



Araştırma Makalesi

Doi: [10.5281/zenodo.8377936](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8377936)

SEARCHING FOR ONTOLOGICAL SECURITY: BIOGRAPHICAL NARRATIVE OF “NEW TURKEY” IN THE EARLY TURKISH REPUBLIC PERIOD¹

1. Okan Gülbak²

ORCID No: 0000-0002-7220-5545

Başvuru Tarihi: 09.06.2023

Kabul Tarihi: 30.07.2023

Yayın Tarihi: 26.09.2023

ABSTRACT

This article presents a conceptual account of the narrative of New Turkey in the early Turkish Republic period (1920s and 1930s). It adopts the biographical narrative concept from ontological security theory to understand the main functions and intentions in the narrative of New Turkey. Employing a descriptive method, this conceptual study emphasizes that the concepts of ontological security and biographical narrative should not be separated from the establishment of the Republic as a new state identity and the New Turkey narrative that forms the basis of this identity. It relates this biographical narrative to the way in which it provided the basis for the process of establishing a stable identity for the Republic on the international arena and suggests that it also provides a useful framework for understanding the dynamics of state-formation that constituted the process of self-identity on the domestic stage. The paper will argue that the dominant political actors of the period, Atatürk and İnönü, through the narrative of New Turkey, were not only concerned with the physical security needs of the Republican state, but also sought ontological security by attempting to create a coherent identity and self-identity for the state between yesterday, today and tomorrow.

Keywords: Biographical Narrative, Early Republican Period, New Turkey, Ontological Security, State Identity

ONTOLOJİK GÜVENLİK ARAYIŞI: ERKEN CUMHURİYET DÖNEMİNDE YENİ TÜRKİYE’NİN BİYOGRAFİK ANLATISI

ÖZ

Bu makale, erken Cumhuriyet döneminde (1920'ler ve 1930'lar) söylenegelmiş Yeni Türkiye anlatısının kavramsal bir açıklamasını sunmaktadır. Yeni Türkiye'nin temel işlevlerini ve kullanım amaçlarını anlamak için ontolojik güvenlik ve biyografik anlatı kavramlarından faydalanmaktadır. Betimleyici metod kullanan bu çalışma, ontolojik güvenlik ve biyografik anlatı kavramlarının yeni bir devlet kimliği olarak Cumhuriyetin kuruluşunu, bu kimliğe zemin teşkil eden Yeni Türkiye anlatısından ayrı düşünülmemesi gerektiğini vurgulamaktadır. Bu biyografik anlatının, Cumhuriyete uluslararası sahada istikrarlı bir kimlik oluşturma sürecine zemin teşkil etmesiyle ilişkilendirmekte; aynı zamanda, ulusal alanda da öz-kimlik sürecini oluşturan devlet-oluş dinamiklerini anlamak için faydalı bir çerçeve sunduğunu önermektedir. Çalışma, dönemin başat siyasal aktörleri olan Atatürk ve İnönü'nün Yeni Türkiye anlatısıyla yalnızca Cumhuriyet devletinin fiziksel güvenlik gereksinimleri düşünmediklerini, aynı zamanda bu devlete dün, bugün ve yarın arasında tutarlı bir kimlik ve öz-kimlik oluşturmaya çalışarak ontolojik güvenlik arayışında olduklarını da öne sürecektir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Biyografik Anlatı, Devlet Kimliği, Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi, Ontolojik Güvenlik, Yeni Türkiye

¹ Bu makale çalışması doktora tezinden türetilmiştir.

² Okan Gülbak, İstanbul Üniversitesi, ogulbak@gmail.com



1. INTRODUCTION

Security is a widely used concept in International Relations (IR) literature with its attribution to the other concepts as identity, foreign policy, and survival. Though the concept of security gained momentum and it is widely used, there is not a clear and simple definition for it (Buzan, 1991). Based on the realist and liberal IR scholars' approach to security as prime motivator for the state behaviors and focusing on essential of a war, Buzan suggests redefinition of security with approaching its value-laden definition benefiting from social constructivism (Gülbak, 2018). Accordingly, the security concept is related with the core values of states and the notion of value does not possess a universal sense; rather each state has their own values that can be performed, each can have their own understanding of security that can also be performed. Like the concept of security, the concept of identity is changing and evolving in time, and it has also relation with its performative sense. As identities can tell you and others who you are and who others are (Hopf, 2002); for the sake of the states, identities can also give us which values make your state-being. and which other values make others are. In this light, the stories that make state-being are important to understand the gap between the identity and security of the states and narratives of each state has a meaning power to fill this gap.

