

MODERN DEMOCRATIC FAMILY: AN ETHICAL AND INTEGRITY PRIVATE PLACE TO GROW

Paulus Satyo Istandar Tan ¹

¹ STPK Santo Yohanes Rasul Jayapura, Indonesia

*Corresponding Address: globalanesia51@gmail.com

Received: 03 March 2022 | Approved: 21 May 2022 | Published: 28 June 2022

Abstract: This research aims to analyze the family's role in forming the younger generation's character in the context of the Modern Democratic Family. The research method used involves analysis of themes, basic principles, and discourse regarding repositioning family roles. The research theme responds to ulama and educational figures' moral and social movements regarding the importance of character education in building ethical individuals with integrity in national life. The basic principles identified explain why character education is integral in building ethical individuals and their integrity in national life. The choice of family as the main focus of research is related to achieving education as a nation's intelligence and the birth of a generation of leaders with character. The research results show that repositioning the role of the family is a fundamental issue, and the responsibility for forming the character of the younger generation should be a collective obligation of the Indonesian people. The main obstacle lies in a wrong understanding of the process of character formation, with society tending to blame the weak role of state institutions in formal education. Awareness of the family's significant contribution to character formation's success or failure is an important key. In conclusion, this research emphasizes the need for a correct understanding of the process of character formation and an emphasis on the active role of the family as the main pillar in producing people who are religious, intelligent, independent, and with character in the future.

Keywords: Family, Ethical, Integrity

INTRODUCTION

A harmonious and democratic family living situation is one of the keys to successful reform and transformation of the nation's social life. The concept of social reform and transformation by placing the role of the family as the core segment of national social life is the synthesis to be achieved in this review, where the life referred to is an ethical life expressed by a person with integrity. Our historical reflection should lead to answering the essential question about where the problem of the failure of a system to provide a prosperous social life lies. Using the term modern family, here is somewhat paradoxical. On the one hand, the term family itself refers to a social entity that is traditionally closed within itself.

Meanwhile, on the other hand, the term modern refers to a renewal trend of a global process that demands openness to the latest dynamics of social change. For us, the contrast between the two could be an effort to build a synthesis. Between the era of closure and openness, it contains problems. Absolute closure limits the space for human movement, creating many ethical problems. Meanwhile, absolute openness opens up space for unrestrained movement in the demands of individual freedom, which must have integrity. The democracy we live in now is a system that stands on the tension between the power of old traditional ideas, which are feudal and authoritarian, and the power of new ideas, which are liberal and individualistic. However, it must be acknowledged that this assumption is not the result of a scientific survey of existing real conditions. We assume that improvements to social conditions are largely determined by how individuals (actors/agents) understand themselves amidst this tension.

Understanding ourselves amidst the realities of family, society, and the state is an absolute prerequisite for improving our standard of living and social role. Improvements in living standards and personal roles open up wider space for the growth of leadership seeds capable of leading the nation towards the lofty goals of its founding, as stated in the preamble to our constitution. Every individual within himself must have internal (ethical) and external awareness (integrity) to create a balanced and harmonious equilibrium. Internally, he must have the awareness and characteristics of a responsible person. Externally, he must have character qualities that can move the nation's social system in the right direction according to the country's hopes and ideals. The dynamics of internal and external awareness is the empty space that must be filled in this nation, namely regarding the importance of a formula for a democratization program in the modern family.

There is often a paradox between shared ideals and personal actions in achieving those ideals in transition conditions. It's like a car that runs on petrol but is filled with diesel. As a result, the process of cultivating democratic values does not work. We have succeeded in breaking through and

overthrowing colonial power because we believe that we are an independent nation with the right to determine its destiny. Therefore, we have agreed on independence as the pinnacle of our struggle, as the basic essence of democracy. And democracy should have become an integral part of the ideals of independence, not just adopting Western ideology. But why haven't democratic values provided significant benefits and meaning to our national life? Why are we still walking in place? Even if it's a road, it's still very slow and jerky. Indonesia's ideal of implementing a modern, democratic system is not new (Demos, 2017).

