

CHRISTIANS' TOLERANCE OF MUSLIMS' RELIGIOUS SOUNDS IN TANA TORAJA

Akbar

State Institute for Islamic Studies, Kendari
Jalan Sultan Qaimuddin no. 17 Baruga, Kendari, Southeast Sulawesi, Indonesia
email: akbar@iainkendari.ac.id

Syani Bombongan Rantesalu

State College for Christian Studies, Tana Toraja
Jalan Poros Makale-Makassar, Km 11,5 Batukila' Mengkendek Tana Toraja
email: syani.rantesalu777@gmail.com

Article received August 27th, 2022; Article revised April 30th, 2023; Article approved May 30th, 2023

Abstract

Despite extensive research on religious tolerance, there is little empirical research on the sensitive issue of sacred sound, particularly in minority Muslim areas. This issue emerged in Indonesia following the Minister of Religious Affairs' policy to regulate loudspeakers from mosques, which were seen as potentially causing intolerance. Religious tolerance remains well established in Muslim-minority areas such as Tana Toraja, even though mosques are allowed to sound freely. The present research explores the traces of Christian tolerance to the sound of mosques heard by minority Muslims. This qualitative study applied an interpretive phenomenological research design with religious leaders, academics, students, and Christian community members as data sources. Garret Keizer's noise theory and Robert Hayden's concept of tolerance categorisation were used to analyse the data. The research results indicated tolerance between religious communities as the mosque sound was accepted as a natural-cultural sound rather than a theological sound. Therefore, intolerance potential arises from the sociological rather than theological dimension. This study suggests that religious tolerance should be shaped by a professional understanding of one's faith and an appropriate response to the religious practices of others. External factors such as social, economic, and political issues, often framed as religious issues, are at the root of religious intolerance. In order to counter the risk of intolerance, a systematic and continuous socialisation of a moderate understanding of all elements of the religious communities is required.

Keywords: Muslim-Christian; noise; religious voice; tana toraja; tolerance

INTRODUCTION

The use of loudspeakers and amplification of mosque sounds has caused religious conflict around the world, particularly in Muslim minority areas. In several Muslim minority countries, such as India, South Africa (Moosa, 2021), and the Netherlands (Tamimi Arab, 2015), Muslims associated with the sound of *azan* (the call to prayer) from mosques are prohibited from interacting with followers of other religions. The local government has established several strategies and regulations to resolve inter-religious conflicts caused by religious sounds. However, these have not reduced the conflict potential to the maximum level.

The main challenge in mitigating this long-standing phenomenon lies in the traditions and teachings of different religions or sects. Certain religions or sects believe the noise is part of a series of rituals that bring them closer to God. In contrast, other religions or sects regard noise as a disturbance because they are uninvolved and have no interest in the ritual.

In Indonesia, including Muslim minority areas like Tana Toraja, religious noise does not cause interfaith conflict. In contrast to other Muslim-majority countries, tolerance between Christians and Muslims is still widely practiced in Tana Toraja (Taylor, 2014). Despite the mosque's loud noises

disturbing most Christians, their religious practices continue as usual.

Tolerance between Muslims and Christians is essential for in-depth research to learn the sustainability of religious tolerance. At the same time, the practice of amplifying the sound of mosques has continued to exist. In addition, this research is crucial in examining the need to restrict loudspeakers, particularly the sound of the *Azan* from mosques. As is well known, Muslims have been debating the pros and cons of restricting loudspeakers in recent years. The idea of Vice President Jusuf Kalla (2004-2009 and 2014-2019) and Minister of Religion Yaquut Cholil Qoumas (2020-2024) to regulate the use of loudspeakers was rejected by Muslims because it was considered irrelevant for Indonesia, which has no history of conflict on this issue. However, both agreed that mosque noise had the potential to cause intolerance and conflict.

Studies focusing on religious noise are still limited, even though religious tolerance in majority-minority areas has been the subject of extensive research. Previous publications have prioritized conceptual analysis (Setyabudi, 2020), social interactions (Marpuah, 2019), and the construction of places of worship (Pamungkas, 2014). Meanwhile, research on the sound of houses of worship has only focused on political issues, legal and regulatory issues (Grant, 2018; Kovačič, 2016b; Moosa, 2021), conflict-related issues, and conflict resolution strategies (Kovačič, 2016a; Tamimi Arab, 2015). Therefore, more research is still needed on religious noise and how it relates to the tolerance of majority adherents towards minority religious adherents. This article aims to fill this gap by developing the idea of Christian-Muslim tolerance for mosque sound in Muslim-majority areas.

