As Sidney Mintz details in his article, “Eating American,” Americans have always struggled to foster and identify a national cuisine. In the late 1970’s, American chefs tried to create a national cuisine through two very different approaches. The first group, those forging what would later be called “New American Cuisine” looked to old, mostly New England-based, classic dishes. They attempted to elevate and modernize chowder, planked shad, pandowdy and other forgotten or ignored dishes. The second group argued that those touting New American Cuisine ignored that the American cultural landscape had changed since colonial times. What once would have represented American food did not, in the late 70’s, represent the multitude of ethnicities in America. This second group created fusion cuisine. The goal of fusion was to merge and merry the ingredients and techniques of different cultures in one dish. A single dish may include Chinese, Malaysian, French, and Mexican elements. A single dish could represent the tapestry of the American experience.

Since the 1970’s fusion cuisine has proliferated from the realm of haute cuisine into more casual restaurant food and even home cooking. As fusion went from being a fad to a reality, restaurant critics developed strong opinions of it. While the positive reaction to fusion cuisine represented acceptance of and excitement for a multi-ethnic
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America, the negative critical response, brought on by fusion’s refusal to exoticism ethnicity, constituted culinary eugenics.

For the purposes of this discussion, it is important to understand exactly what fusion cuisine is. In fusion food, there is no reverence for ethnic divisions. It assumes that all foodways have more similarities than differences. All cultures appreciate the interplay between savory, sweet, salty, spicy, bitter and tart. All cultures see eating as a way to create community as well as provide sustenance. Yes, some cultures may have different resources and ingredients. Some cultures may find a food morally repulsive while others cultures may eat the same dish without a second thought (for instance, beef in some parts of Asia, guinea pig in South America). However, there are some basic, universal truths to cooking. Because of that universality, dishes and ingredients from different cultures can mingle in fact, due to increasing globalization, this mingling is a delicious inevitability.

One example of a popular fusion dish is the Korean taco. The universal truth at play is meat, usually beef, grilled quickly over a hot fire. In parts of Mexico and Mexican-America, this truth takes form in dishes such as carne asada and it is often served wrapped in a tortilla. In Korea, it is known as bulgogi and is usually marinated in garlic, sugar, soy sauce, and seasame oil. The fusion of these two dishes is known as the Korean taco. The tacos use bulgogi, with all of its Asain seasonings, and the Mexican corn tortilla and fuse them together into one dish. Fusion dishes are often more
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complicated than this, playing on many universal food truths and incorporating many food cultures.

In the last thirty years, the positive critical response of fusion cuisine has lauded it as the true, American cuisine and thereby praised and embraced the consequences of a diverse America. Often, the chefs who are creating fusion food are multi-ethnic themselves. Patrick Concannon was an Irish-Mexican-American, French trained chef based in Chicago. He said of fusion cuisine: “I call it simply ‘modern American cooking. For a long time America was the melting pot of cultures. In the past 10 years, it’s become the melting pot of cuisines as well.” Some critics argued that fusion cuisine was a pleasant inevitability of multi-ethnic chefs and cliental. William Grimes of *The New York Times* wrote, “Unlike nouvelle cuisine, fusion cuisine never developed a theory. This may be because it is not so much an idea as a fact, a practical response to a global market and increasing global popular culture.” Grimes argues that, at its best, fusion food embodies a “faith in the people” to be able intermingle the flavors of these cultures. Amanda Hesser, also of *The New York Times*, expounded on the benefits of fusion cooking. “Fusion made diners reflect on flavors and their context, and it felt like a natural advance for American cooks, who had always relied on adopted foodways.” Chef Mary Sue Milliken said of fusion food, “We are America. Mixing things up is sort of our
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6 Marcus Samuelsson, another chef famous in the fusion food movement, is Ethiopian, but raised in Sweden by Swedish parents. He studied in Switzerland and Austria and runs a Japanese fusion restaurant. Even Wolfgang Puck, considered one of the creators of fusion embodies multi-ethnicity. He is Austrian, but trained in Italy and spent most of his life in California. Roy Yamaguchi, another important figure in Fusion cooking, is Japanese but trained classical French cooking in New York and now lives in Hawaii.
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nature. And if fusion cooking helps us explore and understand other cultures better, it's worth it.” These chefs and critics recognized fusion cuisine as an inevitable consequence of globalization. As people intermingled, so did their food.

