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Abstract

This paper on the external policies of Neo-Confucian Joseon in the 17th century in comparison to those of contemporary France is above all about international relations of Joseon Korea (1392-1910) based on Neo-Confucian values. And that is also about profound reflections on this Neo-Confucianism-based diplomacy of Joseon dynasty in terms of world diplomatic history. This subject is nowadays much worthy to be interested by those who study the Korean history of international relations since Joseon era. In fact, many intellectuals remarked generally diplomatic measures taken by Joseon Neo-Confucian aristocrats in the 17th century. So to speak, Joseon Korea was at that time menaced by Qing dynasty of Manchurian origin (1636-1912) becoming stronger to surpass Ming China, which Joseon Neo-Confucian elites had admired as the unique center of the world. But this Neo-Confucian Joseon was pushed to recognize the Manchurian despised like barbarians as a new master of East Asia. Finally, Neo-Confucian aristocrats who were in practice governing Joseon dynasty were put into a big dilemma between seeking national interests and keeping their Neo-Confucian view of the world and values. Actually, external policies taken by Neo-Confucian Joseon during the 17th century have been discussed merely in terms of domestic factors such as political justification of radical Neo-Confucian aristocrats who overthrew by a coup the 15th King Gwanghaegun (1608-23) who sought neutrality between Ming China and the Manchurian Empire.
However, this paper would try to analyze objectively the Neo-Confucianism-based diplomacy of Joseon vis-à-vis Ming and Qing dynasties in terms of the world diplomatic history. That’s to say, this would be done in comparison with contemporary France because France was a so much concerned state of the 17th century Europe, where they had gone through also lots of international vicissitudes such as the Thirty Years War (1618-48) and the Besiegement of Vienna by the Ottoman (1683). In particular, France of those days was a nation of strong Catholicism and her political elites including the Bourbons were undoubtedly Catholic, exactly like Neo-Confucian Kings and aristocrats in Joseon. Therefore, through this comparison between Neo-Confucian Joseon and France of the 17th century, this paper would discuss principally the pertinence of the Neo-Confucianism-based diplomacy to actual international relations. Finally, this paper would to talk about its legacies on Joseon elites of the late 19th century who didn’t succeed in preventing their nation from being colonized by Japan. Maybe that is the most important point of this subject.

As a result of the study on this subject, first one confirmed that the 17th century Joseon under radical Neo-Confucian aristocrats, they caused two Manchurian invasions (1627 and 1636) through the Anti-Manchurian Policy based on Neo-Confucian values. And the Northern Expedition Policy against the Qing provoked the Self-Isolation of Joseon which brought no national interests to Joseon people and their future. Second, one confirmed that the 17th century France under political elites of Catholic conviction contributed to the establishment of the hegemony of France on Europe through standing on the Protestant side against Catholic powers. And France of Louis XIV continued the Pro-Ottoman Policy during the Besiegement of Vienna, in order to consolidate her eastern territory on the Rhine. Third, the Neo-Confucian-based diplomacy influenced the 19th century Joseon, making it continue inflexible and passive external policies vis-à-vis foreign colonial ambitions which were unprecedented at that time. In conclusion, one confirmed that Joseon Neo-Confucian elites and their
external policies were insane and irresponsible concerning disastrous consequences to the Korean nation. And there could be no pretext for this Neo-Confucianism-based diplomacy, considering the national interest-based diplomacy of French Catholic elites against their religious ideals and the pragmatic diplomacy of the former dynasty Goryeo (918-1392) between great powers.

