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Abstract

Drawing from experiences in Indonesia, Malaysia, and the United States, a relationship appears to exist between tolerance for satire, freedom of expression, and academic freedom in higher education. Empowering the under empowered for participation in vibrant democracies and rational public discourse seems to coincide with an increasing tolerance for satire. We posit vibrant democracies must contain educational elements essential to empower the under empowered for democratic participation, in particular, to provide new democratic citizens with an understanding of the role of satire to cultivate rational public discourse in new democracies. New Southeast Asian democracies need growing evidence of dynamic strivings toward empowering higher education and increasing tolerance for satire, as tools for reflection, deeper understanding, and participation in democratic processes.
Overview

We consider the relatedness within a social milieu of

A: engagement in higher education, as a means to empower the under empowered in a vibrant democracy,

and

B: tolerance for satire, as a tool for reflection and deeper understanding

If one is to argue that A and B are directly related, then both a presence of A should imply a presence of B and a presence of B should imply a presence of A. In this paper will argue the former (i.e., a presence of A should imply a presence of B) usually directly, while we will usually argue the latter in the contrapositive form that

an absence of A implies an absence of B.

Support for the argument of an absence of A implying an absence of B is robust in scholarly literature related to cultural, popular, historical, political, and local wisdom of Southeast Asian communities. Indeed, the authors’ lived experiences in Indonesia and Malaysia corroborate a logical connection of increasing gains in freedom of expression and academic freedom in higher education and tolerance for satire. We posit freedom of expression, academic freedom, and tolerance for satire are essential elements of vibrant new democracies.
Our paper consists of four sections. The first two sections ground the reader in cultural lived experiences of both authors. Their anecdotal evidence derives from in-depth experiences with higher education to empower the under empowered for participation in new democracies and the lack of satire to cultivate rational public discourse within the new democracies of Indonesia and Malaysia.

The first author spent the first six months of her full-year sabbatical 2014-2015 in Indonesia gathering material for her book EMPOWERING HIGHER EDUCATION IN INDONESIA (about pathways for improving both analytical thinking and liberal arts education in Indonesian universities). She experienced a broad and deep exposure to Indonesian culture through living with the family of Professor Chaedar Alwasilah. Professor Puncochar co-taught Professor Alwasilah’s PhD and master’s seminars for one semester at the Indonesian University of Education in Bandung. Her understanding of an absence of A (engagement in higher education, as a means to empower the under empowered in a vibrant democracy), implies an absence of B (tolerance for satire, as a tool for reflection and deeper understanding) is in Section 1: Lived Experiences in Indonesia.

The second author spent one-third of his professional career in Malaysia and (more recently) Indonesia. His experiences concerning an absence of tolerance for satire and an absence of freedom of expression and academic freedom in higher education began with the exceptional embeddedness of living in small communities for three years while functioning totally in the Malay language and teaching primary school with a national Malaysian Curriculum Development Project in mathematics and science. His understanding of how an absence of A implies an absence of B is in Section 2: Lived Experiences in Malaysia.
In Section 3: Historical / International Experiences with Satire, we briefly survey documentation in both popular and scholarly literature related to Malaysia and Indonesia for the phenomenon of how an *absence of A implies an absence of B*.

Finally, after briefly summarizing research evidence in Section 4: Increasing Tolerance for Satire by Empowering Higher Education, we outline plans for work in Indonesia during 2017-2018 to create increased understanding of knowledge and skills of democratic processes. This corresponding increase in knowledge and skills has potential to increase freedom of expression and academic freedom in higher education, as essential elements of Indonesia’s vibrant new democracy, while simultaneously (and to some degree consequentially) increasing the presence (decrease the absence) of tolerance for satire.

