

INTRODUCTION

CAITLIN GORDON-WALKER AND MARTHA BLACK

IN THE LITERATURE AND TEACHING about museums and museology – and there are increasing numbers of both publications and museum studies courses that generate and consume that literature – one frequently encounters “the museum” as an abstract entity but less frequently meets the individuals who work with and in museums. For this special issue of *BC Studies* we wanted to make the dynamics of museum work with and by Indigenous people more evident and to foreground not just the theories, essential though they are, but also the varied conversations that take place around the necessary and often difficult work of meaningful collaborations, actual and virtual repatriations, attempts to Indigenize European-style institutions, and implementation of enhanced relationships (and perhaps different kinds of encounter) in the current Canadian climate of reconciliation.

We wanted this issue to capture some of the conversations happening in and around BC museums that offer insights into contemporary museums’ policies and practices, and into the broader politics and realities of reconciliation. So we start with a few thoughts from conversations that we as guest editors have been having as this volume has come together. Indeed, “together” is an underlying concept throughout.

Caitlin Gordon-Walker: Thirty years ago, James Clifford, in his well-known essay “Four Northwest Coast Museums: Travel Reflections,” wrote about the museological approaches of the University of British Columbia Museum of Anthropology (MOA), the Royal BC Museum (RBCM), the Kwagwalth Museum (now the Nuyumbalees Cultural Centre), and the U’mista Cultural Centre.¹ This work interrogated the intersections between Indigenous and traditional Western perspectives on how to classify, value, care for, and represent both tangible and

¹ James Clifford, “Four Northwest Coast Museums,” in *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*, ed. Ivan Karp and Stephen D. Lavine, 212–54 (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991).

intangible Indigenous heritage in British Columbia. The questions it raised about the “shifting power relations and competing articulations of local and global meanings” within British Columbia’s public heritage institutions are still highly relevant,² but both the context and the practices of museums in British Columbia have changed. At the same time, what is occurring currently in BC museums builds on a longer history of relationships, both inside and outside of museums, that Clifford did not investigate – as he clearly states even in his essay’s title, his reflections are a kind of travelogue of an informed and perceptive visitor and do not explore the complexities of relationships behind the scenes in these museums. The papers in this special issue demonstrate both the changes and continuities in British Columbia’s heritage institutions, and, while they do address what can be seen in public exhibitions, the focus of this volume is on conversation, on relationships, and on the work that goes on within and beyond the museums’ walls.

My interest in these conversations is grounded in my academic research, which focuses on the politics of heritage – how people represent and understand the past and, correspondingly, how they understand and act in the present. My perception is that a lot of innovative work has occurred in BC museums and that it offers insight into museum politics and practice more widely as well as into the broader political contexts of changing relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people. Some of this work, both historical and contemporary, has been highlighted in publications and documentaries (see below), but the current moment, in which discussions about reconciliation and what it must mean are in the foreground, seemed to me an important time to foster dialogue about the wider contexts and implications of this work and to present different perspectives and conversations occurring in heritage institutions in a place that not only brings together academic and practice-based museum scholars but also connects these conversations to related ones occurring in other fields and disciplines. Working with Martha has been essential to this process of dialogue.

Martha Black: I welcomed the opportunity to work with Caitlin, who has written about the RBCM exhibitions pertaining to colonial history and on museum theory in her book *Exhibiting Nation* and elsewhere.³ We bring similar interests but different experiences, and thus different

² Ibid., 248.

³ Caitlin Gordon-Walker, *Exhibiting Nation: Multicultural Nationalism (and Its Limits) in Canada’s Museums* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2016); Caitlin Gordon-Walker, “The Process of Chop Suey: Rethinking Multicultural Nationalism at the Royal Alberta Museum,” in

perspectives, to the topic of Indigeneity in museums – perspectives that bridge the often separate discussions of theory and politics on the one hand and process and application on the other. These discussions are interdependent and intertwined, yet few people outside of museums see how the conversations happen in practice – the on-the-ground reality of collaboration and repatriation – and how both Indigenous cultural activists and museum staff are currently thinking about this, and feeling about this, too, because these are emotional topics. It has been a productive and enjoyable partnership and an interesting conversation (as befits a special issue that is essentially about partnerships and conversations).

