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China- Tibet tensions are continually growing, as Tibetans are protesting for total independence from China, despite condemnation from their spiritual leader, the Dalai Lama, who is only seeking a sense of autonomy for Tibet (Sinder, 2008). As Tibetan protests are becoming violent and aggressive, the Dalai Lama has also threatened to resign as Tibet’s government in exile (Sinder, 2008), however, his rhetoric is not being exposed to the Tibetan people, due to government censorship in China. Therefore the Dalai Lama, an exiled institutional entrepreneur, has to find new methods that will enable his influential message, to be received by the Tibetan people. With that, the Neofunctionalist theory on institutional entrepreneurship, has to be modified to take advantage of globalization. This paper will discuss, (a) the key aspects of Neofunctionalism and functionalism, in light of censorship, (b) the struggle faced by institutional entrepreneurs, due to censorship, and (c) the new role of institutional entrepreneurs in a global village, as a means to counteract censorship.

For the purposes of this paper censorship is defined as the control of information, images, and ideas by the government. The goal of censorship is to prevent citizens, from being exposed to information, images, and ideas that contradict a government’s ideology and vision. In the context of this paper, ideology is defined as the idealistic views and beliefs that reinforce the status quo, meaning a specific way of life that is based on a specific political structure in society (e.g. communism). Vision is defined as the practical intervention (e.g. legislation) taken by a government to construct a path, that that doesn’t deviate from the status quo, and protects against deviation from the status quo.
Government censorship is evident in China, as the citizens of China are not being fully exposed to the China-Tibet conflict, due to China’s control over media outlets. In relation to Parsons AGIL scheme, censorship is a means to ensure latency and non-contradictory goal attainment. The latency component of the AGIL scheme, which can also be seen as culture, maintains consistent value patterns that foster a recognizable cultural atmosphere, meaning the status quo (Colomy & Greiner, 2005). For instance, when one superior authority (e.g. Chinese Government) controls what citizens are exposed to, it is easy for a sovereign nation to maintain a coherent and recognizable pattern in society, which in turn allows citizens to feel comfortable about who they are (Colomy & Greiner, 2005). It is important to point out that, in the AGIL scheme, latency/culture is a product of societal functions (Trevino, 2005), but for Neofunctionalist’s, it is a product of institutional entrepreneurship, and tool for institutional entrepreneurs (Colomy & Greiner, 2005). Censorship also allows for non-contradictory goal attainment, which gives citizens, meaning society at large, socially significant goals they can collectively pursue (Trevino, 2005). With that, because of government censorship, sovereign nations such as China do not have to compete with democratic goals, social movements, or other goals that may undermine their governments ideology and vision. Therefore in terms of functionalism, censorship contributes to half of societal consistency and stability, as it allows for non-contradictory goal attainment and latency, which are two of the four functional imperatives identified by Parsons.

For Neofunctionalism, censorship would pose a threat to institutional entrepreneurs. In light of U.S presidential nominations, the absence of censorship has
made it easy for politicians (institutional entrepreneurs) to manipulate the media, in order
to foster a specific culture they can take advantage of. Gov. Romney illustrated this point
as he problematized the U.S recession, and bolstered his economic skills while exposing
Sen. McCain’s economic incompetence, through the media. Gov. Romney then formed
and maintained a “recession worry” culture, and used it to win the Michigan primary. The
Dalai Lama on the other hand, doesn’t have the comfort of manipulating local media
outlets in China, as a way to problematize China’s rule over Tibet, and form a culture he
can take advantage of. Chinese censorship, and the fact that the Dalai Lama is not
allowed in China, has made it extremely difficult for the Dalai Lama to problematize
issues, and expose the citizens of China, to China’s injustice toward the Tibetan people.

In todays postmodern society, globalization, a product of capitalism and
technological advancements in communication and transportation (modernization), has
produced a global village (Heiskala, 1993). As a result, countries around the world have
become interconnected and integrated (Heiskala, 1993), which reflects the time-space
compression concept identified by Harvey. Time-space compression refers to the idea
that, the world has become smaller due to transnational processes that have integrated,
and connected communities and organizations (Heiskala, 1993). With that, institutional
entrepreneurs who are struggling with censorship, can take advantage of the
consequences of globalization. For example, because the world has become
interconnected, people around the world, especially those in western democratic nations,
have developed a sense of responsibility to others around the world. This type of
responsibility resembles that which would be seen in a pre-modern society. Therefore
institutional entrepreneurs faced with censorship, have to take advantage of this sense of responsibility that is felt by citizens of democratic nations. This means that, when institutional entrepreneurs want to problematize an issue, and form and maintain a specific culture, they must do so in a democratic nation, since they will be able to manipulate the uncensored media outlets, present in those nations.

Based on Neofunctionalist’s theory of institutional entrepreneurship, the process of social change can be illustrated as follows: Institutional entrepreneurs → problematize issue through local media → culture formation and maintenance → culture used as tool → social change (Colomy & Greiner, 2005). This illustration is useful, as it explains how leaders, such as politicians, may go about bolstering their cause when censorship is absent. Secondly, this illustration provides a mental picture that can be used to understand differences between the Neofunctionalist approach, and the modified Neofunctionalist approach. As a result of censorship restraints in China, the Neofunctionalist approach would not be beneficial for institutional entrepreneurs, and so the modified Neofunctionalist approach, termed the Globalized-neofunctionalist approach, would be advantageous. Before illustrating the processes involved in the Globalized-neofunctionalist approach, two ideas must be explained. First, democratic nations refer to countries that have: (a) a government that is not above the law (Hay, 2006), (b) a government that is influenced by public opinion (Hay, 2006), (c) a government that can tolerate social movements (Wacziarg & Taveres, 2001), (d) governmental official who have been elected by the citizens (Wacziarg & Taveres, 2001), (e) a government that values life, liberty, and human rights, and (f) a government that doesn’t regulate media
outlets. Secondly, the double-headed arrows that will be depicted point out that, the social change momentum can move either forwards or backwards.

