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Abstract: Radical empathetic access theory builds the framework to envision the archives as memory institutions and encourages archivists to redefine ourselves as stewards. When we as archivists practice empathy, we can learn and document all narratives. The root of archival sovereignty is to build an inclusive community that recognizes indigenous oral traditions as an archival practice. Moving beyond decolonization towards indigenization is to adapt a broader theory like radical empathetic access and apply it through a cultural practice. Aloha ‘āina is comprised of three major tenets: to recite genealogies (moʻokūʻauhau), to tell the stories (moʻolelo), and the responsibility (kuleana) to share the knowledge. This article will provide a case study on how this author moves through each affective responsibility of the radical empathetic access theory, while practicing aloha ‘āina in helping to return the Queen’s table to her home, Washington Place.

‘Onipa’a i ka ‘imi naʻauao./Be steadfast in the seeking of knowledge. —Queen Liliʻuokalani

‘Onipa’a was the motto of Queen Liliʻuokalani (1838-1917), last reigning monarch of the Hawaiian Kingdom between 1891 to 1893 (Figure 1). To be steadfast, solid, and immovable, ‘onipa’a was meant to encourage her people to remain together, to move forward. Despite the overthrow of the Queen in 1893, she remains an enduring symbol of hope for kānaka ʻōiwi (Native Hawaiians). The mana or energy that flows through every aspect of the lāhui (group) connects kānaka ʻōiwi to each other, the land, and the cosmos. It is aloha ‘āina and to practice and honor this movement is to be steadfast in understanding the lifeforce or ea. Aloha ‘āina allows me as an archivist to reimagine myself as a caretaker of my place, its collections, and the connections to my lāhui. It is my kuleana or responsibility to seek the knowledge, to respect what is shared, and preserve to ensure its continuation.

This article will provide a case study on how building an inclusive community starts with the archivist learning the place, Washington Place, recognizing the moʻokūʻauhau or connections to the creator and subject, listening to the moʻolelo or stories of the users and unseen users, and having the kuleana or responsibility to build relationships between archivists to preserve the knowledge. As I strived to practice each tenet or value, the acquisitions process became the kānaka ʻōiwis’ narrative of returning Queen Liliʻuokalani’s table home.
The **Kumulipo** is one of the original mele koʻihonua or genealogy chants of the universe that links Native Hawaiians to the ʻāina (land), the gods, and each other (Luomala, 1972, p. xiii). This mele talks of the birth of the Hawaiian archipelago, indigenous people (kānaka ʻōiwi), and ʻōiwi’s self-governance (sovereignty). It also documents the genealogy of the last two reigning monarchs or aliʻi nui of the Hawaiian Kingdom, King Kalākaua and his sister Queen Liliʻuokalani (McGregor & MacKenzie, 2014, p. 16). The chant speaks of ancestral ties and how mana or sacred power is passed down through generations, literally through our bones or ʻiwi (Luomala, 1972, pp. xiii, xvii-xviii). The closer to the gods, the more sacred a kānaka ʻōiwi’s mana, thus the importance of genealogy. Queen Liliʻuokalani, last reigning monarch of Hawaiʻi, is in theory the last aliʻi tied to the highest spiritual mana. Our connection to our aliʻi is our connection to our beginnings. The mana flows and exchanges between each kānaka ʻōiwi and our land. This concept is broadly defined as aloha ʻāina. Aloha ʻāina is the selfless social and political love that is at our core as a lāhui (nationality, citizenship, group) that drives the ʻōiwi in every aspect of our society (Elkington, 2019, p. 58). 'Onipaʻa reflects the lāhui, as we must remain firmly as one and act with aloha ʻāina, no matter how we identify ourselves individually.

