

THE NATSIR INTEGRAL MOTION IN GEOPOLITICAL PERSPECTIVE

Pepen Irpan Fauzan, Ahmad Khoirul Fata** & Riffki Abror Ananda****

* Sekolah Tinggi Agama Islam Persatuan Islam Garut, Indonesia

** Institut Agama Islam Negeri Sultan Amai Gorontalo, Indonesia

*** Universitas Islam Negeri Imam Bonjol Padang, Indonesia

Email: ppnrpn@gmail.com

Abstract

The peaceful transformation of the Republic of the United States of Indonesia (RIS) into the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia (NKRI) represents a defining milestone in the nation's post-independence trajectory. This study examines the pivotal role of Mohammad Natsir, a leading Islamic intellectual and statesman, who initiated the Integral Motion that catalyzed Indonesia's reunification. Through historical and socio-political analysis, this research explores the political strategies, diplomatic negotiations, and moral convictions that shaped Natsir's leadership during this critical period. Utilizing a qualitative methodology rooted in the social-scientific history paradigm, the study combines historical inquiry with structuralist theory to analyze both the internal fragmentation and external pressures that Indonesia faced in the early years of its independence. The findings reveal Natsir's instrumental role not only as a political leader but also as a key architect of national integration. His ability to mediate between federalist and unitarian forces, while maintaining a vision grounded in moral and ideological commitment, proved crucial in resolving divisive tensions. By fostering consensus among RIS constituent states, Natsir's initiative laid the groundwork for a unified Indonesian state, steering the nation toward political consolidation and stability. This research contributes to a deeper understanding of Indonesia's early state-building efforts and underscores the urgent need to revisit and recognize the foundational roles of key national figures in shaping modern Indonesia. In an era of renewed interest in national identity and cohesion, Natsir's legacy

offers valuable insights into leadership, diplomacy, and the pursuit of unity through peaceful means.

Keywords: geopolitical perspective; Natsir integral motion; NKRI

Received: March 14, 2024; Revised: May 07, 2024; Accepted: 03 June, 2024

Introduction

On April 3, 1950, a motion was submitted to the parliament of the Republic of the United States of Indonesia (RIS). The motion, later known as the “Natsir Integral Motion,” became the gateway to the dissolution of the RIS and the formation (or reformation) of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia (NKRI) (Abdurrahim 2023). This event serves as compelling evidence that Islamic figures, such as Natsir, are true nationalists. Thus, juxtaposing Islam with nationalism is a foolish act because history proves how much Indonesia owes to Islamic figures. The significant role of Islam for Indonesia is acknowledged by many scholars, such as Merle C. Ricklefs and Howard M. Federspiel (Ricklefs 2008; Federspiel 2001). Even the study of Wahyudin, Maimun and Mat Jalil concluded that the Islamic humanism is highly relevant in Indonesian context which upholds the life philosophy of Pancasila (Wahyudin et al. 2019).

There are numerous studies that discuss Natsir’s role in reunifying Indonesia into the NKRI, such as those conducted by Syahrul Adli (Adli 2023) and Murjoko (Murjoko 2020). Both delve into the historical background of the motion’s issuance, the process of Natsir persuading the heads of the constituent states and leaders of the RIS to agree to return to the NKRI. The success in convincing the leaders of the constituent states and the RIS highlights Natsir’s communication prowess (Tobroni 2017).

According to Pangestu and Sudrajat, Natsir voiced the motion not only out of concern over the turmoil among the divided people in various constituent states but also inspired by his paradigm regarding the relationship between religion and the state. In Natsir’s view, as Pangestu and Sudrajat wrote, the primary task of the state is to unite and prosper the people. However, the existence of the RIS actually caused unrest among the people, making it difficult to achieve both goals. Hence, Natsir sought to reunite all regions into the NKRI (Pangestu & Sudrajat 2020). Integral Motion was not only about unifying territories; it was also part of

Natsir's efforts to unite the Muslim community in the former Dutch East Indies territories (Adan & Jalil 2019). The positive impact of Natsir's Integral Motion is also revealed by Latief, Pramono, and Kusuma (Latief et al. 2024).

Research on the Integral Motion by Natsir has been conducted by many researchers. Murjoko's study (2020) focuses on the debate over the form of the state in Natsir's Integral Motion, particularly regarding the term "unitary state". His study tends to lack detail in explaining the political background surrounding the event, both locally and nationally, thus not representing an adequate explanation of political history. Likewise, the studies conducted by Adan and Jalil (2019) and Latief, Pramono, Kusuma (2024) emphasize the significance of the political role of Natsir, but there was no discussion of the political context behind it. Meanwhile, Pangestu and Sudrajat's study (2020) analyzed the Natsir's Integral Motion incident from the perspective of the state's relationship with religion (Islam), but this is not a new finding. In fact, it could blur historical facts, as Natsir's Integral Motion was also supported by secular political actors and even adherents of other religions, not just Muslims.

