

tainability of the Creative Industries in Uganda” project. Of course, the NACCAU has a responsibility to its members, which includes the expectation that the association as such also considers their economic interests. Cultural hegemony, its discourses, and the reproduction thereof organize utterances and statements that determine “what is to be known and what is understood and what is *not*” (Clarke et al., 2018: 225, emphasis as in original). In doing so, they set the “conditions of possibility” and hence also the “conditions of impossibility” (ibid, emphasis as in original) and co-determine what will be heard, seen, and considered. However, this does not automatically mean that they do not exist nor that they are less important in the situation. It is noteworthy that they are articulated not in utterances and statements with an outward orientation, but in inward-oriented moments and actions, which are particularly present in the positions taken by those independently organized artistic handicraft groups on the peripheries and outside the realm of what could commonly be associated with civil society activity.

In the previous chapter, I reconstructed how relevant social worlds and organizations such as the NACCAU engage with one central non-human element in the situation of inquiry – artistic handicraft products. In doing so, I highlighted some contestations and contradictions in the conceptualizations of artistic handicraft objects, which are subject to the establishment and continuity of cultural hegemony but also of ruptures in my research situation. In what follows I continue to dwell on the roles, the discursive power of some non-human elements, and the assigned impotence of the discursive construction of handicraft artists in positioning the NACCAU as an association in-between.

6.3 Interlinkages and -Dependencies

Unlike chapter 6.2, which was mainly based on the analysis of interviews, round-table discussions, photographs, and ethnographic protocols by use of open coding strategies to zoom in on the segments within the NACCAU, the findings in chapter 6.3 are empirically based on the relational analysis of messy-situational maps (see also chapter 4.4.1) of the NACCAU in the broader situation of inquiry. Through mapping, I found two cultural policies to be re-emerging elements of reference, the 2006 Ugandan National Culture Policy and the 2005 UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions. I will therefore briefly introduce them before I show where and how these non-human elements become actants in the research situation, thereby returning to international project cooperations already covered throughout the previous chapters, the *Strengthening the Sustainability of Creative Industries in Uganda* project and the *Marketability of East African Cultural Crafts* project. In addition, I elaborate on the non-human element material(ity), the discursive construction of artistic handicraft artists who, in this particular moment within

the situation, are implicated actors, and the discursive element overcoming poverty of the debate around how to best support them, which reconnect with the discourses on sustainable development, (women's) empowerment, cultural heritage, and creative industry.

Cultural Policies

The 2006 Uganda National Culture Policy

Culture is the sum total of the ways in which a society preserves, identifies, organizes, sustains and expresses itself. Uganda is endowed with a rich and diverse cultural heritage, which includes sixty-five indigenous communities with unique characteristics. The Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP, 2004) acknowledges that culture is intrinsically valuable and an important dimension of identity and a form of capital with the potential to move people out of income poverty. However, there is a general lack of appreciation of the significance and value of Uganda's cultural heritage towards the realization of Uganda's development goals. (Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development, 2006: 2)

With these opening words in the foreword of the 2006 Uganda National Culture Policy (NCP), the Minister of Gender, Labour and Social Development at the time, Syda Namirembe Bbumba, set the tone for the content of the policy paper to follow. It mentions the diversity and richness of Uganda's cultural heritage, which is comprised of 65 indigenous communities but does not elaborate on either aspect named. Instead, Bbumba turns towards the linkage between culture and poverty eradication, which she emphasizes by referring to *the Poverty Eradication Action Plan* (PEAP) that was ratified two years prior. Not only does culture bear the potential to "move people out of poverty" (ibid: 2), but the general lack of appreciation for culture is considered a barrier to development here. Furthermore, Bbumba refers to culture's potential in overcoming *income* poverty. This is relevant in two ways: First, it acknowledges the multidimensionality of poverty by emphasizing culture's agency in overcoming this particular kind of poverty. In doing so, it secondly limits culture's agency to the very particular kind of income poverty and hence to its potential economic benefits. It disregards all other poverty dimensions in which culture might have agency or in which cultural hegemony maintains the current social order, which, with Bourdieu, are closely connected to income, hence financial, poverty (Bourdieu, 1984 [1979]).

