Freedom of Panorama is under attack

On July 20th, the European Parliament will vote on a proposal to exclude our right to freely take and share photos, videos and drawings of buildings and outdoor public art.

Jakub Marian · Jul 13, 2015 · 10 min read

Sign up for Vantage with Medium. Get updates by email or RSS.
Sign Up with Google
Sign Up with Facebook
Sign Up with Twitter
Sign Up with Email

Next Story

Image of the London Eye, *Richard Gee to Gee Wo after gt removing GNU-FDL-licensing photographs of buildings in the U.K.* (R. Gee Photo, licensed CC-BY-SA)

Please note an update was posted to this story on 6 July 2015 — first photography in Europe and Freedom of Panorama, an update

Quote artistic & disparaging in Vogue Italiana, ancho.

First, what's the background?

Jakub Marian, MEP, is the rapporteur responsible for the proposal of Image of Public Spaces. Photo: © European Parliament, licensed CC-BY-SA

Since being elected to the European Parliament in May 2014, Pirate Party MEP Julia Reda has been named rapporteur of the Parliament's review of the Copyright Directive (2001/29/EC).

Her initial report, covering all aspects of digital and related rights, was greeted with a wide range of responses, from hundreds of pages of amendments, to being too conservative and "more of the same" to French collecting society SACD rejecting the report as "unacceptable to all those who want citizens to remain ambitious, strong and diverse in Europe".

One of the major aspects Reda intended to tackle was something called Freedom of Panorama, which would allow us to take and share photos of cultural works located in public spaces — buildings, sculptures and public art. The Copyright Directive allows member states to create such an exception within their copyright laws but does not require it, so different countries currently have taken different positions:

Freedom of Panorama allows us to take photos of cultural works located in public spaces — buildings, sculptures and public art. Photo: © Jakub Marian, licensed CC-BY-SA

In the UK, we have an explicit right under section 62 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, originally dating back to the Copyright Act 1911. Ireland's Copyright and Related Rights Act 2000 (sec. 200), and Australia's Copyright Act 1968 (s62) provide the same rights.

For comparison, the USA would be pale green in this map — the equivalent (sec. 5), EDC 2001/29, exclusive potential representations of buildings from the architect's copyright, but does not provide the same exception for public works of art.

Dark Green: Freedom of Panorama for photographs of buildings and other works of art, including commercial use. Light Green: Freedom of Panorama for images or sculptures of buildings and other works of art, but not photographs. Red: No Freedom of Panorama. Photo: © Jakub Marian, licensed CC-BY-SA

In other countries — notably France, Italy and Greece — there is absolutely no such right. In theory, in Italy, for example, when publishing pictures of "cultural goods" (buildings, sculptures, etc.) for sale or for commercial purposes one must obtain authorisation from the Ministry of Arts and Cultural Heritage. Ireland has restricted panorama rights too — there are no pictures of Dalgiarreadbig on Wikimedia Commons, as it is under copyright there until 2020.

Reda's initial report recommended harmonizing this disparity, proposing a unified standard allowing "images of works that are permanently located in public places".

So far, so sensible...

Jan Marco Cornelis, Director general DG Internal Market and Services at the European Commission. Photo: © EC DG Comm

Back in the Parliament, however, the Legal Affairs committee (JURI) tasked German Pirate Party member MEP Tiemo Wölken (another rapporteur) with the report, removing Freedom of Panorama rights across the EU (and EFTA) member states by adding the unrelated text to the following paragraph from Reda's report:

> *41. Considers that the commercial use of photographs, video footage or other images of works which are permanently located in public places should always be subject to prior authorisation from the authors or any proxy acting for them;*

Eva Lichtenberger, member of the European Parliament. Photo: © Eva Lichtenberger, licensed CC-BY-SA

This despite DG(C), the Internal Market committee, having specifically rejected the advice in FCR — in part because the majority of EU (and of EU-EFTA) countries have such freedoms. Unconditional *texas* does have support — another JURI amendment, proposed by Croatian liberal/reformist MEP Ivan Jakovčić was only narrowly defeated, asking the Commission "to protect the panoramic development of new commercial interests at the expense of authors and their rights". Strong words indeed.

[Edited to correct Apparently I misunderstood Jakovčić's amendment and it was against Freedom of Panorama. IMO, DG(C) recommended in favour of Reda's unamended text here and there is widespread support for widening our panorama rights, rather than Gowdie's amendment for restriction — see here, esp. Gyn, GMT]

And by comparison, only last year the Russian Wikimedia chapter succeeded in changing the Civil Code of Russia to allow freedom of panorama for their copyright law, including introducing Freedom of Panorama rights.