However, from what we have observed, existing studies still revolve around the history of the dissolution process of the RIS and the reestablishment of the NKRI through the Integral Motion by Natsir, as well as its benefits for Indonesian unity. So far, we have not encountered research that examines the Integral Motion by Natsir in the context of the dynamics of regional, interregional, and international relations (geopolitics). In fact, geopolitically, there is contestation at the domestic level and international pressure which greatly influences the political policies of a country, including those of Indonesia (Alvian & Ardhani 2023).

This gap is what we seek to address through this article. Therefore, this study discusses the Integral Motion by Natsir within the geopolitical context of that time. A geopolitical perspective will provide a deeper understanding of the complexity of the political events behind Natsir's Integral Motion in Indonesia.

Research Method

This article employs a historical method with several steps: selecting a topic, heuristic, source criticism, interpretation, and historiography (Kuntowijoyo 2005, 91). A qualitative approach is used, incorporating a

multidisciplinary framework, specifically social-scientific history approach. This historical approach is synchronized (extended in time) with the theories and concepts from the social and political sciences that are synchronistic, focusing on the study of structuralism. In an attempt to place synchronic conditions in a synchronic context, the writing of this history is based on chronology. However, to present a historical-interconnective approach, this chronological method is combined with the thematic arrangement of writing. Using this interdisciplinary research model allows for a more comprehensive examination of both continuity (diachronic) and structural changes (synchronic). Consequently, this method acknowledges that alongside diachronic continuity, there have been significant synchronic changes (Latif 2012, 47)

Results and Discussion

The Socio-Political Background of Natsir

Natsir was born in Alahan Panjang, Solok, West Sumatra, on July 17, 1908. His early education began at the Sekolah Rakyat (People's School) in Maninjau for two years until second grade, then he moved to the Hollandsch-Inlandsche School (HIS) Adabiyah in Padang. After a few months, he moved again to Solok and stayed at the house of Haji Musa. In addition to studying at HIS Solok during the day, he also studied Islamic knowledge at a Madrasah Diniyah in the evenings. Three years later, he moved back to HIS Padang with his brother. In 1923, he continued his education at Meer Uitgebred Lager Onderwijs (MULO). After graduating from MULO, he moved to Bandung to study at the Algemeene Middelbare School (AMS) until he graduated in 1930. During his time at AMS and afterwards, from 1928 to 1932, he served as the chairman of the Bandung branch of the Jong Islamieten Bond (JIB) (Mahendra 1995; Kahin 1993; Nursahid & Fata 2020).

According to Taufik Abdullah, Natsir's life story unfolded in three stages: as a defender of religion, as a teacher, and as a politician. In the first two stages, Natsir was heavily involved in the Persatuan Islam (PERSIS) organization (Abdullah 1996, 27). Natsir was a product of PERSIS's cadreship under the guiding hand of A. Hassan (Fauzan et al. 2020). Under A. Hassan's guidance, Natsir learned to argue and became a skilled writer in his time. This was acknowledged by Natsir himself: "...from Mr. Hassan, one thing that greatly impressed me was his way of

encouraging me to progress... he always discussed and encouraged me to keep thinking" (Yani et al. 2023).

Supported by PERSIS, young Natsir established a modern Islamic education institution called PENDIS, which was based on Islamic principles. Natsir played a crucial role in transforming Persis from its initial character as a study club into a modern organization as it is known today. Natsir also contributed to the drafting of the articles of association (AD/ART) submitted to the Dutch East Indies Judiciary Assembly, aiming for PERSIS to be recognized as a legal-formal organization (Bachtiar & Fauzan 2019, 121; Saefulloh & Muaripin 2022).

Since the Japanese era, Natsir had been associated with senior figures in both the Islamic and nationalist movements. Thanks to the goodwill of Mohamad Hatta, Natsir was appointed as an official in the Education Bureau of Bandung City. Hatta also advocated for Natsir to be appointed as the Secretary of the Islamic Higher School in Jakarta to the Japanese Government (Hatta 1987, 326; Waskito 2023). Therefore, he actively engaged with Islamic figures in facing the politically unstable situation leading up to and after the Proclamation of Independence on August 17, 1945.

After the issuance of the Vice President's Proclamation on November 3, 1945, which encouraged the establishment of political parties (Hatta 1987, 437; Hidayat & Gumilar 2016; Adan et al. 2023), Islamic figures agreed to form a political party as a common tool for the struggle of the Muslim community. Subsequently, the Congress of Indonesian Muslim Community was held in Yogyakarta on November 7-8, 1945. Natsir served as the chairman of the committee, with members including Dr. Sukiman Wirjosandjojo, Abikusno Tjokrosujoso, A. Wahid Hasjim, Wali Alfatah, Sri Sultan Hamengkubuwono IX, Sri Paku Alam VIII, and A. Ghafar Ismail (Noor 2016; Rachmanto et al. 2023). The congress, attended by 500 people, resulted in the decision to establish the Masyumi Party as the sole political vehicle for the struggle of the Indonesian Muslim community (Fata 2020, 123; Rambe & Zulkarnain 2022).

