Contrary to popular assumption, the transitional period from the late Edo into the early Meiji period was anything but bloodless. A civil war, known as the Boshin War, ran for over a year from 1868 to 1869, and it pitted the troops of the new Meiji government against a number of adversaries, not all of whom were fighting for the same objectives. This thesis examines in detail the history of the Northern Alliance, the circumstances of its formation, its aims, and its composition. It further analyzes the terminology used by the victors in their writings about the war. Finally, this thesis proposes a radical reinterpretation of our understanding of the Boshin War, and of the Meiji Restoration as a whole.
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INTRODUCTION

“The domains of Mutsu and Dewa, presently gathered in council at Sendai, communicate the following to the government-general for pacification. Having cultivated this covenant, we desire to follow the path of fairness and justice, to engage in unanimous cooperation, to revere the imperial court above and comfort the people below, and by preserving the imperial land, to set His Majesty's heart at ease…”

Thus begins the treaty of alliance which formed the Ōuetsu Reppandōmei (奥羽越列藩同盟, hereafter “Northern Alliance”) of 1868.¹ It only existed for the briefest of historical instants, but I believe that reevaluating Northern Alliance—or in the case of the western academic world, evaluating it for the first time— is beneficial as it adds depth and color to a period in Japanese history that all too often gets short shrift in favor of discussions on various aspects or individuals of the Meiji era whose existence or lifespan straddles this interstitial period. To quote Bob T. Wakabayashi, we are in “haste to see the Bakufu fall.”²

Furthermore, our view of the Meiji Restoration is one of unobstructed or nearly-unobstructed change, but I believe this view would benefit from revision by looking at the history of the Alliance. Not only will reevaluating the Alliance better help us scholars to understand the state of things in this era of great transitions, I believe that it will serve to remind us that while hindsight may seem perfect, there is, ultimately, no such thing as historical inevitability. Historians often speak of this alliance as “Tokugawa partisans,”³ “diehards” of the

old order,⁴ or otherwise somehow opposed to the idea of imperial rule. In the pages that follow, I will show that none of this was the case.

In this thesis, I will argue that the victors’ narrative of the war, and specifically of the Alliance and its actions and its intentions, is at odds with the reality of what truly happened. To that end, I will first look at the western (predominantly American) historiography of the Alliance. I will then offer an historical summary of the Northern Alliance-related events of the war up to the end of 1868, the first such summary to appear in English. I will then summarize the victors’ narrative on the war, and identify some of the key terms that they use in discussing those who were vanquished. Subsequently, I will deconstruct the major terms used by the victors in describing the Alliance, and look at some of the ways that the survivors of the vanquished challenged these terms, before offering my conclusion.

The victors will always write the history—neither I nor all the historians in the world can change that. I also cannot change the fact that all the people involved are dead, as are all their institutions— even the Greater Japanese Empire [Dai Nippon Teikoku] that was born with the Restoration. It is safe to say that these events are firmly outside the realm of living memory. Therefore, there is no reputation to save here, nor any honor to vindicate. Even General Shiba Gorō (1860-1945), a survivor of the Boshin War who lost much of his family in the fighting, wrote late in his life, “more lamentations will serve no purpose, nor is there any point in dredging an ancient grudge.”⁵ As an historian I do not see myself, in Herbert Butterfield’s

---

words, as “the avenger.”\textsuperscript{6} The victors may always write the history, but I believe that we can choose to also acknowledge the narratives, and experiences, of those who were vanquished. This thesis represents my attempt to do my own small part toward this end.

\textsuperscript{6} Sir Herbert Butterfield, Introduction to \textit{The Whig interpretation of history} (New York: Norton, 1965), x.
CHAPTER I: A Look at American Historiography on the Alliance and the War

What have American scholars said about the Boshin War and the Northern Alliance? There has been much written in English on the Meiji Restoration and many of these works make at least a passing reference to the events of 1868-1869. In recent decades, for the most part, western historiography seems to have followed the language of the victors. In his work on Sakamoto Ryōma, Marius Jansen calls the Alliance members “Tokugawa partisans.”7 James Baxter spoke of them as “diehards of the old order” in his discussion of the Meiji transition in Ishikawa-ken.8 In his work on the Imperial Japanese Army, Edward Drea calls them “pro-bakufu vassals.”9 Richard Storry, writing in A History of Modern Japan, says that they were “mindful of their allegiance to the heirs of [Tokugawa] Ieyasu.”10

The common thread one encounters in these works is a lumping together of everyone who fought against the Meiji government into one amorphous body. However, this is understandable, given the man who has become the face of those who fought against the Meiji government. This is none other than Enomoto Takeaki, a shogunal retainer who served as the admiral-in-chief of the shogunal navy.11 He went on to work in the Meiji government, and work in the development of the modern Japanese navy and in treaty negotiations with the Russian Empire. If Enomoto is the face of those who fought against the Meiji government, and Enomoto was a Tokugawa retainer, then it would seemingly make sense for those who fought against the Meiji government to all be “Tokugawa partisans.”

---

7 Jansen, Sakamoto Ryōma and the Meiji Restoration, p. 334.
9 Drea, p. 15.
11 Nihonshi Yōgoshū B, p. 198.
Despite this reductionist tendency, there are some scholars who do as certain Japanese scholars in the late Meiji era did and remove the issue of disloyalty to the emperor from the discussion. In his work discussing the collapse of the Tokugawa shogunate, Conrad Totman states succinctly, “Daimyo in northeast Japan put up a fierce resistance to the conquest for several months thereafter, but their struggle was not a defense of the Tokugawa bakufu.”\textsuperscript{12} Harold Bolitho, too, takes issue with Jansen’s label of “Tokugawa partisans” in his aforementioned work on the fudai daimyo: “There is little to support a claim that [the domains of the Alliance] were working for a Tokugawa restoration.”\textsuperscript{13} He then brings up the enthronement of Emperor Tobu, and the creation of a new imperial court, as some of his evidence toward that view.\textsuperscript{14} How, after all, could an alliance that had its own imperial pretender have been opposed to the idea of an imperial government?

In short, there is some scholarship out there which at least begins to look at the Boshin War in a more detailed manner. However, the prevailing terminology, here as in the victors’ narrative, hinges on the pro/anti emperor dichotomy. It bears noting, though, that this reduction is understandable. This reduces the complexity of the war, and the Restoration, to manageable brevity, and makes it easy to move ahead and talk about other things. In all of the works I have cited which espouse that position, the war is not the central matter of discussion. The discussion in these books is \textit{never} centered on the Boshin War; the war is always a part of the story, but never the focus. While there is nothing wrong with this, it seems that as it appears so often in English language discussions on other topics, it might deserve further, more direct

\textsuperscript{12} Totman, p. 443.
\textsuperscript{13} Bolitho, \textit{Treasures among Men}, p. 246.
\textsuperscript{14} Ibid.
treatment. Perhaps the time has come, then, for a comprehensive, monograph-length, English-
language study of the Boshin War as a whole.
CHAPTER II: The Northern Alliance: A History

The Meiji Restoration has been characterized by some writers as having been “bloodless”\(^\text{15}\) or “almost bloodless.”\(^\text{16}\) However, when we look closely at its events, and particularly at the events of the Boshin War 戊辰戦争 (1868-1869), we can see that this was anything but the case. The historical encyclopedia *Kokushi Daijiten* defines the period of the Restoration to be 1853-1879.\(^\text{17}\) Starting with Commodore Perry’s arrival in Japan and running through just after the Seinan War, this period includes the Tokugawa shogunate’s two Choshu expeditions, the fighting in Kyoto, the Satsuma-England War, the Boshin War, and the various samurai uprisings culminating in the Seinan War. Needless to say it was very bloody. The casualty list of samurai class people alone runs in the tens of thousands.\(^\text{18}\) We are speaking, therefore, of an event in history that was hardly bloodless. Calling the Restoration “bloodless” deprives it of the complexity, conflict, and color that is part and parcel of its history. One political entity that was part of this complexity was the Ōuetsu Reppandōmei—the Northern Alliance. Below I will offer the first comprehensive, in-depth summary of the Alliance’s history ever penned in English, starting with the circumstances of the Boshin War which led to its formation.


\(^{18}\) For a list of the dead samurai in this period (excluding those who died in the Seinan War), see *Bakumatsu Ishin zen junannsha meikan* 幕末維新全殉難者名鑑. 4 Vols. Ed. Aketa Tetsuo 明田鉄男. (Tōkyō: Shin Jinbutsu Ōraisha 新人物往来社, 1986). To my knowledge, no one has ever counted the dead people of other classes.
The Boshin War: Background

In 1867, it was obvious to most people in Japan, including the shogun, that the system of a shogunate was no longer viable. Consequently, the last shogun Tokugawa Yoshinobu 徳川慶喜 (1837-1913) resigned in late 1867 and returned his political authority (seiken 政権) to the imperial court. A myriad of different people had a myriad of different ideas about what to do next. Yoshinobu's understanding was that, as the preeminent landholder in Japan, he would be the first among equals in a new national council of daimyo that would emerge. However, the loosely allied Satsuma-han 萩摩藩 and Chōshū-han 長州藩 seized the opportunity and with the help of allies at the imperial court, engineered a coup d'état on the morning of 12/9/Keiō 3.