Since I came to the RBCM in 1997, I have worked on collaborative projects, partnership exhibitions, and repatriation both inside and outside the Treaty Negotiation Process. I have been thinking about how our collections are conceptualized and exhibited and how fundamental Indigenous concepts (such as family) are missing from our records, labels, and language.⁴ It has been particularly interesting for me to think about the work currently being conducted around the province given the recent changes at the RBCM: the announcement in 2016 of \$2 million in provincial funding for repatriation; the change from what used to be called the Anthropology Department to the First Nations and Repatriation Department; the hiring of Lucy Bell from the Haida Nation as department head; the organization, in partnership with the First Peoples' Cultural Council, of a symposium – “Indigenous Perspectives on Repatriation: Moving Forward Together” – that brought together more than two hundred delegates and over forty presenters in Kelowna in March 2017; the establishment of the First Nations Advisory and Advocacy Committee; the establishment of a granting program to fund Indigenous repatriation initiatives and the hiring of Lou-ann Neel, who is Kwakwaka'wakw, as repatriation specialist to set up and run that program.⁵ We are redoing exhibitions in the First Peoples gallery, working with Indigenous communities to support them in establishing

Diverse Spaces: Examining Identity, Heritage and Community within Canadian Public Culture, ed. Susan Ashley, 16–38 (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013).

⁴ Martha Black, “All of the Related People: Family Connections in the Ethnology Collection,” in *The Language of Family: Stories of Bonds and Belonging*, ed. Michelle van der Merwe, 147–65 (Victoria: Royal BC Museum, 2017); Martha Black, “Living Cultures – From Artifacts to Partnerships,” in *Treasures of the Royal British Columbia Museum and Archives*, comp. Jack Lohman, 49–80 (Victoria: Royal BC Museum, 2015).

⁵ As this journal goes to press our department at the RBCM is having a conversation about the terminology we use in policy and other documents, and whether the term “First Nations” should be changed to “Indigenous” in the name of the department and the advisory committee.

their own archaeological depositories, and bringing Indigenous concepts into documentation and access at the BC Archives. There is a lot going on where I work and just as much going on elsewhere, some of which is outlined in this issue. It is an exciting and sometimes challenging time in BC museums.

We spent the last year soliciting contributions and working with authors, attempting to bring together diverse perspectives from both Indigenous and non-Indigenous museums on a wide range of topics: repatriations, collaborations and partnerships, exhibitions, engagement, archives, language – the works (and the work). Although what is being done is not particularly new for many museums in British Columbia, with the province having been in the forefront of these initiatives, the conversations in this volume significantly update the view currently represented in the literature. Obviously, the voices included here represent a small fraction of those participating in these conversations, but together they provide a snapshot of some of the work currently being done throughout the province.

SOME HISTORY AND CONTEXT

Since Clifford wrote about the ground-breaking and internationally influential work of the Nuyumbalees Cultural Centre and the U'mista Cultural Centre, one of the most visible changes in the museum landscape in British Columbia has been the proliferation of Indigenous-run heritage institutions. The two Kwakwaka'wakw cultural centres, opened respectively in 1979 and 1980 at Cape Mudge and Alert Bay, were among the earliest institutions of this kind; today there are too many to list here, and they vary greatly in size and form, from those that to some extent resemble traditional museums or art galleries (e.g., the Nisga'a Museum/Hli Goothl Wilp-Adokshl Nisga'a) to small locally focused learning resources and repositories (e.g., the Heiltsuk Cultural Education Centre) to land-based experiential heritage sites and cultural tours (e.g., Xwísten Experience Tours) to online virtual museums (e.g., the Sq'ewlets virtual museum website).⁶ In this volume, Jordan Coble

⁶ For more on the Nuyumbalees and U'mista Cultural Centres, see Marie Mauzé, "Two Kwakwaka'wakw Museums: Heritage and Politics," *Ethnohistory* 50, 3 (2003): 503–22. For discussion of other Indigenous-run cultural centres in British Columbia, see Katie Bresner, "Sharing Identity through Indigenous Tourism: Osoyoos Indian Band's Nk'Mip Desert Cultural Centre," *Anthropologica* 56, 1 (2014): 135–50; Kelly Whitney-Squire, Pamela Wright, and Jason Alsop (Gaagwiis), "Improving Indigenous Local Language Opportunities in Community-Based Tourism Initiatives in Haida Gwaii (British Columbia, Canada)," *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 26, 2 (2018): 173–91; Natasha Lyons, David M. Schaepe, Kate Hennessy,

talks about the relatively new Sncəwips Heritage Museum, and Jisgang Nika Collison and Nicola Levell discuss the work of the Haida Gwaii Museum at Kay Llnagaay.