It is important to know how states narrated their biographical narratives for the understanding the nexus on the identity and security of states (Rumelili & Adisönmez, 2020). Though there are relevant studies to analyze why and how states search for their ontological security (Mitzen, 2006; Subotic, 2015) (Steele, 2008), the research on the function and the use of narratives and the concept of biographical narrative are rarely studied for understanding state-being and state formation at the same time (Berenskoetter, 2014). With the help of ontological security theory, the biographical narratives of the states can be a useful tool not only for understanding the state identity as a social construction of personhood of a state to the international (Rumelili, 2015); but also evaluating the logic of state self-identity as identification of established or desired feelings of a state (Krickel-Choi, 2022).

Under this light, with a particular focus on the relation between state behavior and states' biographical narratives, the present study aims to understand Turkey's search for ontological security in the early Turkish Republic period through a descriptive method. Although there are important studies that analyze main tenets of Turkey's foreign and security Policy (Aydın, 2010; Hale, 2013; Karaosmanoğlu, 2000), and the identity crisis of Turkish Republic (Ahmad, 2006; Al, 2016), there is not many studies on combination of both identity and security with an emphasis on biographical narrative. That is why early Turkish Republican period is chosen as a case study for applying ontological security and biographical narrative. The study examines international behavior and internal organization of the state with a specific focus on change and continuities of the state over the fears and threats. Moreover, this study argues the narrative of New Turkey is used as a shield to overcome the fears and threats and to eliminate uncertainties, it is also used a mechanism to establish a desired self. In other words, the narrative of New Turkey is used for searching for ontological security, it is proved by observing the established feelings from geopolitical experience and by understanding a desired self with confrontation of fears. In line with this aim, particularly, the causal inferences based on Turkey's search for ontological security are presented under two categories: international behavior and internal organization of the state.

2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

A narrative is told by and with others to us; moreover, a narrative functions as political act that tell stories about us in a chosen or desired form (Subotic & Steele, 2021). Nation state is a bounded entity of political community with sovereignty and territoriality which has found a centered place in conceptual studies in IR literature. While the realist IR studies have put power and autonomy of the nation state at the center, liberal IR has more concentrated on institutional linkages for existence of states. As a matter of fact, both theories give nation state to narrate identities in static terms and promotion of national interest is the natural strategy for the nation states' identity preservation in international arena. On the



other hand, constructivism gives much more attention to the cultural and historical factors when defining nation states' identities, since nation states do not have fixed or natural identities. Thus, constructivism narrates state identities dynamically with their external and internal dimensions (Berenskoetter, 2014). Accordingly, like the individuals, nation states have identities that makes their existence meaningful with their actions which meant nation states consolidate their identities by their actions and performances. Moreover, they present themselves in everyday practices with their performances, which can be observed through biographical narrative resulting from historical and cultural evolutions. For both dimensions, it is important to understand how biographies are formed and narrated, indicating how nation states constitute their past and reinterpret it in changing circumstances.

Biographical narrative is defined as “experiencing of what matters” and “highlighting emotional and moral components of identity” (Berenskoetter, 2014, p. 269). Referencing Martin Heidegger’s ontology, scholars in psychology, sociology and international relations define biographical narrative in terms of representation of identities and its change over time. As Giddens argued, biographical narratives give us reflexive revisions of identity (Giddens, 1991). In other words, it can be a piece that shows “where we come from, where we are and going” (Berenskoetter, 2014, p. 269). In line with this, it is necessary to understand change and continuities in defining biographical narrative which bases state identity in constructivist terms.

The Turkish Republic has descended from the Ottoman Empire. Like any other newly founded nation states after the World War I, which caused fall of multinational empires and kingdoms; the Turkish Republic experienced similar changes and continuities in terms of its imperial past in its biography. However, as a nation state, it gained a new identity and saw a new state formation. Despite there were some continuities in the international behavior of state related to geopolitics and security for survival, there were also changes in the identification of a new nation state for the recognition in the international arena and its reaffirmation in the domestic context.

