Reactualization of Mohammad Natsir's Integral Motion for the Modern National and Democratic Movement

Marhamah Annazah Tambunan*[1], Zaydan Syamsul Alam[2], Ijlal Al Kindi[3]

[1] Graduate School of Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University Jakarta

[2] Loughborough University, UK

[3] King Fahd University, Saudi Arabia

Corresponding E-mail: anajah0106@gmail.com

Abstract

This study examines the reactualization of Mohammad Natsir's Integral Motion within the framework of national identity and modern democracy in Indonesia. Proposed in 1950, the Integral Motion was not only a political initiative that unified the Republic of the United States of Indonesia (RIS) into the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia (NKRI), but also embodied enduring values of unity, social justice, and deliberation that remain highly relevant today. Employing a qualitative approach through library research and historical-critical analysis, this study interprets the political and philosophical dimensions of the Integral Motion and its significance in the context of contemporary democracy. The findings reveal that the values contained in the Integral Motion can be reactivated to address current democratic challenges such as political polarization, oligarchic dominance, and digital disinformation. These values provide moral and intellectual foundations for strengthening democratic practices in Indonesia. Viewed through the lens of deliberative democracy theory, the Integral Motion underscores the importance of rational communication, inclusive dialogue, and consensus as the basis of political legitimacy. Therefore, the reactualization of the Integral Motion not only reinforces national solidarity but also serves as a strategic inspiration for developing a more substantive, inclusive, and sustainable democracy in Indonesia.

Keywords: Integral Motion, Mohammad Natsir, National Movement, Modern Democracy.

Abstrak

Penelitian ini mengkaji reaktualisasi Mosi Integral Mohammad Natsir dalam kerangka kebangsaan dan demokrasi modern di Indonesia. Mosi Integral yang diajukan pada tahun 1950 tidak hanya berfungsi sebagai inisiatif politik untuk melebur Republik Indonesia Serikat (RIS) menjadi Negara Kesatuan Republik Indonesia (NKRI), tetapi juga merepresentasikan nilai-nilai persatuan, keadilan sosial, dan musyawarah yang tetap relevan hingga masa kini. Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif dengan metode studi kepustakaan (library research) dan analisis historis-kritis untuk menafsirkan dimensi politik dan filosofis Mosi Integral serta relevansinya dalam konteks demokrasi kontemporer. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa nilai-

nilai yang terkandung dalam Mosi Integral dapat direaktualisasi untuk menjawab tantangan demokrasi modern, seperti polarisasi politik, dominasi oligarki, dan disinformasi digital. Nilai-nilai tersebut memberikan fondasi moral dan intelektual bagi penguatan praktik demokrasi yang berkeadaban. Dalam perspektif teori demokrasi deliberatif, Mosi Integral menegaskan pentingnya komunikasi rasional, dialog inklusif, dan konsensus sebagai dasar legitimasi politik. Oleh karena itu, reaktualisasi Mosi Integral tidak hanya memperkuat solidaritas kebangsaan, tetapi juga menjadi inspirasi strategis dalam membangun demokrasi Indonesia yang lebih substantif, inklusif, dan berkelanjutan.

Kata Kunci: Mosi Integral, Mohammad Natsir, Gerakan Kebangsaan, Demokrasi Modern

Introduction

Indonesia's post-independence political history is marked by complex dynamics, struggles, and debates about the most ideal form of government to maintain national stability and unity (Gani & Sembiring, 2023). After a long struggle against colonialism, Indonesia finally gained recognition of its sovereignty thru the Round Table Conference (KMB) in 1949. However, the outcome of the negotiations resulted in a federal state known as the United States of Indonesia (RIS) (Adan & Jalil, 2019). Although formally the RIS was a diplomatic compromise accepted by the nation's leaders, in reality, this federal structure actually caused political instability. The RIS is considered a Dutch colonial legacy that aimed to weaken Indonesian unity by dividing power into states. This then sparked various debates and resistance among national figures, including Mohammad Natsir.

Mohammad Natsir, a political leader, Muslim intellectual, and statesman, came up with an idea that later became known as the Integral Motion. On April 3, 1950, he submitted this motion in the parliament of the Republic of Indonesia (RIS) with the aim of reuniting the states into the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia (NKRI) (Fajri et al., 2024). Mosi Integral is not merely a practical political step, but a strategic vision that emphasizes the importance of national unity above group or regional interests. This resolution successfully gained majority support and ultimately became the basis for the rebirth of the Republic of Indonesia on August 17, 1950. Since then, Natsir's Integral Motion has been remembered as one of the important milestones in the nation's historical journey.

However, the reading of Integral Motion must not stop solely in its historical realm. The values and spirit contained in it remain relevant to be discussed in today's situation, especially when the Indonesian nation faces new challenges in the era of modern democracy. Indonesian democracy, which has been in place for over two decades since the Reformation, still faces various serious problems, ranging from political oligarchy, corruption, digital disinformation, to the rise of identity politics that has the potential to damage national unity (Hidayat, 2025). In this conditions, the reactualization of the Integral Motion as a source of national political values becomes an urgent need.

The national movement that was once the main basis of the struggle for independence now faces new challenges that are different in form but similar in essence: maintaining national unity amidst the fragmentation of interests. If fragmentation previously appeared in the form of federalism inherited from colonialism, it now

manifests as political polarization, identity conflicts, and the strengthening of group interests that prioritize power ambitions over the overall national interest. In recent years, political differences have become increasingly sharp, especially during elections. Identity politics has become a primary tool in shaping public opinion, often exacerbating divisions within society (Wingarta et al., 2021). This condition is further exacerbated by the development of digital technology, which, while bringing ease to communication and political participation, also creates space for the spread of hoaxes, hate speech, and the manipulation of public opinion, dividing society.

