EXAMINATION OF ONTOLOGICAL SECURITY WITHIN SECURITY STUDIES:

A CASE STUDY OF THE UKRAINE AND RUSSIA CONFLICT

ASLI İLAYDA TEZEL

Master's Thesis

Graduate School

Izmir University of Economics

Izmir

2022

EXAMINATION OF ONTOLOGICAL SECURITY WITHIN SECURITY STUDIES:

A CASE STUDY OF THE UKRAINE AND RUSSIA CONFLICT

ASLI İLAYDA TEZEL

A Thesis Submitted to

The Graduate School of Izmir University of Economics

Master Program in Political Science and International Relations

Izmir

2022

ABSTRACT

EXAMINATION OF ONTOLOGICAL SECURITY WITHIN SECURITY
STUDIES: A CASE STUDY OF THE UKRAINE AND RUSSIA CONFLICT

Tezel, Aslı İlayda

Master's Program in Political Science and International Relations

Advisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Serhun Al

July, 2022

What is the security understanding of mainstream IR theories? What is Ontological
Security? How did it emerge and how did it spread to the discipline of International
Relations? How does this new approach differ from classical understandings of
security? This thesis unpacks and discusses the Ontological Security framework in
International Relations and Security Studies in relation to more mainstream
approaches to the concept of security. By analyzing contemporary Russian –

Ukrainian conflict, this thesis emphasizes that states are also searching for Ontological Security, not only Physical Security, and explains what is different from traditional security theories. Overall, this thesis provides a holistic framework of Ontological Security and analyzes it with the recent war in Ukraine as a result of Russian invasion.

Keywords: Ontological Security, Ukraine-Russia Conflict, Anxiety in Ontological Security, Security in IR theories, Hierarchy of needs.

ÖZET

GÜVENLİK ÇALIŞMALARI İÇİNDE ONTOLOJİK GÜVENLİĞİN İNCELENMESİ: UKRAYNA-RUSYA ÇATIŞMASI ÖRNEĞİ

Tezel, Aslı İlayda

Siyaset Bilimi ve Uluslararası İlişkiler Yüksek Lisans Programı

Tez Danışmanı: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Serhun Al

Temmuz, 2022

Geleneksel yaklaşımların güvenlik anlayışı nedir? Ontolojik Güvenlik Nedir? Nasıl ortaya çıktı ve Uluslararası İlişkiler disiplinine nasıl yayıldı? Bu yeni yaklaşımın klasik güvenlik anlayışlarından farkı nedir? Bu tez, Uluslararası İlişkiler ve Güvenlik Çalışmalarındaki Ontolojik Güvenlik çerçevesini, güvenlik kavramına yönelik daha ana akım yaklaşımlarla bağlantılı olarak açmakta ve tartışmaktadır. Rusya ve Ukrayna'yı inceleyerek, aralarındaki çatışma nedeniyle kendilerini ontolojik olarak güvende hissedip hissetmediklerini incelemektir. Devletlerin sadece fiziksel

güvenliği değil, ontolojik güvenliği de aradıklarını vurgular ve geleneksel güvenlik teorilerinden farklarının ne olduğunu açıklar. Bu çalışma hem Ontolojik Güvenliği açıklamayı hedeflemektedir hem de Ukrayna - Rusya çatışmasını güvenlik kavramları çerçevesinde bir örnek olarak değerlendirmeye çalışmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Ontolojik Güvenlik, Ukrayna-Rusya Çatışması, Ontolojik güvenlikte kaygı, Uluslararası ilişkiler teorilerinde güvenlik, İhtiyaçlar hiyerarşisi.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

EU: European Union

IR: International Relations

NATO: North Atlantic Treaty Organization

OS: Ontological Security

SU: the Soviet Union

US: United States

USA: United States of America

USSR: the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The main purpose of this study is to examine the Ukraine-Russia conflict through Ontological Security (OS) to show that Ontological Security paradigm explains this case study better than other theories. Before that, the subject to be investigated in this thesis is what Ontological Security is and where it fits among other security approaches. It tries to explain whether states are ontologically secure or not through a case study. Security has always been a difficult concept to define. It is a concept that each approach understands within its own framework. The first chapter mentions how the theories of International Relations have looked at security throughout history and how they have affected the lives of individuals and countries. The views of the old articles were blended with the new comments and arranged as what the security was and what happens afterward. For a better understanding, its features have been classified and tried to be placed according to their approaches to security.

Many cases and issues cannot be interpreted with traditional security approaches. Their perspective on security remains incomplete as times and threats change. Since ontological security provides a perspective beyond physical security, a broader evaluation can be made. In the second part, Ontological Security, which is one of the new generation security understandings, was tried to be defined, and the differences between the old security definitions and their approaches to issues were revealed by taking examples from the authors working on this subject. Questions such as 'How to provide Ontological Security?' and 'How insecurity occurs?' were also examined based on authors, and both their psychological, sociological, and historical backgrounds were tried to be discussed. The psychological effects cannot be ignored when it comes to the security of the self. Although Ontological Security, which is included as a security subject in International Relations, attracts the attention of many people, it has only begun to be heard in Turkey. An attempt was made to synthesize from well-known security perceptions to lesser-known security understanding. I thought that it would be more accurate to switch from previous security understandings to ontological security in order to initiate the processing of different topics within the framework of the OS.

As for the last chapter, the Russian-Ukrainian conflict, which is a current issue in which the previously described theoretical contents can be interpreted, is discussed. Information about the historical background of both Russia and Ukraine has been given and the reason for the conflict has been tried to be interpreted in the light of these. In the current situation, it was examined whether Ukraine and Russia felt safe ontologically and although the thesis was based on the articles, personal comments were also included. The Russian-Ukrainian conflict, which is a current event, had to be evaluated specifically in this regard. I thought it would be right to convey whether the two states felt ontologically secure by reflecting their background before the conflict. The trouble between the two countries of common origin has affected them both as a country and as citizens. The factors that are important in the construction of security were tried to be evaluated towards the end. The feeling of being safe is easily lost, and as is mentioned in the rest of the thesis, anxiety causes it. There are things that need to be done in order to return to the old sense of security. As it is still a developing subject, it is open to different research and analysis. We can interpret many events happening around us within the framework of ontological security. It can also pave the way for new research, as we can examine the process of rebuilding safety when the Ukraine-Russia conflict is over.

1.1. Methodology

This thesis attempts to answer the following main question: Which security theory can better explain the Ukraine-Russia conflict? There are some points that the approaches mentioned in the first part of the thesis fail to address in different state behaviors. Since these approaches are insufficient to answer some questions, they have led to the emergence of new security understandings. It was more accurate to use the qualitative method while conducting research and to gather information by scanning academic articles, journals and other written documents from reliable databases and libraries. It is a study on International Relations theories as concepts and definitions are examined more in the beginning. So it can be said that the analysis is content-based. There are plenty of written and verbal documents in general about security but these are based on mostly conventional security, since Ontological Security is not well known in Turkey, it has been tried to be examined in detail to contribute to the literature. It has the purpose of providing a transition with

the traditional security theories covered in the first chapter. Traditional approaches cannot meet the answers of every question when there is a breaking point or unexpected situation, and ontological security deals with these instant problems. States are not really different from humans; they also have intentions, interests and their aim is to survive by providing their needs. In the end, states are human entities and they are ruling by human beings. With the emergence of Ontological Security Theory, some people have tried to explain state behavior from a broader perspective. Laing and Giddens claimed that, an individual needs a stable and enduring self. And this self can be established through routines and their self-narratives. If unexpected situations occur in human's life people will get stressed and will not be able to think as well as before. For the state level; states also have routines and need routines to be safe. When there are breaking points in International Relations like wars, global health problems, or terror; such alarms can create anxiety and uncertainty about the future. To live in peace for a long time, states need to force themselves to stay in the same direction and act more or less the same way based on their self-narratives. These similarities between human and state have led to further examination of the effects of human psychology on state behavior. When it comes to level analysis, it is on the basis of both the state and the leader. When it comes to level analysis, it is on the basis of both the state and the leader, because leaders are decision-making mechanisms like states in general. Since the Ukraine-Russia conflict in the last chapter cannot be explained with traditional security approaches, it has been examined both on the basis of state and individual within the framework of ontological security. It is sometimes referred as Russia, or referred as Putin and vice-versa Ukraine and Zelenskyy as well. Important events that may be the cause of the current situation are mentioned without diving into the historical past too much. Thus, the context of cause and effect due to war between countries was tried to be established more easily. Looking at this conflict from the perspective of Ontological Security remains based on interpretation as it has not been addressed before and cannot contain numerical data.

CHAPTER 2: HISTORICAL ROOTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS (IR) THEORIES AND THEIR UNDERSTANDINGS ON THE SUBJECT OF SECURITY.

This chapter aims to explain the perspectives of International Relations (IR) theories toward security in detail. It deals with the historical background of security and its change over time rather than current debates. Therefore, the references are older in this chapter than in the rest of the thesis. By explaining traditional security, this chapter discusses where ontological security belongs and which International Relations (IR) approach it stands closer to. In order to see where ontological security fits in the literature, it was thought that it would be more accurate to examine the Security and IR theories as if they were explained to those who have never heard of them. The evolution of the concept was tried to be evaluated with its strengths and weaknesses with comprehensive analyzes. Conceptual discussions were examined before going into the main subject which is Ontological Security.

2.1. Explaining the differences between Idealism and Materialism

In the history of International Relations, there have been discussions called the Great Debates. The first debate was between Idealism and Materialism from World War One to Post-World War Two. The second was in the Cold War period 1940 – 1950 between Behaviorism and Traditionalism. Neo - Neo debate was the third one between Neorealism and Neoliberalism in 1960 – 1970. The last one begins from the 1960s until the end of the cold war 1990s among Positivists and Post-positivists. The first debate is the basis of almost every philosophical discussion. It is a basic discussion on thoughts and reality and Politzer tries to explain this debate. People observe and classify things to understand the world better. On one hand, there are material things that can be seen and touched, on the other hand, there are ideal things that cannot be touched, measured like ideas (Politzer, 1950). Reality is created by our minds according to idealism. Everything exists in our brain and there is no independent external world or outside reality. First, people have ideas that create the outside world. And the ideas are just reflections of the things. All of the things do exist only in their minds. Besides all of these, materialists believe that the outside world, which includes things or beings, creates our ideas. Idealists do not deny the existence of things; they also believe things exist but only within us and do not have any substance outside the mind (Berkeley, 2004). For materialism, things come first,

and then the ideas emerge. It means the world or matter produces the mind. Matter does not need a mind to exist, but the mind itself is the highest product of matter (Friedrich, 1886). Which one is true is an ongoing question and unfortunately, there is no right answer. That's why theories have their alignment on the line and find their place accordingly.

2.2. Classification of the International Relations Theories

In International relations, there are several theories, approaches, and ideas. Sometimes finding a place for new theories is hard while categorizing these into debates that have already been put in the literature. It is difficult to classify the contents as the extensions of the discussions also touch upon different areas. If there is a straight line that covers all theories, it should be easier to categorize them in the mind. There has to be Idealism at the left and Materialism at the right end of the continuum. Then others can find their place in between based on their ontology and epistemology. The ways in which theories explain events are shaped by the point of view they are close to. After analyzing what ontological security is, it is necessary to decide where it fits among other theories and approaches in order to understand and interpret it. It should be noted that all the theories have a different understanding of security, structure, relationships, and power; there is no single simple definition. Concepts should be considered and evaluated within the theory itself.

The origins and formations of words and concepts have a very important place in defining words. Knowing where a word comes from and how it emerges makes commenting on verbal matters more settled. For this reason, the etymology of the words is especially important in international relations when dealing with verbal issues, a word has the capacity to change the whole process as witnessed in history. That is why speeches, rhetoric, or the language in the agreements have always had a significant place. After understanding the use of words, subjects can be evaluated in a more meaningful framework.

2.3. Etymology of Ontology

Ontology is a compound word; onto and -logy. Like some Greek words, it is a combination of two words to form a single new word (Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, 2022). Genitive case of words; Ontos means "a being, individual; being, existence" and Logos also has different meanings such as "word, a speaking; the act

and capacity to speak up; narrative, discourse; science, treatise, theory; law". When these two words are combined, it becomes in the manner that "the study of being, the science of being" (Douglas, 2022a). Not only for this word, but also all the words ending with "logos, logy, and logia" mean the science of something or the teaching of something. Examples of uses for this explanation are as follows: Apology (a speech in defense), Etymology (study of the true sense/ of a word), Epistemology (theory of knowledge), Iconology (study of icons), Philology (love of learning) can be given.

2.4. *Etymology of Security*

Secure is another compound word; se and cura in Latin. Se means "free from something" and Cura means to care. Latin words Securus and Securitas create a meaning "free from care" (Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, 2022). The roots of the "Security" are based on these words. It means the "condition of being secure". In English, the word is used for "free from danger, freedom from fear or anxiety"(Douglas, 2022b). Researchers have made different definitions on this subject but Ontological security can be interpreted simply as the security of being. Most of the definitions are continuation or complement of each other; therefore, the security of the existence and the security of the essence or being have been not only included in the field of international relations but also different subjects as well.

2.5. *Is Security a requirement?*

In 1943 Maslow drew a pyramid that shows the hierarchy of needs, as a living being, everyone has some needs and people are motivated by the hierarchy of these needs (Maslow, 1943). At the bottom, there are basic needs and at the top, there are high-level ones. An individual should be satisfied with the needs of the lowest part to step up to another level. The most basic need is for physical survival called physiological needs. They are the biological needs of an individual. This includes air, water, food, shelter, sleep, clothing, reproduction, etc. These should be satisfied for the human to function well. This very first level can be adapted to the state. To become a state there should be; defined territory, government, and permanent population based on international law and norms. These three elements must be provided to function well for a state. The next level is safety-related needs. People need order and predictability in their lives. Basically, there should be no fear, and there should be health safety, financial welfare, well-being, property, clear law, and

order. It also includes protection from violence. These can be satisfied either by the state, society, or even the smallest unit of the society; the family. For this position states mainly focused on military security, because they thought protecting borders are essential for their independence and survival. Only with that way they believe they can continue to exist. After that, there is a social level; love and belongingness needs that are related to human interaction. Both emotional and physical intimacy is necessary. It requires being a part of a group, interpersonal relationships, friendships, and family bonds and connections with others on the basis of trust, intimacy, affection, and love. When considering it for states as being a part of an organization can help them to feel belonged. Belonging feelings and getting support create a safe environment for states. These organizations that became a part can be for economic, environmental, or political issues. Trust can grow due to healthy relationships among states. Citizens also feel secure with the strong bond created by their state with another state. Esteem needs are one step higher and they are based on an ego of the self. Esteem brings self-respect which is a belief for a human herself or himself is valuable. According to Maslow (McLeod, 2018), self-esteem has two types; one is based on others and a person expects the outside world to get respect and approval. And the other one is based on a person's evaluation of himself. Independency and self-confidence arise for this second type of self-esteem needs. States' pursuit of status and prestige is an example of this. States have a desire to introduce themselves for gaining a reputation (Emiroğlu, 2021). And they ask the other states to accept them to feel more strength. Especially for the first type of esteem states generally hope for accomplishments from others; if they can gain others' respect, they start to feel freer and more powerful. For this reason, they try to gain firstly recognition and then gain respect from other states and maintain a reputation that they built over time in the outside world. The highest level of the pyramid has self-actualization needs. That is on the top in Maslow's hierarch. It refers to the potential of a person that needs to be seeking personal realization. It is also known as self-fulfillment needs because a person's skills, potential, experiences are included. The individual may choose to express him or herself athletically by developing in sports, artistically using creativity, or perhaps academically by educating. Just like individuals all states also try to realize themselves and use their potential to act accordingly. Knowing their capacities for states is very effective in predicting what they can do. For example, the USA has one of the biggest economies in the world and does not

hesitate to use it as a tool to gain power. Japan puts itself on the ground technologically and tries to fulfill its own potential as a state.

According to McSweeney, arranging the human needs in a psychological, biological, social, cultural way is based on an intangible hierarchy. With any empirical observation is not possible to decide which of human needs is primary (McSweeney, 1999). Maslow's pyramid is a generalized version for that time and solid but it is also undeniable that the hierarchy is left to the individual preferences of people in itself. The order of these needs is not strict; it can change due to external conditions or internal differences. Sorting itself can change within the needs. Sleeping, which is one of the physiological and vital needs may be more important to a person than eating. Furthermore, sorting also can change among the needs. Being respected, one of the esteem needs may be more important to a person than making friends and bonding in love and belongingness need.