The boy-emperor Meiji was a mere fifteen years old: unlike his adult predecessor Kōmei (孝明天皇 1831-1867), he was young and therefore easily malleable. With the imperial court firmly in their hands and blocked off behind their soldiers' guns, the Sat-chō clique engineered a campaign of terrorism in the shogunal heartland of the Kantō, and other armed provocation in the Kansai region, designed to force Yoshinobu and his allies into military action. Imperial banners were prepared without the emperor's sanction and set aside for the impending

---

20 Ibid, pp. 13, 232. By the modern calendar it was Friday, January 3, 1868.
22 As defined by the U.S. government, “terrorism is said to be: ‘the unlawful use of force and violence against persons or property to intimidate or coerce a government, the civilian population, or any segment thereof, in furtherance of political or social objectives.’” John Fay, Encyclopedia of Security Management. (Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, 2007), pp. 560-561.
Yoshinobu sent his troops to Kyoto at the start of the new year, with a letter telling the Sat-chō controlled emperor that he was Sat-chō controlled. Understandably, the Sat-chō alliance did not allow this message to reach the imperial “jewel” (gyoku 玉) that they had now “seized” On 1/3/K4, Satsuma troops fired on the advancing shogunal soldiers, and so began the Battle of Toba-Fushimi and the Boshin War. On the second day of the battle, the imperial banners were raised and the Sat-chō troops became the imperial army.

These banners had been prepared far in advance of the battle, without the emperor’s sanction. Historian Donald Keene’s words on these banners bear quoting in full:

[T]he imperial forces were also helped by a secret weapon, the brocade pennant carried by imperial forces when doing battle with traitors. On October 10, 1867, Ōkubo Toshimichi and Shinagawa Yajirō (1843-1900, a Chōshū leader) visited Iwakura Tomomi at his place of exile to discuss the stratagem of restoring imperial rule. Iwakura showed the others the design of a pennant conceived of by his “brain” Tamamatsu Misao, and asked them to have some made. In Kyoto, Ōkubo bought red and white damask, which Shinagawa took to Yamaguchi to be made into pennants. Half the pennants were kept in Yamaguchi, the other half, at the Satsuma residence in Kyoto.

Despite his willing surrender of power to the court, and the loyalty to the court (attested by the previous emperor, Kōmei 孝明天皇 (1831-1867)) of Yoshinobu’s chief

---

28 Monday, January 27, 1868.
31 Keene, p. 126.
32 Ibid, p. 126.
supporter, Aizu-han daimyo Matsudaira Katamori 松平容保 (1836-1893), 33 Yoshinobu and all of his subordinates were declared enemies of the court by simple virtue of firing back in self defense at the Sat-chô troops who now bore the emperor's banners. Even if they had not fired, there were edicts issued far in advance of the war, without the emperor’s sanction, calling for their armed subjugation. 34

The vestigial leadership apparatus of the former shogunate, along with the bulk of its armies, escaped to Edo, 35 but the leaders soon chose surrender and cooperation rather than resistance. The new imperial army, which was slowly growing with the addition of other domainal troops, had a set date for an attack on Edo, 36 but this was soon called off after a peace was negotiated via the mediation of British diplomat Sir Harry Parkes (1828-1885). 37 With the peace-minded Katsu Kaishû 勝海舟 (1823-1899) in charge of the Tokugawa family's affairs, the official Tokugawa policy was cooperation and submission (kyōjun 恭順), so the handover of Edo was bloodless. 38 Katsu ordered potentially violent Tokugawa troops out of Edo by promising them ex-bakufu land in Kai 39 and Shinano 40 Provinces-- if they could take and hold it--

35 Onodera Eikô 小野寺永光, Boshin nanboku sensô to Tôhoku seiken 戊辰南北戰爭と東北政権. (Sendai 仙台: Kita no mori 北の社, 2005), p. 189.
39 Kojima, p. 95.
40 Ibid, p. 95.
as private fief land. Other Tokugawa troops left Edo of their own accord, and the domainal forces, such as those of Aizu and Shōnai, also headed home on their own.

The imperial troops entered Edo in the spring of 1868; thanks to the negotiations noted above between shogunal retainer Katsu and Satsuma official Saigō Takamori. The troops entered Edo without bloodshed. However, two of the biggest enemy domains on the imperial agenda, the northeastern han of Aizu and Shōnai, remained unsubdued. Aizu was wanted for its actions at Toba-Fushimi, Shōnai for burning the Satsuma yashiki in Edo during its counterattack on Satsuma-sponsored terrorists who had sheltered there. Aizu was working feverishly to secure a negotiated peace, but anything short of unconditional, total surrender was unacceptable for the imperial army.

To this end, the imperial government repeatedly ordered the domains of northeastern Japan to organize their forces and take down Aizu and Shōnai. From a point of view of sheer manpower, this makes sense, as the Satsuma and Choshu forces were tied down in Edo dealing with the challenge posed by the Tokugawa partisan band Shōgitai. The imperial government had been issuing orders practically from the very day it was founded: the first order for Sendai-han, chief among the northeastern domains, to attack Aizu was issued a mere

41 Onodera, p. 191; Sasaki, pp. 56-57.
42 Ishii, p. 284.
44 Onodera, p. 189; Ravina, p. 145.
46 Sasaki, p. 231.
fourteen days after the Battle of Toba-Fushimi. As time went on the imperial government felt it important to send a delegation to Sendai-han to ensure its cooperation. So on 2/26, Kujō Michitaka 九条道孝 (1839-1906), a court noble who had served as the Minister of the Left (Sadaijin 左大臣), was selected as commander-in-chief (Sōtoku 總督) of the Army for the Subjugation of the North (Ōu-chinbugun 奥羽鎮撫軍). He was accompanied by a few hundred troops as well as a small staff that included both men of the court and men of Satsuma and Chōshū. They departed Osaka on 3/1, bound by ship for Sendai. On 3/18 they arrived at the Sendai-han naval station on Sabusawa Island, and on 3/23, they were in the Sendai castle town and had set up a command post at the Sendai domain school; upon arrival, Kujō immediately issued another order to “attack Aizu quickly.” The next day, Date Yoshikuni, the daimyo of Sendai, went there, both to offer his greetings to the imperial delegation and to consult with them about the orders regarding Aizu.

Despite this and similar orders that Kujō and his staff ceaselessly issued after their arrival in Sendai, the northeastern domains were not eager at the thought of war. They had very little interest in getting involved with a war that had broken out independently of them and certainly did not want to see it spread to their lands, so they quickly cooperated with the imperial forces and sent troops, bearing the same imperial banner that Sat-chō now flew, to advance on the borders of Aizu and Shōnai.

---

50 Onodera, p. 190.
51 Yamada, p. 44.
52 Onodera, p. 191; Sasaki, p. 74.
53 Sasaki, p. 75; Yamada, p. 219.
54 Ibid.
At this point there were limited engagements fought between Sendai and Aizu troops. At the same time as this low-level fighting, the northeastern domains tried to act as intermediaries, for Aizu in particular, in the hopes of negotiating a peace agreement. This period in the war’s chronology is filled with events and anecdotes that make the reader wonder if anyone was taking the war seriously. There are drunken Aizu pickets,\textsuperscript{56} drunken imperial troops rampaging through the Sendai castle town,\textsuperscript{57} Aizu troops in caves surprising imperial patrols,\textsuperscript{58} Aizu and Sendai combatants agreeing to shoot blanks at each other,\textsuperscript{59} and refugees from Edo pouring into the Aizu castle town. These refugees, who even included an entire fire brigade that later served during the siege, came in such great numbers that it took on a new life and energy of prosperity, not at all the air of a capital of an embattled territory.\textsuperscript{60} The following song became popular in those days.\textsuperscript{61}

\begin{quote}
\textit{If you wish to see a capital,}\\
\textit{Come no further!}\\
\textit{Watch now as Aizu}\\
\textit{Is becoming Edo.}
\end{quote}

In order to discuss these issues and work toward greater regional cooperation, four senior retainers from Sendai-\textit{han} and Yonezawa-\textit{han}-- two of the largest domains of the northeast-- sent the following message. The message invited representatives from the \textit{han} of

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Hoshi Ryōichi 星亮一, \textit{Ōuetsureppandōmei} 奥羽越列藩同盟. (Tōkyō 東京: Chūkōron-shinsha 中央公論新社, 1997), 18.
\item Yamada, p. 104.
\item Yamada, p. 108.
\item Ibid, p. 104.
\item Hoshi Ryōichi 星亮一, \textit{Tonami ni ikita Aizu no hitobito} 斗南に生きた会津の人々. (Tōkyō 東京: Rekishi Shunjūsha 歴史春秋社, 1983), p. 41.
\item Hoshi, \textit{Tonami ni ikita Aizu no hitobito}, p. 41.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
the northeast to gather for a council at Shiroishi, a secondary castle town in the southwestern part of Sendai-han.  

