Summary

The aim of this thesis *Documentary Film from the Copyright Point of View* is to explore and evaluate copyright specifics of documentary cinema. Chapter One describes documentary film as a culture phenomenon with peculiar relationship to reality. It shows possible definitions and classifications and outlines some of the ethical questions connected with the documentary cinema. Then follows a brief excursion into the history of copyright protection of audiovisual works (both in the Czech Republic and in the international context), with emphasis on speciality of documentary films protection.

Chapter Three examines terms audiovisual work and authorship of an audiovisual work as defined in effective Czech Act No. 121/2000 Coll. on Copyright and Rights Related to Copyright and tries to mark boundaries of these terms and its possible interpretation especially in relation to the documentary and other non-fiction films. Next chapter deals with the legal nature of protagonists of documentary or social actors which differs from legal nature of the actors in fiction films, because social actors does not perform artistic performances as defined in Czech Copyright Act. Subsequent Chapter Five analyzes protection of personal rights of social actors in documentary films which is governed by general protection of personal rights in Act no. 89/2012 Coll. Civil Code which may cause some significant problems in the production of documentary films. Another chapter explores the relationship of constitutionally enshrined freedom of expression and documentary cinema and deals with possible liability for expressions depicted in the film.

The last part focuses on possibilities of non-contractual use of copyrighted works of other authors in documentary films, especially on four statutory licenses according to Czech Copyright Act (quotation, incidental inclusion, use of a work in a public space, reporting license). A separate chapter examines the US doctrine of fair use and its application in the documentary cinema, including relevant case law.