

Review of: "Ecotheology: missiological perspective in awareness"

Michael Nausner

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper overall contains a worthwhile emphasis on the public significance of eco-theology for the climate crisis in Indonesia, and also a valid theological critique of humanity's exploitation of the earth. The introduction, however, could be sharpened, and the implicit claim that a lack of belief in the earth as a creation of God necessarily leads to the collapse of the earth is too generalizing.

Some suggestions for improvement:

- The paper consistently makes references to entire monographs which is not helpful for readers who want to verify quotes etc. More concise quotations would be meaningful.
- Most of the headlines do not convey the following content in an intelligible way.
 - The title of the paper '**Ecotheology: Missiological perspective in awareness**' is hard to grasp. I would suggest: "Ecotheology as Christian Mission in Indonesian Society"
 - The passage under the headline '**Research Methodology**' does not really deal with methodology except the very general remark that web and library resources were used, and critical thinking was applied. No reference to theological methodology, but instead a narration of the development of Indonesia's climate policies. That is not research methodology.
 - And how can the second of six headlines already contain **Results and Discussion**? The passage contains a description of the threat of climate change to Indonesian society and argues that the Christian constituency with the help of eco-theological resources can contribute to a change. That is not a result but an argument ...
 - The passage '**Eco-theology in the new paradigm**' needs some work as well: A) It is not clear what is meant by the "new paradigm". It is only mentioned once in passing in the entire paper. B) The argument wavers between "man" [sic.] being "equally positioned with nature" and being the "pinnacle of creation". Please clarify! C) What does it mean that the entire creation lives "independently mutual manner"? Please clarify!
 - The passage '**Impact on Climate Change**' is too short, and it is not clear why it is positioned at this place. Also: Why "Impact on Climate Change" and not "Impact of Climate Change"? I would suggest to skip this passage and maybe add the content to the descriptive part in the introduction.
 - Even the headline '**Missiological Perspective Ecotheology in Indonesian Context**' needs a rephrasing. What is meant here? Is it about a missiological perspective on eco-theology? Given the argument for Christian teaching and preaching on the climate crisis, the headline could be "Eco-theology as Mission in the Indonesian Context".

- When it comes to “Conclusion”, I consider the sentence “The whole creation consists in interconnectedness or interrelatedness” as key. The final claim that man is “the loftiest creature” stands in tension to the previous claim of “equal positioning” with nature ... Clarify!
- Quite a number of sentences still need clarification in order to be intelligible.
- Given the title of the paper, I would suggest at least one reference to a major introduction to “Eco-theology”. There is no definition of the term in the entire paper.
- Finally: The abstract needs to be rephrased, because the paper does not “explain ecological theology (what is the difference to eco-theology?) from a missiological perspective.” The missiological perspective is hardly mentioned in the paper. To me the paper seems to have as a key argument that Christian (eco)theology can and needs to contribute to Indonesian society in times of climate crisis. This is expressed in the sentence: “The churches or theologians should involve and be concerned about God's creation ...”