Although the arrangements change, the need for security never goes away. Every theory has a different understanding of being secure. The points they focus on and the secure environment they try to provide also differ. As mentioned above, the second most important need is safety and protection. The first definition that comes to mind when thinking about being safe is mostly considered as an individual's body should be free from external threats. Buzan defines security as the pursuit of freedom from being away from threat (Buzan, 2007). Wolfers divided security into two; first, he defines it in an objective manner as in the absence of threats to one's acquired values, and in a subjective manner as the absence of fear that these values might be attacked (Wolfers, 1952).

According to Ullman, we may not be able to understand how important security is, without the threat of losing the elements we define it. That is why security is defined through threats and its importance is understood (Ullman, 1983). First, a threat is identified or threats that cause insecurity are detected, and then the absence of these threats is considered as security. So security is usually defined by its negative status. David Baldwin tried to identify threats to security by using questions such as Security for whom/what? These questions aimed to find the subject, whose existence is threatened? After the Cold War, new security subjects emerged. The understanding of security included different groups and organizations. Security

against which threats: Threats are always changing over time, and the definition evolved to provide security with freedoms rather than restrictions. For example, food and water security became important because the drought was not an issue before but it is a threat now. Security by which means: These can be military vehicles, economic and political measures. It may also change depending on the situation. Security for which values: It was only about the military issues before but; economic, environmental, individual, and cyber also emerged as a security problem that needs to be solved. For how long: Security should be up to the point where security is ensured (Baldwin, 1997).

2.6. Realism and its understanding of security

Thomas Hobbes defines the state of nature as wild and cruel before the establishment of sovereign states. Scarcity of resources causes competition and the struggle for the protection of what has already been gained creates an insecure arena. Dealing with these conditions is only possible by giving up man's absolute freedom, only in that way a man can get rid of this insecure environment. People need a unitary state and centralized power (Hobbes, 2008). Machiavelli tells the state administrators about which policies will be possible to obtain and protect national interests. He also gives some advice on how leaders should act in power struggles because he believes there are deceptions in state relations (Machiavelli, 1998). According to the most primitive theory of international relations, the main actor is the state. It can be said that states are responsible for ensuring the security of individuals, nations, and societies living within their borders. In other words, states need decision-makers or leaders in terms of security. For Realists, power is both aim and means. It is necessary to survive in an anarchic system; it is a system that has no higher authority above states. There is no institution to provide checks and balances. It means there is no arbitrator, no 911 for the international arena (Walt, 2014), no control mechanism hence there is a self-help system that forces states to protect themselves. Every state must take care of itself because no one will do that for them. Hobbes claimed human nature is competitive, selfish, and not collaborative. Thus, Realists also do not believe cooperation is possible to sustain for a long time. They see the situation as zero-sum game. There is no trust in anyone for Realists; states can only establish temporary alliances and coalitions or can sign treaties to get benefits from each other. These non-permanent relations can live as long as they are

useful to states entering into such arrangements. Lack of information, fear of the unpredictability of the future, and no transparency create failures in cooperation. For this reason, states strive to be stronger against other states by constantly increasing their power. Power is a reflex to be secure, power is an end for Realists (Morgenthau, 2018).

Since there is no absolute power, even hegemon states were challenged in history. According to this understanding, power will never be enough. Balance of power is a key to removing uncertainty and providing stability in international relations; it emerges from power struggles and capacities (Morgenthau, 2018). To have peace, there must be equilibrium between states. When the balance is broken, the perception of threat emerges and the state tries to balance the other state that disrupts the balance by its own power or joining forces with similar states. Finding new ways to keep itself safe can be increasing military capability and it has the possibility to lead to security dilemma (Herz, 1951). When some states increase their power and become a threat to the survival of other states, others start to feel they are losing their relative power because the more military capability means the more possibility to attack. This situation causes perpetual security competition because Realists believe it is zero-sum world; every state cannot win at the same time. Dilemma itself can turn into an arms race and decreases security in the international area. The main actor is the state which is why the concept of security is also state-oriented. The state is at the center of all issues. The problem here is the state should be both the subject and the object of security. The state should provide security by being a subject and needs to be secured by being an object. They believe security is a concept that can only be provided by military power. Since the main goal is to survive and maintain territorial integrity; it is obvious that if a state does not continue to survive, it cannot pursue other goals like low politics. Protecting human rights or prosperity are the secondary issues to deal with.

There is no big difference between Classical Realism and Structural Realism which is also known as Neorealism. Structural Realists try to understand how an international system is shaped; that is the reason why they are deductive because they concentrate mostly on the structure rather than units to explain the state's behaviors. The main actor is again the state that seeks power and aims to preserve national interests. Struggle for survival is permanent because there is no central authority and

anarchic world order cannot be overcome. They also think that anarchy is an unchanging condition and it is the reason for wars and insecurity of the environment. Unlike Classical Realists, they believe it is because of the system not the human nature. Main difference between them is Neorealism sees power as a tool to be used when necessary, and not both a means and a goal like Classical Realists. But the architecture of the international system forces states to pursue power to survive. There is no guarantee that country A will not attack country B. So the B should protect itself, which is called a self-help system. That is why states should be powerful to survive, to guarantee that the A cannot dare to attack others. For an Offensive Realist like Mearsheimer, states look for opportunities to gain an advantage. Becoming a hegemon would be great for a state to guarantee its survival. If a state cannot be the global hegemon, at least it should try to be the regional hegemonic power. Mearsheimer believes, unless you become a hegemon power, you will never feel secure. The anarchic structure encourages states to maximize their power that is why states should gain as much power as possible (Mearsheimer, 2001). Waltz mentioned in his book,

"I defined domestic political structures first by the principle according to which they are organized or ordered, second by the differentiation of units and the specification of their functions, and third by the distribution of capabilities across units. Let us see how the three terms of the definition apply to international politics" (Waltz, 1979, p.88).

Basically, states are considered equal to each other because there is no superior authority above them. There is also no hierarchical order. There are no laws to regulate. That is the reason that states' place in the international system is determined by their respective power. Since the power of the states is not evenly distributed, capacity differences should be the decisive element (Waltz, 1979). According to the Defensive Realists, the bipolar world order can be more peaceful than the multipolar one because there was no direct military confrontation during cold-war. Bipolarity is less war prone and creates stable living standards for all states. States tend to maintain the status quo and this can deter wars. States should not try to maximize their power but instead protect the current situation to maintain their position. He examines how much power is enough and says; the system punishes the states if they attempt to gain too much power. States should limit their

hunger for gaining more power otherwise they are threatening their own survival (Waltz, 1979). The system tries to balance the aggressive or offensive states by convincing other states to come together to stop them. Nazi Germany or Japan under the fascist regime would be examples. An appropriate amount of power should be enough to be secure. Additionally, being offensive is costly. For states, seeking power and maximizing their military capability need more economic powers. Realists are criticized for ignoring non-state actors by adopting state-centrism. Due to rational choice theory which believes states are rational actors like individuals and have interests, they do not pay attention to culture and identity; because for Realists every state behaves similarly under similar pressures, and states know their demands and act according to them. They disregard domestic politics, only deal with the power distribution in the international system. Realists are strict that security is equal to power and do not believe in changing but different states may act differently and their perspectives can shape.

2.7. Liberalism and its understanding of security

Liberals believe in progressive human nature so humans can improve themselves because they are rational and they have the ability to use their logic. State behavior can be associated with human behavior that is the reason they are focusing on the individual and analyzing the part to understand the whole. Liberal international order tries to put a solution to conflict resolutions. With the impact of globalization, interactions of states increased with multiple networks of communication and trades among states have caused economic interdependence (Rothschild, 1995). Like Realists, Liberals also accept that there is an anarchical structure and the lack of a higher authority creates an unsafe environment. Unlike Realists, they think anarchy is not constant and can be overcome because human nature may be self-interested too but it does not mean that they cannot create cooperation. That's why anarchy itself pushes states to cooperate; Neoliberals say the anarchic system needs cooperation. The main actor is not only the states as Realists claim, but for them the individuals, non-state actors, and the international organizations are also included. Especially these organizations enhance cooperation and play a significant role in solidarity (Ikenberry, 2020). These actors focus on their absolute gain rather than on relative gain. For Realists their gain should be higher compared to others, otherwise, they tend to end cooperation. Liberals mostly focus

on whether they have any gain or not, if they can make a profit they continue to cooperate. Cooperation creates a more harmonious society, thus peace and secure neighborhoods can be achieved.

Immanuel Kant put forward the idea of a federation of nations that let states be still sovereign and have domestic regulations but also subject to a union's regulations. Democracy has an indirect impact on promoting peace because democracies rarely threaten each other. Peace and prosperity will be achieved when libertarian states increase and share common interests together. Only in that way, a peaceful international system will be formed (Kant, 1903). The interpretation of the concept of perpetual peace turned into democratic peace theory by Michael Doyle; Liberal states do not fight with each other. They refrain from using force against others (Russett et al., 1995). There are many reasons; the cost of war is high, clashes reduce economic dependency, weapons are creating other maintenance and repair expenses, etc. For them, wars can be avoided and conflicts may end with collective security alliances by expanding democracy and trade among states, creating a free and prosperous environment for individuals, and growing international law and organizations. Norms and international law help states to resolve issues peacefully by negotiations and compromises because at the end of the day, they respect each other mutually. The role of International organizations has great impact on creating transparency and better communication. These organizations can diminish the low mutual trust between states and reduce uncertainty with shared similar values and can create a more integrated community. On an individual level, Rousseau introduced the social contract. This contract is based on interpersonal reconciliation and protects individuals from violence. The state is responsible for guaranteeing the freedom, life, and property rights of the individual. A higher authority is needed to secure people's freedoms. When the individual is free, equal, and independent; democracy occurs. Democratic and free public opinion prevents war because it makes states act rationally. In order to achieve a long-lasting peaceful environment, there should be law and this law must be in accordance with common sense (Rousseau, 1968). Reasonable decisions can only happen when the education level of society rises. In international law, however, the states must have their consent. Consent develops society, it causes common gain, both state and individuals win, and dependency increases. Thus, cooperation increases, peaceful environment is

provided. Adam Smith mentions on liberal economic order; stability and safety in private property and economic issues are related to the political systems of states, their relations with their societies and the welfare of individuals (Smith, 2002). To repeat, the main reason for the existence of the state is to ensure the safety of its citizens. Security is about the concepts of equality, freedom, and private property that are based on common interest, international law, international norms, and values. If a peaceful environment is continuous, people feel more secure. Neoliberal Institutionalism is a bit more state-centric comparing to Liberalism. They believe International Organizations (IOs) can mitigate the negative effects of anarchy (Meiser, 2017). They also agree on the impacts of interdependence that can pacify or decrease clashes. In this way, unintended or undesirable consequences can be substantially reduced. IOs can maintain and deepen cooperation but cannot totally eliminate cheating or free-riding. Defection is always a possibility as participation in collective organizations is on a voluntary basis. The Brexit, in which the United Kingdom preferred to leave the EU, caused differences of opinion even within the country (Virdee and McGeever, 2018). Leaving global organizations might cause tension due to the unpredictability of future outcomes. This kind of tension may lead to unreliable relations in long term. Small states are more likely to be affected by this situation, which Realists argue: alliances and international law are for weak states because powerful ones are too strong to be affected by them. Great powers can cover up and would be less hurt when they abandoned these organizations or treaties.

The main difference in security between Realists and Liberals is that Liberals are concerned with issues on how to increase economic welfare and social security instead of focusing on power and interest. Realists do not believe wars can be eliminated because they are natural, Liberals, on the other hand, accept changing of nature, and individuals can act rationally and escape the war-prone aggressive side within them. Neoliberals believe regime types are important, with democracy the impacts of anarchy can be decreased. When states come together and search for the common good, they can cooperate under the help of IOs based on absolute gain. They mostly focus on economic power to ensure security unlike Neorealists because Neorealist understanding believes maintaining cooperation is hard for the long term, securing the state should be the priority. Independent decision-making, self-help mechanism, and the survival-based international system should be considered while

thinking about security and peace processes. For Liberals, a peaceful environment without war is safe, so thoughts are shaped around it.

2.8. Constructivism and its understanding of security

People started to focus on themselves and humanitarian problems rather than old troubles mostly after Cold War (Balaban, 2020), thus a different approach emerged; Constructivism. They started with questioning the reality and found out it is subject to change based on historical, political, social or cultural, ideological contexts. There are multiple realities for them and reality is not rational, it is socially constructed. If something is socially constructed, it means that is not natural, not constant, and not fixed (Wendt, 1992). Social construction has an ideational dimension. The reality is created by the one who thinks it. Once it's constructed, it becomes real. That is why they believe that reality exists, but there is no single reality. Just like anything else, concepts are not univocal and fixed. They are subject to change and development over time. For example, the concept of sovereignty began to be constructed in the 17th century, since Westphalia; nowadays it is a loose norm. Since they claim that every concept changes and therefore sovereignty also loses its influence and weakens. The constructivist approach agrees that international society exists but they question whether the state is the main actor. They accept there is anarchy which means there is no higher authority above states to control them (Onuf, 1989). Anarchy is the product of socialization which happens by the interaction among actors. Anarchy itself also can change from state to state, therefore, there is no single logic of anarchy and it depends on how the state perceives the anarchy. Anarchy of friendly states is not the same as the anarchy perceptions of the enemy states. There is no single perception of the terms. It based on what states understand from it and cannot apply to all states universally because states understand the outside world through their norms and beliefs (Wendt, 1992). The difference emerges here; constructivists do not accept all states are the same as Realists claim. Just like people having their unique personalities; international society and international relations also have their own characteristics. Society and individuals affect each other. These differences in characteristics create a social order in international society. The dynamics of social order can change thus the international system can change. For constructivists, the international system is not a struggle for power as Realists say or is not a common interest and cooperation as

Liberals claim either. For them; social relations, cultures, perceptions have effects on the international system. The identity, culture, discourse, and language concepts of actors are giving information about the security of states and their place in the international environment. Anderson mentioned the "imaginary" part of nationalism; he believed the nation is just a mental construct. Nationalism can be used to define identity. Nationalistic leaders may easily create discrimination by seeing others closer or farther. But the concept of nationalism is a dangerous subject for studying. It is necessary to examine how nations acquired their historical existence and how their meanings changed over time (Anderson, 2016). For him, the nation is imagined because all people are different but they believe they belong to the same collective. Just like Anderson, constructivists generally believe everything is socially constructed and kind of imaginary. This approach focuses on how social reality is formed or constructed. It tries to understand the social world between states-states, state-individuals, and nation-nation. Even International relations is also constructed concept by the result of social relations of people. For Onuf, the world itself is also a product of humans, he assumes people do not necessarily live in a world (Onuf, 1989). Classical Realists believe the interactions between state-state occur in an anarchic system, Structural Realists think that the anarchical structure limits or motivates state and there is a one-sided relationship. Conversely, constructivists claim there is a mutual relation and interaction between agency and structure. These two terms can shape and change each other; the agency is creating the structure and the structure is limiting the agency. At the same time states produce the structure by their relations with others (Wendt, 1992).

States act with other states based on what those states mean for them. It is confusing to understand why different states interact with each other differently. Their perceptions can change over time under different conditions. The idea of a friend and enemy depends on socialization and interaction. Their actions rely on interests. Interests are also constructed and shaped by identities and historical backgrounds. These are relation-specific terms and can differ in time. Before knowing the interests, states should know themselves. The definition or the identification starts with a question; who am I? Then; who are they? These key questions develop state actions, choices, and even their attitude towards foreign countries accordingly. They believe security understanding and security policies are

also related to identities and context. And security is also dependent on actors' definitions of security and the policies of security (Buzan, 1997). Identities are created by mutual interactions of people in the social world. They play a significant role to shape the perception of security and represent interests. For example, the perception of states that are in interaction toward each other has changed because of identities. States can have varied identities and can perceive other states differently from each other. Mutual interactions of the states in social order affect how states' identities are constructed and changed. Constructing social identity also causes the acceptance of other identities, and that means accepting the existence of the other. If there is no other, concepts like sovereignty should not be that important because it is also constructed. These kinds of two-way approaches can induce dichotomies; states can see the different identities as "THEM" and closer mindsets to them as "US" (Albayrak, 2019). Being safe for a state is also related to identities because identity, as it was said before, has an impact to shape interests, thus foreign policies can change due to the identities and also the culture of this specific state. States have certain places in international relations area, they have certain ideas which are affected by international law and cooperation; these ideas can affect the behavior of states in power politics (Wendt, 1992). Social structures that are a product of social relations consist of inter-subjective understanding; this is how security policies are determined. States usually act on the worst assumptions about other states, according to these assumptions they do not feel secure enough and may not create better policies for the political environment. These assumptions are mostly created by the identities they have. Then the interests that are determined by the identities, of states are not independent of their ethnicity, identity definition, religion, race, cultural expectations, beliefs, historical backgrounds, or norms they accepted. When states construct a friendly relation through a common worldview or common interest, they do not see each other as a threat. They feel like living under the same roof and share a common understanding and feel like belonging to the same pan of scale.

