



Blue Pencil

ISSN 2202-1361 (Online) PO Box 254, Broadway NSW 2007

Legal issues for editors

Richard Potter practised law in England for nine years before moving to Australia to work with Phillips Fox (now known as DLA Piper). In 1997 Richard acted for Random House in an action brought by Tony Abbott and Peter Costello and thereafter advised and assisted a number of local publishers on pre-publication issues including defamation, copyright, trademarks, suppression, contempt and court reporting restrictions. Richard decided to go to Bar in 2005 and become a barrister, but still continues his advisory practice with publishers

The paper I have put together is available and if you have not got a copy, let us know and we will get that to you.

I have tried to put in those areas of law, not just defamation, which you might come across. a bit of copyright, contempt and suppression, because they come up from time to time and it is quite useful to know just the basics of what is a problem in relation to things like reporting names of victims in sexual offences, that sort of thing.

So, I am sure there are various levels of understanding about the law here, and I apologise beforehand if I am making it too basic.

I thought I would start off talking about defamation. I have not gone into great detail, here in the paper, except for a couple of defences that I thought you might come across, such as truth, which is the obvious defence, and fair comment, which is the defence in defamation that you

are entitled to express an opinion on something which is a matter of public interest, and even if it is defamatory or prejudicial in extreme, you can use that as a defence as long as the facts upon which you are basing that opinion are accurate: if they are not, then it has no application.

The first thing is 'What is defamatory?' If you are going through a book and you come across a reference and you think 'oh, that's a bit of an attack, a bit much', then the first litmus test is 'if I put myself in the position of the person subject to whatever the litigation is, would I be offended?' And if it is something offensive, if it is an allegation of criminal conduct, then clearly it is going to be something that is defamatory.

Audience comment: I wonder if you can comment, from an editorial viewpoint on the use of the words 'seemed', 'alleged' and 'it has been

said'?

Okay, unfortunately they do not mean much at all. It depends entirely on the context but if someone has been charged with an offence, then you would always say it is alleged that they did something and you can say alleged because they have been charged, and therefore they are reasonably suspected by the police of committing an offence, but if you just say 'rumour has it' then that is when the alarm bells ring, because the words 'rumour has it' show that you cannot prove it to be true and therefore everything you are going to say is unprovable or simply hearsay and rumour, and you are not going to be able to prove it to be true, so you would take those words out.

Are you suggesting that if an editor has passed this as okay, the editor is liable too?

In Australia there was a high court

continued on page 2

Inside

Legal issues for editors	1
2013 Winter Dinner	1
Accreditation unveiled: where are we heading?	3
Job market	5
News and notices	6
New members	6
Professional development	7
2013 committee	8

2013 Winter Dinner: Tuesday 2 July

6.30 p.m. for 7.00 p.m.

William Blue Dining, Northpoint, 171 Pacific Highway North Sydney

Three-course menu of modern Australian cuisine, in a private dining room
\$35 per person with soft drinks/\$45 with wines
Alternate drop entree, main and dessert plus tea or coffee.

Gluten-free and vegetarian options available if

ordered at time of booking.

Do not miss a night of good food, good fun and good company.

case in the 1950s called Webb and Block, which says any person connected with, or accessory to, publication in any way is liable as the publisher, but the reality is, if proceedings are commenced, it is the publisher and the author because no-one is ever going to really know, or be able to prove, just what influence or role an editor has had in the decision.

So, even if you have an instinct that something may be defamatory, you have to ask ‘can I neutralise it, by just wording it just a little bit separately, by taking out some offensive word’, then read it again. The other side of being defamatory is ridicule. You don’t have to accuse someone of being a thief; there have been cases where someone has been called hideously ugly or a picture of somebody in Melbourne, a fashion designer that happens to have a nose that is pushed back, that was called Miss Piggy by the newspaper from the photograph, and she succeeded.

Another big thing about defamation is identification. You do not need to be named to be identified, you just have to be identified by somebody who knows

‘Companies can no longer sue for defamation if they have over nine employees or subcontractors’

who it is from the facts, and so by not naming somebody or even giving them a pseudonym does not necessarily protect you; because if the next-door neighbour knows because they are privy to facts that are not published, but it is obvious it is that person, then the damages would be restricted to the people who knew them, the damages would be lower, but it is still an actionable defamation.