There are many Hawaiian translations for Native Hawaiians. Kānaka maoli and kānaka ʻōiwi are the two primarily used; however, kānaka maoli has been widely accepted throughout time by Native Hawaiian advocates for sovereignty and independence (McGregor & MacKenzie, 2014, p. 5). Maoli means “native” and ʻōiwi translates to “ancestral bones” (McGregor & MacKenzie, 2014, p. 5). To be defined as an indigenous Native Hawaiian, one must be able to trace an ancestor to the islands prior to 1778. This distinction was not significant until the Kingdom of Hawaiʻi allowed foreigners to become naturalized citizens and in 1859 the term kānaka maoli was used (McGregor & MacKenzie, 2014, p. 5). From 1878-1890, maoli referred to being full Hawaiian and ʻōiwi of Hawaiian ancestry (McGregor & MacKenzie, 2014, p. 5). Up until writing this article, I had heard but did not see much in print regarding the use of kānaka ʻōiwi. The Hawaiian Renaissance from the 1970s widely adopted maoli as I believe it was a fight to identify themselves as native people. As cultural revival, genealogy, and mana are currently expressed more freely—to be taught and learned—the term, kānaka ʻōiwi, is increasing. Kānaka ʻōiwi, is a movement to be further identified by our cultural importance or our “ancestral bones.” Our ancestral knowledge is physically passed down through our ‘iwi or bones and it is this connection that makes the term ʻōiwi significant (McGregor
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*Figure 1: Clement L. Robertson, Portrait of Queen Liliʻuokalani, c. 1992. Oil on canvas, 90 x 63 in. Collection of the Washington Place.*
& MacKenzie, 2014, p. 5). In my opinion, it is this significance that is encouraging the younger generations to identify more as kānaka ʻōiwi as they continue to perpetuate the sovereignty of our ancestors, our aliʻi, and our universe. To transition from maoli to ʻōiwi is to move from decolonizing to indigenizing. It is more than undoing the process of settler colonialism, it is an indigenous resurgence that includes all kānaka or indigenous people of the ʻāina.

Decolonization originally referred to the process that former colonies underwent to physically free themselves of colonial supremacy. In the 1970s to 1980s decolonization shifted from fighting for national independence to fighting to stop annihilation of a people’s culture—to decolonize the mind (Betts, 2012, pp. 23–35). The term is meant to acknowledge settler colonialism and its endemic relationship with society.

The potential downfall of this movement is that “...the decolonized world, it seems, mimicked the Western one” (Betts, 2012, p. 34). This is further reflected in Eve Tuck and Wayne K. Yang’s (2012) argument that “settler fantasies” have “domesticated decolonization” (pp. 3–4). The solution seems that by simply applying this term to the everyday, settler colonialism has been reconciled and solidarity formed between all parties. The cliché that all is forgiven and forgotten. Ironically, the overuse of the term redefines this movement as another form of settler appropriation, a metaphor (Tuck & Yang, 2012, pp.3). In response to Eve Tuck and Wayne K. Yang, I believe the indigenization movement has reclaimed that decolonization is not a metaphor. Indigenization is the act of removing western concepts and values from within by the indigenous person. The root of both movements is to support indigenous sovereignty and futurity. However, using the term indigenization potentially eliminates appropriation. Furthermore, indigenization moves beyond just recognition or inclusion to actively changing the practices and structures—to “move on” and “begin anew” (Coulthard, 2014, p. 125). As cultural identities restrengthen and traditional knowledge is learned, indigenization takes on a form of independence from decolonization.

Indigenous resurgence is the renewal and revival of cultural practices by actively engaging in the “everyday” by regenerating place-based connections (Corntassel, 2012, pp. 88–89). However, no matter how supportive one is, if one is not from that culture, they can never be at the center of fueling these actions. Although Eve Tuck and Wayne K. Yang (2012) state that, “solidarity is an uneasy, reserved, and unsettled matter…” I argue that decolonization and indigenization is a collective effort that has a potential to build a framework that specifically addresses the archivist and the memories of their institutions (p. 3). In this essay, to decolonize the archives starts with no longer being purely objective, but to empathize with connections that involve the archivist’s place, collections, and role. To indigenize is the act of doing, to interweave cultural practices with archival standards. Together, these movements have the potential to form meaningful alliances with individuals from all races, genders, class, and marginalized groups that have felt excluded from the power of permanence in archival institutions. The connection between these two is the act of empathy, the collective effort, or the “everyday practice” that creates space for resurgence.

