


Coffee and Identity: Consuming Coffee, Building Identity, Maintaining Variety (Case Study in Palintang Community, Cipanjalu Village, Cilengkrang Sub-district, Bandung District, West Java)

Rahman Latif Alfian
Freelance Researcher
Johan Iskandar
PSMIL & DIL Universitas Padjadjaran
Budiawati Supangkat Iskandar
Anthropology, Universitas Padjadjaran

Arabica coffee was introduced and farmed in the Perhutani forest of Palintang hamlet, Cipanjalu village, Cilengkrang sub-district, Bandung district, West Java fifteen years ago. The local people of Palintang have been involved in the farming coffee of Perhutani forest to get better the household income of local people and to improve the local environment of the Perhutani forest. This article discusses the impact of the coffee crop farming in the Perhutani forest conducted by local people to various aspects of social, cultural and ecological aspects of Palintang area, Cipanjalu Village, Cilengkrang District, West Java. This study used an ethnographic approach that aims to reveal meaning from the standpoint of cultural stakeholders. Some techniques of collecting data, including observation, in-depth interviews, non-planned interviews, and casual interviews were applied. The results of the study showed that coffee cultivation in the forest of Perhutani conducted by Palintang community has been an important role not only in economic aspect but also influence on social and ecological aspects of the Palintang community. Initially, the main purpose of introduction and the farming of coffee crops in the Perhutani forest that involve in the participation of the local community was to increase the income of the Palintang community. Yet, the commodity of coffee farming has been popular and providing good economic value for local the community and has been an identity of Palintang community. Palintang locals have considered their coffee has very distinctive characters that are different from that other coffee produced in other areas. As a result, the coffee produced in the Perhutani forest has become an identity of the
Palintang. The Palintang coffee has been recognized as special distinctive coffee by other communities in West Java. Moreover, the distinctive coffee crop planted in the Perhutani forest has been an important role in enhancing the high diversity of coffee varieties (landraces) in West Java particularly, and Indonesian in general.
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Beyond Disciplinary Diversity and Debates in Parallel Universes: Anthropology and Political Science in Conversation
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An enduring critique of the phenomenon of disciplinary diversity, nay fragmentation, in social sciences and humanities is one regarding the lack of conversation across the boards. Disciplinary boundaries render disciplines at times impervious to interdisciplinary borrowings and innovations. This situation severely hampers accumulation of knowledge and often led scholars into “debates in parallel universes” (Robison 2016). Anthropology and Political Science are no exception: tension exists between these disciplines resulting in, for instances, marginalization of ethnographic method within political scientists’ methodological toolkit (Bayard de Volo & Schatz 2004, but see Laitin 1998) as well as uneasiness on the part of anthropologists regarding social science’s claim on causal inference and its generalizability. And yet there always seem to be leading maverick scholars in Anthropology and Political Science successfully breaking disciplinary straitjacket to produce exemplary works cherished in both disciplines. To mention a few, some leading anthropologists have interrogated the state (Gupta 2012), explored the practice of governmentality (Li 2007), traced democratic transition (Hefner 2000), or charted the topography of globalization (Appadurai 1996, Tsing 2005).

Similarly, there are also political scientists utilizing ethnographic method to study peasant resistance (Scott 1979, 1985, 1990), understand the poetics of power (Weeden 1999), or claim meaning embedded in commodities as a causal factor driving mobilization (Simmons 2016; Wood 2003), all the while generally claiming how meaning-making can be a powerful independent variable. In addition, a methodological literature on how to wed Anthropology and Political Science as disciplinary practices or how to craft causal inference using ethnography begin to emerge (Aronoff & Kubik 2013, Aronoff 2006, Katz 2001, 2002, Schatz 2009). Thus, this panel aims at starting a conversation between political scientists and anthropologists working on Indonesia taking stock of issues pertaining to possible interdisciplinary engagements. The set of questions to be explored includes but is not exclusively limited to the following: (i) What are the objections regarding disciplinary practices from both disciplines that could possibly hamper mutual interdisciplinary engagements? (ii) What are the most fruitful areas of conceptual, theoretical, and methodological intersections between the two disciplines that inform practitioners and benefit their research? (iii) Are there examples of current works from actual practitioners—political ethnographers or political scientists drawing from ethnographic methodological toolkit—conducting research from which we can draw lessons regarding challenges and possibilities?