However, the negative critical response to fusion cuisine represents the segregationist and nativist backlash to a multi-ethnic America. Soon after it originated fusion became to critics as “confusion.”11 These critics attacked the universal truth principle of fusion. They argued that simply because globalization had given Americans access to all of these ethnic ingredients did not mean that they should be used together. Fusion dishes were often describe as “muddy” and “too complicated.”12 In a review of a Japanese fusion restaurant, Amanda Hesser refers to clutter: the pairings and mixtures of cultures that do not go well together. She that foie gras and sushi writes were “compatible as Bush and Kerry.” Other critics reflected a similar message and vocabulary. One review stated “…fusion developed a bad reputation…It came to mean food that was neither one thing nor another, in which marriage of cultured blurred their distinctiveness and created a mush rather than a genuinely new cuisine.”13 Another stated that fusion merely “waters down” the cuisine of origin.14 In 1999, French chef Paul Bocuse proclaimed that any cuisine that combines different elements from different traditions to be “confusion cuisine.”15 Chef Susan Feniger wrote: “[I have] always been opposed to fusion cooking…There is a maturing among cooks, but while some combinations work, in many the flavors are muddy, not clear and concise. We still prefer to focus on a single cuisine
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and learn to re-create what’s pure and authentic.”\(^\text{16}\) As fusion food never claimed to be authentic and therefore is not bastardizing a single culture, this language was highly segregationist and racist. These chefs and critics argued for racial purity and said that a mix of the cultures causes “confusion” and “clutter.”\(^\text{17}\)

This response to fusion cuisine was “culinary eugenics.” Eugenicists, starting at the end of the 19\(^{\text{th}}\) century, argued that there were fundamental differences between races and those differences should not be adulterated through interbreeding. While some many eugenicists used the theory to argue for the superiority of the white race and the eradication of other races, others argued for celebrating and cultivating all races, but separately.\(^\text{18}\) These cultural pluralists, such as Horace Kallen, argued that immigrants should celebrate their “psycho-physical inheritance” and that discouraging interbreeding could act as a “shield” against modernization.\(^\text{19}\) These theories construct race as intractable and best left pure. Just as those critical of fusion cuisine do not argue that, for example, French cuisine is superior to Chinese and therefore should not mix, cultural pluralist eugenicists do not argue that one nationality is inherently superior to another. These critics and cultural pluralists argue that each ethnicity has inherent qualities that are best kept separate from other ethnicities.

The root of this negative reaction was that fusion cuisine challenged the exoticization of ethnic foods. The more standard conception of ethnic food, of an authentic, foreign cuisine, was dominated by the cosmopolitanism associated with exoticism. Kristen Hoganson writes: “However much may have seemed to elide
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difference, foreign entertainments reinforced it.”20 Ethnic food was popular, in part,
because it was entirely different from “American” cuisine. The two had no universality.
Lucy Long identifies “culinary tourism” as the ethos much ethnic food consumption.
Culinary tourism is dependent on creating an “other” and highlighting the differences
between oneself and the other. She writes: “Foods are not inherently strange or exotic, the
experiences of an individual are not what determine the status of foods. In this sense,
tourism depends on a perception of otherness rather than an objective reality of an item’s
relationship to that individual.”21 Fusion cuisine’s commitment the universality of foods
did not allow ethnic food to be exoticized. Therefore, it presented a threat to the
mainstream conception of ethnic food.

Conceptions of ethnic food reflect conceptions of ethnicity.22 This historic
exoticization of ethnic food highlighted the differences between cultures, a eugenicist
principle. Therefore, when fusion challenged those differences, critics responded with
culinary eugenics. By arguing that different ethnicities have common ground, fusion
cuisine challenged culinary eugenics.
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