Our lords Mutsu-no-kami and Danjō-daihitsu have been ordered to form the vanguard of the attack on Katamori of Aizu. Lord Mutsu-no-kami has been dispatched already, but as Katamori’s retainers have come to his encampment with a petition of surrender and apology, we would like to invite group discussion on this. Therefore we ask that you send men from among your senior officials to Shiroishi as soon as possible.

Most of the domains of northeastern Japan, large and small alike, sent delegates to Shiroishi in short order. This gathering of delegates from the domains of the northeast was the seed of the Northern Alliance. But rather than laud the northern domains for their cooperation and their efforts at negotiating a peaceful end to the conflict, the imperial forces saw these developments as intransigence and "making light" of the imperial court. A letter from one of the imperial officers (who had already denounced Sendai samurai as “cowards”) sent to the Kyoto government denounced the entire northeast as "vulgar," and said that there was "no choice" but to view the entire region as an enemy.

Birth of the Alliance

At the same time, those southwestern troops who had accompanied Kujo and his staff were out of control with their conduct, according to one observer, going on drunken rampages and sexually assaulting women. This letter to Kyoto, which came into the hands of samurai

---

62 Hoshi, Ōuetsureppandōmei, p. 27.
63 Date Yoshikuni of Sendai-han.
64 Uesugi Narinori of Yonezawa-han.
65 Ravina, p. 159.
67 Ravina, p. 159.
68 Hoshi, Ōuetsureppandōmei, p. 18.
from Sendai-han, not only led to the assassination of its hapless author, but served as the catalyst for the loosely allied Shiroishi council to become the Northern Alliance. The Alliance then took up arms against the imperial army. Sendai, and the entire northeastern part of Japan’s main island, was now under the same label of traitor as the samurai population of Aizu. The day after the Alliance was formed, it set up a command post in the Fukushima castle town under Sendai leadership, and drew up battle plans against the imperial army. The war that had previously been limited to the borders of Aizu could no longer be escaped.

Faced with this situation, Sendai lord Date Yoshikuni issued a letter on of exhortation 5/8 to the warriors and commoners of his domain. In my opinion this aptly summarizes the official policy of Sendai-han and Alliance as a whole, at the time that the northern clans took up arms against the Meiji government’s armies.

Though I have obeyed the imperial order to subdue Aizu, [Matsudaira] Katamori has submitted a writ of surrender and apology. Though the myriad domains have submitted petitions, he has not been forgiven, and now a nameless order to attack Shōnai has even been issued. These are not the wishes of Sir Kujō, and this is furthermore not the wish of His Majesty [the Emperor]. The gang of [Sat-chō] villains has deceived the imperial court, stolen political power, and there is no doubt that they advance their private agenda with cunning and cruelty. Therefore it is my intention to join the Alliance, raise great justice and end chaos, and sustain the Imperial land. Not only great and small retainers, but the common people as well, should make determination their object and assist me, let there not be any forgetfulness on this. The details will be given to you by the magistrates.

---

69 Sasaki, p. 231; Nihon no Kassen 8, p. 157.
70 Nihon no Kassen 8, p. 157. Sera Shūzō 世良 修蔵 (1835-1868) of Chōshū-han, its author, was hunted down by enraged Sendai samurai and found in a brothel in the Fukushima-han castle town. He was executed at the nearby riverbank the following day. A monument to Sera was built by the government during the Meiji era and placed in Shiroishi, former Sendai-han territory. When I was there in 2005, my homestay family informed me that the monument still stands, but the characters on the inscription denouncing the northeastern clans as “traitors” were defaced shortly after its construction.
71 Nihon no Kassen 8, p. 157.
As we will see later, this alliance was by no means an alliance that was restricted to the northeastern Japanese provinces of Mutsu and Dewa. Rather, it later expanded to include six domains of neighboring Echigo Province, led by the Nagaoka-han 長岡藩. Kawai Tsunosuke, chief elder and de facto ruler of Nagaoka, had tried to personally negotiate peace and the noninterference of the imperial troops vis-à-vis his domain. Unfortunately for him, he was rebuffed by an inexperienced imperial army negotiator who was criticized for years by his Sat-chō colleagues.

The final draft of the Alliance’s treaty document, as signed by all 31 of the domains who would join it, read as follows.

The domains of Mutsu[,] Dewa, [and Echigo], presently gathered in council at Sendai, communicate the following to the government-general for pacification. Having cultivated this covenant, we desire to follow the path of fairness and justice, to engage in unanimous cooperation, to revere the imperial court above and comfort the people below, and by preserving the imperial land, to set His Majesty's heart at ease. Therefore our rules are as follows.

**ITEM:** Extending great justice to all the country as our goal, we shall avoid trivialities.

**ITEM:** As though traveling across the sea in the same boat, we will be with trust and move with justice.

**ITEM:** If there is a case of emergency, neighboring domains are to promptly provide assistance and notify the government-general.

**ITEM:** Let none rely on brute strength or bully the weak. Let there not be plans for private gain. Let there not be leaking of secret matters. Let there be no one who leaves the Alliance.

**ITEM:** Though fortifications are built and provisions transported, even though it is inconvenient, the peasants are not to be made to toil and suffer pointlessly.

---

73 Sasaki, p. 232.
74 Hoshi, Ōetsureppandōmei, p. 75.
75 Nihon no Kassen 8, pp. 173-174.
**ITEM:** Major incidents shall be decided with the deliberation of the entire Alliance, with intent to return to a principle of fairness. By virtue of the agreement being solid, the details will naturally fall into place.
**ITEM:** Plans with other provinces or troop deployments to neighboring borders, must be done with notification to the entire Alliance.
**ITEM:** Let there not be slaughtering of innocents. Let there not be plundering of money and grain. Those who follow the path of injustice shall be met with severe punishment.
In the case that these rules are disregarded, let the Alliance, gathered in council, visit severe punishment [on the offender].

This alliance, comprised at its peak of thirty-one large and small domains (excluding Aizu and Shōnai but working together with them), used a combination of old and new weapons, and its members fought against what they perceived as Sat-chō dominance of the imperial court. They were not opposed to the emperor's rule, neither were they supporters of the former shogun, though they did take advantage of the ex-Tokugawa troops who had come into their territory, since they shared a common enemy. Eventually the alliance had its own sovereign, the Emperor Tōbu 東武天皇 (1847-1895; later known as Prince Kitashirakawa-no-miya Yoshihisa), and called its troops the True Imperial Army (Shin-kangun 真官軍), developments which were even covered by *The New York Times.* They said they sought to defeat the Sat-chō control of the imperial court, so that the emperor "may indeed reign over it."

---

77 Onodera, pp. 128-129.
79 From the Alliance’s message to the foreign representatives in Japan: “We will destroy the offenders. Those who fly before us we shall not pursue; but we will reconquer Japan, that the Emperor may indeed reign over it.” John R. Black, *Young Japan: Yokohama and Yedo*, Volume II. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968), p. 214.
The following is a table of the Alliance’s members. This should offer some idea of the diversity of its member domains, in terms of size and classification. With several domains that had incomes over 100,000 koku, the combined incomes of the Alliance amounted to over 2,500,000 koku; against this, the domains that formed the backbone of the Meiji government’s army had a combined income level of 1,200,000 koku. Some ruling families’ names appear twice in this list; these are branch families of larger domainal lords, and should be understood as following whatever the course of action that the main family would choose to follow.

Table I.1: Members of the Alliance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Ruling family</th>
<th>Income level</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sendai</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>625,000 koku</td>
<td>Tozama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yonezawa</td>
<td>Uesugi</td>
<td>150,000 koku</td>
<td>Tozama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yonezawa-Shinden</td>
<td>Uesugi</td>
<td>10,000 koku</td>
<td>Tozama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morioka</td>
<td>Nanbu</td>
<td>200,000 koku</td>
<td>Tozama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akita</td>
<td>Satake</td>
<td>205,800 koku</td>
<td>Tozama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirosaki</td>
<td>Tsugaru</td>
<td>100,000 koku</td>
<td>Tozama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nihonmatsu</td>
<td>Niwa</td>
<td>100,000 koku</td>
<td>Tozama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moriyama</td>
<td>Matsudaira</td>
<td>20,000 koku</td>
<td>Shinpan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shinjō</td>
<td>Tozawa</td>
<td>68,200 koku</td>
<td>Tozama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hachinohe</td>
<td>Nanbu</td>
<td>20,000 koku</td>
<td>Tozama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanagura</td>
<td>Abe</td>
<td>100,000 koku</td>
<td>Fudai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakamura</td>
<td>Sōma</td>
<td>60,000 koku</td>
<td>Tozama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miharu</td>
<td>Akita</td>
<td>50,000 koku</td>
<td>Tozama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamagata</td>
<td>Mizuno</td>
<td>50,000 koku</td>
<td>Fudai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwakidaira</td>
<td>Andō</td>
<td>67,000 koku</td>
<td>Fudai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matsumae</td>
<td>Matsumae</td>
<td>10,000 koku</td>
<td>Tozama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fukushima</td>
<td>Itakura</td>
<td>30,000 koku</td>
<td>Fudai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honjō</td>
<td>Rokugō</td>
<td>20,000 koku</td>
<td>Tozama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izumi</td>
<td>Honda</td>
<td>20,000 koku</td>
<td>Fudai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kameda</td>
<td>Iwaki</td>
<td>20,000 koku</td>
<td>Tozama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yunagaya</td>
<td>Naitō</td>
<td>15,000 koku</td>
<td>Tozama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimotedo</td>
<td>Tachibana</td>
<td>10,000 koku</td>
<td>Tozama</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

80 Kurohane-han (Shimotsuke Province, 18,000 koku, tozama), ruled by the Ōseki family, sent delegates to the initial conference at Shiroishi, but did not join the Alliance. See Hoshi, Ōuetsureppandōmei, p. 27.
81 Onodera, pp. 127-128.
### A Few Key Figures

Any discussion of the Alliance would be incomplete without a discussion of some of its key figures. Below are a few brief biographical sketches.