**Introduction**

As you see, Korea is well known for its Confucian culture and tradition. For the last five centuries, this East Asian nation had been highly imbued with Confucianism. As Catholicism was so dominant in medieval Europe, Neo-Confucianism became the only ideology of Joseon. In particular, since radical Neo-Confucian aristocrats came to power in the early 17th century, Joseon external policies were also pushed to correspond to Neo-Confucian ideals. Precisely, Joseon had to jump on the bandwagon between Ming China (1368-1644) and Qing dynasty (1636-1912). Here, we have an important problematic on if this Neo-Confucian Joseon’s diplomacy is worthy to be estimated as right and ineluctable in history. Concretely, the key question is this Neo-Confucianism-based diplomacy was really a reasonable or inevitable decision? And how should we evaluate this nowadays in terms of promotion of Koreanology to the world? Perhaps, it would be interesting to study this unique case in terms of the world diplomatic history. In order to do that, this paper suggests France of the 17th century as barometer of this comparative study. Actually, France was at that time so concerned by international mutations of Europe, that she is sufficiently pertinent to be compared with Joseon of those days. As Joseon was menaced by the regional hegemonic change from Ming dynasty to Qing dynasty, France had faced also huge international vicissitudes such as the Thirty Years War (1618-48) and clashes with the Habsburg and Spain. Furthermore, Europe of those days was endangered by
the Ottoman invasion to Vienna (1683) to destroy the entire Christian civilization. And this paper would show and compare reactions and external policies of French and Joseon political elites in those international crises. Through that, we could evaluate objectively the Neo-Confucian aristocrats of Joseon in the world diplomatic history. Finally, this paper would discuss about legacies and influences of this Neo-Confucianism-based diplomacy on political elites of the 19th century Joseon facing more serious international issues. Probably, the consolidation of Neo-Confucianism-based diplomacy could give a certain impact on Joseon inabilities to resist to the colonial ambition of Japan.

I. The Analysis of the External Policies of Neo-Confucian Joseon

i. The International Situation of the 17th Century in East Asia

1. The Decline of Ming dynasty and Rise of the Manchurian

Since the early 17th century, Ming dynasty was also much damaged because they dispended extravagant war costs to save its vassal state from Japan. Since military dispenses had already increased because of fighting the Mongols and supressing internal revolts, the intervention of Ming China to push back the Japanese from Joseon deteriorated its financial situation. Henceforth, the Ming began to decline more rapidly. It means that the Han Chinese were not sure any more to secure the Sinocentric world order in East Asia against another challenger. That would bring a big confusion to the international situation of East Asia. This happened in East Asia at the beginning of the 17th century. That’s to say, the Manchurian, who were controlled by Ming dynasty for a long time began to rise so fast, benefiting from this unexpected vacuum of power. Especially, the Manchurian became a new big power in East Asia under an ambitious man called “Nurhaci” (1559-1626). During Ming China could not intervene in Manchurian affaires, he achieved the unification of scattered Manchurian tribes. Hence, he could found the second Manchurian dynasty in 1616 called “Later Jin”
(1616-1636). Of course, the new empire of Nurhaci was not at that time sufficiently strong to vanquish Ming China. But all Manchurians were highly skilled nomadic warriors. It means that they are not inferior to Ming China in terms of military abilities. For this reason, the Ming Emperor Wanli (1572-1620) decided to wipe out this danger of Manchuria despite reduced capacities of his empire. In response to that, Nurhaci began to eliminate Ming influences from all Manchuria by military actions.

2. The Manchurian as Conquerors of China and New Regional Hegemon

In contrast to Ming dynasty, Later Jin was much more stabilized domestically. At last in 1619, the Ming and Manchurian armies collided with each other in Sarhu of Western Manchuria. And Joseon sent some troops there to help the Ming.\(^{100}\) But it was Nurhaci’s army which won the battle. Since this defeat, Ming China lost the control of Manchuria and had to be defensive toward Manchurian military attacks.\(^{101}\) At the same time, they proclaimed the foundation of Qing dynasty in 1636. Before that, they subdued also the Mongols. Henceforth, Ming dynasty was remarkably stalemated. In the end, Beijing was fallen by the peasant rebels under Li Zicheng (1606-45) in 1644. The last Emperor of Ming dynasty\(^{102}\) committed a suicide. That was the end of Ming dynasty. Finally, it was for the Qing to establish a new world order of East Asia instead of the Han Chinese. However, it’s true that there were still Anti-Qing resistances of Ming Chinese people during the second half of the 17\(^{\text{th}}\) century. In the end, all these resistances were eliminated in the late 17\(^{\text{th}}\) century under the leadership of the 4\(^{\text{th}}\) Qing Emperor Kangxi (1661-1722) who has been respected as one of the greatest

\(^{100}\) The Ming forced the Joseon court to help them against Nurhaci, reminding of the fact that they saved Joseon from Japan 20 years ago. Finally, Joseon sent 1,5000 men to Sarhu.

\(^{101}\) P.245, Timothy Brook, The troubled Empire China in the Yuan and Ming Dynasties, Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Pr., 2010.

