

---

| RESEARCH ARTICLE

## Pros-Cons of *Nasi Padang* Containing Pork on Social Media

Nafri Dwi Boy<sup>1</sup> ✉ and Anwar Efendi<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>Master of Indonesian Language and Literature Education, Faculty of Languages and Arts, Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia

**Corresponding Author:** Nafri Dwi Boy, **E-mail:** [NafriDwi.2021@student.uny.ac.id](mailto:NafriDwi.2021@student.uny.ac.id)

---

| ABSTRACT

This study aims to find out and describe the pro and con discourses on social media about *nasi Padang* containing pork which is currently viral. The discourse is seen from the text dimension, discourse practice, and sociocultural practice based on the model put forward by Fairclough. This is a qualitative descriptive study that used the theory of Fairclough's critical discourse analysis to analyze the data. From the result of the analysis, *nasi Padang* containing pork has raised various pro and con discourses. The contra party considered *nasi Padang* containing pork to have insulted the *Minang* people, so they asked the authorities to take action. Meanwhile, the pro party defended the business owner and considered the contra party to have played on the SARA issue to break tolerance. Besides, it turns out that historical factors have also sparked the viral issue of *nasi Padang* containing pork.

| KEYWORDS

*Nasi Padang* Containing Pork, Critical Discourse, Text Dimension, Discourse Practice, Sociocultural Practice

| ARTICLE INFORMATION

**ACCEPTED:** 02 February 2023

**PUBLISHED:** 26 February 2023

**DOI:** 10.32996/ijllt.2023.6.3.3

---

### 1. Introduction

Discourse becomes an inseparable part of life. People keep producing discourse every day, either spoken or written. Discourse is born from various urges that influence the human desire to express opinions. The urge can be a problem that always exists in humans. Especially in facing rapid technological developments, there is a lot of discourse spreading on social media. When a discourse is produced, that discourse becomes a trigger for the emergence of other discourses.

That kind of case appeared behind the viral of *Nasi Padang* containing pork. Discourses written by the owner of the Babiambo account were later responded to by several parties in the form of criticism. This criticism provoked netizens to comment and produce various discourses. There is a discourse of rejection. There is also a discourse of support for Babiambo business owners. Various discourses that were born made the atmosphere even hotter; moreover, big figures also commented. It is indicated that this case was driven by political interests. The more lively the conversation, the more viral *Nasi Padang* containing pork that makes its owner checked by the police. The checking actually led to parties protesting in the name of tolerance.

The community is divided into two parties, namely, the pros and cons. The cons clearly object if *Nasi Padang* is contained pork. They thought that this act had insulted the *Minang* people. However, the pros consider that there was no element of humiliation in Babiambo's business. They think food has no religion, so it can be mixed with any ingredients. Moreover, the owner of Babiambo has written the label "non-halal" on his Instagram account. They accused the con parties is playing on the SARA issue to bring down the owner of Babiambo.

The problem of *Nasi Padang* containing pork which is getting hotter is interesting to analyze. Many discourses emerge from various points of view. The point of view is influenced by various factors outside the discourse text that form the paradigm of society.

**Copyright:** © 2022 the Author(s). This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) 4.0 license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). Published by Al-Kindi Centre for Research and Development, London, United Kingdom.

Critical Discourse Analysis can be used to look at these factors. Rohana and Syamsudin (2016: 17) considered that Critical Discourse Analysis could be used to analyze other sciences, such as politics, race, gender, hegemony, culture, and social class contained in discourse. The discourse will be viewed critically using the Norman Fairclough model because Fairclough (1995: 14) considered that Critical Discourse Analysis could be used to view the ideology of social practice. Then, it can draw conclusions contained in a discourse. This finding is a scientific contribution to the development of the discourse on social media.

## **2. Methodology**

This is a qualitative descriptive study using the model of Norman Fairclough's critical discourse analysis. Because discourse is not only an empty sentence, there are many elements in it. Fairclough (1995: 7) argued that in discourse, various forms of social practice appear, so in discourse analysis, texts also function to view sociocultural practices. The discourse will be analyzed and described textually, as well as elements that build from outside the text.

