

LONE STAR OF THE NORTH: The Northern Alliance Reconsidered

by

Nyri Ani Bakkalian

Bachelor of Arts, Ursinus College, 2007

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of

The College of Arts and Sciences in partial fulfillment

Of the requirements for the degree of
Interdisciplinary Master of Arts (IDMA) in East Asian Studies

University of Pittsburgh

2011

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

This thesis was presented

by

Nyri Ani Bakkalian

It was defended on

April 18, 2011

and approved by

Martha Chaiklin, Professor, History

William Crawford, Professor, East Asian Languages and Literatures

Richard Smethurst, Professor, History

Copyright © by Nyri
Bakkalian 2011

LONE STAR OF THE NORTH: THE NORTHERN ALLIANCE RECONSIDERED

Nyri Ani Bakkalian , MA

University of Pittsburgh, 2011

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.

Acknowledgements

In Pittsburgh: Dr. Richard Smethurst, Dr. Martha Chaiklin, Dr. William Crawford, Dr. Brenda Jordan, Dr. Debra Cashion, Hiro Good, Zou Xiuying, Kobayashi Sachie, Tsukuda Kenzaburō, Alec Balian, Christy Czerwien, Jim Hommes, Amanda Robinson, Sam Zavaletta, Sarah Guest, Brian Portzer, and Barb Bzdzia.

In and around Philadelphia: Dr. Hugh Clark, Dr. Matthew Mizenko, Dr. Frank L. Chance, Lindsey Stone, Amanda Tyska, my parents, and my students in Havertown, who bring me the greatest joy and hope.

In Miyagi Prefecture: Dr. Kawanishi Kōsuke, Dr. Nanami Masato, Dr. Ted Demura-Devore, Mizuno Mami-*san* and the aptly named Aizu-*san* of Tōhoku Gakuin University, the Demura family of Sendai, and the Toda family of Ōgawara. Thankfully all of them are safe after the March 11 tsunami.

In Kōbe: Tim Smith and Sara Biondi.

Elsewhere: Joseph Davis, Jonathan Bronson, Tiffany Namwong, and Theresa & Ariele Hammill.

Institutions I'd like to thank include the Hillman Library, the Van Pelt-Dietrich Library at the University of Pennsylvania, the library at Tōhoku Gakuin University (Izumi and Tsuchitōi Campuses), the Myrin Library at Ursinus College, the Gest Library at Columbia University, the New York Public Library, and the US-Japan Iron and Steel Fellowship for making full-time focus on this project possible in my second year of study.

That's about it; any and all errors are my own.

Dedication

To the people of Sendai.

May their city rise from the ashes once again

Table of Contents

SIGNATURES	ii
ABSTRACT	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
DEDICATION	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
LIST OF TABLES	viii
INTRODUCTION	1
I. A Look at American Historiography on the Alliance and the War	4
II. The Northern Alliance: A History	7
A. The Boshin War: Background	8
B. Birth of the Alliance	14
C. A Few Key Figures	20
D. Battles and Fall of the Alliance	22
III. The Victors' Narrative and Some of its Key Terms Defined	26
IV. Deconstructing the Victors' Narrative: The Question of <i>Sabaku</i>	32
V. The Victors' Narrative Challenged, the Current State of that Challenge	38
VI. Conclusion	42
APPENDIX A: Articles of Alliance	45
APPENDIX B: The Full Invitation Message of i4/4	47
APPENDIX C: Brief Timeline, 1868	48
BIBLIOGRAPHY	51

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1.1: Members of the Alliance	18
--	----

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

¹ *Nihon no Kassen 8: Meiji Ishin* 日本の合戦八：明治維新. Ed. Kuwata Tadachika 桑田忠親 (Tōkyō 東京: Shin Jinbutsu Ōraisha 新人物往来社, 1978), pp. 173-174.

² Bob T. Wakabayashi, *Japanese loyalism reconstrued : Yamagata Daini's Ryūshi shinron of 1759*. (Honolulu : University of Hawaii Press, 1995), p. 6.

³ Marius B. Jansen, *Sakamoto Ryōma and the Meiji Restoration*. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961), p. 334.

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

⁴ James Baxter, *The Meiji Unification through the Lens of Ishikawa Prefecture*. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994), p. 57.

⁵ Shiba Gorō, *Remembering Aizu: The Testament of Shiba Gorō*. Ed. Ishimitsu Mahito, trans. Teruko Craig. (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1999), p. 28.

words, as “the avenger.”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.

⁶ Sir Herbert Butterfield, Introduction to *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.

⁸ James Baxter, *The Meiji Unification through the Lens of Ishikawa Prefecture*. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994), p. 57.

⁹ Drea, p. 15.

¹⁰ Richard Storry, *A History of Modern Japan* (New York: Penguin Books, 1987), p. 102.

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.”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.”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.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 *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

¹² Totman, p. 443.

¹³ Bolitho, *Treasures among Men*, p. 246.

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”¹⁵ or “almost bloodless.”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 1853-1879.¹⁷ 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.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.

¹⁵ Frederic E. Wakeman, *History and will: philosophical perspectives of Mao Tse-tung's thought*. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973), p. 151.

¹⁶ John Breuilly, *Nationalism and the State* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1982), p. 214.

¹⁷ *Kokushi Daijiten* Volume 13 國史大辭典第十三卷. Ed. Kokushi Daijiten Henshū linkai 国史大辭典編集委員会. (Tōkyō 東京: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan 吉川弘文館, 1997), p. 723.

¹⁸ For a list of the dead samurai in this period (excluding those who died in the Seinan War), see *Bakumatsu Ishin zen junnansha 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.¹⁹ 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* 薩摩藩 and Chōshū-*han* 長州藩 seized the opportunity and with the help of allies at the imperial court, engineered a *coup d'etat* on the morning of 12/9/Keiō 3.²⁰ 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,²¹ the Sat-chō clique engineered a campaign of terrorism²² in the shogunal heartland of the Kantō,²³ and other armed provocation in the Kansai region,²⁴ 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

¹⁹ Sasaki Suguru 佐々木克, *Boshin sensō: haisha no "Meiji-ishin"* 戊辰戦争：敗者の「明治維新」. (Tōkyō 東京: Chūōkōron-shinsha 中央公論新社, 2002), p. 232.

