

## Is It All a Dream?

### *Global Movement and the Gossamer of “Globalization”*

Lisa Uperesa

#### ABSTRACT

Sedimented orientations to the concept of globalization today often rest on a technocratic triumphalism—“time-space compression”—made possible by emerging technologies, “flows” of various kinds transforming “-scapes” they transit and shape, capital straining toward unfettered freedom stalking new markets and shaping governance possibilities, the movement of humanity facilitated by infrastructure, and cities that serve as pulsating nodes of a global order. Not only does this triumphalist vision exclude vast swathes of the globe, it draws on a set of ideologies and ontologies from the West to represent global pasts, presents, and futures to all. These exclusions and focal points are not just coincidental, but mutually constituting. With attention to two topics often situated within globalization imaginaries—mobility discourses and sport ideologies—this chapter engages Pacific worldviews of movement to probe the limits of globalization as a conceptual framework. Focusing on strands of what becomes obscured as global movement, it suggests that adopting a kaleidoscopic approach attentive to historical contingency, transnational connections, place, and competing ontologies helps us to understand better the dynamics of our time.

#### KEYWORDS

indigeneity, mobility, Pacific, sport, transnationalism

Sedimented orientations to the concept of globalization today often rest on a technocratic triumphalism—“time-space compression”—made possible by emerging technologies, “flows” of various kinds transforming “-scapes” they transit and shape, capital straining toward unfettered freedom stalking new markets and shaping governance possibilities, the movement of humanity facilitated

by infrastructure, and cities that serve as pulsating nodes of a global order. While some technology and business sectors wholeheartedly support this framing, even the critical insights provided by scholars to illuminate the architecture and dynamics of connection get folded into a view of globalization as teleology—with an inevitable, self-sustaining, and increasingly abstracted power (see Appadurai, 1986, 1990; Harvey, 1989, 1990; Sassen, 2002, 2016 for example). Toby Miller et al. argue that “globalization is a knowledge effect with definite impacts on intellectual, economic, social, and governmental practice” (2001, 8). In tracing the emergence of globalization as a core concept, Paul James and Manfred B. Steger describe it as being encoded with progressively condensed meanings as it “contributed to the articulations of the emerging global imaginary in new ideological keys that corresponded to the thickening of public awareness of the world as an interconnected whole” (2014: 423; see also Steger & James, 2019). What has become represented as a universalized vision excludes vast swathes of the globe and draws on a set of ideologies and ontologies from the West to represent global pasts, presents, and futures to all. These exclusions and areas of focus are not just coincidental, but mutually constituting.

While a globalization frame may be useful for capturing aspects of large-scale connections seeded and enabled by technological shifts, we still need better insight into the articulations and disjunctures between what we understand to be “local” and “global,” or perhaps to better understand the utility (and limits) of conceptualizing them in this way. Among scholars the awareness of the local as part of larger systems, whether state, regional, national, or international, is well established, with few places in the world unaffected by the shifts that have happened over the past several decades. When we think of “local,” it is not just an exercise in rhetorical provincializing, but encompasses place-based, historical, and contingent dynamics that shape everyday life, and this demands attention to specificity. In contrast, we often think of the “global” as amorphous connections powered elsewhere by others, as filaments woven in the ether of media or materialized in commodity chains and seasonal labor schemes. Meanwhile, transnational flows of labor are conditioned by the rise of nation-states and border politics, and disciplined by national policies, transnational capital, and international governance bodies. The COVID-19 disruptions fractured the view of globalization as a powerful self-sustaining system as they revealed worldwide connections to be highly dependent on lines in the networks, and these in turn are impacted by conditions on the ground that sustain effective nodal connections. This raises the question of whether we should be writing against “globalization” and toward a kaleidoscopic approach toward examining our world today.

Attentive to two topics often situated within globalization imaginaries—mobility discourses and sport ideologies—this chapter asks: What is useful and what is left out of a globalization frame? What might we gain from shifting the lenses so often used in power centers of the Western world? Drawing from the

Indigenous and diasporic Pacific, ontologies of global movement are challenged by Indigenous frameworks and articulations, showing how globalization as an imaginary not only obscures but erases. Secondly, attending to mythmaking and global sport, we see more clearly how fantasy not only informs reality but begins to bend it through people's everyday choices. Taking concrete examples from the sport world—often either conceptualized as hyperlocal or grandiosely global in scope—we can instead ask, how might attending to transnational connections as a methodological choice and adopting a kaleidoscopic sensibility help us to better understand the dynamics through which what is often seen as the local and global shape each other? Focusing on strands of what becomes obscured as “global movement” helps us to understand better the dynamics of our time and provides a different approach to our emerging futures.