The success of the independence revolution seven decades ago paved the way for implementing democratic principles in our state system. Once again, we need the mirror of history to see our faces. With that, we realize that the face is still pockmarked and needs to be polished again. We must be able to find the root of the problem of why democracy is still not functioning well until now. Is it true that the trauma of colonial history, with its feudal, oppressive, and shackled patterns, for three and a half centuries is still thickening in the bloodstream of our nation so that we are still dragging and stumbling? The answer to this problem is that democratic understanding and values have not touched social life's roots. That is why the term dichotomous appears, although controversial. We are limited to implementing a procedural-artificial democratic system and have not yet reached the stage of substance and essence of democracy. This kind of dichotomous trend is certainly not limited to legitimizing our leadership's limitations and weak character in encouraging participation, accountability, and effectiveness of government (good governance). Procedural democracy should not just justify the praxis of national life limited to the hustle and bustle on the political stage before elections.

Dichotomy, in a concept ontologically, does not exist. What is happening now is personal reluctance and socio-cultural and economic reluctance. We are reluctant to implement a democratic system on the smallest scale, whether for primordial interest groups, businesses, or families. We think democratic values are only a matter of how to lead the nation and state. The essence of democracy touches all elements of life. Democracy creates a more open space for the growth of the principles of truth, justice, honesty, trust, equality, and recognition of the right to life.

In contrast to a monarchy system, for example, democracy recognizes the universal dimensions of human dignity. And this is contained in the moral values of almost all major religions. So what separates the two: procedural and substantial?

The wall that separates the public environment and the social environment in the realm of democratic life is only a perception formed from our failure to become democratic individuals with character, individuals with ethics, and integrity. We have not yet truly matured into democracy, so

our perception of the importance of national ethics and morals is still partial and tends to be fragmented. It is as if democracy is studied and interpreted only by intellectuals and educated groups or is limited to filling in the school curriculum. This separation becomes even worse when national issues are only a matter for the political elite and not a matter for the public or civil society. Participation in controlling the running of state government is only the duty and responsibility of groups with a social role.

In contrast, others are sufficient to take care of daily economic routines. As a result, democratic praxis opens up more space for abuse of power than for implementing social welfare. This condition clearly shows that feudalistic culture is still strong in society's social and cultural layers. Accepting this kind of partial understanding certainly has the impact of not realizing a better national life. On the contrary, this condition influences the mindset and attitudes of individuals in playing their role on the political stage. Something that is patterned in social routines in the family – traditional notions of leadership – will be difficult to change by the demands of roles on the public stage. At this point, the family, if likened to an atomic nucleus, must be shot by a cyclotron so that the atomic nucleus is opened, which is also important for living the values of modern democracy. In this way, understanding democracy is not limited to touching the outer walls of the nation's social building but must also penetrate its inner spaces. This means that being a democratic nation should mean being a democratic person, too. But in reality? Maybe democratic ideology is misunderstood as ethical actions that are independent and integrated into modern life itself.

There is a kind of friction or discontinuity between the democratic political system and our behavior as public figures. At the political level, we accept the concept of democracy as a system that is suitable for prioritizing effectiveness and professionalism in managing, leading, and carrying out the duties and responsibilities of the state. But in practice, we still prioritize "trust" based on emotional kinship ties in appointing and appointing public officials. Conditions like this show that our social ties as citizens are still primordial rather than nationalist. Outwardly, we shout the spirit of nationalism to reject foreign intervention to uphold national sovereignty. Still, ironically, internally, we agree with discriminatory practices among fellow citizens of our nation.

METHODS

The research methods used are theme analysis, basic principles, and discourse. The type of research applied is qualitative research, focusing on an in-depth understanding of the role of the family in forming the character of the younger generation in the context of the Modern Democratic Family. The research data and data sources come from themes that respond to moral and social