Conversations can hold different meanings to different people, despite the shared knowledge. It changes depending on the way people perceive and connect with that conversation or narrative. Empathy is the first-person experience of intersubjectivity, which allows for two individuals to share a mutual situation or understanding. Edith Stein’s empathy theory states that people are not stagnated in their feelings and experiences; empathy allows for a fluid and shared human occurrence (Angell, 2011, p. 21). This theory allows the archivist to stay at the center of these conversations that involve their place, collections, and responsibility as caretaker. In my cultural context it is the essence of aloha. For simplicity of translation, “alo” means sharing and “ha” is breath. Thus, aloha can mean sharing breath and respecting what each other have to say. Empathy understands this exchange or the act of aloha.

Reimagining the archive as a space for the collection of feelings rather than just the collection of content is fueling the concept of critical archives studies, while influencing the development of theoretical frameworks (methodologies) like radical empathetic access. The entire archival field is being analyzed for its imperialistic power of determining who and what get preserved and displaced. At the root of critical archival
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sciences is the drive to decolonize and support marginalized narratives. To summarize, American archival history tended to favor preserving evidential information, lacking any cultural or social aspect. A postmodern view of archival theory in the 1960s demanded the reevaluation of the field from its institutional neutrality and the archivist as neutral custodian to the concept of memory institutions and the archivist as steward or caretaker (Wetli, 2019, p. 1). This coincided with the 1970s revival of the decolonization movement and cultural renaissances. The major transition of archives is one from neutral centers that hold records of evidential information to place-based institutes that preserve society’s memories. With this transition comes the concept that “material artifacts can extend the temporal and spatial means of human communication much like oral and cultural traditions” (Foote, 2002, p. 30). Now in the twentieth century, archival studies have started the conversation on social justice and cultural context (Ghaddar & Caswell, 2019, p. 80). The development of critical archives studies suggests that the archivist has had and still has the power to decide what is and is not included in the collections available for research, mention, or thought (Ghaddar & Caswell, 2019, p. 76). Radical empathetic access theory is a critical race theory that builds the framework to envision the archives as memory institutions and encourages archivists to help center indigenous people’s knowledge and involve their voices.

As institutions change to include the idea of temporal space and feelings, it makes sense that the individual archivist adapts. If sites are becoming more of memory institutions, then Washington Place becomes a site of memory and I as an archivist have the responsibility to understand and respect the relationship these memories create. Being the sole librarian, archivist, and curator of Queen Lili‘uokalani’s home, Washington Place, has its professional challenges as I navigate through changes in my discipline to best preserve the home and its collections. In addition, I am reconnecting to my heritage and finding my own way to my ancestral bones as a kānaka ʻōiwi.

My genealogy traces my lineage back to pre-western contact before Captain James Cook “discovered” the Hawaiian Islands in 1778. Back to Kamehameha the Great, the one who unified the islands and first ruler or ali‘i nui of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i in 1810. Before the Great Māhele of 1848, that divided our lands, destroyed our ahupua’a systems (socioeconomic divisions) and allowed individuals to “own” the ʻāina (land). To the overthrow of 1893 led by foreign or haole businessmen mainly from the United States, to 1895 when they arrested our Queen on the steps of this little house museum, Washington Place, and imprisoned her at ʻIolani Palace. This Palace was built for our ali‘i nui and becomes the place where our Queen was forced to choose her people or her crown. My ancestors can be traced back to the days our flag was lowered from the grounds of ʻIolani Palace. In 1898 the American Flag was raised, symbolizing the annexation and official beginning of the Territory of Hawai‘i and just a little over 60 years ago (1959) the American Flag adopted another star in celebration of Hawai‘i as the 50th state. My kūpuna (elders) remember a time when it was kapu or forbidden to speak ʻōlelo hawaiʻi to a time our kānaka rose up in the 1970s and began the Hawaiian renaissance. Each line we draw to another ancestor tells a story. These are the stories of our oppression, but also the stories of sovereignty and our continuation—our ea (life, breath, sovereignty). Genealogies are important to our culture. It shows our lineage, where we come from, who we come from, and how we are connected.