In relation to a book that I wrote, it is fiction, I didn’t base the characters on anyone but I made up the characters based on the fact that they do this particular form of art, but I know nothing about the actual artists, I have not even tried to find out anything about them. Is that a problem, or would a waiver...

A waiver is always a good idea. It means very little in legal terms but it tends to put people off because you’ve put a disclaimer in there, but if you coincidentally defame someone who exists but you had no idea, then if people can afford to say ‘yes, I read that in there and it was obvious it was Fred Smith’, then that is a problem.

What about in the front of the book ‘all characters in this book are fictional’, which is quite a common phrase, does that get you off the hook?

No. It means absolutely nothing, really. *How does this apply to a government, say if a book is talking about the Chinese government, in fiction, talking about something like Tibet? How do you get around that?*

A government cannot sue for defamation, police cannot sue for defamation, a body cannot sue for defamation. An individual can, a company can, but in 2005 the law changed so that companies can no longer sue for defamation if they have over nine employees or subcontractors.

So I cannot defame the Catholic Church but I could be found to have acted maliciously toward the Catholic Church?

The Catholic Church is different because for years and years they have pretended they do not exist as a legal entity, ‘you cannot sue us because we are really just a bunch of churches and real estate and trusts’, and they have now, at long last, I think, accepted that you can sue the Catholic Church. However, it is too big and amorphous a body to be defamed, but if you said, ‘oh, Cardinal Pell said this...’ then he would have a course of action against you, as an individual, but not the Church.

Defamatory meaning: just for your amusement, I have put in a cartoon and it depicts Satan and someone has written on the wall of the cave where he is in Hell “Satan is a warm and tender guy. For a pleasant conversation call 555 ****.” In America triple five is a special number that does not exist, and people use it in fiction, but in Sydney it does exist and someone who had that telephone number was rung up by various people and so she sued for defamation, but the judge threw it out saying ‘no reasonable person could possibly think that. . .’

I came across one when I was doing some voluntary work at the law centre down at Woolloomooloo and a woman came to me for advice. She was a circus dwarf and she had been on a plane and met someone and chatted and never saw him again and then someone brought to her attention this book where this guy met a circus dwarf on a plane, female circus dwarf, and they had sex on the plane and she was mortified. She did not sue in the end because it is an expensive past-time, or something, so she didn’t,

but it was an interesting example of something extreme that you would not think would ever come up, but the heads of authors can sometimes be mystical places.

Disclaimers: I say a disclaimer will not protect from libel but it does sometimes help. There are times when you really have to craft a disclaimer in a way that addresses some issue that could come up.

Offensive comment, which I look at because it comes into ridicule and satire, yes, the Patrick Cook cartoon about the Harry Seidler architecture being like little boxes, Harry Seidler old folks’ home, quite a famous cartoon, and I don’t know if you remember that, and Harry Seidler sued saying that...the cartoon said he’s the sort of architect that designed hideous boxes...and the jury found the cartoon was an expression of opinion on the notoriety and style of Harry Seidler’s architecture, and he lost.

Is that the same with restaurants and chefs? That’s an opinion that you are giving out.

Yes well, they are troublesome things because the one recently about the Coco Roco restaurant that shut down because of the review, Fairfax lost that case only because they expressed an opinion about the food in the restaurant, but it turned out to be two restaurants, Coco on one level and Roco on the other, and they defamed both of them and so they could not have a comment in relation to the other one because they had not been in there. That was just a technicality, and it was a shame that they went down on that.

Do they have to be living to be part of defamatory case? Like, if they are alive when you publish it and then the court case and they are dead, what happens?

No, if they die at any time, if you have an entire trial and the judge takes six months to make a judgement and they die in that six months then they have lost their whole right to sue and so it goes without saying that if they are already dead then you can say what you want. They did try and change the law, in 2005.

So the estate cannot sue?

No. Phillip Ruddock, for example, someone said something about his parents and they were deceased and he thought he would have a go at trying to change the law.

Now, in the paper I have put a little section about the basics of copyright and I heard yesterday there is a book, that I was not involved with, involving Allen

continued on page 4

Accreditation unveiled: where are we heading?

Desolie Page AE, Accreditation Board representative (Qld), and Kerry Davies AE, President, Society of Editors (Qld)

Accreditation of Australian editors and the maintenance of national standards are IPEd’s major functions. They are the principal reasons that a national organisation of editors was set up, first as the Council of Australian Societies of Editors (CASE), formed in 1998. CASE set up the Accreditation Working Group in 2002, following the publication of Australian Standards for Editing Practice in 2001, its first priority. In 2005, CASE formalised as the Institute of Professional Editors Ltd.