Natsir also became a member of the central executive board of the Masyumi Party. In 1945-1946, Natsir was appointed as a member of the Working Committee of the Central Indonesian National Committee (*Badan Pekerja Komite Nasional Indonesia Pusat/BP KNIP*) (Sugiharto 2010). Natsir's political career flourished when he was invited to join the

government as Minister of Information in the Syahrir II Cabinet (March–October 1946), the Syahrir III Cabinet (October 1946–June 1947), and the Hatta I Cabinet (1948). Natsir's excellent performance was appreciated by many. Bung Hatta even wrote, “Bung Karno refused to sign a government statement if it was not drafted by Brother Natsir” (Hatta 1987, 204). Natsir grew into a great-moderate Indonesian Muslim politician (Setyaningsih 2016; Fauzan & Fata 2019; Nursahid & Fata 2020;). Islamic politics in Indonesia -which Natsir runs- has always been on a constitutional path (Mukrimin 2012).

The Integral Motion: Historical Geopolitical Context

Geopolitics fundamentally focuses on the political balance between regions or territories, both in international (inter-state) and regional (inter-regional) contexts. Linguistically, geopolitics has three meanings: (a) a study of the influence of factors such as geography, economics, and demography on the politics and particularly the foreign policy of a state; (b) a governmental policy guided by geopolitics; and (c) a combination of political and geographic factors related to something (such as a state or specific resources). Thus, geopolitics can be understood as the relationship between the meanings, values, and influences of political geography based on considerations of the benefits and losses of a country's national interests, particularly national security and economic prosperity (Hochberg & Sloan 2017; Fard 2021).

This perspective is relevant for analyzing the Integral Motion of Natsir in 1950. The Integral Motion is generally understood as a real-pragmatic political case, regardless of the normative-religious aspects or political ideology, contrary to the aforementioned conclusion drawn by Pangestu and Sudrajat. There is no ideological debate within it. Instead, the issue revolves around the conflict between the central government and the regions, intertwined with economic issues on both a macro (national) and micro scale in the regions. The problem becomes more complicated with the involvement of Western interests (the Netherlands and its allies).

The *Konferensi Meja Bundar* (KMB) in The Hague, Netherlands, in December 1949, agreed to transfer sovereignty over Indonesia from the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the Indonesian government. However, there were two major consequences that Indonesia had to bear: (1) the burden of debt from the Dutch East Indies Government to Indonesia, financing for 17 thousand former Dutch East Indies employees for two

years, and accommodating 26 thousand former KNIL (Dutch) soldiers; and (2) the newly established state in the former Dutch East Indies territory had to be based on federalism, including the formation of the Dutch-Indonesian Union. The RIS government was formed under the leadership of Mohammad Hatta, while Soekarno became the symbolic President (Tasnur & Fadli 2019; Gea et al. 2022).

These two consequences clearly gave rise to further political problems in the country. The economic situation of the new state, which was not yet stable, worsened with the “Sjafruddin Scissors” policy to address inflation caused by the existence of three types of currencies at that time (money issued during the Dutch East Indies era, NICA money, and ORI/*Oeang Republik Indonesia*). At the national level, this policy was quite successful, but not so in the regions. For example, in Sumatra, there were two social groups: those who had worked for the Dutch East Indies Government, who lived prosperously, and the “Republikens” who tended to be poor because they had to evacuate from the city due to the war with the Dutch. When the RIS was formed, the “Sjafruddin Scissors” policy actually benefited the former group and burdened the Republikens themselves (Fauziah 2023).

The Republikens in Sumatra who held the Indonesian Republic Provincial Sumatra Currency (*Uang Republik Indonesia Provinsi Sumatera/URIPS*) had to exchange their money for RIS money with a significant disadvantage: 1 federal Rupiah was equivalent to 125 URIPS. This disparity triggered large-scale demonstrations in Bukittinggi under the theme “*Nasi-Bungkus*” (packed rice). Similar conditions generally occurred in other regions as well (Amal 1992).

Complicated issues also arose within the military, both at the central and regional levels. The large number of military personnel, including former Republic fighters and ex-KNIL members, could not all be supported by the state. Therefore, during military rationalization, the majority selected were ex-KNIL because of their better military capabilities. Political jealousy certainly arose, because it was unlikely that the Republic faction would accept such an ironic political reality. Consequently, unrest emerged in various regions.

The second political issue was the principle of federalism for the newly sovereign Republic. Many questioned this principle, asking, “Why federal?” Considering Indonesia’s vast geographic expanse with diverse cultures, ethnicities, and religions, federalism seems suitable for

Indonesia. However, geopolitically, federalism could be detrimental to Indonesia. In the international context, it is undeniable that federalism was a scheme by Western capitalist groups (the Netherlands and its allies) to maintain their political grip in the East—specifically Indonesia. This is evidenced by the numerous RIS constituent units modeled after the Dutch system and predominantly filled with former Dutch East Indies officials, or at the very least individuals cooperative with the Netherlands (Amal 1992, 39-40).

The fact that the establishment of a federal state was the result of van Mook's engineering (a Dutch intellectual), according to Taufik Abdullah, eliminated the historical and cultural legitimacy for those states. Federalism is also seen as a 'colonial stain' that is worthless in the eyes of most people, despite attempts to justify it with historical, cultural, and other arguments (Abdullah 1998, 119).

