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Abstract

Purpose. This article aims to analyze some examples of solidarity and cooperation between Portuguese cultural institutions, enterprises, artists, workers, volunteers, and local communities during the Covid-19 crisis. The research will focus on the years 2020 and 2021.

Approach/methodology. Our approach to the subject matter encompasses four main components. One is an in-text glossary to clarify a few concepts in view of national legislation. The second is a brief contextualization of the evolution of the pandemic at an (inter)national level. The third one is a description of how cultural institutions, heritage sites, and professionals were affected by the widespread virus. And the fourth one is the analysis of five case studies of actions of solidarity and cooperation within the cultural field.

Findings. Thanks to our research, we distinguish the negative impacts of Covid-19 from pre-existent problems in the sector. We have also found that some initiatives created to support cultural heritage may be questionable. Since the sanitary crisis is not over yet, the research is limited to the current state of knowledge. Future exploration on the matter may be relevant to find new case studies and consequences of the pandemic. We believe this article can have a social impact since it promotes a reflection on the economic sustainability, social engagement, and ethical responsibilities of cultural institutions and stakeholders. Besides, the discussion about the vulnerable conditions in which cultural workers found themselves during this crisis is of utmost urgency to design a better future for the sector and those who keep it running.

Originality. The originality of our study lies in the registration of creative strategies found
to counteract the outcomes of the pandemic, which may be inspiring in future times of emergency.
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### 1. Introduction

We developed the present research within the Ph.D. in Heritage Studies from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities of the University of Porto. We presented its content at the International Conference “Solidarity in Culture: Heritage Protection Under Conditions of Crisis” (2021), organized by the National and University Library in Zagreb (Croatia). This article explores the relation between social needs, culture, and heritage safeguarding during contingency periods. We selected this subject matter since the Covid-19 pandemic brought a new light to the use of art, culture, and cultural heritage in solving societal problems. For the purposes of this paper, we will be focusing on Portuguese examples of cultural solidarity and cooperation, mostly during 2020.

In Portugal, the widespread disease exposed and aggravated the fragility of several areas, leading the government to temporarily superimpose social needs over culture and heritage safeguarding (Correia 2020, 5-6; Januário 2020, 39, 45). Such a complex scenario gave birth to multiple initiatives of solidarity and cooperation both in a top-down and a bottom-up direction. These models of mutual help aimed to support cultural institutions, heritage sites, professionals, artists, and local communities (Leão 2020a, 4-5). The identification, analysis, and debate of those actions is the primary goal of the current article. The ultimate purpose of this approach is to document such strategies since they can serve as memories of the occurrence and can be convenient in upcoming periods of emergency.

Considering the previous premises, what are the first consequences of the pandemic for the cultural area and its professionals? Which weaknesses were already present in the field? How can they be mitigated, and what are the possible strategies to do so? How can cultural organizations, workers, volunteers, local populations, and governmental bodies cooperate to surpass those challenges? Should the policies, measures, and actions flow in a top-down, a bottom-up direction, or both? Finally, what future is there for Portuguese cultural heritage, institutions, and laborers?

In the text, we will be addressing problems related to the drastic decrease in tourist activities, the lack of profit and financing for culture, and the inequalities and precariousness within the sector. In addition, we will explore two hypotheses: one is that some actions of

---

1 The theme was addressed by Cyrielle Gauvi during the event “TRANS-DIGITAL: Transitions et transformations des secteurs «arts et culture» à l’aune de la pandémie (2020-2021)”, organized by the IESA Arts & Culture and held in Paris (France) on the May 27, 2021. George Kalamantis also approached the subject matter during the “Conference from Democratization to Cultural Democracy: Rethinking Institutions and Practices” led by the Portuguese Presidency of the Council of the European Union, in Porto Santo, on the April 28, 2021. The same applies to Gregory Sholette and his communication at the “Art and Human Rights International Conference”, which took place in the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation in Lisbon on the May 20, 2021.
solidarity act as marketing campaigns for cultural enterprises, and the second is that some plans found by the State to support cultural heritage may raise ethical issues. Despite Covid-19 being an ongoing phenomenon (2020-), academics have already been studying the dilemma and its aftermath worldwide. Portuguese authorities, cultural institutions, and research centers have been producing information since the declaration of the pandemic by the World Health Organization in March 2020 (WHO 2020).

Concerning the state-of-art, we consulted different sources and references. Their differentiation was then made based on their format and tenor. We consider sources such as normative instruments, official websites of cultural institutions, governmental bodies, and statistical data, and as references we consider books, journal articles, articles of opinion, and speeches retrieved from scientific events.