In many cases, the opening of these sites is directly connected to efforts to bring home both ancestral remains and tangible cultural heritage from museums and other sites in British Columbia and further away. The Nuyumbalees Cultural Centre and the U'mista Cultural Centre opened after the repatriation of objects that had been confiscated following the raid of a potlatch hosted by Dan Cranmer in 1921. Although they built on work that had begun in the 1950s, negotiations for the return of these objects and other efforts towards repatriation were still relatively new in the 1970s, both for museums and for Indigenous communities. Today, repatriation is an expected part of museum practice. That is not to say that the difficulties of repatriation are gone, but today most museums recognize the mutual benefit that can come from engaging in repatriation.⁷ Moreover, discussions have moved beyond just the return of physical objects to address questions of intangible heritage and different understandings of ownership. In this volume, a number of authors address repatriation directly – including Willy White, David Schaepe, Jordan Coble, Alyssa Tobin and Tracy Calogheros, Jisgang Nika Collison

et al., “Sharing Deep History as Digital Knowledge: An Ontology of the Sq'ewlets Website Project,” *Journal of Social Archaeology* 16, 3 (2016): 359–84; and Charlotte Townsend-Gault, “Not a Museum But a Cultural Journey: Skwxwú7mesh Political Affect,” *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 17 (2011): 39–55. Indigenous Tourism BC provides information about some of these institutions at <https://www.indigenousbc.com/things-to-do/museums-heritage-sites-cultural-centres/>.

⁷ The literature on repatriation, both in specific and in general, is extensive. Examples related specifically to British Columbia include: Andrea Sanborn, “The Reunification of the Kwakwaka'wakw Mask with Its Cultural Soul,” *Museum International* 61, 1 (2009): 81–86; Martha Black, “What the Treaty Means to Us: Museums and Treaties in British Columbia,” in *Northwest Coast Representations: New Perspectives on History, Art, and Encounters*, ed. Andreas Etges, Viola König, Rainer Hatoum, and Tina Brüderlin, 125–44 (Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung with support of Ethnologisches Museum, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag GMBH, 2015); Stó:lō Nation and The Reach Gallery Museum Abbotsford, *Man Turned to Stone: T'xwelátse* (Abbotsford, BC: Reach Gallery Museum Abbotsford, 2012); Cara Krmpotich and Laura Peers with the Haida Repatriation Committee and staff of the Pitt Rivers Museum and British Museum, *This Is Our Life: Haida Material Heritage and Changing Museum Practice* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2013); Cara Krmpotich, “Repatriation and the Generation of Material Culture,” *Mortality* 16, 2 (2011): 145–60; Stacey R. Jessiman, “The Repatriation of the G'psgolox Totem Pole: A Study of Its Context, Process, and Outcome,” *International Journal of Cultural Property* 18, 3 (2011): 365–91; Aaron Glass, *In Search of the Hamatsa: A Tale of Headhunting* (Watertown, MA: Documentary Educational Resources, 2004), DVD; Kevin McMahan, *Stolen Spirits of Haida Gwaii* (Mississauga: McNabb Connolly, 2004), DVD; Gil Cardinal, *Totem: The Return of the G'psgolox Pole* (Montreal: National Film Board of Canada, 2003), DVD.

and Nicola Levell, and Bruce Miller – but broader conversations about ownership run through each of the contributions in some way.

Alongside physical repatriation are increased efforts to improve access to museums and the objects they hold, to Indigenize or decolonize museum practices, to foster collaboration and partnerships, and to support Indigenous museum professionals. These changes in process have yielded different outcomes as well, with many exhibitions about Indigenous people in mainstream museums foregrounding Indigenous voices and sovereignty.⁸ In this volume see especially Leona Sparrow, Jordan Wilson, and Susan Rowley; Alyssa Tobin and Tracy Calogheros; Genevieve Weber; Caitlin Gordon-Walker; and Jennifer Kramer.