²⁰ Ibid, pp. 13, 232. By the modern calendar it was Friday, January 3, 1868.

²¹ Ibid, p. 13.

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.

²³ Mark Ravina, *The Last Samurai: The Life and Battles of Saigō Takamori*. (New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, 2004), p. 145. On the orders of Saigō Takamori, a group of men led by Sagara Sōzō 相楽総三 (1839-1868) ransacked merchant warehouses, burned shogunal property, and attacked and harassed the shogunate police. In March 1868 the imperial army disposed of Sagara in short order, beheading him on charges of leading a "false imperial army" (*nise kangun* 偽官軍).

²⁴ Fukushima Hiroshi 福島博, *Bakumatsu, Ishin Yume no ato kikō* 幕末維新・夢の跡紀行. (Tōkyō 東京: Kyoiku shōseki 教育書籍, 1990), p. 163.

conflict.²⁵ 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.²⁶ Understandably, the Sat-chō alliance did not allow this message to reach the imperial “jewel” (*gyoku* 玉) that they had now “seized.”²⁷ On 1/3/K4,²⁸ Satsuma troops fired on the advancing shogunal soldiers, and so began the Battle of Toba-Fushimi and the Boshin War.²⁹ On the second day of the battle, the imperial banners were raised and the Sat-chō troops became the imperial army.³⁰

These banners had been prepared far in advance of the battle, without the emperor’s sanction.³¹ Historian Donald Keene’s words on these banners bear quoting in full:³²

[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

²⁵ Donald Keene, *Emperor of Japan: Meiji and his world, 1832-1912* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000), p. 126.

²⁶ Quoted in Conrad Totman, *The Collapse of the Tokugawa Bakufu, 1862-1868*. (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 1980), pp. 416 to 417.

²⁷ George M. Wilson, *Patriots and redeemers in Japan: motives in the Meiji Restoration*. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), p. 49.

²⁸ Monday, January 27, 1868.

²⁹ Mori Mayumi 森まゆみ, *Shōgitai Ibun* 彰義隊遺聞. (Tōkyō 東京: Shinkōsha 新潮社, 2004), p. 284.

³⁰ Sasaki, p. 26; Noguchi Shin’ichi 野口真一, *Aizu-han* 会津藩 (Tōkyō 東京: Gendai Shokan 現代書簡, 2005), p.167.

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-chō 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 Kaishū 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 Kai³⁹ and Shinano⁴⁰ Provinces-- if they could take and hold it--

³³ *Kyōto Shugoshoku Nisshi*, Vol. 1 京都守護職日誌第1巻. Ed. Kikuchi Akira 菊池明. (Tōkyō 東京: Shin Jinbutsu Ōraisha 新人物往来社, 2008), p. 262.

³⁴ Ishii Takashi 石井孝, *Ishin no Nairan* 維新の内乱. (Tōkyō 東京: Shiseidō 至誠堂, 1977), p. 11.

³⁵ Onodera Eikō 小野寺永光, *Boshin nanboku sensō to Tōhoku seiken* 戊辰南北戦争と東北政權. (Sendai 仙台: Kita no mori 北の杜, 2005), p. 189.

³⁶ *Meiji Tennō ki*, Vol. 1 明治天皇紀第一巻. Comp. Imperial Household Agency 宮内庁 (Tōkyō 東京: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan 吉川弘文館, 1977), p.19.

³⁷ Kojima Keizō 小島慶三, *Boshin sensō kara Seinan sensō e: Meiji Ishin wo Kangaeru* 戊辰戦争から西南戦争へ: 明治維新を考える. (Tōkyō 東京: Chūōkōron-shinsha 中央公論新社, 2002), pp. 98-99.

³⁸ Kikuchi Akira 菊池明, "Toba-Fushimi no tatakai kara Nagareyama made," 鳥羽・伏見の戦いから流山まで pp. 96-109, in *Shinsengumi Saitō Hajime no subete* 新撰組斉藤一のすべて. (Tōkyō 東京: Shin Jinbutsu Ōraisha 新人物往来社, 2003), p. 101; Takano Kiyoshi 高野澄, *Tokugawa Yoshinobu: Kindai Nihon no Enshutsusha* 徳川慶喜近代日本の演出者. (Tōkyō 東京: Nippon Hōsō Shuppan Kyōkai 日本放送出版協会, 1997), pp. 266-269; Totman, pp. 439-441.

³⁹ Kojima, p. 95.

⁴⁰ Ibid, p. 95.

as private fief land. Other Tokugawa troops left Edo of their own accord,⁴¹ and the domainal forces, such as those of Aizu and Shōnai, also headed home on their own.⁴²

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.⁴³ 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.⁴⁴ Aizu was working feverishly to secure a negotiated peace,⁴⁵ but anything short of unconditional, total surrender was unacceptable for the imperial army.⁴⁶

To this end, the imperial government repeatedly ordered the domains of northeastern Japan to organize their forces and take down Aizu and Shōnai.⁴⁷ 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 彰義隊.⁴⁸ 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.

⁴³ Kojima, pp. 98-99.

⁴⁴ Onodera, p. 189; Ravina, p. 145.

⁴⁵ Kawabata Tahei 川端太平, *Matsudaira Shungaku* 松平春嶽. (Tōkyō 東京: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan 吉川弘文館, 1967), p. 446.

⁴⁶ Sasaki, p. 231.

⁴⁷ Onodera, p. 189; Nakamura Akihiko 中村彰彦, *Byakkotai* 白虎隊. (Tōkyō 東京: Bungei-shunjū 文藝春秋, 2001), p. 18.

⁴⁸ Sasaki, p. 232; Matsuo Masahito 松尾正人, *Ishin Seiken* 維新政権 (Tōkyō: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan 吉川弘文館, 1995), p. 299.

fourteen days after the Battle of Toba-Fushimi.⁴⁹ 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* 総督) of the Army for the Subjugation of the North (*Ōu-chinbugun* 奥羽鎮撫軍).⁵⁰ 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.⁵¹ On 3/18 they arrived at the Sendai-*han* naval station on Sabusawa Island,⁵² 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.”⁵³ 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.⁵⁴

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.⁵⁵

⁴⁹ Yamada Norio 山田野理夫, *Tōhoku Sensō* 東北戦争. (Tōkyō 東京: Kyōikusha 教育社, 1978), p. 24.