According to the recognition theory “states are not exclusively concerned with survival, but also care about how they are recognized by others” (Gustafsson, 2016, p. 255). Especially, states are highly akin to focusing on recognition by others in the early formation periods and the case of Turkey is a good example; because the new state had to recognize by others to prove its being. Starting from overcoming ontological security crisis after the defeat of the Ottoman Empire, the Turkish Republic defined itself as a new state which have different identity that should have been recognized by others. Since the old one had not realized a sense of agency and had been unable to solve its identity crisis, founding itself in unpredictability and uncertainty; the new state had to deal with the changes by showing that it had confident expectations and was able to formulate sustainable means to ends related to govern its social life (Mitzen, 2006). For the sake of these aims, the new state constituted itself with a new biographical narrative that deserved a different state identity for its recognition.

The time and space new states have been experiencing have fundamentally changed in the first decades of the 20th century and change made newly formed nation states' ontological ‘being’ questionable in an uncertain world. As Mitzen (2006) argued, states' fundamental motivation in tragedy of world politics is uncertainty, that is why states are identified as security-seekers. For this reason, to overcome uncertainties, states do not only seek physical security, but also look for ontological security. At the basic level, ontological security requires having a consistent self that should be affirmed and recognized by others. For the sake of ontological security, states need a sense of agency with relations that they construct. They look for stable cognitive environment, and they are in search of stable social relations with the world. With their relations, they overcome uncertainty and fulfill their identities.

In the first decade of its founding, Turkey was busy to search for ontological security. It had to adapt itself in changing times and was fully occupied by defining and formulating its identity. In constructivist terms, state identities cannot be constructed in isolation, rather intersubjectively (Zarakol, 2010). Thus, recognition of a state identity by other states is a necessity for elimination of uncertainty. It also directly enables the approval of existence and its being into a world which brings the notion of ontological security. To be recognized, Turkey sought a new status which not only differentiated itself from the predecessor for the international position but also helped processing state formation in the domestic



context. Moreover, every step taken in early Turkish Republic can be considered for prevailing state identity and state formation. In line with this aim, the founders of the Republic formulated the new state's biographical narrative as "New Turkey". Consequently, the biographical narrative served the reaffirmation of national community in Turkey's domestic context whereas it also served the search for status and recognition of Turkey's national standing to the international arena.

3. INTERNATIONAL BEHAVIOR OF THE STATE

From the old Empire to the new Republic, the identity of Turkish state had changed especially in the state-being while sharing some continuities. While the changes were on the side of ontological side such as the status and recognition of the new state; the continuities were mostly on physical side based on the geopolitical legacies coming from the old state. Therefore, the new state had to adjust its identity with precaution in an uncertain world after being among the losers of the World War I. Moreover, the founders of the new state had to prove to the world that the Republic was a new state entity whose identity could not be treated with the same way as the old one. They concentrated on recognition of the new state's being as a sovereign entity with Lausanne Peace treaty (Malkoç, 2023). By doing that, they did not only give a birth of a new state in de jure sense, but they also aimed to consolidate its identity in de facto. Moreover, the new state was also recognized as an independent state that peaceful and status-quo character in international behavior disposing of a dependent state status so called as sick man of Europe (Arıboğan & Odabaşı, 2023).

Despite these changes, New Turkey had to deal with some structural continuities on its identity adjustment in international arena and the geopolitical consciousness coming from the Ottoman past were at the top of the continuities' list. Firstly, it dealt with the definition of geopolitical fears and threats which have been based on identity formulation and international behavior of the state and Russia had always been a significant other for both state identities. While it did not mean the new state had been sharing anti-Russian identity in international arena, the decision makers of New Turkey to be consider Russia's steps in precaution for the new state's stabile geopolitical continuation. Following that, the defensive character of the geopolitical orientation was also another contribution to the new state from the old one, though in a different sense. While the old one's pro-defensive character used to be geopolitical necessity losing its material power, the new one's defensive character were contributed to its peaceful and status character in international behavior.

Continuities from the old state to the new one

Turkish national anthem starts with a direction: "No fear!". Although this statement is moving, it is ambiguous how to know to fear from what. Though, it contributes to fears of existence and continuity of Turkish society and Turkish state in the world; there is no precision in the aim of the national anthem in terms of whether the sources of fear are internal or external. One way or another, figuring out the sources of fear is important for defining Turkish state's personhood, because fear is tightly related to identity. As Campbell (1992, s. 85) argued "A notion of what 'we' are is intrinsic to an understanding of what 'we' fear". According to this, the definition of fear clarifies the ontological question of who Turkey is. Furthermore, Giddens (1991, p.43) defines fear in modern societies as "a response to a specific threat and therefore has definite object". Adopting this view to the international behavior of the state, it requires defining Turkey's fears by observing long-term specific threats. Thus, observation of geography and history gives long traditions of what specific threats are. As Aydın (2003) posed, Turkey inherited its heartland from the Ottoman Empire, which means Turkey had to deal with inherited geopolitical fears from the Empire. As a matter of fact, sharing geopolitical fears with its predecessor played a major role on security enhancement of New Turkey, whereas dealing with anxieties in an uncertain world was a new exam for the new state.