The following three questions are addressed to achieve the research objectives: 1) How does the Christian community in Tana Toraja respond to the *azan* from the mosque? 2) Why do Christians in Tana Toraja respond to the call to prayer in the way they do? 3) How the *azan* in the mosque might lead to intolerance between Christians and Muslims?

Literature Review

The use of loudspeakers broadcasting sound from mosques began in the 1920s, though their use for *azan* became well-known in the 1930s (Pijper, 1977). According to Abbink (2018), loudspeakers became widespread around the 1990s and served as the foundation struggling for hegemony among religious communities.

Behind the struggle for hegemony, sounds from houses of worship, such as sermons, religious songs, and hymns, are referred to as disturbances that violate the neutrality and freedom of public space. On the other hand, Hsieh and Hwang's (2015) findings show that not all sounds are annoying. Some sounds can induce a sense of safety in a person, so they are drawn to the sound's source. This sound contains historical, geographical, ecological, and cultural characteristics.

The findings of Hsieh and Hwang are supported by Aili et al. (2014) that sound embodies the social and cultural meanings of local communities and specific regions. In fact, according to Calleri et al. (2019), certain voices contribute significantly to a sense of safety and social comfort in individuals. Particularly, Yelmi (2016) perceives the *azan* sound as a cultural sound that indicates the significance of the characteristics of the daily traditions of a community, both urban and rural.

Religious voices or the sounds of houses of worship, such as the *azan* in mosques and the ringing of church bells, are also claimed to be sacred voices with theological overtones because they are functioned following religious guidance. Concerning this sacredness, Mojca Kovacic (2017) explained that when the sound of places of worship is associated with problematic noise issues, a holistic approach is required to understand it. The classification of sacred sounds as noise is highly precarious because, according to Kovacic, the sound of bells has been undervalued because it has been a part of the everyday soundscape, which is sometimes no longer perceived as a disturbance.

A holistic or multi-disciplines approach to religious voices is necessary because religious practices are inextricably linked to numerous facets of life, such as culture, economy, and politics. Considering

the defense for the right to religious liberty, Najma Moosa's (2021) study employs a perspective based on South African laws and legal cases to analyze the sound of the call to prayer. Moosa recognizes the call to prayer as both a religious symbol and a cultural artifact. In addition to emphasizing the importance of a holistic approach, the Moosa Study is highly relevant to research on mosque voices, religious freedom, and tolerance because it is conducted in Muslim minority areas.

Due to the prevalence of religious conflict in areas with majority-minority tendencies, there is an urgent need to study religious [in]tolerance in regions with both majority and minority adherents. For example, Pooyan Tamimi Arab (2015), provides evidence of relevant research by examining instances of the use of minarets by Muslims in the Netherlands to mark prayer times as an alternative to the call to prayer, which is opposed by the majority. This study illustrates the majority's resistance and the minority's strategy to preserve their respective religions. Furthermore, multicultural and multi-religious factors create a tendency toward intolerance. In his study of Ghana, De Witte (De Witte, 2008) describes violence fuelled by religious voices in multicultural settings.

Indonesia is a multicultural nation with the world's largest Muslim population. Nonetheless, there are regions in Indonesia where Muslims are a minority population. Tana Toraja is one of these countries. It is dominated by Christians and Muslims with minority status. 85.94% of Tana Toraja's inhabitants are Christians (69.49% Protestant and 16.45% Catholic), whereas 12.17% are Muslims (Statistik, 2021).

Based on the description of previous studies, the study of voice and religious tolerance in Tana Toraja will fill a gap in tolerance research dominated by cultural and traditional studies. Based on cultural practices and cultural principles, it has been asserted that the Tana Toraja is religiously tolerant. Furthermore, this research will employ a communication approach, a sound and soundscape study, and a religious study. In contrast to previous researchers, the theological approach to religious voices cannot be used as a single approach.

Conceptual Framework

Sound and noise are two concepts frequently used interchangeably despite having distinct connotations for listeners. Sound is a vibration that travels through air or other media and is audible when it reaches the ears of animals and humans, whereas noise is "unwanted sound".