This is where the relevance of the Integral Motion finds its momentum. The values of unity, national solidarity, and the awareness of placing the nation's interests above group interests are the main message of the Integral Motion that must be revived. Reactualizing the Integral Motion does not mean repeating historical events exactly, but rather extracting its fundamental values to serve as inspiration in addressing contemporary national and democratic issues. In other words, this reactualization is an effort to bridge the gap between historical heritage and the needs of the times.

Furthermore, the Integral Motion also holds significant meaning in building Indonesia's political civilization. Political civilization is not only determined by the formal institutions of the state, but also by the political values, norms, and practices that grow within society. Mosi Integral shows that politics can be a means of unity, not just an arena for power struggles. In this regard, Natsir's leadership provides an example of how politics can be conducted with integrity, idealism, and a commitment to the nation's interests (Hasan et al., 2024). If these values are revived, then Indonesia's modern democracy will have a stronger moral foundation to face various forms of challenges.

Modern democracy in Indonesia is certainly different from democracy in the 1950s. Today, democracy operates within the framework of globalization, information openness, and highly intensive interaction between the state and civil society. Democracy is no longer limited to an electoral mechanism, but also involves broad public participation, government accountability, and respect for pluralism. However, democracy also faces the risk of degradation due to the strengthening of oligarchy and the weak political education of the public (Hidayat, 2025). Many circles believe that Indonesian democracy today tends to be procedural, without being accompanied by a deep substance of values. Therefore, strengthening democracy must once again refer to national values that emphasize unity, mutual cooperation, and collective responsibility, as reflected in the Integral Motion.

Reactualizing the Integral Motion is also relevant for bringing back political ethics into national life. Politics solely oriented toward power will tend to give rise to transactional practices, corruption, and polarization. Conversely, politics built on the values of unity and morality will be better able to foster a healthy democracy. In this regard, the Integral Motion teaches that politics must be placed within the framework of national responsibility, not merely individual or group interests (Hasanah & Mufarohah, 2024).

Additionally, the Integral Motion can be seen as a successful form of social movement that changed the course of the nation's history. As a political movement, the Integral Motion was born from a collective awareness to reject the colonial legacy that

divided the nation. From a social movement perspective, the Integral Motion serves as an example of how a political movement based on the idea of unity can mobilize broad support and bring about systemic change (Latif et al., 2024). If this principle is reactivated, then the Integral Motion can become an inspiration for modern national movements oriented toward strengthening democracy and social justice.

On a global stage, many nations face a similar dilemma between particular interests and national interests. Identity crises, radicalism, and disintegration pose serious challenges to democracy in various parts of the world. Indonesia, with its own experience, has valuable historical capital to serve as a reference. Mosi Integral is one of them. By using it as a foundation, the Indonesian nation can demonstrate that democracy does not have to be at odds with unity; in fact, it can be strengthened thru inclusive national values.

Research on Mohammad Natsir's Integral Motion has been conducted extensively by various academics using diverse approaches. Ramadhan examines how the Integral Motion became an effective model for national unity in the face of separatist threats, particularly in the period following independence, when the federal structure of the RIS still caused political instability (Ramadhan, 2018). His research highlights how Natsir's leadership successfully convinced various parties to return to the Republic of Indonesia without using military force, but rather thru political and diplomatic approaches. Suryanegara discusses the influence of Natsir's thot on Islamic political policies in Indonesia, tracing how Natsir's ideas regarding the relationship between Islam and the state are reflected in political policies from the Old Order era to the reform period (Suryanegara, 2019). This study reveals that although Natsir supported democracy based on Islamic values, he also emphasized the importance of national integration and avoiding religious-based political exclusivity. Meanwhile, Hakim and Prasetyo examined the challenges of national integration in the digital era, which is increasingly accelerating political and social fragmentation due to the development of social media (Hakim & Prasetyo, 2021). They highlighted how political polarization in the digital space can threaten national unity, as well as the need for new strategies in managing differing political viewpoints to prevent broader social conflict.

Previous research has provided a strong foundation for understanding various aspects of Mohammad Natsir's Integral Motion, from historical and Islamic political perspectives to contemporary challenges. However, there remains ample opportunity for further analysis on how the values embodied in the Integral Motion can be actualized within the dynamics of an increasingly complex modern democracy.

Therefore, this article seeks to emphasize the relevance of Mohammad Natsir's Integral Motion within the framework of the national movement and modern democracy. With a historical-critical approach, this article not only reviews the Integral Motion as a historical event but also explores its values and meanings to serve as inspiration for strengthening democracy in Indonesia today. The fundamental question we want to answer is how the Integral Motion can be reactualized in the face of modern national and democratic challenges. Thru this study, it is hoped that new perspectives will emerge on the importance of preserving historical heritage as a source of value in building the nation's political future.

Method

This research uses a qualitative approach with the methods of library research and historical-critical analysis. This approach was chosen because the research focus is not on quantitative data or statistical measurements, but on exploring the meanings, values, and relevance of Mohammad Natsir's Integral Motion within its historical setting and the dynamics of contemporary politics. Historical-critical analysis was used to reinterpret documents, archives, and academic literature related to the Integral Motion, while also comparing them with phenomena of democracy and national movements in the modern era.