These changes highlight positive directions in museum practice. They have developed in relation to the different power dynamics that have been achieved between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people over the past three decades in British Columbia, in Canada, and internationally, both in general and in museums specifically. In British Columbia, these changes have been effected in part through negotiations and struggles in land claims cases, modern-day treaty processes, and land and resource stewardship. At the national level, the official apology for residential schools and development of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) has shifted discourse from one of opposition to, increasingly, one

⁸ On improving access and Indigenizing or decolonizing museum practice, see, for example, Krista Ulujuk Zawadski, “Lines of Discovery on Inuit Needle Cases in Museum Collections,” *Museum Anthropology* 41, 1 (2018): 61–75; Jonathan Alex Clapperton, “Contested Spaces, Shared Places: The Museum of Anthropology at UBC, Aboriginal Peoples, and Postcolonial Criticism,” *BC Studies* 165 (2010): 7–30; Anthony Shelton and Gustaaf Houtman, “Negotiating New Visions: An Interview with Anthony Shelton by Gustaaf Houtman,” *Anthropology Today* 25, 6 (2009): 7–13; Mique’l Askren, “Dancing Our Stone Mask Out of Confinement: A Twenty-First Century Tsimshian Epistemology,” in *Objects of Exchange: Social and Material Transformation on the Late Nineteenth-Century Northwest Coast*, ed. Aaron Glass, 37–47 (New Haven, CN: Bard Graduate Centre and Yale University Press, 2011); Ruth Phillips, “Dancing the Mask, Potlatching the Exhibition: Performing Art and Culture in a Global Museum World,” *THEMA: La revue des Musées de la civilisation* 3 (2015): 12–27; and Ruth Phillips, *Museum Pieces: Toward the Indigenization of Canadian Museums* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queens University Press, 2011). For more on collaboration, partnerships, and oppositional exhibitions, see Martha Black, “Collaborations: A Historical Perspective,” in *Native Art of the Northwest Coast: A History of Changing Ideas*, ed. Charlotte Townsend-Gault, Jennifer Kramer, and Ki-ke-in, 785–827 (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2013); Julia Harrison, “What Matters: Seeing the Museum Differently,” *Museum Anthropology* 28, 2 (2005): 31–42; Jill Baird and Damara Jacobs-Morris, “The Voices of the Canoe Project: Weaving Together Indigenous and Western Historical Knowledge Traditions,” in *Museums and the Past: Constructing Historical Consciousness*, ed. Viviane Gosselin and Phaedra Livingstone, 35–59 (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2016); Nicola Levell, “Coppers from the Hood: Haida Manga Interventions and Performative Acts,” *Museum Anthropology* 36, 2 (2013): 113–27; Jennifer Kramer, “Figurative Repatriation: First Nations ‘Artist-Warriors’ Recover, Reclaim, and Return Cultural Property through Self-Definition,” *Journal of Material Culture* 9, 2 (2004): 161–82.

of working together. On an international scale this discourse is supported by the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). In museums, it is reflected internationally in UNESCO and International Council of Museums recommendations, and in national policies outside Canada, it is reflected in such things as the United States Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, 1990. In Canada, museums have worked to implement the recommendations of the Task Force on Museums and First Peoples since the early 1990s,⁹ with many museums creating their own policies and building relationships to meet locally specific contexts and requirements. The merits and challenges of developing a national repatriation policy continue to be discussed.¹⁰

Museums are just one place where the changing relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people are apparent, along with other heritage, memory, and learning institutions – archives, art galleries, heritage sites and monuments, libraries, schools, and government. Of course, policy and discourse do not always match reality. Various kinds of exclusion, ignorance, inequality, and violence persist, in discussions about and in the treatment of Indigenous people, in Canadian society and elsewhere. However, if museums and similar institutions help shape possibilities for discussion and action, then the work presented in this volume offers hope for more equitable futures. At the same time, the papers included here also demonstrate that these conversations need to be ongoing and that a lot of work still needs to be done.

ONGOING CONVERSATIONS

The papers themselves cover a relatively wide range of topics and perspectives. The first part of the volume includes a series of shorter and more informal contributions. Willy White, featured above in “This Space Here,” Jordan Coble, and David Schaepe share the thoughts they first presented at “Indigenous Perspectives on Repatriation: Moving Forward

⁹ Task Force on Museums and First Peoples, *Turning the Page: Forging New Partnerships between Museums and First Peoples* (Ottawa: Canadian Museums Association and Assembly of First Nations, 1994).