It is this dichotomy between acknowledging that culture is important for any society and that cultural diversity is a significant contributor to social cohesion, and the subsequent limitation of cultural practices to income-generating activities that

dominate the tone of the 2006 NCP. In this sense, the document informs about the value of cultural articulations for “traditional communities in what is now Uganda”, which

were closely knit units. Their social, political and economic organisation [sic] revolved around the family, clan and/ or the institution of the traditional leader. The daily activities of men, women and children, whether as individuals or as groups were intrinsically linked to, and determined by their cultures. (Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development, 2006: 6)

Due to the exposure to “various influences” (ibid), among which foreign rule, those traditional socio-political setups were weakened, indigenous knowledge either ignored or belittled, the document further argues. In this logic, the setup of the Ministry of Culture and Community (MoCC) of the first post-independence government emphasized the importance of culture for the social and political coherence in the newly established nation-state. Today, culture is a department under the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development and that the major aim of the policy, which is the first major cultural policy paper or act since 1977, according to its authors, is to “guide the formal and informal systems of managing culture at all levels” (ibid: 7).

Regarding *Visual Arts and Handicrafts*, here seen as one, the document follows the same pattern: it refers to the variety of visual arts and handicrafts first and then positions objects such as basketry, mats, ceramics, beads, hand-woven textiles and products, and others as being products of culture and history of a particular place and a particular ethnic group. In their functions, they have “promoted the identities of the various communities and created avenues for income generation” (ibid: 9). However, when it comes to challenges and areas of concern, the policy addresses the “poor quality of products due to limited capacity of producers and marketers”, “inadequate quantities”, and “limited research about the products and the markets”, in addition to a threat to the availability of raw materials previously described as “readily available” due to environmental degradation (ibid). This juxtaposition establishes two meanings of culture in general terms and, more concretely, of visual arts and handicrafts. While the early government, it seems, understood the intrinsic value of culture for social and political cohesion of communities and the development of a post-independence nation-state rooted in localities, the contemporary importance of culture provided by the NCP is predominantly linked to an economic development creed.

The *Development and Promotion of Cultural Industries, the Development and Promotion of Indigenous Knowledge; -of Cultural Beliefs, Traditions and Values and -of Visual Arts and Handicrafts* are four of the priority areas of the NCP. By now, the document is mainly concerned with the economic potential and commercialization of culture as expressed in the following:

Uganda is endowed with diverse cultures, which produce unique products including visual arts and crafts. These products are some of the raw materials on which cultural industries thrive. Visual arts and handicrafts have the potential to reduce income poverty [sic] if their quantity and quality is deliberately enhanced. (Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development, 2006: 22–23, emphasis added)

Visual arts and handicrafts are now exclusively considered as bearing the potential of diminishing the income poverty:

Cultural industries have the potential to promote the livelihoods of the marginalised, the poor, and the vulnerable. Cultural industries create employment opportunities and produce economic gains and incomes at all levels. These cultural industries further contribute to cultural development by protecting and enriching cultural values, promoting creativity, optimising skills and human resources. (ibid: 20)

Cultural values, the document implicitly argues, are not always inherently good. Therefore, the 2006 NCP specifically seeks to “mitigate social practices that are oppressive to people” (ibid: 21). At times, beliefs, traditions, and values are at conflict with modern laws, as is the case with, e.g., “widow inheritance and female genital cutting” (ibid: 10). Unlike cultural values, which are promoted when they “impinge on human dignity” and “promote respect and tolerance among different beliefs and value systems” (ibid), indigenous knowledge is considered a

key factor in social and economic development [...]. In addition, there is recognition of the important role of local communities in contributing their indigenous knowledge systems to enhance the sustainability of development programmes. (Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development, 2006: 21)

According to the 2006 NCP framework, the ideal cultural industries, then, build on indigenous knowledge as well as on human dignity conform cultural beliefs, traditions, and values.

The 2005 UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions

The 2006 NCP was technically and financially supported by the British Council and the National Commission of the UNESCO in Uganda. Only shortly prior to the ratification and publication of the 2006 NCP had the UNESCO member states accepted the *2005 UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions*. It was ratified by Uganda in 2015, but already prior to its ratification, it shaped cultural work and policies and promoted the previously rather unknown

concept of the cultural and creative industries (CCIs) across the African continent (De Beukelaer, 2017). The direction of my research does not allow me to draw any conclusions whether and, if so, to what extent the 2005 UNESCO convention and the development thereof might have already impacted the 2006 NCP. Since its ratification in 2015, however, it has become a vital non-human actant in the situation of inquiry.

