

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

Jason Kaufman<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Minnesota State University, Mankato

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

I appreciated the opportunity to read this article. As someone who lives in the States, specifically on Dakota land, it was intellectually beneficial to learn of the corollaries between the two countries' histories of colonization.

Overall, I thought this “supplementary” paper, as the author defined it, was written well and demonstrated a cohesive internal logic across (a) the brief introduction, (b) the consideration of the three perspectives, and (c) the conclusion.

I also found there to be a few minor issues that would benefit from additional attention. I offer three recommendations for revision, in increasing order of importance:

First, the author is inconsistent in how they refer to Graham. In some places Graham is referred to as “Graham” and in other places as “Mary Graham”. I recommend choosing which approach is preferred and making it consistent for the sake of the article's flow.

Second, the second perspective to which the reader is introduced early in the paper is the “naturalistic” philosophy perspective. Indeed, in all but one spot this is the utilized label. However, when the perspective is given its own heading, the term “Aboriginal naturalistic” philosophy is introduced. If this is really the point from the start, why not call it what it is throughout the paper? Regardless, adding “Aboriginal” to the term only in the one heading breaks the flow of argument a bit.

Third, the first perspective, the First Nations perspective, is addressed in its own section as little more than a redirection to the relevant URL. It would be beneficial to offer a brief overview of the statement, especially for the sake of readers unfamiliar with it.