A person itself can develop a sense of belonging that is collective identity. It becomes part of the person's individual identity (Wendt, 1994). The belonging feeling can cause categorizing about issues and people who participate. Constructivists found it worth examining not only the structure like classical approaches but also the actors. And they did not consider structure or actors more

important than the other. That is why leaders and their speech acts also have great importance as identities. Words and their meanings may be heard differently by different leaders. Copenhagen School put a theory called Securitization. It basically argues that security issues are constructed through speech acts and generally used for security problems that appear suddenly. It aims to initiate tension that the issue cannot be settled in the ordinary process. Daily life arrangements cannot be a solution for this kind of problem that has been securitized. It should define the issue as an urgent security problem and try to convince the public that it should be solved by extraordinary methods. When certain issues are constructed as a security problem or threat by the powerful political elites, taking extraordinary measures against these issues is legitimized. They make it seem like ordinary solutions will not be effective and make it a security issue. To make these happen, speeches and discourses are getting important to convince the public (Buzan, Wæver and De Wilde, 1998). As a contribution, Ole Wæver deepened the security concept by claiming the reference object of security can be not only states but also societies and individuals (Rumelili and Adısönmez, 2020). In traditional security approaches, the state is the both object and the subject of security. According to this, states become the actors that both experience the insecurity and have security elements that will take measures against it. Constructivists do not specify a unit for analyzing international relations; it is neither the state nor the international system nor the individual itself. And Buzan widened the security understanding; security is not only about military or borders but also environmental, economic, and societal security which includes threats to identities (Buzan, 2007).

Foucault believes there is a mutual relationship between knowledge and power. Ideas are creating power and power makes ideas (McDonald, 2002). Changing the thinking should change the power or anarchy or security approaches. People are social and language is so important that can affect the masses. States are social beings and the international area is a social field thus identities and interests may also change and may be shaped, and even their own definitions may change and evolve in time. Mainstream approaches like Realism and Liberalism claimed that identities and interests are stable and cannot modify themselves. However, critical security studies mainly focus on the security is not a tangible and fixed concept; it is changing and constantly being built due to mostly the identities that are able to

change the perceptions and policies. If the definition of security can be asked at the same time to a person who is in Chicago or Damascus, it should have huge differences compared to each other. This approach does not have any policy implications or recommendations for preserving international peace and creating secure living standards, it just examines its definition and approaches.

2.9. *Feminism and its understanding of security*

Until the late 80s, there was a male-dominated point of view in every situation. In 1988 special issue was published by the Millennium Magazine and the main problems of international relations were evaluated from women's perspectives for the first time (Brown, 1988). In particular, the male-dominated decision-making mechanism was criticized. While focusing on the terminology of International Relations, it is possible to say that this discipline is mainly concerned with relations between sovereign states, and men's experiences are considered as a universal point of view. Therefore, patriarchal structures that states are concerned about like being powerful, protecting national security, maintaining sovereignty, realpolitik, and military capacity dominate international politics (Atmaca and Gözen Ercan, 2018).

The field of high politics, which is considered in a masculine perspective, deals with issues such as international security, the balance of power, military capacity, and state administration; the low politic sphere, on the other hand, is seen as a feminine sphere, is defined by the topics such as the environment, human rights, minority rights, immigration, and family (Tickner, 1988). Women were not allowed to get into high politics; so it became a discussion that women should not be placed in decision-making positions in political and military structures. Tickner tried to turn gender differences into gender neutrality; her aim was not to change all terminology from masculine to feminine, although these institutions were predominantly male-constructed. Feminist International Relations theory argued that this kind of hierarchy was created by a men-based patriarchal structure, and this structure should be demolished. Only by that way a new gender-based perspective can be developed in order to talk about a new understanding of security. Confronting the fact that women also affected closely by conflicts and wars were undermined the security of male domination within itself.

Security starts with recognition and identification, women were invisible beings nothing more than a wife who does laundry and cooks for her husband (Enloe, 2000) in the global market but with gender politics, the situation began to evolve to a new generation of women and men in the world of international relations. Women should not be ignored in international political life and it is necessary to close the gap created by gender in social analysis to make the world more secure. Feminists define security by focusing on individuals especially females instead of a state-centered definition. The definition of security should be developed and used for them as an alternative to the concepts of anarchy and national security that the dominant realist view put forward. It must go beyond national security. Because the fact that states are secure or have the military capacity to provide security for citizens in the classical sense does not mean that gender-based inequalities and insecurities in society have disappeared. In order to ensure security, state policy should focus on international peace instead of the warlike masculine state perception. And also non-hierarchical state-society relationships should be developed where there is no gender-based discrimination. For feminists, security ranges from domestic violence within the family to identity, from societal to international violence. This should include not only direct but also indirect violence (Tickner, 1992). They believe female voices must be heard to achieve more comprehensive security in the international system (Blanchard, 2003). It can be obvious to say that the basic importance of women's safety comes from the following; future generations pass through women's hands, mostly women raise the kids based on their instincts coming from creation and if women feel safe, a better generation will grow. Growing up in a peaceful family environment can suppress aggressive acts in the future. Thus, the understanding of maintaining a safe environment based on equity can be transferred from generation to generation.

2.10. *Marxism and its understanding of security*

The Marxist approach criticized security instead of describing and explaining it. In the 19th century, after the industrial revolution, Marxism developed as a current of thought that criticizes heavy working conditions. Marxists believe there were social injustices and defended individual freedom during the beginning of industrial capitalism. Karl Marx says that the relations of production constitute society. The class that owns the means of production dominates the society. This powerful class

creates a general perception that every threat to its own existence and interests is also a threat to the whole society (Marx and Engels, 1975). For Marx, the state is not independent from that high-level class so this understanding creates its security policies. And this security policy also serves the interests of the ruling class. The process of capital accumulation started with the flow of resources from east to west. After Western countries' discoveries the developments of economic trade, financial structures have gained momentum. These Western countries such as France and England which hold the capital accumulation and control the economic cycle have importance on this process. They have been active in the structuring of the capitalist world system with the industrial revolution. They have made rapid development and stabilized it. While stabilizing the development of a country, ensuring cultural security is also a must (Sun, 2021). Educated brains with advanced information have a significant effect on both national and ideological security, and they can also provide security in their culture. Development is achieved through education and countries can improve themselves.

In terms of financial and technological development, the core countries are the capitalist ones and the periphery is the exploited ones by the cores. Between the two, those that are seen as in the process of developing are called semi-periphery. According to world system theory; states, multinational and international corporations represent the dominant class' interests in the global economic system. And again for this theory, class conflicts dominate the international system (Wallerstein, 1976). These differences between classes create unbalance in economic structure. This structure is also connected to dependency theory but it is not based on growing together or acting together, as Liberals advocate (Kolodziej, 2005). Periphery ones are totally dependent on the cores; they do not stabilize their existence without wealthy countries. Liberals defend a free-market global economy, but it creates inequalities according to Marxists. It cannot be ignored that economic factors determine security that is why the Marxist approach mostly relies on the economy and tries to fix it. In this context, to establish a safe society and make them feel secure, welfare should be included. Without managing the economy correctly, a prosperous atmosphere cannot be achieved. According to this theory, underdevelopment creates a crisis of confidence and security problems. The main source of this crisis is the expansionist structure of the capitalist system itself (Marx

and Engels, 1975). Although it is older than the discipline of international relations, Fukuyama claimed that Marxism ended with the collapse of the Soviet Union, which was governed by communist ideology (Fukuyama, 1992).

2.11. *Posts and their understandings of security*

The field of Security Studies is built on the security dynamics that emerged as a result of the relations between the great powers and power struggles since the Second World War. Post-structuralism is as a subcategory of critical approaches under new security studies. Derrida criticizes traditional approaches that based on dualities and dichotomies. He explains a new technique of reading texts by the term of "deconstruction." This is not only a theory of literary interpretation of interests but also it constitutes a mode of political action. That means deconstruction is not basically analyzing the discourse, can also transform context without limiting themselves to theoretical constative utterances (Zuckert, 1991). So it is kind of a method of analysis that has been comprehended as an alternative form of criticism and understanding (Joque and Haque, 2020). Therefore, to repeat, this phenomenon is not just a method for interpreting text for better understandings but kind of a mode of political action that has political consequences. This method can be used to understand whether they are secure or insecure for concepts and structures. The aim is to bring an alternative approach to concepts such as security or war. In international politics, identity representations are constructed. This construction can be through security discourses with foreign policies. For classical approaches national security is the first thing that comes to mind while considering security. State security is essential for individual security and it is only possible when individuals give the right to define and defend national security to the sovereign state.

Post-colonial security studies mostly criticized general theories by rationalist and positivist way and try to put an alternative to these theories. They believe all of the concepts were formed out of the relations between the great powers and the perception of security basically constructed the West-centered (Barkawi and Laffey, 2006). It has resulted in a duality in the global political system; West which is in the center and developed countries and South which is less developed third world countries. Clashes between these two poles have created a different perception of security in different geographical regions. Post-colonial security studies say that the

North-South, East-West dualities are constructed by the powerful. And for them, it is not healthy to try to understand "others" with the view of the West because these definitions are made up and constructed by the stronger side so they are not neutral. Definition of the "other" has variability and it also plays an important role in defining who will ensure the security or who will establish the security (Derrida, 1998). Definitions and also practices that dominate security studies have led to ingrained conceptualizations in the field as a reflection of the already existing power hierarchy because the strong ones, who create the laws, also have the power to form discourses. Therefore, power is not only about the military, but also about shaping discourses. Strong actors that make up the security language apply a one-sided security definition. Context is at the center of discourse and this unilateral definition always negatively affects the contextual construction of discourse. Security discourse tries to block the violence brought by the dominant practices, the colonial and hierarchical problems in world politics. The view of the West can cause exclusionary practices, but classics naturalize exclusionary narratives and legitimize violence. Post-colonial understanding defends that classical approaches are not sufficient because they cannot comprehensively address security problems caused by non-state actors such as terrorist organizations because the perceptions of security and insecurity have shaken by the global terrorist incidents with the asymmetric and hybrid conflict methods that brought to the agenda.

All definitions and judgments about security always require the enemy or the other (Campbell, 1998). For instance, the US uses fear to identify a danger/enemy and presents the State as the only legitimate protection against that danger/enemy. Because of that, the "war on terror" justifies obedience to the United States, and the US foreign policy builds an identity. This created identity can cause the differentiation of the self from the other or the "us" from "them." It is important to understand not what the threat is, but how the order of fear and hierarchy is formed. Therefore, it focuses on the security or insecurities of the "other" as opposed to traditional security approaches. In particular, racial othering is one of the most important dynamics of global security relations (Sylvester, 2006). According to the post-colonial security critique "the other" is the weak state in the dominant security policies and discourses and the weak state produces threats that give legitimacy ground for the interventions of the developed side. All Western interventions that

completely shattered the security were justified on the basis of the weak Third World countries constantly producing conflicts and they created an understanding that only the West could end these conflicts. The security problems of Third World countries are referred to as "post-colonial insecurity". As Acharya mentioned, at the global level, most conflicts take place in geographies that are excluded and seen as Third World countries from mainstream studies which cause postcolonial insecurities (Acharya, 2014). But it should be considered the security of one side may actually be the insecurity of the other.

There are those who argue that the concept should be expanded and redefined to reflect empirical and normative changes as well (Miller, 2001). McSweeney argued that security is a difficult concept to define. He explained it as a term that can be associated with other concepts such as peace, honor, and justice, but resists being defined (McSweeney, 1999). There is always an ambiguity in the definition of the concept of security (Baylis, Smith and Owens, 2008), however, in the most general terms, security has been defined as *"the absence of threat to acquired values"* (Wolfers, 1952). Since these values also change over time, the definition becomes more difficult, thus finding a place for new security understandings became harder. The theories of international relations shape the society we live in. These theories are not neutral and cannot always be used by people with whom we agree with their policies and that's why, there are still a lot of mistakes and incompleteness (Prichard, 2018). Time passes, threats change, and it is imperative to develop the understanding and interpretation capacity accordingly. It is necessary to complete these deficiencies and fill the gaps with new security understandings; unexplained situations can become understandable in this way. All theories are influenced by each other and are shaped by developing each other, so it would not be very accurate to make a linear order. After looking at the perception of security within each theory, it can be said that Ontological Security has both individual and structural views and its effects and reflections are closer to idealism. Nevertheless, we can place Ontological Security, which will be discussed in detail in the next chapter, between two understandings Posts and Constructivism. According to ontological security, interpretations vary from person to person. It tries to explain situations by observing and comparing, based on identities and humans.

CHAPTER 3: THE EVOLUTION OF ONTOLOGICAL SECURITY

This section discusses what Ontological Security is and how it has evolved. The main question was how it intervenes with traditional understandings of security and which sides were filled that mainstream approaches could not explain. In this section, Ontological Security has tried to examine the authors one by one and compare what they thought and wrote. Considering the dates of the articles and books, it has been tried to be explained in chronological order. Since states are tried to be interpreted on the basis of human beings, they have also been included in the field of International Relations due to the anthropomorphic approach.

3.1. *Comparing the Security understandings*

Ken Booth states that an understanding of security based on power maximization does not provide balance in the system; on the contrary, it creates deep insecurity. This power maximization assumes that the actors can ensure their security according to the level of power they obtain in the system, which means that the perception of security actually pushes the entire system into a constant insecure environment. For him, security cannot be defined in an objective way. The definition of security changes depending on different actors, threats, and solutions because they are feeding on different dynamics in every context (Booth, 2007).

As a result of the military and nuclear obsessions imposed by the Cold War period, it was thought that security was studied in a narrow field and new perceptions and approaches began to emerge. Since only the military threat is understood as a security threat in the traditional approach, the idea of the survival of the state and the state being the most important value to be protected has begun to change. It has been argued that the scope of security should expand to other issues such as environmental and economic problems (Ullman, 1983). In the 1990s Wæver put a concept called Securitization into literature (Wæver, 1995), and then it became the basis of the theory of the Copenhagen School. Security is subjective to followers of this School, not objective. They claimed that it is not a static but a dynamic process and has and it has many variables. The aim is to offer a comprehensive understanding of security, including different (in) securities, by extending the analysis levels of security not only to the state but also to sub-state actors and supra-state actors. Explanations of Wæver deepened the security understanding with the constructivist roots and seeing

security as a speech act. According to the theory, security issues are constructed as security threats through speech acts. Simply calling an issue "security" makes it a security problem. It does not matter whether the security issue is a "real" threat or "imagined" because it defines security from a constructivist point of view as an inter-subjective construction. With the act of securitization, an issue is already shown as a threat so that it takes absolute priority over other issues. No other issues are important enough to be resolved before that. Thus, the actors who deal with this issue, gain the legitimacy to solve it by using extraordinary means or taking measures (Buzan, Wæver and De Wilde, 1998). States can also use democratic mechanisms such as referendums while dealing with the security problem. They can offer in front of the people what society needs by first making individuals feel insecure and then saying these are your security needs. The real problem may be the security issue that was created when there was no security concern. The object that was declared as targeted by the security threat should be the state. Individuals or small groups rarely have the legitimacy that can be securitized. To broaden the level and to make the security a reference object for world peace or all humanity is not possible even some states have a nuclear threat or worldwide climate change and global warming. In these two levels, individual and global, successful securitization is not easy that's why it should be on the middle level which is the state (Buzan, 2007). Not only military issues should be security issues, but also security studies should be addressed on many different issues such as economics, gender, identity, and environment. Buzan thought that security is a state-centered concept and that's the reason he described security as an underdeveloped study area. He tried to widen and develop it with critical and innovative studies (Buzan, 1997).