Data was obtained thru a literature study from various sources, including books, academic journals, scientific articles, and documents discussing Mohammad Natsir's Integral Motion. The research also draws on previous research on Natsir's role, national integration policies, and current political challenges (polarization, decentralization, and leadership integrity crises). Literature analysis was conducted using the principle of source triangulation, which involves verifying data from various references to gain a more complete understanding (Moleong, 2017). In this way, the research can uncover both the historical dimensions of the Integral Motion and the political values contained within it, to be reactualized in the present.

Data analysis techniques are carried out in several stages. First, data collection from various literature sources relevant to the Integral Motion, the national movement, and modern democracy. Second, data reduction to select information that aligns with the research focus. Third, a contextual analysis is carried out by linking the meaning of the Integral Motion to contemporary political situations. Fourth, a critical interpretation seeks to extract the values of unity, integrity, and democracy contained in the Integral Motion, and then formulate strategies for its reactualization within the modern sphere (Creswell, 2018). With this method, the research is expected to produce a comprehensive analysis, not only highlighting the historical aspects of the Integral Motion but also its relevance to strengthening Indonesian nationalism and democracy today.

Deliberative Democracy Theory

Deliberative democracy is a concept that emphasizes the importance of deliberation and rational communication in political life. Democracy is not only understood as an electoral procedure or election mechanism, but also as a discursive space where citizens engage in dialog to reach a just and rational consensus. Habermas explains that true political legitimacy can only be achieved if public decisions are born thru a communication process free from domination and prioritizing rational arguments (Habermas, 1996).

In the Indonesian context, deliberative democracy holds significant relevance considering the long-standing traditions of deliberation and mutual cooperation that have been part of the nation's political culture. The principle of deliberation, as enshrined in the fourth tenet of Pancasila, reflects the deliberative spirit, where political decisions are ideally made thru inclusive dialog that prioritizes the common good (Nino, 2024).

However, it's important to distinguish between procedural democracy and deliberative democracy. Procedural democracy emphasizes formal mechanisms like

elections, while deliberative democracy places more emphasis on the quality of the political communication process. In practice, democracy in Indonesia is often trapped in proceduralism without bringing deliberative values to life, making it vulnerable to political polarization, identity politics, and oligarchy (Sukma & Saparuli, 2021).

In relation to Mohammad Natsir's Integral Motion, deliberative democracy theory is highly relevant because the motion was born thru parliamentary sessions based on dialog and consensus. Natsir emphasized that national unity could not be achieved thru military force, but thru deliberation that prioritized the collective interest above individual groups. Therefore, the reactualization of the Integral Motion can be understood as an effort to bring back deliberative values in addressing the challenges of modern Indonesian democracy, especially in facing political polarization and digital disinformation.

Discussion

Analysis Mohammad Natsir's Integral Motion: Context and Implications.

The political history of Indonesia after independence is marked by debates regarding the most ideal form of government to maintain stability and national unity. After the Round Table Conference (KMB) in 1949, Indonesia adopted a federal form of government known as the United States of Indonesia (RIS) (Adan & Jalil, 2019). However, this system soon faced serious challenges. Many states within the RIS had a tendency to maintain broader autonomy or even secede from Indonesia. This instability sparked concerns among national leaders, including Mohammad Natsir, who saw federalism as a threat to national integration.

Mohammad Natsir, who was then the Chairman of the Masyumi Party Faction in Parliament, understood that newly independent Indonesia needed a stronger and more centralized system of government to be able to face political, economic, and social challenges. On April 3, 1950, Natsir submitted the Integral Motion to parliament as a political step to end the federal system and restore the form of the Unitary Republic of Indonesia (NKRI) (Fajri et al., 2024). This resolution received widespread support and was eventually adopted as the basis for dissolving the RIS and reuniting the regions of Indonesia under a single central government.

The success of the Integral Motion not only reflects Mohammad Natsir's political acumen but also demonstrates leadership oriented toward national interests (Fadlilah, 2020). In that context, Natsir placed national unity above the political interests of certain groups or factions. This is proof that policies based on integrity and a commitment to the common good can create strategic decisions that have a long-term impact on the country (Hasanah & Mufarohah, 2024).

The implications of the Integral Motion are enormous for Indonesia. First, this motion reaffirms the importance of unity in diversity (Hasan et al., 2024). With a federal system, Indonesia faces the threat of disintegration because each state has significant autonomy and the potential to develop into its own political entity. With the return of the Republic of Indonesia, the government structure became more centralized, making it easier to coordinate in building more effective national policies. Second, the Integral Motion proves that leadership with integrity can overcome complex political crises

(Hasan et al., 2024). In the history of world politics, many countries have experienced prolonged conflicts due to ideological differences or unstable systems of government. Indonesia, thru the Integral Motion, was able to resolve these differences without resorting to armed conflict or a prolonged civil war. Third, the Integral Motion provides a foundation for a national political model that prioritizes deliberation and consensus (Aulia & Rizqi, 2022). The decision to return Indonesia to the form of a Unitary Republic of Indonesia (NKRI) was not made unilaterally, but thru parliamentary mechanisms and involved various parties in the decision-making process. This reflects that the principles of deliberative democracy have been applied since the beginning of Indonesia's political journey.

Additionally, the Integral Motion also had a significant impact on the formation of a more stable and accessible government system. With the end of the United States of Indonesia (RIS) form of government and Indonesia's return to being a unitary state, the central government gained greater authority to regulate and direct national policies comprehensively. This has a positive impact on the effectiveness of decision-making, particularly in sectoral strategies as national development, domestic security, and improving people's welfare (Hasan et al., 2024). Centralization of authority allows the government to formulate more consistent, equitable, and coordinated policies across regions. Additionally, responses to various challenges, whether threats of disintegration, horizontal conflict, or external pressure from the international community, can be carried out more quickly and decisively because they are no longer fragmented by differences in national interests. In the long run, this condition also strengthens the legitimacy of the central government and strengthens the nation's foundation in navigating national political and development dynamics sustainably.