The regional geopolitical situation was also unfavorable for the RIS. The unfavorable economic conditions for the Republicans, the domination of administrative and military officials in the regions by Dutch individuals, and the federal system accused of being Dutch-engineered, were a "time bomb" for the existence of the RIS. Regions were in turmoil. Demonstrations occurred everywhere with demands to return to the unitary system of the Republic of Indonesia (RI): unitary, not federalist. As we entered 1950, one by one, the states fell and joined the centralized RI based in Yogyakarta. By April 1950, only the *Negara Sumatera Timur* (NST) and the *Negara Indonesia Timur* (NIT) remained standing. However, both were relentlessly besieged by demonstrations from the "unitarists." Eventually, the two remaining federal states entrusted the RIS Cabinet with a solution to the political conflict they faced (Leirissa 2006, 134; Husain & Horton 2023).

Thus, the demise of the federal system of the RIS was merely a matter of time. So where does Natsir fit into this picture? In such a political constellation, we see piety intersecting with geopolitical insight and political diplomacy in Natsir. As a Muslim reformist, Natsir adhered to the principle of general welfare as an important part of Islamic law. He believed that the public interest should be prioritized, especially regarding economic issues that burdened the general population due to the political constellation between unitarists and federalists. Without prompt solutions, these problems could lead to division.

This was evident when Natsir expressed the stance of the Masyumi Party Faction at the Parliamentary Session on April 3, 1950. In his speech, Natsir proposed the formation of a unitary state to replace the Republic of the United States of Indonesia (RIS) resulting from the negotiations with the Netherlands during the Renville Agreement, not because of the issue of Unitarism or Federalism. Natsir sought to separate the issues of unitarism vs. federalism and direct them towards the main goal of the Indonesian people's struggle for independence. This seemed to be aimed at avoiding exhausting debates about the form and structure of the state. Natsir stated,

“...to steer clear of discussions regarding unitarism and federalism in relation to this motion... Those who agree with this motion need not imply that they are unitarists, and federalists may also agree with it” (Natsir 1957, 3-7).

The motion itself was proposed as a strategic national solution, not just for the interests of the Masyumi Party. However, indirectly, Natsir asserted that the federal statehood based on Dutch interests with its van Mook line was the thorn in the flesh that caused the nation's division. This made it difficult to achieve the core goals of the state, namely efforts for the prosperity of the people and security assurance, which could not proceed as long as there were no domestic political arrangements. Natsir vividly depicted the situation in the regions associated with the nation's struggle for independence. Natsir emphasized,

“...Political tranquility cannot be achieved as long as there are ‘thorns in the flesh’ felt by the people, even though sovereignty is in our hands, but we are still faced with colonial structures and political encirclement tools created by Van Mook in the regions” (Natsir 1957, 5).

Natsir's geopolitical insights were not only shaped by his Minang background, his teaching stint in Bandung, and his national-level political involvement. Beyond that, Natsir had the opportunity to travel to various regions, where he met and engaged in dialogue with leaders in Sumatra, Java, and Sulawesi. This opportunity was facilitated by Prime Minister (PM) of RIS Mohammad Hatta, who assigned Natsir and Sri Sultan Hamengkubuwono IX to lobby for the resolution of various crises in the regions. Traveling around the regions expanded Natsir's network and geopolitical awareness.

Another aspect is Natsir's willingness to engage in dialogue accompanied by diplomatic intelligence. This adeptness became a distinct political-diplomatic art. He sought to embrace all factions in parliament for the success of the integral motion. Moreover, his negotiating skills with faction leaders in the RIS Parliament, such as IJ Kasimo from the Catholic Party Faction and AM Tambunan from the Christian Party, led Natsir to the conclusion that the states were willing to dissolve themselves to unite with Yogyakarta-meaning the RI-as long as they were not forced to dissolve independently.

Natsir's lobbying efforts with faction leaders in the Temporary Parliament of RIS and his approach to the regions were then formulated into a highly strategic arrangement of words: "Integral Motion." According to Natsir,

"The voices of the people from various regions and the motions of the People's Representative Council as channels for those voices, are aimed at amalgamating the artificial regions created by the Dutch and merging them into the Republic of Indonesia." Natsir's statement is highly convincing, especially when combined with the assertion that "this policy of amalgamation and merger greatly influences the course of general politics within the governance throughout Indonesia" (Natsir 1957, 5).

In addition to Natsir, the integral motion was also signed by various political factions: Soebadio Sastrasatomo, Hamid Algadri, Ir. Sakirman, K. Wendojo, Mr. AM. Tambunan, Ngadiman Hardjosubroto, B. Sahetapy Engel, Dr. Tjokronegoro, Moh. Tauchid, Amelz, and H. Siradjuddin Abbas. This demonstrates that Natsir's political ideas were recognized as strategic by all political factions in parliament, including the Government.