Moving beyond decolonization towards indigenization is to adapt a broader theory like radical empathetic access and apply it through a cultural practice that reflects me as an archivist and my specific community ethos. Radical empathetic access theory can be broken down into four stages or affective responsibilities an individual can incorporate into archival practices like the acquisitions process. These four relationships developed between me as an archivist to: the record creator, the subject, the user, the unseen user, and other archivists (Caswell & Cifor, 2016, p. 33). In 2017, the Radical Empathy in Archival Practice Panel at the Society of American Archivists proposed a fifth relationship of archivist to archivist (Braun Marks, et al., 2019, p. 33). All five relationships inspired me to translate radical empathetic access theory into a cultural perspective of aloha ʻāina and apply it to the archival acquisition process. Aloha ʻāina is the connections (moʻokūʻauhau), stories (moʻolelo), and responsibilities (kuleana) to place, each other, and the cosmos. By
actively engaging kānaka ‘ōiwi and centering their knowledge, a simple act of accepting a koa table becomes a step towards decolonizing Washington Place.

**Washington Place and Defining Community Ethos**

Before I can understand others’ connections to my place and collections, I need to know its history and significance. For more than 170 years, Washington Place has remained the most enduring residential home in the heart of the Capitol District in downtown Honolulu, Oahu. Washington Place symbolizes the private face of executive authority in Hawai‘i as the residents represent almost the entire breadth of social and political history in Hawai‘i from the 1840s until present. From a sea captain to the last reigning Queen to the governors of Hawai‘i, Washington Place has been and continues to be home to prominent figures.

Washington Place, built between 1842 and 1847, is an eclectic mix of Greek revival architecture and indigenous tropical components. Seen as a commanding American presence, this “foreign style” house was originally constructed in the middle of the dry, dusty landscape on top of land rented from Great Britain. The construction of the original house began in 1842 by Captain John Dominis, an Italian American ship captain and merchant, who traded in the Pacific beginning in the 1820s. Unfortunately, he was lost at sea and was never able to live in the house upon its completion in 1847. To keep the house, his wife, Mary Dominis, chose to take in boarders, including Anthony Ten Eyck, the United States Commissioner, who suggested to Mrs. Dominis in 1848 that she name the house after America’s first president, George Washington. Permission was granted by King Kamehameha III, with the provision that the house retains the name “in all time coming.”

Washington Place is best known as the private home of Queen Lili‘uokalani. She first moved into the home in 1862 as Lydia Pākī, the bride of John Owen Dominis, son of Mary Dominis, and it remained her private residence for 55 years, until her death in 1917. Within these walls, she would become Princess Lili‘uokalani, lose a brother, become Queen, and lose a husband and a kingdom. Despite all of this, Queen Lili‘uokalani chose to remain at Washington Place as a symbol of strength for her people.

After her death in 1917, the home was privately rented by Territorial Governor Charles McCarthy. The home was officially purchased by the Territory of Hawai‘i in 1922 and both Territory and Statehood Governors lived in the home until 2002. In 2002 a private residence was built behind the home, where statehood governors continue to live. Today, Washington Place is a Historic House Museum, listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1973 and designated as a National Historic Landmark in 2007.