Fairclough (Eriyanto, 2003: 288) divided the analysis model into three dimensions: text which is analyzed linguistically. Discourse practice looks at the production process and text consumption, and sociocultural practice looks at the context outside the text. That three dimensions will be used to analyze the discourse taken as data. The discourse will be analyzed from the text side, production practice, and sociocultural practice.

Data in the form of discourses discussing *Nasi Padang* containing pork were taken from social media Twitter and Instagram and then analyzed. Gee (2014: 162) argued that the background of the discourse's production is that to understand what the speaker is saying, the listener needs to know who is speaking. He explained that listeners should further analyze the speaker's identity. The reader must know the author's background so that he can draw conclusions about the reason for the discourse being produced to know the purpose of the writing. Then also look from the side of the influence of the discourse in society.

## **3. Results and Discussion**

### **3.1 Text Analysis and Discourse Practice of Cons Discourse through Nasi Padang containing Pork.**

Based on information from various news, the excitement of *Nasi Padang* containing pork ingredients started from social media Instagram. At that time, the *Minang* Family Association (IKM) received complaints from the public. From that complaint, *Nasi Padang* containing pork went viral, and as technology developed, information spread quickly. Based on it, so the view of Schiffirin (1987: 5) that language is always addressed to the recipient and is communicative works well. This can be seen in the response made to handle reports from the public. Moreover, this case was brought into the scope of SARA, which most often occurs. Because the case went viral, the business owner was investigated by the police.

Many discourses are formed and built from various points of view and perspectives. Everyone has their own views regarding *Nasi Padang* containing pork. One of the interesting discourses to be inspected comes from the Babiambo Instagram account, the account that is used as a promotional medium for that *Nasi Padang*.



Figure 1. The discourses on Babiambo's and Hilmi28's accounts  
Source: Twitter of Hilmi28

### 1. *First in Indonesia, a Non-Halal Padang Food*

At the text analysis stage, discourse 1 is a discourse written as biodata on Babiambo's Instagram account. The discourse is written in English as a promotion to the public. Currently, people's views on the use of English are more "up-to-date" and can increase prices. In discourse 1, the words "first in Indonesia" are seen, which are often used by various products to attract customer attention. The business owner tries to provide information to the public that he was the first to sell the food. This is also reinforced by the discourse on "non-halal *Padang* food", which becomes the strength of the product. Discourse 1 functions as a medium to attract people's attention to buy the products made.

The discourse was born from various conditions that occur in society. As an entrepreneur, looking for product excellence must be done before the business is formed. Business owners see excellence based on the phenomena around them; usually, *Nasi Padang* has never been made from pork. It can be an innovation as well as an opportunity to attract non-Muslim customers. The taste of *Nasi Padang* is no doubt; it has become a favorite food in Indonesia. That reason is what makes business owners do innovation by making *Nasi Padang* from pork. Then discourse 1 was born as a biodata on Babiambo's Instagram account.

At the stage of sociocultural practice, discourse 1 creates pro and contra on social impacts. As Wodak and Meyer (2001: 122) argued, social life is an interconnected network of diverse social practices (economic, political, cultural, and so on). Diversity raises many points of view when looking at the *Nasi Padang* containing pork case.

Several people, especially non-Muslim customers, welcome the presence of non-halal *Nasi Padang* because they can enjoy *Nasi Padang* made from pork. Discourse 1 also raises contra parties, hoping the owner will apologize and close his business even though he blatantly writes the label "non-halal" on his Instagram account. The label provides information that the product made is not aimed at the Muslim community.

If you look at the context of the location, situation, and condition of the discourse produced, it is clear that it has become a wild discourse in society. The discourse could have gone viral and become a problem. SARA is still a hot issue; just a little burning will make it bigger. The media development makes information conveyed quickly.

Hilmi28's Twitter account also spoke out against discourse 1; Fairclough and Fairclough (2012: 53) considered that argumentation always appears as a response to differences of opinion, doubts, or criticism. Based on that view, Hilmi28 argued that there are differences of opinion as well as criticism of Babiambo's owners. He flatly refused to try *Nasi Padang* containing Pork.