\(^{102}\) Emperor Chongzhen (1627-1644).
Emperors in the history of China. With this brilliant Emperor, the Qing domination of China became irreversible.

ii. The External Policies of the 17th Century Joseon.

1. The Anti-Manchurian Policy

As first reaction to the rise of Qing dynasty, Joseon sought the Anti-Manchurian policy. That’s to say, they maintained a closer relationship with Ming dynasty. And they became more hostile vis-à-vis the Manchurian without making any diplomatic channel. At the same time, this policy is the reflection of their Neo-Confucianism-based view of the world. In fact, Joseon people had despised not only the Manchurian but also the Japanese by this racist view of the world. Meanwhile, they had admired Ming dynasty and made profound diplomatic ties with the former. Because of that, Joseon Neo-Confucian elites decided to still treat the Manchurian as dirty barbarians in spite of their powerful soaring. However, the biggest factor for this decision is the total inflexibility of Joseon Neo-Confucian elites. Concretely, they were sincerely convinced of Neo-Confucian values they thought to be absolute ideals of the world. In addition, they underlined the fact that Ming China helped and saved Joseon endangered by Japan. And they told to do the same for Ming dynasty even if Joseon would be fallen. In other words, Joseon Neo-Confucian aristocrats wanted to apply this moral logic to the political reality, even to international relations which were definitively anarchic.

2. The Northern Expedition Policy

Second, Joseon Neo-Confucian elites proclaimed domestically the Northern Expedition Policy, which means to punish Qing barbarians who invaded Joseon and finally conquered Ming China. This policy began under King Hyojong (1649-59) who was taken prisoner of the Qing. But
differently from the Anti-Manchurian Policy, Joseon could not proclaim it as official because at that
time Joseon was definitively submitted after the Second Qing Invasion into Joseon in 1636. However,
King Hyojong and his domestic political supporters launched this risky policy without Qing’s
knowing, reinforcing the military power of Joseon. Even though this policy was not sure to succeed,
that was openly advocated also by most Neo-Confucian elites. There are two reasons for that. Above
all, they could never recognize the Manchurian conquest of China ideologically. Because of that, they
needed another Anti-Manchurian Policy to justify keeping political power and Neo-Confucian
convictions. It means that Joseon was submitted apparently to the Qing Emperor, but there was no
close relationship and interchange between them as those between Joseon and Ming dynasty.103

iii. The Consequences of the External Policies of the 17th Century Joseon

1. The Two Manchurian Invasions

Joseon under King Injo was much more active to make things in favour of the Ming. This
stimulated especially the Manchurian, so that they planned to subdue this Anti-Manchurian Joseon.
At last in 1627, Later Jin invaded Joseon with the cause to restore the dethroned King Gwanghaegun.
The Manchurian army was clearly superior to the Joseon army and the Manchurian devastated the
Northwest region of Joseon in a short time. Fortunately, the Manchurian demanded armistice to King
Injo. Despite this armistice, Joseon didn’t change its Anti-Manchurian Policy. King Injo and Neo-
Confucian aristocrats pursued continually to be attached to the suzerainty of the Ming. And they did
not make serious efforts to reinforce military defence against a second Manchurian invasion. They
still despised the Manchurian as barbarian nation. For example, the Qing Emperor Hung Taiji (1592-
1643) demanded that Joseon accept it as suzerain empire with an embassy in 1636. But the Joseon

regime ignored and refused that. Especially, King Injo did not receive the Qing embassy who brought the official letter of the Qing Emperor.\textsuperscript{104} That caused finally the Second Manchurian Invasion to Joseon. In December 1636, the Qing Emperor led the army with 100,000 men to Joseon and broke the defence of the Joseon army easily. Even if King Injo resisted at the mountain fortress of Namhan near Seoul for 40 days, but he surrendered finally to the Qing Emperor in January 1637. Through this surrender, Joseon promised to break the tributary relationship with the Ming and to serve the Qing as new suzerain state. As symbol of that, King Injo made “kowtow”\textsuperscript{105} in front of the Qing Emperor.