The narratives surrounding this property can be controversial as it can symbolize kānaka ‘ōiwi oppression and settler colonialism. As described by Virginia Price (2009), Washington Place represents “...an American claim to Hawaiian soil in the social and commercial sense of the Dominis family, in the political and military sense of Ten Eyck, and as a touchstone of Hawaiian hopes as personified by their last queen persisted after Lili‘uokalani’s death in 1917” (p. 62). Price’s summary reflects the overall concept of critical race theory that occupation and colonialism are endemic in society. In Hawai‘i, the consequences exploit the ‘āina and appropriates kānaka ‘ōiwi’s identities through tourism, and de/militarization (Cristobal, Nik, 2018, p. 36). Often referred to as the “white house in the middle of the pacific,” Washington Place personifies the centrality of the political status of Hawai‘i as an occupied and colonized space.

The collections inside also exemplify this thought as historical objects and archival material originally owned by the first family, the Dominis Family, the Queen, and Territorial and State Governors from 1918 until today are now considered “state property.” In 1909, Queen Lili‘uokalani executed a will for funds from her possessions to be given to establish a Trust dedicated to the welfare of kānaka ‘ōiwi orphaned children (Smith, 1909, pp. 1–6). The items that remained in the home were those purchased by the Territory of Hawai‘i, although over the course of the years, items have returned. Territorial Governor Charles McCarthy personally purchased several items to be used at Washington Place by him and his family, including the
Queen’s koa table (Figures 2-4), and took them when he left in 1921. Personally, the return of the table symbolizes the practice of aloha 'āina and the beginning of empathizing with Washington Place’s history and provides me a chance to center cultural practices, while understanding my role as steward.

Moʻokūʻauhau: Archivist to Record Creator and Subject

Moʻokūʻauhau (connections to people, places, and spaces) roughly translates and explains genealogical ties and succession (Cristobal, 2018, p. 36). These connections are recited through mele, oli, and other oral traditions (Elkington, 2019, p. 30). It legitimizes existence, legacies, and ancestry as well as becomes the basis for Hawaiian identity. At its foundation, moʻokūʻauhau is ‘ohana or family and the memories that they bring. Honoring these “cultural memories” and connections comes with the responsibility of learning the history of the places and spaces (Powell, 2008, pp. 121–122). Understanding the overall narrative of Washington Place allows the beginning of a relationship with any record creator(s), or in this case the potential donors and an object or subject. Moʻokūʻauhau further strengthens the cultural concept of mana and how it is transferred through genealogical connections and objects.

The first affective responsibility is the archivist developing a relationship with the record creator (Caswell & Cifor, 2016, p. 33). By being a steward of a collection, the archivist starts to care for the creator and allows that empathy to drive the archival process (Caswell & Cifor, 2016, p. 33). Culturally, learning the genealogical ties helps to create the space for the donors’ memories or connections. I invited the descendants of Territorial Governor Charles McCarthy to Washington Place to experience how their ancestors might have lived. I realized, the koa table to them is a family heirloom and not a historical object or even the Queen’s table. To them this table represents their narratives. Inclusion means to listen and document all stories, especially since it might help with the provenance and vetting of the object. Through oral histories and tracing genealogies, these descendants were not only connected to the Territorial Governor Charles McCarthy, but to other ‘ohana (family) and historical objects in the collections that have already been established as the Queen’s furnishings. This connection strengthens the provenance of the table as being the Queen’s as well as aids me to empathize more with the donors. Washington Place archives hold an original copy of the Queen’s Estate. However, this copy is incomplete. By active listening and connecting with the donors, I was able to identify that the donors had the original copy of the Bill of Sale. These two documents together provided a complete chain of custody, which authenticated the table. Caring for the creator or donor encouraged me to look beyond the controversy. It was no longer about the “colonizer” taking a physical representation of the Hawaiian culture, but about a family wanting to repatriate a symbolic object.