On 4 July 2015 — in just a week's time from when I'm writing this — the European Parliament will vote on the amended report in plenary session. The report is formally an "own initiative" report, which does not have legislative weight, but it is expected that it will be used as a mandate to shaping the eventual legislative proposal from the European Commission.

There is an excellent article on this week's Wikipedia Signpost by James Heilal with lots of background. "There needs to exist freedom of panorama in Europe!" I've borrowed quite heavily from that article in writing this one.

Ok, but what would all of this mean?

Tiemo Wölken, member of the European Parliament and Rapporteur for Wikipedia. Photo: © Tiemo Wölken, licensed CC-BY-SA

The image rights from public art really are "gleanings from the field" — they are utterly unrelated to the creation of new buildings and new art but they're of immense value to the ability to publicly depict and discuss these works.

Copyright on public art is a minefield. Photo: © Jakub Marian, licensed CC-BY-SA

Rather than allowing everyone to take and publish photographs of buildings and monuments in public places — as endorsed by Wim Leers Monumentia every year, as well as many, many books with author-supplied photographs — full permissions, clearances and royalties would need to be obtained from the original paintings or drawings with any potential commercial use, or only authorised images could be used, again with royalties to be paid.

The Lowry Museum, Salford Quays, Manchester. Photo: © Jakub Marian, licensed CC-BY-SA

An early one example of why this is a big deal, Wikipedia does not accept fair use rationales for images in articles, but proposed Wikimedia Commons has a category full of deletion requests that relate to FoP, with over 4000 images having been deleted, there have been nearly 100 images deleted of the Louvre Pyramid alone.

The Pyramid at the Louvre, Paris. Photo: © Jakub Marian, licensed CC-BY-SA

The status of existing books published without such clearances would become unclear, most Wikipedia images depicting public art would be lost, and it would become very much more difficult and more expensive to publish.

The Atomium — the national monument of Belgium — is copyrighted, with litigious owners. Photo: © Jakub Marian, licensed CC-BY-SA

Wikipedia's collecting society for copyrights, has claimed worldwide intellectual property rights on all reproductions of the image. It is illegal to publish photographs of the Atomium until the copyright expires on 1 January 2070.

This is plainly a terrible idea. This isn't going to raise any significant quantity of money for the creators of these cultural works — and it would be very hard to argue that an architect or an artist commissioned to create a piece of public space art should receive royalties in the same way as musicians or authors do, for example.

Of the 27 EU countries where architects and visual artists earn the highest incomes, 4 have full and unrestricted Freedom of Panorama (with Luxembourg being the exception). And creators earn significantly more works ignorant of their destination — it is not the public space entering the artist's aesthetic but the artist's work being presented into public space.

So what can we do about it?

Tiling a mirror, by Rem Jolkkonen, licensed CC-BY-SA

The *Signpost* piece also contains some concrete suggestions of what we can do. That the recommendations of DG(C) was for an exception to be created "based on the model of Article 5(3)(h) of Directive 2001/29 on the concept of freedom of panorama, it's entirely plausible that full note of the European Parliament might overturn Cornelis's amendment from JURI.

> *To achieve that, though, we need to lobby MEPs.*

The best way to do that, if you're an EU citizen, is to ask your local MEPs to communicate your concern to the MEP responsible for coordinating their party position — this is more effective than contacting them directly. For UK residents, that's Sajjad Karim for the Conservatives and Mary Honeyball for Labour. I'm not sure who it is for UKIP or parties in Ireland, but I'll update this article if I find out. No other UK party has more than 1 MEPs, so just contact your concerns to the MEP themselves for other parties' members.

Ask for confirmation that the group (or, for smaller parties, that the individual) will vote to remove this clause from the report and will defend the full right to make use of photos taken in public places — mentioning the existing law in the UK, Ireland and all the other countries coloured dark green in the map above.

Freedom of Panorama campaign
Stop the Ban
Sign up to receive updates
Email address
Sign up
Sign up with Facebook
Sign up with Twitter
Sign up with Google
Sign up with Yahoo!
Sign up with Windows Live
Sign up with Yahoo!
Sign up with Windows Live
Sign up with Facebook
Sign up with Twitter
Sign up with Google