2. The Self-Isolation of Joseon

In spite of the tragedy of 1637, Neo-Confucian aristocrats of Joseon didn’t have any sincere intention to acknowledge the suzerainty of Qing dynasty on them. They were just nominally submitted to the Qing Emperor, because they turned out to be incapable to overcome the military superiority of the Qing. Nevertheless, they remained the same even after the end of Ming dynasty in 1644. Consequently, this led Joseon to the Self-Isolation with the conviction that Joseon is now “little China” instead of Ming dynasty destroyed by the barbarians from Manchuria. Henceforth Joseon didn’t seek serious political and cultural interactions with Qing dynasty, except annual diplomatic ceremonies. This self-consolation to deny the reality and responsibilities for the national humiliation never helped Joseon to improve itself and to benefit from extraordinary cultural developments in Qing China. For Neo-Confucian elites of Joseon, the Manchurian were merely barbarians from whom there is nothing to learn. In this extreme hatred against the Qing, Joseon remained only a hermit and calm nation of the Far East until the arrival of Western colonial powers in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century.

\textbf{II. The Analysis of the External Policies of the 17\textsuperscript{th} Century France}

\textsuperscript{105} This is an imperative ceremony to meet the Emperor. Concretely, they must kneel three time and each time for that, they must hit the bottom with the forehead three times.
i. The International Situation of the 17th Century Europe

1. The Thirty Years War (1618-48)

Like in East Asia, Europe had also experienced international turbulences during the 17th century. These began because of religious conflicts which became finally political and military questions. That continued in the 17th century. Even if Europeans were at that time in a remarkable progress with early capitalistic dynamics fuelled by the advancement into new Continents, they were also suffering from religious conflicts that made themselves kill each other. In the 17th century, Europe was clearly divided in two political spectrums based on each religious faith: Protestant league and Catholic league. Henceforth, domestic religious civil wars became a European-scale war that would culminate in the Thirty Years War (1618-48). During these 30 years, a series of carnages had taken place. More this war was escalated, more European powers such as Poland and Denmark joined those carnages. At last in 1648, the European powers including France concluded the Treaty of Westphalia to end this religious war.

2. The Ottoman Expansion to Europe

After the end of the Thirty Years War, a fatal threat arrived from the East. That is the Ottoman which planned to conquer all Europe before long. Actually, In the 17th century, the Turks wanted to use the situation that Europa was exhausted by religious wars. Accordingly, they launched an expedition to Europe again in order to submit completely it. That was also about expanding Islam to the European Christianity. At last in 1683, the Ottoman invaded Europe and besieged Vienna like in 1529. Though the Habsburg were a hegemonic power of Europe, but they were not able to fight alone against the Turks. And other European countries were so anxious of that situation. If Vienna falls,
they would be endangered soon by the Ottoman invaders. Because of that, the Vatican called other
European monarchies to help the Habsburg against Islam. Finally, some of them came to save Vienna.

ii. The External Policies of the 17th Century France

1. Standing on the Protestant Side

First, France decided to stand on the Protestant side concerning the Thirty Years War. So to
speak, France joined the Protestant league against the Catholic league led by the Habsburg and Spain.
In fact, this is so surprising and unthinkable, if we consider the religion of France. Despite that, these
French elites decided to fight against the Catholic monarchies, even if that would be also against the
Vatican. In fact, France made this surprising decision for two reasons. Above all, France needed to
prevent her traditional rival the Habsburg from strengthening their hegemony not only on the Holy
Roman Empire, but also on Europe. Thus, the French saw that the Habsburg became triumphal against
Protestant powers after the Swedish defeat in Nördlingen.\textsuperscript{106} Although the Habsburg and Spain were
on the same side with France in terms of religion, it would be probable that these Catholic powers
would consolidate their hegemonic position on the European continent. That would not be positive
to France of the Bourbons wishing to be a hegemon of Europe. But because the Habsburg and Spain
were the most powerful in Europe at that time, France didn’t enter the war with them from the
beginning. Instead, the French concluded a treaty with Guillaume V de Hessel-Cassel (1602-37) to
subsidize his army with 10,000 men against the Habsburg.\textsuperscript{107} And France supported the Dutch who

\textsuperscript{106} P.625, Ulrich Menzel, Die Ordnung der Welt: Imperium oder Hegemonie in der Hierarchie der Staatenwelt, Berlin: Suhrkamp Verlag, 2015.
were also fighting against Spain. At the same time, she supported also the Catalan Revolt (1640-59).\textsuperscript{108} In the end, France assumed the leadership of Inner-Catholic opposition to the Habsburg.\textsuperscript{109}

