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Abstract. The issues raised in this paper are potential conflicts and efforts to create harmony of the socio-cultural environment of ethnic Chinese-Javanese. This research is to know the historical background of the process, and the development of ethnic Chinese descent in Surakarta City and how far the potential conflict and causal factor of conflict between ethnic Chinese and ethnic indigenous of Java so that known factors become obstacle of social integration process of ethnic of Chinese and indigenous Java in Surakarta. Approach of this research is descriptive qualitative. Data collection techniques were initially used in the questionnaire distribution model, followed by: in-depth interviews and (2) involved observation, document content analysis and FGD. To obtain degree of high validity, done by technique triangulation, recheck and peer debriefing. This research using interactive technique analysis. The result of the research can be concluded that the conflict arising from the existence of domestic economic and political pressure has forced Chinese people to migrate to Southeast Asia, including Indonesia and then there are several conflicts in many areas in Indonesia. The conflict between ethnic Chinese and Javanese in Surakarta occurred in 1980 and 1998. The conflict resolution can be done by optimizing social, cultural, and economic factors. This factor is used as a social adhesive to the integration between ethnic Chinese and Javanese in Surakarta.

1. Introduction
Racial opposition (racism) first appeared in Java when the Dutch Company (VOC) carried out its colonialist politics. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in Java there was a great kingdom Mataram in Yogyakarta which then moved to Surakarta in 1745. Through the colonial political system, the Dutch colonial government (since the VOC) repeatedly deliberately dramatized the divisions that occurred in the Kingdom of Mataram. VOC exploit the chaos that occurred in the internal kingdom of Mataram. Even for its political purpose, the VOC used war. They are used for exploitative purposes. Its main focus is to master the economy, the territory of the fief, and greater political power[1].
To achieve these targets, the political system of “devide et impera” becomes an effective pattern. For example, in 1743, Pakubuwono again occupied the post of king by the VOC after previously lowered by his political opponents through an insurrection. He moved the Kraton's palace to Surakarta and handed the entire coast of Java to the VOC. This was the beginning of VOC colonial penetration into the core region of the Mataram kingdom. From here, the beginning of Dutch colonialism played its political power[2].

The success of VOCs entering the core area of Mataram led to the patih in charge of the coastal areas of Java working for the interests of the VOC and “Sunan” (King). A royal “kraton” was established after establishing Yogyakarta Sultanate with Sultan Hemengkubuwono I as the full holder of power through the 1755 Gianti Agreement. Two years later, the Mangkunegaran kraton, as a royal court, was established in Surakarta Through the Salatiga 1757 Agreement with Raden Mas Sâid (Prince Sambernyawa) as founder. The land given to him was made a kingdom that had power and self-government.

Racism politics not only ceases to attempt to divide the power of Java through the Mataram conflict, but at the same time confront the Chinese ethnic. The main settlement of the Chinese people at Pasar Gede Hardjonagoro (City Market), located on the northern edge of Pepe River (Kali Pepe) in the center of Surakarta, is on the agenda. This area is a Chinese opium trade area designated by the VOC. This VOC employee has close family and business relationships with Chinese opium merchants. Thus, VOC employees can freely supervise Chinese businessmen including its networks, the circulation of its merchandise, the circulation of money and credit to the rural areas of Java. The area of Pasar Gede town Surakarta that became the residence of the Chinese community formed a center of non-European economic activity.

Social unrest that occurred in mid-May 1998 in Surakarta led to anti-Chinese ethnic riots; then they are the target of the rampage of the masses. Their businesses, homes, cars and goods were many victims of destruction, arson and looting. Even in the midst of such a tense situation, news of rape and ill-treatment happened[3].

Ethnic problem is really a latent problem in our beloved country, and almost has happened all over Indonesia with a high enough frequency. Even almost all the mass riots that occurred in Indonesia, whatever the trigger-always inserted with anti-Chinese action. The factors behind the occurrence of social unrest in Surakarta in mid-May 1998 will be presented in this paper.

2. Methods
The method used in this research is descriptive qualitative. The approach model in this research is descriptive qualitative which leads to ethnographic, where in describing an empirical reality of research result, demands the researcher to go directly to the research location, in order to appreciate the customs, and the symptoms of daily life which is full of social phenomenon local culture[4]. During the study the authors were more involved and attempted to live the socio-cultural system of the local community, especially in relation to the context of the Chinese-Javanese conflict which has such a high value for its players[5]. Data collection techniques were initially used in the questionnaire distribution model, followed by: in-depth interviews and (2) involved observation, document content analysis and FGD (Focus Group Discussion). To obtain degree of high validity, done by technique triangulation, recheck and peer debriefing. The research analysis is done by interactive technique[6].

