

Jun/Jul 2011

FREE

LFB meetings

13 June

Interns get pay:  
Branch campaign  
celebration

11 July

Selling abroad  
See back page

# Intern wins pay

**INTERN** Keri Hudson, 21, won at a Central London employment tribunal on 12 May – proving she had a right to be paid for work carried out over several weeks at the My Village Website in late 2010. This is the first cash victory for the London Freelance Branch Cashback for Interns campaign. Fi O’Cleirigh writes:

Keri Hudson won £1024.98 for five weeks’ work for MyVillage website earlier this year, against defendants TPG Web Publishing Limited, who did not attend the hearing. The figure included £111.76 holiday pay on a pro rata basis. Ms Hudson, who had no written contract, worked full-time and both coordinated and trained a team of other interns.

In January the website was taken over by a new company, which promised she would receive payment if she stayed on. She resigned five weeks later, on 7 February, when it became clear that she would not be paid. She was headhunted by another firm the same evening and began paid employment the next week.

Speaking immediately after the hearing, she said: “This shows that interns are more valuable than employers such as TPG give them credit for.” Ms Hudson encouraged other



Keri Hudson outside the employment tribunal at – appropriately enough – Victory House, Kingsway  
Photo © Fiona O’Cleirigh

unpaid journalist interns to get in touch with the union. “If they feel they have added value to a company and not received value in return, then that’s not fair. If they don’t feel they have been treated fairly, then they shouldn’t be scared to get in contact.”

Any intern wanting NUJ assis-

tance in claiming back the National Minimum Wage should contact [interns@londonfreelance.org](mailto:interns@londonfreelance.org)

Keri Hudson will be speaking to LFB about her internship experience at the London Freelance Branch meeting on Monday 13 June.

© Fiona O’Cleirigh

Cashback for Interns instigator

## © report’s partial welcome

THE Hargreaves report on copyright has been given a mixed welcome by the National Union of Journalists, which was among organisations that made submissions through the Creators’ Rights Alliance to the review for the government by ex-Independent editor Professor Ian Hargreaves.

NUJ freelance organiser John Toner said: “We are pleased that the report rejects the so-called ‘fair use’ doctrine which is based on questionable notions of fairness. The doctrine, which comes from United States law, permits the use of a creator’s work without permission and requires potentially huge legal costs for a successful challenge.”

The Creators’ Rights Alliance expressed “regret that, following the sad example of previous reviews, Hargreaves has avoided confronting the issue of creators’ rights to be identified as author of their works and to defend their integrity – the so-called ‘moral rights’. It is a nonsense,” the CRA goes on, “to propose mechanisms for licensing of works whose authors cannot be

identified – ‘orphan works’ – while authors in the UK, whether they be scriptwriters or photographers, do not have a secure and enforceable right to be identified.” The deficiencies in UK law need to be remedied.

“In an age,” the CRA says, “where, as Hargreaves notes, all citizens are likely to be published or broadcast creators through FaceBook and YouTube and so on, these rights and the right to a fair share of income from commercial exploitation of works are essential for every citizen. Hargreaves’s proposal that remedies for unauthorised use be restricted for those who have not registered their works (buried at paragraph 4.34) risks undermining the legitimate interests of citizens, particularly those of young creators who will be the drivers of the next generation of the creative economy.”

The CRA is “disappointed by the lack of measures to help individual creators achieve a level playing field. An exception is the recommendation for a Small Claims Court procedure for copyright cases, which we

wholeheartedly welcome, long having called for it.”

The report’s headline proposal for a “digital copyright exchange” requires much careful thought: how will it serve the interests of the actual creators, and how will it be regulated to ensure that it does? The biggest problems that individual creators face are not with teenagers copying stuff on their iThings: they are with publishers and broadcasters imposing unfair contract terms that restrict their ability to work as dedicated professionals on whose work the entire “industry” depends.

It may be interesting that Ireland has launched a review of the possibility of US-style “fair use” and also called for a “clearing house” in Dublin. The question has to be asked whether the UK and Ireland have been set up to compete to best serve certain online interests.

Meanwhile, the European Commission (the EU’s civil service) has issued a “communication” setting out intriguingly similar proposals for legislation in the next few years.