Daniel Fink considers this definition of unwanted sound inadequate, as there are desired sounds that threaten human health. Therefore, Fink reconstructs the noise theory by introducing a "harmful" variable. "Noise is unwanted and/or harmful sound", according to Fink. A new definition of noise is urgently required to account for the variable hazard posed by the noise itself and to aid in altering perceptions of noise (Fink, 2019b). Fink's perspective aligns with that of David Shaw, who observes the potential dangers of noise that are sometimes overlooked because they are deemed non-disturbing. Shaw developed this variable through his "noisy autonomy" theory (Shaw, 2021). Fink and Shaw's theory regarding the existence of a "danger" indicator in noise is also consistent with González's view that noise is pollution that can negatively impact human health and comfort, as well as ecosystems (González, 2014).

Garrett Keizer argues that noise is difficult to define due to the difficulty separating the listener's subjectivity and objectivity. Therefore, Keizer emphasized that a multifaceted approach, such as human rights and political approaches, is necessary to define noise. Although Keizer also defines noise as unwanted sound, he adds that noise contains a "pain" component. As stated by Fink in his study (Fink, 2019a), this "pain" is determined by external factors such as political policies (Keizer, 2010), not just "pain" which means physical discomfort. In certain situations, physical pain and discomfort triggered by loud noises can cause emotional responses such as anxiety and avoidance of sound, known as Phonophobia (Henry et al., 2022).

Experts concur that noise indicates danger and a threat to human life. Keizer's approach to the danger mentioned above differs from the opinions of Fink, Shaw, and Gonzales. Whereas for Fink, Shaw, and Gonzales, the posed a threat has a

physiological dimension, while for Keizer, it has a psychological dimension.

Marie Suzanne Thompson uses the psychological dimension to explain the hazard indicators of noise. Marie points to the relationship between noise, "unwantedness" and "badness". She acknowledges the difficulty of defining noise in terms of subject-oriented and object-oriented definitions. According to her, the subject-oriented definition of noise suggests that the listener produces it, whereas the object-oriented definition defines noise as a type of sound. By combining Michel Serres' analysis of Relational Philosophy with Baruch Spinoza's Philosophy of Affect, Marie concludes that noise is a productive, transformative force and an essential component of material relations (Thompson, 2014).

In material relations, noise and silence are binary opposites. Marie then identified a 'conservative politics of silence' and a 'transgressive politics of noise.' Noise is associated with spectacle, which drowns out the beauty of silence. According to Marie, this generalisation needs to be revised (inaccurate) because the ugliness of noise is secondary, relational, and contingent. It is possible to have pleasant noise and, conversely, destructive silence. Like silence, noise can generate positive affection when it creates feelings of belonging, safety, and connection (Thompson, 2014). Therefore, Marie claims that a sense of belonging, safety, and connectedness causes what was first perceived as noise to have an affectionate effect, an essential consideration in the concept of tolerance.

Tolerance is often interpreted literally as an attitude of respect and allowing others the freedom to behave and act. To practice religious tolerance, one must abstain from physical and verbal violence against individuals of different religions. Recognising individual rights, including the freedom not to be subjected to violence by others, is fundamental to this disposition.

In addition to recognition, several other variables include hospitality, respect, and the acceptance of the right of other people's traditions to exist, as well as the ability to acknowledge differences and regard others as equals. Bretherton recognises that societal differences in religious values require an

openness to accept them. Accepting differences is synonymous with recognising and valuing the existence of religious groups (Bretherton, 2004).

Rainer Forst (2012) constructs hierarchical tolerance dimensions from variables and indicators of religious tolerance. The first level is "permission" which means the majority gives power to the minority; the second level is "coexistence" which is the constellation of plurality of groups undergoing pragmatic tolerance; the third level is "respect" which is the constellation of the plurality of groups that respect each other as equal; and the fourth level is "plurality of groups" that mutually recognize existence and equality based on respect for the diversity of identities.

If Forst reveals the tolerance levels, Robert Hayden categorizes it as positive or negative. Positive tolerance is characterized by recognition and respect, whereas negative tolerance is characterized by non-interference, i.e., tolerance that merely refrains from rejecting. Negative tolerance is also referred to as antagonistic tolerance (Hayden, 2002)

According to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, religious tolerance is the recognition of religion's rights and freedoms, including internal and external freedoms. Internal freedom encompasses the freedom of the heart to believe, adhere to, and alter religions and beliefs. While external freedom to express religion in the form of teaching, practice, and worship in public or private spaces, either alone or in groups. This freedom includes the rights to establish places of worship, use religious symbols, celebrate religious holidays, determine religious leaders, propagate religion, and the rights of parents to educate their children, as well as the rights to establish and manage religious organizations (Foundation, 2020: 17-18). The violation of these rights signifies proof of religious intolerance.