The second affective responsibility is to empathize with the subjects of the records or, in this case, the table, the Queen, and its importance to kānaka ‘ōiwi. Empathizing with these connections is different from Western implementation of archival practices. Archivists typically consult legal rights involving the creator or donor and less on the record and the subjects that might surround that record (Caswell & Cifor, 2016, p. 36). In understanding the importance records or objects can hold to my community, it encouraged me to seek the community’s help. A local conservator and an expert in Native Hawaiian wood collaborated and assessed the table out of love for our Queen and interest in the table’s history. From these interactions, I was able to collect information on the original craftsman. Based on the characteristics of the table, the conservator and I were able to attribute the work to German cabinet maker, Christian LaFrenz. In 1847, King Kamehameha III awarded LaFrenz a commission to fabricate the Monarchy’s first throne (Jenkins, 1983, p. 105). This moʻokūʻauhau or connection brings even more mana as the creator also has ties to our aliʻi. In addition, the donors conducted an official appraisal, which also verified this research. Each connection or pathway that can be followed adds value and opens the potential for more stories.
Moʻolelo: Archivist to User and Unseen User

Hawaiian culture is predominantly an oral culture where traditional knowledge is passed through moʻolelo. Moʻo is succession and ʻōlelo means to speak, thus moʻolelo is the succession of stories shared (Elkington, 2019, p. 4). Moʻolelo is spoken and the breath shared is one way knowledge is passed on; however, listening and paying attention is just as important. To really listen is to hoʻolono or to invoke a spirit, a deity (Meyer, 2001, p. 132). It is the moʻolelo or stories that can explain genealogical ties; however, genealogy can also be used to put context to content. These practices are intertwined, and one must listen to learn. The knowledge shared is important, especially since we are all ʻohana (family) and come from the single cosmos. One also never knows when knowledge will be shared by another, especially a kūpuna or elder. Oftentimes a casual “talkstory” (conversation) can end up being a transfer of mana. By learning, understanding, and perpetuating the moʻolelo of our kūpuna (elders, ancestors), ʻōiwi are empowered with ʻike (knowledge) (Salis Reyes, 2018, p. 753). It is the knowledge that will inspire us to kū ʻē or resist and survive (Salis Reyes, 2018, p. 753). Practicing radical empathetic access is creating the space for the kūpuna to share as well as listening to the knowledge being freely given—to acknowledge the user but also the unseen user.

The third affective responsibility is the archivist’s empathy with their users by acknowledging the users’ emotions to the records or objects (Caswell & Cifor, 2016, p. 37). However, archivists can forget about the internal users like staff, volunteers, and other stakeholders. Involving my Director in this acquisitions process taught me the value of providing an opportunity to be a part of the acquisitions process. As Director he is tasked with ensuring the logistics of the project, which can be tedious at times. He asked if he could uncrate the table upon its arrival. I realized that, as a kānaka ʻōiwi too, he had similar feelings towards this object like me. As a caretaker, it is my responsibility to not only care for the object but its connections to others. This simple act strengthened his personal investment. It not only helps my cause for more acquisitions or resources for the home but encourages a more creative working environment. The Director took the project a step further and found a conservator to restore the piece out of love for our Queen. He also suggested that we need to be pono or roughly have the right balance and actions. Washington Place needed to have the object blessed and to culturally welcome the table home.

The fourth affective responsibility is the relationship the archivist builds with the larger community, or to those who are not direct users (Caswell & Cifor, 2016, p. 38). By being empathetic to the user, the Director, I was able to learn that doing “right by the larger community” is to follow cultural protocols or seeking a kahū or priest to bless the table. Until recently, I only experienced a blessing with the opening of a place or the beginnings of a major project. I never thought to incorporate a blessing into an acquisitions process and to bless a single item. The kahū used salt from Kalaupapa to mix with his holy water to sprinkle the table, while he oli (chanted). Kalaupapa was the leper colony on the island of Molokaʻi in the late nineteenth century. Families would send their loved ones there if they had the disease. The kahū chose this salt to heal the separation and establish the connection of reunion of the table and the mana between the object and our Queen. It was also to honor the family and mahalo or thank the table for all it has given to all families who might have sat at this table.