We argue satire has the potential to serve as a tool for reflection and deeper understanding. Using the metaphor of satire as analogous to a boat, an 18-wheeler, or a plow through dirt, perhaps satire could disturb the social environment and potentially pull people toward healthy debate. When a boat moves across a body of water, the boat displaces water and produces a wave, which spreads outward from the source and disturbs the flow downstream to create a reverse flow region where the flow moves back toward the body (see https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wake). In a similar fashion, a car driving closely behind an 18-wheeler reduces drag (called drafting) and increases miles per gallon about 40% at 10 feet distance away from an 18-wheeler (see https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/MythBusters_%282007_season%29#Drafting_For_Money). We inquire about the degree that satire is allowed to disturb the social discourse and potentially pull people toward a healthy debate in new Southeast Asian democracies.
Section 1: Lived Experiences in Indonesia

As first author, I (Judith Puncochar) spent six months of my 2014-2015 yearlong sabbatical in Bandung, Indonesia, as a visiting research and teaching professor in the Graduate School of the Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia (UPI, aka Indonesia University of Education). UPI is the equivalent of Columbia University’s Teachers College in the United States. I conducted research and taught four graduate seminars at UPI. Two seminars were at the master’s level (S2) and two seminars were at the PhD level (S3). I also gave occasional undergraduate (S1) guest lectures at the Universitas Pasundan (UNPAS).

Indonesian graduate and undergraduate students tend to be talented, hardworking, prompt with their homework, and eager to please their instructors. UPI graduate students were keenly interested in learning strategies to hone skills as lecturers and improve their students’ active participation in classroom learning. S3 graduate students as lecturers were eager to practice cooperative learning, structured academic controversies, reciprocal questioning, effective communication strategies, and conflict resolution, which are all important skills of an active democratic citizenry.

Resolving conflicts cooperatively requires participants to ask what they want. To practice a common step of tactfully voicing a desired outcome, I gave my S2 and S3 students an assignment to write a letter to the Indonesian Minister of Education and Culture on an educational issue of their choice; few students completed the assignment. When discussing the delay, students shared how they grappled with a fear of “authority”. One woman shared how her fear initially “paralyzed” her (November 22, 2014). She spoke of how she remembered the Jakarta rapes in May 1998 (see Sumardi, 1998), how Indonesian families “were intimidated into
silence” (see Permadi, 2004), and how she feared she could lose her job as a lecturer at her university if she sent a letter suggesting improvements to Indonesian education.

I assured my students that they would decide whether to send their letters to the ministers and that my role was to give feedback on their use of written English and application of course concepts to educational issues. Students completed their letters by the time grades were due, but whether any letters reached the education ministers remains unknown, even though students’ suggestions for improvements to Indonesia’s educational practices were positive and significant.

Freedom of Expression

Indonesia has a national curriculum all public, private, and religious universities and K-12 schools must follow. Previous national curricula guidelines advocated skills involved with active learning and students speaking in classrooms (see Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi, 2013 & 2014). Freedom of expression is the right to state one’s opinion in a public setting, classroom, or coffee shop, at a community meeting, or on social media. Freedom of expression is a necessary liberty in a participatory democracy, but freedom of expression is influential only when people practice the freedom. In the safety of the classroom, my students were willing to talk about the (many) teaching issues their instructors could “do better”, but they were unwilling to meet with their instructors and discuss improvements to teaching. Likewise, my students were unwilling to place anonymous suggestions about improvements to teaching under a door or in a mailbox. When I asked about including teaching suggestions on anonymous course evaluations, my students claimed that they wrote only of their gratitude for knowledge gained.

I asked students to discuss the differences between Americans and Indonesians. I started a discussion by suggesting, “Americans smile a lot”. The students countered that “smiling a lot”
and joking were common in Indonesia. What are differences between Indonesian and American cultures? Without hesitation, one student said, “Americans have rights; we have values.” I countered that Americans had “values”, too. What values differentiate Indonesian and American cultures? Students discussed the importance of getting along in Indonesia and individual rights in America. I asked about current ecological issues such as the many individuals who burned garbage and plastics in backyards and gutters. My students encouraged me to be sympathetic and understanding of smoke wafting through my bedroom because people were “probably ignorant through no fault of their own and, if someone offered to remove their garbage or asked them not to burn, they might feel bad” (J. Puncochar, personal communication, October 21, 2014). The smell of burning plastics appeared as a small inconvenience relative to a risk of bad feelings in the community.

I mentioned an across-the-street neighbor who narrowed the neighborhood lane to one-way traffic for several weeks because of a huge pile of dirt excavated from his home during extensive remodeling. I learned this neighbor had been remodeling his house for years and frequently blocked the lane, but no one mentioned the inconvenience to the neighborhood.