According to UNESCO, intolerance is a "result" and a symptom manifesting in violent acts. UNESCO identifies 14 forms of violence that can indicate intolerance: language, stereotypes, ridiculing, prejudice, scapegoating, discrimination, neglect, harassment, bullying, expulsion, exclusion, segregation, oppression, and genocide (UNESCO, 1994).

Thus, the 14 symptoms of intolerance proposed by UNESCO are involved in identifying tolerance symptoms in society, along with Forst's multilevel tolerance concept, which is integrated with Hayden's positive-negative tolerance concept.

RESEARCH METHOD

This qualitative study with an interpretive phenomenological design investigated how the Christian community in Tana Toraja perceived the sound of the call to prayer and how it influenced their perceptions and behaviour towards Muslim minority communities. As is well known, the interpretive phenomenological analysis seeks to identify how individuals make sense of their experiences by actively interpreting events, objects, and other people in their lives (Pietkiewicz & Smith, 2014).

The Christian community in Tana Toraja was recruited for the study based on their involvement in religious issues and their familiarity with the sound of the loudspeakers in the mosque. The recruited informants included eight people of different genders, ages, statuses, and professions, including educators/lecturers, students, religious leaders, activists, writers, and priests (details of the informants' demographics are shown in Table 1). Data were collected through observation and interviews between March and June 2022, following the issuance of a circular by the Indonesian Minister of Religious Affairs entitled *Pedoman Penggunaan Pengeras Suara di Masjid dan Musala* (Guidelines for the Use of Loudspeakers in Mosques and Prayer Rooms).

Table 1: Informants' Demographic

No.	Pseudoname	Age	Gender	Status
1	GD	25	M	Teacher
2	Ts	30	F	Lecturer/religious leader
3	Jf	42	M	Religious leader
4	LB	49	F	Pastor
5	BB	25	M	Lecturer/Activist
6	AB	28	M	Pastor
7	Yh	35	M	Lecturer/Writer/Pastor
8	SNE	24	F	Student

Source: Collected data

The data was analyzed using Daniel Fink's reconstructed noise theory, namely unwanted and/or harmful sound (Fink, 2019b).

The "harmful" indicator is combined with Garret Keizer's (2010) "pain" and Marie Thompson's "badness" indicators (2014). The concept of tolerance is then applied to the noise perception findings. The tolerance analysis in this study is based on Rainer Forst's tolerance hierarchy (2012), combined with Robert Hayden's concept of positive and negative tolerance (2002). Positive tolerance is characterized by recognition and respect, whereas negative tolerance is characterized by non-interference.

DISCUSSION

Azan as a Natural Voice, not a Theological Noise

For Christians in Tana Toraja, the *azan* is a daily phenomenon as the sound of a Muslim house of worship. All informants confirmed that the sound of *azan* is a call or reminder of Muslim prayer times echoed in the mosque. SNE confirmed that by listening to the *azan* sound from the mosque, he knows that Muslims pray five times a day. According to SNE, "*Azan* is a call to worship for Muslims as well as a reminder of the five daily prayers."

Christians reacted differently to the call to prayer. Five informants, Jf, LB, AB, Yh and SNE thought it was expected, like any other noise. It is because they are used to hearing the call to prayer every day. Yh strongly related the *azan* to other natural sounds; he said: "I am not disturbed by the call to prayer, it has been a phenomenon in my daily life since childhood. It is like hearing a rooster crow every day. It is an everyday aspect of life". Another respondent, GD, compared the mosque's sound to other loud noises. He described the disturbing sounds as "the sound of police sirens, ambulance sirens, recitations before the call to prayer, and the noise of motorbikes carrying people to death."

Another aspect of the sound of the *azan* is the melodious sound of the muazzin's voice. The SNE appreciates this aspect: "I feel comfortable listening to it because the voice is beautiful". For SNE, the sound of *azan* is like other beautiful sounds, which are unobtrusive and can even be enjoyed for the beauty.

GD and LB are the two informants who reported being disturbed by the mosque's sound. GD felt disturbed by the use of loudspeakers during many activities. GD said:

"I am disturbed by the sound of the mosque because the sound of the *Azan* and the recitation before the *Azan* is quite disturbing. As LB said, he had met other Christians who had complained about the loud sound from the mosque, which was coming from four loudspeakers in all four directions. The two informants, GD and LB, complained about the excessive use of loudspeakers regarding the number of activities and loudspeakers used. They felt that the excessive use of loudspeakers made daily activities such as studying and sleeping at night less effective.