The 2005 *UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions* links the endurance of cultural diversity with (sustainable) development. The protection of cultural diversity here is connected to the cultural and creative industries, since it is through the creative industries that the global circulation of products is facilitated (De Beukelaer, 2015). To withstand the threat imposed by globalization and a free market, which could result in the diminishing of cultural diversity, the rationale of the 2005 Convention assumes that “all countries must have sufficiently strong cultural industries to make sure their internal market can withstand the influx of imported films, music and books” (ibid: 20–21).

In its logic, the protection of cultural diversity is a global responsibility, and therefore, wealthier countries, “in a spirit of partnership”, are called to support the enhancement of “the capacities of developing countries in order to protect and promote the diversity of cultural expressions” (UNESCO, 2005: 7). The Convention, unlike the NCP, assumes culture to be inherently good, and the protection of its diversity here is associated with democracy, the empowerment of women as well as of minorities and indigenous people, conflict resolution and peace building, and economic development. For example, by recognizing “the importance of traditional knowledge as a source of intangible and material wealth, and in particular the knowledge systems of indigenous people, and its positive contribution to sustainable development” (ibid: 2) and by reaffirming “the importance of the link between culture and development for all countries, particularly for developing countries” (ibid: 6). It is this form of relative universalism, as Steffen Geiger and I call it, in which all are addressed (the importance for all countries), but some are particularly exposed (particularly for developing countries) (Klages & Geiger, in preparation). This emphasis, by which social inclusion occurs through the explication of a particular group, the rhetoric in the document specifies some addressees of the Convention as more relevant than others. This is a rather common linguistic tool that can also be found in other IOs’ documents, for example in the SDGs (ibid). Here, it re-emphasizes the interconnectedness of culture and development, especially for countries of the Global South, whose cultures, due to wealth imbalances, are particularly endangered.

In my research situation, the major role of the 2005 *UNESCO Convention Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions* is to justify and direct the major narrative of sustainable development through visual arts and handicraft work, which is culturally sensitive because it acknowledges and promotes indige-

nous knowledge, and it protects the tangible and intangible cultural heritage of ethnic groups and communities not inventoried in the UNESCO lists.

International Cooperations

“Strengthening the Sustainability of Creative Industries in Uganda”

The first of the two projects, the *Strengthening the Sustainability of Creative Industries in Uganda* project was a collaboration between the UNESCO and local partners and financed by the Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism of the Republic of Korea through its Funds-In-Trust (K-Fit) program. Through this program, the Republic of Korea has funded more than 20 UNESCO projects in several countries, thereby considering K-Fit a method of operationalizing the 2005 *Convention*. All of them aimed and aim at the development of the creative industries in so-called developing countries. The creative industries development here was identified as

key in building an enabling environment for creative entrepreneurship in developing countries [...]. Through these investments, artists and cultural professionals have developed the capacity to create, produce, disseminate and access a wide diversity of cultural expressions. (Ottone Ramirez, 2021: 1)

The *Strengthening the Sustainability of Creative Industries in Uganda* project shares its name with projects implemented in, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Rwanda, and Uzbekistan, and ran between 2015 and 2019. Its local partners included the Uganda National Commission for the UNESCO, was implemented by the NACCAU, and was further strategically supported by the Ministry of Tourism, Wildlife and Antiquities, the Ministry of Education and Sports, the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development, the Export Promotion Board and the Arts and Culture Department of Makerere University.

For this project, the 2005 *Convention* serves as a framework as well as an initiator. It is *because* of the convention and the therein articulated need to globally strengthen the creative industries that the K-Fit was established, which made the strengthening-project in Uganda possible. Regarding the status-quo of the creative industries in Uganda, the project took a deficit-oriented approach and a proposed set of interlinkages that establish discursive dependencies of local collective actors such as the NACCAU:

The objective is to strengthen the artistic, design, marketing and management skills of Ugandan craft workers in order to improve the production and quality of their products for economic and sustainable development. It aims to identify, promote and safeguard traditional know-how in crafts making in the diverse cultural

expressions, [...] and create awareness about the importance and role of the crafts industry in the economic development of the country. (UNESCO, 2017: n.p.)