2. In my opinion, this has crossed the line. The *Minang* people are firm with the principles of *ADAT BASANDI SYARAK and SYARAK BASANDI KITABULLAH*. *Padang* food is famous in the world for its taste, delicacy and halal. Please don't destroy it. Even if it is a marketing trick, this is too much. Please take action soon.

Discourse 2 is a post written by Hilmi28 on his Twitter account, containing her objection to the presence of *Nasi Padang* containing pork. Hilmi28 wrote, "*ADAT BASANDI SYARAK, SYARAK BASANDI KITABULLAH*" this fragment is a reinforcement that all *Minang* people obey traditional law based on religion and religious law based on the Qur'an.

Hilmi28 provided information about practice and Islam in the *Minang* community through aphorisms. Aphorisms are written in capital letters, thus creating an emphasis on the reader. Hilmi28 used a lot of abbreviations because they were written on social media. Usually, social media users often use abbreviations in writing.

Discourse 2 was produced by Hilmi28 due to his long experience and knowledge. According to him, the *Minang* people are known for their tradition and religious laws originating from the Al-Qur'an, so all the food consumed is made from halal meat. Such as the part of the discourse "*Padang* food is famous in the world because of its taste, delicacy & halalness", which requires that all *Nasi Padang* is made from halal ingredients. That's why discourse 2 was born, the Hilmi28 account tried to provide information to the public so they could control it, and no one made *Nasi Padang* from non-halal ingredients.

Moreover, that product carries the identity of "*Padang*", which is still thick with Islamic nuances. Tradition and cultural factors become absolute forms of power. *Nasi Padang* has been made by generations from halal ingredients, so it has become something absolute. If *Nasi Padang* is made from non-halal ingredients, then it becomes an aberration. Hilmi28 asked the public not to ruin the halal values contained in *Padang* food.

His opinion was posted on Twitter as a form of protest, and many people supported it. Most Twitter users and *Nasi Padang* lovers in Indonesia are Muslim. Twitter, as a social media, has succeeded in spreading Hilmi28's opinions quickly throughout the region.

Through his experience and knowledge, Hilmi28 also suspected that the Babiambo account was trying to use marketing tricks to attract customers.

Through the discourse "even if it is a marketing trick", two different views have been formed between Hilmi28 and the owner of the Babiambo account. According to Hilmi28, the use of pork in *Nasi Padang* is not an innovation but is suspected as a sales trick. In line with *Nasi Padang's* popularity among the public, he suspected that the business owner was deliberately creating a scene so that his products sell well. The discourse ends with the sentence, " Please take action soon", which means that Hilmi28 asked the authorities to take action on the case.



Figure 2. The Discourses on Fadli Zon's Account  
Source: Twitter of Fadli Zon

Fadli Zon also commented on the containing pork issue on his Twitter account, which is in line with Hilmi28's opinion.

3. *Minang/Padang* food is known as halal cuisine. Moreover, the principle of the *Minang* people " *adat bersendi syarak, syarak bersendi Kitabullah*". Rendang has also been recognized by the world as one of the most delicious foods made from halal meat. If someone uses pork, it will obviously hurt the *Minang/Padang* people.
4. As General Chairman of the *Minang* Family Association (IKM), we strongly protest against the sale of *Minang/Padang* culinary containing pork. This is sensitive and undermines the principles of halal *Minang/Padang* cuisine.

Discourses 3 and 2 have the same intention; Fadli Zon is also against the seller of *Nasi Padang* containing pork. He considered that *Minang* food is always made from halal ingredients. In fact, its halalness has gone global; Fadli Zon also elevated the principles of the *Minang* people through the aphorisms of *Adat Bersendi Syarak, Syarak Bersendi Kitabullah*.

In part 4 of the discourse, "as General Chairman of the *Minang* Family Association (IKM), we strongly protest against the sale of *Minang/Padang* culinary containing pork," there is a form of power. Eriyanto (2011: 224) considered that in discourse, there are social structures, domination, power, and thoughts that form the text of the discourse. Power in Discourse 4 is defined as a group of people who control allegations of deviations from their culinary traditions which have been known as halal food. They were trying to return the culinary to its original state so that no one uses non-halal meat anymore.

