manga, anime, Chinese folklore, and *rasquachismo*. These paraliterary genealogies call our attention to the significance of imaginative literary forms that arise out of paracapitalist contexts and therefore might provide even more grounds for imagining the world beyond capitalist realism.

In the first chapter of this book, "Imperial Rubber: The Speculative Arcs of Karen Tei Yamashita's *Rainforest Futures*," I examine the work of Yamashita, a Japanese American writer whose speculative fiction *Through the Arc of the Rain Forest* (1990) exhumes the traces of multiple empires that have shaped contemporary transpacific circulations of labor and culture. Set in the Amazon jungle, the novel unearths U.S. neocolonial enterprises in Brazil by excavating the ruins of Fordlândia, a Ford rubber plantation cultivated in the 1920s and abandoned in the 1930s. By analyzing archival material on Fordlândia alongside Yamashita's text, I situate the civilizing mission Henry Ford used to rationalize his plantation building within the longer history of nineteenth-century European imperialist discourses on tropical nature, health, and race, which sustained ethnographic and scientific expeditions to the Amazon. If both financial speculation and speculative fiction draw on at least the recent past, what are their extrapolation points? If those points of departure shift, or if authors of the future look to alternative historical flash points, how might their projections change? Chapter 1 extrapolates from the historical narrative of Fordist ruin and failure rather than Fordist triumphalism to inquire what might have happened if the fortune of global capitalism had foretold ecological disaster rather than only spectacular profit. By understanding Yamashita's *Through the Arc of the Rain Forest* as a dystopian tale of flexible citizenship and neoliberal

economic policy, I foreground how global finance capitalism provides only a partial utopian perspective of what such globalizing moves will unleash.

The second chapter, “Homeland Futurity: Speculations at the Border,” examines the U.S.-Mexico border as a site of historical and ongoing speculation. Frontiers and borders—whether imagined by Frederick Jackson Turner in the late nineteenth century as unruly wilderness demanding containment and civilization or reimagined a century later by Gloria Anzaldúa as spaces of mythical transformation—have perpetually been called into being through fantastic speculation. As decades of scholarship in Latin American and Latinx literary studies show, the production of borders involves a practice of worlding, of fabulations of time and space.⁷⁷ Amid discussions of surveillance technologies, the War on Drugs, the War on Terror, and anti-immigration campaigns, I analyze late twentieth- and early twenty-first-century examples of critical speculations that renegotiate border futures by contesting the strategies of risk management and containment that fill the Homeland Security imaginary. Yamashita’s novel *Tropic of Orange* and Alex Rivera’s independent film *Sleep Dealer* provide helpful counternarratives to more predatory forms of speculation by producing the possibilities of cross-border coalitions that disrupt the corporatization and militarization of the Southland, a region that always also shares a border with the Pacific Ocean.

Carrying through the project’s critique of speculation in the service of securitization and surveillance states, chapter 3, “Speculation and the Speculum: Surrogations of Futurity” turns to another important field of imagining futurity: reproduction. In my consideration of Alfonso Cuarón’s film *Children of Men* and Nalo Hopkinson’s science fiction *Midnight Robber*, I examine two speculative narratives that foreground black pregnant women as bearers of a new tomorrow while overturning techno-utopian visions of progress. Though a radical revision of P. D. James’s 1992 nationalist novel of the same name, Cuarón’s *Children of Men* ultimately disappoints because it imposes a gendered and racialized reproductive imperative onto the pregnant body of Kee, the “fugee” woman who must navigate her way through the heavily surveilled police state of near-future England, with limited awareness of how this reproduces the kind of necropolitical violence the film sets out to expose. While the protagonist Theo tries to get Kee to a boat called *The Tomorrow*, the film reinstates the promise of the white savior, even as they pass through a dystopian futurescape through which Cuarón launches an unequivocal critique of the War on Terror, carceral

states, and securitization measures. *Midnight Robber* articulates the conditions of survival in end-of-the-world scenarios quite differently. Hopkinson emphasizes cross-species alliances and gender-queer family formations that dislodge futurity from models of heteropatriarchal reproduction.

The fourth chapter, “The Cruel Optimism of the Asian Century,” leaps across oceans to focus on Singapore and its self-conscious marketing as a place of optimism about the future. The chapter questions Singapore’s optimism by examining Sonny Liew’s *Malinky Robot*, a graphic story collection by a Malaysian-born Singaporean writer-artist, in which the protagonists eke out an existence in a dystopic, near-future, pan-Asian city where the future’s promises have clearly passed them over and instead left them with ramshackle shelters to inhabit and mutant life forms with which to commiserate. These graphic narratives about street urchins trying to survive in a foreboding landscape interrogate what it is like to live amid the towering edifices of futurity without the means to make a home. *Malinky Robot* also opens onto questions about life in the Capitalocene, where humanistic aspirational subjectivity has only sustained what Berlant calls a “cruel optimism.”⁷⁸ Finally, as two of the main characters are nonhumans, surrounded by humans who inexplicably accept the dehumanizing conditions to which they are subjected in their everyday lives, *Malinky Robot* provides an occasion to think futurity beyond the human. This query about multi-species futures is a thread that continues more intentionally in chapter 5, in which a feminist-queer commons emerges as one response to the individualist structures of capitalist subjectivity.

That final chapter, “Salt Fish Futures: The Irradiated Transpacific and the Financialization of the Human Genome Project,” turns to Larissa Lai’s *Salt Fish Girl*, an Asian-Canadian speculative fiction set in a near-future where corporate enclosures have replaced international cities, genetically modified organisms proliferate both within and beyond zones of regulation, and the Island of Mist and Forgetfulness enlists immigrants in telemarketing schemes securing investors in offshore business ventures. Living in this world shaped by predatory speculation, Lai’s protagonists nevertheless experiment with unpredictable ways to foment collective dissent across species, spaces, and temporalities. I read *Salt Fish Girl* as one example of radical speculation that explores histories of transnational migration and nuclear holocaust, transgenic mutations and transcultural memory, as well as queer sex and anticapitalist forms of exchange to articulate a strange futurity that disrupts the smooth surfaces of techno-Orientalism.

Speculating from the margins, the migrant futures explored herein offer alternative approaches to futurity. Yamashita's exhumations of failed plantation futures in the Brazilian Amazon stage the disintegration of capitalism's gleaming promises in the form of a new resource with seemingly limitless potential that ultimately proves to be structurally flawed. In *Tropic of Orange* and *Sleep Dealer*, the elusiveness of the horizon and the cross-ethnic solidarity across fugitive networks sustain a mode of looking to the future without hoping to contain it. In *Malinky Robot*, the children of the future take truant paths through makeshift geographies to eke out a life in the shadow of an Asian Century. Finally, *Salt Fish Girl* formulates a transgenic commons that intervenes in the privatization of the future. Taken together, these speculative acts model a cultural politics of decolonizing futurity, of occupying the not yet, to hold it open for the yet to come.