⁵⁰ Onodera, p. 190.

⁵¹ Yamada, p. 44.

⁵² Onodera, p. 191; Sasaki, p. 74.

⁵³ Sasaki, p. 75; Yamada, p. 219.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Onodera, p. 74, *Miyagi-ken shi* 宮城縣史 Vol. 2. (Sendai 仙台: Miyagi Kenshi Kankōkai 宮城縣史刊行会, 1987), p. 705.

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,⁵⁶ drunken imperial troops rampaging through the Sendai castle town,⁵⁷ Aizu troops in caves surprising imperial patrols,⁵⁸ Aizu and Sendai combatants agreeing to shoot blanks at each other,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.⁶⁰ The following song became popular in those days.⁶¹

*If you wish to see a capital,
Come no further!
Watch now as Aizu
Is becoming Edo.*

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

⁵⁶ Yamada, p. 104.

⁵⁷ Hoshi Ryōichi 星亮一, *Ōuetsureppandōmei* 奥羽越列藩同盟. (Tōkyō 東京: Chūōkōron-shinsha 中央公論新社, 1997), 18.

⁵⁸ Yamada, p. 108.

⁵⁹ Ibid, p. 104.

⁶⁰ Hoshi Ryōichi 星亮一, *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.

⁶¹ Hoshi, *Tonami ni ikita Aizu no hitobito*, p. 41.

the northeast to gather for a council at Shiroishi, a secondary castle town in the southwestern part of Sendai-*han*.⁶²

Our lords *Mutsu-no-kami*⁶³ and *Danjō-daihitsu*⁶⁴ 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.⁶⁵ A letter from one of the imperial officers (who had already denounced Sendai samurai as "cowards"⁶⁶) 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.⁶⁷

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.⁶⁸ 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.

⁶⁶ William G. Beasley, *Modern Japan: Aspects of History, Literature, and Society*. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977), p. 45.

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.⁶⁹ The Alliance then took up arms against the imperial army.⁷⁰ 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.⁷¹ 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.⁷²

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.

⁷² *Miyagi-ken shi* Vol. 2, p. 707.

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.⁷³ Kawai Tsugunosuke, 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.⁷⁴

The final draft of the Alliance's treaty document, as signed by all 31 of the domains who would join it, read as follows.⁷⁵

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, *Ōuetsureppandōmei*, 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,⁷⁶ 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.⁷⁷ 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*.⁷⁸ They said they sought to defeat the Sat-chō control of the imperial court, so that the emperor "may indeed reign over it."⁷⁹

⁷⁶ Harold Bolitho, "The Echigo War." *Monumenta Nipponica* 34 (Autumn 1979), p. 276.

⁷⁷ Onodera, pp. 128-129.

⁷⁸ "JAPAN." *New York Times* (1857-1922): Oct 18, 1868; ProQuest Historical Newspapers *The New York Times* (1851-2006), p. 3.

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.⁸⁰ 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*.⁸¹ 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

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

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.

Yajima	Ikoma	8,000 koku	Tozama
Ichinoseki	Tamura	30,000 koku	Tozama
Kaminoyama	Matsudaira ⁸²	40,000 koku	Fudai
Tendō	Oda ⁸³	20,000 koku	Tozama
Shibata	Mizoguchi	50,000 koku	Tozama
Muramatsu	Hori	30,000 koku	Tozama
Mineyama	Makino	11,000 koku	Fudai
Nagaoka	Makino	110,000 koku	Fudai
Kurokawa	Yanagisawa	10,000 koku	Fudai

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

⁸² Though a Tokugawa collateral, this family (of the Fujii-Matsudaira branch) was of *fudai* rather than *shinpan* status. *Tokugawa Matsudaira Ichizoku no Jiten* 徳川・松平一族の辞典. Ed. Kudō Hiromasa 工藤寛正編. (Tōkyō 東京: Tōkyōdō Shuppan 東京堂出版, 2009), p. 491-495.

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

⁸⁴ *Yoshihisa-shinnō Jiseki* 能久親王事蹟. Ed. Tōinkai 棠陰会. (Tōkyō 東京: Shun'yōdō 春陽堂, 1908), p. 1.

⁸⁵ Edward Seidensticker, *Low City, High City: Tokyo from Edo to the earthquake*. (New York: Knopf, 1983), p. 27.

died of malaria in Taiwan, and was enshrined in the Shintō shrines that existed on the island until the end of World War II.⁸⁶

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.⁸⁷ 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.⁸⁸ Uesugi Narinori, the other governor-general, was daimyo of Yonezawa.⁸⁹ 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.⁹⁰

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.⁹¹ 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

⁸⁶ Andrew D. Morris, *Colonial project, national game : a history of baseball in Taiwan*. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011), p. 47.

⁸⁷ Bakumatsu ishin jinmei jiten 幕末維新人名事典, ed. Miyasaki Tomihachi 宮崎十三八, Yasuoka Akio 安岡昭男. (Tōkyō 東京: Shin Jinbutsu Ōraisha 新人物往来社, 1994), p. 562.

⁸⁸ Richard Smethurst, *From Foot Soldier to Finance Minister: Takahashi Korekiyo, Japan's Keynes* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007), p. 35.

⁸⁹ *Meiji Ishin Jinmeijiten* 明治維新人名辞典. Edited by Nihon Rekishi Gakkai 日本歴史学会. (Tōkyō 東京: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan 吉川弘文館, 1981), p. 136.

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

⁹² Sendai-shi shi 仙臺市史 Vol. 10, Ed. Sendai Shishi Hensan linkai 仙臺市史編纂委員会編 (Sendai-shi 仙臺市: Manyōdō shoten 萬葉堂書店, 1975), p. 169.

⁹³ Yamada, pp. 208-211.

⁹⁴ Hoshi, *Ōuetsureppandōmei*, p. 80.