As chairman of the *Minang* Family Association, Fadli Zon clearly expressed his protest in Discourse 4. He considered that the presence of Discourse 1 had damaged the principles of *Padang* cuisine, which are known to be halal based on history, customs and culture. This view is influenced by the domination of a strong group of people, thus giving birth to certain habits or traditions. A paradigm emerged that *Minang* culinary must be halal.

For him, halal has become a culture and tradition that cannot be changed. If it is served with non-halal meat, then there is a deviation from culture and tradition. It could be that deviations lead to harassment of a group of people. That harassment is what is being felt, so discourse 4 is born against *Nasi Padang* containing pork.

Discourses 3 and 4 were produced and distributed via Twitter because they can reach a wider and faster audience. Fadli Zon also frequently criticizes various issues via Twitter. Criticism via Twitter has had a major impact on the attitudes people take. So *Nasi Padang* containing pork can go viral and become a serious problem.

The Tifsembiring's Twitter account also commented on this case, which criticized the seller of Nasi Padang Babi.



Figure 3. A Discourse on Tifsembiring's Account  
Source: Twitter of Tifsembiring

5. You have defaced the image of *Minang/Padang* food, which has been guaranteed HALAL. This label is well-known throughout the world. There is no history, *Minang* cuisine has a pork menu. He is really looking for trouble.

In terms of text, the discourse written by Tifsembiring contained his views on *Minang* food which is known as halal throughout the world. Straightforwardly discourse 5 is addressed to Babiambo's account owner.

Tifsembiring thought the owner of Babiambo had defaced *Minang* food because it is made from pork. Even the word "HALAL" is written using capital letters as a form of emphasis. Tifsembiring also wrote the sentence, "This label is well known throughout the world", as reinforcement that *Minang* food must be made from halal ingredients. According to him, the halal label is guaranteed, and there is no history of *Minang* dishes made from pork.

Discourse 5 includes expressions of anger and criticism towards the seller of *Nasi Padang* containing pork. Tifsembiring believed that the owner of the Babiambo's account had caused trouble to the *Minang* people through the discourse, "He is really looking for trouble". So, the discourse was born as a form of anger towards the case.

Anger arose because of Tifsembiring's experience and knowledge of *Nasi Padang*, which is usually made from halal ingredients. Masitoh (2020: 68) explained that when someone has a discourse, he is expressing intent through language intending to inform, order, influence, and persuade. Based on that view, Tifsembiring is informing and ordering that no one should make *Nasi Padang* from non-halal meat anymore.

However, discourses 2, 3, 4, and 5 are not fully supported by the community. Many also support Babiambo's owners and criticize those who take issue with them. Starting from discourse 1, a domino effect emerged on social media. This effect involved the seller, the cons, and those who were pros to the seller. Everyone argued with each other, and many discourses emerged from this problem.

### 3.2 Text Analysis and Discourse Practice of Pro Discourse on Nasi Padang Containing Pork

Criticism discourse of non-halal *Nasi Padang* turned out to be widely addressed by those who support the owner of Babiambo. There are also those who do not support it directly but criticize those who question the birth of *Nasi Padang* containing pork. They view *Nasi Padang* as having no religion. *Nasi Padang* is just a culinary dish that can be made from a variety of ingredients. The innovation made by Babiambo's account owner is not wrong, even though it is combined with pork. That view is what some people try to express through their discourse on social media.

One of which was revealed by the Twitter account of Emerson\_yuntho. He was confused by the case.



Figure 4. A Discourse on Emerson\_yuntho's Account  
Source: Twitter of Emerson\_yuntho

6. The restaurant is clear, "babiambo", and written Non-Halal Padang Food. Then, where is the insulting or disturbing or deceiving or where is the punishment?

Discourse text 6 is a form of Emerson\_yuntho's confusion towards people who are concerned about Nasi Padang Babi. Through a part of the discourse, "The restaurant is clear "babiambo" and written Non-Halal Padang Food," he provided information that the food is only for non-Muslims. According to Emerson\_yuntho, there is no mistake there. The seller has provided information that the product is made from non-halal materials.