The data show that Christians still perceive noise as an unwanted sound. Other data confirm that all informants consider other noise to be annoying. They define noise as loud, artificial sounds people do not want to hear. All informants agreed that noise such as vehicle noise, late-night noise, noise caused by arguments and fights, sirens, and other loud noises are undesirable.

The impression of the informants is paradoxical because, on the one hand, they perceive it as a normal sound as it has become part of their daily life. On the other hand, they feel disturbed by the excessive amplification. They think the loud sound of the mosque with various activities, such as reciting verses from the Qur'an before *azan*, interferes with their activities and rest. It creates a dilemma for Christians who wish to appreciate the noise of the mosque, as they face natural difficulties such as disturbed sleep and impaired concentration.

A physiological argument, i.e., listening to a melodious voice, relieve the disturbance caused by *azan* over Christians in Tana Toraja. A second factor is a humanist argument, which involves recognizing the theological guidance of others. LB, for instance, stated, "I am unconcerned because I understand that they are searching for God; everyone has the right to choose which religion to follow". Another informant, BB stated, "I don't feel disturbed because other people are praying."

The statements of LB and BB demonstrate that some Christians do not consider the *azan* as a disturbance; also, the sound of the *azan* does not bother the spiritual mood, particularly their religiosity. Christians in Tana Toraja accept mosque noise because they adhere to noise as an unavoidable sound,

even though some still feel it as an "unwanted sound". The *azan* is not the sound they love and crave, but it does not cause "pain" or "badness" either.

Psychologically, Christians do not feel offended or hurt because the sacred sound of Muslim practices does not overlap with the sacredness of their religion. Since it contains no threatening Christian indoctrination, it is not considered annoying. Therefore, this sound cannot be classified as noise because, although it is unwanted, it does not contain sounds that should be rejected. According to Pia Heike Johansen (2020), such events are classified as "not listening", i.e. physiologically hearing but not reacting to the sound as it is unnecessary and may even have a negative effect.

The case in Tana Toraja differs from that in India, where non-Muslims resisted the *azan*. Some Indian non-Muslims argue that the phrase "*Lā ilāha illā Allah*" incites hatred, offends sensibilities, and violates the human rights of adherents of other faiths who worship other than "Allah" (Network, 2022). Although the Karnataka High Court rejected the argument that the *azan* sentence violates the fundamental rights of other religions (Staff, 2022), this suggests that the call to prayer in India has a theological dimension and threatens religious freedom.

When it comes to the concept of tolerance, the humanistic approach reducing the theological dimension that leads Christians in Tana Toraja to accept Islamic religious traditions cannot be considered a positive form of tolerance. Their acceptance has yet to reach the level of recognition and respect; it has only reached the level of non-interference tolerance. Essentially, people continue to believe that mosque noise, like other noise, affects mental workload and concentration (Jafari et al., 2019), slows information processing and impairs creativity (Mehta et al., 2012), but not mental stability. It is because, culturally, mosque noise is an integral part of daily life.

Thus, the mosque's production of "noise" is regarded as a cultural phenomenon ingrained in social life. A particular religion's adherents will accept the voices of other religions if they are theologically regarded as religious teachings. Theologically, *azan* and other sounds from houses of worship, such as church bells, do not constitute "noise

pollution.” Every religion and belief will categorically deny that the sounds produced during religious rituals are “noise”; rather, they will insist that they produce sacred sounds (Abbink, 2018).

It shows that Christian tolerance of religious noise in Tana Toraja is mediated by the listener's social identity and their perception of the meaning of the noise as a shared tradition (Abbink, 2018). It shows that due to its perception based on socio-cultural tendencies, religious sound can be interpreted as non-disturbing noise. Shepherd et al. (2020) explained that a person's sensitivity to noise is determined by their social status and where they live.

The Contextualization of *Azan* Sound Promotes Tolerance

The Christian community in Tana Toraja is aware of the conflict potential resulting from uncontrolled sound in places of worship. Five informants, GD, Jf, AB, Yh, and SNE, stated unequivocally that this possibility existed, while LB and BB cautioned that intolerance could occur depending on the context of each region. LB said, “Depending on the region, intolerance can occur, just be wise enough to adjust”. Both are aware that numerous factors can cause intolerance. Ts, another informant, believes that there is no risk of intolerance. She said, “I don’t think intolerance will happen in the future as long as we respect each other's religions”.

