

EU Copyright Directive — what the text before Parliament does and doesn't do:**12 Tweetable lines**

- 1) Creators and performers are also users of copyright works [give examples from your sector, especially digital examples] — it's about a **fair deal for all**
- 2) The proposals aim to **benefit all creators**: professionals will be paid for use of their work, while creators of UGC will get all the rights they need through the upload platform
- 3) Most creators are **individuals and small businesses** — the proposals ask internet giants to follow the offline norm and pay a fair share for creative content used on their platforms
- 4) Creators have always been inspired by works that went before — the proposals don't stop anyone **standing on the shoulders of giants**; they hold the ladder
- 5) People will still be able to **hyperlink** — hyperlinking is explicitly excluded from the proposals
- 6) The proposals state clearly that they don't apply to **online encyclopaedias** like Wikipedia and other non-commercial services
- 7) **Parody** is not threatened — it's already covered by an exception to copyright and the proposals say rightsholders can't prevent uploading of works covered by exceptions
- 8) The proposals aren't **copyright**: that's the very opposite of what most journalists, authors, photographers, film-makers and many other creators devote their lives to
- 9) Not allowing creators to make a living from their work is the real threat to **freedom of expression**
- 10) Not allowing creators to make a living from their work is the real threat to the **free flow of information online**
- 11) Not allowing creators to make a living from their work is the real threat to **everyone's digital creativity**
- 12) Stopping the directive would be a **victory for multinational internet giants** at the expense of all those who make, enjoy and enjoy using creative works.