movements from ulama and educational figures. The basic principles identified are a source of understanding why character education is integral in building ethical individuals and maintaining the integrity of national life. Data was also obtained through discourse regarding the repositioning of family roles, which discussed the responsibility for forming the character of the younger generation as a collective obligation of the Indonesian nation. Data collection techniques involve document analysis, including written works by scholars and educational figures who discuss character education. The discourse on repositioning family roles also becomes a data source through in-depth text analysis. Data analysis was conducted by compiling findings from themes, basic principles, and discourse analysis. These findings were then interpreted to identify the role of the family in forming the younger generation's character and the obstacles faced, especially related to incorrect understanding of the character formation process and perceptions of the role of state institutions in formal education.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The importance of democratizing the modern family is not new at all. Even though there is only one small theme in the overall content of his book *Runaway World*, Anthony Giddens is quite concerned with seeing the family's role on the global change stage (Fukuyama, 2005). According to him, among all the changes taking place in the world, none is more important than those occurring in our personal lives – in sexuality, personal relationships, marriage, and the family. According to Giddens, a global revolution is underway regarding how we understand ourselves and how to build relationships with other people. The strengthening and intensity of global discussions about sexual equality, sexuality regulation and the future of the family mark this. However, if it does not appear in the open debate space, then this must be due to repression by authoritarian governments and fundamentalist groups. According to him, various transformations that affect personal and emotional areas transcend national boundaries. We find this tendency everywhere, only in varying degrees and according to the cultural context in which the transformation occurs.

The starting point for Giddens' evaluation is the inequality between men and women inherent in the traditional family climate. According to him, in traditional families, it is not only women who lose their rights, but children also experience the same thing. However, with the increasing spread of modern influence, married couples are seen as the core and center of family life. In his analysis of pure relationships, Giddens points out that the intimacy factor through emotional communication is the foundation and the means for building the bond in the first place and the main reason for its continuation. Ideally, the bond of love is the basis for the intimacy and commitment of the

relationship. A relationship depends on an active trust process, the momentum of opening oneself to others. Openness is a basic requirement for intimacy. This pure relationship, according to Giddens, is completely democratic. A good family relationship is equal, with each party having the same rights and obligations. In this relationship, each person has respect and wants the best for the other person. Relationships are purely based on communication, so understanding the other person's point of view is essential. Conversation or dialogue is a means that makes the relationship work well. Relationships function best when people don't hide so much in front of others; that's mutual trust. Trust is not simply assumed but must be built and developed. Finally, a good relationship is a relationship that is free from arbitrary power, free from oppression, or violence.

Still, in Giddens's frame of mind, every relationship with genuine relationship quality is based on democratic political values. In a democracy, all are equal, and with equal rights and responsibilities, mutual respect will arise. Open dialogue is the main characteristic of democracy. A democratic system seeks to replace authoritarian power or the power of sedimented traditions with open discussion of various issues – a dialogue of life in the public sphere. According to him, no democracy can function without trust. Democracy will be destroyed if it gives way to authoritarianism or violence. If democratic principles can penetrate the space of interpersonal relationships, then according to Giddens, opportunities for power that are as important as public democracy will emerge, namely emotional democracy in everyday life. Democratic relationships are also related to parent-child relationships. The areas of this relationship cannot and do not need to be materially equal. It is in everyone's interest that parents have authority over their children. However, they must assume the principles of equality. In a democratic family, parental authority must be based on implicit agreement. Therefore, according to Giddens, parents tell their children: “If you were an adult and knew what I know, you would agree that what I am asking you to do is good for you.” The failure to develop a child's character in a traditional family is because he only needs to be supervised and limited but not listened to. Children, in emotional democracy, need and should be able to answer or ask questions. Emotional democracy will not result in reduced discipline and loss of respect.

Giddens's idea of emotional democracy does not mean weakening family obligations or public policy towards the family. We can understand this in the context of the birth of a number of our national policies in child protection and anti-domestic violence laws. The focus of the problem is not whether the idea of a democratic family is appropriate or acceptable in the cultural context of our nation; Rather, the main problem is the weak socialization of the principle of equality and excessive suspicion of global change. As a result, every social entity tries desperately to fortify itself against it. This change is an undeniable fact and a reality before our eyes, which reflects the increasing level of social understanding at the same time as the current revolution in the telecommunications industry.