⁹⁵ Naramoto Tatsuya, *Nihon no kassen: Monoshiri jiten*. (Tōkyō: Shufu to seikatsusha, 1994), p. 414.

of his era, Kawai's wound was mortal.⁹⁶ He died on 8/16 in Aizu territory, just before the siege began there.⁹⁷

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,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 *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.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 *dongori*),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,¹⁰¹ and the action of Sendai-*han*, Ichinoseki-*han* 一関藩, and Morioka-*han* 盛岡

⁹⁶ Yamakawa Kenjiro 山川健次郎, *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.

⁹⁷ Ibid, p. 441.

⁹⁸ Including multiple engagements at the strategic castletown of Shirakawa 白河. *Nihon no Kassen* 8, p. 157; Nakamura, *Byakkotai*, p. 54; Itō Tetsuya 伊藤哲也, "Saitō Hajime nenpu" 斉藤一年譜 in *Shinsengumi Saitō Hajime no subete* 新撰組斉藤一のすべて, pp. 223-243. (Tōkyō 東京: Shin Jinbutsu Ōraisha 新人物往来社, 2003), p. 235.

⁹⁹ Edwin McClellan, *Woman in the Crested Kimono*. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985), p. 12.

¹⁰⁰ *Dongori* being an onomatopoeia: every time the cannons went *don*, the Sendai samurai would run five *ri* (around 12 miles). Hoshi Ryōichi, *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.

¹⁰¹ Yanagi Toshiyuki 柳敏之, *Kikō Ōu 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.

藩 troops in the northern front, against the Akita domain.¹⁰² Shōnai-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,¹⁰³ Honjō,¹⁰⁴ Kameda,¹⁰⁵ and Yajima,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.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,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.¹⁰⁹ Shōnai, despite having nearly incapacitated the Akita domain, surrendered on 9/25.¹¹⁰ Finally, with the surrender of Yonezawa on 8/28,¹¹¹ and Sendai on 9/15/Meiji 1, the Alliance itself ceased to exist.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

¹⁰² Onodera, p. 194

¹⁰³ Kōri Yoshitake 郡義武, *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.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid, p. 8.

¹⁰⁵ Yamada, p. 226.

¹⁰⁶ Kōri, pp. 122-123.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid, p. 8.

¹⁰⁸ Sasaki, p. 230. Iwakidaira surrendered 7/13, Miharu surrendered 7/27, Nagaoka and Nihonmatsu fell 7/29.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.

¹¹⁰ Saitō Shōichi 斎藤正一, "Shōnai-han" 庄内藩, pp. 410-429 of *Hanshi Daijiten* Vol. 1 藩史大辞典大一卷: Hokkaidō, Tōhoku-hen 北海道・東北編. Ed. Kimura Motoi 木村礎, Fujino Tamotsu 藤野保, Murakami Tadashi 村上直. (Tōkyō 東京: Yūzankaku 雄山閣, 1988), p. 419.

¹¹¹ Kamiya Jirō 神谷次郎 and Soda Kōichi 祖田浩一, *Bakumatsu Ishin sanbyappan sōran* 幕末維新三百藩総覧. (Tōkyō 東京: Shin Jinbutsu Ōraisha 新人物往来社, 1977), p. 406.

¹¹² Sasaki, p. 230. Friday, October 30, 1868.

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,¹¹³ arrived in Hokkaido on 10/20,¹¹⁴ and took the city of Hakodate on 10/26.¹¹⁵ 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 Ootobe.¹¹⁶ 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 4/17,¹¹⁷ 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.¹¹⁸ 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).¹¹⁹ The war ended a week later on 5/18/Meiji 2,¹²⁰ with the surrender of Enomoto and his staff at Goryōkaku.¹²¹ 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.

¹¹⁵ Ibid, p. 230.

¹¹⁶ Ibid, p. 229; Onodera, p. 196.

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 troops¹²² 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

¹²² William Elliot Griffis, *The mikado's empire : a history of Japan from the age of the Gods to the Meiji era (660 BC-AD 1872)* (Berkeley, Calif.: Stone Bridge Classics, 2006), p. 313.

the northeast sided with Aizu in a pro-shogunate (*sabaku* 佐幕) alliance.¹²³ 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."¹²⁴ *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

¹²³ Nihon Hakugaku Kurabu 日本博学倶楽部, *Edo sanbyakuhun no igai na sonogo : han kara ken e kyōkasho ga oshienai rekishi* 江戸 300 藩の意外な「その後」:「藩」から「県」へ-教科書が教えない歴史(Tokyo: PHP Kenkyujo PHP 研究所, 2005), p. 182.

¹²⁴ Takie Sugiyama Lebra, *Above the clouds: status culture of the modern Japanese nobility*. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), p. 349.

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

¹²⁶ Ibid, p. 99.

¹²⁷ *Akita-han Boshin Kinnō Shimatsu* 秋田藩戊辰勤皇始末. Ed. Akita Prefectural Governor’s Secretariat 秋田縣知事官房編. (Akita: Akita Kenchiji Kanbō 秋田縣知事官房, 1908).

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,¹²⁸ which was the action by which Akita left the Alliance, is termed as “punitive execution” (*chūriku* 誅戮), a term that connotes the execution of a criminal or traitor.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 *kinno*, 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.

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.

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.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.”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.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.”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

¹³⁰ Marius B. Jansen & Gilbert Rozman, *Overview of Japan in Transition from Tokugawa to Meiji* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), p. 21.

¹³¹ Ibid.

¹³² Oka Yoshitake, *Five Political Leaders of Modern Japan*. Translated by Andrew Fraser and Patricia Murray. (Tōkyō: University of Tōkyō Press, 1986), pp. 85-86.

¹³³ *Nihonshi Yōgoshū B* 日本史用語集B. (Tōkyō 東京: Yamakawa Shuppansha 山川出版社, 2000), p. 209; *Kokushi Daijiten* Volume 14 國史大辭典第十四卷. Ed. Kokushi Daijiten Henshū linkai 国史大辭典編集委員会. (Tōkyō 東京: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan 吉川弘文館, 1997), p. 53; Edward J. Drea, *Japan's Imperial Army: Its Rise and Fall, 1868-1945* (Lawrence: University of Kansas, 2009), p. 18.

all subjects share in the radiance of the emperor's gracious favor,
as is clear to all. So be at rest!¹³⁴

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

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;¹³⁵ by the time the Alliance was formed, the city of Edo was surrendered to the imperial army¹³⁶ and the ex-shogun had gone into confinement in Mito.¹³⁷ 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.¹³⁸ 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.