#### MOBILITY DISCOURSES AND PACIFIC VISIONS OF MOVEMENT

In his landmark article “Our Sea of Islands,” esteemed scholar Epeli Ha'uofa crafted a new vision of the Pacific that turned away from bureaucratic discourses of small islands, limited resources, and dependency to reckon with the fullness of the world of Oceania, thereby effecting a significant paradigm shift that continues to this day. Reflecting on the ancestors, he noted: “Theirs was a large world in which peoples and cultures moved and mingled, unhindered by boundaries of the kind erected much later by imperial powers. From one island to another they sailed to trade and to marry, thereby expanding social networks for greater flows of wealth. They travelled to visit relatives in a wide variety of natural and cultural surroundings, to quench their thirst for adventure, and even to fight and dominate” (1994: 154–55). He went on to describe networks of islands connected by circulation of people and wealth, from which they ventured far afield to the western, eastern, and southern areas of the Pacific. These island conglomerations are evident in oral histories, genealogies, and exchange of cultural forms like dance.

Speaking of the movements of Pacific peoples in the post–World War II era and beyond, Hau'ofa wrote, “The new economic reality made nonsense of artificial boundaries, enabling people to shake off their confinement” that had been imposed by imperial borders. He explained:

They have since moved, by the tens of thousands, doing what their ancestors did in earlier times: enlarging their world, as they go, on a scale not possible before. Everywhere they go—to Australia, New Zealand, Hawai'i, the mainland United States, Canada, Europe, and elsewhere—they strike roots in new resource areas, securing employment and overseas family property, expanding kinship networks through which they circulate themselves, their relatives, their material goods, and their

stories all across their ocean, and the ocean is theirs because it has always been their home. (1994: 155)

In the effort to understand this new volume and directionality of movement, Hau'ofa implored us to widen our lines of sight: "We cannot see these processes clearly if we confine our attention to things within national boundaries and to events at the upper levels of political economies and regional and international diplomacy. Only when we focus on what ordinary people are actually doing, rather than on what they should be doing, can we see the broader picture of reality" (1994: 156–57). In his wider view of shifting histories of mobility in Oceania, he makes the point that movement closer and further abroad has always been part of everyday practice across Te Moananui-a-Kea/Kiwa/Kiva (literally, the wide ocean or Oceanic world). While twentieth-century transportation technologies and shifting border regimes made renewed mobilities a reality in many parts of the Pacific, contrary to common sense around migration and globalization, this movement phenomenon was not new. The Pacific was already characterized by circuits connecting Pacific Island peoples within and beyond their archipelagoes to each other shaped by deeply ingrained travel tendencies and practices (T.D.I. Salesa, 2003).

Peoples of the Pacific have been enacting global mobility, in the sense of cultivating wide-ranging networks and movement far beyond the horizon for settlement and trade for centuries. The intrepid travel practice and expertise was captured in names such as "The Navigator Islands" given by Western explorers. In "The Pacific in Indigenous Time," Damon Salesa charts some of this early movement, drawing on archaeological evidence and oral histories, from the settlement of Austronesia, near and far Oceania, to the later settlement of Ancestral Polynesia or Hawaiki, and parts of what we often call Micronesia. Through the expansion of the Lapita cultural complex and other complementary migrations, Oceanic worlds were expanded (see also Irwin, 1992; Kirch & Green, 2001). "The wide and continuing distribution of objects throughout the Lapita sphere demonstrates ongoing networks or systems of exchange that are ancestral" (D. Salesa, 2014: 35). Other networks or systems of connection, movement, and exchange have been well documented (the Kula system of exchange in Melanesia, for example). Yet while these kinds of far-flung regional connections through specific circuits and nodes are long-standing, they follow particular routes both up until the sixteenth century and with the arrival of newcomers after. The story of the colonial era, as part of a larger worldwide movement of nations, states, and companies in search of lands and resources for extraction, is nonetheless one that was "locally dramatic, but regionally prolonged and haphazard" in the Pacific (D. Salesa, 2014: 36). Attention to these histories reveals a global sensibility in movement far afield but also the importance of specificity and contingencies in the way movement unfolds over time.