The title of the report introduces the same people who here are described as needing to improve on all levels of their engagement with creative and artistic work as “cultural professionals”, and it is by means of foreign-funded and -headed projects such as this sustainability project that traditional expertise can be safeguarded. Both claims are incoherent, but they do powerfully demonstrate the major incentives of this project. The cover page of the project leaflet (see Image 4.1) repeats the controversy between “strengthen[ing] the artistic, design, marketing and management skills,” on the one hand, and the target population, who are addressed as “Ugandan Women Professionals,” on the other hand. The aim of the 2005 Convention is the protection and the promotion of cultural diversity, while the strategies to do so apply marketing strategies and approaches to professionalization conceptualized elsewhere and which, in the research situation, remain alienated to the current lived realities of the very handicraft artists it seeks to support.

Content-wise the project was divided into four stages: First, the UNESCO executed a mapping and assessing of artistic handicraft activities in three selected regions of the country. The assessment then informed the development of a draft training manual, which was tested in those three regions by the NACCAU members who executed the trainings in the respective regions. In the last stage, the manual was revised, and the idea was to make it available for future trainings so that, according to the project partners, “artisan and craft products *“Made in Uganda”* will be synonymous with quality, creativity, employment and sustainability” (ibid, emphasis as in original).

Here, engagement with the creative industries and artistic creation is apolitical. Its objectives are placed first and foremost within the notion of overcoming *income* poverty. Again, the *cultural professionals*, as they are called here, remain implicit. It is assumed that economic development is their major concern. The issue of women empowerment is mentioned without being contextualized in most parts; at times, the project aims to support all cultural professionals, whereas at other times it addresses “Ugandan Women Professionals” (Project Leaflet, n.d.) only, emphasizing on the importance of the project for the “trained women creatives” (ibid). The initiation of the *Strengthening the Sustainability of the Creative Industries* project overlaps with the Ugandan ratification of the 2005 UNESCO Convention. It is thus the first project that builds on the convention’s rationale, and although the subsequent cooperative projects do not necessarily refer to the convention as explicitly as the *Strengthening the Sustainability* project, its impact on meanings associated with artistic handicraft work, jointly with the 2006 NCP and the 2005 UNESCO Convention, are so dominant that other forms of meaning making are pushed to the margins of the discourse and to the periphery in the situation of inquiry.

The “Marketability of East African Cultural Crafts” Project

The *Marketability* project of the Ugandan Tourism Association (UTA) in collaboration with the NACCAU has very similar objectives as the *Strengthening the Sustainability* project, with a particular emphasis on the establishment of an online sales platform. The project received funding from the GIZ. In the project proposal, the major objective is described as follows:

The idea is to further support women and youth who are currently engaged in crafts production and earning very Low [sic] earnings in Uganda and Kenya [...] The ultimate goal of the Idea [sic] is to enable Craft [sic] producers who are mainly women and youths [sic] in Uganda and Kenya build their capacity in terms of production of Quality Products [sic], through benchmarking from each country and improving their Marketing [sic] skills, as well as avenues to enable their crafts reach the final customers internationally through the Online Platform [sic]. (UTA, 2019: 3)

The *Marketability* project echoes the 2006 NCP, which assumes that visual arts and handicrafts “have the potential to reduce income poverty if their quantity and quality is *deliberately* enhanced” (Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development, 2006: 22–23, emphasis added). Furthermore, the project proposal directly refers to the SDGs and the Uganda Vision 2040, which are two additional policy elements of relevance in the research situation. The former is particularly closely associated with discursive, hegemonic power as it has become the reference for most activities in the development realm (Ziai, 2016). The focus on women and empowerment, inclusive of women’s empowerment, of the SDGs is emphasized upon in the project proposal, in addition to the involvement of local communities and the ecological sustainability of materials, which “are mainly local material from plants” (UTA 2019: 3).

In the logic of the *Marketability* project, artistic handicraft products first must be improved upon before they can be successfully promoted internationally by means of an online platform. Again, the NACCAU is the executive partner in this project. It will provide the “trainers with expertise in crafts production skills” (ibid: 11) and the host of the online sales platform to be developed. Partnering tourism actors will support the marketing strategy by guiding tourists to the respective locations where crafts are sold as well as to the online platform. The *Marketability* project, although smaller in scale, can, to a certain extent, be seen as a continuation of the UNESCO *Strengthening the Sustainability* project, at least for the NACCAU. Those members who already supported the implementation of the UNESCO project, including Nuwa Nyanzi, find themselves in the similar position of trainers to enhance the quality of the handicraft products. For Richard Kawere, then CEO of UTA and main author of the proposal, the creative industries and tourism are two sides of the

same coin because it is the handicraft product, the souvenir that “keep[s] [tourists] memory of the destination of Uganda and Kenya alive” (ibid: 5). In our interview, he re-emphasizes this understanding. He tells me:

So, the whole, entire – why tourism industry is attached to the crafts – emerging as a result of: One; is the demand of the souvenirs by the tourists that come to the country. Two, is the need to work with producers to transform their lives, because as they transform their lives, it’s the tourism industry that actually benefits in the end. (Interview with Richard Kawere, CEO UTA, 11/03/2020: 176–178)

Therefore, while associations such as the NACCAU are dependent on support from actors such as the UTA, who, by means of their structures and network, have better access to funding, both the UTA and the NACCAU members emphasize the mutual dependencies between artistic handicraft products and production and tourism. For Nuwa, tourism is more of a byproduct of “natural and built cultural heritage sites. Period. Both tangible and intangible” (Interview with Nuwa Nyanzi, 26/01/2020: 616–617). Therefore, for him, it is no contradiction to the value of artistic handicraft production if the products artists and artisans create are positioned as souvenirs in the tourism sector. In the situation of inquiry, the *Marketability* project manifests the directions taken by the *Sustainability* project, and both are pushed even further by the *Souvenir and Handicrafts Development* project, a US \$1.5 million initiative under the direction of the Ministry of Tourism, Wildlife and Antiquities, which is funded by the Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF), a partnership of countries and donors who jointly support *least developed countries* in establishing trade structures that enhance development and reduce poverty under the World Trade Organization (WTO). In the project description of its first Quadrennial Periodic Report of the Implementation of the 2005 Convention on Cultural Diversity, the authors refer to both the SDGs and the 2005 Convention, thereby referring to SDG Goals #8 (decent work and economic growth), #10 (reduced inequalities), and #17 (partnerships), and the #2 Convention Goal “Flows and Mobility”.

Constructing the Subaltern-Artisan-Others

All policies and projects in the situation have one thing in common, their target population. As I have demonstrated throughout the results chapters of my research thus far, in project negotiations, gatherings, commissions – in brief, in moments where the meanings of artistic handicraft production and the items produced are debated – artistic handicraft artists remain largely absent. With Clarke’s analytical instruments for the reconstruction and analysis of the situated phenomena that are subject to my research, in the relational analysis of the situation, they remain implicated or silent actors (Clarke et al., 2018).

At the roundtable discussion on Art in International Development in February 2019, for example, Nuwa spoke about the *Handicraft Souvenir and Development* project headed by the Ministry of Tourism as one strategy to make artistic practices more sustainable. When I asked him what exactly he means when talking about souvenirs, he replied:

Things to show that you were in Uganda – and you got something from there, to show that you were there, because this is their interest [of the Ministry of Tourism]. They [the ministry members] think they can make more money from it. (Nuwa Nyanzi, roundtable discussion 'Art in Intl. Development', 27/02/2019: 147–149)

I then continue to ask about the artists and artisans who make the products and about their perspectives regarding the terms used, wondering whether what is meant to empower them does not ultimately lead towards the opposite. Nuwa is not concerned with this. Instead, he replies:

Is the word not being 'politically correct'? Because the word souvenir may not sound as alarming to the average Ugandan as it is to an English-speaking person. What I am saying is they don't know that by selling your [sic] work as a souvenir is [sic] actually undermining the value of that bead work. So, they have no feelings towards it until [they] find out that that is what it is. Probably they will have a view to or against. But for now, they are glad for their work to be sold. (Nuwa Nyanzi, artist and art-entrepreneur, roundtable discussion 'Art in Intl. Development', 27/02/2019: 155–160)

In this quotation, Nuwa addresses two important issues. The first issue is the issue of language and terminology. Language matters and is always already culturally encrypted, as I demonstrated at length in the theoretical discussions around *art* and *civil society* in chapters 2 and 3 as well as with regard to cultural interpretations in chapter 4. He suggests that *to the average Ugandan*, the word souvenir is not associated with a threat of devaluing and altering the meanings of material culture as apparently understood by me or an English-speaking person. At least, the average Ugandan does not yet know about the associations others might have with the term. Nuwa also implicitly suggests that the information could be withheld from artisans and handicraft artists, who, currently, readily sell their products as souvenirs. The information about the dynamics connected with labeling something as a souvenir is not shared with them.

