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Generalized maps almost always reflect judgments about the relative importance of mappable features and details. The systematic bias demonstrated by these generalized land-cover maps is not exclusive to computer-generated maps; manual cartographers have similar goals and biases, however vaguely defined and unevenly applied. Through the consistent application of explicit specifications, the computer offers the possibility of a better map. Yet whether the map's title or description reveals these biases is an important clue to the integrity of the mapmaker or publisher. Automated mapping allows ex-

perimentation with different sets of priorities. Hence computer generalization should make the cartographer more aware of choices, values, and biases. But just because a useful and appropriate tool is available does not mean the mapmaker will use it. Indeed, laziness and lack of curiosity all too often are the most important source of bias.

The choropleth map (introduced as the right-hand elements of figs. 2.13 and 2.14) is perhaps the prime example of this bias by default. Choropleth maps portray geographic patterns for regions composed of areal units such as states, counties, and voting precincts. Usually two to six graytone symbols, on a scale from light to dark, represent two to six nonoverlapping categories for an intensity index such as population density or the percentage of the adult population voting in the last election. The breaks between these categories can markedly affect the mapped pattern, and the cautious map author tests the effects of different sets of class breaks. Mapping software can unwittingly encourage laziness by presenting a map based upon a "default" classification scheme that might, for instance, divide the range of data values into five equal intervals. As a marketing strategy, the software developer uses such default specifications to make the product more attractive by helping the first-time or prospective user experience success. Too commonly, though, the naive or noncritical user accepts this arbitrary display as the standard solution, not merely as a starting point, and ignores the invitation of the program's pull-down menus to explore other approaches to data classification.

Different sets of categories can lead to radically different interpretations. The two maps in figure 3.10, for example, offer very different impressions of the spatial pattern of homes in the northeastern United States still lacking telephones in 1960. Both maps have three classes, portrayed with a graded sequence of graytone area symbols that imply "low," "medium," and "high" rates of phonelessness. Both sets of categories use round-number breaks, which mapmakers for some mysterious reason tend to favor. The map at the left shows a single state, Virginia, in its high, most deficient class, and a single state, Connecticut, in its low, most well-connected class. The casual viewer might attribute these extremes to Virginia's higher proportion of disadvantaged blacks and to Connecticut's af-
Moreover, a smaller middle group suggests less overall homogeneity. Machiavellian bias can easily manipulate the message of a choropleth map. Figure 3.11, for example, presents two cartographic treatments with substantially different political interpretations. The map on the left uses rounded breaks at 10 percent and 15 percent, forcing most states into its high, poorly connected category and suggesting a Northeast with generally poor communications. Perhaps the government is ineffective in regulating a gouging telecommunication industry or in eradicating poverty. Its counterpart on the right uses rounded breaks at 20 percent and 30 percent to paint a rosier picture, with only one state in the high group and eight in the low, well-served category. Perhaps government regulation is effective, industry benign, and poverty rare.

The four maps in figures 3.10 and 3.11 hold two lessons for the skeptical map reader. First, a single choropleth map presents only one of many possible views of a geographic variable. And second, the white lies of map generalization might also mask the real lies of the political propagandist.

**Intuition and Ethics in Map Generalization**

Small-scale generalized maps often are authored views of a landscape or a set of spatial data. Like the author of any scholarly work or artistic creation based on reality, the conscientious map author not only examines a variety of sources but relies on extensive experience with the information or region portrayed. Intuition and induction guide the choice of features, graphic hierarchy, and abstraction of detail. The map is as it is because the map author “knows” how it should look. This knowledge, of course, might be faulty, or the resulting graphic interpretation might differ significantly from that of another competent observer. As is often the case, two views might both be valid.