IPEd established the Accreditation Board in 2005 to manage the accreditation process. Four accreditation exams have been held since 2008, largely on a cost-recovery basis; that is, the cost of the exam is covered by the fees charged. A fifth exam is planned for May 2014.

The current Accreditation Board accepts its responsibility to maintain security of the exam delivery and to deliver the exam cost-effectively for IPEd and for exam candidates. This security ensures the integrity of the process and the validity of results. Accreditation is serious business for the profession. There is no point in an accreditation process that is half-hearted or leaky.

Following the fourth exam in October 2012, the board reviewed the process and established a plan to balance its goals and responsibilities with resources, and with requests from societies and members to move towards alternative accreditation models.

Costs and Payments:

How the \$540 member fee was spent in 2012

Exam development	\$111.00
Marking	\$156.00
Printing, formatting (exam)	\$30.00
Appeals and reports	\$68.50
Postage	\$10.00
Venue costs	\$20.00
Exam secretary, coordinator	\$95.00
Advertising and other admin	\$15.00
Certificate printing	\$8.50
Contingency	\$25.00
Total	\$539.00

For candidates, the board has always tried to keep the fee as low as possible, simply to cover costs, even if this has meant postponing an exam when the number

of candidates has not been high enough. The board has decided to offer exams in non-conference years, which should mean that editors do not have to choose between the two professional development opportunities, and expenses, in any year.

Past exams have relied very heavily on volunteers, and have taken their toll on volunteers’ ability to continue. With agreement from IPEd Council, the board Chair, whose role includes overseeing the exam development, delivery and marking, and liaising with the Lead Writer and Assessor, and Exam Secretary, as well as managing the appeals process, will receive an honorarium of \$6000 each exam. The board will also manage the development of a database of specialist questions to draw on for future exams, to help defray the cost of those exams. Exam writers and assessors have always received a small payment and this payment will be extended to database question writers.

Delivery

Past exams have been written exams, using hard-copy mark-up, which many editors now use infrequently, if at all. It is argued that a paper-based exam therefore discriminates against editors who aren’t familiar with copyediting symbols or the process, though societies offer workshops that tutor participants on these aspects prior to each exam. No doubt, hard-copy mark-up is slower, and messier, than onscreen editing using track changes, though that is taken into account in the timing of the exam and by the assessors. Everyone cops that disadvantage.

Others counter that even those who cut their teeth when hard-copy editing was all that was available can be out of practice, and those who edit only onscreen need to be able to show a mark-up on paper in at least some circumstances. Much proofing work is done on hard-copy typeset pages, though there is a trend towards onscreen proofing using high-level PDFs. Think of a contact meeting with a client where you need to show what you mean about a particular grammatical problem – marking up a change can be an awful lot easier than explaining it.

Further, not all of the exam relies on mark-up symbols. Part 1 contains simple copyediting tasks (correcting errors in single sentences) and multiple-choice

questions, worth 20 per cent. Part 2, worth 40 per cent, has the candidates editing a piece of writing and creating a numbered list of author queries—this is where the slow and messy aspect comes in. Part 3, also 40 per cent, is a set of short-answer questions that candidates must answer in longhand—that’s something that most of us aren’t terribly used to any more!

Nevertheless, the question of ‘onscreen’ or ‘online’ delivery to replace or augment the paper-based exam remains high on the board’s priorities. The board is taking a cautious but responsible approach: delivery security and integrity cannot be compromised. First, some definitions.

Onscreen: An electronic exam paper in Word format that would retain the layout of the paper-based exam but allow candidates to complete answers and input text onscreen, and use track changes functions to indicate editing changes.

Online: A fully interactive electronic exam developed by specialist IT professionals, with content provided by an IPEd exam development team.

Board delegates have investigated the extra cost of online delivery and consider it not achievable without greatly increased cost to those sitting the exam and limitations on the complexity of the exam questions. The providers who can develop online exams generally do so for large companies and organisations. The accreditation exam candidature is relatively small to be cost-effective. An onscreen exam, which is a more practical option, will still take time and skills to develop, as well as additional cost (around \$17,000) for development, computer-equipped venues and IT support.