As said above, the Alliance was headed by Prince Rinnōji-no-miya Kōgen. The prince, born in Kyoto in 1847, was the ninth child of Prince Fushimi-no-miya Kuniie.84 He entered the priesthood at a young age and served as the last abbot of Kan’ei-ji, a Tokugawa-affiliated temple in Edo.85 After the takeover of Edo by the imperial forces he fled to the north, and became the northern emperor; he relinquished this title upon Sendai-han’s surrender. A few years later the prince was pardoned. He later joined the Imperial Japanese Army, and as Prince Kitashirakawa Yoshihisa, he led the Japanese expeditionary forces that conquered Taiwan. He

---


83 Direct descendants of the 16th century hegemon Oda Nobunaga. Yamada, p. 32.


died of malaria in Taiwan, and was enshrined in the Shintō shrines that existed on the island until the end of World War II.  

Date Yoshikuni, the daimyo of Sendai, was one of the two governors-general (Sōtoku 総督) of the Alliance. Unlike most of his daimyo peers, he was the son of one of his father’s concubines and therefore actually born in the domain he went on to rule. It bears noting that among the ranks of Yoshikuni’s myriad retainers was one Takahashi Korekiyo, then a young foot soldier sent to study abroad in San Francisco. After the war, Yoshikuni would meet the young Takahashi, who went on to become Prime Minister of Japan and who, as “Japan’s Keynes,” would bring Japan out of the Great Depression sooner than Western nations. Uesugi Narinori, the other governor-general, was daimyo of Yonezawa. Both Date and Uesugi were highly active in negotiation and communication from the very start of the war, and accounts of the Alliance’s actions are filled with their petitions, trips, and meetings with other daimyo, senior officers from various domains, and the representatives of the imperial government.

Tamamushi Sadayu was, by far, the most cosmopolitan among the Alliance’s key figures. He was born in Sendai in 1823, the son of a Sendai domain retainer who served the lord as a falconer. He was part of the shogunate’s 1860 mission to the United States, and kept a lengthy journal of his travels. During the Alliance’s brief history, he was closely involved in the

---

90 Some of these are reproduced in Boshin Shimatsu.
91 Hoshi, Ōuetsureppandōmei, p. 5.
negotiations that surrounded its formation, and he remained an instrumental figure in its operations. After the surrender, and by order of the Meiji government, Tamamushi was made to commit suicide in the spring of 1869.92

Tadaki Tosa, one of the clan elders in whose name the initial invitation was sent, also bears recognition here. He was the head of one of three families who held the hereditary post of magistrate (bugyō 奉行), analogous to the clan elders (karō 家老) of other domains. In other words, he was one of three men entrusted the day-to-day running of Sendai-han affairs in peace and continued to do so during this war. When the Alliance fell, he was one of the many senior retainers in domains across northern Japan who committed seppuku.93

The final figure I would like to present is Kawai Tsugunosuke 河井継之助. Kawai, born in 1827, was clan elder of Nagaoka-han, a relatively small domain in Echigo Province.94 It was by Kawai’s leadership that six domains of northern Echigo entered the alliance, expanding it beyond the borders of Mutsu and Dewa Provinces. The troops under Kawai’s command represented some of the most technologically advanced in the entire Alliance, having even a pair of Gatling guns and other advanced weaponry at their disposal.95 After losing, retaking, and then losing Nagaoka Castle, Kawai retreated to Aizu territory, fatally wounded and suffering from gangrene. Despite the aid of Matsumoto Ryojun, one of the foremost Japanese physicians

---

93 Yamada, pp. 208-211.
94 Hoshi, Ōetsureppandōmei, p. 80.
of his era, Kawai’s wound was mortal.\textsuperscript{96} He died on 8/16 in Aizu territory, just before the siege began there.\textsuperscript{97}

\textit{Battles and Fall of the Alliance}

As the weeks of 1868 wore on, the alliance's troops fought pitched battles, first against the imperial troops on its southern border,\textsuperscript{98} then against those of its member domains which had switched sides. Chief among these deserters was the domain of Akita. Akita, a mid-sized domain of a little over 200,000 \textit{koku}, joined the imperial forces in late summer. Almost immediately it found itself surrounded by its now hostile former allies. Akita was followed by the Hirosaki domain, which was half of Akita's size and immediately bordering it to the north.\textsuperscript{99} Not surprisingly, after the war both domains fared very well in the eyes of the imperial government, while nearly all their neighbors were to suffer loss of land or prestige in some way.

Though some Sendai troops acquired a bad reputation for breaking in heavy combat (earning them the derisive nickname \textit{dongori}),\textsuperscript{100} the Alliance as a whole had a good amount of success in combat. Particularly noteworthy is the action of Sendai guerilla troops on the southern front,\textsuperscript{101} and the action of Sendai-\textit{han}, Ichinoseki-\textit{han}, and Morioka-\textit{han} 盛岡

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{96} Yamakawa Kenjirō 山川健次郎, \textit{Aizu Boshin Senshi} 会津戊辰戦史 (Tōkyō 東京: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai 東京大学出版会, 1933), p. 441.
\textsuperscript{97} Ibid, p. 441.
\textsuperscript{100} \textit{Dongori} being an onomatopoeia: every time the cannons went \textit{don}, the Sendai samurai would run five \textit{ri} (around 12 miles). Hoshi Ryōichi, \textit{Sendai Boshin Senshi: Hoppō Seiken wo Mezashita Yūshatachi} 仙台戊辰戦史：北方政権を目ざした勇者たち. (Tōkyō 東京: Sanshūsha 三修社, 2005), p. 163.
\textsuperscript{101} Yanagi Toshiyuki 柳敏之, \textit{Kikō Ō Sensō} 紀行奥羽戦争. (Tōkyō 東京: Bungeisha 文芸社, 2000), p. 17. One such unit in particular, composed of gangsters and hunters and led by low-ranking Sendai samurai Hosoya Jūdayū 細谷十太夫 (1839-1907), was especially feared. They dressed in dark blue, attacked by night, and were based in a brothel called Kashiwa-ya 柏屋.
\end{footnotesize}
troops in the northern front, against the Akita domain.\textsuperscript{102} Shōnai-\textit{han}, technically not a member, also assisted in the Alliance’s efforts, enjoying a string of crushing victories in its own campaign on the Sea of Japan coast. Shōnai troops overran the domains of Shinjō,\textsuperscript{103} Honjō,\textsuperscript{104} Kameda,\textsuperscript{105} and Yajima,\textsuperscript{106} and were in possession of two thirds of Akita territory by the end of the war and coming close to the Akita castle town.\textsuperscript{107} But with so much of the Alliance’s military power focused northward in trying to bring Akita and Hirosaki in line, it was less and less able to deal with the imperial troops coming up from the south. With several of its members leaving, and the lightning strike of Itagaki Taisuke 板垣退助 (1837-1919) taking several small yet strategically positioned domains out of the equation,\textsuperscript{108} it was unable to remain cohesive. The Aizu domain, the reason for so much of this conflict, surrendered on 9/22 after a month-long siege.\textsuperscript{109} Shōnai, despite having nearly incapacitated the Akita domain, surrendered on 9/25.\textsuperscript{110} Finally, with the surrender of Yonezawa on 8/28,\textsuperscript{111} and Sendai on 9/15/Meiji 1, the Alliance itself ceased to exist.\textsuperscript{112}

The Alliance had passed into the pages of history, but the Boshin War itself had not ended. The fighting went on for several more months, with the theater of action moving

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Onodera, p. 194.
\item Kōri Yoshitake 郡義武, \textit{Akita Shōnai Boshin Sensō} 秋田・庄内戊辰戦争. (Tōkyō 東京: Shin Jinbutsu Ōraisha 新人物往来社, 2001), pp. 34-50.
\item Ibid, p. 8.
\item Yamada, p. 226.
\item Kōri, pp. 122-123.
\item Ibid, p. 8.
\item Ibid.
\item Sasaki, p. 230. Friday, October 30, 1868.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
northward to the island of Hokkaidō 北海道 (then known as Ezo 蝦夷). Ex-shogunal land and naval forces under Enomoto Takeaki 榎本武揚 (1836-1908), having stopped on the coast of Sendai-han territory to pick up anyone there who wished to continue fighting, arrived in Hokkaido on 10/20, and took the city of Hakodate on 10/26. Enomoto’s forces quickly subdued the island and formed a new government of their own, known as the Ezo Republic (Ezo Kyōwakoku 蝦夷共和国), with Enomoto elected as president.