Regarding the sources, one must consider the national normative instruments that constitute the basis of the Portuguese legal system in terms of cultural heritage. From those, we call attention to Lei nº 107/2001 (2001), which establishes the political foundations and regime for the protection of cultural heritage; and Decreto-Lei nº 149/2015 (2015) devoted to the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. Portugal is a State Party of UNESCO and the Council of Europe, for which it has contributed to the creation of several international documents, such as the Council of Europe’s Faro Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (2005), and the Porto Santo Charter (2021) devoted to Culture and the Promotion of Democracy: Towards a European Cultural Citizenship (2021) created by the Portuguese Presidency of the Council of the European Union.

In terms of official websites, we consulted the webpage of ICOMOS-Portugal, ICOM-Portugal, the Portuguese National Institute of Statistics (INE), and the one from the General Directorate of Cultural Heritage (DGPC).

From the consulted references, we single out the first five volumes of Cadernos da Pandemia (2020), or the pandemic notebooks, elaborated by the Institute of Sociology of the University of Porto. Each eBook contains a series of reflections made by different academics, resulting in a multidimensional approach to the subject matter. The texts reflect upon contemporary concerns derived or intensified by Covid-19. They also address social disparities, precariousness, digital transition, culture commodification, and tourism dependency. Finally, in its pages, we can encounter testimonies of cultural workers whose lives were severely affected by the sanitary crisis (Barbosa 2020; Correia et al. 2020; Leão 2020b; Machado and Melo 2020; Marisa 2020).

To follow the developments and the public opinion about the measures implemented by the government and cultural institutions, we consulted a few online newspapers and magazines, namely: Público, Observador, Comunidade Cultura e Arte, RTP, and Diário de Notícias. However, their reading requires a careful look since some of their content is heavily politicized.

We must highlight the contribution of two international events to the debate. The “Art and Human Rights International Conference” (2021), organized by the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation (Lisbon)\(^2\), and the “Conference from Democratization to Cultural Democracy: Rethinking Institutions and Practices” (2021), coordinated by the Portuguese Presidency of the Council of the European Union (Porto Santo)\(^3\).

---

\(^2\) The event took place in Lisbon on May 20 and 21, 2021.

\(^3\) The second Conference happened in Porto Santo on April 27 and 28, 2021.
In the following pages, we will make a brief methodological note and summarize the evolution of the pandemic worldwide and specifically in Portugal. In addition, we will analyze its repercussions and the resulting pressure of superimposing social needs over culture and heritage. Afterwards, we will present and discuss some examples of cultural solidarity and cooperation and, lastly, inquire about the possible futures for Portuguese cultural institutions, artists, professionals, and volunteers.

2. Methodology

The methodology used for the research has three components. A document analysis on the (inter)national normative instruments relating to cultural heritage and labor rights, and consultation of references about Covid-19 and its effects on the sector. The second is a critical reflection on the fragilities of the Portuguese cultural segment and laws, and a brief exposition about some examples of precariousness and labor rights inconsistencies within the cultural institutions. Finally, the third component comprises the analysis of some actions of cultural solidarity and cooperation.

We chose to insert two examples of labor inconsistencies due to the intense debate they triggered on the work conditions of cultural professionals, both in the public and private sectors. These are the cases of the Music House and the Serralves Foundation in Porto. Both institutions were under scrutiny after dismissing workers during lockdowns, leaving them without proper social support due to irregularities in their employment status (Andrade 2020a, 2020b; Correia 2021; Leão 2020a, 5; Paulo 2020; RTP 2020). However, we must highlight that these are not isolated situations, but a sample of an institutionalized problem that runs in all areas.

The selection of the case studies followed different criteria. We choose some actions to integrate the investigation due to their mediatic interest, namely, the Drive-thru organized by Livraria Lello in Porto (Livraria Lello 2020); the emergency funds, and the scholarships granted by the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation in Lisbon (Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian 2020, 2021). Others were selected because of their importance at the local level, which is the case of the #Lifebuoy project, created to support Ó Galeria (Ó Galeria, n.d.); the E-xisto and the Porta a Porta program, set up by the Experimental Group of Theater from the University of Aveiro (GrETUA, Aveiro, Portugal; Notícias de Aveiro 2020; Universidade de Aveiro 2020). On the other hand, we considered the example of the Audiovisual Union due to its national impact owing to the creation of several help-centers around the country and the organization of multiple solidarity concerts (União Audiovisual 2020).