From an economic perspective, the Integrated Motion plays a strategic role in unifying the direction and implementation of fiscal and national economic policies. Before reintegration into the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia (NKRI), the federal system implemented allowed each state to pursue separate economic policies that tended to focus solely on regional interests. This creates imbalances, inefficiencies in resource allocation, and fragmentation in national development. Mosi Integral became an important momentum to end this discoordination. After Indonesia reverted to a unitary state, the central government gained greater authority to consolidate economic policies in a concise and integrated manner. Thus, national development planning and implementation can be carried out more effectively and evenly across all regions of Indonesia, reducing regional disparities and strengthening the foundation for inclusive and sustainable economic growth (Harahap, 2022).

However, despite bringing many positive impacts, the Integral Motion also faces various challenges. Not everyone agreed with the dissolution of the Republic of Indonesia, especially groups who wanted greater autonomy for their regions. Some regions like Sumatra and Sulawesi briefly showed dissatisfaction with the more centralized system, which later developed into separatist movements in the following years (Ma'arif, 2020).

On the other hand, the return to a unitary system after the Integral Motion also demands that the central government be more responsive and adaptable to the needs and

aspirations of the regions throughout Indonesia. Although the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia (NKRI) system is intended to strengthen national integration, in practice there are often criticisms of its implementation, particularly regarding the tendency toward excessive centralization of power in the hands of the central government. This centralization results in minimal regional participation in the national policy-making process, as well as a feeling of marginalization among both local governments and the local community. Inequality in the distribution of resources, authority, and access to development is one of the tangible impacts of an overly centralized model of governance. This condition then triggered demands for stronger decentralization, which began to gain momentum during the Reform era toward the end of the 20th century. Thru decentralization, it was hoped that a more democratic, participatory, and culturally sensitive system of government would be created, as well as one that was responsive to the specific needs of each region (Suriadi et al., 2023).

In the era of modern democracy, the values contained in the Integral Motion are still very relevant. Indonesia is currently facing significant challenges, including increasingly sharp political polarization, the rise of identity politics, and transactional political practices that erode leadership integrity (Rahmadhani et al., 2024). The spirit of integration championed by Natsir can serve as an inspiration for today's leaders in prioritizing national interests above group or class interests.

In addition, the principle of deliberation and consensus, which is the foundation of the Integral Motion, also needs to be applied in addressing contemporary political conflicts. Currently, ideological and interest differences often lead to deadlocks in the decision-making process in both parliament and government. The dialogical approach, as applied by Natsir in proposing the Integral Motion, can be a solution to reduce political tensions and build more inclusive policies (Hasan et al., 2024).

Furthermore, the Integral Motion can serve as a model for building national integration policies based on togetherness and nationality (Latif et al., 2024). As a historic initiative that marked the political landscape in the journey of the Indonesian nation, the Integral Motion reflects the importance of unity in diversity, as well as the ability of the political elite at that time to prioritize collective interests over fragmented interests. Amidst the dynamics of globalization and digitalization, which are increasingly accelerating social disintegration, identity polarization, and increasing challenges to national cohesion, the integration of values contained in the Integral Motion can be used as a normative reference and strategic inspiration in formulating policies that strengthen solidarity and deepen the bonds of friendship. By using the Integral Motion as a reference, the government and stakeholders can reaffirm their commitment to the values of unity, deliberation, and social justice as the foundation for inclusive national policies that are oriented toward the sustainability of national and state life.

Mosi Integral Mohammad Natsir is not just a historical event, but also an intellectual and political legacy that must continue to be studied and applied (Waskito, 2023). The success of this motion in reuniting Indonesia can be a valuable lesson for the next generation of leaders about the importance of prioritizing integrity and national interests in every political policy. By emulating the spirit of integration championed by Natsir, Indonesia can face contemporary political challenges with greater solidarity and

a focus on the broader national interest.

The National Movement in the Perspective of the Integral

Motion Mohammad Natsir's Integral Motion was not merely a political instrument to merge the federal state into a unitary state. Mosi Integral is a symbol of the struggle for unity and social justice, capable of uniting various interests within the framework of national identity (Pangestu & Sudrajat, 2020). Natsir realized that after Indonesia's independence in 1945, the country faced political fragmentation and the threat of disintegration, primarily due to the federal structure of the United States of Indonesia (RIS), which was seen as fragile and did not reflect the aspirations of the majority of the people. In this context, the Integral Motion became a historic momentum that affirmed the importance of returning to the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia (NKRI) in order to maintain national sovereignty and unity.

The core values contained in the Integral Motion are unity and social (Fajri et al., 2024). Unity serves as the pillar that binds ethnic, religious, and cultural diversity, while social justice serves as the foundation for avoiding the dominance of certain groups and ensuring that all elements of society have a fair place in national life. Natsir was not only thinking about immediate political engineering, but also about how to lay the foundations for a nation that could endure in the long term. This shows that the Integral Motion has relevance far beyond the political situation of 1950, as its values continue to resonate in the face of modern political fragmentation.