*Ontologies of Pacific Movement*

One of the largest debates in mid- to late-twentieth-century anthropology contested a seemingly simple question: did Pacific Island peoples voyage deliberately across the vast expanse of the moana or did they drift by accident? Countless reams of paper were inked in dedication to that scholarly debate, held over the heads of practitioners and in ways that rendered oral histories and even material culture suspect. Only when the scaled model could be built and the navigation replicated with Indigenous Pacific knowledges of maritime movement, of swells and currents and seas and landfalls, would the critics—those for whom it seemed the very idea of Indigenous peoples deliberately testing and refining and building knowledge to navigate the world they inhabited was too unbelievable to be true—be finally silenced. The renaissance of Indigenous Pacific voyaging and the revitalization of Polynesian wayfinding built upon the knowledge of Micronesian master navigators to reclaim not only history but practice, shown in the Hōkūle‘a and Hikianalia voyages. In so doing, modern voyagers enacted a global mobility shaped by Indigenous ontologies that was both contemporary and part of a long and storied tradition (see Finney et al., 1995, or Thompson, 2016).

The debate itself over whether early voyaging was accidental or deliberate is emblematic of the kinds of impulses that are alternatively buried within or shouted from the rooftops when globalization imaginaries are mobilized. In these imaginaries agency is exercised by capital, supported by governance structures and policies, driving transformative dynamics that have reshaped our lifeworlds. And while the impetus of capital is perennially tied to mobilizing labor flows, it does so in ways that constrict choice and attempt to render laborers docile and disempowered. In this context the “rational person” of economic theory responding to structural opportunities or difficulties shapes prevalent understandings of how people move and why, and that rational person’s world is always already conditioned by an imaginary of Western market-based capitalism. There is little room for culture and ontology that departs from the normatively unmarked except to act as examples of failure: anachronistic social regimes that must be overcome to enable further infiltration of capital and capitalism. Indigenous ontologies are silenced in globalization theory except as particular responses to more powerful structures of capital and globalization. Yet ethnographic work with transnational communities shows not just response to structural determinism but rather coconstituted practice where personal and community agency not only meets, shapes, and is shaped by larger structures, but in many cases is driven by concerns and sensibilities that are not wholly part of or governed by these structures. Indigenous ontologies are a central element of Oceanic mobility—these are place-based in many ways as they arise out of conceptions of one’s place in the world tied to contextual relations and worldviews, and manifest in cultural sensibilities around movement. What

globalization explicitly or implicitly purports to obliterate (specific expressions tied to place and space) is actually key to understanding these movements.

Working almost contemporaneously with Ha'uofa, Cathy Small's ethnography of Tongan movement in the 1990s traces the story of an extended family from a village in Tonga to California's San Francisco Bay Area. Through her time with the family, she illuminates important shifts in their movement, including adapting gender norms and practices, intergenerational tensions and challenges, and changing cultural obligations in diaspora. But things were not only changing abroad; conditions at home in Tongan villages were already shifting with regard to access to land, economic pressures and consumption patterns, and rhythms of labor and everyday life. Understanding their transnational movement required attention to "the *differential* in both social and economic mobility" ([1997] 2011: 192). "The differential ensures that it is only in returning 'home'—in transnational visits, investment retirement, and remittances—that the real promise of the migration process can be fulfilled" (192). But the drives for migration did not sit neatly within American scripts of migration to the land of opportunity, leaving the old world behind. Tongans were migrating in part for fulfilling *kavenga* or to meet *fatongia* (cultural obligations or shared responsibilities), to serve their families in Tongan ways amidst shifting economic prospects and expectations.

Twenty years later, Tēvita O. Ka'ili's *Marking Indigeneity* (2017) focused on the sensibilities around *tā* and *vā*, Tongan philosophical notions of time and space, as a prism through which to understand efforts to organize daily life, to meet normative workforce expectations, and to fulfill cultural obligations among Tongan migrant communities in Maui. The manipulation of space and approach to time was part and parcel of negotiating Tongan cultural sensibilities and duties as they ran up against the unforgiving persistence of Western time that governed the worlds of work and school. Although Ka'ili does not address this specifically, it suggests that many were stretching themselves thin in the reckoning between Tongan *tā-vā* and the time-space of American capitalism, but persisted anyway. That they were doing their best to balance competing ontologies in these diasporic/transnational spaces pushes back on the deterministic frames of globalization as capitalist triumph. As I found in research on sport with Samoan communities at home and abroad, many Pacific peoples have become capitalist subjects but are not merely subject to capitalism—they have recourse to other ontologies that actively shape action (L. Uperesa, 2022).