Before moving to the body of the article, we think it is necessary to clarify some terms and concepts used in our analysis, namely: cultural heritage, sector, workers, cooperation, solidarity, and precariousness. The geographical and chronological context influences these notions and their application, so we made a brief in-text glossary to specify the referential meaning for each concept:

- Taking into consideration the second article of Lei nº 107/2001 (2001), we recognize cultural heritage as: (in)tangible properties which are valued testimonies of civilization or culture, which possess relevant cultural interest and, therefore, are
objects of protection and promotion. According to the second article of Decreto-Lei nº 149/2015, intangible cultural heritage includes cultural manifestations expressed through practices, representations, knowledge, and skills of traditional nature, recognized by communities, groups, and individuals as worthy of being transmitted to the future generations.

- The increasing link between socio-economic development and creative areas results in an expanded notion of culture. A definition of the cultural sector limited to cultural activities is no longer sufficient since it now integrates the production, distribution, and consumption of services; the creation, differentiation, and development of immaterial elements recognized as creative industries (Augusto Mateus and Associa-
dos 2010, 4).

- According to the first clause of Lei nº 4/2008 de 7 de Fevereiro (2008), artistic activities are related to cinema, dance, theater, music, circus, and bullfights. This concept is insufficient, so the document was revoked. Consequently, the first article of Decreto-Lei nº 105/2021 de 29 de Novembro (2021) extends the regime of work contracts to professionals involved in artistic, “technical-artistic” work and the “mediation of shows or public events”.

- As stated in the fifth article of the United Nations Declaration (1966), cultural cooperation constitutes both a right and a duty, it implies the share of expertise and abilities. According to articles seven and ten of the same document, cultural cooperation should focus on ideas and values capable of promoting “peace, understanding, and friendship”.

- The concept of solidarity is multidimensional. However, here we will treat it as a synonym for compassion, support and as a tool to promote justice, equality, and human rights (Ogrodzka and Stokfiszewski 2019, 7). In cultural terms, it may mean the transition from an individualistic way of creating to a more collaborative one (Ogrodz-
ka and Stokfiszewski 2019, 10). Or even “[…] the capacity to build bridges between mobile individuals of different languages, cultures, and geographies” (Ogrodzka and Stokfiszewski 2019, 12).

- In Portugal, the term “precariousness” is often used to express situations where someone faces unstable work conditions, including informal or illegal relations of labor, the necessity to compromise rights for subsistence, accepting underpaid jobs, or the absence of schedule limitations (Barbosa 2020, 5-7).

3. Between social needs and heritage safeguarding

3.1. The bigger picture

In the past decades, the global interest in heritage matters by the academic community, governments, and the public increased. However, despite this growing awareness and its positive outcomes, the risks for cultural heritage tend to increase due to climate change, natural disasters, armed conflicts, civil unrest, and so on (Costa 2020, 85-86). Nonetheless, those threats let us forget (or underestimate) that an economic crisis can have tremendous repercussions for cultural heritage and the populations whose revenues and livelihoods are (in)directly dependent on it. The circumstances can be even more significant when the
slump reaches international proportions because it is harder for transnational networks to support all those in need. There will be inequalities between continents, countries, and local communities. When the aftermaths are extreme, governments may need to establish priorities, like superimposing social needs to culture and heritage safeguarding. An ethically valid choice but still with massive backlashes in the long run.

By the end of 2019, one of these large-scale crises was about to burst, and no one could predict its temporal and geographical dimensions. What seemed like a controllable outbreak of a new virus detected in Wuhan (China) was later declared a pandemic (WHO 2020). Then, the number of infections skyrocketed, and the list of countries affected by Covid-19 continuously grew, resulting in lockdowns worldwide and restrictions on (inter)national movements.

3.1.1. The Portuguese timeline

Portugal had its first Covid-19 cases at the beginning of March 2020. A few days after the WHO declaration and before any governmental decision, cultural institutions progressively closed their doors (Ponte 2020, 33-34). On March 18, the Portuguese government declared the first emergency state, and institutions devoted to culture were officially closed. That month, 78.4% of the museums were closed to the public (ICOM-Portugal 2020, 66).

If the first ‘wave’ (March 2020) was relatively mild, the second (November 2020) and third (January 2021) ones were more severe. Praised for its initial response to the pandemic, in January 2021, Portugal became the country with a higher number of infections and deaths per million. Once again, the government ‘isolated’ the country, and most of the population stayed at home, attempting to reduce the number of infections. From then on, the situation of the cultural sector deteriorated even further.

