

RESPONSE TO DAN COLE'S REVIEW

David Imus

Dan Cole's review of *The Essential Geography of the United States of America*, which appeared in issue 72 of this journal, raises a number of interesting issues worthy of lengthy discussion. Five of them, however, I can address comprehensively with just a few words.

1. A folded map often requires a reversed cover panel, standing it on its head in relation to the rest of the printed image so that it is right-reading in the sales rack. If the flat sheets had been published with a panel standing on its head, that indeed would have been indefensible. But the flat sheets are published without the cover panel, and the same basic information appears in a separate sheet of "liner notes."
2. In keeping with the use of Spanish spellings in Mexico and French spellings in Québec, I used the reservation nomenclature adopted by the Indian Land Working Group for its map titled "Native American Reservations."
3. I specifically decided to represent the Umatilla Reservation as a point symbol after first comparing polygon vs. point representations. Due to its small size and the high percentage of its boundary line that would have been obscured by overprinting type, this reservation's geographic extent would not have been easy for the user to see when represented as a polygon. It also would have been misleading to show the Umatilla Reservation as a polygon, since much of the area inside the congressional boundary is non-reservation land.
4. While it is true that the Yakama, Jicarilla Apache, and Tohono O'odham people identify themselves as "nations," the websites of these three nations identify their associated lands as "reservations."
5. The reviewer correctly notes the omission of two reservations in Nebraska, which will be corrected in the next edition.

More generally, I appreciate the reviewer's many positive observations and his generous summing up. Many of his

substantive criticisms, however, seem to me to reference the press release more than the map. Criticizing the press release may be valid, but it doesn't address the reasoned cartographic judgments behind virtually every detail on this map, and a more comprehensive explanation of those judgments is appropriate. I'm working on that now and plan to submit it as an article to *Cartographic Perspectives* in the near future.

RESPONSE TO DAVID IMUS

Dan Cole

I have no argument with the concerns David Imus raised in issues #1 and #2 in his letter, although the index tri-lingual title reads "Native American Reservations – Reservas de Indios Americanos – Réserves d'Indiens d'Amérique." So obviously, some consistency is warranted since the Spanish and French translate as "American Indian Reservations."

Regarding issue #3, given space constraints, I assume that Mr. Imus had a square mile figure below which he would symbolize the polygons as points; as well as a lower square mile figure below which he would not symbolize tiny reservations at all. A note should be included in his index for Native American Reservations indicating what these areal cutoffs are. And due to the effects of allotment and alienation, his last sentence is not unique to Umatilla Reservation; rather, it is actually applicable to many other reservations (especially in the Great Plains) that are depicted as polygons.

Concerning Native American lands, a quick overview of the map revealed the following additional problems:

1. The Havasupai point should be moved to the northwest since it borders the Hualapai Reservation and the Colorado River.
2. Portions of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation are labeled as "U O I R." Since I R is not defined in the abbreviations, I suggest replacing it with "U O Res."
3. The Ute Mountain Reservation does not appear as a polygon or a point but instead is included in the



© by the authors. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>

Southern Ute Reservation, which is too large, so those boundaries need to be corrected.

4. The polygon for the Wind River Reservation needs to be corrected: the gap on the east side should be closed since the reservation has not been legally diminished by the courts. That gap area in the east is jointly administered by the tribes and the Bureau of Reclamation. Check the National Map viewer at viewer.national-map.gov/viewer/.
5. The Lake Traverse Reservation is incorrectly labeled as the Sisseton-Wahpeton Reservation. See www.swnsn.gov.
6. The shapes of the Rocky Boys and Zuni reservations do not look correct when compared to those seen at the National Map Viewer.

Concerning the fourth issue that Mr. Imus raised in his letter, when I went to the Yakama Nation website, their map legend provided the name “Yakama Nation Reservation” (www.yakamanation-nsn.gov/docs/CededMap0001.pdf).

As for issue #5, I think that Mr. Imus is on the right track to include the addition of the two missing reservations in Nebraska. Given that, he may decide to add more such as the Oneida in Wisconsin and the Big Cypress and Miccosukee reservations in Florida.

Lastly, I cited the press release only in the first three of nine paragraphs of my review. And as I stated in the last paragraph, *The Essential Geography* is an excellent map and I recommend its use in classrooms and elsewhere, but its use should be in conjunction with other single-theme maps.