¹³⁸ "Toba-Fushimi no tatakai kara Nagareyama made," p. 101; Takano, pp. 266-269; Totman, pp. 439-441.

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 *oku* 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 Kaga¹⁴¹ and Satsuma¹⁴²). 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.*

¹⁴¹ *Edo Bakuhon Daimyōke Jiten* 江戸幕藩大名家辞典, Vol. 2. Ogawa Kyōichi 小川恭一, ed. (Tōkyō: Hara Shobō 原書房, 1992), p. 395.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 804.

¹⁴³ Sasaki, p. 210.

the Uesugi clan's castle.¹⁴⁴ Akita, also in Dewa, was ruled by the Satake family. The Satake were forcibly relocated there by the Tokugawa in the 17th century, so there was no love lost between the two. The 200,000 koku Morioka domain was ruled by the Nanbu clan.¹⁴⁵ The Nanbu lord too was considered a *tozama*. Finally, there was the Hirosaki domain on the far northern tip of Honshu, ruled by the Tsugaru family. The Tsugaru were also *tozama*, and had close family ties with the courtly Konoe family.¹⁴⁶ If the majority of the Alliance was composed of big and midsized *tozama*, why did the *fudai* join? As Harold Bolitho says in his book on the *fudai*, though nominally Tokugawa vassals, they were ultimately lords in their own right who were motivated by self-interest.¹⁴⁷ There were a fair number of *fudai* lords, after all, who had joined the imperial army (including the highest ranking *fudai*, Ii Naonori of Hikone-han¹⁴⁸). 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 *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-han 請西藩.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

¹⁴⁴ *Nihonshi Yōgoshū B*, p. 124.

¹⁴⁵ Sasaki, p. 210.

¹⁴⁶ Hasegawa Seiichi 長谷川成一. *Hirosaki-han* 弘前藩. (Tōkyō 東京: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan 吉川弘文館, 2004), p. 231.

¹⁴⁷ Harold Bolitho, Introduction to *Treasures among Men: The Fudai Daimyo in Tokugawa Japan*. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974), xii.

¹⁴⁸ *Nihonshi Yōgoshū B*, p. 133. Hikone, in Ōmi Province, was rated at 350,000 koku.

¹⁴⁹ Nakamura Akihiko 中村彰彦, *Dappan Daimyō no Boshinsensō: Kazusa Jōzai hanshu Hayashi Tadataka no Shōgai* 脱藩大名の戊辰戦争：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" (*Saigo no daimyō* 最後の大名).

future was secure due to the succession of Tokugawa Iesato as the new family head,¹⁵⁰ as well as the creation of a new domain for the family in the form of Shizuoka-*han* 静岡藩.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 *sabaku* is the person of Prince Rinnōji-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 Tobu. Date Yoshikuni of Sendai even received the title of *shogun* in this document, with Matsudaira Katamori of Aizu as his vice-shogun.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 *sabaku* is its set of stated goals, and its actions toward modernization and industrialization. These goals were as follows.¹⁵³

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

¹⁵⁰ Sasaki, pp. 60, 231; Higuchi Takehiko 樋口雄彦, *Kyū Bakushin no Meiji-ishin: Numazu Heigakkō to sono gunzō* 旧幕臣の明治維新: 沼津兵学校とその群像. (Tōkyō 東京: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan 吉川弘文館, 2005), p. 10.

¹⁵¹ Nakamura, p. 205.

¹⁵² Onodera, p. 193.

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 Toyama¹⁵⁴) 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.¹⁵⁵ In addition to its acquisition of Enfield rifles and modernization of military structure,¹⁵⁶ Sendai-*han* also possessed a modern

¹⁵⁴ *Edo Bakuhan Daimyōke Jiten* Vol. 2, p. 397.

¹⁵⁵ Naramoto, p. 414.

¹⁵⁶ Yamada, p. 219.

steam-driven warship.¹⁵⁷ 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.

¹⁵⁷ *Sendai shi-shi* vol. 10, p. 167.

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,¹⁵⁸ was a combat veteran of the Boshin War, an ex-Aizu samurai¹⁵⁹ and a survivor of the siege at Aizu in fall 1868.¹⁶⁰ 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.

¹⁵⁸ Watanabe Masao, *The Japanese and Western Science*. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990), p. 6.

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 Mclvor. (Tōkyō: 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 Hara¹⁶¹ 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,¹⁶² Fujiwara Ainosuke,¹⁶³ 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).

¹⁶³ Fujiwara Ainosuke 藤原相之助, *Sendai Boshin-shi* 仙臺戊辰史. Ed. Nihon Shiseki Kyokai 日本史籍協會. (Tōkyō: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai 東京大學出版會, 1981).

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.¹⁶⁴ 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.¹⁶⁵ 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.

¹⁶⁵ Ōyama Kashiwa 大山柏. *Boshin no Eki Senshi* 戊辰の役戦史, Vol. 2. (Tōkyō 東京: Jiji Tsūshinsha 時事通信社, 1988), p. 871-877.

More recently, there has been a wave of books focusing on the history of northeastern Japan in the Meiji Restoration. Some are whole domainal 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.

¹⁶⁶ *Narayama Sado no subete* 榎山佐渡のすべて, Ed. Ōta Toshiho 太田俊穂編. (Tōkyō 東京: Shin Jinbutsu Ōraisha 新人物往来社, 1985).

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.¹⁶⁷ 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

¹⁶⁷ Bob T. Wakabayashi, "In Name Only: Imperial Sovereignty in Early Modern Japan." Pp. 25-57 of *Journal of Japanese Studies* 17 (Winter 1991), p. 50.

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 eyeblink 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 Hanamura Tsutomu. Hanamura, 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 Hanamura 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."¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁸ Hanamure Tsutomu 花牟礼勉, *Aru Senpei no Shōnai Boshin Sensō* 或る戦兵の庄内戊辰戦争. (Kokubunji 国分寺: Shinpūsha 新風舎, 1997), p. 8.

Appendix A: The Articles of Alliance

First Draft¹⁶⁹

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 Draft¹⁷⁰

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.