The discourse ended with the question, "Then, where is the insulting or disturbing or deceiving or where is the punishment?" which allows other accounts to comment. Emerson\_yuntho dared to write that question because he believes the owner of Babiambo does not disturb or offend certain groups. But purely for the culinary business, the target customer is non-Muslims.

A similar discourse was also expressed by the Instagram account of Permadiaktivis2; the account criticized those who dispute Nasi Padang containing pork.



Figure 5. A Discourse on Permadiaktivis2's Account  
Source: Instagram of Permadiaktivis2

7. It is getting viral, guys.. just because of selling pork *rendang* using the name "babiambo" and the fuss about bringing SARA to the police and going to court.. these *wong-wong's* (people) life are so complicated, aren't they? Elon Musk has taken care of the planet Mars, China has taken care of the space station, and Indonesia is still taking care of pork *rendang*, do you understand why this nation was colonized for 350 years?

Discourse 7 is in the form of Permadiaktivis2's criticism of those who oppose the presence of *Nasi Padang* containing pork. Discourse is written in a light language, like writing on other social media, occasionally inserting regional languages. Through a part of the discourse "to make a fuss about bringing SARA to the police and to going to court," he thought that *Nasi Padang* containing pork does not offend SARA.

In fact, Permadiaktivis2 thought that these parties were trying to drive wild opinions in society. They wanted to question it so that the owner of Babiambo was caught in the SARA case. Through the passage about " these *wong-wong's* (people) life are so complicated, aren't they?" Permadiaktivis2 considered people who criticize the owner of Babiambo for being complicated in life.

He believed that the people in Indonesia were still making a fuss over the SARA issue, even though the issue was not against SARA. Permadiaktivis2 compared it with other countries such as China which is busy taking care of the space station, Elon Musk, who is busy taking care of the planet Mars, while the people of Indonesia are still busy dealing with the endless SARA issue.

Indirectly, through discourse 7, Permadiaktivis2 assumed people in Indonesia are still left behind from other countries. The reason is that there are still many people who carry the issue of SARA in their lives. The discourse ended with the sentence, " Indonesia is still taking care of pork *rendang*, do you understand why this nation was colonized for 350 years?" which indirectly Permadiaktivis2 equated the current condition of the Indonesian nation with the colonial period. The implied meaning he wanted to convey is the views of the majority of people who are not yet advanced. There are still many who hold old-fashioned views in the midst of rapid globalization.

Looking from the point of view of production practices, discourses 6 and 7 have similarities in the processes that occur in the view of Emerson\_yuntho and Permadiaktivis2. They often criticized several people who offend religion in everyday life. Moreover, people who have "fanaticism" towards religious understanding thus question the differences that occur. This situation has often been protested, especially by Permadiaktivis2, who considered many people to be intolerant, considering differences to be a problem.

That reason led to the inception of discourses 6 and 7, starting from some people's criticism that *Padang* food must be made from halal ingredients. Discourses 6 and 7 were produced with the aim of providing information to the public that cooking has no religion and can be innovated with any ingredients. This view also reaped pros and cons, with many who supported it, but some others gave criticism.

Opinions and mutual criticism have become common things in social media, especially for those who have specific goals so that an issue can become viral and be discussed by many people. Frequently, the content of the discourse is blasphemous, especially to people who do not share the same understanding. From discourses 6 and 7, it appears that views are related to the context of tolerance; the discourse giver considers *Nasi Padang* containing pork not made to offend any group. In fact, it was made as a business, especially in the bio of Babiambo's Instagram account; it was written "non-halal" and aimed at non-Muslim buyers.

The viral case of *Nasi Padang* containing pork was also responded to by the artists; they also commented through several discourses written on social media.





Figure 6. A Discourse on Sosiawanleak's Account  
Source: Instagram of Sosiawanleak

## 8. Rendang Religion

my name is *Minang*  
said the official; my religion is *halal*  
even my child is *rendang*  
associated with the same religion  
although it is not recorded on the identity card  
or state institution

therefore, socializing with non-halal  
banned by them  
pork, for example!

whereas sometimes I allow  
*rendang* playing in the fridge  
which, from its name, is clearly unfaithful  
running around with friends  
who have no faith  
hide and seek with soy sauce,  
bread, margarine and soft drink  
chatting with apples  
pears, cherries and grapes  
the one at the neighbor's house  
instead of liquor to make a digression

with spices and coconut milk  
I take care of *rendang* in a pan  
hang out over the gas stove  
which is raised by fire from an LPG cylinder



maintained hose, regulator and burner without stopping  
all whose beliefs are relative

when grown up  
I serve *rendang* to be married to anyone  
regardless of bad breath, fart sounds,  
and the religion!