Natsir's motion was well-received by all parties. Prime Minister Mohammad Hatta, as the representative of the RIS, affirmed that the integral motion would be used as a guide in resolving the issues. On May 19, 1950, a meeting was held in Jakarta between Indonesia and the RIS government, as well as representatives from the states of the *Negara Indonesia Timur* (NIT) and *Negara Sumatera Timur* (NST), which resulted in the Charter of the Formation of the Unitary State. On August 15, 1950, President Soekarno read the charter during a joint session of the RIS Parliament and Senate. Two days later, on August 17, 1950, coinciding with Indonesia's fifth anniversary, President Soekarno announced the birth of the NKRI (Latief et al. 2024; Adan & Jalil 2019).

Clearly, Natsir's Integral Motion became the gateway to the dissolution of the RIS and the opening path for the establishment of the NKRI. It is no wonder that when the NKRI was formed, President Soekarno did not hesitate to choose Natsir as the first Prime Minister of the NKRI Post-RIS:

"With the existence of such a state structure, inevitably, the RIS Cabinet dissolved and had to be replaced with a new cabinet. When Soekarno was about to form the cabinet formation, a journalist from *Merdeka* daily, Asa Bafagih, came to him seeking news. Asa Bafagih asked President Soekarno, 'What is the situation now? Who is appointed to form the cabinet?' Soekarno replied, 'Who else if not someone from Masyumi?' Asa Bafagih asked again, 'Natsir?' President Soekarno answered, 'Yes! They have a conception to save the Republic through the constitution'" (Puar 1978, 105).

Indeed, even someone of Soekarno's caliber, through what Natsir accomplished via his political lobbying culminating in the Integral Motion, believed that Natsir's concept would save the Republic. This is because Natsir prioritized the welfare of the people and the nation above all else. Natsir also opened and initiated dialogue that was open-minded, crossing ideologies and religious beliefs found within various political party factions, both at the center and in the regions. The purpose is no other than the establishment of the welfare of the people and the nation. This noble goal of welfare is intertwined with Natsir's ability as an administrator with a broad geopolitical perspective.

The Natsir Integral Motion: An Integrative Revolution

The geopolitical context also strongly correlates with issues of political culture. In the RIS, there were complex issues regarding political representation and fair economic allocation, leading to dissatisfaction among many parties. The disproportionate representation of ethnic groups in the government was one of the factors triggering the rise of ethnic sentiments, reflected in the "Javanese - non-Javanese" issue. Other factors included economic downturn, ideological struggles, and the interests of local elites, which also contributed to the emergence of ethnic sentiments. These often intertwined with religious and regional sentiments related to political representation, distribution, and allocation of scarce resources, as well as positions of power, job ownership, and self-esteem. These problems led to turmoil in various regions, giving rise to

armed movements such as Kahar Muzakkar's in Sulawesi (Gonggong 1990; Druce 2020).

This situation generally aligns with Clifford Geertz's thesis, which suggests that the potential strengthening of primordial identities tends to remain significant after a country enters the era of independence (Geertz 1973, 273). Various expressions shown by some communities in the regions are manifestations of self-affirmation and, to some extent, reflections of resistance against the concept of shared destiny in the name of history and commitment to national aspirations. The phenomenon of primordialism revival in the form of ethnic and religious sentiments, leading to efforts towards total independence or even secession, is something that cannot be ignored in the nation-building efforts and Indonesian identity.

An example of the intertwining of ethnic-regional aspects with religious elements can be seen in the case of Aceh. Regionally, the 1950s were very unfavorable for Aceh. Aceh entered the 1950s with pride, as a primary supporter of the Republic in its fight against the Dutch. However, the joy turned into disappointment when the Province of Aceh was abolished and merged into the Province of North Sumatra. From the perspective of the central government, this merger was merely an administrative rationality. For Aceh, however, it meant not only the loss of autonomy but also the denial of historical significance. Moreover, when the central government ignored Aceh's cultural demands for the implementation of Islamic Sharia specifically, it inevitably sparked resistance led by Daud Beureuh, which ultimately led to civil war (Kell 1995; Munadia & Umar 2022).

Geertz argues that in a nation rich with primordial sentiments like Indonesia, an integrative revolution is needed. This refers to the effort to integrate society into broader cultural frameworks that support national governance. Without such integrative movement, even minor disappointments related to ethnicity and religion could increase the potential for political disintegration (Geertz 1963).

This is what Natsir demonstrated with his Integral Motion. Natsir's Integral Motion represents an initial effort towards the growth of an integrative revolution for this nation. It is a political solution to unify various issues, including ethnicity, regionalism, ideology, and religious beliefs, in what Natsir termed as an "integral solution." Natsir, along with Hatta and those aligned with them, sought to foster a political culture that

is rational and adheres to agreed-upon rules of engagement. This is known as civil politics, in contrast to primordial sentiments. Civil politics values performance and merit over familial relationships as considerations.

This was evidenced by Natsir's governance during 1950-1951, following the dissolution of the RIS. Natsir's political leadership style while leading the cabinet was similar to Bung Hatta's, characterized as an administrator-rationalist rather than a solidarity-maker. These two concepts, administrator and solidarity maker, originate from Herbert Feith's analysis of the cabinets during the era of liberal democracy. Feith explained the difference between these two types:

"Administrator in the sense of leaders with the administrative, technical, legal and foreign language skill required to run the distinctively modern apparatus of a modern state. And solidarity makers, leaders skilled as mediators between groups at different levels of modernity and political effectiveness, as mass organizers, and as manipulators of integrative symbols" (Feith 1968, 113).