The kahū asked us to then think of a piece of furniture that represents a feeling of security, warmth, and love. The physical touch instills our memories within the table and helps to dissolve any negative mana from entering the home. One way to honor the genealogies and the connections is to give hoʻokupu. Hoʻokupu is the act of offerings and roughly translates as “to cause growth.” It is the desire to strengthen the relationship between the giver and the receiver, even if the receiver is an invisible entity. We left behind a hoʻokupu or an offering of ti leaves. Ti leaf absorbs the negative mana and the offering represents sustenance for a continued life at Washington Place. The Kahū’s story inspired me to revisit the narrative of just “The Queen’s Table.” The core story needs to be about family. It allows us a reference point to talk about over 170 years of history around this home.
**Kuleana: Archivist to Archivist**

For kānaka ʻōiwi there is a kuleana or responsibility when it comes to knowledge. For moʻokūʻauhau and moʻoleo to matter, the knowledge behind these tenets needs to be practiced and shared (Cristobal, 2018, p. 39). The archivist must be willing to create the space for the information to be shared as well as to take responsibility to respect the knowledge and represent the narrative in the way it is meant to be practiced. The first step to kuleana is to understand that not all knowledge will or can be shared and that knowledge will be given once the receiver has the capacity to listen and understand. The second step is to understand that kuleana is a privilege and to share this privilege one must practice it by using their “…education, talents, and skills to strengthen and give back to the community” (Cristobal, 2018, p. 32). This continuation of knowledge keeps the moʻokūʻauhau and moʻoleo alive. Kuleana becomes a “self-critique and reflexive practice” to ensure that one is practicing in a pono or balanced way (Nakaoka et al., 2019, p. 34). Building relationships with colleagues in the archival field helps this self-critique, as archivists can seek guidance both from indigenous peoples as well as other archivists to ensure the narratives are respectful and the information purposeful. In turn, these relationships help the archivist to continue the knowledge learned and “give back.”

The 2017 *Radical Empathy in Archival Practice* Panel at the Society of American Archivists proposed a fifth affective responsibility to Michelle Caswell’s and Marika Cifor’s existing theory: the act of building relationships between each other in the archival field (Braun Marks, Alexis, et al., 2019, p. 33). The journey started with a call from another institute who asked if I would be willing to talk with these donors. Reaching out to another institute, I was able to find an artist near the donors’ location to handcraft a crate for its shipment as well as find a local vendor who specializes in shipment of fragile objects. Another colleague donated their time and resources to help me design an exhibit, develop a theme, and understand how best to use this table. All these previous relationships encourage me to continuously reflect on the knowledge learned and the potential to share and grow.
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*Figure 2: Side view (left) and base (right) of the double, drop leaf koa table or Queen’s Table at the Donor’s home. 48 x 47.5 x 28.5 in., 220 lbs. Photographer Unknown, ca. 2018.*
This table represents a mixture of thoughts and will potentially encourage discussion. It influences the overall space and will be installed in one of the parlors that represents a family room. The table will be a part of the exhibit that explores the relationship between our Queen and her favorite niece, Princess Ka‘iulani. The objective is that if the visitor is surrounded by the feeling of family and aloha, they will be able to speak their minds. It is these conversations and empathy we show each other that will help Washington Place become a site of healing. Decolonizing and indigenizing museums lies in reconciling and restoring the community’s faith (Roth, 2019, p. 308). It is my kuleana to “self-critique” as I continue to learn how best to represent these narratives that are conducive to this healing and provide a site for my lāhui to practice their aloha ‘āina and “everyday acts of resurgence (Corntassel, 2012, p. 88).

**Conclusion**

ʻŌiwi resurgence comes from genealogies (moʻokūʻauhau), stories (moʻolelo), and responsibility (kuleana). These three tenets are integral values that make up aloha ‘āina. It is the practice of aloha ‘āina that brings life to our lāhui to act together, to be ‘onipaa for the preservation and revitalization of our people.