Solo, June 12<sup>th</sup>, 2022

Discourse 8, written by Sosiawanleak's Instagram account, is a response to the viral *Nasi Padang* containing pork case. Sosiawanleak expressed his opinion through poetry. Many of the language styles used in the form of narrative poetry tell stories about *Rendang*.

Sosiawanleak's first stanza opens by introducing the origins of *Rendang* through a parable. He likens various words that often appear in the *Nasi Padang* containing pork case as reinforcements for poetry. Sosiawanleak likens *Minang* as a human being who is "halal" as a symbol of Islam. *Minang* has a child named *Rendang* through the stanza "even my child is *rendang* / associated with the same religion". *Rendang*, born from the womb of *Minang*, is required to have the same religion, namely halal. The line "although it is not recorded on identity card / or state institution" actually has an implied meaning that there is no written evidence that *Rendang* is halal.

It is clear that the parable of *Rendang* as a human being is a form of satire towards some people who think that food has a religion like humans. Moreover, it is tucked in the diction, "said the official," which often fuels the public with their arguments. Sosiawanleak satirized people who treated *Rendang* like a human being, given a certain religion. So, *Rendang* absolutely must be made from halal ingredients.

The second, third and fourth stanzas begin to "flick" the issues that are currently being discussed. Telling about *Rendang* as adherents of the halal religion are not allowed to associate with non-halal ingredients. It is forbidden for *Rendang* to mix with pork because it is forbidden by "them", which refers to the diction of "official" in the first stanza.

The ban was a wrong and confusing decision. Because sometimes, *Rendang* plays in the fridge, which, according to Sosiawanleak, does not share his faith. Sosiawanleak also likens objects and other materials to human beings, like *Rendang*, which is made human-like by some people. If that is the case, it is clear that the refrigerator, from its name, does not share the same faith as *Rendang*. Moreover, in the refrigerator, *Rendang* mixes with soy sauce, bread, margarine, soft drinks, apples, pears, cherries, wine, liquor, spices, coconut milk, frying pans, gas stoves, and others. The various contents of the refrigerator symbolize the various beliefs they profess. But the belief is still relative.

Logically, if *Rendang* cannot be allowed to play with pork, then it cannot be played with other ingredients that do not share the same faith. Religion can also be made of other materials if *Rendang* is "forced" to have a religion. But when *Rendang* plays with other ingredients that are believed to be unfaithful, the public does not mind. The treatment is different if *Rendang* plays with pork.

Sosiawanleak explained that at that time, *Rendang* was still small. He plays Hide and Seeks with soy sauce, bread, margarine and soft drinks. *Rendang* is treated with spices and coconut milk in a pan. The fourth stanza describes the process of making *rendang*, starting from the form of ingredients to being ready-to-eat food. The manufacturing process is also mixed with various materials and tools that are relatively religious.

The climax of the poem is in the last stanza; the fifth stanza tries to convey the meaning of tolerance to the reader. The diction "I serve *rendang* to be married to anyone / regardless of bad breath, fart sounds, / and the religion" symbolizes that *Rendang* can be enjoyed by anyone and not just certain groups. Although some people require *rendang* to be halal, in reality, *Rendang* is just culinary. Everyone can enjoy it in their own way.

Sosiawanleak taught tolerance through his poetry to readers. This poem is a discourse born because of the viral issue of *Nasi Padang* containing pork. As an artist, it is his idealism and views that lead him to comment through poetry on Instagram. His discourse was born because of the influence of habits, knowledge, and social environment. As a poet, problems become a mine of ideas for writing works. The work is used as a medium to distribute opinions and views.