These other ontologies appear elsewhere and help us to rethink the common sense of globalization frames. For example, in Sia Figiel's novel *Where We Once Belonged* (1996), she focuses on Sāmoa as the sacred center—where the village, the nation, and the world are anchored from the perspective of one whose feet are on the *fanua* or the land in Sāmoa. As her character Alofa Filiga joins her peers in a favorite pastime of counting relatives, she is showcasing Samoan views of *āiga* or

*‘āigapotopoto* (extended family). With the sensibility that a family that is strong is one that is large, she also weaves in the prestige of going abroad as an accomplishment that extends the reach of the family. This appears also in Sa’iliemanu Lilomaiva-Doktor’s work in critical geography that shifts prior lenses of movement and migration to ones consistent with and rooted in Samoan ontologies. In this framing the *moa* is indeed the center, and conceptualized as *i’inei*, here, as distinct from *fafo*, or the outside (2009). This perspective shift is from the bird’s-eye view of globalization theory to one grounded in place; rooted but looking outward rather than disembodied and decentered. But as Cluny and La’avasa Macpherson remind us in *Warm Winds of Change* (2013), movement from this grounded place is still shaped by and negotiated amidst historical contingency and Indigenous sensibilities, and conditioned by specific pathways. (The connections abroad that they trace, and those that feature in Figiel’s work, are not primarily motivated by but remain nevertheless enmeshed with the pasts and presents of New Zealand’s ambitions to empire in the Pacific.)

With the examples from the Indigenous and diasporic Pacific, we can question the seemingly settled ontology of globalization as it emerges in mobility discourses. In doing so, this raises the limitations of globalization as a frame for mobility and highlights the importance of attending to specificity of movement with a kaleidoscopic view that enables agility—illuminating specific histories, power dynamics, and the legacies for the present as well as ongoing accountabilities and responsibilities for the future.

#### SPORT PATHWAYS AND GLOBAL IMAGINARIES

High-profile examples of sport mobility often remain at the individual level, with a focus on dramatic narratives. The breathless media coverage, whether around key figures in a given sport or backstories featured in periodic Olympic coverage, allows viewers to connect to pathways charted by the rise and fall of stars in sport. On the far end of the spectrum from the global sport imaginaries, this hyperfocus also obscures the ways that local contests are increasingly intertwined with regional, national, and international entities. In this section we chart a middle course with examples from the Pacific to highlight the interplay between specificities of pathways and place, and the force exerted by globalized sport imaginaries.

In Aotearoa, New Zealand, the remaking of the national sport through the global advertising campaigns of the multinational company and sponsor Adidas at the moment of the rugby union’s professionalization in 1995 provides a particularly clear example of the way local practices are increasingly enmeshed with circuits that range far beyond the horizon (see Jackson & Hokowhitu, 2002). Rugby dominates the national sportscape, and while the success of icons like Sir Michael Jones, Fiafo Fa’amausili, and Dr. Farah Rangikoea Palmer are elevated in the public eye, the journey is often a long and precarious road. It is one that

is developed in the everyday on the *whenua* across the *motu*, in local clubs and schools supported by families and communities. These flaxroots efforts infuse and sustain the sportscape in place but remain connected to a larger imaginary around sport mobility and movement. That imaginary is reconstituted in every test match and tour, where *taonga* or cultural treasures like *haka* are mobilized as national symbols on the world stage.

Individualizing these journeys obscures the wider networks, contingent histories, and in many ways, cultural sensibilities and ontologies that may feed or propel them; but focusing largely on the systemic macro framework of global sport does as well. The latter discussions are useful for understanding the dynamics of international sporting bodies and wider frames of sport investment and movement in the aggregate.<sup>1</sup> However, the insights they yield, like those focused on the large-scale framing of global migrations, are partial (Carter, 2013). What we might abstract into a “system” of “global sport” is actually an aggregate vision of distinct and overlapping historically contingent pathways connecting what is sometimes called the Global South to the Global North, but also different localities to each other. In many cases the colonial pathways that carried sports migrants of the past are now subsumed into what we call the infrastructure of global sport, but the colonial traces live very much in the present (Grainger, 2011). In this context the global vision hides as much as or more than it illuminates, and to understand what is happening in any given area of the sport world requires attending to local and contingent connections within and across established pathways (Besnier et al., 2020).

