

dues to continue receiving *CP*; "COMP" indicates that you have received a complimentary copy of *CP* that is intended to entice you to become a NACIS member. Both renewals and new memberships can be accomplished by sending a copy of the form on the last page of *CP*, along with a check, to Ed.

Second, contribute materials for publication. If the featured article format doesn't suit you, contact me with an idea for a book review, map review, mapping software review, or "fugitive literature" review. If you don't like to write, just send relevant news clippings or graphics. *CP* is special because it encourages commentators to express themselves in their own voices. Your involvement is essential.

David DiBiase

letter to the editor

Dear Editor:

Brian Harley's commentary, "Can there be a cartographic ethics?" [published in *Cartographic Perspectives* Number 10, Summer 1991], raises serious issues for his colleagues. Such dialogues play an important role in the evolving standards of a profession. Ironically, this article appears to breach another profession's standards. In publishing, careful editing requires meticulous checking of attributions of any kind, including personal communications.

To be more specific, Dr. Harley states correctly that he was invited to publish a version of his paper in the ACSM Bulletin. He then states that he was informed by the editor that his remarks about the Peters projection were at variance with an official ACSM pronouncement on the subject and that for this reason his essay would not be published! [his punctuation]. This is incorrect on two major points.

on two major points. First, in 1987 the ACSM Board of Directors, prompted by a mistaken attribution that had appeared in the literature, confirmed unanimously that ACSM does not have an official position on the Peters projection. Second, after Dr. Harley submitted his article in response to my request, it was read by several cartographers on my review committee, one of whom is the editor of Cartography and Geographic Information Systems (CAGIS), the ACSM scholarly journal addressing cartographic issues. I discussed the reviewers' comments in detail with Dr. Harley and suggested that due to the length and depth of his discussion, CAGIS would be a more appropriate forum for publication. With Dr. Harley's full knowledge, the article was sent to CAGIS. It is my understanding that because additional peer review and further delay would

have been required to publish in the journal, Dr. Harley eventually decided to send his paper to *Cartographic Perspectives*. The paper was not rejected by ACSM.

Dr. Harley's strong implication of censorship by the ACSM Bulletin is totally unfounded. In his attempt to illustrate a well-taken point about the important role ethics must play in cartography, he has been allowed to make statements that responsible editing would have removed. The unfortunate result is that the credibility of an important discussion has been weakened.

Gail Papa, Editor ACSM Bulletin

a passing

On Sunday, October 27, just a few days after the NACIS annual conference in Milwaukee, founding member John Schroeder died.

John will be remembered for his genuine interest in people and what they had to say. He always made a point of getting to know new members at the annual meetings. He will also be missed at future NACIS social gatherings, for John was as smooth on the dance floor as he was in the conference hall. It is a sad irony that John passed away while out dancing with friends. He added much to the quality of the organization and his profession, and we mourn his passing.

The following is reprinted from *The Gazette* of the Library of Congress, November 1, 1991:

Monday, October 28, was to be the day that Geography and Map Division catalogers celebrated receipt of a group award for the

continued on page 23