First, Turkey had to deal with physical security requirements coming from long-term geopolitical fears in the first decade of its existence. Russia had been a specific threat with an object of expansionism into the territory and sovereignty of Turkey. Tzarist Russia and Ottoman Empire faced many times in the



past causing Ottoman loses. Thereby, Ottomans' geopolitical experience with Russians left a legacy to the new state. The threat of Russia was in the forefront of survival issues transmitted from the old state to the new one. Moreover, as an entity searching for its continual identity in uncertain international arena; the new state was certain what it fears. Geopolitical experience with Russia made Turkish state identity pursuing intimate relations towards specific fears in its international behavior. To overcome the fears, it pursued sustainable relations with Russians not to face similar experiences. Due to the heritage from the old state, Russia was significant other for improving relations of the new state's survival and existence. That is why Soviet Russia was the first state for the New Turkey to deal with not only policy considerations but also eliminating fears for its continuity. That also explains why New Turkey was highly defensive and precautious for constructing close relations and signing non-aggression treaties with Russia. Under the light of this, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk posed that "we were developing intimate and progressive relations with our old friend Soviet Russian Republic each passing day", at Turkish Grand National Assembly 2nd term opening in November 1924 (Gürün, 1983). Though, Atatürk had known Russians as friend for Turks, his declaration aimed to find sustainable relations with them starting from that time to the future, without any reference to the past. Also, this declaration reflected that the new state is different from the old one; hesitate any conflictual scenario with Russians rather akin to consolidating peaceful relations with them. Following this, Turkey and Russia signed non-aggression pact in December 1925. Russia was one of the most important sources of fear that shaped international behavior of the new state. Yet, there was also another continuing element from the old state to the new one: awareness of being powerless in international arena geopolitically.

Secondly, the defensive character of the Turkish Republic's foreign policy in the 1920s had roots going back before the Republic period. As mentioned before, it is not wrong to argue that international behavior of the state regarding geopolitical fears was inherited from the Ottoman Empire. Turkey had a defensive realpolitik culture in its security and foreign policy comprehension, and this could be traced back to the late 17th century, the period in which the Ottoman Empire started to diminish (Karaosmanoğlu, 2003). This necessitated orienting the old state's geopolitics towards a defensive sense from the offensive one. The defensive character of new state in international arena during the early republican period followed the same pattern. Turkey did not seek any geopolitical revisionism or indicate any sign of offensive foreign policy rather than saving its own territories. The determinants of Atatürk's foreign policy consolidation could be summed up as "prioritization of peace" and "sovereignty over expansionist-revisionism" (Aydın, 2010), moreover nothing more was deserved or imagined. Non-expansionism can be seen as one of the continuities of the old state, which started with the Treaty of Karlowitz (1699) and continued in the Turkish Republic's early 1920s. Being defensive, as a state identity, was one of the leading characteristics shared by the old and new states to understand the continuing international behavior of the state.

On the other hand, time was changing for the new state. To adapt itself to changing environments, Turkey looked to define its ontological security for the sake of its struggle for existence. In other words, it had to prove its 'being' in the world and receive approval from international society.

Changes of the new state

Together with the continuities, there were also requirements for change in New Turkey's geography due to the uncertain internal and external dimensions. In a basic sense, the sources of threats were not clear from time to time, and this made the new state being anxious uncommon. That is why new state had to overcome difficult critical conjunctures in the early 1920s. Dealing with each conjuncture brought new state some maturity, created a self-consciousness mechanism for its stable identity and helped the consolidation of its status in the international arena.

To begin with, at first glance, time and space that the new state had to live changed. The new state had to define and consolidate its ontological security after the ruined conditions of the Ottoman Empire. In other words, as a new state, the Turkish Republic had to construct its new identity besides necessities of state formation. The purpose of the narrative of New Turkey, used by state elites, targeted internal organization of the state and international behavior of the state at the same time.