Sexual equality is not only a central principle of emotional democracy but also relevant to the family's goal of achieving happiness and fulfillment. Many social changes affecting the family are problematic and difficult, but choosing the traditional family as the best form is a major disaster for democracy. Look, the best-selling displays in bookstores today are sections that talk about human identity amid globalization. Don't forget that the principles of democracy and morality also form the basis for the emergence of popular psychology books for business and other social relations, including the family. This is a clear sign that everything related to social change, including the inclusion of democratic principles - as long as there is openness - will encourage more progress than simply confining ourselves to traditional and fundamentalistic thought patterns that perpetuate oppression in interpersonal relations within the family. Regarding what things we should suspect about the excesses of globalization amidst the strengthening acceptance of democratic principles,

The big challenge that is important to be observed from globalization in all its dimensions towards morality and democratic principles is self-egoism as a means to overcome excessive demands for individual freedom. Freedom without morality is certainly dangerous. The real threat to trust, moral values, and civil society is increasing individualism, as cited by Francis Fukuyama (McLanahan, 1994). In his monumental work "The Great Shock". On the one hand, citing Ralph Dahrendorf's terms, Fukuyama writes that traditional societies have few choices and many bonds (i.e., ties to other people): people have limited choices regarding life partners, work, residence or faith and are tied to family, tribe, caste, religion, feudal obligations, and so on which are often oppressive. However, even in the most optimistic scenario, modern life has not erased this bond altogether.

On the other hand, in modern society, individual choices are numerous but their ties in the network of social obligations are very loose. Replacing bonds of coercion and obligation based on inherited social class, people prefer bonds entered into voluntarily. To a certain extent, the internet is a technological product that has the potential to take voluntary social ties to a new and previously unimaginable level: people can establish relationships with each other throughout the world based on shared interests (Rimm, 2003). The optimistic scenario of the true achievement of modern society in the form of individual autonomy and its release from traditional and authoritarian ties is not without problems, at least causing shocks in Fukuyama's perspective (Fukuyama, 2005).

The first concerns the optimistic scenario itself, which may be the catalyst for the dilemma. Giddens perhaps puts too much rational emphasis on the detachment of the democratic modern family from traditional ties and the conservative viewpoint of the fundamentalists. Still, Fukuyama captures the tendency of individualism - as the basis of modern society - towards closed self-interest. The elaboration of the perspectives of social scientists themselves, such as Peter L. Berger, Alasdair

McIntyre, and Ralph Dahrendorf, signals the existence of danger; breaking these ties is not limited to the coercive ties that characterize traditional and authoritarian societies (Rogers, 2004). According to them, breaking ties also means eroding the social bonds that underlie the self-selected voluntary associations that make up modern society. What is at issue is not only the authority of tyrants but also the authority of officials, scientists, and teachers elected through elections. People become anxious about the obligations arising from marriage and family ties, even though the marriage and family ties were formed of their own accord. People also do not want to be bound by the moral teachings of their chosen religion. Individual autonomy shifted from the admirable capacity for free people's self-care to a self-centered nature. Absolute individual freedom without regard for responsibility towards others is counterproductive to the concept of democracy itself. Thus, according to Fukuyama, in societies where individuals enjoy greater freedom of choice than has been experienced in the past, people increasingly dislike remaining ties. The danger for such people is the emergence of feelings of social isolation, in the sense of being free to relate to anyone but unable to make moral commitments that can connect them with other people in true society (Pakasi, 1985).

Second, shifts in social norms related to the role of the family are emerging in Western countries. In our context, these are the things that need to be anticipated in building a democratic family: the social system and values inherent in local culture remain an important reference because they are the forerunners of the family. The changes occurring in families in the West are reflected in statistics regarding low fertility rates, low levels of bonding and commitment to marriage, high divorce rates, and the rise of out-of-wedlock births. Regarding social capital, the shift in the role of the family in the West has a direct effect. According to Fukuyama, the family remains the most basic social unit: Mother and Father must work together to produce offspring, instill values, and educate children. Social capital here, citing sociologist James Coleman, is, broadly, a set of resources embedded in family relationships and social organizations and useful for developing children's cognitive or social abilities. However, these roles are increasingly being shifted, especially in birth matters. Fukuyama wrote: "The modernization theory popular in the social sciences in the mid-20th century saw no problem with family life: the extended family would naturally shrink to the nuclear family, which was more suited to the conditions of life in industrial society. However, the family did not stop changing in 1950. Major shocks caused the nuclear family to shrink even more in the long term and therefore threatened the reproductive function of the family (Idris, 1980)." According to Fukuyama, this condition is worrying because the decline in fertility levels causes a demographic transition. The total birth rate is lower than the level required to maintain a constant population. Social capital cannot be realized without humans, and Western society has failed to produce it sufficiently for survival.