Beyond the health framework, the impacts of Covid-19 are equally nocuous. According to INE, in 2019, 21.6% of the Portuguese population was at risk of poverty or social exclusion (INE 2019). With the pandemic, the situation degraded. During the first year of the crisis (2020-2021), the country received less than 73.7% arrivals of non-resident tourists (INE 2020, 5). The GDP dropped by c. 7% (INE 2021, 34), and unemployment rose around 6.7% (INE 2021, 23). Consequently, hundreds of thousands of people needed governmental aid and support from local institutions to satisfy their basic needs.

3.1.2. Cultural institutions

With the decrease in touristic activities, lockdowns, and remote work, museums lost visitors, workers, and volunteers. Most institutions transposed their actions to the digital world, helping minimize social isolation but exposing disparities in accessibility (Alves 2020, 40-41; Ponte 2020, 34). With the digital transition came the certainty that there is an obligation to amend questions of mediation, automated, physical, and cognitive access to museums and their contents (Ponte 2020, 34-35). The computerized experience cannot supplant the ‘real’ one (they must coexist) and some activities should be presential, like those provided by educational services (Mota 2020, 44; Sousa 2020, 50).

During this “suspension” time, many found the opportunity to work on the collections, make inventories, reinforce their social work, and rethink institutions (Stoffel 2020, 16-17). From there came the acknowledgement that current management programs may be too
focused on (or limited by) financial results, like the increase in the number of visitors and revenues, and less in the democratization of culture, the educational mission, and the promotion of civic engagement (Ponte 2020, 34-35).

This tendency reflects old problems, such as the lack of a national structural plan for culture, its “abandonment” by the government, and the progressive cuts in funding (Ponte 2020, 34; Sousa 2020, 49-50; Stoffel 2020, 16-17). The situation forced logistical changes, too. Among others, there was the need to guarantee the physical conservation of collections, reschedule events, adapt their format, invest in the research, and re-orientation of agendas to the interpretation of permanent collections (Curtis 2020, 20-21; ICOM-Portugal 2020, 68).

Due to long-term shortages, some institutions reveal signs of rupture. One of the most concerning examples is the Museu Nacional de Arte Antiga (MNAA). Joaquim Caetano, Director of the Museum, warned that the absence of human resources to guarantee the security and maintenance of the building forced the temporary closure of part of the exhibition. Caetano also said that the outdated systems of electricity and air-conditioning endanger one of the richest collections in the country (Lusa 2021). In such conditions, resorting to volunteers seems a viable option. However, this alternative raises ethical issues when analyzed in the light of the numerous cultural workers looking for a way of subsistence.

3.1.3. Cultural professionals

Another problem ‘revealed’ by the deadlock was the high number of people working in precarious conditions, with low incomes and contractual irregularities. Two of the most media-exposed cases come from the cultural sector. The first is associated with Casa da Música in Porto, or the Music House (Leão 2020a, 5). The foundation temporarily dismissed workers with an independent status. After the administration’s decision, some professionals organized a protest in front of the building. Following the initiative, the institution definitively discharged some of the marchers. The situation’s gravity comes from two points. First, even though the workers theoretically had independent status, in practice, some were working full-time and, in other cases, were part of the team for decades. The second problem is that permanently dismissing workers after the protest – when the administration had announced that their liberation was temporary – can be interpreted as a retaliation measure (Correia 2021; Andrade 2020b; RTP 2020).

The second example is the Serralves Foundation in Porto (Leão 2020, 5). The educational team of the institution accused the lack of payment for canceled activities during the pandemic. In addition, the educators expressed discontent that, despite doing guided visits to the museum, they were still considered external workers (Paulo 2020; Andrade 2020a). The administration denied the accusations of reprisals and invited some of them for future works (Andrade 2020a).

According to Susana Januário, a reason for cultural precariousness is the neo-liberalization of the market since companies are free from contracting, and individuals are more exposed to all kinds of risks (Januário 2020, 37, 39-40). In the same logic, Inês Barbosa claims that the liberalization resulted in the “assignment” of rights for subsistence and questionable hiring models (Barbosa 2020, 5-7). Tânia Leão speaks about the lack of commitment against labor and power abuses (Leão 2020a, 4-5). The analysis by Teresa Martinho is equally keen. The author reports that most culture professionals have no limits to working hours, are
(under)paid in compressed or scattered periods, and have a self-employment status (Martinho 2020, 6).