¹⁰ In February of this year, Liberal MP Bill Casey tabled a private member’s bill calling for a national repatriation strategy (Jorge Barrera, “Liberal MP’s Bill Aims to Create National Strategy for Repatriating Indigenous Cultural Items,” *CBC News*, 3 February 2018, <https://www.cbc.ca/news/indigenous/liberal-mp-s-bill-aims-to-create-national-strategy-for-repatriating-indigenous-cultural-items-1.4517725>). A national strategy may further repatriation efforts across the country, but, as the articles in this volume illustrate, the work that has been done and the relationships that have been developed may caution against a one-size-fits-all approach to repatriation.

Together,” a symposium held in Kelowna from 29 to 31 March 2017. Alyssa Tobin and Tracy Calogheros reflect on recent transformations and relationships developed at the Exploration Place in Prince George. Leona Sparrow, Jordan Wilson, and Susan Rowley talk about *é̓sna̓l̓əm: the city before the city*, a collaborative exhibition project hosted at the Musqueam Cultural Centre, the Museum of Vancouver, and the Museum of Anthropology. In a longer conversation, Jisgang Nika Collison and Nicola Levell talk about Jisgang’s experiences working with museums, especially in relation to her own curatorial practice and repatriation (or, in Haida, Yahguudangang).

The second section of the volume includes more formal peer-reviewed articles, although these papers are again more conversational. Bruce Miller describes the repatriation work of the Museum of Vancouver, focusing on the often-unremarked role of the museum board. Genevieve Weber considers how the BC Archives, part of the RBCM, is seeking to Indigenize its practices. Tania Willard and Karen Duffek think back on the Lawrence Paul Yuxweluptun exhibition they curated at MOA, using a series of visitor responses to explore its effects. Caitlin Gordon-Walker examines how mainstream museums in British Columbia work simultaneously to uphold the sovereignty of the settler-colonial nation-state and to support Indigenous sovereignty claims. Finally, Jennifer Kramer explains how a student-curated exhibition about Nuxalk Radio at the University of British Columbia also was able to foreground Indigenous sovereignty and self-representation.

Despite their different subjects, the papers emphasize a number of themes repeated throughout: conversation, relationships, friendship, and family; language, labels, and terminology; the nature of museums and the importance of thinking not only about traditional museum roles but also about the spiritual and emotional dimensions of working with and within museums; repatriation, law, sovereignty, and reconciliation; and work. In thinking about these themes together, we see them as fitting into three broad categories: family, language, and work.

FAMILY

As editors, we explicitly sought to foster conversation when soliciting contributions for this volume, but the conversations that are included here – and the larger ones of which they are a part – rely on relationships, many of them established over years and even decades. In some cases, relationships between museums and Indigenous people have been tense

and even antagonistic. For some, they remain difficult. This is clear in much of the existing literature, in which critiques of museum practices and representations have stressed the need for the kind of work highlighted in this volume. However, the relationships evident and discussed here, even when they are difficult, are often ones of friendship and even family. Family suggests a certain closeness and mutual obligations, but it also leaves room for different perspectives. Family members do not always agree or get along, but they must figure out how to work together.

The idea of family is also important when thinking and talking about objects in museums and about how museums matter. The objects that museums hold are not just artefacts and collections. Sometimes they are ancestors or treasures that once belonged to ancestors and continue to belong to their living descendants. Images and objects are not simply representative of an ethnographic group or style; they depict, signify, and sometimes *are* family members. Family is an important governing principle for Indigenous communities in British Columbia, but family relationships and interactions are rarely reflected in the ways in which museums that seek to represent these communities have understood and classified the objects they hold.¹¹ Instead, the organizational and labelling conventions of these museums often rely on Western classification systems, especially those of art and anthropology – including the distinction between these two disciplines and the categories they have each devised, defining, for instance, different artistic styles or distinct language families. The Nuyumbalees Cultural Centre, the U'mista Cultural Centre, and other Indigenous museums have intentionally rejected or problematized such Western categorizations and instead employed other systems of classification and interpretation, including those that rely on local understandings of family.¹²

LANGUAGE

Understanding how we talk about objects in museums, how we conceptualize and classify them, is essential because the words we use reflect different ways of knowing and different forms of social and political organization. Thinking about the language of museums involves thinking about the naming of individual objects, people, and territories, a topic that ties into parallel conversations in art galleries and broader conversations about place names. It also involves thinking about terminology specific to

¹¹ See Black, “All of the Related People.”