Table 1. Comparison of Security

Traditional Security	**Human Security**	**Ontological Security**
Main Actor: State	**Main Actor:** Individual	**Main Actor:** Individuals Human-made States
Protected: State integrity	**Protected:** Individual integrity	**Protected:** Internal/inner integrity
Main Threats: Inter-state conflicts, Nuclear, Armament	**Main Threats:** Intra-state conflicts, Poverty, Violence within the state, Scarcity, Diseases	**Main Threats:** Incorrect narratives, Identity problems, Disrupted routines

3.2. Where do the roots of Ontological Security come from?

In the 1960s Scottish psychiatrist, Ronald David Laing tried to put a new approach to cure schizophrenia. He asked a question, what do individuals need in order to continue their daily life? The answer was; the experience of being in continuity with one's own stable and enduring self. Ontological security is the instinct that social actors, which are people or states, try to satisfy in order to maintain their own self-identities over time (Laing, 1960). While defining the individual's self-identity it should be in the form of feeling free from doubts and feeling this constantly. As he mentioned, an individual who is ontologically secure is a real, living, whole, internally consistent, and enduring being (Laing, 1960). For him, an individual should be sure of his existence, should feel himself whole, and should maintain his identity to be a person with ontological security. Individuals who are ontologically secure are able to deal with the risks of their life because they have a strong perception about their own selves. It is necessary to draw attention to "continuity" when defining ontological security and ontologically secure individual.

On the other side, individuals who have existential anxieties and question their selves constantly because of the causes or consequences of their acts or external reasons are the individuals with ontological insecurity.

British sociologist Anthony Giddens tried to analyze ontological security with the impacts of modernization and globalization on individuals (Balaban, 2020). People form a sense of confidence in their own continuity through the habits, routines, and self-narratives they develop at birth. Without all of these, people cannot come out of existential pains. For ontological security, at the individual level, every individual needs a self-narrative to ensure his own survival (Emiroğlu, 2021). This self-narrative allows the actor to be accepted by other actors. It also allows him to experience himself as the same person, and if others accept the actor, he will continue in the same way. The bond of trust established with the environment is formed and the ways of practicing the self are provided. Self-narratives describe the person with the answers to these kinds of questions; who are you, where did you come from, and where will you go in the future. A person must have a self-narrative that coherently unifies his past, present, and future (Giddens, 1991a). It is significant to know the answers to these questions. For him, individuals should be comfortable with who they are to be ontologically secure (Giddens, 1991a). People try to forget existential questions to continue daily life. An individual should throw these questions behind them so as not to drown in anxiety. For example, before going to work, a person does not think of going to work. He is sleeping by assuming it will.

According to Giddens, ontological security is about the individual's sense of confidence in the continuity of his self-identity (Sarı Ertem and Düzgün, 2021). For him, individuals need to have trust in the continuity of their self-identity and need to have confidence in the coherence of their social and material environments of actions which have to be stable (Giddens, 1991b). This self-identity is not the sum of the characteristics of individuals. It is the individual's understanding of her/himself with the connection with his own biography. So, individuals determine their own self-identities according to the self that they understand. There should be narratives and routines that stabilize this being's self-identity. These routines should be created by care in infancy. Thanks to the routines, babies trust in the continuity of themselves and the environment. These care routines as a baby can build basic confidence, just because it's continuous. If a baby cries, the parents or its sitter will take care of it. If

this happens all the time, the baby learns this routine and knows what will happen after. The routines between the baby and the caregiver provide the baby's identity formation and create a protective area which is called a cocoon (Giddens, 1991a) for him.

In life, people want to be sure their existence is under control somehow and continues regularly that's why they establish their own routines and self-narratives to feel safer. In order to feel safe, just like babies people also have to have some routines that will continue their self-identities and self-narratives. These start in childhood as mentioned and these are the source of the feeling of trust. Other people should also accept these self-narratives that individual has created on their own, so they can continue to live like the same person in confidence. People need to push down their concerns for life; existential security concerns are basically ontological security problems. It is necessary to ignore the ontological security anxieties to continue daily life normally. By maintaining habits and routines, people protect themselves from the anxiety of possible threats. They try to avoid cognitive and emotional uncertainties because these are perceived as a threat to them. They tend to stick to these routines which can provide stability due to the need to be safe. The social order itself also becomes stable with routines. He argues that the routines that individuals experience in their social life are the main element that shapes their perception of security (Giddens, 1979). Social structure is made up of routines. Routines can be defined as repetitive patterns of behavior. The continuation of this social structure is the main factor for a person to feel completely safe. Ontological security also includes the individual's need for stability in order to realize his expectations. Because the individual seeks clarity in order to feel secure; he is in a constant effort to predict what may happen and plan his future. In other words, the aim is to make one's self-identity feel secure, so routine behavior patterns are necessary.

When the routines are broken or the habits that provide ontological security are disrupted; the uncertainty, instability, hesitations, and anxiety that individuals face are creating ontological insecurity (Sarı Ertem and Düzgün, 2021). When there is a radical change, it brings to the surface the

"fundamental ontological questions"

that were suppressed as Giddens claimed in his book (Giddens, 1991a, p.185). If the stability breaks down and the actor loses confidence in the continuity of himself or his environment it leads to deep anxiety.

3.3. *Differences between Anxiety and Fear*

For Kierkegaard (1844), the object of anxiety is "nothingness". It means that people are concerned or worried about things that don't really exist (Grøn, 2008). It is unlike fear, because the fear is attached to a specific threat or object. Fear always has the object outside of people. It directs people to escape from the threat or fight against it. Anxiety is a feeling of the unknown, a feeling of possibility. So fear is a dangerous emotion and that emotion creates its own threat, it is necessary to worry before it gets to that point. Fear has a certain aim that's why it activates people but anxiety makes people motionless. All animals can fear something but anxiety occurs only in humans. A person cannot escape from anxiety even if he wants to avoid it, but this feeling does not change. It is the unchanging element of being. For Giddens, the ontologically insecure individual has a constant concern about continuing his existence. Giddens exaggerates this concept, particularly in its negative aspect according to Rumelili and she also criticizes this exaggeration. For her, anxiety is a key concept with its positive or negative effects on conflict resolution (Rumelili, 2015). Although fear and anxiety are different concepts, the distinction between them is not emphasized enough in the discipline of International Relations. Anxiety creates an emotional *"turning point"* in the resolution of interstate conflicts (Rumelili, 2015).

Anxiety as Kierkegaard describes is the "vertigo of freedom" that opens to human development. There are perceptions of the external world that can be defined as the reflection forms in the brain. And perceptions have judgments, too (Chace and Carr, 1988). This definition evokes the cave story. Every student of International Relations knows the allegory of the cave: A group of prisoners has been shut-in in a cavern since their birth with no additional knowledge of the outside world. And Plato describes life as like being chained up in a cave. These prisoners were forced to watch shadows flitting across a stone wall. They were unable to turn their heads. A fire behind them gave off a dim light. People passed the prisoners' behind with objects and different animals that cast shadows on the wall. Prisoners in the cave tried to guess and tried to classify these illusions. One of them suddenly became free and saw the sunlight; realized objects were real but shadows were only illusions

(Huard, 2007). A question occurs here: Will he break free himself to struggle towards the sunlight, even if it cost his friends, or stick with the comfortable and familiar illusions he saw from his birth? Perhaps the security is like Plato's cave. The status of a person being inside the cave can be the childhood era. And with the presence of fire makes the person feel safe because it becomes routine to see the shadow all the time. When the concept called the outside emerges, perception begins, just like adulthood. Things change and anxiety increases when a person takes the position of getting rid of existential pains. In other words, it can be said that the vertigo of freedom is anxiety since when freedom comes, it brings anxiety with it. In Giddens, anxiety is equal to chaos, which is an extreme situation (Giddens, 1991a). And chaotic situations such as chaos can be overcome by the reproduction of daily routines. Perhaps, in this case, the anxiety can be overcome by creating new routines outside the cave of the person who comes out of the cave. To put it together, ontological security is a sense of continuity and regularity in events (Giddens, 1991a). Even these events that are not in the individual's own perception environment should also be included.

3.4.   *Comparison of Physical Security and Ontological Security*

In 2006 Jennifer Mitzen defined it as individual-based and then switched to the state analysis. She criticized how limited is the security approach of traditional security that based on physical security and survival. And she tried to use the security of identity to understand international politics. Mainstream approaches focused on the physical existence of the state. Physical existence should maintain, only in this way states can reach their national interests. The state must protect its territorial integrity, the existence of its government, and its citizens from perils. That's why physical security has become so important that the division and order of human security needs in a social, cultural, psychological, and biological became debatable. There is no clear hierarchy of security issues. Physical security assumes that states also have a mortal body. Death is normal for humans, there is no fear of death for states but there is a fear of losing the state sovereignty. This "body understanding" on the state level can be soil/ territory. Mitzen finds it wrong to make physical security the priority of the state (Mitzen, 2006b). Physical security is about the preservation of the body, but ontological security is about the preservation of the self. Self-security understanding is developed by Copenhagen School,

"the continuity of the self of a society in changing conditions, free from real or imagined threats"

as they say (Rumelili and Adısönmez, 2020, p.26). Especially in the post-Cold War era, there were major changes in the security concept.

There is a division between physical security which means protecting the body and ontological security which is self-security of the essence. It should not be the security for the body but the security for identity. She agreed on people have self-identities. The environment is also effective on the self-identity for Mitzen, According to Larson and Mitzen's own definitions in the article; Ontological security is people's feeling of trust about the continuity of their social and physical environments to which they are connected with their self-identities (Mitzen and Larson, 2017). The continuity of actors' understanding of their essence plays a critical role in ontological security. When actors are not certain about their identity, they cannot know how to act in different situations and this can create ontological insecurity. People can reduce uncertainty by bringing a cognitive order to the environment. Routines are necessary to establish a basic security system. Actors routinize their relationships with others thus they know how to behave in different conditions. States are human likely so they also pursue ontological security. At the same time it means that states also tend to be consistent and stable in order to feel ontologically secure (Mitzen, 2006b). Therefore, they stick to certain routines and try to act within their own self-image (Mitzen, 2006a). So, the ontological security need pushes the state to be consistent and stable, to adhere to certain routines, and to act in the direction of its own sense. This ontological security requirement determines the identity's relation to the other. At this point, a question arises: should the need for security be met by seeing the other as a threat to their selves, or can ontological security be achieved in friendly relations? For Campbell, the other is always a threat and it has to be a threat according to his main argument which is: Foreign policy threats or security threats do not arise from specific facts because states perceive threats depending on how they construct their own identity within a relationship to another or towards another (Campbell, 1998). Mitzen answers this question as; It can be achieved through both alliance and cooperation routines because for her the main matter is their continuity (Mitzen, 2006a). Stable Self - Other relationships can

develop within the framework of hostility or non-hostile differences. Therefore, it is not necessary to see the part called "the other" as a threat all the time.

Mitzen also touched upon the security dilemma. This dilemma begins when a state arms itself for its own security. Other states perceive this action as a threat and as a result, they also take up arms for their own security. This creates an arms race, and for that reason, states feel more and more insecure with the arming of other states, despite they were armed for their own safety in the beginning. Easy to see that, in an anarchic system, the policies followed by the states for security create more insecurity. According to the Realist approach, states try to avoid the security dilemma but cannot do because they always have the unpredictability of the attitudes of rival states. For Ontological Security, states do not want to avoid security dilemma because it means the elimination of the identity role that provides ontological security and the routines created by this role. States are in reality unwilling to come out of their current security dilemma and therefore continue to compete for power. This dilemma can create physical insecurity but support ontological security for Mitzen. Therefore, individuals and states do not always prioritize physical security when physical security conflicts with ontological security. Sometimes physical security can be jeopardized in the name of ontological security.

The ongoing conflict environments, the enemy identities built by the conflict, and the conflict routines ensure the self-continuity of the actors (Rumelili, 2015). States ignore the physical security benefits of conflict resolution and prefer the continuation of conflict to resolution because the familiar, ongoing, and continuous things create a comfort zone, even if there are conflicts, as it provides awareness in the states. Israel and Palestine actually do not want to resolve the conflict between them in order to remain ontologically secure. For this reason, they also give up their physical security when necessary. Therefore, since it will not be possible for them to have mutual trust, the conflict becomes unresolved and the routinized conflict relationship becomes permanent (Mitzen, 2006b). If the dilemma disappears, routines also vanish like getting arms and building the defense systems thus, uncertainty increases. That is the main reason that states became addicted to this dilemma by trying to keep routines up and the dilemma persists. States can engage in dangerous routines even when they have risks. Irrational state behaviors such as "being attached to conflicts" can be explained more easily with ontological security

understanding. Conflicts can sometimes provide "security of the self", so abandoning dangerous routines can lead to ontological insecurity as they allow for the reproduction of founding identity. In fact, states may not have subjective judgments about their existence or identity but can view others as competitors or potential aggressors. The security dilemma imposes them to have social relationships. There is an obligation to communicate in the global world. If states accept the other side as an opponent, the uncertainty disappears. With this acceptance, they know who they are dealing with and can try to foresee the actions. This brings the subject to the point of getting to know oneself in Giddens' questions that need to be answered while creating a self-narrative and then determining the other person or state accordingly.

In 2008 Brent J. Steele emphasizes states' self-identity needs and stable self-understandings. Compared to Mitzen, he focused on subjective identities rather than the inter-subjective ones. Self-identities are created and maintained through autobiographical narratives (Steele, 2008b). These narratives are the stories that the actors tell about themselves to others and even to themselves. That is why they play an important role in the continuity of identity. The reason why they routinized these behaviors over time is that the actors act in accordance with their identities created through these biographical narratives. Actors need to act based on their identities due to they created identities of their own. So the identity that is created by narratives causes repeated actions and these actions become routines. Critical situations which are sudden and unexpected can cause damage to these institutionalized routines. When routines are shaken, the continuity of the actors' identities is also shaken. In final, this creates anxiety in actors and anxiety causes ontological insecurity. In critical situations biographical narratives cannot match with actors' practices thus actors feel ontologically insecure. The state, on the other hand, determines its existence or itself by considering its own self-image, self-narrative, and internal dynamics. Social internal dynamics also construct and shape states' own self-images by narratives, just like people. Then it constructs its interstate relations with this imaginary self (Browning, Joenniemi and Steele, 2021). It means states also discursively produce their self-images. They even shape their foreign policies according to these discourses. In order to feel ontologically secure for states, the continuity of their biographical narratives and the routines in their relations with other states are very important (Steele and Innes, 2013).

Based on their foreign policy, do states want to survive in the international arena or more than that (Steele, 2008b)? The decision-making processes of states are not only driven by increasing material power. This process is also not just about concerns about the future. States may come into conflict not only for some material interests or fear but also for moral, humanitarian, or honor reasons (Thucydides, 2013). Although such reasons are specific to the individual, society or states also have concerns about preserving the integrity of the "self". Self-identity understandings and policies appropriate to them are also effective in determining their foreign policy behaviors. According to the ontological security approach, states do not only focus on physical security in international politics but also try to provide their identity security. The identity security of states affects their foreign policy behaviors. And identity security is a factor in understanding state policy (Balaban, 2020). For instance, Belgium decided to fight Germany in the Second World War because of its honor (Mitzen and Larson, 2017). Dignity is a part of self-image and it wanted to protect its self-image, putting its own physical safety at risk (Steele, 2008b). States normally act rationally and prefer not to enter into wars that they cannot win, but sometimes they even risk death by fighting for honor and prestige (Sarı Ertem and Düzgün, 2021). Ontological security concern has led to irrational state behavior in some cases (Rumelili and Adısönmez, 2020). As another example, Britain was planning to enter the American civil war, but when the slavery conflict broke out, Britain thought it would also damage its self-image (Steele, 2005). The ontological security requirement pushes the actors in foreign policy to act against their own interests.

America is a state that likes to reveal its self-image and Classical American identity is value-based. In the military operations carried out after September 11, while the USA tried to ensure the physical security of its citizens, it also legitimized all kinds of policies that could harm others against it. In other words, the USA prioritizes its own interests over its moral obligations, and its liberal and democratic identity in the international arena. This prioritizing increases the anxiety in the society because it does not match with the value-based classical identity of the US, thus it causing distrust which led to ontological concerns. It became confusing for US soldiers too, as they abandon their liberal national ideals to fight terrorism and maintain security. The disharmony arises as they make this sacrifice "in order to

protect the honor of the nation", which is also an element of the American identity (Steele, 2008a). The moments of reunion with the families of American soldiers who returned to their homeland from Iraq and Afghanistan were shared on social media. According to Steele, filming and recording these reunions in public places provides a connection to the past. On the other hand, it aims to give a sense of trust to the society with some rituals that belong to the social memory. When examined from the perspective of ontological security, these videos aim to avoid questioning why soldiers went to war, and try to emphasize the temporariness of chaos by showing a return to ordinary daily routines (Steele, 2019). Thus, it shows people that ontological security can be restored. Not only with external events but also within the country, different ontological insecurities may arise. The election of Trump as president of the USA creates anxiety in the political structure of America, with the concern that there is a change in the traditional American identity. Similarly, the rise of the right and populism in Europe is causing anxiety (Subotić and Steele, 2018).