My students were reticent to suggest confronting Indonesian community behaviors, even when health threatening. I wondered whether Indonesian graduate students would engage in behaviors and/or hone skills expected in a participatory democracy. I conducted a structured academic controversy (see Johnson & Johnson, 1988) that required skills of active listening, perspective taking, argumentation, and group decision-making on the topic of online college degrees at UPI (J. Puncochar, personal communication, October 23, 2014). My PhD students were excited about structured controversies for research and as a teaching strategy for engaging students in active learning. One S3 student wanted to investigate student skills acquisition
associated with learning English as a Second Language using structured academic controversies (see Puncochar, 2005). However, his research advisor refused to grant approval for the research because “controversy is not part of Indonesian culture” (J. Puncochar, personal communication, November 20, 2014).

Consequently, I sought to explore whether the content of Indonesian undergraduate coursework provided evidence of skills generally associated with participatory democracies (e.g., group decision-making, conflict resolution, and civic engagement). Professor Alwasilah and I convened a UPI faculty focus group to discuss the first-year mandatory General Education courses (i.e., Mata Kuliah Dasar Umum [MKDU]). UPI faculty focus group members expressed unanimous agreement about undergraduates’ narrowly focused education on highly specialized courses (e.g., English language, computers, tourism, engineering, and so on) and a need for more rigorous MKDU core coursework. MKDU class time was limited and insufficient to discuss Indonesian history, ecology, culture, and literature. Lectures consumed class time and consisted of material covered previously in secondary education courses.

**Academic Freedom**

In January 2015, while I was wrapping up my teaching at UPI, an Indonesian university lecturer in the province of Aceh lost her job. She taught a world religions course and offered a voluntary instructional fieldtrip to learn about one of the six official religions of Indonesia by visiting a Protestant church (Sijabat & Simanjuntak, 2015). Many of her students were Muslim. Members of the Aceh community vigorously claimed the lecturer practiced apostasy and called for her resignation. The lecturer lost her academic status and position, which reveals the lack of academic freedom in Indonesia. A loss of academic freedom places at risk the role of higher education to influence Indonesia society and democracy, including national policies, local
communities, the Indonesian national goal of Bhinneka Tunggal Ika (Unity in Diversity), innovations in science and teaching, and educational experiences of students at all levels.

Loss of academic freedom threatens Indonesian’s democracy. A lack of independence for higher education faculty members to pursue disconfirming evidence and advance current knowledge can yield only incomplete knowledge and restricted “truths”. PhD students from institutions without academic freedom are at risk of becoming increasingly narrow in their understandings and facing difficulties meeting dissertation requirements of creating new knowledge. Higher education leaders who disregard academic freedom place instructors at risk of stagnation in research and teaching and create academic climates fearful of innovation. Scientific inquiry processes, new educational standards, and peer review are of little help to researchers and instructors who have lost academic freedom. Indonesian institutions of higher education without academic freedom risk indoctrination, loss of international appeal, and unrealized university mission statements.

I met with the dean of the UPI graduate education program to share ideas about the role of academic freedom in higher education. He asked me what he should do. I responded that my role was to share the importance of academic freedom and his role was to lead a balanced approach between the need for academic freedom and the needs of the local community. I suggested he focus on the importance of values held in common by institutions of higher education and local communities related to academic freedom.

**Local Wisdom**

Emphasizing *values held in common* by higher education and local communities is essential for successful engagement with research and teaching of all subjects, efforts to thwart terrorism (Nugraha, 2013), and teaching about world religions (Sijabat & Simanjuntak, 2015).
Some of the values held in common by communities and higher education that I observed include working for a “common” good to increase the vitality of a community (see Cole, 2009). Higher education campuses provide an income for many local families to offer rooms for students who live off-campus. Public support in surrounding communities is essential to lessen possible misunderstandings and increase collaborative efforts and goodwill with higher education institutions.

My UPI research colleague, Professor A. Chaedar Alwasilah wrote several papers about the importance of local wisdom in Indonesian communities. Local wisdom includes cultural practices, social standards, values, and ways of life adopted by a local community (Kusumasari & Alam, 2012). Professor Alwasilah valued the cultural knowledge and practices of community members, but eight-foot walls and locked gates surrounded his home and many Indonesian homes. Communication between higher education faculty members and local community members was infrequent.