Political fragmentation in the contemporary era manifests in more complex forms compared to the early days of independence. If in 1950 fragmentation was primarily caused by the federal structure imposed thru the results of the Round Table Conference, now fragmentation arises from electoral political polarization, differences in party ideology, and the development of identity politics. This polarization has the potential to weaken national solidarity if not managed well. Therefore, Natsir's idea in the Integral Motion about the importance of unity is still very relevant. Unity doesn't mean erasing differences, but rather making them a collective strength to build a stronger nation.

In the face of modern political fragmentation, the value of unity offered by the Integral Motion can serve as a moral and political guide. For example, in situations where electoral contests often lead to social divisions between supporters of certain candidates, the Integral Motion reminds us that the most important thing is to maintain national unity above short-term political interests. The national unity fought for by Natsir emphasizes that Indonesian nationality can only survive if social solidarity is continuously maintained (Setyaningsih, 2016). Solidarity must be built on the principle of social justice, because unity without justice will breed dissatisfaction and potentially trigger horizontal conflict.

To understand the relevance of the Integral Motion, it's important to see how its values are reflected in the national movement in the modern era. One of the clearest examples is the 1998 Reform Movement. Reformasi was born from the accumulation of public frustration with the New Order regime, which was considered to be stifling democracy, perpetuating corruption, collusion, and nepotism, and broadly closing off space for popular participation (Dewi, 2024). The 1998 Reformasi became a turning

point in the resurgence of the national movement because millions of people from various backgrounds united to demand change. In this regard, the unity of the people that transcends ethnic, religious, and class boundaries reflects a spirit aligned with the Integral Motion. If the Integral Motion united Indonesia from federalism back to unity, then the 1998 Reform united the people to break free from the shackles of authoritarianism toward a more open democracy.

The fundamental similarity between the Integral Motion and the 1998 Reform lies in the collective spirit of building a better future for the nation thru unity. Natsir believed that the survival of the Republic of Indonesia depended on the nation's ability to maintain unity amidst diversity, while reform showed that democracy could only be upheld if the people united against structural injustice. The 1998 Reformation also affirmed the relevance of the principle of social justice, which is the spirit of the Integral Motion, because the main demands of society at that time were for clean, transparent governance that favored the welfare of the people (Rustamana et al., 2023). Reformasi can be seen as a modern national movement that revived the values of Mosi Integral in a different context.

In addition to reform, the values of Mosi Integral also found expression in civil society movements in the digital era. One prominent example is MAFINDO (Indonesian Anti-Defamation Society). Amidst the rapid flow of information and disinformation on social media, MAFINDO emerges as a collective movement of the community to combat hoaxes, slander, and hate speech that have the potential to divide the nation (Ardi et al., 2023). Modern political fragmentation occurs not only in physical space but also in digital space, where polarization and misinformation often exacerbate ideological and political differences. MAFINDO's presence is an answer to this challenge, promoting the values of unity, information justice, and national solidarity (Okditazeini, 2022).

The MAFINDO movement has direct relevance to the Integral Motion because both place national unity as the primary goal. If in 1950 the Integral Motion overcame political fragmentation caused by the federal system, then in the digital era MAFINDO seeks to overcome social fragmentation caused by false information that damages social cohesion (Okditazeini, 2022). MAFINDO not only checks facts but also educates the public to be wiser in using social media, so that the digital public space does not become a field of division, but rather an arena for strengthening democracy. MAFINDO is a real representation of how the values of unity and solidarity in the Integral Motion can be revived within the sphere of modern democracy.

These two examples, the 1998 reforms and the MAFINDO movement, show that the values of the Integral Motion are not only historically relevant, but also contextual in facing the challenges of the times. Reformasi emphasizes the importance of people's unity in opposing authoritarian regimes, while MAFINDO highlights the importance of civil society solidarity in maintaining information integrity and strengthening digital democracy (Amilin, 2020). Both illustrate that unity and social justice are not static concepts, but rather dynamic principles that can serve as inspiration for various forms of national movements in the modern era.

The Mosi Integral of Mohammad Natsir must be understood not only as a political document, but also as a living legacy of thot that continues to guide the nation's

journey. In the face of modern political fragmentation, both in the form of electoral polarization and digital disinformation, the values of unity and social justice contained in the Mosi Integral remain a fundamental foundation. Reactualizing the Integral Motion means bringing back the spirit of inclusive, just, and common-interest-oriented national solidarity, as Natsir once fought for over seven decades ago.

Reactualizing Mohammad Natsir's Integral Motion in Responding to the Challenges of Modern

Democracy Modern democracy in Indonesia has faced increasingly complex challenges since the Reform eraThe political system built after the fall of the New Order did manage to open up a wider space for civil liberties and political participation, but at the same time it also gave rise to political polarization, oligarchy dominance, and the spread of digital disinformation (Simanjuntak, 2015). These challenges are not only technical in the administration of government, but also test the foundation of national values that have been the main basis for the establishment of Indonesia from the beginning. It is in this perspective that Mohammad Natsir's Integral Motion, which originated in 1950, finds renewed relevance. Mosi Integral not only served as a historical event that united Indonesia from a federal system to a unitary state, but also as a legacy of thot offering fundamental values as unity, social justice, and deliberation. These values, if re-actualized, can be the answer to the problems of modern Indonesian democracy, especially when read thru the theoretical framework of deliberative democracy, which emphasizes the importance of political communication, dialog, and consensus in maintaining political legitimacy.