3.5. *Moving the concept from the Individual Level to the State Level*

Steele tries to adapt Ontological Security which is at the individual level to the state by giving personality to the state by claiming that states also can fight for their honor and dignity (Steele, 2019). Similarly, Mitzen and Kinnvall also try to explain by comparing humanoid features with the state (Kinnvall and Mitzen, 2017). It is a different method, called anthropomorphic (Sarı Ertem and Düzgün, 2021). This method takes ontological security from psychology and transfers it to International Relations field. It is kind of a bridge or transition phase from individual to state level. It is simulating the state to humans and even humanizing the state. International relations theorists claim that states also pursue ontological security just because they have humanoid characteristics. The state as a person, not only deals with physical existence but also searches for ontological security, the issue is not only being alive physically but also states have a need, for example, to be recognized by other states or actors (Wendt, 2004). Huysmans explained the security on the basis of thickening. One of the fears for actors is the uncertain and unbalanced conditions. It increases the need for a stable environment. When the need for stability increases, it requires recognizing and categorizing the environment they are in (Huysmans, 1998). All conditions should be predictable. Just like individuals, states also seek stability in their inner world. In addition, it is necessary for both parties to

36

be stable in their interactions among themselves. That is why they aim to establish a safe space and stability in their outer world by developing routine relations with other states (Mitzen, 2006b).

This anthropomorphic process causes the level of analysis problem. Humanizing the state means accepting that state is also an actor who is seeking security. Leaving aside the physical security discourses; security of the identity, security as being, or security of self can be explained by biographical narratives and routinized behavior (Rumelili, 2013). At the same time, the state is an actor that threatens the ontological security of societies and makes individuals insecure. The individualized state understanding has been subjected to some criticism for this anthropomorphic approach. Krolikowski believes that ontological security should only be examined on the individual level because individuals are the ones that can feel ontological insecurity; states are the actors that should provide ontological security for their citizens (Krolikowski, 2008). He argues that the assumption of "state personhood" makes it difficult for people to understand the role of the state, and humanizing the state makes it difficult to percept its responsibility to its citizens. That is the reason the state shouldn't be the referent of ontological security, it should be the provider (Erdoğan, 2021). As required by state authority, the state itself is the provider of ontological security. It should not only protect people from the attacks of others but also provide citizens with an order of awareness and predictability (Rumelili, 2020). In 2012 Croft also agreed with Krolikowski, that it should be examined at the level of the individual and the community rather than the level of the state because it aims to understand the individual and the society where the individual belongs, not the state (Croft, 2012).

3.6. *The perception of "The Other" and Internal Dynamics*

David Campbell mentioned that; Post-structuralist International Relations literature emphasized that threat definition is combined with the identity formation process and its security discourses have a subjective dimension (Campbell, 1998). It is a discursive requirement that identity should be defined through differences with the distinctions of US vs. THEM. Even when people split into teams when they were kids, they were also making a distinction between their own team and others. If the identity is defined in terms of ethnic group, the lifestyle of the others, form of government, or an enemy state, the perception of "the other" as a threat becomes

normal. Thus, identity legitimizes violence to the other because what is different, leads to uncertainty and anxiety. Categorizing it and defining it with comparisons make their perceptions easy. It should be kept in mind that, meaning is constructed in oppositions or duals (Giddens, 1979). Building the meaning always requires thinking through dualities. Understanding what something is, also means defining what it is not (friend-enemy, good-bad). When saying "I am a hardworking person", it should cause the thinking about a lazier person in mind. That's why people can examine the distinguishing features between the two.

Bahar Rumelili thinks that ontological security is not based on a definition of a threat. Or it is not the protection from this threat like other security concepts. Therefore, it is not fear for her caused by an identified external threat. Ontological security differs from other security concerns; it comes from the inside of actors and continuity-based concerns. It is not about the fear of a defined threat, it is fed by inner worries and that's why it does not include the identification of an external actor or object as a persistent threat (Rumelili, 2013). The source of worry is not being able to see their future for people. In the process of dealing with this worry or anxiety, fear arises, so what is called fear is actually secondary (Rumelili, 2020). Security politics always starts with fear, but while evaluating ontologically, it develops in a derivative way. At that point, according to Bahar Rumelili, ontological security is in the sense of existence; security-as-being and the physical security is the security in the sense of survivability; security-as-survival (Rumelili, 2013).

States should put an identity to continue their existence in changing conditions and they have to segregate others, especially for social constructivists. According to them, identity is not a given fact arising from the essence of the actor. It can be shaped and changed depending on how actors define themselves in society and to what extent this definition is accepted by others. Actors should find themselves a place and place other actors accordingly. It is kind of a compare and contrasts system: What am I? What others are? Internal dynamics construct and shape their own self-images discursively (Browning, Joenniemi and Steele, 2021). It means that the state formulates its self-image and self-narrative by considering its internal dynamics and then constructs its interstate relations with this imaginary self. That is why states cannot acquire ontological security on their own, separately and independently of others (Rumelili, 2015). Kinnvall agrees on ontological security

cannot be independent of the historical relationship that the actor creates with the other (Kinnvall, 2004b). There should be interaction, Mitzen assumes, ontological security arises from the relations between other states and the continuity of the routines that are part of these relations (Mitzen and Larson, 2017). Basically, Ontological Security in International Relations is about who the states are or what they want; it is kind of a form of security research that focuses on continuities in state identity and factors that may threaten the identity or being (Steele and Innes, 2013). All internal elements that the state sees as an important part of its existence must be free from danger and uncertainty. The important thing is to focus on state behaviors, identities, selves, their own existence, and their interstate relations. The routinization of state narratives and behaviors can be explained in this way. These narratives are often the source of repetitive conflicts in relation to their own and others' definitions (Kinnvall and Cash, 2017). In other words, the state creates its routines with its identity and ensures the continuity of its identity with routines. At this point, Ejdus emphasizes the distinction between self and identity. Actors can have multiple identities and it is mentioned that the identity has a changeable character in order to ensure the stability of their selves (Ejdus, 2020). This variable character is shaped according to the attitude of other states. America can be both friend and enemy; enemy identity for Russia, friend identity for England. This situation is shaped by the definitions of interests and the perception of threat. To give an example at the individual level, the same type of weapon can cause fear in the hands of the terrorist, while it can give peace in the hands of the police. The state first recognizes itself and then defines it. Then it represents itself as domestic and foreign policy, but the process of being accepted by other states works differently. When this state is not accepted by other states, when it is not recognized by others, the inner being of the state suffers. A state cannot maintain the self unless others define or recognize it in the same way. A role that it claims does not exist according to the definition of others can take on its identity. In fact, according to the definition of others, it may even pretend to be an identity that it claims it is not. Social interaction between states is constructive to the state's intrinsic existence (Mitzen, 2006b).

There is a connection between identity construction processes and ontological security; in some cases, the ontological security need is satisfied by belonging to

collective identities. Uncertainties and undefined threats increase with the effect of globalization and in these environments, there is intense insecurity. At the individual level; people with uncertainty, high anxiety, and no sense of belonging are often used to identify concepts such as religion and nationalism (Kinnvall, 2004a). The European Union (the EU) can be given as an example of the created collective identity. The existence of the European Union is causing some crises, even if it does not physically threaten the lives of European people, it can cause anxiety. And anxiety, as always mentioned, leads them to ontological insecurity. There are problems that affect the EU more than physical security, such as refugees, the rise of the right wings, Brexit, and terrorism. But the main concern is that the organization will not be able to meet the increasing economic and social expectations (Kinnvall, Manners and Mitzen, 2018). But at the same time, it is claimed that the identity of the European Union will not change and the reason for this is based on interstate routines. EU has a good impact by prioritizing democracy, rule of law, human rights, and diplomacy. It has been known for its positive terms such as; normative, civilian, peaceful, and civilizing. EU routines provide stability in terms of ontological security and the EU identity formed by these routines will not change and protect its identity (Mitzen, 2006c).

The interest in Ontological Security is increasing day by day. Studies have increased especially due to the deficiencies in the literature and the completion of incomprehensible issues. It is a security that is tried to be provided with routines created based on the feeling of trust and giving importance to continuity. It emphasizes the existence of a self-image formed by stability and consistency. It has been tried to explain that security comes from inner worries rather than old-style security understandings.

CHAPTER 4: THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF UKRAINE AND RUSSIA CONFLICT

This section, which starts with the meaning of Ukraine and its historical background, continues by dealing with Russia's perspectives on Ukraine. With the Russia-Ukraine conflict, the analysis is tried to be deepened by establishing a connection with the events that took place in history. In particular, the reasons behind Russia's behavior and the situations that cause concern were examined from the perspective of leaders. The infrastructure of this situation, which is included in the framework of repetitive conflict routines, has also been examined.

4.1. *Why Ukraine is so important that Putin cannot give up?*

Ukraina (Украина) means *"borderland"* or *"end country"* in the Russian language (Bilener, 2007). The word derived from the Old Russian, *"Okraina"* which means periphery and *"Ukrainian"* was referred to as guards who protected the external borders (Putin, 2021). During Soviet times "the Ukraine" was referred to as a part of the country, after 1991 it became an independent country and a recognized state. That's why it is now Ukraine without *"the"* letter just as William Taylor says who served as the U.S. ambassador to Ukraine from 2006 to 2009 (Steinmetz, 2014).

Russians and Ukrainians are two different nations that have a common religion, common cultural ties, and historical past. Ukraine's first attempt to cut these bonds was when it declared its independence from Russia in 1918. The Treaty of Brest-Litovsk led to international recognition of their sovereignty. Three years later The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic was established but it joined to the Soviet Union (SU) in 1922. They were two of the three Slavic societies which are Belorussia, Ukraine, and Russia known as Kievan Russia (Rywkin, 2015). And also these three republics were representing the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) at the United Nations General Assembly. As it is pointed out, their ties were very tight indeed. In a referendum held in 1991, Ukraine declared its independence with 92 percent of the vote. Then these three countries signed an accord to recognize the dissolution of the Soviet Union (Bigg, 2022). Even Soviet nuclear weapons were located in four republics: the Russian Federation, Kazakhstan, Belorussia, and Ukraine. In the 1994 Budapest Memorandum, Ukraine gave up its stockpile of the nuclear arsenal, which belonged to the SU, under Russia's commitment to respect

Ukraine's sovereignty and independence. In addition to all these, Ukraine is also very important in other aspects as well.

For Russia, Ukraine has always been a strategic region between Europe and itself. It was a transitional zone, a strategic barrier between Russia and Western countries. Then it continued being a buffer zone that separates Russia from NATO and European Union. This may be why Ukraine differs from other former Soviet Republics in many ways, geopolitically in particular. It has an Asia-Europe land connection and a Baltic-Black Sea waterways connection at the same time. Ukraine itself was not a rich country in terms of natural gas and oil resources but always like an energy corridor from the former Soviet Union to the West. Ukraine's strategic importance has increased due to the developments in Russia's energy sector. The country is dependent on Russia in terms of transferring energy sources as a transit country. For all these reasons, a relationship of mutual dependency has emerged between the two countries.

For Ukraine, on the other hand, it was a country that had a conflict of proximity within itself. The changing internal dynamics with the constant invasions made this situation even more difficult. The eastern region had to live under the influence of Russia, and the western region was occupied by Austria and Poland. In 1918 there was a Soviet invasion then German Empire and Austria-Hungary entered Ukraine to repel Bolsheviks. At the beginning of 1919 Russian forces got involved again (Sönmez, Bıçakcı and Yıldırım, 2015). There were always differences of opinion within the country; Western Ukrainians joined the Nazi armies in World War II, and Eastern Ukrainians joined the Red Army. Then they hoped to create a national identity but the Soviet Union re-occupied Ukraine, it was Donetsk (Donbas) region in 2014. They were invaded in every attempt at independence they try to achieve. Cultural policies are the basis of today's heterogeneous ethnic structure of Ukraine.

When sectarian differences were added to all these problems, it became more complicated for the country to find its own identity. The supporters of the Western side, who were influenced by Lithuanian and Polish were Catholic. People who were closer to Russia were Orthodox. This situation did not only affect the country in general but also created the problem of political identity because these differences are related to the proximity to Russia and the West. As such, this situation gave way

to the problem of identity in foreign policy as well, since identity is not given and needs to be constructed. The tides between East and West damaged the sense of belonging, and diplomatic initiatives in foreign policy stuck between Westernism and Eurasianism. 2004 Color Revolution, or for Ukrainians their Orange Revolution, showed that Ukraine had come to a decision as whether to be in the Western or Russian bloc because this event was not just a simple presidential election. The global financial crisis in the first quarter of the 2000s, the natural gas crisis, the extraordinary increase in natural gas prices inflicted by Russia right before the critical elections in Ukraine; the instability in Ukraine, caused a policy change in the government to lean closer to the East by 2010 and, occupation of Crimea further aggravated the situation in 2014 (Sönmez, Bıçakcı and Yıldırım, 2015). The annexation of Crimea with the referendum held in 2014 can also be cited as a result of getting closer to the East. Since Russia sees the former Soviet Republics as its "backyard", it is obvious that it feels it has a historical responsibility and geographical interests in the region. It is a basic principle based on a state's sovereignty and this principle should not be broken. In any case, Russia has violated Ukraine's sovereignty and still continues to violate it. The president of Ukraine won the respect of the people by showing undeniable resistance. Looking at his past, he won the election in 2019 as a comedian with a law degree (Westfall and Pietsch, 2022). Putin's attempt to justify his occupation in the form of "denazification" created confusion because Zelenskyy is coming from a Jewish family. Then the NATO problem which is Ukraine's request to become a NATO member broke out and became a "red line" for Putin (Berger, 2022).

This current conflict process is also a breaking point in International Relations just like September 11. During the time of the COVID-19 pandemic, people have been got in ambiguous anxieties rather than identifiable old-fashioned fears like nuclear or intra-state conflicts (Steele, 2021). The uncertainty of the future process and the situation caused stress. After the pandemic, the Russian-Ukrainian situation was the first defined concern. This is why it has created such deep ontological security concerns. It is a situation that makes people wonder whether humanity still has the peace processes for a more peaceful world order; because such events take people back to the times when the law of the jungle prevailed. At those times, concurring territories were worthy, and material control was important to

survive in the area. There was a shift from the material world which was about costs or economy (based on gold, mines, and oil) to knowledge, it turned into a matter world (Harari, 2022). The danger facing humanity in today's world is to return to the law of the jungle with the invasion of Russia that aims to acquire Ukraine's territory. If the situation of suppressing weaker neighbors by powerful countries again becomes normal, it would affect the whole world's behaviors. It has already caused a sharp increase in military spending, albeit for defense purposes, and led to an unsafe international environment by making states feel insecure due to the security dilemma.

4.2. Point of views on War

To put everything aside and look at the situation from the perspective of Russia, it is obvious that things are interpreted differently. The Russian region has also been full of crises and stresses throughout history. The fall of the Berlin wall was also an end to the Warsaw Pact that Russia has tried to establish as a collective defense organization. The dissolution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in 1991 deeply shook the past of the state. While economic troubles and corruption continued, internal conflicts were added during the Yeltsin period. He deployed the Supreme Soviet, the parliament, and called for new elections. A new constitution was approved by a national referendum, which gave the president enormous powers. The uprising in 1993 is actually an indication that Russia cannot be harmonious with the West, and that concepts such as liberal economy and democracy cannot fit properly (Sokolov and Kirilenko, 2013). In addition to other crisis, the Chechnya problem that erupted in the late 1990s also brought a new leader, Vladimir Putin, to the stage with his great network and strong relations. And Putin has used these presidential powers to direct the country in a more authoritarian way.

Russia has considered itself as a great power in the Soviet times but, the respect they demanded today from the Western countries is not met. Vladimir Putin, who is an ambitious leader, worked for the old Soviet Intelligence Agency (the KGB) and it can be seen by his actions and a mindset that, it was shaped by the Soviet Union. As such, he would like to see Russia as a great power to be reckoned with once more (Hershberg, 2022). He aims to see Russia as more sovereign than others; since with the status of great power, the privilege of decision-making also comes. A paraphrase from Animal Farm

"All animals are equal but some animals are more equal than others."