2. The Pro-Ottoman Policy

Second, France chose the Pro-Ottoman Policy. That is also unexplainable by her religious and civilizational identity, because the Ottoman had been a common threat to entire Europe since 1453. In the second half of the 17th century, it was Louis XIV (1643-1715) who governed France. But he succeeded to national interest-based external policies of Richelieu and Mazarin. Although France was one of the most active monarchies to participate in the Crusades Wars, but she was not interested in leading a Pan-European coalition against the Turks. Finally, Louis XIV sent no army to save Europe from the Ottoman invaders in 1683. But it doesn’t mean that he kept neutrality between Vienna and the Turks. Surprisingly, he was trying to make a friendly relationship with the Ottoman. For instance, he already sent an ambassador\textsuperscript{110} to Istanbul to communicate with the Sultan. As in Joseon Korea they opposed to be close to the Manchurian, there were also opposition people to this Pro-Ottoman Policy of Louis XIV, because also in France there was a strong feeling of Pan-European and Christian solidarity against Islam during the Besiegement of Vienna. In practice, some of the French elites such Prince de Conti and Abbé de Savoie tried to go to Vienna to help the Austrian pushing back the Islamic invaders. Nevertheless, Louis XIV made his ambassador Gabriel de Guilleragues in Istanbul say to the Sultan that it was not from his will.\textsuperscript{111}

iii. The Consequences of the External Policies of the 17th Century France

\textsuperscript{108} P.249, Hans Jürgen Goertz, Deutschland 1500-1648, Paderborn: Schöningh, 2004.
\textsuperscript{109} P.250, Hans Jürgen Goertz, Deutschland 1500-1648, Paderborn: Schöningh, 2004.
\textsuperscript{110} Gabriel de Guilleragues (1628-85).
1. France as Key Power in the Westphalian System

First, as a result of the alliance with Protestant powers in the Thirty Years War, France ended this was to the profit of herself. After the victory on Spain in Rocroi of 1643, France took the control of the war. And thanks to sustainable assistances from France, the Swedish gave the Habsburg a crucial defeat in Jankau 1645. Accordingly, the Catholic league was pushed to make peace with the Protestant powers. In 1648, all belligerent powers reached the Westphalian Peace Treaty to cease all hostilities against each other. By this treaty, they confirmed the independence of the Netherlands and equal sovereignty of each states. This incident was so much important in the history of Europe, because that was the start of modern international relations Hugo Grotius (1583-1645) had dreamed of. Especially, France got the key position to guarantee this new international system of Europe with Sweden. Henceforth, the weight of France in Europe became much heavier than ever. Meanwhile, Spain and the Habsburg had to renounce the ambition of universal monarchy in Europe which would be replaced by the nation-state system.

2. The Consolidation of the Eastern Borders on the Rhine

Second, France completed her eastern borders until the Rhine during the Besiegement of Vienna by the Ottomans. Actually, France was interested in eastern regions like Alsace and Lorraine before long. Fortunately, the Habsburg had a big problem with the Ottoman planning to conquer Vienna. Therefore, Louis XIV used well this chance. As said before, he annexed Strasbourg in 1681. In addition, he conquered Luxembourg in this period. That’s why today Alsace and Lorraine belong to France. Furthermore, the Pro-Ottoman Policy helped France to get much more advantages in

---

relations with the Turks in the 18th century than other European powers. Through this fact, it’s incontestable that like his political predecessors Richelieu and Mazarin, it was much more important for Louis XIV to seek national interests than serving religious causes.

III. The Legacies of the Neo-Confucian Diplomacy on the 19th century Joseon Diplomacy

i. The Influences of the 17th Neo-Confucian Diplomacy on the 19th Century Joseon Diplomacy