Tensions exist between a community’s local wisdom, laws, politics, and religions. Calls to prayer occur six times each day in Bandung over loudspeakers and affect lives of all Indonesian citizens regardless of official religion. The extra sixth call to prayer is an optional prayer for commerce (personal communication, Senny Alwasilah, September 2014).

Higher education must commit to the highest possible international standards of achievement. However, international influence in Indonesian higher education must not uproot local cultural practices and languages, which have a place in the sciences and technologies of higher education (Alwasilah, 2014). Proactive discussions to advance knowledge and understand local wisdom are necessary for Indonesian higher education to co-exist amiably within local communities. “Education, as an agent of socialization and humanization, determines the quality
of democracy” (Gatum, 2015). All Indonesian citizens deserve the highest quality of education possible within their own culture, language, and democracy while adhering to the quality and standards of international higher education.

What skills are to be taught to students? To practice democracy they should have skills of expression and articulation, dialogue, consultation, participation, teamwork and cooperation, negotiation, decision-making and peaceful solution of problems. Education for democracy is a continuing process; appropriately introduced at all levels and forms of education through an integrated approach or through special subjects. These skills are to be taught not by civics or social studies teachers alone, but teachers of all school subjects. – Alwasilah, 2014, p. 412

Section 2: Lived Experiences in Malaysia

Malaysia forms our second example of how an absence of a societal vector for improving freedom of expression and academic freedom in higher education implies an absence of tolerance for satire, as a tool for reflection and deeper understanding.

I, the second author (Don Faust), spent about one-third of my career in Malaysia, as a Malay speaker. First, I worked during the three years of 1969 through 1971 teaching mathematics and working in a curriculum development project in the United States Peace Corps in Malaysia. Following completion of my Peace Corps contract, and the subsequent completion of my doctorate in mathematics in 1979 at the University of Hawaii as a grantee of the East-West Center, I taught for six years in the mathematics and computer science faculties of three Malaysian universities. Finally, I interspersed many shorter visits to Malaysia to present at conferences and workshops and give invited lectures at numerous Malaysian universities. My
work in mathematics at Malaysian universities coincided with leaves or sabbaticals from an academic position at Northern Michigan University during the years 1984 through 2008.

During this extended immersion in Malaysian society, I witnessed laudatory growth in this young democracy’s striving toward more free and open democratic institutions. Indeed, in many conversations with colleagues and students, as well as in informal conversations with people I would engage with ‘on the street’, I found all open to healthy mutual satirizations. Further evidence of satire occurred regularly in the VERY popular and funny Malaysian TV shows that playfully and constructively satirized daily life / culture in Malaysia.

On the other hand, during this entire lengthy period of years of immersion in Malaysian society, I never witnessed any satire of either royalty or political leaders. This delineation of the areas of royalty and political leaders as being “off-limits” to constructive criticism, seemed (and still seems) to denote (for most members of society) that areas existed where rationality was not to be applied (also see Stevenson, 2006). These off-limits areas, in turn, seemed to engender a decrease in freedom of expression and reduce citizens’ self-efficacy for participation in a democracy. Clear thinking was acceptable in a geometry class at school or in business endeavors, but clear thinking did not apply to royalty or political leaders. Consequently, certain issues remained beyond current democratic determination (see Manan, 1999).

Further, throughout my many years participating in the daily flow of life in Malaysia, this absence of satirization of royalty and political leaders seemed insidiously to create a ubiquitous and unfortunate attitude of ‘cowering’ before these institutions, engendering an absence of a robustness in healthy and spirited growth in the breadth and depth of freedom of expression.
I experienced a deep feeling, in moving daily amongst my colleagues, students, and the general public, that, although people had limited but apparently happy strivings toward an enrichment of their democratic institutions,

*the legal bounding of this striving, the laws that prohibited any satirization of either royalty or political leaders, created a felt sadness in ‘the people’ that caused them to feel ‘less empowered’ in their strivings toward further growing their democratic institutions.*

**Section 3: Historical / International Experiences with Satire**

New democracies require a *relatedness* within a social milieu. The question of whether Asian citizens in a new democracy are “prepared” for the messiness of satire and written attacks associated with democratic freedoms is a valid question for cultures steeped in social collectivism (Manan, 1999). The United States has a long-established democracy with a legal history of tolerance for satire embedded within a cultural milieu of individualism, in contrast with new Asian democracies embedded within a cultural milieu of social collectivism.