First, New Turkey overcame a critical conjuncture of recognition starting from 1920. New state announced its territorial borders in the National Pact (*Misak-ı Milli*) on January 28, 1920, in reference to the Wilson Principles, and denounced Sevres Treaty which the old state had signed. By doing this, New Turkey was indicating that it was different from the old one meaning that it should not have been treated like the old one (Ertan, 2023).

After defining its territory, the new state sought to make its status recognized internationally. Signing Treaty of Lausanne (1923) assured some degree of sovereignty and security in the international arena (Soysal, 2000). Attributed to Atatürk's popular phrase "Peace at home and peace in the world" indicated that Turkey had no geopolitical orientation rather than protection of its own territories which had been declared in the National Pact. Consequently, changes of the state were mainly made according to criteria of a nation state: sovereignty and territoriality; and in the first decade, it completed its being into the world by differentiating itself from the old one, by presenting itself as the new one.

When the process is tracked for the international behavior, it is clearly observable that New Turkey started to evolve from the 1920s to the 1930s with some nuances. In the first decade of the Republic, the state elites were fully occupied with defining and reaffirming Turkey's state identity and completing state formation. seeking independent status (Millman, 1995) Moreover, the decision makers of New Turkey sight ontological security by international law and had run from signing pact to the treaties of friendships, since defensive foreign policy was the only viable option for avoiding physical and ontological security entanglements. However, with the beginning of the second decade, defensive character of the state evolved.

Different from the Ottoman Empire's entrance in the World War I, early Turkish Republic was not dragged into the events by any superior power, and a concrete example was the pre-World War II period. Starting from 1934, Turkey presumed that the international context was transforming like the prewar era and the new state had to prove that it would not share the same fate as the old one did. It had an independent status that could not be oppressed and even damaged. Observing the international context and acting reciprocally were crucial tools to preserve its new status and fulfilling self-consciousness.

From Turkey's perspective, Mussolini's speech in the fascism congress on promoting geopolitical expansionism in Asia, Africa and the Mediterranean Sea was initial sign of pre-war period (T.C. Dışişleri Bakanlığı, 1973). After this statement, Atatürk showed Turkey's assurance on promoting its status of self-consciousness by upholding its nuanced defensive international behavior. Making a tour at the Turkey's Mediterranean coast on a destroyer escorted with a military torpedo boat was a crucial example of Turkey's self-consciousness (Millman, 1995). Following this, Atatürk also welcomed Mussolini's ambassador by wearing a military uniform and stated: "Now you can continue talking about Italy's claims on Mediterranean ambassador!" (Millman, 1995, p. 487). Those examples indicated that the particular state identity of New Turkey was changing, and the fascist Italy should not have confused it with the memories of the past. In other words, unless New Turkey should have been recognized with the same way of the European states, it would have kept all reserves to protect its status.

Consequently, starting from the 1930s, Turkey's position in the international arena started to change. State's international behavior of was still defensive but it evolved to be more self-confident and self-conscious. As Gürün (1983) proposed, foreign-policy makers must make the most rational decisions based on the given situations, but they are expected to presume the results of their decisions in the future and beware of being dragged into. The decision makers of Turkish Republic differentiated new state from the old one, since they concentrated more on seeking respected status in the international arena and promoted sovereignty by observing the circumstances with prudence and precaution which reflected as self-consciousness character of being a Turkish state.

4. INTERNAL ORGANIZATION OF THE STATE

Starting from 1920s, the international behavior of the state evolved to be more self-confident and self-conscious, because there were a lot of successful developments in the internal organization of the state.



Although there are many principles taught in Turkish high schools and universities to understand early Republican period, the most prominent figures have become patriotism and economic factors in İnönü's official speeches (İlhan, 2003). The reason behind the frequent use of these two figures can be suggested as İnönü's own intentional preference for the representation of Turkish self-identity. Firstly, self-identity of the state was consolidated with patriotism. People living on the boundaries of the National Pact started to become citizens of New Turkey and they began to have a sense of belonging to the territory. In short, people started to be proud of being a member of New Turkey. Following this, the state was also enabled to strengthen its economy which paved the way towards the financial independence of the state.