1. The Inflexibility of External Policies to New International Mutations

The 17th Neo-Confucian Joseon system had continued until the 19th century. Because of that, Joseon diplomatic elites of the 19th century were basically radical Neo-Confucians. Accordingly, they were not also free from the Sinocentric view of the world, despite the unprecedented international changes. It is obvious that Joseon Neo-Confucian elites of those days were so shocked by the Chinese defeats in the Opium Wars. But since they had been highly obsessed by the Neo-Confucian-based view of the world, their external policies for the Post Opium War period remained outdated and inflexible. So to speak, from the 1860s on, Joseon reinforced its Self-Isolation Policy and increased fear and hatred against the European who were merely barbarians according to the Sinocentric view of the world. But it’s also notable that Joseon had been already informed of Western things before long. For instance, there were already many Catholics in Joseon and some elites knew well-developed sciences of the West before the 19th century. Unfortunately, Neo-Confucian aristocrats had no intention to change their outdated view of the world. Because they were the mainstream political power in Joseon, the Korean had to be exposed to new threats from European imperialistic ambitions.

without any politico-diplomatic alternatives. Even though Joseon defended itself from French and American invasions, it did not mean a success of the Neo-Confucianism-based diplomacy. And that is proved by the fact that Neo-Confucian Joseon got more difficulties in the course of the time.

2. The Passive and Spontaneous External Policies

In fact, the Sinocentric world order had been essential in the history of East Asian international relations. In reality, this international system under the Chinese Empire functioned as guarantee of the stability of East Asia for a long time. That is so distinguished from the balance of power-based world order of the West. Especially since Ming dynasty, Joseon was much more profoundly integrated to this Sinocentric world order. At that same time, more the military dependence of Joseon on Ming China increased\(^{117}\), more Neo-Confucian elites were obsessed by the Sinocentric view of the world. The Ming military help for Joseon against the Japanese invaders in the late 16\(^{th}\) century derived theoretically from that.\(^{118}\) During the Qing era (1644-1912), the problem was the same. That’s to say, although radical Neo-Confucian elites hated the Manchurian conquerors of China, but Joseon was also a part of the Sinocentric world order under the Qing. Unfortunately, this legacy of passive diplomacy continued in the 19\(^{th}\) century Joseon. So to speak since the gradual destruction of the Sinocentric world order in the second half of the 19\(^{th}\) century, Neo-Confucian elites of Joseon didn’t seek an independent diplomacy for national interests and self-defence. After the end of the Closed-Door Policy in the 1870s, Joseon had pursued a short-sighted and passive diplomacy to involve a new hegemon into the Korean Peninsula. This deteriorated the external crisis of Joseon surrounded by foreign colonial powers.

\(^{117}\) In the Sinocentric world order, the relationship between the Emperor of China and his tributary states is theoretically that between the central government and provinces. Therefore, it’s the Emperor who is responsible for military defence of each tributary state. Accordingly, the fact that Joseon reinforces its self-defence and military power could seem to challenge this system.

\(^{118}\) Because it was a duty for the Emperor to protect the world from babarians.
Conclusion

First, we could conclude that the Joseon external policies led by radical Neo-Confucians were not pertinent for national interests. It’s because as you have seen, this Neo-Confucian diplomacy caused national disasters and brought no progress to Joseon for the next centuries. In the meantime, the French external policies under the two cardinals and Louis XIV were so successful that France won the competition with Spain and could establish her continental hegemony on Europe. The biggest difference between Joseon and France during the 17th century was only the presence of national interest and reality-oriented spirits. As said, Neo-Confucian aristocrats of Joseon were so obsessed of Neo-Confucian ideals that they could not see and analyse objectively the international mutations. In my opinion, it was Neo-Confucianism which transformed Joseon political elites in little Chinese men, as they had said it by themselves after the end of Ming China. Therefore, we could say that radical Neo-Confucian elites of Joseon were prisoners of this problematic view of the world tied with loyalty to Ming dynasty, exactly like the father-son relationship. Maybe that’s why the 19th century Joseon elites were not worthy to take responsibilities for foreign affairs. On the contrary, French elites of Catholic faith such as Richelieu and Mazarin didn’t care about their religious conviction, each time it was about national interests. Thanks to that, France rose as European hegemon thank to this highly national interest-based diplomacy.

Perhaps, someone would say that Joseon was originally a regional small power, so that it’s not simply a problem of Neo-Confucian elites. But I would reply that the former dynasty Goryeo (918-1392) made successful external policies despite of its small size. These cases show well that the failure of the Neo-Confucian diplomacy was not predestined. Here, we should remember that Goryeo
dynasty was not a Confucianism-based dynasty and every dynasty with Neo-Confucianism such as Southern Song China and Joseon Korea have not impressed people as successful ones.
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