¹² See Clifford, “Four Northwest Coast Museums.”

museums. Especially evident in this volume are conversations about what to call museum objects – artefacts, masterpieces, belongings, treasures? These conversations tie into others, especially prominent in the 1980s to 1990s, about the distinction between art and culture or between aesthetic and ethnographic interpretation, and therefore also about whether to call something a museum, art gallery, cultural centre, heritage site, or something else.¹³ They not only illustrate that lines have been blurred between art gallery and museum approaches but also offer other ways of talking about objects and communities that elide this distinction.

Besides rethinking the language used in and by museums, the discussions in this volume also highlight more directly the role that museums and archives play in the revitalization of Indigenous languages: recording and preserving language; supporting and developing language programs; incorporating language into catalogues, labels, and titles; and creating exhibitions such as *Our Living Languages* that communicate the importance of Indigenous languages to a wider audience.¹⁴

WORK

The role that museums play in strengthening Indigenous languages is part of the work they do. In many ways it ties into and continues the work museums have traditionally done. One of the primary roles of museums historically has been to preserve and act as guardians, caretakers, or stewards of both tangible and intangible heritage; another is to serve as institutions of education and learning. The importance of continuing to fulfill these roles is apparent in the papers in this volume. However, it is also clear that this is only part of the work museums do.

Museums can also be seen as colonial spaces: they play a role in governance. At the same time, they act as social spaces, sites of performance and interaction. Importantly, they are not neutral. While this acknowledges their potential to cause harm, it also shows the possibility for those working in, with, or even against museums to actively and intentionally engage in work directed towards addressing the damage and the trauma caused by colonialism. In this way, museums can also play a role in healing and in reconciliation. A recurring idea that comes up in

¹³ James Clifford, “On Collecting Art and Culture,” in *The Predicament of Culture*, 215–51 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988); Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblet, “Objects of Ethnography,” in *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*, ed. Ivan Karp and Steven D. Lavine, 386–443 (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991).

¹⁴ *Our Living Languages: First Peoples’ Voices in British Columbia*, created through a partnership between the First Peoples’ Cultural Council and the RBCM, opened at the RBCM on 21 June 2014.

the papers in this volume is that museums are living organizations – that they are part of and seek to represent living communities and that the objects they hold may be living beings or ancestors. Understanding that museums and archives are made up of and about living people centres the emotional and spiritual dimensions of museum work, which are rarely visible (or accounted for in museum budgets) but can be both difficult and rewarding.

Another point that comes up repeatedly is that, in order to play a role in healing and reconciliation, museums must engage in repatriation. The discussions about repatriation in this volume move beyond the oppositional discourse that situates museums and Indigenous people on two competing sides. For the most part, the museums discussed here are keen to do this work. However, for different reasons, the work is not always easy for either Indigenous or museum individuals. It is emotional, can be stressful, and is often slow. It requires acknowledging Indigenous sovereignty, concepts of ownership, and law. It sometimes requires new language or new ways of speaking. It requires extensive conversation and the development of close and enduring relationships. When done well, these may become relationships akin to family, but it takes a lot of time in order to build trust and develop appropriate methods for working together, and this, in turn, requires funding and structural support.

CONCLUSION

The papers included here offer a glimpse into the contemporary work being done in museums throughout British Columbia. Although the volume is not comprehensive, it highlights accomplishments and new understandings while acknowledging that this work is sometimes difficult and that, if it is done properly and well, it takes a lot of time and effort. We hope that what comes forward are the engagements and personalities involved in doing this work, and the relationships they have developed. The themes discussed here suggest avenues for further conversations and work that go beyond museums and Indigenous peoples in British Columbia to all sorts of institutions in Canada and abroad. And to individuals, too, as Canada undertakes to implement the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and answer the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's Calls to Action¹⁵, and as individuals seek to participate in this work.

¹⁵ Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada: Calls to Action* (Winnipeg: Truth and Reconciliation Commission, 2015).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to each of the contributors for the work they put into this volume, many giving their own time outside of busy work schedules and sharing not only their intellectual labour but also their emotional energy. We also want to acknowledge the institutions that supported them. We are thankful to Shawn Hunt for agreeing to let us use his beautiful and evocative image *Shapeshifter/The Watcher* on the front cover. Finally, we are grateful to everyone at *BC Studies* who helped to bring this volume together, including Leslie Robertson and other members of the editorial team who were receptive to the idea of this special issue and furthered its dialogical goal by suggesting that we work together, and Leanne Coughlin who was incredibly patient and endlessly helpful at every stage of the process.