Another account that commented on the problem of *Nasi Padang* containing pork is masbutet. He took a fragment of Joko Pinurbo's poem as writing on the picture and equipped it with a caption.



Figure 7. A discourse on Masbutet's Account  
Source: Instagram of Masbutet

9. DIRTY QUESTION. What is implied from Jokpin's clever poem, Joko Pinurbo, is that it is such a dirty question. Then, it must be cleaned. I deliberately post because now even *badokan* (food) must be religious. Maybe soon, underwear, chairs, cigarettes, towels, lipstick, sandals, etc., will also be asked, "what is your religion?". *Uasuwook*.

Discourse 9 is the contents of the caption written by Masbutet to strengthen his argument from an artist's point of view. Joko Pinurbo's poem quoted has long been written in a different context. However, the atmosphere is appropriate in the problem of *Nasi Padang* containing pork which is being appointed. So, from a context perspective, Joko Pinurbo's poem was used by Masbutet as an argument to criticize people who question *Nasi Padang* containing pork.

Discourse 9 begins with the sentence "DIRTY QUESTION" written in capital letters. Masbutet tried to emphasize to the reader that the question "what is your religion?" is a dirty question. Masbutet criticized people who cannot appreciate differences, especially people who still carry elements of SARA in their activities.

He borrowed the discourse on "DIRTY QUESTION" from a fragment of Joko Pinurbo's poem and, at the same time, called it a clever poem. Even people who still don't want to accept differences have to have their minds washed and cleansed. Differences are absolute; no human being is exactly the same. At least different, from the point of view.

Masbutet's discourse was born because of his frustration with the *Nasi Padang* containing pork problem. He thought the community had gone too far in bringing SARA into a problem. Even though the social environment does not belong to just one group, but belongs to the entire group with tolerance. Masbutet believed that one day other objects such as cigarettes, towels, lipstick, and others would become religious like humans. So not everyone can use it anymore. The discourse ended with the word "*uasuwuok*", which was a swear word that he softened.

Some of the discourses that were born as a form of criticism against people who question *Nasi Padang* containing pork have different backgrounds. Many factors prompted people to give comments, both internal and external factors. But all of these opinions are still in accordance with the track, meaning not as an insult to other people. Differences of opinion occur due to different points of view in looking at the problem.

### **3.3 Sociocultural Practice of Pro and Cons Discourse Through *Nasi Padang* Containing Pork**

If you look at it from a historical perspective, before the *Nasi Padang* containing pork case went viral, similar cases often occurred in the community. The hottest case occurred in the 2017 DKI Jakarta General Election; identity politics is very strong and thick. Political battles become a place for parties to spread their ideology. Dijk (2000: 11) considered that ideology is built from social beliefs, not personal opinions. This point of view can be seen from the parties, which are a group of people, not just one person. At least there are two groups, namely nationalists and religious, who are fighting. They competed with each other to spread influence and power to society until one of the candidates is accused of blasphemy.

Starting from that moment, the atmosphere of identity politics began to heat up, and nationalist and religious groups began to tear each other down. Various propaganda was spread by both parties so as to bring up the names of figures who were considered the originators of the movement. There was also a buzzer that often spread its influence on social media.

Identity politics returned to happen in the 2019 presidential election, nationalist and religious parties began to spread their influence and power. They had their own goals, especially political goals. Nationalists tried to attack with the issue of intolerance, while religious parties attacked with the issue of religion. If there are problems regarding issues of religion and intolerance, it is very likely that political factors also play a role in it.

The issue that is often played by religious groups is blasphemy against religion. Many nationalists were reported for accusations of blasphemy; some even ended up in jail. Meanwhile, the nationalists brought up terrorist and anti-Pancasila issues. So that many organizations were disbanded, considered dangerous to the unity and integrity of the nation.

This problem became the beginning of SARA issues which became increasingly vulnerable in society. Politics also influence social and cultural developments in Indonesia. The development of information media has become a stove to burn people's anger. Although sometimes the issues that are played have not been proven true. Some elements bring up SARA issues with the aim of bringing down certain groups.

Another incident that still brings up the issue of SARA in culinary affairs is when the un-Islamic *klepon* post went viral. Obviously, the post provoked a variety of public opinion. Posts were "fried" by both parties (nationalists and religious) according to their goals. It is even suspected that the Islamic *klepon* issue has political elements.

