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It is a study is mainly about the **daimyo's kaieki** (attainder) which is one of the punishments from the Shogunate to the *shogun and daimyo's power structure in the Edo Shogunate.*

In the former study the disposal of confiscated estate of the Shogunate's **daimyo** was defined as the *kaieki*. From the entire Edo period there were 248 **daimyo kaieki** so it is defined as the strongest control of the Shogunate's **daimyo** restrictions.

However, according to the Shogunate' law, *kaieki* does not mean confiscated estate from feudal lords but a social position punishment that deprives warriors' social position and a confiscated estate is known to be recorded as pecuniary punishment that completely took away the land that the daimyo possessed or took some parts of the land.

In the former study to change the developed relationship between the shogun and **daimyo** (the shogun power's proposition) because of the changed definition of *kaieki*, first there needs to be complete understanding of the definition and there needs to be a reexamination of the former incidents that were thought to be *kaieki* and to draw questions about the shogun power’s proposition.

First, in the first chapter we presented the problems of the former study. In the 2nd and the 3rd chapters we analyzed a major *Tokugawa Jikki* (True Tokugawa Record) and Edo Bakufu Nikki (Edo Shogunate Journals) and researched how the **daimyo’s** the disposal of confiscated estate was recorded in the Shogunate. In the results, there weren't any presentations of the *kaieki* as taking away the daimyo's land only 5 incidents and we knew that the incidents presented as *kaieki* were all *hatamoto* status. Also it can be
called a characteristic that after the confiscated estate, daimyo still could keep their positions as warriors and the daimyo could continue the 'ie' that is household unit of social organization.

In the 4th chapter we looked at the documents to see if there were any daimyo presented as kaieki rather than Shogunate called kaieki. In the results, we found out that the word kaieki was tried to be hidden in the Shogunate because of its big social impact and we found that daimyo was also used in personal documents.

In the 5th and the 6th chapters we looked at special incident Yonezawa Domain Uesugike, Matsumoto Domain Mizunoke and found out that rather than having the Shogunate trying to cut off the Daimyoke, but tried hard to continue with them.

From this analysis we could find two things to challenge. First, kaieki was a punishment for hatamoto status rather than daimyos. In addition, instead of having Shogunate punish the daimyo with kaieki they used a pay cut to continue with Daimyoke or continuation of ie or family by hatamotoke. These challenges bring to conclusion that the relationship between the shogun and daimyo were not having one over another but Shogunate tried to continue their relationship with the Daimyoke to keep the helping relationship by mutual relation.