Differences between Islamic and Christian traditions in the house of worship rituals may have triggered the potential for intolerance in the Tana Toraja case. The sound of *azan* and other routines in the mosque being broadcast loudly is contrary to Christian tradition, preventing outdoor loudspeakers. The SNE said: 'The noise from the church is rarely too loud, and I don't think the sound of the church bothers other worshippers because it's only one day a week'. Other informants emphasised the need for the church to maintain the tradition of not making noise until they leave the church, such as LB, who stated, "the church does not use loudspeakers outside the building, and the sound of the church should be heard enough in the worship room", in

agreement with GD, who stated, "it is better that the sound of the church stays indoors".

Inspired by the church's practice of voice control, the Christian community in Tana Toraja supports controlling loudspeakers as a preventive measure against religious intolerance. Informants GD, Jf, AB, LB and Yh emphasised the importance of regulating loudspeaker usage. Yh stated, "It is a shame that the house is close to a place of worship", while Jf said, "because it is disturbing, especially for those who live right next to the mosque". Yh and Jf indicate that the health of certain people living near places of worship may be at risk.

Ts and SNE, on the other hand, take a more flexible approach by providing conditional-local-temporal notes. Ts said: "The loudspeaker settings depend on the needs of each house of worship", while SNE said: "If the houses of worship are different and close to each other, the volume can perhaps only be adjusted if the timing is the same". However, if one does not pray in a place of worship, it is not a problem because no one disturbs or is disturbed. SNE's view is consistent with Yh's: "The sound of the call to prayer still needs to be controlled; if people know when to worship, they would not need to be called; they would be aware of the worship.

Another informant, BB, disagreed that loudspeaker settings were necessary, stating, “There is no need to regulate them because the rules are already perfect, namely the religion itself.” BB’s point of view is that the sound of the call to prayer should be accommodated as part of the perfection of the actualisation of Islamic teachings. On the other hand, excessive mosque sound amplification is still a point of contention among Muslims. In his opinion, using a loudspeaker to call people to prayer violated the teachings of the Prophet, according to Najmul Huda (Huda, 2021). The Prophet Muhammad chose a call to prayer with a human voice as a prayer time marker, rejecting his friend’s suggestion to use a bell, horn, or light a fire.

The contrast between Muslim and Christian worship traditions of noise and silence in Tana Toraja points out the potential for religious intolerance, as seen in Rwanda. The case in Rwanda demonstrates intolerance due to the contrast between silence and noise in worship between the Pentecostal Church community and the Catholic community

(Grant, 2018). However, this potential can be reduced, according to G.J. Abbink, if the production of religious sound from houses of worship is not viewed as part of an inter-religious competition to dominate other religions or denominational practices. According to Abbink, if the voice of a house of worship is emphasised as religious imperialism or even religious supremacy, the door to intolerance will be reopened, as it was in Ethiopia (Abbink, 2018).

The case of Ethiopia shows that amplifying religious voices often exceeds their basic needs (Abbink, 2018). As a result, religious intolerance may occur if the sound of mosques is not contextually appropriate in Muslim minority areas such as Tana Toraja. Each adherent of religion should make their places of worship sound appropriate to maintain religious tolerance regarding the sound of places of worship. Furthermore, efforts must be made to adapt to specific environments and contexts, as the number and characteristics of religious adherents vary according to location and time.

CLOSING

The tolerance of the Christians of Tana Toraja towards the noise of the mosques of the Muslim minority implies that they respond to it as a socio-cultural practice, reducing its theological dimension. The mosque's sound is not classified as noise because the call to prayer does not cause 'pain'. Denying the theological implications of Christians' acceptance of mosque noise does not eliminate the natural-social implications that disrupt their concentration and daily activities. Therefore, intolerance remains open, even though physiological-sociological tendencies dominate it. Consequently, although symptoms of "antagonistic tolerance" have begun to appear, the tolerance manifested earlier is still classified as positive tolerance.

In promoting and sustaining religious tolerance, noise from places of worship should not always be seen from a theological perspective. Noise from the ritual practices of other religions is not perceived in the same way as noise that is automatically rejected because it is psychologically and spiritually dangerous. Furthermore, using loudspeakers in places of worship increases the possibility of intolerance. Therefore, the socialisation of moderate attitudes should continue to be

promoted among religious people to cover the possibility of intolerance, which can occur at any time.