Focusing on the end result of decolonizing and indigenizing Washington Place can be overwhelming, especially in being mindful not to appropriate the culture, to turn decolonization into a metaphor. To be a kānaka ʻōiwi and an archivist is like standing on the edge of a pili grass.

The way to lose any earthly kingdom is to be inflexible, intolerant, and prejudicial. Another way is to be too flexible, tolerant of too many wrongs, and without judgment at all. It is a razor’s edge. It is the width of a blade of pili grass. (Queen Lili‘uokalani, 1971, as quoted in Allen, 1982, pp. 401-402).

**Figure 3:** The koa table or Queen’s Table being restored at the conservator’s shop.

**Figure 4:** The newly restored koa table or Queen’s Table returns home to Washington Place. Prepping for its installment and new exhibit on Princess Ka‘iulani, the Queen’s favorite niece, and exploring familial ties. Exhibit slated to open in 2021. Please note out of respect for other donors, the room where it will be moved too cannot be photographed. 48 x 47.5 x 28.5 in., 220 lbs. Photo by Cynthia Engle, October 2020, Washington Place Collection.
I realized that by focusing on a specific process, returning the table, the end goal is met. Radical empathetic access redefines archivists as caregivers. When we as archivists practice empathy, we can learn and document all narratives to truly become a steward of the memory institution, and not just a custodian of one voice. The root of archival sovereignty is to build an inclusive community that recognizes indigenous oral traditions as an archival practice. To not only include (decolonization) but to actively change (indigenization). It is like a single blade of pili grass. We must remember that everyone is standing on their own blade, and when we come together like the grass that is woven, each blade can be used to create an indestructible roof, a sense of place, and a space for conversation.

Focusing on the end result of decolonizing and indigenizing Washington Place can be overwhelming, especially in being mindful not to appropriate the culture, to turn decolonization into a metaphor. To be a kānaka ʻōiwi and an archivist is like standing on the edge of a pili grass.

The way to lose any earthly kingdom is to be inflexible, intolerant, and prejudicial. Another way is to be too flexible, tolerant of too many wrongs, and without judgment at all. It is a razor’s edge. It is the width of a blade of pili grass. (Queen Liliʻuokalani, 1971, as quoted in Allen, 1982, pp. 401-402).

I realized that by focusing on a specific process, returning the table, the end goal is met. Radical empathetic access redefines archivists as caregivers. When we as archivists practice empathy, we can learn and document all narratives to truly become a steward of the memory institution, and not just a custodian of one voice. The root of archival sovereignty is to build an inclusive community that recognizes indigenous oral traditions as an archival practice. To not only include (decolonization) but to actively change (indigenization). It is like a single blade of pili grass. We must remember that everyone is standing on their own blade, and when we come together like the grass that is woven, each blade can be used to create an indestructible roof, a sense of place, and a space for conversation. How I feel about the table returning home is a bit of history when the Queen returns from one of her travels to Washington, DC to fight for her people against the annexation or overthrow of Hawaiʻi. There is a photograph that documents this moment of her community lining up outside of Washington Place, welcoming their leader home (Figure 5). A sign drapes over the doorway reading “PUMEHANA,” or loosely translated, affection. At the end of this two-year journey, it was no longer about the product or the table but the affection in returning it home. To practice empathy or aloha is to open one’s mind to these connections (moʻokūʻauhau), to learn the stories (moʻolelo), and to responsibly (kuleana) preserve the knowledge.

How I feel about the table returning home is a bit of history when the Queen returns from one of her travels to Washington, DC to fight for her people against the annexation or overthrow of Hawaiʻi. There is a photograph that documents this moment of her community lining up outside of Washington Place, welcoming their leader home (Figure 5). A sign drapes over the doorway reading “PUMEHANA,” or loosely translated, affection. At the end of this two-year journey, it was no longer about the product or the table but the affection in returning it home. To practice empathy or aloha is to open one’s mind to these connections (moʻokūʻauhau), to learn the stories (moʻolelo), and to responsibly (kuleana) preserve the knowledge.
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