So, a hard-copy exam will again be offered in 2014. At the same time, the board will continue to work towards the development and delivery in 2016 of a fully invigilated, onscreen exam in central (capital city) locations, with full-time technical support to ensure parity between venues.

The board is very aware that the cost of this option may affect candidates’ willingness to pay, and therefore the accessibility of accreditation to all members. Investigation of viable, cost-effective methods will continue, and the board will demonstrate to 2015 conference

& Unwin, about Mercedes Corby. It mentioned Schapelle Corby's father, and he is dead so they are focused on him being a grower of drugs, but the plaintiffs say Mercedes and the rest of the family are involved inferentially.

So it does place an extraordinary amount of responsibility on the editor... to advise the author to the sort of thing you are talking about

If the editor is doing permissions, yes.

I had a query yesterday, from an author, a former journalist, and he wants to use a still from a movie like a Universal studios movie and he asked 'do I need to clear this, get permission' and I said 'yes'. He said that seems crazy because newspapers regularly take stills from movies and use them, why are they exempt? Is that true?

Yes, that is. What happens is this, there is a fair use for reporting news and newspapers just take anything and then say 'oh, it's news'.

Could we suggest that book publishers be given the same exemption on a fair use basis?

Yes, I think that is a perfectly legitimate...

No, because the book is around for a lot longer.

It is a bit like the defamation limits. Limit for defamation is a year but because there was a case called the Duke of Brunswick case in about 1814, where the duke found out he was defamed 14 years before in a newspaper, he sent off his manservant to get an archive copy of the newspaper and then said 'I'm going to sue on that because that is a new publication, the archive' and that has been the law ever since that as long as a book is out there in a library, in a book shop then it is being published and until it the day stops being published that year keeps on revolving and revolving, it never runs out.

That is the problem. And for newspapers that has never been a problem because a year later it has gone, but now it is on the website still.

To make something is to publish, we have got to remember that, that is the definition.

Yes, that is very true. You can own a piece of paper but not own the copyright because all you have is a three-dimensional piece of paper in your hand, but content, if it is a literary work, is protected.

The newspapers are exempt because they are throwaway items? But not if it is

on the internet?

In terms of limitation period, the newspaper comes out once and then a year after it comes out, unless the newspaper is in an archive copy somewhere, usually you can never find it a year later. But the same newspaper publishes the same article on the internet then that is continually being published every single day, so they are liable and vulnerable until a period of one year until it ceases to be on the net.

And they would be just as liable if it were in the archived in the State Library?

Yes, and another argument to bring in is that Fairfax and other media are heavily lobbying to protect archives by saying that archives are an exemption, they should not be able to sue a year later, but they have not got that yet. They are trying to do it in England too.

What about microfilm and microfiche?

The damage is next to nothing because it is published to one or two people and damages are directly limited by the number of people who read it as a cause to the damage you suffer.

'To a professional person, it does not matter what your assessment of the risk is, if it is a reasonable price, get a policy.'

When you take something off the internet and attribute it and indicate when we viewed it, I suppose the obvious reason for doing that is to indicate that it is up to date, but is there any legal implication?

Well, there are a number of implications in that copyright applies to the internet as well, so if you are just taking something holus bolus what you could do is just put a footnote and then the URL and say 'Sourced from this URL' and there are cases to suggest, and nothing has been decided one way or the other, that a publisher could be liable for a hyperlink that leads to somewhere else that is grossly defamatory.

This goes to trademark a little. If you are editing a book and there are brand names referred in that book where do you need to put a TM or an R in a circle?

Usually if you refer to the brand you just put a tiny TM next to it, but referring to the brand is not an infringement of

trademark unless the context of how you are doing it is seen to be commercially exploiting the trademark. If you had a publication that was doing that by pretending that they produce Coke, or something like that, then you would be, but otherwise they never bother with it. In fact it is good for them because it is brand awareness.

I am not sure if this leads on from anything you have talked about, but do you see the benefit, in practical terms, do you see any value in professional indemnity insurance for editors?

Well, my background is insurance as well because I came from a law firm that does insurance. Sometimes things happen that you can never guess where they came from and it is a price utility curve really, if something is very cheap and it is available through your association then it is worth doing.

I would always say, to a professional person, it does not matter what your assessment of the risk is, if it is a reasonable price, get a policy. It is a comfort thing.