Patriotism

There is another important statement in the national anthem related to the need for continuity of being: "I have lived free since eternity, I live free". Although it is unclear whether the Turks have lived in freedom throughout history, this statement presumes that self-conscious component of being a Turk is having an identity to be proud of. In line with this, the clear thing is that this statement has directly been related to the establishment and continuation of the new Turkish identity. Until the end of the 19th century, peoples of the Empire had not been known with their freedom. On the other hand, New Turkey desired incorporation of free and independent people within itself. In the old state, Ottomanism had been forefront biographical narrative that formed political entity of the multinational empire (Al, 2016). However, losing territories not only enforced change in the identity of the state but also led people to consider and embrace Turkish identity.

The identity of New Turkey fundamentally based on 'being independent' narrative as clearly stated in the national anthem. This was formed during the struggle for national independence after the World War I. There were losses of territories in Africa, Balkans and the Middle East, and people of the empire questioned and criticized their belonging to the old state. All those losses were followed by the 1919 War of Independence and resulted as emergence of Turkish self-identity, which was later consolidated during 1920s and 1930s. This identity was directly related to commitment to the territory. As a result, like Bentham's definition of character of nation state, stating that territories gained national character with wars; the Turkish people gained their identity by defending their territories. If there was one word to summarize Turkish identity, it would have been 'adopted patriotism', nothing more.

As Ahmad (2006) argued in reference to Atatürk's words, Turkish identity was based on the people who gained their independence by defending the homeland and encompassed the people who came from different nationalities. Two factors are important for this assumption. The first one is, as mentioned, encompassing of Turkish identity to the different nationalities. Another factor can be noticed as 'gaining'. It refers that the lands were not taken for granted but they were gained thanks to defending people. In other words, Turkish identity was constructed as umbrella attributing to the people's experience of national defense. As a result, no matter where they came or originated, people who defended their lands and their independence were accepted as Turkish citizens and different nationalities were transfused into Turkish identity.

Atatürk was not alone in the reaffirmation of Turkish patriotism narrative in his official speeches during ceremonies. Starting from the 1930s, Prime Minister İsmet İnönü had often promoted this narrative in his speeches. According to İnönü, patriotism was the fundamental characteristic of a nation state that clarified its boundaries, and Turkish people should not have overlooked the idea that Turkish patriotism was the most powerful notion to protect the Turkish territories (İlhan, 2003). In addition, İnönü also mentioned Turkish patriotism referring to the War of Independence in terms of 'Turkish Revolutions'. By doing that, he aimed to differentiate the new state from the old one: "Turkish Revolution found its existence against the Ottoman order which attempted the submission of the country to the foreigners" (İlhan, 2003, s. 64). This statement explains there was a conscious preference of defense of the new state, while the old state had not. In other words, New Turkey had not ever chosen the submission of the country in contrast to the old state, thus the Ottoman order did not indicate such motivation, and it chose not to defend and being doomed.



In the domestic context, New Turkey tried to consolidate Turkey's identity with narratives of Turkish patriotism. Turkish patriotism gained its meaning as being free and independent and it was followed by the defense of territories which old state could not achieve. In this context, Turkish patriotism was important for approval of its existence and recognition of Turkish people and continuation of Turkish identity for the future. As it is stated before, New Turkey had a defensive character in her international behavior but making people ready for national defense in any possible confrontation was an indispensable notion of internal organization of the Turkish state.

Economic factors

Declaration of financial independence was important cornerstone of New Turkey. It was necessary for new state's persistent and stable identity. As a new state, having continual fiscal policies was indispensable for recognition and promotion of its status in the international arena. To reach these aims, gaining economic independence was a necessity at the international level, thus New Turkey constructed its economic base with appropriate tools consciously.

New Turkey had sought consolidation of independent mechanisms since the Lausanne Treaty. As Deringil (1994) argued, İnönü declared "I can never accept economic serfdom for my country!" in Lausanne. With this declaration, he intended to construct independent Turkish identity for every aspect of political organization of the state and economic factors were at the top of the list on the state identity agenda.

In the opening ceremony of Izmir Economic Congress, New Turkey was defined as 'economic state' (*iktisat devleti*), rather than using the adjective of world conqueror (*cihangir*). This identification was not any coincidence, the founders of New Turkey was precautious on material and non-material capabilities of the state and was suspicious about the financial interaction in foreign affairs.

