



**GOT A COMMENT
YOU THINK
WE CAN PRINT?**

**E-MAIL
MAIL@GXO.COM**

**OR FAX
416-961-0941**

**OR SNAIL MAIL TO:
C/O THE PUBLISHER
GRAPHIC EXCHANGE
25 ELM AVENUE
TORONTO ONTARIO
CANADA
M4W 1M9**

FRENCH KEYBOARDS—NON!

Re: *QuarkXPress 6.0—The Last Upgrade*, GX Sep/Oct Peter Dudar did not note that French Canadian users can no longer use QuarkXPress with their French Canadian keyboards and French system as they always did before. Launching XPress with the French Canadian keyboard selected returns a message, “This version of Quark cannot be used with this keyboard.”

Shutdown. Bye, bye, Charlie Brown. So you switch keyboards, to US English (you’ve heard through help groups that you will be able to switch back to the FC keyboard once XPress is launched. Go figure.). So you launch Quark again. You now get another unhelpful message: “This version of Quark cannot be used with this system language.”

We found a workaround. Create a new user, assign English to this user as a System language and US English as a keyboard. Then launch XPress. Then, select the French keyboard from the Menu bar. This will give you normal access to your é’s and â’s and Ç’s.

But of course, you can’t change back to French as a system language, plus this means you have to Log Off and Log On to this new user each time you use XPress.

Can’t imagine anything better to do with my time.

I personally most fervently hope that this article’s title was prophetic. And I can’t wait for it to happen. I only use Quark because my clients use it.

**HÉLÈNE DION, CERTIFIED TRANSLATOR
CINQ SUR CINQ INC.
LORRAINE QC**

WHO TRUSTS REVIEWS?

Kudos on your Quark article. You can’t trust reviews anymore because everyone’s got an advertiser to keep happy, so this is an especially refreshing read. Now, go write a similar article on Macromedia’s MX 2004 suite for OS X...

**JASON MUXLOW
MULTIMEDIA DESIGNER, MUXLOW.ORG
CHICAGO IL**

THOUGHTFUL AND GENTLE

Thank you for your cogent and accurate analysis of Quark’s very belated foray into OS X.

It is disappointing and frustrating to watch a company, having shot itself in the foot,

choose to bleed out. No documentation? A PDF tutorial not updated from OS 9? Poor OS X implementation? Lousy icons and graphics?

I have watched and listened to Quark’s CEO as he railed against OS X, as if Apple’s efforts to save itself were a personal affront. I made the switch to OS X, and did not look back. Drivers were often buggy (remember HP?), updates were frequent, but the Unix core only became more stable with the advent of Jaguar. Still no QuarkXPress, until finally it was announced and released this summer.

I, too, recall Quark’s “we will release no software before it’s time” mantra (although, to be fair, that was always Steve Jobs’ excuse). But to send a product out the door to hapless newbies with no documentation and so many flaws is like trying to sell OS X Public Beta... hmmm, I keep coming back to that, wonder why?

It was a good read and well written. Adobe couldn’t possibly pay you for the painful truth you explicate from your obvious efforts to like this program. I don’t think Quark can pull this off, having put its customers so far behind the OS X curve, and now dealing them another blow. Your advice to customers is thoughtful and reasonable, even gentle. Adobe bit the bullet a long time ago, and ponied up some great programs—even when, as usual, it looked like Apple might not find a hardware platform to make them productive. Adobe deserves recognition for its efforts and professionalism, and for providing tools for users

who choose to accept the path Apple has chosen for its system architecture.

**GARY SOSA
FREELANCE DESIGNER
SALT LAKE CITY, UT**

THE NUMBERS GAME

Great magazine! In particular, I have been following Bob Connolly’s articles with much interest—especially his view on the future of Acrobat and multimedia in general.

I find it time-consuming to find articles from previous Graphic Exchange editions because the magazine numbering system format is so small and hard to see. For example, May/June 2003 is numbered in a different way and in a different place on the front cover than the others. After reading various articles from different editions, one may end up with a pile of GX’s that takes some time to re-order. By comparison, I have always found it helpful the way COMMUNICATION ARTS and HOW number their editions. But those magazines have thicker sides, so perhaps a better comparison would be the old EYEWIRE magazines, which used to have a very clear identity scheme in a box at the top left which was very clear and consistent.

Just some thoughts, although this is really a small issue. I find GX is a fantastic magazine with helpful insights into today’s publishing and communication issues.

**MICHAEL RYZNAR
RYZNAR DESIGN
BURNABY, BC**

[Editor’s reply: Guess it depends on whether we design our covers around the archives or the art. But from now on, Michael, we’ll try to think about both.]