What about where you have a standard form of contract. Is it worth having a society of editors established contract, for freelancers to get ahead of the need for insurance?

The problem is that you cannot necessarily contract out of whatever you want and you might say in your contract that the editor is not liable for anything, but whether that is legally enforceable is another thing. It is a bit like authors are always given indemnity for defamation. I have never yet seen a publisher imply that indemnity because it is a gargantuan thing for them to do. So contract does not necessarily cure all ills, but I would say that an association contract is a really good thing because then you have a contract lawyer look at it to give you all, as a group, the best possible, most advantageous terms to protect you guys.

delegates and to society members in each state and territory how an onscreen exam would work.

Currently, the board's understanding of costs for hard-copy and onscreen options is:

Exam as is	\$32,236 (60)	\$34,111 (75)
	\$540 (society member)	\$690 (non-member)
	\$540 (society member)	\$690 (non-member)

Exam as is + database development and payment to AB chair	\$45,243 (60)	\$47,118 (75)
	\$760 (society member)	\$910 (non-member)
	\$630 (society member)	\$780 (non-member)

Central onscreen exams + above costs	\$61,082 (60)	\$62,957 (75)
	\$1020 (society member)	\$1170 (non-member)
	\$840 (society member)	\$990 (non-member)

Developments in online delivery will still be monitored, and contribution of information and suggestions from members will be more than welcome. The board expects to report its findings and recommendations in two to three years.

The board believes that this considered and structured approach balances its goals and seeks to answer concerns and requests from individuals and societies. Ensuring the integrity of the process and the validity of results must take precedence over rapid changes towards a different delivery method.

For your consideration and feedback

In essence, the path for the coming three to four years is clear. But input from societies and members is encouraged and may make the board's task somewhat easier. Please respond to this article via your society newsletter or on the IPEd website forum at [this address](#). The paper on options for the accreditation scheme, which was delivered at the 2013 national conference, is also on the IPEd website. The board will shortly circulate an online survey about the specific details of the conference paper.

The following questions underpin the statement on the survey: 'The Accreditation Board welcomes feedback and suggestions about onscreen and online testing of editing skills.' Your responses may very well save the board time and money.

- Are you aware of or have experience with a provider with whom we could consult about providing a secure onscreen or online delivery?
- Are you aware of any other provider who may have a different solution?

The editor's job market

The Society of Editors (NSW) Inc. offers publishers the opportunity to advertise positions vacant, by email, free of charge. Reach the editors of New South Wales by using this free service to our professional members.

• Publishers: please send us your ad as a PDF or Word document and we will distribute it by email to our members. You are assured of wide distribution among your target audience.

• Members: please supply or update your email address so that the society can email you notices of jobs for editors.

We welcome advertisements for all editorial roles from trainee to publisher, for permanent, temporary or freelance jobs.

Email Anna Rauls for more information: membership@editorsnsw.com

2013 Prime Ministers Literary Award Shortlist

Fiction

- *Floundering* by Romy Ash
- *The Chemistry of Tears* by Peter Carey
- *Questions of Travel* by Michelle de Kretser
- *Lost Voices* by Christopher Koch
- *Mateship with Birds* by Carrie Tiffany

Poetry

- 'Burning Rice' by Eileen Chong
- 'The Sunlit Zone' by Lisa Jacobson
- 'Jam Tree Gully': Poems by John Kinsella
- 'Liquid Nitrogen' by Jennifer Maiden
- 'Crimson Crop' by Peter Rose

Non-fiction

- *Bradman's War* by Malcolm Knox
- *Uncommon Soldier* by Chris Masters
- *Plein Airs and Graces* by Adrian Mitchell
- *The Australian Moment* by George Megalogenis
- *Bold Palates* by Barbara Santich

Prize for Australian History

- *The Sex Lives of Australians: A History* by Frank Bongiorno
- *Sandakan* by Paul Ham
- *Gough Whitlam* by Jenny Hocking
- *Farewell, dear people* by Ross McMullin
- *The Censor's Library* by Nicole Moore

Young adult fiction

- *Everything Left Unsaid* by Jessica Davidson
- *The Children of the King* by Sonya Hartnett
- *Grace Beside Me* by Sue McPherson
- *Fog a Dox* by Bruce Pascoe
- *Friday Brown* by Vikki Wakefield

