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.

**Keywords:** Construction of Identity, coffee diversity, local knowledge, Perhutani forest, Palintang community.

**Beyond Disciplinary Diversity and Debates in Parallel Universes:**
**Anthropology and Political Science in Conversation**

Coordinator: Gde Dwitya Arief Metera (Northwestern University) & Iqra Anugrah (New Mandala)

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?
Our panel invites papers that explore questions and concerns above. We also welcome papers presenting results of studies utilizing conceptual, theoretical, and/or methodological innovations borrowed from both Political Science and Anthropology.

PATRON-CLIENT RELATIONSHIP: BETWEEN ANTHROPOLOGY AND POLITICAL SCIENCE
Heddy Shri Ahimsa-Putra
Department of Anthropology, Universitas Gadjah Mada

Since the publication of Foster’s ethnography on patron-client relationships among the Tzintzuntzan in Mexico (1963), many anthropologists had followed his step to study, describe and analyze patron-client relationships within the societies they studied. Various terms have been used for those relationships, such as: clientship, clientelism, clientage and patronage. Studies of this phenomenon flourished further as some political scientists used patron-client model to explain political dynamics in non-western countries, as they found that the model they have used in studying political phenomena in western countries could not cope with the socio-political realities and problems in many non-western settings (Scott, 1972).

Fourteen years after Foster’s patronage ethnography, Friends, Followers and Factions: A Reader in Political Clientelism was published. A collection of articles on patron-client relation-ships in anthropology, sociology and political science -mostly from 1960-1970s-, the book is a landmark in patron-client studies. A lot has happened in patron-client studies since then, as anthropologists, sociologists and political scientists continue their research on that topic. The question then is: What perspectives (paradigms) have been used by social scientists in studying patron-client relationships? What kinds of insights have been gained? What kinds of problems have been solved? What kinds of theories have been produced?

In this paper the author attempts to answer those questions. The paper will elucidate further how ideas, views, theories on patron-client relations were developed further by anthropologists, sociologists and political scientists in their studies.

STRADDLING BETWEEN DIFFERENT WORLDS: NAVIGATING DIVERSE FIELDWORK MODES
Iqra Anugrah
New Mandala

Social science fieldwork is often seen as a challenging and often-misunderstood intellectual enterprise. Long seen as the domain of the few, fieldwork – more specifically, its major component, immersion – has made a comeback in social science despite the enduring drive toward quantification in the discipline (Morgenbesser and Weiss, 2018; Schatz, 2009). But misperceptions regarding fieldwork, such as its perceived machismo and inability to offer generalizations, still persist among social science researchers and readers while in reality fieldwork entails different types of work and modes of engagement with local interlocutors and social realities.

This paper therefore aims to debunks the myths surrounding fieldwork and contextualizes it. Focusing on my own fieldwork experience in Indonesia since 2015 as an early-career, anthropologically-inclined political scientist, I will discuss my experience conducting fieldwork for three different types of research: policy, dissertation, and advocacy research. In particular, I will