3. Results and Discussion
To understand the conflict between Chinese and Javanese in Surakarta, it is necessary to note the relation between the cause and the solution formulation. In this paper will be discussed several factors as well as the potential to break the conflict, which includes historical factors, socio-cultural, economic and political.

3.1. Historical Factors
Historical history, the Chinese problem has emerged since the colonial era, when the Dutch applied the policy of "de vide et impera"; which systematically separates each community group. In this colonial era, many Chinese became Dutch trading partners, some of them even given the right to tax. This authority is sometimes abused to extort the indigenous people. Since then the seeds of anti-Chinese sentiment have begun to emerge; because the colonial government made a clear line between the high classes for the Europeans, the middle class for the foreign Easterners (Indians, Arabs and especially Chinese), while for the indigenous people the lowest class[7].

With the ordinance contained in the Staatsblad 1910 (number 536, 537 and 538) the Chinese were given greater freedom of movement "for the changing times and for the sake of trade and traffic". Even after the outbreak of the 1911 Chinese Revolution which succeeded in overthrowing the Manchu rule and succeeding in forming the Republic, it also influenced the Chinese in Indonesia, they became more demonstrative. Because they dominate middle (economic) marketing, practically they can play with consumers who are mostly indigenous people. This is what is felt by Surakarta people (Solo) especially those who own batik companies; because the batik material must buy from the Chinese people. In reality the Chinese people not only as batik traders, but also have a batik company. Because of their trading position, they can buy materials directly from importers at low prices. In contrast, indigenous batik entrepreneurs must purchase materials from intermediary traders (China), so the price has been high[8].

According to Charles A. Coppel, (1994), one of the triggers of the establishment of the Sarekat Dagang Islam (SDI) in Surakarta is the existence of trade competition with the Chinese people. Even the followers of the SDI have the notion that Chinese traders are a racial threat to be faced with violence. This view raises one of the characteristics of the SDI movement that is "Anti Cina". It is not surprising that around the year of the establishment of the SDI, there were frequent anti-Chinese riots in Surakarta. On the streets the Chinese were attacked, shops and shops owned by the Chinese were destroyed. Shop "Sie Dian Hoo", a leading trader in the city of Solo became the main target. Even the riots at that time not only occurred in Surakarta alone but also occurred in Semarang, Blora, Lasem, Tuban and Surabaya. The anti-Chinese social unrest in Surakarta reappeared in November 1980 and recurred in mid-May 1998.

3.2. Socio-Cultural Factors
Chinese ethnic exclusivism that caused prejudice for the indigenous people is still maintained today. This statement is in line with The Jakarta Post (July 30, 1998) note that the violence between "indigenous (Java) and non-indigenous (China)" is caused by the attitude of exclusivism, arrogant, greedy, self-conscious and most of the Chinese ethnicity. According to Sobary, this exclusive life is shown by a towering wall fence (Solopos, October 10, 1998). In the case of building towering walls that do not guarantee they will be protected. On the contrary, such a fence shows an arrogant and arrogant attitude from the owner. On the same occasion, Taufik said that the "bowl fence" and "spoon fence" is stronger than the wall fence. That is, the citizens of Chinese descent who live in the village will be more successful if they socialize with local people (Solopos, October 10, 1998).

The results of socialization or assimilation with the community can be proven in the case of riots in Surakarta in May 1998. Although the target of the mass rampage is the property of ethnic Chinese, but many of them are survivors. Among them is that which occurred in Kebakkramat, Karanganyar. In the area there are two textile factories facing each other. The factory located on the north side of the road was burned by the mob, because the owner was an important official in Jakarta who was allegedly involved in Corruption, Collusion and Nepotism (CCN). However, the factory located south of the road just survived, because it is protected by local residents (Solopos, October 10, 1998). From the description above, it is clear that not all ethnic Chinese are targeted by the mob. China's mass-ridden property is a citizen of Chinese descent caused by their arrogant and exclusivist stance and has no regard for the environment in which they live.
3.3. Economic Factors

With the trading capabilities possessed by ethnic Chinese, the colonial government ultimately positioned them as intermediary traders. Therefore, Chinese citizens are able to play a role in trade, so that trade activities in Indonesia are majority dominated by ethnic Chinese. In addition, it should be acknowledged that its progress in the field of business is also supported by its very prominent character and character that is a relatively high work ethic, diligent in effort and frugal[9]. In totok Chinese trade is more successful than the Chinese Peranakan. Three values often referred to as the determinants of success of Chinese people are "hopeng, hong-sui and hoki". They are the values, beliefs and myths used to run the business. The third value is what usually affects the courage to speculate in running the business[10].