The Globalized-neofunctionalist process can be illustrated as follows: Institutional entrepreneurs ↔ problematize issue through democratic media outlet, due to the absence of censorship ↔ culture formation and maintenance ↔ culture as a tool impacts citizens of democratic nations ↔ democratic world leaders are influenced by their citizens ↔ world leaders take the issue to the U.N, where it is debated and discussed ↔ social change due to sanctions or diplomacy. The Globalized-neofunctionalist process, will be explained in reference to the China- Tibet situation. The institutional entrepreneur is the Dalai Lama, and because he cannot problematize Tibet’s injustice in China, due to government censorship, he must problematize Tibet’s injustice in democratic nations. This allows the Dalai Lama to take advantage of the sense of responsibility, people feel toward others around the world. Through the use of democratic media outlets and transportation (products of modernization), the Dalai Lama can form and maintain a culture that he himself can use to liberate the Tibetan people, as he travels to different countries. Next, the formed culture, such as “Tibetans want justice”, will begin to personally impact people in democratic countries, due to feelings of responsibility. With that, the problem of Tibet’s injustice will be expressed by citizens of democratic nations, which in turn will become the governments problem, as the government wants to secure its trust with the people. Further more, as world leaders of democratic states are faced with similar problems, they will take the issue to the U.N. Then finally, if issues are recognized as violating universal human rights or international law, the U.N may enforce
sanctions, or take diplomatic measures in order to so solve the problem, which in turn will bring about social change.

In reference to the double-headed arrows, any weakness or resistance faced in a stage, can cause the social change momentum to fall back a stage. For example, if the U.N lays out sanctions to pressure China into giving Tibet some autonomy, but the Chinese government doesn’t comply, the social change momentum falls back to the U.N stage, where the problem may be re-debated. However, if there is inactivity on the U.N’s behalf, social change falls back onto democratic world leaders, who have to diffuse problems among their citizens. The U.S illustrated this point as they presented the Dalai Lama with the Congressional Medal of Honor, due to U.N inactivity. However, if leaders of a country don’t view the Tibetan issue as a problem, then it is up to the people to advocate for the issue. Lastly, if the people of democratic nations loose interest in an issue, such as the Tibetan conflict, it is up to the Dalai Lama to be tenacious.

In the Globalized-neofunctionalist approach, culture is a tool that initiates societal awareness among democratic citizens, and U.N sanctions/ diplomacy are the tools that enforce social change. In the modified Neofunctionalist’s theory, institutional entrepreneurs, such as the Dalai Lama, would play the initiating role, but the U.N would take the role of the “change enforcer”, and take credit for the social change. For example, if China begins to ease the violent resistance used on Tibetan protests, and eventually decides to give Tibet it’s independence, or at least recognized autonomy, international players such as the U.N, or the fact that the Olympics are being held in China, may take credit for the social change.
It is evident that the Dalai Lama is talking this approach himself, as he has been to many democratic nations such as Canada, France, and the U.S, in order to bolster his cause. It is apparent that this method is working, as the Dalai Lama has not only received the Nobel Peace Prize, but he was also recently awarded the Congressional Gold Medal, which is Americas highest civilian honor (Kaufman, 2007). In addition, he has gotten support from world leaders such as President Bush and President Sarkozy.

It is also important to note that, institutional entrepreneurs due have hidden motives (Colomy & Greiner, 2005), and so the Dalai Lama may indeed have a hidden agenda, though he portrays himself as a peaceful spiritual leader. It is possible that the Dalai Lama is using self-censorship, which is when people exercise self-restraint (Kirtley), meaning they prevent the full release of their ideas and goals in order to protect their diplomatic image. For example, in the media, the Dalai Lama only discloses positive rhetoric, as he calls for dialogue with China, and emphasizes that he is not seeking Tibet’s independence from China, only a sense of autonomy for the Tibetan people (Sinder, 2008).

Censorship does seem to contribute to societal consistency and stability, in a Functionalists perspective, but it also puts strain on institutional entrepreneurs, when taking a Neofunctionalists perspective. Culture is an important and viable tool that initiates the chain of events, that contribute to social change, in terms of the Globalized-neofunctionalist approach. This modified version, places a heavy emphasis on the citizens of democratic nations, and this is logical, as societal awareness about diverse issues, and societal immobilization, is more likely to be tolerated in democratic nations. Though
censorship is an obstacle to the Neofunctionalism theory of institutional entrepreneurship, censorship does not cause institutional entrepreneurship to be a lost cause, as the Globalized-neofunctionalist approach enables institutional entrepreneurs, to take advantage of the global village formed by globalization. Therefore, the Globalized-neofunctionalist approach is most equipped to counteract censorship, in a globalized/globalizing context, due to globalization and the tools produced by modernization, namely the mass media (communication) and transnational transportation (e.g. planes).
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