Understanding the significance and composition of sports like rugby union and rugby league in places like Aotearoa requires insights into specific colonial histories, presents, and afterlives. Over a century after its introduction, rugby remains a national pastime in Aotearoa—folded into durable national narratives that in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries privileged gendered settler-colonial sensibilities around rugged masculinities and whiteness (Phillips, Nauright, & Chandler, 1996; Pringle, 2004). Although marginalized in early accounts, Māori have been part of the local game from its early days (Hokowhitu, 2005; Calabrò, 2016). Today Māori and Pasifika players are increasingly central to both the men’s and women’s game (Grainger, Falcous, & Newman, 2012).<sup>2</sup> For non-Māori Pacific peoples, this heavy sporting presence builds on migration histories that themselves have been enabled by colonial pathways and Indigenous sensibilities around movement. Pasifika peoples make up just over 8 percent of Aotearoa’s population,<sup>3</sup> and are largely drawn from Pacific Island countries historically associated with New Zealand empire and those with historical linkages to the British Commonwealth.<sup>4</sup> Reading colonial entanglements in the Pacific present can be crucial, but the field of sport mobilities incorporates other connections, disconnections, and inequalities as well (Besnier, 2014).

At the other edge of the moana, my research on Pacific Islander participation in American football has traced the movement from areas of the Pacific like Sāmoa



and Hawai'i to the sport fields of the United States, facilitated by legacies and contemporary realities of U.S. empire (F.L. Uperesa, 2014b). Waves of post-World War II migration from Sāmoa came largely through the territorial status of Tutuila and Manu'a, the site of the former Naval Base Tutuila, and the statehood status of occupied Hawai'i. In the ensuing decades horizons stretched further afield and movement networks have become more complex, transforming the Polynesian Pipeline of the past into the Polynesian Network of the present, but the larger story is incomprehensible solely as a narrative of global sport movement. While there is more freedom today than in the past, historical pathways shape present and future possibilities, and these pathways have specific contingencies rooted in place, tied to complex dynamics. At the same time, engagements with these pathways often build on and are shaped by cultural sensibilities around *tautua* or service and long-standing Indigenous orientations to mobility discussed earlier. It is in paying attention to this articulation that we understand better not only the movement of capital but the agency of those who are enacting globalization "from below" (Portes, 2000). They do so not only as passive actors buffeted by the winds of change driven by whims of elites, but as empowered agents themselves actively shaping the world around them.

### *Sports Imaginaries and Place*

While sports migrants are empowered agents, they are also working within contexts shaped by sport imaginaries. In these imaginaries, particularly in the late twentieth century and since, mobility (geographic, economic, social) anchors the dream. Across the world globalized sport mobility often represents unfettered access to future possibilities through networks, contracts, visibility and branding, access to educational pathways, and flow-on professional opportunities. In this vision, sport fields offer a chance to change the trajectory of a life and the lives of those around them, standing as a rare opportunity to bypass existing inequities, hierarchies, and limited life chances. It is a potential escape from the harsh realities of late capitalist shifts—neoliberal disinvestment, rising inequality, and reconfiguration of sectors that once were paths to sustainable working-class and middle-class employment (Esson, 2013; Trimbur, 2013). For many Pacific Islander players, representation as athletes in popular culture and the opportunity provided by expanded investment in sport infrastructure together influence everyday choices by players and families. These shape youth views of future careers (Fitzpatrick, 2013) and the perception of sports as a "meal ticket" (McDonald & Rodriguez, 2014). Whether amassing athletic capital or navigating athletic-industrial complexes and transnational sport mobility routes (Maguire & Falcous, 2011; Runstedtler, 2018; L. Uperesa, 2022), athletes engage these imaginaries as they actively produce their own mobility (Carter, 2011).

Yet in many of these sports the probability of upward mobility through sport is far outpaced by the sense of possibility (Eitzen, 2009). In the United States,

for example, considering the journey from high school to the pros, one's overall chances are exceedingly slim: of the millions who play high school football, only 254 players are drafted to the NFL in a given year (NCAA, 2020). In this, the force of the global sporting imaginary seems to bend everyday choices even in the face of contrary realities—for every star college or professional athlete there are thousands who didn't progress, and some with distressing consequences for them or their families (Menke & Germany, 2019).

If we reject abstracted global sport mobility narratives, what does attention to specific networks anchored in place reveal? In places like Hawai'i, which has significant racialized economic inequalities and a large split between public and private education (Okamura, 2008), youth sport is one strategy for accessing private schooling opportunities from middle school up. While these may position student-athletes well in feeder programs for college recruiting, they are more likely to provide access to social networks and privileged educational experiences. These yield outcomes as well, even if the dots are harder to connect because of the delayed arc of outcomes that may materialize years into the future. Abstracting youth sport participation as part of a global or national system yields only partial insight, and leaves aside factors that are intensely local but shaped by widening concentric circles of context. Moreover, these local considerations are not fully captured by visions of mobility or access to capital (social, economic, or cultural). For some groups like local Japanese descendants playing barefoot football or baseball throughout the twentieth century, demonstrating cultural citizenship particularly after the bombing of Pearl Harbor was key (Franks, 2000, 2002); for others, like many Polynesian football recruits, sport became a way to represent the nation, push back on cultural racism, and acquire the means to fulfill cultural obligations like *tautua* or service to family and community (F.L. Uperesa, 2014a).