The success of ethnic Chinese in the trade continues until now. In fact, they not only dominate trade, but also industry, banking and other economic sectors. The control of the national economy by ethnic Chinese is what among other things cause dissatisfaction among the indigenous, because this immigrant class that controls most of the Indonesian economy[11]. This is in line with the writings of Abdul Baqir Zein which concluded from various observers that the rise of anti-Chinese riots was triggered by economic jealousy rather than feelings or racist sentiments, because our nation has always lived in a pluralistic society[12].

The riots that occurred on 14 and 15 May 1998 in Surakarta can also be sought from the cause of economic factors. At that time the people are already experiencing food shortages, as a result of the long-standing crisis of monetary. They are no longer able to meet their daily needs, due to mass dismissal and soaring prices of nine basic commodities (basic food) and other necessities. All of which resulted in the suffering of indigenous peoples, which are generally the weaker economies. But on the other hand they still see the goods they cannot afford to buy or get it is still a lot of piling up in warehouses or shops belonging to ethnic Chinese. These conditions and situations lead to social unrest. They then ignored the behavior, destruction, arson and looting of Chinese minority property[2].

3.4. Political Factors

Ethnic issues are not just a matter of economic disparity between indigenous and non-indigenous, but also political issues (Solopos, 21 October 1998). The same thing was also put forward by Thung Ju Lan, a Chinese citizen, LIPI researcher, who stated that the riots that occurred in Surakarta in mid-May 1998 were very strong with political factors compared to the failure factor of mixing between ethnic Chinese as a minority with indigenous people. In addition, he also argues that the government has failed as mediation through the process of intermingling ethnic Chinese with indigenous peoples (Solopos, 8 September 1998).

The incorporation of incorporation politics provides only a place for Chinese citizens in the economic field. Besides they do have entrepreneurship skills, the government provides monopoly rights for certain commodities and business loans worth trillions of rupiahs. Because their activities are limited to economic life, so the image exists among themselves that ethnic Chinese are born and raised for economic activity, trade and entrepreneurship[13].

The position of the Chinese minority as a triple minority was deliberately exaggerated by the New Order Government, and was made a shield for misunderstandings and deviations from the policy of economic development. The national economic assets that are majority controlled by the Chinese minority, that's what makes the gap wider. As a result, social unrest, mass amok, looting and even physical abuse and rape are often aimed at ethnic Chinese. This is because the people have no power against the New Order government which is very authoritarian and repressive. Therefore, the people's resistance is deflected to ethnic Chinese who are considered close to the accused of being involved in corruption[14].

4. Conclusion
For ethnic Chinese as a minority community in Surakarta should not live alone, even become an exclusive group in the midst of other communities, especially ethnic Javanese. Rather, it should be able to blend in with other people, either ethnic Javanese or other ethnic groups. Feelings more super, exclusive and in the economic field stronger than other ethnic, should be thrown away. We live in the midst of society, called for shoulder to shoulder, strong to help the weak, build spirit of gotong royong, so as to create harmony and peace among peoples in society. This will foster a sense of unity and unity in society. If that happens, then the community will not be easily provoked by issues that can divide the community.

The Javanese who are the majority, should also be a small guardian, willing to embrace and invite to work together to help each other in facing various problems in society. The Javanese ethnic group is expected to be the leading leader in realizing a sense of unity and unity among the people, especially in a multi-ethnic society.

The government should be firm in seeking for assimilation or assimilation between ethnic Chinese and Javanese in particular and other ethnic groups in general. Thus, there is no longer any restriction on activities and life between ethnic Chinese and ethnic Javanese or other ethnic groups in the social, economic, cultural and even political and religious fields. Strong ethnic Chinese in the field of economics can be team work and effort between ethnic in Indonesia and even the government; so it can boost the national economy.
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