The forces of the Meiji government were delayed by the winter, but in the spring, renewed their offensive, landing troops on the island on 4/9 at Otobe. In the face of overwhelming opposition and the loss of several of its warships, the Ezo Republic was unable to continue effective opposition. Matsumae fell on 4/17 and by 5/11 the Meiji government troops were in Hakodate and had started an all-out offensive and barrage on Goryōkaku 五稜郭, the huge western-style fortress at the center of the city. On 5/15 Bentendaiba 弁天台場, the last outlying Ezo Republic fortress, was surrendered by its commander, Nagai Naomune 永井尚志 (1816-1891). The war ended a week later on 5/18/Meiji 2, with the surrender of Enomoto and his staff at Goryōkaku. Thus, at the price of blood and internecine war, Japan passed from the early modern era into the modern era.

---

113 Naramoto, Nihon no kassen, p. 433.
114 Sasaki, p. 198.
117 Onodera, p. 196.
118 Ibid, p. 196.
119 Kamiya, p. 408. Nagai, incidentally, was the great-grandfather of the author Mishima Yukio.
120 Sunday, June 27, 1869.
121 Onodera, p. 196; Sasaki, p. 229.
CHAPTER III: The Victors’ Narrative and Some of its Key Terms

Many different people can be characterized as having written about the Boshin War from the victors’ point of view. They came from a variety of origins: some from the three big han that led the fight (Satsuma, Choshu, and Tosa), others came from domains who later joined that coalition, still others were unaffiliated with any particular domain and were simply espousing the predominant viewpoint of their era. However, there are enough key points of commonality that one can form something of a summarized view of their perspective. After a lengthy struggle by pro-emperor (kinnō 勤皇) activists in the 1860s, a loose alliance of southern clans and their aristocratic supporters at the imperial court seized control of the court and the young emperor Mutsuhito in order to restore the power of the emperor that had long been usurped by the Tokugawa shogunate. The shogun had resigned, yes, but he refused to surrender all his lands and titles. At the beginning of the new year, the ex-shogun’s disobedience turned to treachery as he sent his horde of warmongering Aizu and Kuwana troops to forcibly retake control of the court. But on the second day of the battle the imperial banners were raised and Yoshinobu and his supporters now formally became enemies of the throne (chōteki 朝敵) and an army of brigands (zokugun 賊軍). The armies of the southern alliance, by contrast, demonstrated their loyalty and the banners designated them as the imperial army (kangun 官軍). Emissaries were sent all around Japan to demand obedience to the imperial court and urge armed suppression of Yoshinobu’s supporters, but some clans in

---

the northeast sided with Aizu in a pro-shogunate (sabaku 佐幕) alliance. After their defeat, the Tokugawa separatists in Hokkaido held out, but they too were crushed in short order, and the new era of enlightenment and civilization (bunmei kaika 文明開化) could now begin.

What are the key terms in the victors’ narrative? The first is kinnō. This is a term that should be very familiar to scholars of the 1860s. It was used by all sorts of people to describe and justify a wide range of activities, but very often refers (in the context of the 1860s) to adherents of sonnō-jōi ideology. The next term is chōteki. This is an abbreviation, with chō being short for chōtei, or the imperial court. This was a truly horrifying state of affairs for those to whom the label was applied. In the case of Aizu, as Takie Sugiyama Lebra says, the label of chōteki “agonized Aizuites more than their defeat.”

Zokugun, “brigand army,” is a term that implies chōteki status. However, it uses the phrase “zoku,” which can be used for any robber or thief. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, there is the term sabaku, incorporating the characters for “help” and the first character in bakufu (shogunate). We will turn to this term in the section below.

This sort of language was already readily apparent in primary materials from the war itself. Even if it did not use these specific terms, it used other terms with similar connotation. Take, for example, this edict, issued by the imperial government on 1/17 to the Sendai domain:

---

125 Yamada, p. 24.
On this occasion Aizu [lord, Matsudaira] Katamori has assisted in the treachery of Tokugawa Yoshinobu and fired on the imperial banners, thereby committing wickedness and high treason! As an army of subjugation is necessary, and your domain has requested to singlehandedly attack his main castle, we are pleased by this speedy result that has come without any loss of your martial exertion. Therefore you are ordered to proceed per your wishes, and to quickly earn the distinction of striking him in pursuit.

The language clearly delineates ex-shogun Yoshinobu, and Aizu lord Matsudaira Katamori, as criminals of the highest order. Matsudaira Katamori, the document would have us believe, has gone beyond “mere” treason to high treason (daigyaku 大逆) and wickedness (mudō 無道). As he is guilty of such horrific crimes, therefore, it behooves the lord of Sendai to take the initiative and lead an army of subjugation (seibatsugun 征伐軍) to crush the forces of such a wicked man as soon as possible. Another order from the court, this one dated 4/17 and addressed directly to Date Yoshikuni himself, shows more of this language at play.126

DATE MUTSU-NO-KAMI:
You have been previously ordered on this occasion to pursue the Aizu brigands and wipe them out, but the news of your victory has yet to emerge; the Emperor’s mind is troubled [at this].

The operative term here is “Aizu brigands” (Kaizoku 会賊). The zoku is the same zoku as in zokugun, here abbreviated and specifically referring to the people of Aizu.

But what of material written after the war? A good example of an “orthodox” text on the Boshin War and the Northern Alliance is Akita-han Boshin Kinnō Shimatsu 秋田藩戊辰勤皇始末.127 This text, written in Akita Prefecture, was created to praise and justify the conduct of Akita-han, one of the northeastern domains which made the imperial victory possible by...
leaving the Alliance. Even in the title this is apparent: it translates to “An Explanation of Akita-han’s Imperial Loyalty in the [Year of] Boshin.” The key term in the title is kinnō, “imperial loyalty.” In the text itself, the forces of and allied to the Meiji government are termed as the “imperial army” (kangun 官軍). Those who fought against the Satsuma and Chōshū-dominated imperial army are therefore termed the “traitor army” (zokugun 賊軍) or “pro-Shogunate faction” (sabaku-ha 佐幕派). The assassination of Sendai-han messengers, \(^\text{128}\) which was the action by which Akita left the Alliance, is termed as “punitive execution” (chūrikō 誅戮), a term that connotes the execution of a criminal or traitor. \(^\text{129}\) The imperial court and those claiming to work in its name were “good,” anyone fighting against it for any reason was not only “bad,” but also a remnant of the old order. Therefore, fighting the “bad” side was not only just, it was punishment for treason.

In short, “good” side and “bad” side in the orthodox Meiji view of the Boshin War hinges upon one’s relation—as parsed by the men who controlled him—to the emperor. The people who fight under the emperor’s banner are kinnō, and anyone who opposes them is not only an enemy of the throne, but a brigand, to boot. Furthermore, because they are opponents of the emperor’s soldiers, they automatically fall into the category of “pro-shogunate,” whether they had anything to do with the now defunct shogunate or not.

\(^\text{128}\) Nozoe Kenji 野添憲治, Akita kenjin 秋田県人. (Tōkyō 東京: Shin Jinbutsu Ōraisha 新人物往来社, 1975), pp. 184-185. The coda to these executions was the killing of the two young sons of chief Sendai messenger Shimō Matazaemon 志茂又左衛門. The boys had come to Akita looking for their father when he didn’t return home. \(^\text{129}\) Akita-han Boshin Kinnō Shimatsu, p. 56.
This pro/anti emperor dichotomy is but one part of the deliberately emperor-centered order that was Japan in the Meiji era.\textsuperscript{130} The emperor was, of course, present in the preceding eras and was, among other things, an important part of the legitimacy claimed by the shogun. However, in the Meiji era, to quote the historians Jansen and Rozman, “the sovereign became the cornerstone of every institution.”\textsuperscript{131} The defeat of those who resisted the imperial army was termed in the language of foreign conquest, making the vanquished somehow less than Japanese.\textsuperscript{132} Yasukuni, the new shrine built in Tōkyō at the end of the war, to house the war dead, also deliberately excluded “enemies of the throne.”\textsuperscript{133} But in the eyes of those who had been defeated, including people who had fought as part of the Alliance, loyalty to the emperor and support of the imperial court had never been in question.

Years down the road, when the youth of 1868 had grown old, Hara Takashi 原敬 (1856-1921), a Morioka-han samurai who later became prime minister, gave a speech at a temple in Morioka. The speech is, in my opinion, a good summary of the feelings of those who survived defeat in 1868:

When we look back, how could any Japanese subject of olden days, any more than now, draw his bow against the emperor? The Restoration was simply a conflict of political views. At the time, there was a popular song, “Winners—the imperial army; losers—rebels.” That accurately describes the situation in 1868. But now

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{131} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{132} Oka Yoshitake, \textit{Five Political Leaders of Modern Japan}. Translated by Andrew Fraser and Patricia Murray. (Tōkyō: University of Tōkyō Press, 1986), pp. 85-86.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
all subjects share in the radiance of the emperor’s gracious favor,
as is clear to all. So be at rest!\textsuperscript{134}

Having summarized the victors’ view on the Boshin War, let us now turn to a
deconstruction of that view.