¹⁷⁰ *Nihon no Kassen* 8, pp. 173-174.

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].

Appendix B: The Full Invitation Message of i4/4¹⁷¹

Our lords *Mutsu-no-kami*¹⁷² and *Danjō-daihitsu*¹⁷³ 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.

i4/4

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:¹⁷⁴

Nanbu *Mino-no-kami*, Nanbu *Tōtōmi-no-kami*, Nanbu *Mimasaka-no-kami*, Tsugaru *Shikibu-dayū*,
Matsumae *Izu-no-kami*, Tsugaru *Etchū-no-kami*, Matsudaira *Daigaku-no-kami*, Abe *Mimasaka-*
no-kami, Sōma *Inaba-no-kami*, Akita Mannosuke, Andō Riichirō, Itakura *Kai-no-kami*, Naitō
Chōjūmaru, Tachibana *Izumo-no-kami*, Niwa *Sakyō-dayū*, Tozawa *Nakatsukasa-dayū*, Mizuno
Shinjiro, Fujii *Izu-no-kami*, Rokugō *Hyōgo-no-kami*, Honda *Noto-no-kami*, Yonezu *Ise-no-kami*,
Uesugi *Suruga-no-kami*, Oda *Sakon-no-Shōgen*, Iwaki *Sakyō-dayū*, Satake *Ukyō-dayū*, Satake
Harima-no-kami, Ikoma Ōkura
Total 27 Domains

¹⁷¹ Otokozawa Chisato 男澤千里, Itō Sukemasa 伊藤祐将, Yano Michisato 矢野道理, & Imamura Moriyuki 今村盛幸, “Boshin Shimatsu” 戊辰始末, pp. 41-325 of *Sendai Sōsho Volume 12* 仙臺叢書第十二卷. (Sendai 仙台: Hōbundō 宝文堂, 1974), pp. 161-162.

¹⁷² Date Yoshikuni of Sendai-*han*.

¹⁷³ Uesugi Narinori of Yonezawa-*han*.

¹⁷⁴ The names that follow are the names of the daimyo whose *karō* were invited: Nanbu Toshihisa of Morioka-*han*, Nanbu Nobuyuki of Hachinohe-*han*, Nanbu Nobutami of Shichinohe-*han*, Tsugaru Tsugumichi of Kuroishi-*han*, Matsumae Norihiro of Matsumae-*han*, Tsugaru Tsuguakira of Hirosaki-*han*, Matsudaira Yorinori of Moriyama-*han*, Abe Masakiyo of Tanagura-*han*, Sōma Tomotane of Nakamura-*han*, Akita Akisue of Miharu-*han*, Andō Nobutake of Iwakidaira-*han*, Itakura Katsuhisa of Fukushima-*han*, Naitō Masayasu of Yunagaya-*han*, Tachibana Taneyuki of Shimotodo-*han*, Niwa Nagakuni of Nihonmatsu-*han*, Tozawa Masazane of Shinjō-*han*, Mizuno Tadahiro of Yamagata-*han*, Matsudaira (Fujii) Nobutsune of Kaminoyama-*han*, Rokugō Masakane of Honjō-*han*, Honda Tadatoshi of Izumi-*han*, Yonezu Masatoshi of Nagatoro-*han*, Uesugi Katsumichi of Yonezawa Shinden-*han*, Oda Nobutoshi of Tendō-*han*, Iwaki Takakuni of Kameda-*han*, Satake Yoshitaka of Akita-*han*, Satake Yoshimichi of Akita Shinden-*han*, and Ikoma Chikayuki of Yajima-*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 others¹⁷⁶ 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 Interdomainal 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

¹⁷⁵ Ōishi Manabu 大石学. *Shinsengumi: "Saigo no bushi" no jitsuzō* 新撰組：「最後の武士」の実像. (Tōkyō 東京: Chūōkōron-shinsha 中央公論新社, 2001), p. 178.

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.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid, p. 74; *Miyagi-ken shi* Vol. 2, p. 705.

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.

¹⁸⁶ *Miyagi-ken shi* Vol. 2, p. 707.

¹⁸⁷ Onodera, p. 193.

¹⁸⁸ Sasaki, p. 230.

¹⁸⁹ *Akita-han Boshin Kinnō Shimatsu*, pp. 56-59.

¹⁹⁰ Sasaki, p. 230.

¹⁹¹ Yamada, p. 225.

¹⁹² Onodera, p. 194.

¹⁹³ Ibid.

¹⁹⁴ Ibid, p. 195.

¹⁹⁵ Kamiya, p. 406.

Ninth Month:

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

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

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

[23] (Saturday, November 7, 1868): Shōnai-*han* surrenders.²⁰²

[24] (Sunday, November 8, 1868): Morioka-*han* surrenders.²⁰³

¹⁹⁶ Ōishi, p. 223.

¹⁹⁷ “JAPAN.” *New York Times*, p. 3.

¹⁹⁸ Sasaki, p. 230.

¹⁹⁹ Per Onodera, p. 195.

²⁰⁰ Sasaki, p. 230.

²⁰¹ Onodera, p. 195.

²⁰² “Shōnai-han,” p. 419.

²⁰³ Kamiya, p. 406.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Akita-han Boshin Kinnō Shimatsu 秋田藩戊辰勤皇始末. Edited by the Akita Prefectural Governor's Secretariat 秋田縣知事官房編. Akita: Akita Kenchiji Kanbō 秋田縣知事官房, 1908.

Bakumatsu ishin jinmei jiten 幕末維新人名事典, edited by Miyasaki Tomihachi 宮崎十三八 and Yasuoka Akio 安岡昭男. Tōkyō 東京: Shin Jinbutsu Ōraisha 新人物往來社, 1994.

Bakumatsu Ishin zen junnansha meikan 幕末維新全殉難者名鑑. 4 Volumes. Edited by Aketa Tetsuo 明田鉄男. Tōkyō 東京: Shin Jinbutsu Ōraisha 新人物往來社, 1986.

Baxter, James. *The Meiji Unification through the Lens of Ishikawa Prefecture*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994.

Beasley, William G. *Modern Japan: Aspects of History, Literature, and Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.