In 1734 in the American Colonies, John Peter Zenger faced litigation for his satirical essay in the *New York Weekly Journal* about the governor of the New York Colony. Zenger’s defense attorney argued successfully for a jury trial of a political satirist for seditious libel (Olson, 2000). Libel is a published false statement damaging to a person's reputation. The Zenger case determined that a jury (rather than the governor’s appointed judge) could consider whether the content of written articles had a basis in truth. The jury was to determine the basis of truth according to neighbors of the community who may have witnessed the events referred to by the satirist. The jury acquitted Zenger and paved the way for relatively safety of American writers to publish satire of political figures. The case was a turning point of political expression in American Colonies and other nations under the rule of national laws.
British colonization of the Americas officially began in 1607 at Jamestown, Virginia. American Colonies existed 127 years before the Zenger case of 1734. Current citizens of the United States live in a culture 282 years beyond the Zenger case. A span of nearly three centuries is significant time for current US American citizens to develop tolerance for satirical attacks on figures of authority. Tolerance of satire is a norm of our society based on cultural values and public opinion. As in the time of John Peter Zenger, the “truth” (see Faust & Puncochar, 2016) required of satire is according to norms of “neighbors” of the community (Olson, 2000).

In contrast, Indonesia’s constitution-based civil law system has been in existence since 1945, with exceptions of the Aceh province on the island of Sumatra, which observes sharia law, and the Sulawesi Toraja ethnic group, who observe animistic customary law (see https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Law_of_Indonesia). Indonesia has had 71 years of new democracy, but no court cases yet have established satire against authorities or religion as freedom of expression.

The Jakarta Post appears to be one of the freest presses in the world of young democracies, yet Jakarta Post editor, Meidyatama Suryodiningrat, was charged with blasphemy for publishing a cartoon satirizing ISIS as deviant (Fuller, 2014). Haris Amir Falah, leader of Jamaah Anshorut Tauhid, a group advocating for Sharia law across Indonesia (see Arnaz & Malik, 2010), said the cartoon "strengthens the stigma that Islam represents senseless murderers" (Fuller, 2014, para. 6). Blasphemy in Indonesia carries a maximum penalty of five years in prison (Ecumenical News, 2014). The 2016 World Press Freedom Index (https://rsf.org/en) ranks Indonesia as the 130th (27.8%) of 180 countries in media freedom. Media freedom is “the basic human right to be informed and to inform others” (https://rsf.org/en/our-values). (Finland is first and the United States is 49th [72.8%] of 180 countries in media freedom.)
Using blasphemy as a threat of punishment to satirists promotes fear, conservatism, and stagnation of expression. According to norms of “neighbors” of the community (Olson, 2000), the current Indonesian “truth” (see Faust & Puncochar, 2016) is one of silence. Indonesian voices of authorities and religious conservatives dominate the media, interspersed occasionally with a tactful editorial espousing an alternative opinion (Suryakusuma, 2015). Silence and limits to freedom of expression and academic freedom are current norms in Indonesia.

Technology, Research, and Higher Education Minister Muhammad Nasir sought to ban universities from holding academic discussions of lesbians, gays, bisexuals, and transgendered community members (The Jakarta Post, January 25, 2016). In February 2016, a South Jakarta District Court judge, Sarpin Rizaldi, evoked the penal code on academics who were critical of his rulings against human rights and anti-corruption efforts (Wiratraman, 2016). Several campuses have banned controversial documentary films (e.g., Samin vs. Semen and Alkinemokiye) (see Wiratraman, 2016).