Structural, intersectional factors are not considered, nor do the framings of the projects in the situation provide space for alternative meaning making of engaging with artistic handicrafts. I argue that although handicraft artists are essential actors in the creative industries, they are generally not considered as people who partici-

pate and co-constitute the discourse. This is the second important issue addressed in the quote above – the appointed positionality of handicraft artists who at times are frequently from low-income households, but generally also understood to be unknowing subjects, individuals, and groups who are assumed not to care about issues other than economic gains or who might care but are not informed.

The here discussed projects both emphasize the need to professionalize people who are presented as professionals, and the projects propose to teach them price calculation and marketing skills. When I spoke to a small number of handicraft artists in rural Eastern Uganda, it did not seem like they did not know how to decide on an adequate price for their products. At times, however, one woman from the women's collective said, she needs money fast, and hence sells at any price a customer is willing to pay, even if it comes at a loss for her.

Overcoming Poverty

The narrative of all three third-party funded artistic handicraft projects discursively individualizes poverty and proposes individualized strategies towards economic empowerment as the solution to overcome it. At least the two trainers I already introduced, Nuwa Nyanzi and Bruno Sserunkuuma, both believe in this philosophy as well, which for them is connected with their own biography, albeit in different ways. Sserunkuuma grew up being raised by his mother. For him, it is clear that it was because of her tireless efforts that he was able to attend school, continue to pursue a university degree, and become a successful artist (unrecorded conversation, 08/2018). This personal biographic experience motivates him to support and engage with project that aim to empower women, mostly mothers, who are in similar situations. He is convinced that supporting mothers is automatically always also to the benefit of their children. Artistic handicraft production, to him, is an activity that will help them in establishing their financial independence, just like he was able to make a living from making art, thereby creating a brighter future not only for himself, but for his entire family.

Nuwa lived in political exile in Kenya from the late 1970s till the early 1990s. It is in exile where he started pursuing art and established himself as an artist among the Ugandan expats residing in Kenya at the time. In his narrative, his dedication, passion, and patience were the companions that made success as an artist possible. Therefore, he assumes that everyone should be able to achieve similar successes, provided they are dedicated enough to overcome hardships. Therefore, he has little understanding for those round-table discussion participants who are skeptical about the sustainability of time-bound projects:

For three years they have taught you how to make this craft, they have made a market for you and you want to tell me you have not been empowered – and when I

leave you collapse?! Then, there is something fundamentally wrong with a person who has been taught how to create a product but cannot go further than that. That will mean there has to be another expert to come and teach them marketing. And then after that they will have to have another person to come and teach them selling, because the is different from marketing. So – when will it stop?! (Nuwa Nyanzi, artist and art-entrepreneur, round table discussion 'Art in Intl. Development, 27/02/2019: 274–280)

In the debate another participant, who introduces himself as Philip Balimuni, points towards the fact that what worked for Nuwa may not work for others who live with very different circumstances and who may not have the same objectives and initiative. While Nuwa mentions that he had been a trained professional working in the medical military system prior to his flight, that he had had a cousin who gave him some money, that he had met a supporter who took one of his artworks to the US, where he was “making connections with sponsors to support refugees in Kenya” (ibid: 271–272), and that he had had an aunt who at the time lived in Nairobi, owned a restaurant, and provided him a roof over his head, he does not link any of those factors with his success as an artist. It appears as if he does not recognize these aspects as supportive elements that impacted the course of his career as an artist. Therefore, maybe out of humbleness, maybe out of naïveté, or for reasons about which I can only speculate, he believes that after having received training, others should be able to build their artistic careers on that. After all, he had succeeded in doing so as well.

As trainers, Nuwa and Sserunkuuma are powerful and convincing because both tell their visions through their biographic experiences. Both are successful artists who travel abroad and who live well from their art. They are the living proof of the authenticity of the narratives they tell, and I met several people who told me that during the UNESCO (the *Strengthening* project) training, they were told to continue to work and push through hardship, and that it was because of the training they were able to gather new hope, continue with their work, or resume it.

6.4 Conclusions

Of Being and Not Being in Art and Civil Society

The NACCAU as an organization traces its roots back to 1994, the year in which the monarchies were reinstated as cultural institutions. With its restructuring in 2003, it became the National Arts and Cultural Crafts Association of Uganda. In its name it brings together art, craft, culture, and the aspiration to be(come) an association of national importance. Yet, it is also a member-based association whose activities by and large cluster around its main site of action, its crafts village. As a mem-