Black, John R. *Young Japan: Yokohama and Yedo*, Volume II. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Bolitho, Harold. "The Echigo War." *Monumenta Nipponica* 34 (Autumn 1979).

_____. *Treasures among Men: The Fudai Daimyo in Tokugawa Japan*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974.

Boyer, Samuel P. *Naval Surgeon: the diary of Dr. Samuel Pellman Boyer*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1963.

Breuilly, John. *Nationalism and the State*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1982.

Butterfield, Sir Herbert. Introduction to *The Whig interpretation of history*. New York: Norton, 1965.

Drea, Edward. *Japan's Imperial Army: its rise and fall, 1853-1945*. Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 2009.

Edo bakuhan daimyōke jiten 江戸幕藩大名家事典, Chū-kan 中卷. Edited by Ogawa Kyōichi 小川恭一編著. Tōkyō 東京: Hara Shobō 原書房, 1992.

Fay, John. *Encyclopedia of Security Management*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, 2007.

Fujiwara Ainosuke 藤原相之助. *Sendai Boshin-shi* 仙臺戊辰史. Ed. Nihon Shiseki Kyokai 日本史籍協會. Tōkyō: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai 東京大學出版會, 1981.

Fukushima Hiroshi 福島博. *Bakumatsu, Ishin Yume no ato kikō* 幕末維新・夢の跡紀行. Tōkyō 東京: Kyoiku shōseki 教育書籍, 1990.

Griffis, William Elliot. *The mikado's empire : a history of Japan from the age of the Gods to the Meiji era (660 BC-AD 1872)* Berkeley, Calif.: Stone Bridge Classics, 2006.

Hanamure Tsutomu 花牟礼勉. *Aru Senpei no Shōnai Boshin Sensō* 或る戦兵の庄内戊辰戦争. Kokubunji 国分寺: Shinpūsha 新風舎, 1997.

Hasegawa Seiichi 長谷川成一. *Hirosaki-han* 弘前藩. Tōkyō 東京: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan 吉川弘文館, 2004.

Higuchi Takehiko 樋口雄彦. *Kyū Bakushin no Meiji-ishin: Numazu Heigakkō to sono gunzō* 旧幕臣の明治維新: 沼津兵学校とその群像. Tōkyō 東京: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan 吉川弘文館, 2005.

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.

_____. *Ōuetsureppandōmei* 奥羽越列藩同盟. Tōkyō 東京: Chūōkōron-shinsha 中央公論新社, 1997.

_____. *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.

_____. *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.

Ishii Takashi 石井孝. *Ishin no Nairan* 維新の内乱. Tōkyō 東京: Shiseidō 至誠堂, 1977.

Itō Tetsuya 伊藤哲也. “Saitō Hajime nenpu” 斉藤一年譜, pages 223-243 of *Shinsengumi Saitō Hajime no subete* 新撰組斉藤一のすべて. Tōkyō 東京: Shin Jinbutsu Ōraisha 新人物往来社, 2003.

Jansen, Marius B. and Gilbert Rozman. *Overview of Japan in Transition from Tokugawa to Meiji*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986.

Jansen, Marius B. *Sakamoto Ryōma and the Meiji Restoration*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961.

“JAPAN.” *New York Times* (1857-1922): Oct 18, 1868; ProQuest Historical Newspapers *The New York Times* (1851-2006).

Kamiya Jirō 神谷次郎 and Soda Kōichi 祖田浩一. *Bakumatsu Ishin sanbyappan sōran* 幕末維新三百藩總覽. Tōkyō 東京: Shin Jinbutsu Ōraisha 新人物往来社, 1977

Kawabata Tahei 川端太平. *Matsudaira Shungaku* 松平春嶽. Tōkyō 東京: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan 吉川弘文館, 1967.

Keene, Donald. *Emperor of Japan: Meiji and his world, 1832-1912*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.

Kikuchi Akira 菊池明. "Toba-Fushimi no tatakai kara Nagareyama made," 鳥羽・伏見の戦いから流山まで pp. 96-109, in *Shinsengumi Saitō Hajime no subete* 新撰組斉藤一のすべて. Tōkyō 東京: Shin Jinbutsu Ōraisha 新人物往来社, 2003.

Kitahara Masanaga 北原雅長. *Shichinenshi* 七年史. Kyōto 京都: Rinsen shoten 臨川書店, 1972.

Kojima Keizō 小島慶三. *Boshin sensō kara Seinan sensō e: Meiji Ishin wo Kangaeru* 戊辰戦争から西南戦争へ: 明治維新を考える. Tōkyō 東京: Chūōkōron-shinsha 中央公論新社, 2002.

Kokushi Daijiten Volume 13 國史大辭典第十三卷. Edited by Kokushi Daijiten Henshū linkai 國史大辭典編集委員会. Tōkyō 東京: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan 吉川弘文館, 1997.

Kokushi Daijiten, Volume 14 國史大辭典第十三卷. Edited by Kokushi Daijiten Henshū linkai 國史大辭典編集委員会. Tōkyō 東京: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan 吉川弘文館, 1997.

Kōri Yoshitake 郡義武. *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.

Kuno Akiko. *Unexpected Destinations: the poignant story of Japan's first Vassar graduate*. Translated by Kirsten Mclvor. Tōkyō: Kodansha International, 1993.

Kyōto Shugoshoku Nisshi, Volume 1 京都守護職日誌第1卷. Edited by Kikuchi Akira 菊池明. Tōkyō 東京: Shin Jinbutsu Ōraisha 新人物往来社, 2008.

Lebra, Takie Sugiyama. *Above the clouds: status culture of the modern Japanese nobility*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

Matsuo Masahito 松尾正人. *Ishin Seiken* 維新政権. Tōkyō: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan 吉川弘文館, 1995.

McClellan, Edwin. *Woman in the Crested Kimono*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.

Meiji Ishin Jinmeijiten 明治維新人名辞典. Edited by Nihon Rekishi Gakkai 日本歴史学会. Tōkyō 東京: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan 吉川弘文館, 1981.

Meiji Tennō ki, Volume 1 明治天皇紀第一卷. Compiled by the Imperial Household Agency 宮内庁. Tōkyō 東京: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan 吉川弘文館, 1977.