Some Indonesian university leaders are interested in promoting academic freedom and freedom of expression for purposes of scientific inquiry and learning, but they are reluctant to voice support in public (J. Puncochar, personal communication, January 23, 2015). The Indonesian saying, “anjing menggonggong kafilah berlalu or 'the dogs bark and the men continue’” implies that if Indonesians were to continue on a democratic path and give no attention to the barking dogs (i.e., threats from religious radicals), then the barks (i.e., calls of blasphemy) would eventually become quiet (see Sumaktoyo, 2016, para. 22). Editors and universities presidents appear to ignore not only the radical conservatives, but also opportunities to educate about freedom of expression and academic freedom. Will editors and university
presidents adhere to their institutional mission statements and act on their responsibilities as leaders of freedom expression and academic freedom?

Indonesian and Malaysian editors and university presidents have yet to advocate collectively for understanding of satire or tolerance of freedom of expression. Several opportunities for articulating responsibilities associated with freedom expression and academic freedom are available. For example, a Malaysian blogger received a six-month jail sentence for uploading a Ramadan *bak kut teh* (pork stew) post on Facebook (Jakarta Post, May 27, 2016). A well-known Malaysian cartoonist received nine charges of sedition (defined by Malaysian law as promoting hatred against the government) over a series of tweets criticizing the country's judiciary (Jakarta Post, April 3, 2015). The Indonesian Broadcasting Commission (KPI) imposed sanctions on TransTV and halted a comedy show in response to a scenes deemed insulting to the late Benyamin Sueb, an Indonesian actor, singer, and comedian. “The sanction was imposed based on the public interest,” said a KPI commissioner (Jakarta Post, June 26, 2014).

We posit Indonesian and Malaysian tolerance for satire and criticism of authority figures will take at least two more generations. Indonesia would need 56 more years to reach the tender age of 127 years of the American Colonies when the Zenger landmark case on tolerance for satire reached a jury of community members. Indonesia must enforce strong national laws based on its democratic constitution to overcome a minority of conservative but strong voices for sharia law. In addition, of critical importance, we posit Indonesian citizens must have access to an empowering education (see Alwasilah & Puncochar, 2016a & 2016b).

Empowering the under empowered citizens of any new Asian democracy requires an education suitable to a social collectivist culture within a democratic framework. Taking action on responsibilities expected of a democratic citizenry may not have appeal to a social collectivist
culture. Speaking one’s opinion in public, writing letters to newspaper editors, advocating debate, accepting the vote of the citizenry rather than an authority, and tolerance for satire are not historic Southeast Asian norms. However, over time, an educational framework to empower the under empowered to participate in new democracies could become possible when institutions of higher education and editors of newspapers and other forms of media acclaim academic freedom and practice freedom of expression as critical to Indonesia and Malaysia’s futures, rather than as disruptive to a community’s sense of compliance.

Section 4: Increasing Tolerance for Satire by Empowering Higher Education

We posit A PRESENCE of improving freedom of expression and academic freedom in higher education implies A PRESENCE of tolerance for satire as a tool for reflection on and a deeper understanding of democracy and the social milieu. First, we examine whether improvements to higher education improve democratic values such as political and religious tolerance. Second, we propose exciting plans to conduct a 2017 series of workshops in Indonesia to promote civic education skills necessary in a developing democracy (e.g., constructive controversies, civic engagement, cooperative workgroups, and effective communication and decision-making). These workshops should promote the use of active learning strategies by lecturers and teachers to increase their students’ skills for speaking up and expressing their opinions. Speaking up is an essential component of freedom of expression and academic freedom, which we posit as essential elements of a vibrant democracy.

Indonesia declared independence from Dutch rule in 1945 and emerged as the world’s third largest democracy, with an estimated population of over 258 million people. The Indonesian Pancasila outlined the philosophical ideology to unify the diverse archipelago of Indonesia as an independent nation:
• Belief in the one and only God
• Just and civilized humanity
• Unity of Indonesia
• Democracy guided by the inner wisdom in the unanimity arising out of deliberations amongst representatives
• Social justice for all of the people of Indonesia

“Democracy presumes the existence of enlightened and rational citizens, respect for human dignity, equality, and commitment to work together toward a common end . . . these values are truly in accord with the pillars of the state ideology, Pancasila, a genuine concept unearthed from the soils of the newly founded Indonesia” – A. Chaedar Alwasilah (2014, p. 152)

The Pancasila mandates belief in one god. The Indonesian constitution gives citizens freedom to choose one of six official religions. Every citizen of Indonesia receives a national identity card with an identity number and an official religion on the card. Indonesians have freedom to pick one of six religions, but currently are not free to abstain from picking a religion or satirize religion. Indonesian and Malaysian laws do not protect freedom of expression or satirists.