As a first step of economic factors, the new state aimed differentiation of itself from the old one not only on the articulation of financial independence but also its implementation. Nationalization of economic means was at the top of the agenda on economic policy. Due to the legacies of Ottoman past, the new state had to abide by the old state's regulations of tariffs for almost two decades. Privileges given to the foreign traders were in force during the first decade of the Turkish Republic, such that independence from them was gained years later after the foundation. For instance, the coastal trade was nationalized in 1926 whereas the last privileges on railroad transportation ended in 1947. According to Deringil (1994), Turkish policy makers were always suspicious of the intentions of the foreigners due to experiences of plots and outrages in the Ottoman past. Therefore, having suspicions about the foreigners was another heritage from the old state. To eliminate the old suspicions and to prevent new state from possible experiences like the old state had endured, the new state sought to strengthen the economy through nationalization of economic means.

Secondly, having a stable economy was thought to be complementary to financial independence, and that should have been adopted by the Turkish people. As İnönü posed, stability in the economy was one of the prominent figures among us that proved New Turkey's existence in the international arena. Therefore, for the policy makers of New Turkey, strengthening the economy would also bring consolidation and continuation of Turkish state identity, and this should have been understood by each Turkish citizen. Under the light of this, Turkish citizens were frequently informed about the adoption of financial independence and the protection of national money. For the protection of the value of national money, hesitation from becoming indebted was the first tool. İnönü highlighted this statement in almost every speech of his opening ceremonies for the new factories. For instance, at the opening of the *Ergani* copper factory, İnönü said that the focal point of our economy was self-sufficiency, and we had to talk about it with each of our citizens. Our new state had one and only option for having a sustainable financial order, which was the adoption of conscious and self-sufficient economic policy by all our citizen. Consequently, giving importance to financial independence was important not only for Turkish state identity at the international level, but also for Turkish identity at the domestic level.



For the sake of financial independence, the final factor was the protection of the value of national money. If national money was protected and conserved, it would also lead to the existence of Turkish state identity by improving Turkish state legitimacy in the international arena. On the one hand, New Turkey's policy makers thought that there was a direct relation between the people's trust in the state and the protection of national money; if the trust mechanism between the state and society was formulated, the value of national money would be protected and Turkey would become self-sufficient towards foreigners, which would directly increase Turkish national security. On the other hand, there were tremendous attempts to industrialize the country to achieve financial independence. Railroad stations, iron-steel factories and nationalization of coalfields were important economic sectors for creating Turkish industry, followed by cotton and sugar beet industries. As a matter of fact, the establishment and nationalization of industrial factories were important means of becoming a self-sufficient state. Moreover, industrialization also contributed to the notion of an established civilization. Accordingly, İnönü articulated that a modern nation cannot exist without industry; thus, industry was the main hope for civilization, and this took place thanks to the Republic regime and her financial independence policies.

5. CONCLUSION

Given that knowing the relationship between a state's identity and security depends on knowing how states have told their biographical stories, the current study adopted a descriptive method to examine Turkey's deliberate pursuit of ontological security throughout the early Turkish Republic period, with a special emphasis on the relationship between state behavior and states' biographical narratives. With a focus on state change and continuity, it covered domestic policy as well as the state's external interactions with the world, and causal inferences based on Turkey's quest for ontological security are provided under foreign policy and domestic political structure.

Turkish Republic was a new state that sought recognition in international arena with differentiation of itself from the old state and presentation of its new identity. Despite there were some historical continuities for state identity coming from geography and history; new state gave many efforts to adopt the changes and dealing with the uncertainties. Moreover, the decision makers focused the changes for the consolidation of state's identity along with the state formation, and the biographical narrative of the New Turkey has been a potent instrument to illuminate those processes. Analyzing its use defined Turkey's pursuit of ontological security as well as the state's existence in the following ways: it explained the concerns that underlie international action and establishes the economy and patriotism that support the state's internal structure.

In summary, the present study argues that the decision makers of early Turkish Republic period not only sought physical continuity of Turkish state but also psychological continuity of Turkish identity and Turkish self-identity, which can be understood by adopting ontological security. While the Turkish identity can be observed in international behavior of the state, the Turkish self-identity can be observed thorough internal organization of the state. Given continuities with its predecessor, New Turkey has struggled to differentiate itself from the past with its Turkish identity through the effort to prove its sovereignty by receiving approval from international society and with its Turkish self-identity by forming a desired Turkish self with patriotism and financial independence.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, F. (2006). *Bir kimlik peşinde Türkiye*. İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Al, S. (2016). Young Turks, Old State. In M. H. Yavuz, & F. Ahmad, *War and Collapse: World War I and the Ottoman State* (pp. 135-160). Salt Lake City: The University of Utah Press.
- Arıboğan, D. Ü., & Odabaşı, H. Y. (2023). Psikopolitik işlevi açısından Lozan Anlaşması'nı nasıl okumalı? *Toplumsal Tarih*, 355, 47-51.
- Aydın, M. (2003). Securitization of history an geography: Understanding of security in Turkey. *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, 3(2), 163-184.