One of the main challenges facing Indonesian democracy today is the increasingly sharp political polarization. This polarization is evident in every electoral contest, where differences in political choices often lead to deep social divisions. Religious, ethnic, and ideological identities are used massively by political elites to gain support, but the long-term impact is a weakening of social cohesion. Polarization doesn't just happen in formal public spaces like political campaigns; it also extends to private spaces, even families and communities, which are divided by differences in political affiliation. Social media exacerbates this situation by providing fertile ground for the spread of hate speech, hoaxes, and slander (Yunus et al., 2023). Instead of being a healthy means of political communication, the digital space often turns into an arena for identity battles that deepen social segregation. This phenomenon reflects the fragility of democracy in Indonesia, as healthy deliberative democracy should be able to manage differences thru dialog, not exacerbate them into social conflict.

Beside political polarization, the dominance of the oligarchy is also a serious problem in Indonesian democracy. Although the people are given full rights to directly elect their leaders, in practice access to power is still heavily influenced by a small group of elites with economic power and political networks (Marhamah et al., 2024). Democracy, which is supposed to place the sovereignty of the people in a central position, is often co-opted by elite interests (Koho, 2021). The political process that is taking place more closely reflects negotiations between oligarchies rather than the representation of the aspirations of the wider public. The gap between the people and the

elite is widening, leading to public dissatisfaction with the effectiveness of democracy in achieving prosperity. This condition shows that Indonesian democracy is still largely procedural. Elections are held regularly and formally, but their substance in creating

Social justice and equitable prosperity is still far from expectations. The third increasingly prominent challenge is the spread of digital disinformation. The development of information technology is bringing about radical changes in the patterns of political communication (Elizamiharti & Nelfira, 2023). Social media has become the primary space where public opinion is formed, but unfortunately, this space is rife with information manipulation. Hoaxes, slander, and hate speech spread so quickly, often used as political weapons to bring down opponents (Yunus et al., 2023). This situation undermines the integrity of democracy because public opinion is no longer formed based on facts or rational arguments, but by false narratives that are systematically produced. In the long run, this can erode public trust in democratic institutions and trigger political instability.

Amidst these challenges, the values contained in Mohammad Natsir's Integral Motion become highly relevant to be revived. First, the value of unity, which is the core of the Integral Motion, can serve as a foundation for addressing political polarization (Hasanah & Mufarohah, 2024). Unity does not mean erasing differences in identity, but rather making them a collective strength that sustains the nation's continuity. In situations where society is divided due to identity politics, the value of unity reminds us that the interests of the nation must be placed above the interests of certain groups or factions. Second, the value of social justice inherent in the Integral Motion can be a critique of oligarchic domination (Pangestu & Sudrajat, 2020). Healthy democracy must be substantive, meaning it not only ensures the electoral process runs smoothly but also ensures that public policies favor the welfare of the wider community. Without social justice, democracy will only become an arena for elite struggles that do not provide real benefits to the people (Abdullah, 2025). Third, the value of deliberation emphasizes that politics should be conducted in a spirit of dialog and consensus (Aulia & Rizqi, 2022). In the face of digital disinformation, deliberation can serve as a guide for building a healthy public space where differing viewpoints are processed thru rational communication, rather than a battle of false narratives.

The reactualization of the values of the Integral Motion can be understood more deeply by using the perspective of deliberative democracy theory proposed by Jürgen Habermas. Habermas emphasizes that "legitimacy rests on the discursive process of opinion- and will-formation, in which the only force is the force of the better argument" (Habermas, 1996). This quote shows that political legitimacy can only be obtained thru a process of rational public communication free from domination. In this framework, politics is not just about electoral procedures, but also the quality of public dialog that takes place within the political process. True democracy demands that public decisions arise from a discursive process that allows all parties to present their arguments equally.

Mosi Integral can be seen as a real-world example of deliberative practice in Indonesian political history. Natsir proposed the idea of national integration thru parliamentary mechanisms, not thru military force. Natsir successfully gained the support of a parliamentary majority because his idea was presented rationally, with the argument

that national unity was more important than maintaining a fragile federal structure. This process aligns with the principles of deliberative democracy, where political legitimacy is obtained thru deliberation and consensus. Mosi Integral not only saved Indonesia from the threat of disintegration but also demonstrated that political deliberation can be an effective means of overcoming national crises.

If the values of the Integral Motion are read thru the perspective of deliberative democracy, several important lessons can be drawn for Indonesian democracy today. The value of unity contained in the Integral Motion aligns with the deliberative principle of the importance of building social cohesion thru dialog. In the face of political polarization, unity must be maintained by opening up space for cross-identity communication. Deliberative democracy rejects exclusivity and prioritizes inclusivity, ensuring that all identities are recognized and respected in the political process (Haliim, 2016). The value of social justice aligns with the demands of deliberative democracy, ensuring that democracy does not stop at procedure but delivers substantive public policies that benefit the wider community. Oligarchic dominance clearly contradicts this principle, as it transforms democracy into an exclusive arena for the elite. Therefore, re-actualizing the Integral Motion with an emphasis on social justice can serve as a normative critique of the oligarchy that is weakening Indonesian democracy. Furthermore, the value of deliberation championed by Natsir aligns with the deliberative principle regarding the importance of healthy political communication. Habermas himself emphasizes that deliberation is only possible if "participants enter the discourse free from coercion, with equal opportunity to speak, and with a genuine orientation toward understanding" (Habermas, 1990). This principle inspires the construction of more rational digital public spaces, where differences in perspective are managed thru dialog, not thru the battle of hoaxes.