\textsuperscript{134} Quoted in Oka, pp. 86-87.
CHAPTER IV: Deconstructing the Victors’ Narrative: The Question of Sabaku

In my opinion that the most important question to ask, in response to the victors’ choice of words, is this: were the domains of the alliance sabaku, i.e. pro-shogun? As we will see later in the section on western historiography, one of the tendencies among scholars is to place in one group everyone who fought against the Meiji government. Perhaps because the last to surrender in the Boshin War were Tokugawa vassals, everyone who fought against the Meiji government is frequently grouped together in this category. The other labels attached to the enemies of the Meiji government (e.g. zokugun, chōteki) are ultimately subjective. However, in my opinion sabaku is the one label from among them that could, given the right facts, be construed as an objective label for the alliance. Given the facts, though, the answer is a resounding no.

My first reason is that by the time the Alliance came into existence, the bakufu was dead. The last shogun resigned in late 1867; by the time the Alliance was formed, the city of Edo was surrendered to the imperial army and the ex-shogun had gone into confinement in Mito. The armies of the ex-shogun fought on, but they were operating against the official policy of surrender and cooperation taken by the people chosen to represent the Tokugawa family. The vestiges of the bakufu’s administrative apparatus were gone. If the bakufu was dead, and the Tokugawa family’s official representatives were dedicated to keeping it dead, how could anyone support it? It seems that speaking of the Alliance’s political stance as sabaku,

135 Sasaki, p. 232.
136 Onodera, p. 191.
137 Onodera, p. 191.
or describing the actions of the imperial army as *tobaku*, is more geared toward killing the idea of the *bakufu*, since the *bakufu* itself was dead.

My second reason for opposing the idea of the alliance as pro-Tokugawa is the issue of the Alliance’s composition. As seen in the table above, at its height, the Alliance was comprised of 20 *tozama* domains, nine *fudai* domains, and one *shinpan* domain. The majority of the Alliance’s domains were *tozama*. *Tozama* were outsiders in the Tokugawa order, domains whose lords had only pledged fealty to Tokugawa Ieyasu after the Battle of Sekigahara.\(^{139}\) In this category were the Alliance’s leading domains of Sendai and Yonezawa, but the category also included the Satsuma and Chōshū domains, who were busy denouncing Sendai and Yonezawa as “pro-Tokugawa.” While it is true that all *tozama* including Satsuma and Chōshū received perks (the big ones received the honorary Matsudaira surname, as well as marriage ties to the shogunal house and its collaterals),\(^ {140}\) they were forcibly excluded from the Tokugawa regime. What possible interest could any of them have in bringing back an order that left them disenfranchised? Out of seven major (100,000 *koku* and above) domains in the Alliance, five were ruled by *tozama* daimyo. Sendai, in Mutsu Province, was the largest domain of the region, and the third largest domain in the country (after Kaga\(^ {141}\) and Satsuma\(^ {142}\)). Its ruling family, the Date, had been a major power in the region for well over three centuries. Yonezawa, in Dewa Province, was ruled by the Uesugi family.\(^ {143}\) They were another old rival of the Tokugawa—the Edo period had begun with the Date, as allies of the Tokugawa, besieging

\(^{139}\) *Nihonshi Yōgoshū B*, p. 133.
\(^{140}\) Ibid.
\(^{142}\) Ibid, p. 804.
the Uesugi clan’s castle.\textsuperscript{144} Akita, also in Dewa, was ruled by the Satake family. The Satake were forcibly relocated there by the Tokugawa in the 17\textsuperscript{th} century, so there was no love lost between the two. The 200,000 koku Morioka domain was ruled by the Nanbu clan.\textsuperscript{145} The Nanbu lord too was considered a \textit{tozama}. Finally, there was the Hirosaki domain on the far northern tip of Honshu, ruled by the Tsugaru family. The Tsugaru were also \textit{tozama}, and had close family ties with the courtly Konoe family.\textsuperscript{146} If the majority of the Alliance was composed of big and midsized \textit{tozama}, why did the \textit{fudai} join? As Harold Bolitho says in his book on the \textit{fudai}, though nominally Tokugawa vassals, they were ultimately lords in their own right who were motivated by self-interest.\textsuperscript{147} There were a fair number of \textit{fudai} lords, after all, who had joined the imperial army (including the highest ranking \textit{fudai}, Ii Naonori of Hikone-\textit{han}\textsuperscript{148}). As Sendai, the biggest power in the region, had chosen to be at the core of a competing attempt at a new government, they sided with Sendai. In the entire war, out of all the \textit{fudai} lords in Japan, there was only one who took up arms on behalf of the Tokugawa family. This was the 21 year old Hayashi Tadataka 林忠崇 (1846-1941), ruler of the tiny Jōzai-\textit{han} 請西藩.\textsuperscript{149} He was present in northeastern Japan during the Alliance’s existence, and fought alongside its troops, as they shared a common enemy. He laid down his arms when he learned that the Tokugawa family’s

\textsuperscript{144} \textit{Nihonshi Yōgoshū B}, p. 124.
\textsuperscript{148} \textit{Nihonshi Yōgoshū B}, p. 133. Hikone, in Ōmi Province, was rated at 350,000 koku.
\textsuperscript{149} Nakamura Akihiko 中村彰彦, \textit{Dappan Daimyō no Boshinsenso: Kazusa Jōzai hanshu Hayashi Tadataka no Shōgai} 脫藩大名の戊辰戦争：上総請西藩主林忠崇の生涯. (Tōkyō 東京: Chūōkōron-shinsha 中央公論新社, 2000). Jōzai was a mere 10,000 koku; Hayashi, who lived until 1941, is known by some as “The Last Daimyo” (\textit{Saigo no daimyō} 最後の大名).
future was secure due to the succession of Tokugawa Iesato as the new family head,\textsuperscript{150} as well as the creation of a new domain for the family in the form of Shizuoka-\textit{han} 静岡藩.\textsuperscript{151} It bears noting, however, that Hayashi’s domain was not in northeastern Japan, it was in the Bosō Peninsula.

My third reason for opposing the notion of the alliance being \textit{sabaku} is the person of Prince Rinnō-ji-no-miya Kōgen (later known as Prince Kitashirakawa-no-miya Yoshihisa). The prince, who had been abbot of the Kan’ei-ji temple in Edo, fled to the north and as stated above, installed himself as emperor, taking the name Emperor Tōbu. This was not all: a document exists which shows us that the daimyo who had joined the alliance received positions in a new imperial court centered around Emperor Tōbu. Date Yoshikuni of Sendai even received the title of \textit{shogun} in this document, with Matsudaira Katamori of Aizu as his vice-shogun.\textsuperscript{152} These would not seem to be the actions of people who were eager to once again place themselves under the subjection of a Tokugawa shogun. They are, rather, the actions of people who had created their own alternative version of the new world order.

My final reason for opposing the notion of the alliance being \textit{sabaku} is its set of stated goals, and its actions toward modernization and industrialization. These goals were as follows:\textsuperscript{153}

1. Stopping the imperial army’s entry to Shirakawa Castle.
2. Sendai-\textit{han} to set up Shirakawa Castle as a command post from whence to direct the activities of the nearby domains.

\textsuperscript{151} Nakamura, p. 205.
\textsuperscript{152} Onodera, p. 193.
\textsuperscript{153} Onodera, pp. 128-129.
3. Aizu troops to advance on Nikkō from Takahara, together with ex-shogunate forces in the area.
4. After expelling the imperial army from Utsunomiya, Alliance is to bring in the domains of Shimotsuke and Hitachi, and for a time, treat the Tone River as its boundary. Strengthening its defenses, it will extend its control to the Bōsō Peninsula. As Edo is easy to take but well-defended, plans for its takeover will be decided later.
5. Reach is to be extended to Shinano, Kōzuke, and Kai, and advances to be made with the help of domains in the Kantō.
6. The southerners’ force strength is to be reduced by making an alliance with Kaga and Kii a reality.

These goals show a robust strategy that was looking to bring in others from outside the region. Bringing in Kaga, the largest tozama domain in Japan (and by extension, its three branch domains of Nanokaichi, Daishoji, and Toyama\textsuperscript{154}) at over 1,000,000 koku, was no small matter. The goals aim for the use of ex-shogunate forces, but even so, In my opinion this may best be characterized as an alliance of convenience rather than a meeting point of ideology. The alliance’s and the ex-shogunate troops’ views on the future may have differed but their enemy was the same. One is left to wonder what the ex-shogunate forces would have done, had the alliance been successful in its aims and managed to realize its advance southward. Might they have been a thorn in the side of an Alliance-led imperial government? In the realm of technology, while the Alliance was unable to field all-modern technology, its members were taking their own steps toward that goal. The troops of Nagaoka-han, for instance, were equipped with breech-loading rifles and two Gatling guns\textsuperscript{155}. In addition to its acquisition of Enfield rifles and modernization of military structure\textsuperscript{156}, Sendai-han also possessed a modern

\textsuperscript{154} Edo Bakuhan Daimyōke Jiten Vol. 2, p. 397.
\textsuperscript{155} Naramoto, p. 414.
\textsuperscript{156} Yamada, p. 219.
steam-driven warship. Given these and other actions, it is fair to assume that the Alliance would have continued and intensified that trend, had it been able.