Aydın, M. (2010). Determinants of Turkish foreign policy: Changing patterns and conjunctures during the Cold War. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 36(1), 103-139.

Berenskoetter, F. (2014). Parameters of a national biography. *European Journal of International Relations*, 20(1), 262-288.

Buzan, B. (1991). *People, states and fear: An agenda for international security studies in the post-Cold War era*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Pub.

Campbell, D. (1992). *Writing security: United States foreign policy and the politics of identity*. Mineapolis: University of Minnesota.

Deringil, S. (1994). *Denge Oyunu: İkinci Dünya Savaşı'nda Türkiye'nin dış politikası*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.

Ertan, T. F. (2023). Lozan Konferansında Türkiye: İmparatorluğu ihya etmek mi, bağımsız bir devlet kurmak mı? *Toplumsal Tarih*, 355, 20-25.

Gülbak, O. (2018). *Turkey's Syria policy during the AK party era: From desecuritization to securitization*. (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Marmara Üniversitesi.

Gürün, K. (1983). *Dış ilişkiler ve Türk politikası (1939'dan günümüze kadar)*. Ankara: Ankara Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları.

Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity self and society in the late modern age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gustafsson, K. (2016). Recognising recognition through thick and thin: Insights from Sino-Japanese relations. *Cooperation and Conflict*, 51(3), 255-271.

Hale, W. (2013). *Turkish foreign policy since 1774*. London and Newyork: Routledge.

Hopf, T. (2002). *Social construction of international politics: Identities & foreign policies, Moscow, 1955 and 1999*. New York: Cornell University Press.

İlhan, K. T. (2003). *İsmet İnönü: Konuşma, demeç, makale, mesaj ve söyleşiler: 1933-1938*. Ankara: TBMM Kültür, Sanat ve Yayın Kurulu Yayınları No: 98.

Karaosmanoğlu, A. L. (2000). The evolution of the national security culture and the military in Turkey. *Journal of International Affairs*, 54(1), 199-216.

Krickel-Choi, N. C. (2022). State personhood and ontological security as a framework of existence: moving beyond identity, discovering sovereignty. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 1-20.

Malkoç, E. (2023). Pandora'nın kutusu açıldı mı? *Toplumsal Tarih*, 355, 10-11.

Millman, B. (1995). Turkish foreign and strategy policy 1934-1942. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 31(3), 483-508.

Mitzen, J. (2006). Ontological security in world politics: State identity and the security dilemma. *European Journal of International Relations*, 12(3), 341-370.

Murray, M. (2019). *The struggle for recognition in international relations: Status, revisionism, and rising powers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.



- Rumelili, B. (2015). Identity and desecuritisation: the pitfalls of conflating ontological and physical security. *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 18(1), 52–74.
- Rumelili, B., & Adısönmez, U. C. (2020). Uluslararası ilişkilerde kimlik-güvenlik ilişkisine dair yeni bir paradigma: Ontolojik güvenlik teorisi. *Uluslararası İlişkiler*, 17(66), 23-39.
- Soysal, İ. (2000). *Türkiye'nin siyasal andlaşmaları 1. Cilt (1920-1945)*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.
- Steele, J. B. (2008). *State, ontological security in international relations: Self-identity and IR*. New York: Routledge.
- Subotic, J. (2015). Narrative, ontological security, and foreign policy change. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 12(4), 1-18.
- Subotic, J., & Steele, B. (2021). History and memory: Narratives, micropolitics and crises . In B. d. Carvalho, J. C. Lopez, & H. Leira, *Routledge handbook of historical international relations* (pp. 503-511). London and New York: Routledge.
- T.C. Dışişleri Bakanlığı, A. S. (1973). *Türk dış politikasında 50 yıl: Montreux ve savaş yılları (1935-1939)*.
- Turan, İ. K. (2003). *İsmet İnönü: Konuşma, demeç, makale, mesaj ve söyleşiler*. Ankara: TBMM Kültür, Sanat ve Yayın Kurulu Yayınları .
- Zarakol, A. (2010). Ontological (in)security and state denial of historical crimes: Turkey and Japan. *International Relations*, 24(1), 3-23.