Mosi Integral is not only relevant in the Indonesian history but also in modern democracy. Its values align with the principles of deliberative democracy, which emphasize the importance of dialog, consensus, and social justice in building political legitimacy. Reactualizing the Integral Motion means bringing back the deliberative spirit in the face of contemporary challenges, from political polarization to digital disinformation. Indonesian democracy will only survive if it can move from proceduralism to deliberative processes, from formality to substance. By emulating the spirit of unity, social justice, and deliberation as contained in the Integral Motion, Indonesia can build a healthier, more inclusive, and sustainable democracy.

Conclusion

This research concludes that Mohammad Natsir's Integral Motion was a significant milestone in Indonesian political history because it successfully reunited the nation from a federal system toward a unitary state. The values it contains, namely unity, social justice, and deliberation, are not only relevant in the 1950s but also offer normative solutions to the challenges of modern democracy. In the face of political polarization, identity politics, oligarchic dominance, and digital disinformation, the Integral Motion can be reactualized by reaffirming the importance of placing national interests above group interests, building inclusive social solidarity, and ensuring justice as the foundation

of public policy. Mosi Integral is not only understood as a historical instrument, but also as a political legacy that can serve as a reference in maintaining national cohesion.

The reactualization of the Integral Motion will be even stronger when read thru the perspective of deliberative democracy theory, which emphasizes rational communication, inclusive dialog, and the pursuit of consensus. Natsir demonstrated that true political legitimacy is born from a deliberative process, not coercion, when the motion he proposed was accepted thru the support of a parliamentary majority. This is the principle that needs to be revived to strengthen Indonesian democracy so that it doesn't get stuck in mere formal proceduralism. By emulating the deliberative values of the Integral Motion, Indonesia can build a more substantive, participatory, and socially just democracy, while also preserving national unity in the face of increasingly complex global and domestic challenges.

References

Abdullah. (2025). Reformasi Hukum dalam Cengkeraman Oligarki: Menelusuri Kesenjangan Legitimasi Konstitusional dan Kepentingan Elite. *Jurnal Serambi Hukum*, *18*(01), 85–100.

Adan, H. Y., & Jalil, H. (2019). *Mosi integral Mohammad Natsir: Upaya perpaduan ummah dan bangsa dalam NKRI* (Ed. 1, Cet. 1). 'Adnin Foundation Publisher Aceh.

Amilin, A. (2020). Pengaruh Hoaks Politik dalam Era Post-Truth terhadap Ketahanan Nasional dan Dampaknya pada Kelangsungan Pembangunan Nasional. *Jurnal Lemhannas RI*, *7*(3), 5–11. https://doi.org/10.55960/jlri.v7i3.73

Ardi, I. M., Mulyaning Ati, R., Rhangga, A., Anggraini, P., & Eka Syahputra, H. (2023). Literasi Digital sebagai Upaya Kritis Memrangi Berita Bohong: Studi Terhadap Gerakan Masyarakat Anti Fitnah Indonesia (MAFINDO). *KOMUNIKA*, *10*(2), 145–153. https://doi.org/10.22236/komunika.v10i2.10756

Aulia, R., & Rizqi, R. (2022). Pemikiran Agama nan Negara Mohammad Natsir. *Siyasah Jurnal Hukum Tatanegara*, *2*(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.32332/siyasah.v2i1.5113

Creswell, J. W. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage Publication.

Dewi, N. K. (2024). Reformasi 1998: Transisi dari Orde Baru ke Era Demokrasi di Indonesia. *Historia Vitae*, *4*(2), 76–90.

Elizamiharti, E., & Nelfira, N. (2023). Demokrasi Di Era Digital: Tantangan Dan Peluang Dalam Partisipasi Politik. *Jurnal Riset Multidisiplin Dan Inovasi Teknologi*, *2*(01), 61–72. https://doi.org/10.59653/jimat.v2i01.342

Fadlilah, S. N. (2020). Kepemimpinan Da'wah Mohammad Natsir. *Jurnal Da'wah: Risalah Merintis, Da'wah Melanjutkan*, *2*(01), 69–94. https://doi.org/10.38214/jurnaldawahstidnatsir.v2i01.45

Fajri, N. F., Sinurat, J. Y., & Istiana, K. (2024). Pemikiran Muhammad Natsir dalam Sejarah Politik Indonesia 1930-1950. *KRINOK: Jurnal Pendidikan Sejarah & Sejarah FKIP UNJA*, *3*(2), 165–175. https://doi.org/Doi: 10.22437/krinok.v3i2.36368

Gani, F. A. D., & Sembiring, M. Y. G. (2023). Mengenal Identitas dan Integrasi Nasional Indonesia. *Indigenous Knowledge*, *1*(2), 166–178.

Habermas, J. (1990). *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action*. MIT Press.

Habermas, J. (1996). *Between facts and norms: Contributions to a discourse theory of law and democracy*. The MIT Press.

Hakim, R., & Prasetyo, B. (2021). *Tantangan Integrasi Nasional di Era Digital*. Gramedia.

Haliim, W. (2016). Demokrasi Deliberatif Indonesia: Konsep Partisipasi Masyarakat dalam Membentuk Demokrasi dan Hukum yang Responsif. *Masyarakat Indonesia*, *42*(1), 16–30.

Harahap, F. (2022). The Historical Context of the 2022 Integral Motion in Indonesia. *Southeast Asian History*, *13*(2), 150–165.