Children's fiction

- *Red* by Libby Gleeson
- *Today We Have No Plans* by Jane Godwin and illustrated by Anna Walker
- *What's the Matter, Aunty May?* by Peter Friend and illustrated by Andrew Joyner
- *The Beginner's Guide to Revenge* by Marianne Musgrove

NEW MEMBERS

Lauren McKellar
Tony Falkner

Freelancers' lunch

Join this monthly gathering for lively conversation and networking opportunities. We meet at Café Delizia, located at street level in the Hyde Park Towers Building, 148 Elizabeth Street, in the CBD between Liverpool and Goulburn Streets (Surry Hills side of the road). Meet at **noon** or thereabouts. Put it in your calendar. There's no need to book or RSVP—just come. Some come early, some later. We are generally there from **noon until 2pm**.

Our next gatherings will be held on

- **Wednesday 24 June**

We deliberately vary the days and dates to accommodate the varying schedules of our freelancers, and the venue is centrally located and easy to reach via public transport. This little café has a cosy and quiet back room with floor-to-ceiling books along three and a half walls (they had to leave an opening as a door). The menu is limited, but the food is good and inexpensive. We welcome suggestions for other venues, if anyone wants a change of scenery.

Vale

Hazel Hawke was patron of the Society of Editors (NSW for a time in the mid-1990s before the society was incorporated.

Alan Halbish, publisher, production manager, and mentor for more than 50 years died in February.

Professional development

Microsoft Word for editors: beginner to intermediate*

Date: Friday 2 August 2013

Time: 9.30 a.m. to 4.30 p.m.

Presenter: Kevin O'Brien

Venue: To Be Advised (by email, inquire upon registration)

Cost: \$220 for members, \$350 for non-members (includes lunch and refreshments).

Please let our Administration manager, Anna Rauls, know if you are interested in attending—membership@editorsnsw.com.

Microsoft Word is the industry-standard software for editing manuscripts on screen, yet few editors have received formal training in it. This hands-on workshop will take you through the fundamentals of using Word as part of the editorial workflow. It is aimed at both in-house and freelance editors who may (or may not) have prior knowledge of the software but feel, or worry, that they are not using best practice. As well as a full day of practical training, this course will provide you with:

- A handout tailored to your version of Word
- A suite of macros that will speed up your document preparation and editing
- A template containing paragraph styles for your future use
- A cribsheet of Word's in-built keyboard shortcuts and useful find and replaces

*Please bring your own laptops – Mac or PC – to the class and ensure you have a version of Microsoft Word installed

Microsoft Word for editors: intermediate to advanced*

Date: Monday 5 August 2013

Time: 9.30 a.m. to 4.30 p.m.

Presenter: Kevin O'Brien

Venue: To Be Advised (by email, inquire upon registration)

Cost: \$220 for members, \$350 for non-members (includes lunch and refreshments).

Please let our Administration manager, Anna Rauls, know if you are interested in attending—membership@editorsnsw.com.

Are you comfortable with using track changes in Word, and on nodding terms or better with document clean-up and paragraph styles? If so, this workshop will bring your Word skills to the next level, in terms of optimising your efficiency and understanding digital workflows. Advanced features of this course include:

- Recording, writing and testing macros
- Character styling
- Throughput of tagged text to InDesign and epub
- Advanced find and replace (using wildcards)
- Special elements such as endnotes and tables.

Kevin O'Brien is an onscreen editor with more than 15 years experience. He started at Butterworths in London where he received excellent training in Word. Having worked as a senior editor for Random House in Sydney for the last five years, he now lives in the Adelaide Hills and freelances for a range of publishers. He teaches editing onscreen for the Australian Publishers Association and the University of Sydney.

***Please bring your own laptops – Mac or PC – to the class and ensure you have a version of Microsoft Word installed**

Feel free to email questions and examples in advance of the workshop to the administration manager at membership@editorsnsw.com.

Workshop information

Registration

To register for regular workshops use the enclosed form or download one from the society's website and send it to the Administration manager, Anna Rauls. Please note that workshops require a minimum of 10 registrations by the closing date to proceed. The society reserves the right to cancel workshops if there are insufficient enrolments.

Payment for workshops

To secure a place you must send payment with your registration form. Workshops fill quickly and we often have people on a waitlist for courses. Please contact the administration manager at membership@editorsnsw.com if you need a tax invoice.