This study is limited because it focuses only on one group of religious adherents, Christians, and excludes Muslims as actors. Furthermore, this study excludes culture and cultural analysis, which is important in formulating religious tolerance, especially in Tana Toraja.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author would like to thank all informants and other colleagues who helped with the research's completion. Thank you to the editors and reviewers who provided feedback and constructive criticism to help improve this article. Finally, we believe that this article can serve as an academic resource for improving interfaith tolerance, particularly in Indonesia.

REFERENCES

- Abbink, G. J. 2018. The religious soundscape of Ethiopia: "noise" production between sacred and secular spaces. In F. Girke, S. Thubauville, & W. Smidt (Eds.), *Anthropology as Homage. Festschrift for Ivo Strecker* (pp. 251–269). R. Koeppe Verlag.
- Aili, L., Fucheng, L., Zhiyong, D., Mi, L., & Changhong, Y. 2014. 文化地理学视角下的声景研究及相关进展 (Progress in soundscape studies from the perspective of cultural geography). *Progress in Geography*, 33(11), 1452–1461. <https://doi.org/10.11820/dlkxjz.2014.09.003>
- Bretherton, L. 2004. Tolerance, Education and Hospitality: A Theological Proposal. *Studies in Christian Ethics*, 17(1), 80–103. <https://doi.org/10.1177/095394680401700106>
- Calleri, C., Astolfi, A., Pellegrino, A., Aletta, F., Shtrepi, L., Bo, E., Di Stefano, M., & Orecchia, P. 2019. The effect of soundscapes and lightscapes on the perception of safety and social presence analyzed in a laboratory experiment. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 11(11), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11113000>

- De Witte, M. 2008. Accra's Sounds and Sacred Spaces. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 32(3), 690–709. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2427.2008.00805.x>
- Fink, D. 2019a. Ambient noise is “the new secondhand smoke.” *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 146(4), 2835–2835. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.5136828>
- Fink, D. 2019b. A new definition of noise: noise is unwanted and/or harmful sound. Noise is the new ‘secondhand smoke’. *Proceedings of Meetings on Acoustics*, 050002. <https://doi.org/10.1121/2.0001186>
- Forst, R. 2012. *Tolerance in Conflict*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139051200>
- Foundation, W. 2020. *Kemajuan Tanpa Penyelesaian Akar Masalah*.
- González, A. E. (2014). What Does “Noise Pollution” Mean? *Journal of Environmental Protection*, 05(04), 340–350. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jep.2014.54037>
- Grant, A. M. 2018. Noise and Silence in Rwanda's Postgenocide Religious Soundscape. *Journal of Religion in Africa*, 48(1–2), 35–64. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15700666-12340125>
- Hayden, R. M. 200). Antagonistic Tolerance: Competitive Sharing of Religious Sites in South Asia and the Balkans. *Current Anthropology*, 43(2), 205–231. <https://doi.org/10.1086/338303>
- Henry, J. A., Theodoroff, S. M., Edmonds, C., Martinez, I., Myers, P. J., Zaugg, T. L., & Goodworth, M.-C. 2022. Sound Tolerance Conditions (Hyperacusis, Misophonia, Noise Sensitivity, and Phonophobia): Definitions and Clinical Management. *American Journal of Audiology*, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1044/2022_AJA-22-00035
- Hsieh, H. C. L., & Hwang, C. Y. 2015. Applying Soundscape to Creating an Interactive and Cultural Centered Experience. *Cross-Cultural Design Applications in Mobile Interaction, Education, Health, Transport and Cultural Heritage*, 113–120. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-20934-0_11
- Huda, N. 2021. *Muslims must give up azaan by loudspeakers. Even Prophet would have rejected it*. The Print. <https://theprint.in/opinion/muslims-must-give-up-azaan-loudspeakers-even-prophet-rejected-it/626407/>
- Jafari, M. J., Khosrowabadi, R., Khodakarim, S., & Mohammadian, F. 2019. The Effect of Noise Exposure on Cognitive Performance and Brain Activity Patterns. *Open Access Macedonian Journal of Medical Sciences*, 7(17), 2924–2931. <https://doi.org/10.3889/oamjms.2019.742>
- Johansen, P. H. 2020. Listening to Silence: Bringing Forward the Background Noise of Being. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 37(7–8), 279–293. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276419871654>
- Keizer, G. 2010. *The Unwanted Sound of Everything We Want; A Book About Noise*. PublicAffairs.
- Kovacic, M. 2017. Official regulations and perceptual aspects of bell ringing. *Muzikologija*, 22, 59–73. <https://doi.org/10.2298/MUZ1722059K>
- Kovačič, M. 2016a. *Conflicting religious sounds in an urban space: The case of Ljubljana religious soundscape*. 122–131.
- Kovačič, M. 2016b. “Sacred Noise”: The Case of the Ezan in Ljubljana. *Musicological Annual*, 52(2), 25–38. <https://doi.org/10.4312/mz.52.2.25-38>
- Marpuah, M. 2019. Toleransi dan Interaksi Sosial antar Pemeluk Agama di Cigugur, Kuningan. *Harmoni*, 18(2), 51–72. <https://doi.org/10.32488/harmoni.v18i2.309>
- Mehta, R., Zhu, R. (Juliet), & Cheema, A. 2012. Is Noise Always Bad? Exploring the Effects of Ambient Noise on Creative Cognition. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 39(4), 784–799. <https://doi.org/10.1086/665048>
- Moosa, N. 2021. How Loud Is Too Loud? Competing Rights to Religious Freedom and Property and the Muslim Call to Prayer (Adhan or Azan) in South Africa. *Religions*, 12(5), 349. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel12050349>

