Hawker culture need not be exclusive

No country can call hawker culture exclusively its own but each can confidently claim its own version, tested and tasted over time.
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So what I thought might happen has happened. This was my reaction after reading The Straits Times article, “Hawker culture move starts food fight” (Aug 23). There are some objections from some of our neighbours to Singapore nominating hawker culture for Unesco’s Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.

It happens to be invited, along with many others working in the broad field of culture, to discuss and make suggestions as to what might be the best item to nominate. Clothing? Complicated. Song and dance? Maybe. Food? Everything that we have got rather excited. But food can be nationalized, globalized, hybridized, gendered, et cetera. And some dishes (plus songs and dances) have come into one country to be eaten with another in the past. I am well aware of this as I have a very good sense of the cultural and its contested meanings.

I agreed with the others to suggest hawker culture for the Unesco List. According to the National Environment Agency (NEA) survey in 2016 that close to 86 per cent of respondents felt that hawker centres play an important role in community bonding. The same survey revealed that nine in 10 respondents strongly agreed or agreed that hawker centres are an integral part of Singapore’s identity.

But at the recent focus group discussions, I also shared that one needs to find a possible solution to this problem of identity. It seems there is only one way to resolve any possible objection to this and there is another other cultural form as broadly shared heritage, with hybridised and localised versions and placing each in historic, social and cultural contexts.

Singapore’s hawker culture has seen its own evolution and development, from street food by peddlers and stalls in the 18th and 19th centuries (probably earlier). It is a hawker centres and food courts.

It is now distinctive in character, encompassing the economic and its own version, tested and tasted over time.

Singapore’s hawker culture has seen its own evolution and development, from street food by peddlers and stalls in the 18th and 19th centuries (probably earlier). It is a hawker centres and food courts.

It is now distinctive in character, encompassing the economic and consumption, everyday life, culture and practices, and multicultural in terms of dishes, traditions and clientele.

It is true that other places also have hawker cultures, such as Malaysia, Thailand and Hong Kong, each with its own history, distinctiveness and contributions to the cultural heritage of humanity, even as there are some common origins and heritage.

We also need to understand the broader terms in which different types of food (and many cultural items) have travelled in various era of globalisation, and has been absorbed into cultures, some to become local culinary delights. This is so true for South-East Asia, where food has travelled and developed alongside huge migrations and movements of people historically and still do. Of course, this sometimes raises issues of cultural authenticity and appropriation. It is not the historical and cultural contexts of different places, it seems more positive and enriching to think of shared heritage, yet with distinctiveness – some of the hawker centres are an integral part of Singapore’s identity.
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It is now distinctive in character, encompassing the economic and consumption, everyday life, culture and practices, and multicultural in terms of dishes, traditions and clientele.

It seems it is the cooks who want to start a food fight (or cookup a storm in a teacup). They should keep calm and continue to work towards their wonders. Most of us eaters just want to be able to eat, and eat peacefully and happily wherever we go.

And all chefs should know that many eaters and foodies know how to sniff out the best dishes and places because we have grown up crazy over food and cannot be fooled by rhetoric. The proof of the pudding (or porridge) is in the eating.

Frankly, I don’t care if it is a celebrity (chef for foodies) who thinks this or that about which dish or which eating place is better here or there. It is subjective at the personal level.

I mean, I have yet to find a polite expression for Japanese curry or durian chilli crab. And still prefer eating durians out of their husks at the stall instead of from take-home styrofoam boxes. But there you are. I wouldn’t want to pick a fight over someone’s meat even though it may look like poision to me.

Some 20 years ago, I took a colleague to eat poripah in Jon Chan. She took one bite and promptly announced: “Our poripah is far better!” I didn’t want to start a food fight, so I just smiled and finished my piece.

Looking back, I wish we had discussed provincial arrogance (we are both cultural anthropologists from different parts of a neighbouring country). Hopefully, we have all tasted enough of life than to make quick judgments and comparisons of food and hawker culture, and are able to understand and appreciate cultural diversity and hybridity in many other types of food and things.

There is room for cultural pride over food and food culture but not for arrogance or superiority and conflict. There can be only gratitude when we have food to share, and appreciation that we can taste and partake of each other’s cultural dishes and even embrace them as our own.

So much of culture these days has become shared heritage which is at the same time hybridised in each localised context. No country can call hawker culture exclusively its own but each can confidently claim its own version, tested and tasted over time.

If we were to be a member of the deciding Unesco team, I would make sure I understood South-East Asia’s hybridised food history and heritage and list the item as Hawker Culture (Singapore). I would also encourage Chef Wan and other cooks to nominate the next item – Hawker Culture (Malaysia). I hope to soon add Hawker Culture (Thailand) and Hawker Culture (Hong Kong). Show humanity that seems to be always fighting that we can genuinely have peace and happiness through appreciation of the diversity of food and hawker cultures. It can only be a win-win, die-die-must-try Unesco list from our part of the world.

If there is one reservation I have about adding Hawker Culture (Singapore) to the list, it is a domestic one: The table manners of some customers – they leave their mess after their meal for others to clean up. They have no place in the intangible cultural heritage of humanity.
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