Across Te-Moananui-a-Kiwa and beyond, continued participation is also reproduced through family and community commitments to particular sports (Lakisa, Adair, & Taylor, 2014; Lakisa et al., 2019). The linking of cultural identities and homeland loyalties to representation on the field is shaped by but ultimately exceeds the frames provided by global mobility narratives driven by capitalism (Teaiwa, 2016; F.L. Uperesa, 2018, 2021; see also Guinness and Besnier, 2016). High-profile examples out of rugby league challenged conventional wisdom about chasing the big payday or the highest-ranked team, as well-placed overseas Tongan players chose to join a lesser-ranked and more poorly funded team to represent their ancestral home in the Rugby League World Cup, and in so doing fulfilled cultural sensibilities around service and fidelity. The opportunity to "Die for Tonga" on the sports field, wrote one of the players during the journey, was "unlike anything I had known in my career" (Tupou, 2017).

A closer look at sport mobility pathways in the Pacific includes structures propelled by capital at the higher end and their flow-on effects at amateur and youth levels, but players navigate routes with particular histories, contingencies,

and constraints. Here the view of “global sport” is less useful than attending to transnational connections and specificities, as well as considering worldviews of mobility that may resonate with “transnational” conceptions but are not exclusively anchored in or constrained by the nation-state. As in the earlier discussion of ontologies of Pacific movement, understanding lifeworlds and meaning-making attached to the pursuit of sport mobility also requires attention to aspects of culture and difference that may not be fully captured by Western frameworks. Understanding sport mobility, then, requires a kaleidoscopic approach wherein level, context, and scope shift into focus, always tied to place and localities.

### RETHINKING GLOBAL IMAGINARIES

What is useful and what is left out of a globalization frame? What happens when the pursuit of capital as an individual or collective strategy to tap into the millenarian fantasies of globalization fails to encompass and explain whether, how, and why people move? When they flatten out important histories, contingencies, and distinctions that shape movement? What might we gain from shifting the lenses so often used in power centers of the Western world? To paraphrase the late great Biggie Smalls for provocation, is it all a dream—like filaments of gossamer woven before our eyes?

Shifting to a vantage point grounded in Pacific worldviews allows us to breach the veil, and the utility and limits of globalization become clearer. As an aggregating concept it is a useful heuristic, but for clarity toward deeper understanding we have to pay attention to contingencies, transnational connections, and competing ontologies, values, and sensibilities. These allow us to connect the local with that beyond the horizon, and together with a kaleidoscopic approach give us more tangible insights into massive shifts in lifeworlds in our time. Accepting the terms and assumptions of globalization imaginaries not only limits our sight, it maintains the force of ontologies and ideologies from the West masquerading as universal and renders all else marginal.

### NOTES

1. See for example Chatzigianni (2018) and Maguire (2011).
2. I use Pasifika, Pacific peoples, and Pacific Islander as institutionally recognized terms in this essay; the first two are terms widely used in Aotearoa New Zealand and Australia, while the latter is used in the United States.
3. [www.stats.govt.nz/tools/2018-census-ethnic-group-summaries/pacific-peoples](http://www.stats.govt.nz/tools/2018-census-ethnic-group-summaries/pacific-peoples).
4. This includes Tokelau, Niue, Cook Islands, Samoa, Fiji, and Tonga.