- Network, L. N. 2022. *Is Azaan A Hate Speech?* Law Street Journal. <https://lawstreet.co/known-the-law/azaan-hatespeech-secular-democratic-loudspeakers-republic-azan>
- Pamungkas, C. 2014. Toleransi Beragama dalam Praktik Sosial: Studi Kasus Hubungan Mayoritas dan Minoritas Agama di Kabupaten Buleleng. *Epistemé: Jurnal Pengembangan Ilmu Keislaman*, 9(2), 285–316. <https://doi.org/10.21274/epis.2014.9.2.285-316>
- Pietkiewicz, I., & Smith, J. A. 2014. A practical guide to using interpretative phenomenological analysis in qualitative research psychology. *Psychological Journal*, 20(1), 7–14.
- Pijper, G. F. 1977. *Studien over de gesciedenis van de Islam in Indonesia :1900-1950*. E.J.Brill.
- Setyabudi, M. N. P. 2020. Penguatan Toleransi Bagi Pemanjuaan Budaya Keagamaan: Studi atas Praktik Toleransi Agama di Puja Mandala Bali. *Harmoni*, 19(2), 274–296. <https://doi.org/10.32488/harmoni.v19i2.432>
- Shaw, D. 2021. Noisy Autonomy: The Ethics of Audible and Silent Noise. *Public Health Ethics*, 14(3), 288–297. <https://doi.org/10.1093/phe/phab026>
- Shepherd, D., Heinonen-Guzejev, M., Heikkilä, K., Welch, D., Dirks, K. N., & McBride, D. 2020. The Epidemiology of Noise Sensitivity in New Zealand. *Neuroepidemiology*, 54(6), 482–489. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000511353>
- Staff, O. 2022. *Karnataka: High Court dismisses PIL saying that words of Azan like 'Allah-hu-Akbar' violate fundamental rights of other religions*. OpIndia. <https://www.opindia.com/2022/08/karnataka-high-court-pil-azan-violate-fundamental-rights-other-religions/>
- Statistik, B. P. 2021. *Penduduk Menurut Wilayah dan Agama yang Dianut: Kabupaten Tana Toraja*. <https://sp2010.bps.go.id/index.php/site/taabel?search-tabel=Penduduk+Menurut+Wilayah+dan+Agama+yang+Dianut&tid=321&search-wilayah=Kabupaten+Tana+Toraja&wid=7318000000&lang=id>
- Tamimi Arab, P. 2015. “a minaret of light”: transducing the islamic call to prayer? *Material Religion*, 11(2), 136–163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17432200.2015.1059126>
- Taylor, J. G. 2014. Edwin de Jong. Making a Living between Crises and Ceremonies in Tana Toraja: The Practice of Everyday Life of a South Sulawesi Highland Community in Indonesia. *Asian Affairs*, 45(2), 367–369. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03068374.2014.911523>
- Thompson, M. S. 2014. *Beyond Unwanted Sound Noise, Affect and Aesthetic Moralism*. Dissertation, Newcastle University.
- Unesco. 1994. *Tolerance: the threshold of peace A teaching / learning guide for education for peace, human rights and democracy*.
- Yelmi, P. 2016. Protecting contemporary cultural soundscapes as intangible cultural heritage: Sounds of Istanbul. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 22(4), 302–311. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2016.1138237>