

# Review of: "The Uluru Statement from the Heart – A consideration from three perspectives"

Eglee Zent

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

(English is not my first language, I apologize if there are mistakes in my text below)

I welcome the author effort to make visible the many underlying meanings of *Uluru Statement from the Heart* (USH). I share his strong commitment with justice for the First Nations. From my view there are fundamental significances in the USH that are not tangible, that cannot be explicitly worded. Those immaterial meanings are immensely valuable, they are relational-sensorial and are allocated in that elusive space between ideas and behaviors that somewhere else I called ecogonic nodes. The USH help us to enter their amazing ecogony embracing a life-styles, an ethos that refuses to disappear after 60 thousand years beyond coloniality. I have just a few comments to perhaps add some spheres of meanings:

1. Reading the USH it seems to me that the *Becoming* is more related not to the past only but also and mainly to the future, or at least stimulates to conceive a cyclical possibility but not blind to potential change (the reason to enter the legal arena in Australia for instance).
2. I feel somehow uneasy with the notion of "naturalistic", as immersed in an implicit notion of nature as an sphere separated of the human one. It seems to me that the USH advocated to avoid conceiving the mind as separated from the feelings, or the people as separated from the land. Thus, the discourse of nature vs culture somehow is not relevant, naturalistic vs. spiritual or naturalistic as closer to not culture are part of a Western tradition that perhaps is not the First Nation one in Australia.
3. As a result of my ideas in above, I wonder what supports the following interpretation of the author *it is evident that this is a naturalistic spirituality... whatever it is that is called 'spiritual'*, p. 4 Why is evident? It does not seem at all to me evident. On the contrary, it seems to me that Mary Graham stresses the flows of life in an integral sense, not to disassociate parts that conform a dynamic whole.
4. Perhaps enrich the paper if the meaning of belonging contemplates as Graham mentions the central issue of not being culturally attached. That is: all humans can and (perhaps) should recognize their belonging to the land, a meaning totally detached of the sense of property. On the contrary Graham and USH stated that it is in fact a human-plan belonging to the land and associated to care for the earth & live, similar to other ideologies worldwide.
5. Graham second axiom seems to be polysemic, when she said: *You are not alone in the world.* (Graham, 2008) implies also the collective emphasis, to be aware that we must not be individually centered but rather dividual ones.



Thank you.