Hasan, Z., Aryandhana, D. A., Saputra, I. N. O. A., Silpiani, Y., & Al-Zahra, R. Z. (2024). Peran Mosi Integral Yang di Usulkan Muhamad Natsir Pada Tahun 1956 Untuk Keutuhan Negara Kesatuan Republik Indonesia. *Jaksa: Jurnal Kajian Ilmu Hukum dan Politik*, *2*(3), 50–69. https://doi.org/DOI: https://doi.org/10.51903/jaksa.v2i3.1871

Hasanah, U., & Mufarohah, S. (2024). Dari Tanah Minang Hingga Bandung: Biografi dan Pemikiran Muhammad Natsir. *El Tarikh : Journal of History, Culture and Islamic Civilization*, *5*(2), 135. https://doi.org/10.24042/jhcc.v5i2.21469

Hidayat, S. (2025). Demokrasi di Indonesia: Tantangan dan Solusi. *JOCER: Journal of Civic Education Research*, *3*(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.60153/jocer.v3i1.99

Koho, I. R. (2021). Oligarki Dalam Demokrasi Indonesia. *Lensa*, *15*(1), 60–73. https://doi.org/10.58872/lensa.v15i1.6

Latif, M., Pramono, M. F., Rohman, M. N., & Reza, A. (2024). Merajut Persatuan Indonesia Dalam Momentum Mosi Integral Mohammad Natsir. *Journal for Islamic Studies*, *7*(1), 841–854. https://doi.org/10.31943/afkarjournal.v7i1.884

Ma'arif, Z. I. (2020). *Revolusi Kebangsaan: Telaah Konsep Persatuan Mohammad Natsir (1908-1993)* [Skripsi]. UIN SUSKA RIAU.

Marhamah, I., Wijayanti, A. S., Ristyawati, M. S., Bardana, S. A., & Sari, D. P. (2024). Analisis Prinsip Demokrasi Dalam Konstitusi Indonesia: Tinjauan Terhadap Implementasi dan Tantangannya. *Intellektika : Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa*, *2*(6), 132–143. https://doi.org/10.59841/intellektika.v2i6.2020

Moleong, L. J. (2017). *Metodologi penelitian kualitatif*. Remaja Rosdakarya.

Nino, M. (2024). Demokrasi Deliberatif Juergen Habermas dan Relevansinya Bagi Demokrasi Pancasila. *Jurnal Akademika*, *23*(2), 50–62.

Okditazeini, V. (2022). The Role of Mafindo (Masyarakat Anti Fitnah Indonesia) in Maintaining Religious Harmony. *Analisa: Journal of Social Science and Religion*, *7*(1), 19–35. https://doi.org/10.18784/analisa.v7i1.1575

Pangestu, D. A., & Sudrajat, A. (2020). Mohammad Natsir: Konsep Hubungan antara Negara dan Islam dalam Mosi Integral Natsir. *JRP (Jurnal Review Politik)*, *10*(1), 69–87. https://doi.org/10.15642/jrp.2020.10.1.69-87

Rahmadhani, A., Tarigan, F. S. B., Gorat, L. M. B., Sinaga, N. N., & Zai, F. P. D. (2024). Politik Identitas dan Polarisasi Dalam Pemilu. *Indonesian Journal of Education*

and *Development* *Research*, *3*(1), 364–369. https://doi.org/10.57235/ijedr.v3i1.4671

Ramadhan, A. (2018). *Mosi Integral Mohammad Natsir: Model Integrasi Negara dalam Sejarah Politik Indonesia*. Mizan.

Rustamana, H. A., Adillah, P. M., & Zatua, Z. (2023). 1998 Reform Movement. *Indonesian Journal of Applied and Industrial Sciences (ESA)*, *2*(6), 543–562. https://doi.org/10.55927/esa.v2i6.6880

Setyaningsih, E. (2016). Perjuangan dan Pemikiran Politik Mohammad Natsir (1907-1993). *Jurnal Tapis: Jurnal Teropong Aspirasi Politik Islam*, *12*(2), 73–94.

Simanjuntak, K. M. (2015). Implementasi Kebijakan Desentralisasi Pemerintahan di Indonesia. *Jurnal Bina Praja*, *7*(2), 111–130.

Sukma, F., & Saparuli. (2021). Menimbang Demokrasi Deliberatif dalam Proses Pembentukan Hukum yang Demokratis di Indonesia. *IBLAM Law Review*, *1*(3), 140–154. https://doi.org/10.15408/ushuluna.v2i2.15180

Suriadi, H., Magriasti, L., & Frinaldi, A. (2023). Sejarah Perkembangan Desentralisasi dan Otonomi Daerah di Indonesia. *Jurnal Media Ilmu*, *2*(2), 193–210.

Suryanegara, A. M. (2019). *Pengaruh Pemikiran Mohammad Natsir terhadap Politik Islam di Indonesia*. Ombak.

Waskito, T. (2023). Institusionalisasi pemikiran pendidikan Mohammad Natsir ke dalam lembaga Pendidikan Tinggi Islam di Indonesia. *Ta'dibuna: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, *12*(3), 285–303. https://doi.org/10.32832/tadibuna.v12i3.13829

Wingarta, I. P. S., Helmy, B., Hartono, D., Mertadana, I. W., & Wicaksono, R. (2021). Pengaruh Politik Identitas terhadap Demokrasi di Indonesia. *Jurnal Lembaga Ketahanan Nasional Republik Indonesia*, *9*(4), 117–124. https://doi.org/DOI: https://doi.org/10.55960/jlri.v9i4.419

Yunus, F. M., Yasin, T. H., & Rijal, S. (2023). Politik Identitas dan Politisasi Agama dalam Konteks Pemilu di Indonesia. *Jurnal Sosiologi Dialektika Sosial*, *9*(2), 121–137. https://doi.org/DOI. 10.29103/jsds.v9i2.12590