The character of Natsir's Cabinet government, as explained by Herbert Feith, was policy-oriented towards problem-solving and adherence to the rules of the game. In his cabinet, Natsir gave prominence to technocratic politicians. The Natsir Cabinet also emphasized the process of reorganization and rationalization, both in terms of the financial capabilities of the military and bureaucracy, as well as the stimulation of economic activities (Feith 1968, 154; Amal 1992, 32). Natsir's political policies are no longer trapped in the interests of certain groups, but rather about nation building and public benefits - which in Prihantoro's terms is a transformation from fiqh of politics to fiqh of citizenship (Prihantoro 2019).

Unfortunately, the short tenure of the Natsir Cabinet led to the interruption of efforts to accommodate fair aspirations for Aceh and other regions to have autonomy within the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia. Meanwhile, subsequent cabinets did not immediately continue the efforts initiated by Natsir, leading to growing unrest and dissatisfaction until the outbreak of rebellion in Aceh two years later. This rebellion could only be stopped after more than a decade, with all the sad consequences that ensued. Herbert Feith's regretful comment about the short period of the Natsir Cabinet is as follows:

“In the very short time it had been in office, the Natsir Cabinet pursued its policy goals intently and with some success. It moved the country several steps along the road to civil security, administrative routinization, increased production, and planned economic growth. That it failed was clear from the fact of the very short time it had in office: it had failed to build itself a basis of political support” (Feith 1968, 176).

In Herbert Feith's perspective, Natsir's cabinet programs are actually good, relevant and at the same time visionary for building the nation and state of Indonesia post-RIS. The downfall of the Natsir cabinet was caused more by political intrigue, not the programs. This condition tends to have the impact that the central government vis-a-vis the regions continues to roil in post-Natsir Indonesia.

Conclusion

This article has taken us through a series of significant events in Indonesian political history, particularly during the formation of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia (NKRI) in 1950. Mohammad Natsir's Integral Motion emerged as a crucial point in the dissolution of the Republic of the United States of Indonesia (RIS) and the reestablishment of NKRI. The article delineates Natsir's involvement in formulating, presenting, and executing the Integral Motion. Through a historical approach, we see how Natsir's political lobbying and diplomatic intelligence played a key role in convincing state leaders and RIS officials to reunite under the banner of NKRI.

Gaining insight into Natsir's political background and personal life offers deeper understanding of the factors that shaped his political ideology and actions. From his early education in West Sumatra to his role in *Persatuan Islam* and political parties, Natsir demonstrated a strong dedication to national unity and prosperity. His political views and ideology, based on the common good and the unity of the Islamic community, highlight the moral commitments underlying his actions. Geopolitical analysis highlights the international and regional contexts at the time that influenced political dynamics in Indonesia. The *Konferensi Meja Bundar* (KMB) and the sovereignty transfer agreements from the Netherlands marked the starting point, but economic challenges, internal conflicts, and Western interference complicated the process towards the formation of NKRI. In this situation, Natsir's Integral Motion became a

strategic response to the internal and external challenges facing Indonesia at that time.

This study demonstrates the important role of the Integral Motion in triggering an integrative revolution in Indonesia. The motion was not just a political move but also an effort to address ethnic, religious, and regional conflicts that emerged after independence. In this context, Natsir emerged as a figure who advocated for unity and integration within a framework of rational politics oriented towards the nation's welfare. Overall, Natsir's Integral Motion became a significant milestone in Indonesian political history, marking the transition from a period of conflict and instability to efforts towards a stronger and more integrated national development. Through a combination of political strategies, morally based thinking, and a deep understanding of geopolitical dynamics, Natsir played a crucial role in directing Indonesia towards a brighter and more united future.

References

Abdullah, Taufik. 1996. Pemikiran dan Perjuangan M. Natsir. In *Pemikiran dan Perjuangan Mohamad Natsir* (Tarmizi Taher Ed.). Jakarta: Pustaka Firdaus.

Abdullah, Taufik. 1998. *Dinamika Regionalisme dalam Konteks Negara Nasional*. Yogyakarta: UGM Press.

Abdurrahim, Ali. 2023. The Contribution of Mohammad Natsir's Thoughts in the Formation of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia (NKRI): Perspective of Religious Moderation Da'wah. *Syntax Transformation*, 4(10): 10-27.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.46799/jst.v4i10.830>.

Adan, Hasanuddin Yusuf *et al*. 2023. Islam and the Foundation of the State in Indonesia: The Role of the Masyumi Party in the Constituent Assembly the Perspective of Fiqh Al-Siyāsah. *Samarah*, 7(1): 377-98.
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22373/sjhk.v7i1.16650>.