Indonesian law mandates study of the Indonesian Pancasila and civics education from Kindergarten through university for all Indonesian students in public and private educational institutions (see Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi, 2013 & 2014). Studying the Pancasila supposedly instills a sense of patriotism in Indonesians, but assessment of patriotism as a learning outcome is thus far nonexistent. Expecting patriotism from coursework without civic engagement in the community is doubtful.
Civic education interventions are unlikely to affect democratic values such as political tolerance, support, and trust (see Finkel, 2014). The design of civic education programs must include high quality trainers and teaching methods to affect any practical significance of democratic outcomes. An effective civics lesson, for example, could involve training high school students to conduct voter registration campaigns (Tillotson & Puncochar, 2014). Students in the mandated civic education course do not yet participate in community activities involving political, civic, or democratic processes as part of their classwork.

Educational attainment correlates with increased health, wealth, and happiness (Hartog & Oosterbeek, 1998). Indonesians live within communities separated by vast amounts of ocean and unequal access to education, wealth, and political influence. Unequal access to higher education severely limits job opportunities, productivity, and access to potential experiences associated with academic freedom and freedom of expression, but Indonesians appear to have relatively equal access to social media. Indonesians are the world’s fourth largest users of Facebook (Statista, 2014), and Jakarta is the most active Twitter city in the world (Lipman, 2012). However, a lack of national laws to protect freedom of expression and use of satire potentially limits active participation in the new democracies of Indonesia and Malaysia.

Teaching Democratic Principles in Local Communities

The place to start teaching about democracy is within the local communities. The question, “What is democracy?” initially may evoke responses, such as “voting” or “elections”, but with dialogue, people should begin to realize that democracy is about balancing freedom with responsibility. Democracy includes respecting and practicing the four “D’s”: diversity, dissent, deliberation, and decision-making (Deliberating in a Democracy in the Americas, n.d.). A democratic citizenry continually modifies, upholds, and strengthens democracy. Democracies
change with its citizenry. Several websites have lessons and ideas to support the understandings of students and community members about their role within a democratic nation (e.g., see Branson & Quigley, 1998; Citizenship Foundation, 2015; Deliberating in a Democracy in the Americas, n.d.).

“Education, as an agent of socialization and humanization, determines the quality of democracy” – Alronsus Murtanto Gatam (Jakarta Post, April 4, 2015)

We plan to return to Indonesia in 2017 and conduct a series of one-week summer workshops on a number of university campuses throughout the archipelago. The goal of the workshops is to create a framework to empower Indonesian education with active learning teaching strategies appropriate for the Indonesian communities (e.g., cooperative learning, group decision-making, and academic structured controversies). We plan to conduct these “teaching for learning” workshops to lecturers and secondary teachers using the new book by Chaedar Alwasilah a and Judith Puncochar (2016a & 2016b) as a basis to help Indonesians nurture their rich cultural heritage using skills necessary to maintain a progressive Indonesian participatory democratic society.

A balance between Indonesian democracy and local wisdom and must remain in social and educational outreach opportunities between higher education, international partners, and community members. We posit a committed group of trained people can change the norms of Indonesian higher education toward freedom of expression and academic freedom, affect Indonesia’s future to achieve a highly educated Indonesian citizenry, and increase tolerance for political satire. Indonesian citizens with democratic skills and capacities to meet the challenges of Indonesia’s future will be able to build a peaceful, cooperative, respectful, and economically fair and transparent, safe society for all citizens.
Community members and college graduates who have confidence in their problem solving and decision-making skills and knowledge of how their cultures fit within their new democracy will lead the next generation of rational, ethical, collaborative Indonesian citizens. An enlightened citizenry will build Indonesia’s preferred future with a tolerance for and understanding of satire.

*Lifelong education suggests the completion of formal education is not the end of education. It presupposes the formation of a learning society, one where ongoing learning activities will be broadly embraced.*” – A. Chaedar Alwasilah (2014, p. 153)
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