Even if their actions had not been in support of the ex-shogun, the survivors from among the ranks of the vanquished were to a point *persona non grata* in the new Japan. Because of the importance of the emperor in the new Japan, setting the record straight, in their eyes, was vital. It was not only a matter of trying to achieve fairness, but also a matter of justifying their place in the new order, and proving that they too were just as Japanese as everyone else. How did they do this? We will see below.

---

CHAPTER V: The Victors’ Narrative Challenged, the Current State of that Challenge

Though they were vanquished, the people of northeastern Japan did not stay silent. Some among them, particularly among the former samurai population, published their views as the years went on, and challenged the victors’ narrative. What did they say, and how did they challenge the victors’ narrative and its language?

A good example of one such author is Yamakawa Kenjirō 山川健次郎 (1854-1931). Yamakawa, famed for being the first Japanese professor of physics, was a combat veteran of the Boshin War, an ex-Aizu samurai and a survivor of the siege at Aizu in fall 1868. Later in life, in addition to his academic duties as a professor and then as a university president, he was also an historian. His preeminent history text is Aizu Boshin Senshi 会津戊辰戦史, which is an account of the Aizu domain and its actions in the Boshin War, up to its surrender in the late autumn of 1868. Though he was, doubtlessly, motivated by a desire to tell a vanquished fiefdom’s side of the story, he chose words that would sidestep the issue of loyalty to the emperor. Yamakawa refers to the imperial army as the western army (seigun 西軍), and to those who opposed them, variously, by what they actually were. So the ex-shogun’s army is “the former shogunate army” (kyū bakugun 旧幕軍), Aizu troops are “the Aizu army” (Aizu-gun 会津軍), and the Alliance forces are “the alliance army” (dōmeigun 同盟軍). By avoiding the labeling of who constitutes “imperial army” and who does not, he removes the issue of imperial loyalty from the discussion.

159 Hoshi Ryōichi 星亮一, Byakkotai to Aizu bushidō 白虎隊と会津武士道 (Tōkyō 東京: Heibonsha 平凡社, 2002), p. 168.
160 For more on the Yamakawa family, see Kuno Akiko, Unexpected Destinations: the poignant story of Japan’s first Vassar graduate. Trans. Kirsten McIvor. (Tōkyō 東京: Kodansha International, 1993).
Another example, quoted above, is that of Prime Minister Hara. As stated, Hara was a native of Morioka, born into a high-ranking family of retainers in the service of the Nanbu lord. In the late Meiji and early Taisho eras, Hara served in the imperial government (as prime minister 1918-1921). He used this position to bring about a change in at least some of the language used by the imperial government with regards to the Boshin War. Part of a diary entry by Hara during his tenure as home minister and chief commissioner for the enthronement ceremony of the soon-to-be Emperor Taisho, bears quoting in full:

Afternoon. When I attended the commissioners’ conference and we discussed a number of matters, I was annoyed to see that certain banners to be displayed at the enthronement ceremony bore titles such as ‘Used in the suppression of the northeast at the time of the Restoration,’ or ‘Designed after an imperial standard entrusted to the commander-in-chief during the subjugation of Ou province.’ It was agreed that today, when we are all grateful subjects of the emperor, expressions usually used to describe foreign conquest were improper, and I had them removed.

The shades of the victors’ language, mentioned above, is clearly evident in the labels accompanying the objects that Hara saw. But having climbed to a political position with clout, he had the power and the prerogative to have these objects removed, and that is just what he did.

Aside from Yamakawa and Hara, other such individuals from defeated territories in northeastern Japan include Shiba Gorō, Kitahara Masanaga, Fujiwara Ainosuke, and Yamakawa’s brother Yamakawa Hiroshi. All of them wrote about the war; some, like Shiba Gorō, wrote about their lives before the war. Many of the key Japanese authors in modern

---

161 Quoted in Oka, pp. 85-86.
162 Kitahara Masanaga 北原雅長, Shichinenshi 七年史. (Kyoto: Rinsen shoten 臨川書店, 1972).
scholarship on the Boshin War are descendants of people from northeastern Japan: Hoshi Ryōichi, Yamada Norio, and Kobiyama Rokurō are three key examples. As time marched on, more and more of the survivors either sat for interviews or put their own words to paper, with the result that there is a wealth of eyewitness material available to modern scholars.

What is the present-day result of these voices who spoke out against the status quo of historical interpretation? Some sources still make use of terms like “pro-shogun” to describe the Northern Alliance and anyone else who fought against the Meiji government. However, on the whole, there is a great deal of nuanced discussion on the Boshin War in general and on the Alliance in particular.

There are many Japanese books in print which mention the Alliance, and give at least some coverage to the stories of those among the ranks of the defeated parties in the Boshin War. Particularly noteworthy is Boshin no Eki Senshi, a massive two-volume work by Ōyama Kashiwa numbering well over 1800 pages in total, which took over twenty years to complete. It covers almost every single military action of the war in detail, and includes maps, orders of battle, and photographs of key figures. Ōyama even discusses the rewards and punishments meted out by the central government that followed the war. While Ōyama’s views are understandably skewed given that his father was none other than Field Marshal Ōyama Iwao, he devotes a great deal of time and space to analyzing the war, battle by battle, from both sides. Being a trained officer of the old Imperial Japanese Army, he was more than equipped, in terms of training, to look at these battles through the perspective of modern military science.

164 Kōri, p. 99.
More recently, there has been a wave of books focusing on the history of northeastern Japan in the Meiji Restoration. Some are whole dominal histories, like Noguchi Shin’ichi’s *Aizu-han* which I have used in this thesis. Others focus on the actions of individual domains in the Boshin War, as with Hoshi Ryōichi’s *Sendai Boshin Senshi*. As far as scholarly attention given to the Alliance, Sendai-born authors Onodera Eikō and Hoshi Ryōichi have authored works entirely devoted to its history, and offer interesting insights into the complexities of its short, turbulent existence. Indeed, this thesis is possible, in part, because of both men’s efforts in producing modern writing on the Alliance. Finally, there also exist a number of works concerning the senior commanders active in the Northern Alliance, such as Ōta Toshiho’s *Narayama Sado no Subete*.166

As seen above, the landscape of Japanese discourse on the Meiji Restoration is broader than it once was. Thanks in no small part to the efforts of the survivors from among the vanquished clans, the official line is still repeated but is no longer uncontested.

---

CHAPTER VI: Conclusion

The Boshin War was a catastrophe. It pitted Japanese against their fellow Japanese, all ostensibly in the name of a man whom most of them had never seen before and whom some had never even heard of before: the emperor. Because the ideology of the new order was so centered on the emperor, the historical narrative was no exception. Historical writing by the victors centered on the emperor and their privileged connection to him, as opposed to the other side in the war, who they felt had betrayed the emperor. So the Northern Alliance, despite its intentions, its composition, and even its own emperor, was characterized as anti-Imperial or pro-shogun. However, when one looks into the primary sources, one finds that this was anything but the case. As Prime Minister Hara said, the Boshin War was a difference of political opinion, and had nothing to do with loyalty or disloyalty to the emperor. In time, Japanese voices arose which challenged the victors’ viewpoint. Through their work, they showed that another way, using words not as politically charged, was possible in discussions of the war. This resulted, in the present day, in a rich plurality of viewpoints on the war. The discourse on the war is no longer locked up in the language of the winners.

While a few western historians have chosen the latter path, the preponderance still tends to follow the language of the victors. This is understandable, given that the war, not to mention the Alliance, is a mere footnote or chapter in works on other topics or individuals, and it is easier to take a reductionist approach for the sake of moving the discussion along. However, I think that as the war appears in so much of western scholarship on the era, it deserves a focused study of its own. In the meantime, I believe that the western historical establishment

---

should take this point of deficiency as a challenge to do as Japanese scholars have done. It should look deeper into the history of the Meiji Restoration, and continue to seek out new perspectives, new narratives, and new texts in an effort to deepen and broaden the discourse on this pivotal episode in Japanese history.

As stated in my introduction, the Northern Alliance existed for what amounts to an eyelink on the stage of history. From foundation to collapse, it did not even last for a whole year. Furthermore, it was only one of a set of competing visions for the future of Japan. But when one realizes this, and that its stance was not in support of the old order, a new picture of the Boshin War and the Meiji Restoration begins to emerge. It shows us that the war was not a mere footnote in the tale of unopposed progress to a new, modern Japan. It also suggests to us that perhaps there was not only one choice and one path for Japan’s advance into the modern age.

In closing, I feel it is fitting to quote the writing of Hanamure Tsutomu. Hanamure, a descendant of a Satsuma samurai who fought in the northeast, edited his ancestor’s combat diary from the Boshin War, and penned a concise introduction to that work. Both Hanamure men take a remarkably open-minded approach in their writing on the war, and show remarkable magnanimity for people who have more in common with the men of the Meiji government than the men of the Northern Alliance. For better or worse, it sums up the importance of acknowledging the stories, and the humanity, of those who were vanquished.