Third, a big reflection problem for us is the danger of excessive dependence on family ties. As indicated by Fukuyama, in the context of China, Latin America, and Southern Europe, this will have negative consequences for society rather than the family environment. This is the threat of familism in a democratic political system. "Familism leads to nepotism. Economic efficiency, therefore, demands that business partners, clients, and banks are selected without sentiment based on qualifications and expertise, not on heredity. Modern bureaucracies are run not by family members and close friends, but by people who meet objective job requirements or pass official examinations (Gardner, 1991)." Bureaucratic professionalism is an inherent demand in a democratic state system. However, an orthodox political culture that emphasizes procedures and connectivity of individuals carrying power in recruitment patterns for employees or state bureaucratic officials can be a serious threat (Sipe, 2003). It not only betrays the rational process but also pulls the system back to old, nepotistic patterns of power.

Fourth, a turning point in people's trust in democratic political leaders in countries with established democracies. Amid the widespread spread of democracy worldwide, it is "as if" the Western world is unsure about their choice of a democratically elected government. This is the turning point or anomaly of democracy. In Giddens' view, this condition is a paradox of democracy (Samiana, 2006). According to him, in most Western countries, the level of trust in politicians is declining. Political participation in exercising the right to vote in elections is decreasing. However, according to Giddens, people have lost much of the trust they used to place in politicians and orthodox democratic procedures. However, they have not lost faith in the democratic process.

The same issue of trust is also supported by Fukuyama's analysis, especially about formal institutions and trust in traditional sources of power – the armed forces, the legal system, and the police – which shows a decreasing trend in most countries adhering to democratic systems. Feelings of doubt about the seriousness of the state or government are also high because of the perception that the government tends to be wasteful and inefficient and that the government tends to interfere too much in their daily affairs (Rahadyan, 2000). Here, the problem remains clear: trust is more related to the character and behavior of politicians, government officials, and other formal institutions. Orthodox government practices (ways cultural perceptions) will be more likely to occur so that full trust will be difficult to achieve, not to mention the frequent overthrow of elected governments in parliamentary democratic systems.

Fifth, the dimming of the modest dimensions of life amidst economic, political, and social competition in achieving wealth, position, and status. Democracy does provide open space for people to no longer be under pressure to control their behavior. Freedom involves escaping from the confines

of old authority and the freedom to enter new arenas of struggle in the various fields mentioned above. Living simply in the past was a heroic act. Modesty gives way to total devotion, high trust in state authority, and binding social norms. Modernization has also contributed to weakening ties to socio-cultural norms and traditions.

Meanwhile, democracy, which grew along with the development of new ideas in modern society, also contributed to the high level of public distrust in the control system carried out by formal institutions. Markets are freed from government intervention. Religion and morality became private matters. Involvement and participation in the political field is a free, non-binding choice.

Apart from the four problems mentioned previously, perhaps we need to add that nowadays, a consumerist lifestyle is stalking the lives of modern families. Coinciding with the creative innovation of the "market" to package consumer goods into "goods of extraordinary taste" without realizing it, the appetite for spending and satisfying the external needs of some people, especially in big cities, has become increasingly evident. As a result, the residue from the "instant" packaging creates ecological problems. Every day, families in big cities produce tons of waste. Unfortunately, most of the rubbish is thrown away haphazardly. In the name of freedom, self-control increasingly fades and goes out of control – then, whether they realize it or not – people harm each other. Modesty and heroic-commendable behavior are the only remaining stories in the main reading comics of modern children. The concept of taste cannot be debated –*de gustibus non est disputandum*. It is in the background of this problem that liberal economic marketing experts reduce human behavior to merely pursuing personal "tastes" that cannot be changed according to what is desired (Giddens, 2004)