Facing the number of professionals without a net of support, the government created aid mechanisms, such as specific allowances for artists, authors, and other cultural professionals. However, help did not reach all because some were not officially part of the sector (Martinho 2020, 7, 10-11). In 2021, the state released Portaria nº 37-A/2021 (2021), a regulation on extraordinary measures to support the area during Covid-19. Thanks to its first article, the new document encompasses artists, authors, technicians, and other professionals, a big step for recognizing workers previously disregarded.

How can these situations be mitigated?! Januário defends a renewed net of cooperation and collectivism, contrary to the individualism and the neoliberalism institutionalized (Januário 2020, 40). On the other side, Martinho reinforces the need for a contributory career proportional to the activity, access to unemployment allowance, medical discharge, and more investment in the cultural sector (Martinho 2020, 9, 12).

### 3.2. Examples of solidarity and cooperation

The sanitary crisis brought many misfortunes. Nonetheless, it also motivated actions of mutual help. While the events were unfolding, we accompanied and registered some examples of cultural solidarity and cooperation that may constitute positive models for future impasses. The following case studies took place within Portuguese territory, during 2020.

**Ó! Galeria** in Porto is an art gallery devoted to contemporary illustration. During the pandemic, the company lost part of its revenues and survived on online selling. Facing a dangerous cut in profit, the managers decided to create the #Lifebuoy. The project involved several illustrators that contributed by donating new or pre-existing prints. Matilde Horta, Uma Joana, Sílvia Rodrigues, and Marcos Matos are some of the creators. The #Lifebuoy initiative proves that cultural enterprises and artists can cooperate to surpass economic challenges (Ó Galeria, n.d.). An interesting case study since the inventors are the ones who keep the gallery ‘floating’.

GrETUA is an experimental theater group linked to the University of Aveiro. The community recognizes the space for its performative agenda. The association is mostly led by student-volunteers, even though it has some official members responsible for its management. As a result of the restrictions to live events, the group decided to reorganize itself and apply its human resources to help the local community. GrETUA organized two projects, the E-xisto (literally translated as E-xist) and the Porta a Porta (or Door to Door). The E-xisto consisted of fundraising computers, tablets, webcams, and microphones to donate. The initiative intended to support children, teenagers, and young adults that needed these devices to follow activities related to homeschooling or remote work (Notícias de Aveiro 2020). On the other hand, the Porta a Porta aimed to distribute essential goods to those confined, including seniors, people from endangered groups, and Covid-19 patients (Universidade de Aveiro 2020). Therefore, GrETUA is a positive example of how a cultural association can reorganize itself and its means while basic needs surpass cultural ones.

Livaria Lello in Porto is one of the most famous historical bookshops in the country. Defined as a monument of public interest by Portaria 625/2013 (2013), the store is one of the most touristic places in Porto. In a regular year, Lello receives thousands of visitors. Unfortunately, in 2020, the bookshop saw its schedules drastically shortened and the reduction
of (inter)national tourists who guaranteed its survival. In the same period, Lello’s administration created a Drive-Thru and offered more than 10,000 copies to local readers, which, as stated by its representatives, embodied an enormous financial effort. As a justification, the ‘ambassadors’ of the bookshop said that books were goods of first necessity, especially in times of crisis, and that the institution had a social responsibility towards the community (Livraria Lello 2020). The action was welcomed and was undoubtedly a positive gesture toward the statement on the book’s value. Nevertheless, we cannot stop asking if such an action was not also a great marketing campaign planned to attract new visitors.

Another socially active institution is the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation situated in Lisbon. Being one of the most important art centers in the country, Gulbenkian reinforced its humanistic image by creating several aid mechanisms for artists, students, and general citizens. The first action we want to recall is the creation of an emergency fund of five million euros. In the cultural area, the fund intended to support artists and organizations whose projects were canceled during 2020 (Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian 2020). The attribution of scholarships to master’s students is another contribution of the Foundation in supporting those in vulnerable situations. However, the most curious initiative counted on the collaboration of the Ministry of Health. The Foundation cooperated with governmental bodies by acquiring vans destined to drive across the country to help with the vaccination process (Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian 2021). The project is an outstanding example of how cultural institutions, and the State can join efforts to mitigate social problems.