Regional members

Regional members living more than 200 km from Sydney may receive a 40 per cent discount on the cost of the society's regular workshops (excluding computer-based workshops).



Follow us online: Facebook, Twitter and LinkedIn
(search for us using our full name:
The Society of Editors (NSW) Inc.)

www.editorsnsw.com
www.facebook.com/SocietyofEditorsNSW
www.twitter.com/SocEdNSW

2013 COMMITTEE

President: Jacqui Smith

Email: president@editorsnsw.com

Vice presidents:

Pam Peters

Email: vp1@editorsnsw.com

Rochelle Fernandez

Email: vp2@editorsnsw.com

Secretary: Shelley Reid

Email: secretary@editorsnsw.com

Treasurer: Ian Close

Email: treasurer@editorsnsw.com

General committee members:

Owen Kavanagh

Email: committee1@editorsnsw.com

Agata Mrva-Montoya

Email: committee2@editorsnsw.com

Laura Daniel

Email: committee3@editorsnsw.com

Mangai Pitchai

Email: committee4@editorsnsw.com

Susie Pilkington

Email: events@editorsnsw.com

Newsletter editor: Rochelle Fernandez

Email: bluepencil@editorsnsw.com

Publicity officer: Susie Pilkington

Email: publicity@editorsnsw.com

Meetings coordinator:

Rochelle Fernandez

Email: meetings@editorsnsw.com

Professional development coordinator:

Agata Mrva-Montoya

Email: committee2@editorsnsw.com

Website coordinator:

Abigail Nathan

Email: web@editorsnsw.com

Editorial Services Directory

Email: membership@editorsnsw.com

Administration manager: Anna Rauls

Email: membership@editorsnsw.com

Events manager: Susie Pilkington

Email: events@editorsnsw.com

IPed councillor (NSW):

Owen Kavanagh

Email: iped@editorsnsw.com

Accreditation Board representative (NSW):

Alison Moodie

Email: accreditation@editorsnsw.com

Society of Editors (NSW) Inc.

PO Box 254, Broadway NSW 2007

Voicemail: (02) 9294 4999

www.editorsnsw.com

(c) 2013 The Society of Editors (NSW) Inc.

Blue Pencil

Editor: Rochelle Fernandez

Assistants: Jacqui Smith, Robin Appleton, Agata Mrva-Montoya and Owen Kavanagh
The *Blue Pencil* is available only in digital format (PDF). If you required a printed version, please contact the Administration manager at membership@editorsnsw.com

Published: 11 issues a year (combined January/February issue)

Your comments and contributions are welcome. Mail them to the Editor, *Blue Pencil*, Society of Editors (NSW) Inc., PO Box 254, Broadway NSW 2007, or email the Editor at bluepencil@editorsnsw.com.

Copy deadline for the August 2013 issue is Tuesday, 9 July 2013

The views expressed in the articles and letters, or the material contained in any advertisement or attachment, are those of individual authors, not of the Society of Editors (NSW) Inc.

Advertising rates

Full page \$375; half page \$200; one-third page \$125; quarter page \$100; one-sixth page \$75 (half of one column). Newsletter PDF attachments: \$200 per attachment. Circulation: approximately 400. Please note that the committee reserves the right to decide whether advertisements are appropriate for this newsletter.

Membership

Membership of the Society of Editors (NSW) Inc. is open to anyone working as an editor for publication (print or electronic documents) and anyone who supports the society's aims. Membership is available in different categories.

Membership runs for a calendar year. The 2013 fees are \$85 for professional members (new or renewal) and \$65 for associate members (new or renewal). Interested organisations can become corporate associates for \$400 per year.

To obtain a membership application form visit the Society of Editors (NSW) Inc. website—www.editorsnsw.com, phone (02) 9294 4999 or write to PO Box 254, Broadway NSW 2007.

Listing in the Editorial Services Directory

The *Editorial Services Directory* is available online at www.editorsnsw.com/esd.

New listings and updates can be added quarterly as follows:

- January (deadline 31 December)
- April (deadline 31 March)
- July (deadline 30 June)
- October (deadline 30 September).

The cost is \$40 per year in addition to the fee for membership of the society. Only professional members are eligible for a listing. New listings should be submitted using a template available from the Administration manager at membership@editorsnsw.com.

Committee meetings

All members are welcome to attend the society's committee meetings, generally held on the second Tuesday of each month. Please contact a committee member for details if you wish to attend the next meeting.