In context In general, the track record of the problems above is not a reason to judge democracy as a failed system. We must realize that most of the revelations of the "black box" mystery that befell the Western world today are the domino effect of the communication and information technology era. Openness and civil rights to public information are the links in the chain of the role of community control and supervision. In addition, the mass media is very intense in bringing various irregularities and abuses of power to the public arena, as well as other routine humanitarian information in civil society. Then, what model system would allow "nothing hidden" anymore if not for agreed historical-democratic values? When Indonesia pledged to adopt a modern democratic system, there were many evaluative notes at the implementation stage. Should the limitations of understanding and meaning be debated again? What needs to be debated is the level of seriousness of this nation's children in exploring the constructive potential of democracy so that they do not easily turn towards skepticism due to the perception that the status quo is formed, merely legitimizing deviations. The modern democratic family remains a reference for social capital in building the nation.

Modernity and globalization are realities that cannot be denied and reframed by mere historical memory (Soedarsono, 1990). Modern civilization, with its winds of influence, must be faced with a flexible and not rigid attitude. A flexible attitude means accepting the new as just one perspective while remaining firm in adhering to moral principles that have been tested and are deeply rooted. This means that democracy gives us free space to filter all influences, both from within and outside, so that we walk with the flow but are not swept up in it. Globalization threatens not only moral principles and thereby uproots us from traditional roots but also the existence of democratic principles themselves. Therefore, we believe that our problem is not whether understanding democracy is suitable but rather how deeply we instill the principles of democratic life so that we are no longer easily led into a condition out of control by the influence of globalization itself. So our problem lies not in the swift flow of influence of global industrial progress but because our traditional and moral roots are not strong enough to support our lives so as not to be carried away by globalization. And, the moral foundations that we dig are not deep and strong enough to support the social buildings of our nation that tower high and point to all corners of the compass.

The smallest organizational unit, the family, is also the most important. The family environment is a factory of thought filters and moral beliefs. If the family factory machines run well and are renewable in the management system, the processed products will undoubtedly provide the best quality guarantee. But the family is not a static, mechanical machine. It is more appropriate as a machine whose dynamics experience fluctuations. Sometimes, the process runs smoothly, but sometimes it stagnates. Family is a computer device. There is a central processing unit (CPU) that is closed but very decisive, and there is a program window open from the monitor that projects the work results of a process. If the CPU still comes from old hardware while the software is always new, then what is changed is not the software but the hardware that needs to be transformed. Because inserting new programs on old devices will be problematic, besides being slow and stuttering, it can also stall (hang), or the machine won't run. It is too naive to make a metaphor like this, but it is important to understand that civilization and human creativity and innovation continue to develop. We only need a landscape of internal mechanisms that are constantly transforming. Morality and the roots of our traditions remain a guide, but there must be adjustments so that history continues to run dynamically on the national life transformation stage. This is the role of the family (Sujiono, 2005).

The emphasis on the democratic characteristics of the modern family ultimately stretches our reflections on efforts to find the true structure of our family life. The traditional family model as a natural process may no longer be suitable. As Giddens reminds us, it would be just as dangerous to imitate mass behavior trends that are completely free from moral control. The democratic family model is searching for identity by re-emphasizing the importance of commitment as a free choice that

binds the two people who form the family, husband and wife. The emphasis on the family's vision of life, especially those originating from religious understanding, has taken a central place in the birth of various psycho-social approaches today. In essence, a democratic family is certainly formed from communication that gives birth to and perpetuates the value of love. Love fosters an atmosphere of mutual trust, mutual respect, and understanding. Love expresses the equality of two different sides of sexuality. Love is the ultimate expression of egalitarianism. Love cannot possibly grow in an authoritarian atmosphere. Likewise, love cannot possibly develop in an individualistic and self-centered attitude.

