

Myth: “Article 13 will break the Internet, affect freedom of expression and stifle innovation and creativity”

FALSE!

So much biased disinformation (to say the least) is circulating on Article 13 that the first thing you should do is to ... READ it! It's [here](#). In fact, Article 13 aims at rebalancing the current unfair relationship between certain big platforms and the ones who created and invested in creative works. It requires certain big profit-making platforms with large amount of copyright works to get an authorisation from rights holders (paragraphs 1, 2 and 3) or to remove specific works, based on the information provided by rights holders (paragraph 4).

Who is concerned? See Article 2, paragraph 5 and the definition of online content sharing service provider. READ it! It is [here](#):

- It **ONLY applies** to those whose **MAIN PURPOSE** is to store and give access to a **LARGE amount of copyright protected works** uploaded by its users which it organises and promotes **for PROFIT-MAKING purposes**.
- It **does NOT apply to non-profit players, such as** online encyclopedias, open source software platforms or online marketplaces. Neither to services whose main purpose is not giving access to large amount of copyright works for commercial purposes

Who is responsible? Today, users are responsible for copyright infringement. With Article 13, **USERS** will **NOT** be responsible, but the **PROFIT-MAKING** platforms mentioned above will be (paragraph 2).

No threat to freedom of expression: Article 13 does NOT prevent people to upload their content, nor it will prevent them to freely upload content for the purpose of quotation, criticism, review, caricature, parody or pastiche. Freedom of expression is safeguarded for creators and citizens and protected from automatic blocking (paragraph 5). As authors, freedom of expression is in our DNA: we would not support any laws that limit it in any way.

No obligation to put “upload filters” in place: If no licences are available, those platforms need to be able to identify specific copyright protected content **for which rightsholders provide relevant information**. Any general monitoring obligation is explicitly banned (paragraph 4 and 7).

No one size fits all approach: In case rightholders do not want their content to feature on the platforms, the obligation to keep the content out will depend on the platforms' type, their audience, their size, the works uploaded, the means available to them and their cost (paragraph 4a).

Special regime for start-ups: In order to create even more legal security for small players, Article 13 includes a specific regime for startups if a) they have existed for less than three years, b) generate less than 10 million euros in turnover annually and c) have an average number of monthly unique visitors below 5 million. They will benefit from a light regime altogether (paragraph 4aa).

Now ask yourself: when a citizen enjoys a creative work on a global profit-making platform, do you think the revenues generated should go mainly to those who created the work or to the platforms?

Time to read the text, be fair to creators and adopt the Copyright Directive!