(Orwell, 2021, p. 112) can be interpreted as "some states are more sovereign than others." According to Putin some great powers such as Russia, India, China, and the United States can have absolute sovereignty. Other states' sovereignty like Ukraine, Kazakhstan, or Georgia should be limited. There should be limit for them to freely choosing which alliances they join or reject (Stent, 2013).

From the 1990s to 2009, being a member of NATO has expanded to different states. That's the reason that Russia felt threatened more than before. These Westernization signs couldn't be accepted by Russia. Russia always tried to block the expansion of NATO through its "near abroad". This near abroad understanding is formulated by Putin; it includes former Soviet Republics which are Russian-speaking populations (Rywkin, 2015). He tried to protect who is similar to Russia as a big brother. For him, the plea to be a member of NATO or the European Union means being democratic and accepting Western influences such as a free government system. And this mentality is different compared to Russia's. Different ideologies have always posed a psychological threat to each other.

Today's Ukraine problem is not only about Ukraine itself. Putin clearly thinks Russia has a right to seize Ukraine just because it has close ties with them ethnically and linguistically. In the deep there is a threat, even the possibility of Ukraine becoming a member of NATO, and this threat makes Russia feel insecure and ideologically alone. For him, former Soviet neighbors should not join any alliances which are hostile to his worldview. They should not bother to become members; at least they should remain neutral (Putin, 2021). This anxiety brings ontological insecurity with it. When there is a security threat, the use of force is appropriate. Putin thinks that the global order ignores Russia's concerns about its security and he demands the right treatment for their interests (Stent, 2013). In Maslow's pyramid esteem needs should be satisfied such as prestige and feeling of accomplishment, that's why Russia wants to feel respected and seen as powerful by others (Maslow, 1943). They are trying to see themselves as stronger as before which has not been achieved since Soviet times. After all, there were troubled domestic situations in America; ongoing racial tensions, the raid on the Capital, immigration problems, and voter fraud that undermines confidence in elections. Europe on the

other hand was dependent on Russia in terms of gas, and the surrounding countries were not yet strong enough to have a say in making decisions about themselves. And those were a sign of the right timing for Russia to act.

When looking at military equipment and armaments, Russian power is superior compared to Ukrainians. Overestimating their forces was a mistake for Russia because this war is not only about military victory but also about political gains (Freedman, 2022). Nationalism, which is one of the most powerful forces in the world, should not be underestimated especially when it comes to Ukrainians. Individuals are keen to commit to nationalism to prove that they are better compared to others and in the conditions of globalization, ontological security needs are satisfied especially with nationality (Kinnvall, 2004a). Ukrainians want to ensure their survival and autonomy (Walt, 2019). They will never want to withdraw to Russian control; President Volodymyr Zelenskyy is performing bravely on the battleground (Freedman, 2022). Because they have no other option to protect the Ukrainian identity they have created, Ukrainians are fighting not to become Russified. Maybe it is the shared culture and collective past that caused harshly promoted nationalism to preserve their independence. It became an obsession for Putin to make Ukraine a part of Russia and sacrifices became usual in Ukrainians' life. Kinnvall explains this as; when uncertainty and instability prevail in the environment after critical situations rising nationalist rhetoric can function as a cocoon of protection against insecurity. Increasing insecurity affects individuals' attitudes towards nationalism (Kinnvall, 2006). To interpret this situation, the Russia-Ukraine conflict may also be the explosion of tensions due to the uncertainty of the COVID-19 pandemic process which affects all the habits of daily life and the routines of countries. If nationalism can succeed to form a safe cocoon, more nationalistic and aggressive attitudes can be expected from Ukraine.

Sudden shifts in strategies are normal in wars. That is the main reason for states to feel anxiety when there are unintended consequences. Russia feels stressed and pressured because the war is taking longer than they expected. Russia does not have enough capacity to sustain such power for a long time. In this way, actors lose their trust, that's why they find themselves in anxiety and this leads to insecurity as they cannot predict the future clearly. Russian soldiers are demoralized; they show poor performance because Ukraine did not overwhelm quickly even if they are

significantly smaller compared to Moscow's forces (Johnson, 2022). The reason the war is running slower than planned may be that it is not popular at home (Acton, 2022). It was one of Putin's miscalculations, he did not think that global opinion will turn against him so quickly and did not consider the support of his own people (Tetruashvily, 2022). Although there are attempts at launching anti-war movements in Russia, security forces will arrest anyone who tries to make their voices heard. At this point, the person who influences and changes the security discourse of the country is the leader. Putin has always seen the collapse of the Soviet Union as the greatest catastrophe of the twentieth century (Stein, 2022). He could not accept what he saw as a genuine tragedy. The loss has deepened over time. Considering former republics as a historical territory gives him a right to have a say over them. Europe and the United States take up seriously the premise that states freely determine both their domestic relations and foreign policy affiliations. The situation is different in Russia, dating back to Soviet times. The Soviet Union also tried to control both domestic and foreign relations of Warsaw Pact members. If a country moves away from the Soviet model, its leaders will be replaced. These arrangements are made by force through Communist Parties, the Red Army, or the Secret Police (Stent, 2013).

Putin has great anxiety about losing his ideology, hence the ideology of the state. For him this is not an invasion, but "a special military operation" (Acton, 2022). He attacked Ukraine in the name of denazification and he also did not want Ukraine to join NATO for fear of the destruction of his own ideology. But at the end of the day, even if Ukraine did not join NATO, it distanced itself further from the ideology of Russia and made it more pro-Western (Hershberg, 2022). Not only the fear of losing the ideology but also Russia has concerns that are coming from its past. The country does not see its borders as safe, Russia feels threatened and insecure, both ideologically and physically. It had hard times because of the Anti-Bolshevik allied forces in the 1920s. Back in the day, they were occupied by Germany in 1941; despite they had made a pact in 1939 to guarantee that they would not interfere with each other. Germany caused the loss of Soviet citizens in the Second World War. Justifiably, Russia wants to know that its physical security is solid so that it can achieve the conditions for considering its ontological security. NATO is not helping this situation at all, on the contrary, it is doing exactly the opposite (Stent, 2013). Even if Russia's small and weak neighbors won't attack it because of the nuclear

weapons it has, that possibility still creates security concerns. For Putin, neighbors should remain weak and neutral states. If they become NATO allies there would be military prevalence by NATO and this causes Russia to feel under threat.

The first aim of the other states' attitudes was to eliminate the chance of war with Russia. States tried to warn Russia and collectively agreed on there would be economic outcomes (Stein, 2022). The consequences of the war were harsh on Russia. So many nations reacted to that action. There was always a fear of Russia, it was a strong state. It still has the world's largest nuclear arsenal. The US and its allies' economic sanctions are still punishing this action. Imposing sanctions take time to work (Stein, 2022), and lifting the sanctions is not easy and cannot quickly disappear. In these situations, time is of the essence. Protecting Ukraine creates a dilemma, especially for the US. On the one hand, states try to avoid getting into a full-scale war with Russia, and on the other hand, they try to stand strong against Russian aggression. The Foreign Minister of the Russian Federation said that if there is a war with NATO, it would be nuclear. Irrational leaders like Putin are prone to making riskier decisions, and more likely to choose dangerous paths. The only thing predictable about this kind of leader is his unpredictability (Kendall-Taylor and Frantz, 2022). What goes through the mind of physically and ontologically unsatisfied Russia with the process of the war is hard to predict. Despite Russia's openly voicing its nuclear issue, America's failure to take this threat very seriously has led to the humiliation of the country. Russia, which found strength due to America's internal problems (Acton, 2022), became even more aggressive because it did not see its opponent as strong enough as before. Based on the blood ties becoming together with Ukraine will make them stronger and more successful. For Putin, the statement "Ukraine is not Russia" is no longer an option (Putin, 2021). For Hershberg, the Russian regime made a big mistake. It tried to be more secure by invading Ukraine's territory and gaining back its historical legacy. But at the end of the day, the country feels less secure due to the course of the war (Hershberg, 2022).

For Putin, Russia was never anti-Ukraine, but Ukrainian citizens should decide what they will be. Ukrainians are more willing to fight for their gained rights compared to Czechoslovaks; there is a memory of scarcity at the beginning of the 1930s when Stalin's collectivization policy caused millions of ethnic Ukrainians have killed. That situation evokes bad memories like this and made them show

resistance to standing by the Russian side. It is about the honor that needs to be considered, just like in Belgium in the Second World War (Steele, 2008b). Ukraine wanted to protect its self-image and was willing to put a risk its physical security. As mentioned, Mitzen calls these situations the ontological security dilemma, meaning that physical security may not always be the first priority (Mitzen, 2006a). Maybe it was not a rational choice because in long term it would cause casualties and economic loss but fighting for prestige (Sarı Ertem and Düzgün, 2021) is the right thing to protect ontological security. Ukrainians are confident and think that the Russian side has no other choice than negotiate. They are not eager to roll over quickly.

4.3.   *Russia and Ukraine are both Ontologically Insecure*

As defined in the previous chapter, there should be a continuity of the actor's both physical and social environments. Actors are connected to these environments by their self-identities (Mitzen and Larson, 2017). Ontological Security finds occurs in the sense of trust with these two: continuity of the environments and self-identities. This sense of trust enables the actor to act within a certain framework. This feeling also makes them be an actor. Ontological problems arise when circumstances change, and unexpected situations are encountered. For this situation, Russia's act caused Ukraine to become unable to practice its own self. If the trust of the state in itself or its environment is shaken, the state finds itself in deep anxiety. At this point, Russia seems to have lost its self-confidence and Ukraine has lost its trust in the environment but mostly in its neighbors. Russia thought that it could end the war in a very short time and achieve what it wants from Ukraine in particular.

Other issues that provide ontological security are the self-narratives and behavioral routines of states. There are many ways for them to occur. For intersubjective understanding, states cannot acquire ontological security independently from other actors. States should be social and not isolate themselves from relationships with other states because ontological security occurs with these routines which are established by the interactions with others (Mitzen, 2006a). According to Rumelili, any kind of stable relationship with the "Other" satisfies the need for ontological security. The important thing is to establish some kind of interaction, so it doesn't necessarily require the other to be defined as a threat, it can be positive other. It means that it meets the need for ontological security, whether it

is a friend or an enemy (Rumelili and Adısönmez, 2020). Regardless of the circumstances, external actors have a great influence on states. For Ukraine, as a state that is influenced by many different ideologies, its ontological security is based on its relations with other states. When Ukraine did not get the help it wanted from other states, it felt lonely and insecure. It also began to question the state relations, which are considered close to itself. According to another understanding, self-identity and self-narratives are formed by internal dynamics. States act with their imaginary self (Browning and Joenniemi, 2017). States construct their interstate relations with the imaginary self (Steele, 2008c). An example of this can be that the United States constantly tries to show that it is a democratic state and acts by taking shelter behind it. America's democracy-based society is undermining within itself, perhaps because the country currently feels too insecure to deal with the status of any outside country. In other words, America sees Russia in a different class from themselves, as the "other". For Kinnvall, each actor has an "other" that they attached importance to. The ontological security of that actor cannot be examined independently of the historical relationship that has formed with this "other". Identity is described by others and identity needs actors which are opposite to it to exist and be constructed. The self-other distinction has an important place in foreign policy and at the same time, foreign policy is a tool that emphasizes this distinction. Its ontological security is based on the distinction between the two. For example, Russia does not see itself as European; on top of that, it tries to prevent the states that it sees as its own (former Soviet lands) from seeing themselves as European. Because the state is an actor that reflects the character of the groups it is a member of and becomes similar over time by being influenced by them. For this reason, the possibility of Ukraine getting into NATO is perceived as a threat to Russia. At the same time, countries try to market their national image around the world. This can give them an economic advantage or allow them to spread their ideologies. It provides ontological security as it matches its own national narratives. Because there is a concern that post-communist countries will not be fully accepted as EU members (Subotić and Steele, 2018) and Russia is trying to take advantage of this situation.

Considering the security of individuals living during the war process, it is seen that they could not continue their daily practices. People's routines about identity formation have been damaged. Religious rituals and family practices have

changed. What the change creates is discomfort at first, but later can turn into anxiety. Although Ukrainians are more likely to be physically safe in the bunkers; they worry about their houses, shops, workplaces they closed, and the churches they left empty. Shops were looted, buildings were bombed, and people couldn't find clean water they gathered snow and drank it (Cookman, 2022). It is not easy for people to adapt to the shaken daily life. All the routines which keep people away from anxiety are decaying. After this war, some sculptures and monuments can be built to remind fear and anxiety of these days in Ukraine by showing Russia as the reason for the disorderly life that people live. If this happens, ontological security is reconstructed in society. In this case, the state tries to reactivate the ontological security by placing small reminders. Because sometimes people do not feel safe even when there is no visible threat. They may feel in their perception as; there is still a threat. Even though physical security is ensured, there is always the anxiety in thoughts of whether this conflict will repeat, since the security of the self is in question.

The question of whether this will be repeated actually creates a different routine in itself. It is seen that some conflicts are repeated throughout history. These protected conflicts do essentially not want the problem to be resolved. The continuation of the existence of "the other" maintains the existence of that state as well. The state is accustomed to creating itself through the existence of the other because formed its routines accordingly. The state wants to continue this conflicted condition because it has now linked its existence to it. Israel and Palestine were an example of this situation. In this conflict, both parties may want to destroy or invade others but not want to be harmed by others. They were not aggressive but still were willing to fight. Both Israel and Palestine saw themselves as security-seeker, just like USSR and the US in the Cold War (Mitzen, 2006b). This situation puts countries in a vicious cycle because they associate their ontological security with the conflict they are used to and ignore their physical security. For Mitzen, abandoning routines, however difficult it may be, requires sacrifices (Mitzen, 2006a). Even if it is seen as an irrational state behavior, continuing this conflict becomes a situation that they are used to, know, and stay within their comfort zone. States have to do certain things while trying to preserve the identities they have (Wendt, 1999). For Ukraine, maintaining its independence and moving closer to the West is perhaps in the

"certain things" category and for Russia, it is important not to surrender its old relatives to the opposite ideology. That is the reason that they prefer habitual conflicts to the uncertainty that will occur when routines are disrupted. At this point, it should not be forgotten that identity is a process. Every identity is in constant crisis and must be constantly produced. In times of deep crisis, marginalization increases, and bilateral differences between conflicting states reach a disturbing level.

Ukraine's independence was a chosen victory for Ukraine, but a chosen trauma for Russia. It is constantly reminded by mourning or celebrations. In critical times such as national crises, state elites produce perceptions about these situations because actors shape their past, present, and future through collective memory (Rumelili and Adısönmez, 2020). Traumas are negative, tiding to them and impersonating them begin to shape the lives of actors and become concepts that determine their behavior. Russia's obsession with this trauma over the years is the reason for its current action. In this case, even if the war ends in Ukraine's victory, it may provide physical security but may take a long time to ensure its ontological security. It may feel insecure even during the peace process. Because Russia is a certain enemy for them, as it has been for a long time, and they shape their self-narratives accordingly (Rumelili, 2015). By acting in a way that supports their existing self-narratives, they will seek to increase their ontological security through their continuous actions (Kinnvall and Mitzen, 2017). Actions that support existing self-narratives help establish the security of the self.

States fear that their new identity which is established by a new bilateral relationship may threaten their long-term self-narratives and self-images. This changing self-narrative can also create a situation of ontological insecurity. Like older people who are stubborn in their own knowledge. States are afraid of sudden changes and worry about falling into a void when what they know from the past is taken away. As in the case of Japan, acknowledging and apologizing for the country's past historical crimes, such as Nanjing Massacre, may also mean changing the self-image of the state it has presented so far (Zarakol, 2010). While apologizing is not costly, it can cause states to reconsider their sense of self. On the other side of establishing a new identity, Post-communist countries are concerned about not being accepted as full members of the European Union membership process (Subotić, 2018). For those countries, this means renewing the images that they are used to and

changing the narratives which have been reflected outside for years. As mentioned, image is something that can be marketed. The image can create a good or bad impression and support the construction of an identity that is expected to be accepted by other countries. Therefore, it contributes to the self-actualization need of the country. In this way, states strengthen and satisfy their ontological-security demands by reinforcing their national narratives consistently (Browning, 2015).