On the other hand, love can only grow in a harmonious and democratic atmosphere. Communication will only be positive if each subject sees themselves as equal. The monologue-instructive and tyrannical communication model will only erode the essence and morality of marriage itself. Two older adults who always seem to walk together until they enter old age but wear tortured faces are nothing more than a play on the most tragic drama of life, even though we argue that it would be better than living in marriage for the rest of our lives. Making love the principle and essence of living together seems ideal, but it will survive if facilitated by equality, openness, honesty, and tolerance (Sarwono, 2005).

Globalization, marked by increasing demands for democratization in various parts of the world today, will not cause excessive shocks to moral standards and cultural values if everyone has sufficient insight into the essence of the influence itself. The progress of science and technology and the information technology revolution are like the shock of a tsunami wave for families built on closed traditional foundations (Sobur, 1985). On the contrary, this progress will be a testing ground for the strength of the filtration system built into democratic families. This means that shifts and changes in the global order that impact all aspects of social life do not need to be seen as a situation where humans have been thrown from the moral ties of religion or tradition into the well-known information age secularism. On the other hand, from a more democratic perspective, we see that many positive values are also present on the world stage, and it is nothing more than a recycling of old moral traditions; that is why every social scientist and futurist group today sees the current era as an era of religious revival.

For all the jolts of the globalization cannon aimed at socio-cultural entities, there is no reason for us to worry too much. Don't let this anxiety drag our social system back to a barbaric era, merely legitimizing the presence of the leviathan of the tyrant who seeks to emphasize false "morality" above the dominance of mass support. We need to reposition our socio-cultural building through internalizing democratic principles. Therefore, instead of going through the trouble of building thick

walls to close and fortify our families from the flow of global influence, we should increase real efforts to hone and sharpen our moral-religious filtering performance by rooting the principles of democracy itself. And, in its place, we again pin the demands on the role and privilege of the family as determining the movement of national civilization. We believe and support that the ideals of the 45 Revolution and the 98 Reform movement will reach their culminating success only if our families can transform themselves into fertile fields for the growth of people with a democratic character.

CONCLUSION

The research results show that repositioning the role of the family is a fundamental issue, and the responsibility for forming the character of the younger generation should be a collective obligation of the Indonesian people. The main obstacle lies in a wrong understanding of the process of character formation, with society tending to blame the weak role of state institutions in formal education. Awareness of the family's significant contribution to character formation's success or failure is an important key. In conclusion, this research emphasizes the need for a correct understanding of the process of character formation and an emphasis on the active role of the family as the main pillar in producing people who are religious, intelligent, independent, and with character in the future.

REFERENCES

- Beaty, Sally V (ed.). **FAMILY PORTRAIT: A STUDY OF CONTEMPORARY LIFESTYLES**, (California: Wadsworth Publishing Co. Belmont), 1986.
- Biddulph, Steve and Shaaron. **MENDIDIKA ANAK DENGAN CINTA**. (Danan Priyatmoko, penerj.) Jakarta: Gramedia, 2006.
- Diamond, Lary. **DEVELOPING DEMOCRACY TOWARD CONSOLIDATION** (ed. Terj.; (Yogyakarta: IRE Press), 2003.
- Fukuyama, Francis. **GUNCANGAN BESAR**, (Edisi terj. Jakarta: Gramedia), 2005.
- _____. **THE END OF HISTORY AND THE LAST MAN** (Ed. Terj. Jakarta: Gramedia). 2004.
- Gardner, Howard. **THE UNSCHOOLED MIND. HOW CHILDREN THINK AND HOW SCHOOLS SHOULD TEACH**, (New York: Basic Books), 1991.
- Giddens, Anthony. **RUNAWAY WORLD: Bagaimana Globalisasi Merombak Kehidupan Kita**, (A. Kristiawan dan Yustina K.S., penerj. Jakarta: Gramedia), 2004.