Adan, Hasanuddin Yusuf & Husni A. Jalil. 2019. *Mosi Integral Mohd. Natsir: Upaya Perpaduan Ummah dan Bangsa dalam NKRI*. Banda Aceh: 'Adnin Foundation Publisher.

Alvian, Rizky Alif & Ardhani, Irfan. 2023. The Politics of Moderate Islam in Indonesia: Between International Pressure and Domestic Contestations. *AlJami'ah*, 61(1): 19-57.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14421/ajis.2023.611.19-57>.

Amal, Ichlasul. 1992. *Regional and Central Government in Indonesia Politics: West Sumatera and South Sulawesi (1949-1979)*. Yogyakarta: UGM Press.

Bachtiar, Tiar Anwar & Fauzan, Pepen Irpan. 2019. *Sejarah Pemikiran dan Gerakan Persis*. Bandung: PERSIS Press.

Druce, Stephen Charles. 2020. A South Sulawesi Hero and Villain: Qahhar Mudzakkar (Kahar Muzakkar) and His Legacy. *International Journal of Asia Pacific Studies*, 16(2): 151-79.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21315/ijaps2020.16.2.8>.

Fard, Rebin. 2021. Towards a New Concept of Constructivist Geopolitics: Bridging Classical and Critical Geopolitics. *Central European Journal of International & Security Studies*, 15(1): 26-57.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51870/CEJISS.A150102>.

Fata, Ahmad Khoirul. 2020. *Buya Hamka: Pemikiran & Perannya di Pentas Politik Nasional*. Semarang: Rasail Media.

Fauzan, Pepen Irpan & Fata, Ahmad Khoirul. 2019. Portraying Political Polarization in Persatuan Islam in the Case of Mohamad Natsir Vs Isa Anshari. *Journal of Contemporary Islam and Muslim Societies*, 3(2): 78.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30821/jcims.v3i2.5589>.

Fauzan, Pepen Irpan et al. 2020. Pola Kaderisasi Gerakan Islam Puritan: Studi Kritis Atas Persatuan Islam. *Millah: Jurnal Studi Agama*, 19 (2): 247-78.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.20885/millah.vol19.iss2.art4>.

Fauziah, Khopipah. 2023. Usaha-Usaha Perbaikan Ekonomi Era Demokrasi Liberal (1950-1959). *Journal of Indonesian History*, 11(2): 75-84.

DOI:<https://doi.org/10.15294/jih.v11i2.74936>.

Fedderspiel, Howard M. 2001. *Islam and Ideology in the Emerging Indonesian State: The Persatuan Islam (Persis) 1923 to 1957*. Leiden-Boston-Koln: Brill.

Feith, Herbert. 1968. *The Decline of Constitutional Democracy in Indonesia*. Ithaca - New York: Cornell University Press.

Gea, G. B., Subaryana, & Kaswati, A. 2022. Konferensi Meja Bundar dan Pengaruhnya terhadap Eksistensi Kemerdekaan Indonesia. *Tjantrik*, 1(01): 70-84.

Geertz, Clifford. 1963. The Integrative Revolution: Primordial Sentiments and Civil Politics in the New States. In *Old Societies and New States: The Quest for Modernity in Asia and Africa*, edited by Clifford Geertz, 105-157. London: Collier-Macmillan.

Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.

Gonggong, Anhar. 1990. Abdul Qahhar Mudzakkar dan Gerakan DI/TII di Sulawesi Selatan 1950-1968. Universitas Indonesia.

Hatta, Mohamad. 1987. *Memoir*. Jakarta: Tinta Mas.

Hidayat, Asep Achmad, & Gumilar, Setia. 2016. Friction in Masyumi: A Historical Studies on Internal Conflict Event of Islamic Party in Indonesia, 1945-1960. *TAWARIKH: Journal of Historical Studies*, 8(1): 59-68.

DOI:<https://doi.org/10.2121/tawarikh.v8i1.719>.

Hochberg, L. & Sloan, G. 2017. Mackinder's Geopolitical Perspective Revisited. *Orbis*, 61(04): 575-592.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orbis.2017.08.007>.

Husain, Sarkawi B. & Horton, William Bradley. 2023. The Debate between Mochtar Lutfi and Nadjamoeddin Daeng Malewa Regardinga Ministry of Religion within Negara Indonesia Timur (The State of East Indonesia), 1946-1950. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*, 44(03): 781-788.

DOI:<https://doi.org/10.34044/j.kjss.2023.44.3.15>.

Kahin, George Mc Turnan. 1993. In Memoriam: Mohamad Natsir (1908-1993). *Indonesia* 56:158-165. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3351203%0A>.

Kell, Tim. 1995. *The Roots of Acehnese Rebellion 1989-1992*. Ithaca: Modern Indonesia Project.

Kuntowijoyo. 2005. *Pengantar Ilmu Sejarah*. Yogyakarta: Bentang.

Latief, M., Pramono, M. F., & Kusuma, A. R. 2024. Merajut Persatuan Indonesia dalam Momentum Mosi Integral Mohammad Natsir. *Al-Afkar: Journal For Islamic Studies*, 7(01): 842-54.
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.31943/afkarjournal.v7i1.884>.