Distressing situations can be used by actors and traumatic events are usually used by them to make their security routines and self-images clear (Steele, 2008a). Religion, nationalism, marginalization, and populism can affect the collective memory and can trigger the anxiety of the people. Memory policies are critical while dealing with ontological security (Kinnvall, 2017a). For Kinnvall, traumatic emotions which may occur before, during, and after the event manage the actors' ontological securities. Collective memory shapes the past, today, and the future (Kinnvall, 2017b). Considered on a European basis, ontological security issues from the colonial period support today's populist politics (Kinnvall, Manners and Mitzen, 2018). Even this memory can cause anti-immigration policies. This anti-immigrant situation reflects on those who have displaced themselves due to the war, and their ontological insecurity does not end with getting rid of the war environment, on the contrary, it continues. Many people from both Ukraine and Russia began to live in different countries due to war and the consequences of the war. Physical security and ontological should be provided together. Because insecurity continues until they create new self-narratives and new routines for themselves (Rumelili and Adısönmez, 2020). The feeling of being marginalized shows similar characteristics in societies and states. It brings actors closer together due to common concerns, especially because it causes insecurity. This may be a community like the Kurds in Northern Iraq or a country like Russia in the international arena. Being "the other" causes anxiety and this anxiety can pass from generation to generation. Russia itself has mostly been neglected by the European side, both mentally and physically. Russia's power has been thrown into the background, and its ideology has never found the place it deserves. This can be shown as the reason for the current conflict to prove itself and to return to the subject to which it is accustomed. Familiar acts and familiar enemies may remind them of old routines.

Routines are needed to be safe, and the routines in the lives of states are linked to social interactions and stability (Sarı Ertem and Düzgün, 2021). The established relationship with the other is known and stable. Therefore, it gives a sense of security with predictable behavior patterns up to a certain point (Mitzen, 2006b). The Russian-Ukrainian conflict was also familiar and stable. Both sides wanted to feel secure. This pursuit of security lies behind every policy, regardless of domestic or foreign policy. These kinds of repetitive conflicts are actually routines within themselves. Since the need for self-actualization is at the top hierarchically, it should be included after meeting other needs, but this hierarchy is not always followed (Maslow, 1943). Due to the socio-psychological infrastructure, states can also disrupt this hierarchy and display irrational behaviors. Security of identity or security of the self that couldn't be understood in physical security studies can be prioritized. Whether in human, society, or state life routines, anxieties, social interactions, and stability are related to ontological security. A sense of control occurs in individuals who know what is happening inside them and around them or can predict what may happen in the future, and this protects the individual from uncertainties (McSweeney, 1999). The predictability provided by the stable identity is very important in this security creation (Wendt, 1994). The same applies to states, they need to know what's happening and what will happen and should be sure of their existed identity. Kinnvall mentions that the security of existence is the belief and confidence that the world is as it seems (Kinnvall, 2004a). As in the cave allegory, it is comforting to believe that everything is as it seems. Routine patterns of behavior adopted through social interactions distract states from concerns; with these routines, they protect their self-identity, and thus they try to protect the facts of their existence that include all self/identity elements. When the sense of continuity and coherence is lost, it is possible for it to become a self-identity crisis (Ejdus, 2020).

4.4. *Evaluating the Case within the framework of other Security Definitions*

The general definitions given by pairing with traditional security in the first section are defined ontologically and continued in the next section. Every theory has situations it can and cannot explain. According to Realism, wars and clashes are unchanging truths and they will always exist. States always have worries about their future and try to protect themselves because there is no other protector for them.

Great powers, in particular, are willing to compete for power to stay strong. Russia's invasion of Ukraine was a result of trying to protect its security interests (Walt, 2022). According to Realists, states try to avoid the security dilemma, in which case Ukraine does not feel safe to seek support (economically, for armament, health or psychological help). Therefore, it deepens Russia's concerns and insecurity increases in both states. Routinized relations among states may help the reproduction of security dilemmas (Mitzen, 2006b), with that way Russia may have tried to return to the conflict to which it was accustomed. Establishing different habits through aggressive attitudes can be seen as acting in irrational ways. Illegal situations in the form of the invasion of the country cannot be justified, but Realists argue that every way is permissible to achieve interests anyway. States are rational actors, they eager to calculate their interests and opportunities before acting. Ukraine can be a miscalculation for Putin, he underestimated Ukrainian power and misread the West's response.

For Liberals, establishing international organizations and international law can prevent states from making bad decisions due to the sanctions that will follow. It should even be said that one of the reasons for the deepening of today's conflict is the idea of Ukraine's desire to become a member of NATO, an international organization. But these attempts like imposing sanctions to stop aggressors are not effective enough for a leader like Putin who does not take international norms into consideration such as not to use force in the U.N. Charter. In fact, the idea of establishing a more peaceful world order with the mentioned economic interdependence could not prevent Moscow's action. A shortcoming of liberalist thinking is that the agreements and promises made may not always be valid. Before states enter into a war, they convince themselves that the war will not be long or expensive and that they will achieve their goals at the end of the war. However, when the process is prolonged or unexpected developments occur, the loyalty and desire of the states decrease or on the contrary, they can become more aggressive. The understanding of being a democratic country advocated by Liberalism can reduce the level of global violence. Democratic leaders scrutinize their decisions more by thinking about the next election, and autocratic leaders, on the other hand, have almost unlimited room for action because they have no such concerns.

According to the constructivists' understanding of multiple realities, it is formed by interactions with other states. It is the mindsets that decide whether an issue is security related or not. Russia's relationship with Ukraine could not prevent the perception that it was a state that emerged from the Soviet Union. And looking at Putin's interpretation in his own article, it is seen that there would not be a problem if Ukraine remains neutral (Putin, 2021). Constructivists attach great importance to culture and values, since both states have shared cultural heritage in their past, it is natural to want to be united. At the same time, Russia has an instinct to protect its interests shaped through Ukraine in its bilateral relationship. On the other hand, Ukraine does not want the independence it has achieved and the new identity that it is still trying to create, to be damaged. What smaller and relatively weaker countries like Ukraine miss is that they tend to join collective organizations like NATO or the EU in order to feel more secure and powerful. So they actually become dependent on these kinds of organizations as they try to be more independent. Since Constructivism believes that security problems are produced by discourses and thoughts, they also think that securitization will be achieved with speeches.

In terms of women's security, the war caused more than two million refugees, most of them women and children, who went to neighboring countries or had to relocate within the country. Trying to re-establish a life in a different place and obtaining the living conditions they had were psychologically challenging. Pregnant women and newborns suffered. Women are seen as vulnerable and need to be protected but so many females signed up to fight against Russia (Moaveni and Nagarajan, 2022). Women are also arming themselves and making Molotov cocktails to defend their land. Considering the general perception, although men were seen as pro-war, they were not willing at all. It shows that, the warlike masculine understanding started to decline. They were right in one demand; states began to deal more with low politics such as human rights, civilian protection, minority rights, and migration problems.

For Marxists, the upper class is producing security policies and the state is not independent of this high class. So the perception of security is established by elites and the ruling class. In this case, it can be interpreted as; Ukraine can be the low-level class and Russia as the higher one. Because Ukraine itself does not have the resources that Russia has in terms of oil and natural gas. Means and resources are

in the hands of Russia, and Russia's perception of Ukraine is nothing more than a transit country or an energy corridor. All the understandings create threat to society and make people feel insecure day by day. Since the security is based on the economy for them, the sanctions imposed by the states on Russia affect the economic situation that the country has been accustomed to until now. This causes Russia to follow different policies.

Post-structuralism argues that concepts and policies are formed out of the relations between great powers. And the concept of security is one of them; it was also created based on West. Most of the resources used in preparing the research are also Western-centered. Therefore, making an objective assessment becomes difficult due to both the language barrier and the lack of access to the written data. While the actions of the great powers do not shake them deeply, even if they affect them, it may take a long time for third-world countries to recover from the problems that they are going through. Security approaches may not fully cover every issue, so new approaches and interpretations are needed.

In this chapter, a case analysis has been tried to be made. Non-rational state behaviors that classical security approaches cannot explain have been associated with ontological (in)security. It has been mentioned that the understanding of security, which is overturned by the disruption of routines, creates ontological insecurity for both Russia and Ukraine. It is not known what direction the war will take, but it can be said that if Russia does not get what it wants, it will sink into a deeper ontological distrust than Ukraine. Because Ukraine will reflect itself the way it wants, it can somehow get out of the situation it is in, even if it takes time to re-create its routines.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

This study, which started with the question of which security theory can better explain the Ukraine-Russia conflict, continues by explaining both old and new security understandings. In the beginning, this thesis dealt with security in general from traditional approaches. It has sought to convey what older security approaches think and in what context they evaluate the cases in history. Sensitive issues such as wars and conflicts have constantly created security-related questions in international relations. When individuals, societies and states got involved, it hosted more studies due to the level analysis difference.

The ontological security theory is shaped around concepts such as identity, self-other distinction, security and insecurity, the anxiety which is different in many aspects from fear, routines, habits, self-narrative, and self-image. Ontological Security means the appropriate securing of self/identity/being. It differs from the understanding of physical security in many respects and requires continuity and predictability provided by routines in social life. When these routines are disrupted, uncertainty, indecision, instability, and anxiety will lead to ontological insecurity. Anxiety that triggers ontological insecurity, unlike fear, does not have a demonstrable concrete object; it is a feeling that cannot even be understood why it is felt. It is an explanatory theory that attempts to fill the gaps in the literature. It tries to explain that states are not as classical and unshakable as is thought and changes can occur regarding time and place. It is especially effective in interpreting irrational and risky state behaviors. It takes a complementary approach to the issue of security by covering many different subjects. Since it is interdisciplinary interpretable, it is gradually expanding and developing. A state that is consistent, stable, sets and adheres to certain routines, and acts in accordance with its own self-image is expected to be ontologically secure.

Although the subject has been evaluated specifically for Russia and Ukraine, it can be said that many countries experience similar feelings in similar situations. This conflict between them is also a war of memories and identities. After examining the Ontological Security, if the reasons are listed together, it will be understood how this type of security can be achieved. The main reasons why Russia feels ontologically insecure are based on its historical past. Because they were so attached to their own past power, their goal is still to maintain that power authority. In the

post-Soviet international arena, they were not at peace with their self as they do not get as much power and respect as they would like. When the anxiety of losing Russia's ideology was added to the *"Special Operation"* the course of the conflict began to change. Like every state, Russia also wanted its borders to be secure. And even the risk of neighboring countries becoming members of organizations contrary to their own ideology is enough to trigger this situation. The fact that economic sanctions caused trouble for the country also creates insecurity due to uncertainty about the future. Uncertainty about the future also exists in Ukraine, as they cannot predict Putin's next step. The disruption of people's routines during the war made them more anxious because, as described, disruption of routines triggers ontological insecurity. Therefore, identity formations have also been damaged due to disrupted routines. The problems of intimacy in the past of the country, the question of east or west forced their own self-identity development. Since they do not want to lose their identity, they are trying to give a fully nationalistic and strong response.

I hope this study will be a source of inspiration for other studies. As ontological security is adaptive to any subject, it can be extended from everyday situations to international issues. Therefore, as the field of study increases, different evaluations and studies will emerge. The best part of the subject is that it has sociological and psychological foundations, so one can take an example from himself/herself and his/her environment when evaluating it.

REFERENCES

Acharya, A. (2014) *Global International Relations (IR) and Regional Worlds: A New Agenda for International Studies,* International Studies Quarterly, 58(4), pp. 647–659.

Acton, J. M. (2022) *How to prevent nuclear war: Give Putin a way out,* The Washington Post, 1 March [Online]. Available at: https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2022/03/01/putin-russia-nuclear-alert/?mkt_tok=MDk1LVBQVi04MTMAAAGC5l0nEO8uD_lwFDyXWMwzd2L2LC5TwNfeYcph17NNhkqaH8IN6nsG-zfj4HVW8AcJg7E_9EVg4M2vKYjU7-7EXY2VG5KpDNO-B_7eu7hTKSWZ (Accessed 14 April 2022).

Al, S. (2021) *Kürt Çalışmaları Ortadoğu Çalışmaları'nın Neresinde?*, Mülkiye Dergisi, 45(1), pp. 89-124, 14 March [Online]. Available at https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/mulkiye/issue/61971/927460 (Accessed 7 May 2022).

Al, S. and Byrd, D. (2018) *When do states (de)securitise minority identities? Conflict and Change in Turkey and Northern Ireland.* Journal of International Relations and Development 21, pp. 608–634.

Albayrak, B. (2019) *Syrian Refugees and the Politics of Migration in Europe*. Master Thesis. Boğaziçi University.

Anderson, B. (2016) I*magined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. 1st edition. London: Verso Books.

Atmaca, A. Ö. and Gözen Ercan, P. (2018) *Rethinking International Security: Feminist Critiques in International Relations,* Uluslararası Ilişkiler, 13(59), pp. 19–31.

Balaban, G. (2020) *Ontolojik Güvenlik,* Güvenlik Yazıları Serisi, (53), pp. 1-9, Ekim 2020, [Online] Available at https://trguvenlikportali.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/OntolojikGuvenlik_GokceBalaban_v.2.pdf (Accessed 20 May 2022).

Baldwin, D. A. (1997) *The concept of security,* Review of International Studies, 23(1), pp. 5–26.

Barkawi, T. and Laffey, M. (2006) The Postcolonial Moment in Security Studies, Review of International Studies, 32, pp. 329–352.

Baylis, J., Smith, S. and Owens, P. (2008) *The Globalization of World Politics.* 5th edition. Oxford University Press.

Berger, M. (2022) *Putin says he will 'denazify' Ukraine. Here's the history behind that claim.* The Washington Post, 24 February [Online]. Available at https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/2022/02/24/putin-denazify-ukraine/. (Accessed 10 May 2022).

Berkeley, G. (2004) *Three Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous in Opposition to Sceptics and Atheists.* 1st edition. Utah: Gutenberg. Available at Gutenberg Ebook. (Accessed 9 May 2022).

Bigg, M. M. (2022) *A history of the tensions between Ukraine and Russia,* The New York Times, 26 March [Online]. Available at https://www.nytimes.com/2022/03/26/world/europe/ukraine-russia-tensions-timeline.html (Accessed 3 May 2022).

Bilener, T. (2007) *The Factors Determining the Ukrainian Foreign Policy,* Journal of the Black Sea Studies, 13, pp. 115–132.

Blanchard, E. M. (2003) *Gender, International Relations, and the Development of Feminist Security Theory,* Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 28(4), pp. 1289–1312.

Booth, K. (2007) *Theory of World Security*. 1st edition. Cambridge Studies in International Relations, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, S. (1988) *Feminism, International Theory, and International Relations of Gender Inequality,* Millennium: Journal of International Studies, 17(3), pp. 463-464.

Browning, C. S. (2015) *Nation Branding, National Self-Esteem, and the Constitution of Subjectivity in Late Modernity,* Foreign Policy Analysis, 11(2), pp. 195–214.

Browning, C. S. and Joenniemi, P. (2017) *Ontological security, self-articulation and the securitization of identity,* Cooperation and Conflict, 52(1), pp. 31–47.

Browning, C. S., Joenniemi, P. and Steele, B. J. (2021) *Vicarious Identity in International Relations: Self, Security, and Status on the global stage.* 1st edition. New York: Oxford University Press.

Buzan, B. (1997) *Rethinking Security after the Cold War,* Cooperation and Conflict, 32(1), pp. 5–28.

Buzan, B. (2007) *People, states, and fear: An agenda for international security studies in the post-cold war era.* 2nd edition. Colchester: ECPR Press.

Buzan, B., Wæver, O. and De Wilde, J. (1998) *Security: a new framework for analysis.* 1st edition. Boulder, Colo. : Lynne Rienner Publisher.

Campbell, D. (1998) *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*. Revised edition. University of Minnesota Press.

Chace, J. and Carr, C. (1988) *America Invulnerable: The Quest for Absolute Security from 1812 to Starwars*. First edition. Philippines: Summit Books.

Cookman, L. (2022) *The World Must Know What Happened to Us,* Foreign Policy, 18 March [Online]. Available at https://foreignpolicy.com/2022/03/18/mariupol-ukraine-russia-civilians/. (Accessed 1 June 2022).

Croft, S. (2012) *Constructing ontological insecurity: The insecuritization of Britian's Muslims,* Contemporary Security Policy, 33(2), pp. 219–235.

Derrida, J. (1998) *Of Grammatology.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Douglas, H. (2022a) *Etymology of Ontology*, Online Etymology Dictionary. Available at: https://www.etymonline.com/word/ontology (Accessed 1 May 2022).

Douglas, H. (2022b) *Etymology of Secure*, Online Etymology Dictionary. Available at: https://www.etymonline.com/word/secure (Accessed 1 May 2022).

Ejdus, F. (2020) *Crisis and Ontological Insecurity: Serbia's Anxiety over Kosovo's Secession.* 1st edition. Palgrave Macmillian.