The final case study we bring is the one of the Audiovisual Union. An informal group created the socio-cultural association to help artists and audiovisual workers struggling with unemployment and the lack of social support. With the motto #No one left behind, the association helped numerous families all around the country by collecting and donating food in cooperation with supermarket chains, food brands, and other enterprises (União Audiovisual 2020). Amid its several initiatives, the Union orchestrated some solidarity concerts. Every person was ‘invited’ to bring a bag of food. Among the musicians were the well-known Dead Combo (now ‘extinct’) and The Legendary Tigerman (Lusa 2020). We can assert the concerts have a triple solidarity nature since the bands do not charge, the public pays the ticket price, and brings essential goods to donate.

### 3.3. What future is there?

The future for cultural institutions, heritage sites, and professionals seems challenging. The lack of funding in coordination with the weakening of touristic activities may perpetuate the need for a close net of cooperation. In the long run, the economic sustainability of cultural institutions and heritage sites cannot continue to depend on it. Nor can it have the precariousness of its workers or the transposition of essential functions to volunteers as pillars.

Ultimately, the State will need to revise its attitude towards culture. We recall one example that is quite illustrative of how the government handles cultural matters. To raise money for cultural heritage, it created the heritage lottery “[…] to promote the involvement of all in the national mission of cultural heritage rehabilitation” (OE 2021). This well-intentioned action takes other contours when one knows about the addiction problem related to scratch cards. In recent years there has been a debate about the dependence on luck games, which affects especially vulnerable groups (Duarte 2021). The recognition of the problem by the
public triggered widespread criticism of the State’s initiative. Cultural organizations may need to have a more democratic approach. The topic was discussed at the “Conference from Democratization to Cultural Democracy: Rethinking Institutions and Practice” (2021) organized by the Portuguese Presidency of the Council of the European Union in Porto Santo. During the event many talked about accessibility, representation, diversity, and social inclusion. Notwithstanding, the subject leans more toward the public and less to human resources policies adopted by institutions. Even so, George Kalamantis stated that cultural organizations must focus on the administration, the collaborators, and the public; in the inversion of hierarchies and the promotion of bottom-up initiatives.4

4. Results and final considerations

In this research, we identified and discussed the first consequences of the pandemic for the cultural area and its professionals, namely, the reduction of income, funding, the dismissal of workers, and the resulting aggravated social crisis. We distinguished the preexistent weaknesses in that field from those provoked by Covid-19. Respectively, legal gaps relating to labor rights and inconsistent discharges of workers. By examining some cases of cultural solidarity and cooperation, we showed different strategies capable of mitigating the existing problems. We also demonstrated how bottom-up and top-down actions coexist and complement each other to support cultural institutions, heritage sites, workers, artists, and even local communities. Indeed, we concluded that the best option is a coordinated effort among all. To end, we raised some provocative questions about the possible futures for Portuguese heritage sites, artistic institutions, and laborers.

We didn’t fully confirm the hypothesis that some solidarity and cooperation initiatives act as marketing campaigns for cultural enterprises. Yet, we believe it should not be omitted from the research. On the other hand, not all State measures are free from ethical issues, as proved by the heritage lottery. Considering the ongoing crisis, we must assume that the present study has its limitations. First, because the existing literature is incomplete. Secondly, since the real outcomes of the pandemic will only be understood in the following years. So, there are research directions to deepen, such as the long-term changes in the cultural sector, gaps regarding labor rights, and ethically problematic policies concerning human resources in cultural institutions and heritage sites.
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Sažetak

Između društvenih potreba i čuvanja baštine: primjeri solidarnosti i suradnje u vrijeme Covid-19 krize: portugalska studija


Rezultati. Istraživanje je ustanovilo negativne utjecaje Covid-19 krize na već postojeće probleme u sektoru. Također smo ukazali na to da su neke inicijative, stvorene kako bi podržale kulturnu baštinu, zapravo upitne. Budući da nije proglašen kraj pandemije, istraživanje je bilo ograničeno na trenutačno stanje u sektoru kulture u Portugalu. Buduća istraživanja mogla bi pokazati, s pomoću novih studija slučaja, kakve su posljedice pandemije. Ovim radom donosi se refleksija na ekonomsku održivost, društveni angažman i etičku odgovornost ustanova u kulturi i drugih dionika. Osim toga, rasprava o ranjivim stanjima u kojima su se našli radnici u kulturi za vrijeme krize apsolutno je neophodna kako bi se planirala bolja budućnost i za sam sektor i za one koji ga pokreću.

Originalnost. Originalnost je rada u pronalasku kreativnih strategija koje neutraliziraju ishode pandemije, a koje ujedno mogu poslužiti kao inspiracija za buduća krizna razdoblja.
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