### REFERENCES

- Appadurai, A., ed. (1986). *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Appadurai, A. (1990). "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy." *Theory, Culture and Society* 7: 295–310.
- Besnier, N. (2014). "Pacific Island Rugby: Histories, Mobilities, Comparisons." *Asia Pacific Journal of Sport and Social Science* 3 (3): 268–76.
- Besnier, N., D.G. Calabrò, & D. Guinness (2020). *Sport, Migration, and Gender in the Neoliberal Age*. New York: Routledge.
- Calabrò, D.G. (2016). "Once Were Warriors, Now Are Rugby Players? Control and Agency in the Historical Trajectory of the Māori Formulations of Masculinity in Rugby." *Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology* 17 (3–4): 231–49.
- Carter, T.F. (2011). *In Foreign Fields: The Politics and Experiences of Transnational Sport Migration*. London: Pluto Press.
- . (2013). "Re-placing Sport Migrants: Moving beyond the Institutional Structures Informing International Sport Migration." *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 48 (1): 66–82. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1012690211429211>.
- Chatzigianni, E. (2018). "Global Sport Governance: Globalizing the Globalized." *Sport in Society* 21 (9): 1454–82.
- Eitzen, D.S. (2009). "Upward Mobility through Sport? Myths and Realities." In D.S. Eitzen, ed., *Sport in Contemporary Society: An Anthology*, 8th ed., 249–56. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Esson, J. (2013). "A Body and a Dream at a Vital Conjunction: Ghanaian Youth, Uncertainty and the Allure of Football." *Geoforum* 47: 84–92.
- Figiel, S. (1996). *Where We Once Belonged*. Auckland: Pasifika Press.
- Finney, B., et al. (1995). *Voyage of Rediscovery: A Cultural Odyssey through Polynesia*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Fitzpatrick, K. (2013). "Brown Bodies, Racialisation and Physical Education." *Sport, Education and Society* 18 (2): 135–53.
- Franks, J. (2000). *Crossing Sidelines, Crossing Cultures: Sport and Asian Pacific American Cultural Citizenship*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- . (2002). *Hawaiian Sports in the Twentieth Century*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press.
- Grainger, A. (2011). "Migrants, Mercenaries, and Overstayers: Talent Migration in Pacific Islands Rugby." In J. Maguire & M. Falcous, eds., *Sport and Migration: Borders, Boundaries, and Crossings*, 129–140. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Grainger, A.D., M. Falcous, & J.I. Newman (2012). "Postcolonial Anxieties and the Browning of New Zealand Rugby." *The Contemporary Pacific* 24 (2): 267–95. [www.jstor.org/stable/23725603](http://www.jstor.org/stable/23725603).
- Guinness, D., & N. Besnier (2016). "Nation, Nationalism, and Sport: Fijian Rugby in the Local-Global Nexus." *Anthropological Quarterly* 89 (4): 1109–41.
- Harvey, D. (1989). *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- . (1990). "Between Space and Time: Reflections on the Geographical Imagination." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 80 (3): 418–34.
- Hau'ofa, E. (1994). "Our Sea of Islands." *The Contemporary Pacific*, 6 (1): 148–61. [www.jstor.org/stable/23701593](http://www.jstor.org/stable/23701593).
- Hokowhitu, B. (2005). "Rugby and Tino Rangatiratanga: Early Maori Rugby and the Formation of 'Traditional' Maori Masculinity." *Sporting Traditions* 21 (2): 75.
- Irwin, G. (1992). *The Prehistoric Exploration and Colonisation of the Pacific*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jackson, S.J., & B. Hokowhitu (2002). "Sport, Tribes, and Technology: The New Zealand All Blacks Haka and the Politics of Identity." *Journal of Sport and Social Issues* 26 (2): 125–39. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0193723502262002>.
- James, P., & M.B. Steger (2014). "A Genealogy of 'Globalization': The Career of a Concept." *Globalizations* 11 (4): 417–34.