This series of issues was the trigger for the emergence of the *Nasi Padang* containing pork case, which went viral in June 2022. Again, the nationalists and religious parties differed in opinion; various discourses were born like hot balls in society. The issue is also allegedly politically charged because, in a few years, a general election will be held. A group of people who have political goals is building their social environment. Badara (2012: 20) considered that in Critical Discourse Analysis, individuals are not neutral subjects who are free to interpret according to their thoughts but are influenced by social forces that exist in society. So, it is suspected that some of the people who commented on the *Nasi Padang* containing pork case were also driven by political interests.

Zoes (Aliah, 2014) considered texts to never be separated from ideology and have the ability to manipulate readers towards an ideology. Based on that opinion, some people who comment on *Nasi Padang* containing pork are directing readers to follow the ideology they understand. Although, there are also many people who comment without being ridden by political interests. They are the ones who really care about inter-religious harmony and, at the same time, have their own idealism in seeing a problem.

#### 4. Conclusion

This study aims to analyze the discourse critically that was born due to the *Nasi Padang* containing pork that is excited on social media. The discourse raised pros and cons with different opinion's backgrounds. The owner of Babiambo used discourse as a promotional medium for his *Nasi Padang* containing pork. So, it became a wild discourse that raised the pros and cons. Moreover, technological developments made information spread quickly. Those who opposed *Nasi Padang* containing pork thought that the owner of Babiambo had insulted the *Minang* people. However, the pros think food does not have a certain religion like humans. So, it does not matter if it is made with a variety of ingredients, one of which is pork. The *Nasi Padang* containing pork case is only one of a series of cases that led to SARA, which has long been used by several parties in Indonesia. One of the big issues was during the 2017 DKI Jakarta General Election, one of the candidates was considered to have insulted religion and was put in prison. This case was also brought up during the 2019 presidential election; SARA issues were very heavily brought into the political sphere. So that when *Nasi Padang* containing pork became viral, political influence could also be felt through some people who deliberately used the *Nasi Padang* containing pork case to spread their influence.

These findings are expected to provide in-depth information regarding the *Nasi Padang* containing pork problem so that people can think critically and determine attitudes. Communities are expected to respect each other and not be divided just because of different views. Provocative discourse can divide society to bring each other down. The results of the discourse analysis in this study seek to influence the public that the pros and cons are normal.

This research is still limited by a few discourses, even though there are many other discourses that appear on social media. Netizens' opinions have not all been included, so only a few samples are limited. This limitation is also a suggestion for further research so that it can reach other discourses that have not been included in this study.

**Funding:** This research received no external funding.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

**Publisher's Note:** All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers.

## **References**

- [1] Aliah, YA. (2014). Analisis Wacana Kritis dalam Multiperspektif. Bandung: PT Refika Aditama.
- [2] Badara, A. (2012). Analisis Wacana: Teori, Metode, dan Penerapannya pada Wacana Media. Jakarta: Kencana.
- [3] Dijk, TAV. (2000). Ideology and Discourse a Multidisciplinary Introduction. Barcelona: Pompeu Fabra University.
- [4] Eriyanto. (2003). Analisis Framing: Konstruksi, Ideology, dan Politik Media. Yogyakarta: LkiS Printing Cemerlang.
- [5] Eriyanto. (2011). Analisis Wacana Pengantar Analisis Teks Media. Yogyakarta: LKiS Printing Cemerlang.
- [6] Fairclough, I., dan Fairclough, N. (2012). Political Discourse Analysis a Method for Advanced Students. Canada: Routledge.
- [7] Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman.
- [8] Gee, JP. (2014). *How to do Discourse Analysis a Toolkit*. Canada: Routledge.
- [9] Masitoh. (2020). *Pendekatan dalam Analisis Wacana Kritis*. Jurnal Elsa. 18(1).
- [10] Rohana, dan Syamsudin. (2016). Analisis Wacana. Makassar: CV Samudra Alif-Mim.
- [11] Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [12] Wodak, R., dan Meyer, M. (2001). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.