"Over 130 years have passed since the Boshin War, Japan's first revolutionary conflict that engulfed its entire territory. Many great men starting with Saigō Takamori were made by way of the Meiji Restoration that arose through the opportunity of this war. However, the war was fought, on both the (new) government and shogunal sides, and suffered through wounding or death, by the individual soldiers who were lower
samurai, country samurai, and commoners. We must never forget that
the Meiji Restoration, and the founding of modern Japan, was founded
on the sacrifice of this nameless multitude.”

---

Appendix A: The Articles of Alliance

First Draft

The domains of Mutsu and Dewa, presently gathered in council at Sendai, communicate the following to the government-general for pacification. Having cultivated this covenant, we desire to follow the path of fairness and justice, to engage in unanimous cooperation, to revere the imperial court above and comfort the people below, and by preserving the imperial land, to set His Majesty's heart at ease. Therefore our rules are as follows.

ITEM: The allied domains shall visit punishment on those who rely on [brute] strength, pressure the weak, and take advantage of emergencies.
ITEM: Let those who plan for private gain, leak secret matters, or leave the Alliance be visited with punishment.
ITEM: Let those who needlessly exhaust men and horses, and do not consider the plight of the common people, be visited with punishment.
ITEM: Major matters shall be decided with all the domains in council, but in cases of military matters, detailed deliberations are unnecessary, and the orders of the larger domains are to be followed.
ITEM: Let those who slaughter innocents, plunder money and grain, and do other things which violate just cause, be swiftly be given severe punishment.

Second Draft

The domains of Mutsu and Dewa, presently gathered in council at Sendai, communicate the following to the government-general for pacification. Having cultivated this covenant, we desire to follow the path of fairness and justice, to engage in unanimous cooperation, to revere the imperial court above and comfort the people below, and by preserving the imperial land, to set His Majesty's heart at ease. Therefore our rules are as follows.

ITEM: Extending great justice to all the country as our goal, we shall avoid trivialities.
ITEM: As though traveling across the sea in the same boat, we will be with trust and move with justice.
ITEM: If there is a case of emergency, neighboring domains are to promptly provide assistance and notify the government-general.
ITEM: Let none rely on brute strength or bully the weak. Let there not be plans for private gain. Let there not be leaking of secret matters. Let there be no one who leaves the Alliance.
ITEM: Though fortifications are built and provisions transported, even though it is inconvenient, the peasants are not to be made to toil and suffer pointlessly.
ITEM: Major incidents shall be decided with the deliberation of the entire Alliance, with intent to return to a principle of fairness. By virtue of the agreement being solid, the details will naturally fall into place.
ITEM: Plans with other provinces or troop deployments to neighboring borders, must be done with notification to the entire Alliance.

169 Hoshi, Ōuetsureppandōmei, p. 33.
ITEM: Let there not be slaughtering of innocents. Let there not be plundering of money and grain. Those who follow the path of injustice shall be met with severe punishment. In the case that these rules are disregarded, let the Alliance, gathered in council, visit severe punishment [on the offender].
Our lords Mutsu-no-kami and Danjō-daihitsu have been ordered to form the vanguard of the attack on Katamori of Aizu. Lord Mutsu-no-kami has been dispatched already, but as Katamori’s retainers have come to his encampment with a petition of surrender and apology, we would like to invite group discussion on this. Therefore we ask that you send men from among your senior officials to Shiroishi as soon as possible.

Retainers of Uesugi Danjō-daihitsu TAKEMATA MIMASAKA, CHISAKA TARŌZAEMON
Retainers of Date Mutsu-no-kami TADAKI TOSA, SAKA EIRIKI

To the karō of each han
Attention:
Total 27 Domains

---

172 Date Yoshikuni of Sendai-han.
173 Uesugi Narihito of Yonezawatō-han.
Appendix C: Brief Timeline, 1868

First Month:

[3] (Monday, January 27, 1868): Battle of Toba-Fushimi, start of the Boshin War.\(^{175}\)

[10] (Monday, February 3, 1868): The imperial court strips the court rank of ex-shogun Tokugawa Yoshinobu, Aizu-han daimyo Matsudaira Katamori, Kuwana-han daimyo Matsudaira Sadaaki, and Matsuyama-han daimyo Itakura Katsukiyo, as well as 24 others\(^{176}\) and confiscates their estates (yashiki) in Kyoto.\(^{177}\)

Fourth Month

[10] (Saturday, May 2, 1868): Aizu and Shōnai form a defensive alliance (not part of the Northern Alliance).\(^{178}\)

[11] (Sunday, May 3, 1868): Edo Castle surrendered to the imperial army.\(^{179}\) Sendai-han deploys troops as part of the imperial army, bearing the imperial banner, to attack Aizu.\(^{180}\) This is the last occurrence of the Date clan’s old battle deployment ritual.\(^{181}\)

Intercalary Fourth Month:

[4] (Monday, May 25, 1868): Clan elders of Sendai-han and Yonezawa-han send an invitation for delegates from the northeastern domains to gather for a conference at Shiroishi.\(^{182}\)

[11] (Monday, June 1, 1868): Shiroishi Interdominal Assembly opens at Shiroishi Castle under the leadership of Date Yoshikuni.\(^{183}\)

Fifth Month:

[3] (Monday, June 22, 1868): Alliance established as Ōu Reppandōmei, encompassing domains of Mutsu and Dewa Provinces.\(^{184}\)


\(^{176}\) Mori, p. 285.

\(^{177}\) Sasaki, p. 232; Mori, p. 285.

\(^{178}\) Onodera, p. 191; Sasaki, p. 169.

\(^{179}\) Here composed of forces from Satsuma-han, Chōshū-han, Sadowara-han, Ōmura-han, Okayama-han, Kumamoto-han, and Owari-han. Onodera, p. 191.


\(^{181}\) Onodera, p. 73.

\(^{182}\) Ibid, p. 108.

\(^{183}\) Ishii, p. 282.

\(^{184}\) Sasaki, p. 232.
[6] (Thursday, June 25, 1868): Six domains of northern Echigo Province join the Alliance, making it the Ōuetsu (Mutsu-Dewa-Echigo) Reppandōmei.¹⁸⁵

[8] (Saturday, June 27, 1868): Date Yoshikuni issues a letter to the warriors and commoners of Sendai-han.¹⁸⁶

Sixth Month:

[15] (Monday, August 3, 1868): Northern Alliance changes era name (nengō) to Taisei, and installs Prince Rinnōji-no-miya Kōgen, erstwhile abbot of Kan’ei-ji in Edo, as the Emperor Tōbu.¹⁸⁷

[16] (Tuesday, August 4, 1868): Emperor Tōbu named head (meishu 盟主) of the Alliance.¹⁸⁸

Seventh Month:

[4] (Friday, August 21, 1868): Akita-han retainers kill Sendai-han messengers staying in the Akita castle town;¹⁸⁹ Akita-han leaves the Alliance.¹⁹⁰

[7] (Monday, August 24, 1868): Alliance issues a statement to foreign representatives in Japan.¹⁹¹

[16] (Wednesday, September 2, 1868): Miharu-han turns against the Alliance.¹⁹²

[29] (Tuesday, September 15, 1868): Nihonmatsu Castle and Nagaoka Castle fall.¹⁹³

Eighth Month:

[23] (Thursday, October 8, 1868): Siege of Aizuwakamatsu begins.¹⁹⁴

[28] (Tuesday, October 13, 1868): Yonezawa-han surrenders.¹⁹⁵

¹⁸⁵ Sasaki, p. 232.
¹⁸⁷ Onodera, p. 193.
¹⁸⁸ Sasaki, p. 230.
¹⁹⁰ Sasaki, p. 230.
¹⁹¹ Yamada, p. 225.
¹⁹² Onodera, p. 194.
¹⁹³ Ibid.
Ninth Month:

[3] (Sunday, October 18, 1868): Last major Northern Alliance war council held at Sendai Castle.\textsuperscript{196} *New York Times* reports on accession of the “new mikado,” Emperor Tōbu.\textsuperscript{197}

[15] (Friday, October 30, 1868): Sendai-han surrenders.\textsuperscript{198} Effective end of the Northern Alliance.\textsuperscript{199}

[22] (Friday, November 6, 1868): Aizu-han surrenders.\textsuperscript{200} Emperor Tōbu relinquishes his rank and title.\textsuperscript{201}

[23] (Saturday, November 7, 1868): Šōnai-han surrenders.\textsuperscript{202}

[24] (Sunday, November 8, 1868): Morioka-han surrenders.\textsuperscript{203}

\textsuperscript{196} Ōishi, p. 223. 
\textsuperscript{197} “JAPAN.” *New York Times*, p. 3. 
\textsuperscript{198} Sasaki, p. 230. 
\textsuperscript{199} Per Onodera, p. 195. 
\textsuperscript{200} Sasaki, p. 230. 
\textsuperscript{201} Onodera, p. 195. 
\textsuperscript{202} “Šōnai-han,” p. 419. 
\textsuperscript{203} Kamiya, p. 406.
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