- Goode, William J. *WORLD REVOLUTION AND FAMILY PATTERN*. (London: Collier Mcmillan), 1963.
- Gordon, Thomas. *MENJADI ORANG TUA EFEKTIF*, (Farida LS, penerj. Jakarta: Gramedia), 1984.
- Gunarsa, Singgih D. *DASAR DAN TEORI PERKEMBANGAN ANAK*, Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 1985.
- Hendropuspito, D. *SOSIOLOGI SISTEMATIK*, (Yogyakarta: Kanisius), 1989.
- Idris, Zahra. *PERANAN ORANG TUA DI RUMAH TANGGA*, (Bandung: Angkasa), 1980.
- Jeffries, Vincent, and H. Edward Ransford. *SOCIAL STRATIFICATIONS: A MULTIPLE HIERARCHY APPROACH*, (Boston: Allyn and Bacon Inc.), 1980.
- Levine, Mel. *MENEMUKAN BAKAT ISTIMEWA ANAK*, (Lina Jusuf, penerj.) Jakarta: Gramedia, 2004.
- Magniz-Suseno, Franz., dkk. *AGAMA DAN DEMOKRASI* (Jakarta: P3M), 1991.
- _____. *ETIKA DASAR: MASALAH-MASALAH POKOK FILSAFAT MORAL*, (Yogyakarta: Kanisius), 1987.
- McLanahan, Sara S, and Gary D. Sandefur. *GROWING UP WITH A SINGLE PARENT: WHAT HURTS, WHAT HELPS*. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press), 1994.
- Pakasi, Soepartinah, *ANAK DAN PERKEMBANGANNYA: PENDEKATAN SOSIOLOGIS, PSIKOLOGIS, TEOLOGIS*, (Jakarta: Gramedia), 1985.
- Rahadyan, Rizki P. Dan JS Tukan, *KOMUNIKASI ORANG TUA DAN ANAK DALAM KELUARGA*, (Jakarta: YPPM, 2000).
- Raka, J.T.S. *WAWASAN PENDIDIKAN*, (Jakarta: Depdikbud), 1981.
- Rogers, Bill. *PEMULIHAN PRILAKU* (Rahayu Ratnaningsih, penerj.) Jakarta: Grasindo, 2004.
- Rimm, Sylvia, *SMART PARENTING, MENDIDIK DENGAN BIJAK*, (Mangurhardjana, penerj.), Jakarta: Grasindo, 2003.
- Samiana, I Made, dkk. (eds.) *ETIKA, POLITIK DAN DEMOKRASI: DINAMIKA POLITIK LOKAL DI INDONESIA*, (Salatiga: Pustaka Percik), 2006.
- Saryadi, Soegeng dan Sukardi Rinakit. *MEMBACA INDONESIA* (Jakarta: SSS), 2005.
- Sasongko, HD Haryo. *ANAK BANGSA TERPIDANA*, (Jakarta: Pustaka Utan Kayu), 2003.

- Sipe, James W., And Don M. Frick. SEVEN PILLARS OF SERVANT LEADERSHIP: PRACTICING THE WISDOM OF LEADING BY SERVING, (New York: Penguin Books), 2003.
- Shene, H.G., ARTI PENDIDIKAN BAGI MASA DEPAN, (Jakarta: Pustekom Depdikbud dan Rajawali), 1984.
- Soedarsono, Soemarno. PENYEMAIAN JATI DIRI, Jakarta: Elex Media Komputindo, 1999.
- _____. HASRAT UNTUK BERUBAH: JATI DIRI REFLEKSI EMPIRIS. (Jakarta: EMK), 2006.
- Severe, Sal. BAGAIMANA BERSIKAP PADA ANAK AGAR ANAK BERSIKAP BAIK (T. Hermaya, penerj.) Jakarta: Gramedia, 2000.
- Sobur, Alex. KOMUNIKASI ORANG TUA DAN ANAK. Bandung: Angkasa, 1985.
- Soenoesoebrata, Soejatna. KORUPTOR INDONESIA RETAK SETENGAH BAGIAN, (Jakarta: Mata Aksara), 2009.
- Suryabrata, Sumadi. PSIKOLOGI KEPRIBADIAN, Jakarta: Rajawali, 1988.
- Sarwono, Sarlito Wirawan, PSIKOLOGI REMAJA, Jakarta: Rajagrafindo Persada, 2005.
- Sujiono, Bambang dan Yuliani Nurani, MENCERDASKAN PRILAKU ANAK USIA DINI, Jakarta: Elex Media Komputindo, 2005.