Latif, Yudi. 2012. *Inteligensia Muslim dan Kuasa: Genealogi Inteligensia Muslim Indonesia Abad ke-20*. Jakarta: Democracy Project.

Leirissa, R. Z. 2006. *Kekuatan Ketiga dalam Perjuangan Kemerdekaan Indonesia*. Jakarta: Pustaka Sejarah.

Mahendra, Yusril Ihza. 1995. Combining Activism and Intelectualism: The Biography of Mohammad Natsir. *Studia Islamika*, 2(01): 111-147.
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.15408/sdi.v2i1.844>.

Mukrimin. 2012. Islamic Parties and The Politics Islamic Parties and the Politics of Constitutionalism in Indonesia. *Journal of Indonesian Islam* 6 (2): 367-390.
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15642/JIIS.2012.6.2.367-390>.

Munadia, I., & Umar, M. 2022. Strategy in Resolving The DI/TII Rebellion in Aceh, 1953-1959. *Riwayat*, 5(01): 1-13.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24815/jr.v5i1.23879>.

Murjoko, Ahmad. 2020. *Mosi Integral Natsir 1950*. Bandung: PERSIS Press.

Natsir, Mohamad. 1957. *Capita Selecta II*. Jakarta: Pustaka Pendis.

Noor, Firman. 2016. Islamic Party and Pluralism: The View and Attitude of Masyumi Towards Pluralism in Politics (1945-1960). *AlJami'ah*, 54 (2): 273-310.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14421/ajis.2016.542.273-310>.

Nursahid, F. & Fata, A. K. 2020. Integralis-Moderat: Potret Politik Mohammad Natsir. *Kalam*, 14(2): 95-118.
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24042/klm.v14i2.7147>.

Pangestu, D. A. & Sudrajat, A. 2020. Mohammad Natsir: Konsep Hubungan Antara Negara dan Islam dalam Mosi Integral Natsir. *Jurnal Review Politik*, 10(1): 69-97.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15642/jrp.2020.10.1.69-87>.

Prihantoro, Hijrian Angga. 2019. Islam and the Humanity of the State: From Fiqh of Politics to Fiqh of Citizenship. *Ulul Albab: Jurnal studi Islam*, 20 (2): 364-87.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18860/ua.v20i2.5673>.

Rachmanto, Arif Fajar *et al*. 2023. The Formation Of Islamic Parties In Post-Independence Indonesia. *Jurnal Sejarah Islam*, 2(02): 15-26.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24090/jsij.v2i02.8213>.

Rambe, Safrizal, & Zulkarnain. 2022. An Overview of the Journey of Political Parties in Indonesia from a Socio-Historical Perspective. *Polit Journal* 2(02): 52-62.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33258/polit.v2i2.645>.

Ricklefs, MC. 2008. *Sejarah Indonesia Modern 1200-2008*. Jakarta: Serambi.

Saefulloh, U. & Muaripin. 2022. Natsir Young's Intellectual Git: Between JIB, Persis, and Pendis (1908-1945). *Transformasi*, 4(02): 306-320, in <https://transformasi.kemenag.go.id/index.php/journal/article/view/257>.

Setyaningsih, Emi. 2016. Perjuangan dan Pemikiran Politik Mohammad Natsir (1907-1993). *Jurnal Tapis*, 16 (2): 73-94.
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24042/tps.v12i2.824>.

Sugiharto, Unggul. 2010. Komite Nasional Indonesia Pusat (KNIP) Sebuah Anomali Suprastruktur Negara pada Tahun 1945. *Politika*, 1(02): 78-87.
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.14710/politika.1.2.2010.78-87>.

Tasnur, I. & Fadli, M. R. 2019. Republik Indonesia Serikat:Tinjauan Historis Hubungan Kausalitas Peristiwa-Peristiwa Pasca Kemerdekaan terhadap Pembentukan Negara RIS (1945-1949). *Candrasangkala*, 5 (02): 58-67.
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.30870/candrasangkala.v5i2.6599>.

Tobroni, Roni. 2017. Komunikasi Politik Mohammad Natsir. *Communicatus: Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi*, 1(01): 39-60.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15575/cjik.v1i1.1208>.

Wahyudin et al. 2019. Islamic Humanism in Indonesian Context: Discourse Analysis of Nationality Problems in Indonesia. *Ulul Albab: Jurnal Studi Islam*, 20(02): 302-321.
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18860/ua.v20i2.6772>.

Waskito, Tejo. 2023. Institusionalisasi Pemikiran Pendidikan Mohammad Natsir di dalam Lembaga Pendidikan Tinggi Islam di Indonesia. *Ta'dibuna*, 12 (03): 285-303.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32832/tadibuna.v12i3.13829>.

Yani, Z. et al. 2023. Nationalism Thoughts of Ahmad Hassan, M. Isa Anshary, and M. Natsir: A Study of the Works of Islamic Thinkers in the City of Bandung, Indonesia. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 9(02).
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2023.2281049>.

Puar, Yusuf Abdullah ed. 1978. *Mohamad Natsir 70 Tahun*. Jakarta: Pustaka Antara.