Miyagi-ken shi 宮城縣史 Volume 2. Sendai 仙台: Miyagi Kenshi Kankōkai 宮城縣史刊行会, 1987.

Mori Mayumi 森まゆみ. *Shōgitai Ibun* 彰義隊遺聞. Tōkyō 東京: Shinkōsha 新潮社, 2004.

Morris, Andrew D. *Colonial project, national game: a history of baseball in Taiwan*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011.

Nakamura Akihiko 中村彰彦. *Byakkotai* 白虎隊. Tōkyō 東京: Bungei-shunjū 文藝春秋, 2001.

_____. *Dappan Daimyō no Boshinsensō: Kazusa Jōzai hanshu Hayashi Tadataka no Shōgai* 脱藩大名の戊辰戦争：上総請西藩主林忠崇の生涯. Tōkyō 東京: Chūōkōron-shinsha 中央公論新社, 2000.

Narayama Sado no subete 榎山佐渡のすべて. Edited by Ōta Toshiho 太田俊穂編. Tōkyō 東京: Shin Jinbutsu Ōraisha 新人物往来社, 1985.

Nihon no Kassen 8: Meiji Ishin 日本の合戦八：明治維新. Edited by Kuwata Tadachika 桑田忠親. Tōkyō 東京: Shin Jinbutsu Ōraisha 新人物往来社, 1978.

Nihonshi Yōgoshū B 日本史用語集 B. Tōkyō 東京: Yamakawa Shuppansha 山川出版社, 2000.

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.

Ōishi Manabu 大石学. *Shinsengumi: "Saigo no bushi" no jitsuzō* 新撰組：「最後の武士」の実像. Tōkyō 東京: Chūōkōron-shinsha 中央公論新社, 2001.

Oka Yoshitake. *Five Political Leaders of Modern Japan*. Translated by Andrew Fraser and Patricia Murray. Tōkyō: University of Tōkyō Press, 1986.

Onodera Eikō 小野寺永光. *Boshin Nanboku Sensō to Tōhoku Seiken* 戊辰南北戦争と東北政権. Sendai 仙台: Kita no mori 北の杜, 2005.

Otokozawa Chisato 男澤千里, Itō Sukemasa 伊藤祐将, Yano Michisato 矢野道理, and Imamura Moriyuki 今村盛幸. “Boshin Shimatsu” 戊辰始末, pages 41-325 of *Sendai Sōsho Volume 12* 仙臺叢書第十二卷. Sendai 仙台: Hōbundō 宝文堂, 1974.

Ōyama Kashiwa 大山柏. *Boshin no Eki Senshi* 戊辰の役戦史, 2 Volumes. Tōkyō 東京: Jiji Tsūshinsha 時事通信社, 1988.

Ravina, Mark. *The Last Samurai: The Life and Battles of Saigō Takamori*. Hoboken: John Wiley, 2004.

Saitō Shōichi 斎藤正一, “Shōnai-han” 庄内藩, pages 410-429 of *Hanshi Daijiten* Volume 1 藩史大辞典大一卷: Hokkaidō, Tōhoku-hen 北海道・東北編. Edited by Kimura Motoi 木村礎, Fujino Tamotsu 藤野保, Murakami Tadashi 村上直. Tōkyō 東京: Yūzankaku 雄山閣, 1988.

Sasaki Suguru 佐々木克. *Boshin Sensō: Haisha no Meiji Ishin* 戊辰戦争：敗者の「明治維新」. Tōkyō 東京: Chūōkōron-shinsha 中央公論新社, 2002.

Seidensticker, Edward. *Low City, High City: Tokyo from Edo to the earthquake*. New York: Knopf, 1983.

Sendai shi-shi 仙台市史, Volume 5. Sendai 仙台: Sendai City 仙台市, 2001.

Sendai-shi shi 仙臺市史 Volume 10. Edited by Sendai Shishi Hensan linkai 仙臺市史編纂委員会編. Sendai-shi 仙臺市: Manyōdō shoten 萬葉堂書店, 1975.

Smethurst, Richard. *From Foot Soldier to Finance Minister: Takahasi Korekiyo, Japan's Keynes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007.

Steele, M. William. *Alternative Narratives in Modern Japanese History*. New York: Routledge, 2003.

Storry, Richard. *A History of Modern Japan*. New York: Penguin Books, 1987.

Takano Kiyoshi 高野澄. *Tokugawa Yoshinobu: Kindai Nihon no Enshutsusha* 徳川慶喜近代日本の演出者. Tōkyō 東京: Nippon Hōsō Shuppan Kyōkai 日本放送出版協会, 1997.

Tokugawa Matsudaira Ichizoku no Jiten 徳川・松平一族の辞典. Edited by Kudō Hiromasa 工藤寛正編. Tōkyō 東京: Tōkyōdō Shuppan 東京堂出版, 2009.

Totman, Conrad. *The Collapse of the Tokugawa Bakufu, 1862-1868*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1980.

Wakabayashi, Bob T. "In Name Only: Imperial Sovereignty in Early Modern Japan." *Journal of Japanese Studies* 17 (Winter 1991): 25-57.

_____. *Japanese loyalism reconstrued : Yamagata Daini's Ryūshi shinron of 1759*. Honolulu : University of Hawaii Press, 1995.

Wakeman, Frederic E. *History and will: philosophical perspectives of Mao Tse-tung's thought*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973.

Watanabe Masao. *The Japanese and Western Science*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990.

Wilson, George M. *Patriots and redeemers in Japan: motives in the Meiji Restoration*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Yamada Norio 山田野理夫. *Tōhoku Sensō* 東北戦争. Tōkyō 東京: Kyōikusha 教育社, 1978.

Yamakawa Kenjirō 山川健次郎. *Aizu Boshin Senshi* 会津戊辰戦史. Tōkyō 東京: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai 東京大学出版会, 1933.

Yanagi Toshiyuki 柳敏之. *Kikō Ōu Sensō* 紀行奥羽戦争. Tōkyō 東京: Bungeisha 文芸社, 2000.

Yoshihisa-shinnō Jiseki 能久親王事蹟. Edited by Tōinkai 棠陰会. Tōkyō 東京: Shun'yōdō 春陽堂, 1908.