Emiroğlu, E. (2021) *Ontological (In)Security Between Turkey And Egypt: The Possibility Of Rapprochement *,* Uluslararası Stratejik Boyut Dergisi, 1(1), pp. 1–16.

Enloe, C. H. (2000) *Bananas, Beaches and Bases : Making Feminist Sense of International Politics.* 2nd edition. University of California Press.

Erdoğan, E. F. (2021) *Ontological Security and Support for Peace Process.* Sabancı University, 10 September [Online]. Available at https://research.sabanciuniv.edu/id/eprint/42401/ (Accessed 22 May 2022).

Freedman, L. (2022) *A Reckless Gamble*, Substack, 25 February [Online]. Available at https://samf.substack.com/p/a-reckless-gamble?utm_source=substack&utm_medium=email&utm_content=share&s=r (Accessed 13 March 2022).

Friedrich, E. (1886) *Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy.* 1st edition. Stuttgart: Die Neue Zeit.

Fukuyama, F. (1992) *The End of History and the Last Man*. 1st edition. New York: Free Press.

Giddens, A. (1979) *Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis*. 1st edition. Palgrave Macmillian.

Giddens, A. (1991a) *Modernity and Self-Identity.* 1st edition. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Giddens, A. (1991b) *The Consequences of Modernity*. 1st edition. Oxford: Polity Press.

Grøn, A. (2008) *The Concept of Anxiety in Søren Kierkegaard*. 1st edition. Mercer University Press.

Harari, Y. N. (2022) *What's at stake in Ukraine is the direction of human history,* The Economist, pp. 1–4.

Hershberg, J. (2022) *Putin is Repeating the USSR's Mistakes,* Foreign Affairs (New York).

Herz, J. H. (1951) *Political Realism and Political Idealism: A Study in Theories and Realities,* 1st edition. [Chicago], University of Chicago Press.

Hobbes, T. (2008) *Leviathan*. Edited by J. C. A. Gaskin. London: Oxford University Press.

Huard, R. L. (2007) *Plato's political philosophy: the cave*. New York, Algora, 1st edition [Online]. Available at http://public.ebookcentral.proquest.com/choice/publicfullrecord.aspx?p=319238 (Accessed 2 May 2022).

Huysmans, J. (1998) *Security! What do you mean? From concept to thick signifier,* European Journal of International Relations, 4(2), pp. 229–242.

Ikenberry, G. J. (2020) *The Next Liberal Order,* Foreign Affairs (New York).

Johnson, R. (2022) *Letter from Kyiv: Putin's War on Ukraine is 'Pozor Rossii',* Breaking Defense. Available at: https://breakingdefense.com/2022/03/letter-from-kyiv-putins-war-on-ukraine-is-pozor-rossii/?utm_campaign=Breaking Defense Air &utm_medium=email&_hsmi=205813655&_hsenc=p2ANqtz-8_GKgEIeeC9L-297vSc8jMVo4EBiIQEinBOheF96kCIXO1jLBKE0yEjidJmEPlCYvnZnSlmFc6QSl iAw (Accessed 5 March 2022).

Joque, J. and Haque, S. M. T. (2020) *Deconstructing Cybersecurity: From Ontological Security to Ontological Insecurity,* in ACM International Conference Proceeding Series, pp. 99–110.

Kant, I. (1903) *Perpetual peace; a philosophical essay*, 1795. 1st edition. London: S. Sonnenschein.

Kendall-Taylor, A. and Frantz, E. (2022) *Why Putin Probably Won't Give Up Anytime Soon,* Foreign Policy. 17 March [Online]. Available at https://foreignpolicy.com/2022/03/17/putin-russia-ukraine-war-end/. (Accessed 23 March 2022).

Kinnvall, C. (2004a) *Globalization and Religious Nationalism: Self, Identity, and the Search for Ontological Security,* Political Psychology, 25(5), pp. 741–744.

Kinnvall, C. (2004b) *Globalization and Religious Nationalism: Self, Identity and the Search for Ontological Security,* Political Psychology, 25(5), pp. 741–767.

Kinnvall, C. (2006) *Globalization and Religious Nationalism in India: The Search for Ontological Security*. 1st edition. London: Routledge.

Kinnvall, C. (2017a) *European Trauma: Governance and the Psychological Moment,* Alternatives, 37(3), pp. 266–281.

Kinnvall, C. (2017b) *Feeling Ontologically (In)secure: States, Traumas and the Governing of Gendered Space,* Cooperation and Conflict, 52(1), pp. 90–108.

Kinnvall, C. and Cash, J. (2017) *Postcolonial Bordering and Ontological Insecurities,* Postcolonial Studies, 20(3), pp. 267–274.

Kinnvall, C., Manners, I. and Mitzen, J. (2018) *Introduction to 2018 Special Issue of European Security: Ontological (in)Security in the European Union,* European Security, 27(3), pp. 249–265.

Kinnvall, C. and Mitzen, J. (2017) *An introduction to the special issue: Ontological securities in world politics,* Cooperation and Conflict, 52(1), pp. 3–11.

Kolodziej, E. A. (2005) *Economic Liberalism and Marxism,* in Security and International Relations. 1st edition. Cambridge University Press, pp. 175–224.

Krolikowski, A. (2008) *State Personhood in Ontological Security Theories of International Relations and Chinese Nationalism: A Sceptical View,* Chinese Journal of International Politics, 2(1), pp. 109–133.

Laing, R. D. (1960) *The Divided Self: An existential study in sanity and madness.* Revised edition. London: Penguin Books.

Machiavelli, N. (1998) *The Prince*. Edited by H. C. Mansfield. 2nd edition. University of Chicago Press.

Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1975) *Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works.* 1st edition. New York: International Publishers.

Maslow, A. H. (1943) *A Theory of Human Motivation,* Psychological Review, 50(4), pp. 370–396.

McDonald, M. (2002) *Human Security and the Construction of Security,* Global Society, 16(3), pp. 277–295.

McLeod, S. (2018) *Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs,* Simply Psychology, May, pp. 1–16, 21 May [Online]. Available at https://canadacollege.edu/dreamers/docs/Maslows-Hierarchy-of-Needs.pdf (Accessed 22 February 2022).

McSweeney, B. (1999) *Security, Identity and Interests: A Sociology of International Relations.* 1st edition. Cambridge University Press.

Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001) *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. Updated edition. New York, Norton.

Meiser, J. W. (2018) *Introducing Liberalism in International Relations Theory,* E-International Relations Publishing, pp. 1-4, 18 February [Online]. Available at https://www.e-ir.info/2018/02/18/introducing-liberalism-in-international-relations-theory/ (Accessed 7 March 2022).

Miller, B. (2001) *The Concept of Security: Should it be Redefined?,* The Journal of Strategic Studies, 24(2), pp. 13–42.

Mitzen, J. (2006a) *Anchoring Europe's Civilizing Identity: Habits, Capabilities and Ontological Security,* Journal of European Public Policy, 13(2), pp. 270–285.

Mitzen, J. (2006b) *Ontological Security in World Politics: State Identity and the Security Dilemma,* European Journal of International Relations, 12(3), pp. 341–370.

Mitzen, J. (2006c) *Ontological Security in World Politics: State Identity and the Security Dilemma,* European Journal of International Relations, 12(3), pp. 341–353.

Mitzen, J. and Larson, K. (2017) *Ontological Security and Foreign Policy,* Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics, pp. 3-4.

Moaveni, A. and Nagarajan, C. (2022) *Another deeply gendered war is being waged in Ukraine,* Aljazeera, 15 March [Online]. Available at https://www.aljazeera.com/opinions/2022/3/15/another-deeply-gendered-war-is-being-waged-in-ukraine (Accessed 15 May 2022).

Morgenthau, H. J. (2018) *Politics among nations: The struggle for power and peace.* sixth. Edited by K. W. Thompson. 6th edition. New Delhi: Kalyani Publishers.

Ontology. (2022). In Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary. Oxford University Press. https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/ontology (Accessed 1 May 2022).

Onuf, N. G. (1989) *World of Our Making: Rules and Rule in Social Theory and International Relations.* 1st edition. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.

Orwell, G. (2021) *Animal Farm.* 1st edition. London: William Collins.

Politzer, G. (1950) *An Elementary Course in Philosophy*, 1st edition. Current Book Distributors. Sydney.

Prichard, A. (2018) *The ' Isms ' Are Evil . All Hail the ' Isms '! A Reflection on IR Theory,* E-International Relations Publishing, pp. 1–5, 13 February [Online]. Available at https://www.e-ir.info/2018/02/13/irs-isms-are-evil-all-hail-the-isms/ (Accessed 20 February 2022).

Putin, V. (2021) *On the Historical Unity of Russians and Ukrainians*. Kremlin, 12 July [Online]. Available at http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/66181 (Accessed 11 June 2022).

Rothschild, E. (1995) *What is Security?,* Daedalus, 124(3), pp. 53–98.

Rousseau, J. J. (1968) *The Social Contract,* 1st edition. London: Penguin Books.

Rumelili, B. (2013) *Identity and Desecuritization: The Pitfalls of Conflating Ontological and Physical Security,* Journal of International Relations and Development, pp. 1–23.

Rumelili, B. (2015) *Conflict Resolution and Ontological Security: Peace Anxieties,* in Burgess, J. P. (ed.) New Security Studies. PRIO.

Rumelili, B. (2020) *Integrating anxiety into international relations theory: Hobbes, existentialism, and ontological security,* International Theory, 12(2), pp. 257–272.

Rumelili, B. and Adısönmez, U. C. (2020) *Uluslararası İlişkilerde Kimlik-Güvenlik İlişkisine Dair Yeni bir Paradigma: Ontolojik Güvenlik Teorisi,* Uluslararası Ilişkiler, 17(66), pp. 23–39.

Russett, B. et al. (1995) *The Democratic Peace,* International Security, 19(4), pp. 164–184.

Rywkin, M. (2015) *Russia and the Near Abroad Under Putin,* The Journal of the National Committee on American Foreign Policy, 37(4), pp. 229–237.

Sarı Ertem, H. and Düzgün, A. N. (2021) *Uluslararası İlişkiler Disiplininde Ontolojik Güvenlik Teorisi: Kavram ve Literatür Odaklı Bir İnceleme*, Güvenlik Stratejileri Dergisi, 17(37), pp. 39–83.

Security. (2022). In Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary. Oxford University Press. https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/security?q=security (Accessed 1 May 2022).

Smith, A. (2002) *An inquiry to the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations.* Digital edition. Edited by S.M. Soares. MetaLibri Digital Library.

Sokolov, M. and Kirilenko, A. (2013) *20 Years Ago, Russia Had Its Biggest Political Crisis Since the Bolshevik Revolution,* The Atlantic, 4 October [Online]. Available at https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2013/10/20-years-ago-russia-had-its-biggest-political-crisis-since-the-bolshevik-revolution/280237/. (Accessed 26 May 2022).

Sönmez, A. S., Bıçakcı, H. and Yıldırım, C. (2015) *Analysis of Russia-Ukraine relations in context of Crimea problem,* International Journal of Social Sciences and Education Research, 1(3), pp. 1–15.

Steele, B. J. (2005) *Ontological security and the power of self-identity: British neutrality and the American Civil War,* Review of International Studies, 31(3), pp. 519–540.

Steele, B. J. (2008a) *'Ideals That Were Really Never in Our Possession': Torture, Honor and US Identity,* International Relations, 22(2), pp. 243–261.

Steele, B. J. (2008b) *Ontological Security in International Relations: Self-Identity and the IR State*. Edited by R. Little, I. B. Neumann, and J. Weldes. The New International Relations Series.

Steele, B. J. (2008c) *Ontological security in international relations*. 1st edition. London: Routledge.

Steele, B. J. (2019) *Welcome Home! Routines, Ontological Insecurity and the Politics of US Military Reunion Videos,* Cambridge Review of International Affairs, pp. 1–3.

Steele, B. J. (2021) *Nowhere to run to, nowhere to hide: inescapable dread in the 2020s,* Journal of International Relations and Development, 24, pp. 1037–1043.

Steele, B. J. and Innes, A. J. (2013) *Memory and Trauma in International Relations*. 1st edition. Routledge.

Stein, J. G. (2022) *The Ukraine Dilemma.* Foreign Affairs, 9 March [Online]. Available at https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/russia-fsu/2022-03-09/ukraine-dilemma. (Accessed 6 June 2022).

Steinmetz, K. (2014) *Ukraine, Not the Ukraine: The Significance of Three Little Letters.* TIME, 5 March [Online]. Available at https://time.com/12597/the-ukraine-or-ukraine/ (Accessed 3 May 2022).

Stent, A. (2013) *The Putin Doctrine*. Foreign Affairs, 27 January [Online]. Available at https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/ukraine/2022-01-27/putin-doctrine (Accessed 17 March 2022).

Subotić, J. (2018) *Political Memory, Ontological Security, and Holocaust Remembrance in Post-Communist Europe,* European Security, 27(3), pp. 296–313.

Subotić, J. and Steele, B. J. (2018) *Moral Injury in International Relations,* Journal of Global Security Studies, 3(4), pp. 387–401.

Sun, Y. (2021) *Education Research on Marxism Religious Concept from the Perspective of Cultural Security,* in Proceedings of the 2021 2nd International Conference on Modern Education Management, Innovation and Entrepreneurship and Social Science (MEMIESS 2021). Atlantis Press, pp. 161–167.

Sylvester, C. (2006) *Bare Life as A Development/Postcolonial Problematic,* The Geographical Journal, 172(1), pp. 66–77.

Tetruashvily, E. (2022) *How Does the Ukraine War End?,* Foreign Policy, 17 March [Online]. Available at https://foreignpolicy.com/2022/03/17/ukraine-peace-cease-fire-putin/ (Accessed 16 May 2022).

Thucydides (2013) *The War of the Peloponnesians and the Athenians*, Edited by J. Mynott. 1st edition. Cambridge University Press.

Tickner, J. A. (1988) *Hans Morgenthau's Principles of Political Realism,* Millennium: Journal of International Studies, 17(3), pp. 429–440.

Tickner, J. A. (1992) *Gender in International Relations : Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security,* 1st edition. Columbia University Press. New York.

Ullman, R. H. (1983) *Redefining Security,* International Security, 8(1), pp. 129–153.

Virdee, S. and McGeever, B. (2018) *Racism, Crisis, Brexit,* Ethnic and Racial Studies, Taylor and Francis, 41(10), pp. 1801–1819.

Wæver, O. (1995) *Securitization and Desecuritization,* in Lipschutz, R. D. (ed.) On Security. Columbia University Press, pp. 46–87.

Wallerstein, I. M. (1976) *The Modern World-System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century,* 1st edition. New York: Academic Press.

Walt, S. M. (2014) *How to get a B.A. in International Relations in 5 Minutes,* Foreign Policy.

Walt, S. M. (2019) *You Can't Defeat Nationalism, So Stop Trying,* Foreign Policy, 4 June [Online]. Available at https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/06/04/you-cant-defeat-nationalism-so-stop-trying/ (Accessed 5 June 2022).

Walt, S. M. (2022*) An International Relations Theory Guide to the War in Ukraine,* Foreign Policy, 8 March [Online]. Available at https://foreignpolicy.com/2022/03/08/an-international-relations-theory-guide-to-ukraines-war/ (Accessed 3 June 2022).

Walt, K. N. (1979) *Theory of International Politics,* 1st edition. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Wendt, A. (1992) *Anarchy Is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics,* International Organization. The MIT Press, 46(2), pp. 391–425.

Wendt, A. (1994) *Collective Identity Formation and the International State,* The American Political Science Review, 88(2), pp. 384–396.

Wendt, A. (1999) *Social theory of international politics.* 1st edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wendt, A. (2004) *The State as Person in International Theory*, Review of International Studies, 30(2), pp. 289–316.

Westfall, S. and Pietsch, B. (2022) *What to know about Volodymyr Zelensky, Ukraine's TV president turned wartime leader,* The Washington Post, 2 March [Online]. Available at: https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/2022/03/01/ukraine-president-volodymyr-zelensky-russia/ (Accessed 5 May 2022).

Wolfers, A. (1952) *National Security as an Ambiguous Symbol,* Political Science Quarterly, 67(4), pp. 485–487.

Zarakol, A. (2010) *Ontological (In)security and State Denial of Historical Crimes: Turkey and Japan,* International Relations, 21(1), pp. 3–23.

Zuckert, C. (1991) *The Politics of Derridean Deconstruction*, Polity, 23(3), pp. 335–356.