- Ka'iili, T.O. (2017). *Marking Indigeneity: The Tongan Art of Sociospatial Relations*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Kirch, P.V., & R.C. Green (2001). *Hawaiki, Ancestral Polynesia: An Essay in Historical Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakisa, D., D. Adair, & T. Taylor (2014). "Pasifika Diaspora and the Changing Face of Australian Rugby League." *The Contemporary Pacific* 26 (2): 347–67.
- Lakisa, D., K. Teaiwa, D. Adair, & T. Taylor (2019). "Empowering Voices from the Past: The Playing Experiences of Retired Pasifika Rugby League Athletes in Australia." *International Journal of the History of Sport* 36 (12): 1096–114. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09523367.2019.1618835>.
- Lilomaiaava-Doktor, S. (2009). "Samoan Transnationalism: Cultivating 'Home' and 'Reach.'" In H.M. Lee & S.T. Francis, eds., *Migration and Transnationalism: Pacific Perspectives*. Canberra: Australia National University E-Press.
- Macpherson, C., & L. Macpherson (2013). *The Warm Winds of Change: Globalisation and Contemporary Samoa*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.
- Maguire, J., & M. Falcous, eds. (2011). *Sport and Migration: Borders, Boundaries, and Crossings*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- McDonald, B., & L. Rodriguez (2014). "It's Our Meal Ticket': Pacific Bodies, Labour and Mobility in Australia." *Asia Pacific Journal of Sport and Social Science* 3 (3): 236–49.
- Menke, D.J., & M.-L. Germany (2019). "Reconstructing Athletic Identity: College Athletes and Sport Retirement." *Journal of Loss and Trauma* 24 (1): 17–30. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15325024.2018.1522475>.
- Miller, T., G.A. Lawrence, J. McKay, & D. Rowe (2001). *Globalization and Sport: Playing the World*. London: Sage.
- NCAA (2020). *Estimated Probability of Competing beyond High School Figures and Methodology*. [https://ncaaorg.s3.amazonaws.com/research/pro\\_beyond/2020RES\\_ProbabilityBeyondHSFiguresMethod.pdf](https://ncaaorg.s3.amazonaws.com/research/pro_beyond/2020RES_ProbabilityBeyondHSFiguresMethod.pdf).
- Okamura, J.Y. (2008). *Ethnicity and Inequality in Hawai'i*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Phillips, J., J. Nauright, & T. Chandler (1996). "The Hard Man: Rugby and the Formation of Male Identity in New Zealand." In J. Nauright & T.J.L. Chandler, eds., *Making Men: Rugby and Masculine Identity*, 71–90. London: Frank Cass.
- Portes, A. (2000). "Globalization from Below: The Rise of Transnational Communities." In D. Kalb, M. van der Land, R. Staring, B. van Steenbergen, & N. Wilterdink, eds., *The Ends of Globalization: Bringing Society Back In*, 253–70. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Pringle, R. (2004). "A Social-History of the Articulations between Rugby Union and Masculinities within Aotearoa/New Zealand." *New Zealand Sociology* 19 (1): 102–28.
- Runstedtler, T. (2018). "More than Just Play: Unmasking Black Child Labor in the Athletic Industrial Complex." *Journal of Sport and Social Issues* 42 (3): 152–69.
- Salasa, D. (2014). "The Pacific in Indigenous Time." In D. Armitage & A. Bashford, eds., *Pacific Histories: Ocean, Land, People*, 31–52. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Salasa, T.D.I. (2003). "'Travel-Happy' Samoa: Colonialism, Samoan Migration and a 'Brown Pacific.'" *New Zealand Journal of History* 37 (2): 171–88.
- Sassen, S. (2002). *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- , ed. (2016). *Global Networks, Linked Cities*. London: Routledge.
- Small, C. ([1997] 2011). *Voyages: From Tongan Villages to American Suburbs*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Steger, M.B., & P. James (2019). *Globalization Matters: Engaging the Global in Unsettled Times*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Teaiwa, K.M. (2016). "Niu Mana, Sport, Media and the Australian Diaspora." In M. Tomlinson & T.P. Kāwika Tengan, eds., *New Mana: Transformations of a Classic Concept in Pacific Languages and Cultures*, 107–30. Acton, Australia: ANU Press.

- Thompson, N. (2016). "E Ho'i Mau: Honoring the Past, Caring for the Present, Journeying to the Future." *Hūlili: Multidisciplinary Research on Hawaiian Well-Being* 10: 157–81.
- Trimbur, L. (2013). *Come Out Swinging*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Tupou, D. (2017). "Die for Tonga." *Players Voice*, November 23. [www.playersvoice.com.au/daniel-tupou-die-for-tonga/#ApAUCfDvoHsOOEeW.97](http://www.playersvoice.com.au/daniel-tupou-die-for-tonga/#ApAUCfDvoHsOOEeW.97).
- Uperesa, F.L. (2014a). "Fabled Futures: Migration and Mobility for Samoans in American Football." *The Contemporary Pacific* 27 (1): 281–301.
- . (2014b). "Seeking New Fields of Labor: Football and Colonial Political Economies in American Samoa." In A. Goldstein, ed., *Formations of U.S. Colonialism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- . (2018). "Training for Empire?: Samoa and American Gridiron Football." In C. McGranahan & J. Collins, eds., *Ethnographies of U.S. Empire*, 129–48. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- . (2021). "Entangled Histories and Transformative Futures: Indigenous Sport in the 21st Century." In B. Hokowhitu, A. Moreton-Robinson, L. Tuhiwai-Smith, C. Andersen, & S. Larking, eds., *Routledge Handbook of Critical Indigenous Studies*, 511–24. London: Routledge.
- Uperesa, L. (2022). *Gridiron Capital: How American Football Became a Samoan Game*. Duke University Press.